THE HELMSMAN AND THE CHARIOTEER IN THE *AENEID*: EMBLEMS OF POWER

by

GAIL CECELIA POLK

(Under the Direction of Sarah Spence)

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that although in the *Aeneid* Vergil engages extensively with the textual tradition to develop Aeneas' role as helmsman and Turnus' as charioteer into emblems of their contrasting leadership, he subsequently interweaves into the text evidence of this distinction's instability and concludes with its reversal. Chapter 2 discusses the relevance of both Cicero's community-centered helmsman and politicians he implies are charioteers unable to restrain their passions to the *Aeneid*'s two leaders and recent history and attitudes toward the Triumph. Chapter 3 argues that Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*, the story of an internecine war, in which Eteocles is a figurative helmsman with polis-centered values, while Polynices and his chariot-driving, attacking forces connote future brutal domination, is an important unrecognized intertext for the *Aeneid.* In the development of the two emblematic images in the *Aeneid*'s first half (Ch. 4), Juno's affiliation with the chariot is established in the context of Achilles' excessive brutality. Mnestheus' speech to his crew in the ship race engages with that of the *Iliad*'s charioteer Antilochus to express the salient differences in values of helmsman and charioteer in the *Aeneid*. The three-way intertextual dialogue between Aeneas, Palinurus and Odysseus, prepares for the substitution of Aeneas for his helmsman, but also highlights Palinurus' misfortune, while the nature of his sacrificial death evokes the Ciceronian selfless helmsman. Chapter 5 discusses the contribution of Argonautic traces to the construction of the ambivalence of Latinus and his kingdom, symbolically manifested in his ominous gift to Aeneas of fire-breathing horses and a chariot, as well as the intertextual presence of *Septem*'s warriors among those in the Latin catalogue. Although the linking of Aeneas' ship of state in his approach to battle with that of Augustus receives immortal confirmation

(Chapter 6), his subsequent rage-driven domination of suppliant Latin charioteers is incongruous and exhibits similarities with Turnus' tyrannical behavior in the scene of Pallas' death. Significant changes in the heroes' public speech (Ch. 7) and their exchanging of characteristics in book 12 (Ch. 8) prepare for Turnus' allusive likening to Odysseus, foreshadowing his death, and Aeneas' figurative assumption of the role of charioteer.

INDEX WORDS: Vergil, *Aeneid,* Aeschylus, *Seven Against Thebes*, Political Imagery, Helmsman, Charioteer, Cicero

THE HELMSMAN AND THE CHARIOTEER IN THE *AENEID*: EMBLEMS OF POWER

by

GAIL CECELIA POLK

BA, Pennsylvania State University, 1971

MA, Pennsylvania State University, 1973

MA, University of Georgia, 1994

A Dissertaton Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

© 2013

Gail Cecelia Polk

All Rights Reserved

THE HELMSMAN AND THE CHARIOTEER IN THE *AENEID*: EMBLEMS OF POWER

by

GAIL CECELIA POLK

Major Professor:	Sarah Spence
Committee:	James McGregor Ronald Bogue Charles Platter Anthony Corbeill

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2013

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate my dissertation to my father, Stuart Patton, who has been for me the very best life-long model of and advocate for the value of investigative research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I arrived at the point of being able to conceive and execute this project, first, thanks to members of the Latin faculty of the University of Georgia's Department of Classics, Richard LaFleur (my Master's thesis advisor), Robert Curtis (from whom I learned a love of Cicero's Latin) and James Anderson (teacher of the monuments of Rome *par excellence*), who have written me countless letters of recommendation for jobs, summer travel grants and graduate school. The opportunity to teach Vergil's *Aeneid* and readings in Cicero at Athens Academy for seventeen years deepened my appreciation of these authors, while a summer spent at the American School in Athens led directly to my desire to study their Greek antecedents. Again, Georgia's Department of Classics provided me with excellent teachers of Greek literature to whom I feel a great debt of gratitude: Charles Platter, Nancy Felson, Nick Rynearson (who also served on my comprehensive exam committee) and Brett Rogers. Georgia's Department of Comparative Literature not only provided me an academic home to pursue a doctorate, but also instruction in literary criticism and theory, which have so significantly informed the study of Greek and Latin literature. I am especially grateful to Ronald Bogue, Dorothy Figueira and James McGregor for their instruction and help in this area. Richard Tarrant generously provided me early access to a part of his wonderful commentary on *Aeneid* 12 and Stanley Lombardo read and commented on several sections of the dissertation. The opportunity to have the criticism and advice of so distinguished a doctoral committee—Ronald Bogue, Anthony Corbeill, James McGregor and Charles Platter—has been one of the greatest benefits of earning a doctorate. But I am especially grateful to my advisor Sarah Spence. A comparatist and classicist she has brought not only her years as a highly successful teacher and scholar to the reading of my dissertation, but also her ample experience as an editor. Without her knowledge and appreciation of the *Aeneid* and the questions it raises and her insightful and wise criticism the completion of this dissertation is difficult for me to imagine. My husband, Tom Polk, not ony financed the last stage of my studies, but also tolerated the vast amount of time I devoted to them. I have no doubt that I also

owe the completion of this degree to the ever-ready help of the secretaries in the Departments of Comparative Literature (Nell Burger and Sharon Brooks) and Classics (Kay Stanton and JoAnn Pulliam). To all of the above I wish to express my heartfelt thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

CHAPTER

1 Introduction 1

2 Cicero's Engagement with the Platonic Helmsman and Charioteer 13

Plato: The Democratic Ship of State 13

Cicero: The Republican Ship of State 21

Cicero and the *Phaedrus* 45

The Unbridled Dark Horse and Charioteer 53

The Case of Marc Antony 60

The Roman Triumph 63

3 Helmsmen and Charioteers in the Greek Literary Tradition 86

The Epic Tradition: The Domains of Athena and Poseidon 87

The Youthful Charioteer: Hippolytus 93

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: The Ship of State 105

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: The Chariot Ensemble 128

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: Figurative Interaction 140

4 The Developing Political Dialogue: Charioteers and Helmsmen *Aeneid* 1-6 148

Opening Scenes: The Storm 149

Juno's Chariot 156

Juno's Charioteers: Aeolus and Achilles 165

Chariots in the Vergilian Underworld 179

The Ship Race and Communal *Pietas* 187

The Good Helmsman: Palinurus and Aeneas 202

5 Latium, its King and Charioteers: The Beginning of the War 225

The Arrival of the Trojans in Latium: Conflicting Signs 227

Ocean Storms of Latin War Frenzy 250

The Latin Catalogue and Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* 263

Equine Finale: Virbius, Turnus and Camilla 276

The Heroes' Shields: Io the Victim, Augustus the Helmsman 290

6 The Augustan Helmsman and Despotic Charioteer: Divergence and Unity 303

Cybele and the *Aeneid*'s Ship of State 305

The War Chariot and the Tyrant 325

Aeneas *Victor* and the Latin Charioteers 336

The Voyage of Turnus 354

7 The Ethos of the Leaders in Public Speech 361

Aeneas 363

Turnus 373

8 The Helmsman and Charioteer in Book 12: Reversal 403

Thracian Turnus 405

The Chariot and the Palace 414

The Chariot and the City 426

Another Storm and a New Charioteer 440

The Theban Maidens Worst Fear 445

The Wild Olive and the Sea 452

9 Conclusion 465

REFERENCES…….. 476

APPENDICES

A Chariots in the *Aeneid* 492

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Any reader of the *Aeneid* will notice that Aeneas spends much of the narrative onboard ship and that Vergil's presentation of him on the ship at times seems to encourage more than a literal interpretation of his role. Aeneas is the captain of the flagship of the Trojan fleet, but when his helmsman Palinurus falls from the ship, succumbing to the influence of the god Somnus, Aeneas takes over the piloting of the ship in a nighttime scene full of mystery. Neptune has decreed Palinurus' sacrificial death (*unum pro multis*) for the Trojans' safe passage to Italy and upon his loss Aeneas accomplishes the helmsman's task even without the steering oar, almost magically, adding to the otherworldly quality of the scene. Even though the Trojans arrive at the coast of Italy at the beginning of book 6 and the majority of the Trojans are finished with ship travel at the beginning of book 7, Aeneas continues to sail his ship up the Tiber to Pallanteum and back to his camp at the mouth of the Tiber from Etruria, despite the logistical problems this presents.[1] Only as Aeneas enters the war well into book 10 does he finally leave his ship. His approach to camp on the eve of battle now specifically manning the helm reaches a climactic expression of his figurative helmsmanship when he raises his shield,[2] which depicts Augustus at its center also on the stern of a ship, but at the battle of Actium, leading the senate and the Roman people into battle. Both generals are approaching decisive battles, but their position at the stern of the ship (*stans celsa in puppi*, 10. 261; 8. 680), the place from which the helmsman steers, implies that both ships are also in some way an expression of the figurative ship of state,[3] although specific implications for either Aeneas' or

---

[1] Vergil leaves unresolved how Aeneas' ship, which he leaves in Pallanteum as he departs on horse (his only time

[2] Hardie (1987), 169: "The good king in person, sleepless in his care for his people, steers the ship of state (217f)."

[3] The ship of state is traditionally identified as an allegory from the time of Heraclitus' *Homeric Problems* (first century A. D., 5. 3-9) who includes Alcaeus' poem among a series of allegories of the ship of state. The Roman rhetoricians also consider the ship of state an example of allegory in the traditional sense of "a sustained metaphor" (Cic. *De Or.* 3. 166-67; Quin. 8. 6. 44; also see Obbink, 2010, 16). Hunter (2012), 68-89, in a discussion of Plato's ship of state within previous and contemporary versions of the ship of state refers to the figure as an "image" based on Plato's use of εἰκών (488a1, 489a4). Demetrius (probably first century B. C.; *Eloc.* 78) considers the leader

Augustus' leadership are not immediately obvious. Vergil also makes memorable the Trojans association with the ship by creating a ship race in place of a chariot race for Anchises' funeral games, the only such race among ancient epics, in which he foregrounds the good and bad leadership of the captains/helmsmen and the consequences, which foreshadow some of the leaders' actions in the future war in Latium. It is striking, then, that no Latin or Rutulian ever sails in a ship, with the exception of Turnus whom Juno lures out of battle to achieve a temporary reprieve from Aeneas and whom she renders completely powerless.[4]

The exclusivity of the chariot to the Latin side of the war is completely without exception (see Appendix A). Although both the Trojans and Greeks used chariots in the *Iliad*, as Troilus' chariot on Juno's temple in Carthage attests, they are completely absent from the Trojan side in Latium and Heinze's (1903/1993, 159) explanation for their lack ("presumably on the grounds that Aeneas and his followers will not have brought chariots across the sea with them") not only attributes an uncharacteristic fastidiousness to Vergil in such matters,[5] but overlooks other indications that the chariot conveys special meaning in the *Aeneid*. Turnus appears in the chariot more often than any other Latin leader (15 times), while the greatest concentration of words referring to the chariot (9 in 25 lines) are found in the descriptions of Aeneas' dominating defeat of three Latin charioteers in book 10 (see Appendix A). Just as distinctive as its presence is the chariot's absence when it would be expected. For example, among the parade of Roman descendants in the Underworld, the vast majority of whom drove chariots in a triumph, the most prestigious award a man could achieve in Rome, only Memmius, whose victory over Corinth is presented as restitution for the Trojan war, drives a chariot and while Augustus appears at the helm of his ship on Aeneas' shield, the pendant scene of his triumphal celebration does not mention a chariot. Nor

---

alone as helmsman or charioteer a metaphor. He gives the following as an example of a metaphor that is not far-fetched: a "general, pilot and charioteer share the resemblance that they are all leaders. So a safe expression will be a general as 'pilot of the city.'"

[4] But since the war between the Trojans and Latins is fought exclusively on land, the almost total monopoly of ship travel by the Trojan foreigners by itself is perhaps not surprising.

[5] See above note 1 and also consider Vergil's anachronistic use of triremes (introduced in the 6th century B. C. outside Greece) in the (much earlier, c. 12th century) ship race (5. 119-20) and cavalry in the war (Horsfall, 2003, Appendix I, 472).

does Jupiter appear in a chariot, even though he does in the *Iliad* and for centuries was represented driving a *quadrigae* (four-horsed chariot) on the roof of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Aeneas, Augustus and Jupiter almost seem to have been protected from the implications of the chariot in the *Aeneid*. Yet, even though the alignment of the ship with the Trojans (especially Aeneas) and the chariot with the Latins (particularly Turnus) predominates in the second half of the epic, there are numerous indications, both subtle and otherwise, of the vehicles' comparability, the most conspicuous of which is Neptune's sea-chariot in the opening sequence of the epic.

The scene of Neptune in his sea-chariot calming the storm that Juno has sent against Aeneas and the Trojans is arguably the most important appearance of the chariot in the *Aeneid*; the god is compared to a mortal calming mob violence that opens the narrative to the contemporary Roman political context and both god and statesman (with whom Aeneas is linked via their *pietas*; 1.10, 151) are associated with the paradigmatic values of order, *pietas* and rationality against the chaos, *furor* and irrationality of Juno. Is this conflated vehicle—a chariot that moves through the waves, like the one Octavian as Neptune drives on a carved cameo—a better image of leadership for Aeneas, one of integration instead of confrontation? If so, what of the indications of the antagonistic vehicles that seem more appropriate to the opposing values the storm sequence presents? Jumping to the conclusion that Neptune's order-establishing chariot also relates to the currently powerless Aeneas leaves unaddressed his prolonged association with the ship, the novel use of a ship race and the exclusivity of the chariot on the Latin side.[6] The question this dissertation will address is how and especially why these vehicles are disparately related to the two major antagonists and their forces in the war and yet the same vehicles are not only at times presented as comparable, but can actually be conflated, as in Neptune's all-important politically suggestive chariot. A study of Vergil's dialogue with previous texts, an intertextual approach to this problem, has yielded what

[6] For a discussion of the opening storm sequence see Ch. 4. Wilhelm's (1983/4), 75, argument that Vergil's "depiction of the chariot (Neptune's) as an image of order is a visualization of the ideology of imperialism under the reins of the charioteer Augustus" rests in part on the history of the comparability of the job of charioteer and helmsman (as will mine), but he neglects the importance of the ship in the epic and over generalizes or ignores the multiple examples of the chariot that do not fit his positive view of its meaning. He is far from alone in reducing the ship race to a virtual chariot race; again see Ch. 4.

I hope will be seen as "interesting" results,[7] since it has provided increased evidence of the subtlety of Vergilian poetics, of a new system of imagery participating within the epic's overarching thematic paradigm and of sobering political implications in the epic's conclusion. The traces of these previous texts are multiple, but the Greek are especially critical for understanding Vergil's charioteer and helmsman.

A comment in Nestor's speech of advice to his son Antilochus before the chariot race in the *Iliad* is the foundational text for the idea that the charioteer and helmsman are comparable, based on the importance of cunning intelligence for their success, an idea that remained in "the matrix of possibilities constituted by earlier texts" throughout antiquity.[8] Both the chariot and ship were associated with Athena, their creator, and in the *Odyssey* with Poseidon as well, god of the sea and of the horse. Poets did develop different aspects of the chariot and ship around each god, but this only enriched the possible variation in expressions of comparability. Vergil's Neptune,[9] driving a chariot over the sea, signifies something quite different from its Greek precedent, although he still participates in this tradition of the comparability of chariot and ship. But Vergil's allusion to the speech of Antilochus to his horses in the *Iliad*'s chariot race highlights a number of ways in which one helmsman in the *Aeneid* is distinctive.

For the majority of modern scholars, Antilochus' driving in the chariot race and deportment during the awarding of prizes constitutes a successful rite of passage, in which he takes his father Nestor's advice, utilizing cunning to come in second, and argues with skill for the prize he won in his first public speech,[10] but this is not the interpretation the helmsman Mnestheus' speech to his crew during the ship

---

[7] Fowler (1997b), 20, in his important article on the distinctions between the traditional study of allusions and an intertextual approach, acknowledges that the basic arguments over textual correspondences are "unchanged from earlier paradigms. We ask: show me that this is not common, and tell me something interesting." Also on Vergil's intertextuality see Farrell (1997), 222-38.

[8] Fowler's (1997b), 14, characterization of the structuralists' contribution to classicists' study of "parallels;" "meaning is produced within a system (the matrix), not in isolation."

[9] Although authorial intention is typically rejected in intertextuality "because intertextual relations are determined by the textual system, not by the wishes of the author" (Fowler, 1997b, 15), following Hinds (1998), 48-49, who maintains that occluding the author is a kind of fundamentalism, "which privileges readerly reception so single-mindedly as to wish the alluding author out of existence altogether," I have retained the "intention-bearing author, as a discourse which is good to think with" (50).

[10] Himmelhoch (1997), 138-58 with bibliography and Detienne and Vernant (1978), 11-26.

race in book 5, which parallels the structure and topics of Antilochus' speech, supports (Ch. 4). Mnestheus engages the crews' memory of their shared past in Troy and on their long voyage, encourages them with reminders of their future home, shows respect for the gods and is selfless, values which seem by comparison diametrically opposed to Antilochus', which focus on the relentless pursuit of personal glory. The replay of themes from Aeneas' speech to his men when previously shipwrecked on the coast of North Africa also suggests the importance of the allusion to the *Iliad* for Aeneas. In this case the qualities of the charioteer Antilochus in the source-text are "present under erasure," but when "flipped" into prominence they reveal the defining qualities of charioteer and helmsman in the *Aeneid*, which other intertexts confirm, most importantly Aeschylus' tragedy *Seven Against Thebes* (*Septem*).

Aeschylus takes advantage of the common knowledge of the comparability of the charioteer and helmsman, an idea that he activates early in the play with reference to Poseidon as "Lord of horses and ruler of the sea" (131) to capitalize on the connotations that result if these two figures become antagonists as an expression of the warring factions (Ch. 3), a special use of the charioteer and helmsman emblems which I have called interactive because comprehension of meaning requires not only an awareness of what is comparable in the two figures but also reflection on their differences.[11] The tradition of the figures' comparability becomes then an expression of the polis' former and now disrupted unity, which the brothers are threatening to destroy through fighting. Neptune serves Poseidon's function (among others) in the *Aeneid* of announcing the comparability of chariot and ship and Vergil suggests in many ways that the war in Latium is a sort of civil war.[12] The numerous reminders of comparability through metaphor or words common to both vehicles are constant subtle reminders of the divisiveness of civil

[11] Interaction and interactive will only convey this special meaning in reference to the helmsman and charioteer emblems. More commonly in literary theory interaction refers to the process of comparison between narrative and image stimulated by simile or metaphor. See below n. 13 and the extensive treatment in Silk (1974).

[12] For the argument that the *Aeneid* represents the Latin War as a civil war, an archetypal internecine struggle doomed to be repeated at Rome from the originary killing of Remus by Romulus to the civil wars of the first century culminating in Octavian's war against his former brother-in-law, Marc Antony, see Pöschl (1962), 14; Otis (1964), 315; Lyne (1987), 100; Cairns (1989), 92, and Pogorzelski (2009).

war.[13] Eteocles, the current ruler of Thebes, in the first lines of the play represents himself metaphorically as a responsible helmsman and encourages his citizen-soldiers in their defense of the city to honor their responsibilities to the gods, family and polis or state, the traditional three areas associated with Roman and especially Aenean *pietas*, values reflected in Mnestheus' speech to his crew. His brother Polynices is among the Argive forces at that moment driving their (real) chariots in an attack against Thebes, the sound of which terrifies the chorus of Theban maidens who fear their harsh rule should they win,[14] a quality also subtly but strategically implied in the *Aeneid*'s charioteers. Significant parallels both in structure and in the leaders' characters exist in the catalogue of the Latin forces in book 7, many of whom drive chariots (Ch. 5). Aeneas' killing of Turnus, often interpreted as a kind of suicide, in that sense resembles the mutual slaying of the brothers at the play's climax. The Argive charioteer-driving side in *Septem* early in the play is likened to an ocean storm, which later is said to be assailing the ship of state. Vergil develops this combination of charioteer and ocean storm in the epic's initial monumental real storm (Ch. 4) and in a series of figurative storms that accompany both the beginning and end of the war in varied and sometimes complex expressions of the motif, extending the relevance of the interactive images of charioteer and helmsman to the very end of the *Aeneid* (Ch. 8). In short, I hope to prove that Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* is a highly significant unrecognized intertext for the *Aeneid*.

But Vergil also incorporates distinctively Roman aspects into the *Aeneid*'s ship of state that complement and expand the Aeschylean. The ship of state was clearly congenial to Cicero's vision of the Roman state and its helmsman for the figure occurs throughout the course of his writing in letters, speeches and philosophy. His use of the ship of state almost always includes a narrative element (Ch. 2), which expanded with variations and eventually included Cicero himself in an imagined scene on a boat

---

[13] The sense in which I will use metaphor is that of I. A. Richards (1936/1965), 93-94, of "two thoughts of different things active together…whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction." His insistence that meaning in a metaphor is derived from "an intercourse of thoughts, a transaction between contexts," resembles the derivation of meaning from relating the source and target text in intertextuality (Fowler, 1997b, 15). Conte (1986), 53, develops the parallels between metaphor and allusion further: "both require the dynamic functioning of memory" and both are " 'improper' forms of expression…their literary value lies in their capacity to enclose in tension within themselves the gap that extends between their lexical value and the image that they obliquely evoke."

[14] Cameron (1971) in his study of the charioteer and helmsman in *Septem* identified the contrasting implications of charioteer and helmsman.

under a pirate attack (alluded to in the *Aeneid*, see Ch. 4), but a constant and central theme in the Ciceronian ship of state is the helmsman's responsibility for the well-being of the crew on the ship. Bad politicians are demonized as, at first, bad helmsman who will bring certain shipwreck on the state, but then later his greatest adversaries are pirates. Vergil's engagement with Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* has long been recognized in Anchises' eschatology in his speech given to Aeneas in the Underworld, but it is particularly the expression and the personal setting, "a son meets a deceased father and is given a discourse on the role of the statesman" (Feeney, 1986, 2)," that is Ciceronian, narrative elements, and further similarities in their political outlook are becoming more appreciated.[15] Aeneas' assumption of the helmsmanship at the end of book 5 and approach to his camp in book 10 are an important part of the *Aeneid*'s narrative, but the shape of his helmsmanship as developed in Mnestheus' speech in the ship race, especially read through the contrasting intertext of Antilochus' to his team, is Ciceronian in its focus on the community of his crew, who are proleptically called *cives*. Even Cicero's tendency to figure his enemies as failed helmsmen is evident in the ship vying with Mnestheus' to round the turning rock first, that of Sergestus, Catiline's ancestor, which crashes in his wild attempt, a mishap that since the mid-nineteenth-century has been considered an allusion to Catiline's failed conspiracy (Nicoll, 1988). In complicating the use of the ship of state beyond Aeschylus' consistent association of Eteolces alone with the ship of Thebes by the inclusion of a failed helmsman Vergil's use of the image becomes not only more Ciceronian, but also a more accurate reflection of the Roman Republic's contentious competitive vying for office. The confluence of the qualities of the helmsman found in Eteocles', Menestheus' and Cicero's speech form a unified conception of a good helmsman which Aeneas will assume by virtue of the imagery associated with his return to the Trojan camp leading the allied Etrucan fleet (Ch. 6) and as reflected in his public speech (Ch. 7).

In contrast to this picture of complementary amalgamation *Septem*'s charioteers are a varied group and Vergil develops with the same intertextual complexity both the characteristics of the

[15] Johnson (1976), 151 and 178, n. 141, notes similarities in their patriotism and expressions of the ideal city; Zetzel (1996), identifies specific similarities in Cicero and Vergil's political outlook and Connolly (2007), 91, in their love of country.

charioteers as a group—their violence and tyrannical potential—but also some of those distinctive to individual charioteers—the extreme warrior Tydeus represents and deviant otherness of Parthenopaeus, a fair-faced "girl-child" with a mountain dwelling mother. Of these three charioteer types—the tyrannical, the extreme or excessive warrior and the deviant——all of which to some degree share a lack of restrain and predominanting self-concern, that of the extreme warrior is considerably enriched in the *Aeneid* by Iliadic intertexts and plays a dominant initial role and one that is long-lasting. Hera's charioteering in the *Iliad* and her support of Achilles (Ch. 4), alike in their extreme hatred of the Trojans, are prominent in the early lines of the *Aeneid* and Achilles and his chariot, desecrators of Hector's body, a notorious example of excess, pervade the ecphrasis on Juno's temple. While Turnus shares much with Aeschylus' Tydeus in his eagerness for war, allusions to Achilles accentuate the extremity of Turnus' violence in war. The deviant qualities that the Latin catalogue's Virbius, Hippolytus' son, share with Parthenopaeus (Ch. 5), are considerably enriched by additional allusions to the Euripidean Hippolytus, who willfully refuses entry into the responsibilities of adulthood, both marital and political, preferring celibacy and chariot racing instead, and although in his extreme devotion to Artemis he seems to display self-discipline, it is in the pursuit of deviant and civilization-destroying goals. Virbius, in some ways a double of his father, shares many qualities with the catalogue's concluding Amazonian Camilla, but their rejection of marriage for an antisocial alternative life, suggests the failure of marriage aspirations for Turnus, whom Virbius and Camilla flank. Clear Hippolytan types recur in the course of the war to be defeated by Aeneas (Niphaeus, Murranus), but Vergil also expands the youthful charioteers to include a type whose boastfulness causes them to be irresponsibly distracted from their duty to comrades and the war they should be fighting (Aventinus, Turnus). While the Hippolytan charioteer has more indirect relevance for Turnus than the war-appropriate Achillean charioteer, the associations of the tyrant with Turnus and his chariot are suggested with the greatest care.

As the different actual circumstances of the helmsman who works in collaboration with the crew and the charioteer who drives restrained horses would suggest, the connotations of the chariot of state are naturally more authoritarian (Brock, 20013, 57) and its use was somewhat less common in Greece than

the long-lasting ship of state,[16] which is even more the case in Rome (see discussions of the Roman Triumph ceremony, Ch. 2, 4 and 5). But what came to be one of the chief defining characteristics of a tyrant, a lack of self-control, was associated with the charioteer's ability (or its lack) of restraining and controlling his horses, as seems to be suggested in Plato's tyrant in the *Republic*, who comes to stand in the chariot of city by virtue of his domination by passion (Ch. 2). Cicero also attributes a leader's transition to tyrant to an individual's loss of control over his passions, but the image he uses to describe this is that the man is unbridled (*effrenatus*), he is an unrestrained horse, not an adequate charioteer of his soul, a metaphor derived from Plato's charioteer of the soul in the *Phaedrus.* In Cicero the *effrenati* are those he accuses of being tyrants, especially Marc Antony. Vergil demonstrates Turnus' unbridleness in a horse simile with Iliadic precedent, but Cicero's characterization of Tarquinius Superbus in his *De republica* haunts Turnus' first scene in the chariot (Ch. 6). Turnus' speech in the Latin Assembly in book 11, however, helps to locate his character within contemporary Roman culture (Ch. 7), moderating the extremity of this impression.

In the assembly called to discuss the Latins' weakening position, Turnus reveals that his chief value is devotion to achieving a high standard of martial *virtus* comparable to that of his ancestors and he is ever concerned to protect his reputation for *virtus.* In previous speeches he exhibits concern for his soldiers and a willingness to fight alongside them in the tradition of Marius and Julius Caesar's early self-presentation. In the assembly he praises his leaders and expresses a strong desire to continue fighting. Were he a contemporary Roman, Turnus would certainly aspire to a triumph, but the orator Drances, presenting himself as the spokesman of the Latin community, suggests that Turnus is tyrannical and accuses him of being obsessed with gaining a wife and power for himself with complete disregard for the resultant deaths in the Latin community. Although Drances is an unattractive character, the accuracy of his assessment of Turnus will be confirmed in his subsequent behavior. In the immediate contemporary context Turnus' character would probably have suggest a Pompey, Caesar or Marc Antony. That his

[16] Brock (2013), 57. I gained access to this valuable book on Greek political imagery too late to take full advantage of its author's insights.

chariot is the symbolic locus of these aspects of his character is confirmed in his final appearance in the chariot. From here he perceives the destruction of Latinus' city now in flames and, realizing his responsibility for the deaths in the community, he leaps from the chariot and runs toward the city to face Aeneas in what he knows will be certain death. Although the intertexts Vergil engages with in helping to shape his portrait of Turnus as a charioteer represent him as selfishly devoted to achieving his own personal goals, which he will fight ruthlessly to obtain, and as unable to control his passion, allusions as the epic closes to Odysseus' successful accomplishment of his similarly individual goals, because of Turnus' contrasting dark future, create sympathy for the Turnus who bravely meets his fate (Ch. 8).

Finally, allusions to two additional intertexts, the *Odyssey* and the *Argonautica*, are essential in the expression of the negative charioteer Aeneas becomes at the epic's end. Odysseus is among the "superset" of heroes who contribute to the construction of Aeneas (Fowler, 1997b, 17), a fact that is obvious in his opening speech on the storm-tossed ship. But Odysseus also contributes to the presentation of Aeneas' helmsman Palinurus in book 3 and 5; sometimes the same Odyssean scene has relevance both for Aeneas and Palinurus, which encourages a reader to perceive Aeneas and Palinurus as closely related, even interchangeable, and prepares for the sacrificial death of Palinurus and Aeneas' assumption of his duties. While the presence (in erasure) of Odysseus' final voyage home in Aeneas' approach to Italy emphasizes the new kind of responsible hero Aeneas embodies, Palinurus in the Underworld recounts the real circumstances of his death in terms of events Odysseus feared on the island of Scheria, but escaped. Others have noted verbal parallels in the circumstances of Turnus' sacrificial death to that of Palinurus', but there are more correspondences between the men than have been noticed, including a similar intertextual dialogue with Odysseus (Ch. 8). The figurative recurrence of the epic's opening ocean storm near the conclusion accompanies the charioteer now clearly evident in Aeneas' speech and behavior. The considerable allusive presence of the *Argonautica* in book 7 as the Trojans enter Latium (discussed extensively by Nelis, 2001), facilitates this foray of Aeneas into the charioteer's imagery and contributes to its broader implications, inspite of Aeneas' almost total absence from book 7. The familial association of Latinus with Circe, sister of Aeetes, King of Colchis in the *Argonautica*, is foreboding, but so too, are

the fantastic fire-breathing horses and chariot that Latinus sends to Aeneas. The horses' fiery presence will attend a tyrannical Aeneas in book 12 (Ch. 8).

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* confirms that there is a systematic symbolic use of the figures of the charioteer and helmsman in the *Aeneid*, provides the basic conflicting values associated with each figure and develops the antagonistic use of the two figures for the context of civil war. The other contributing intertexts expand the meaning of the individual figures and facilitate Vergil's divergences from Aeschylus' particular creation. Interaction with the *Odyssey* helps to shape the distinctive heroic stature of both Aeneas in the first half of the epic and Turnus near its end, while those with the *Iliad* utilize the Achillean singular pursuit of *kleos* most often to question the actions of Turnus and Aeneas. The competitive arena of the *Iliad*'s chariot race provides an opportunity to compare in Antilochus' speech and actions the conceptual differences between the charioteer and the helmsman Mnestheus in an unobtrusive but clear way, which Cicero's particular expression of the helmsman and charioteer confirms. Cicero's use of these figures both in his public speeches as well as his philosophical work increases the possibility that Vergil's leadership emblems had contemporary political relevance.

Euripides' *Hippolytus* associates Latin charioteers with the wilds of the Amazonian other, but also contributes to the *Aeneid*'s particular focus on youth, a distinctively Vergilian characteristic in Turnus, and their failed transition into adulthood. The near-universal association of the mortal charioteer, both in the *Aeneid* and its specific intertexts, with a lack of personal self-control, at times can be seen as characteristic of youth, but the destructive consequences more often demonstrate it to be a serious flaw that precludes good leadership. While the good helmsman as represented in Mnestheus and Aeneas are committed to the well-being of the collective and model a leadership of service, Vergil's injection of Argonautic fire, which joins together Latinus, Turnus and Aeneas in book 7 and resurfaces in the epic's end, presents self-control as a central issue of leadership.

Although the study of the *Aeneid*'s intertexts will be fundamental to every chapter, the first two chapters will focus on the background texts "that constitute the literary system" for the helmsman and charioteer figures, the inherited literary matrix (Fowler, 1997b, 14-15). The first chapter will explore

Cicero's engagement with Plato's figures of the helmsman and charioteer, while the second will study the charioteer and helmsman in poetry, first as analogous figures and then as interactive in Aeschylus' *Septem*.

CHAPTER 2

Cicero's Engagement with the Platonic Helmsman and Charioteer

In the words of A. A. Long, Cicero's praise of Plato is "persistent and extreme" (Long, 1995, 43). The limits of Cicero's praise extend to figurative deification: he is "virtually a philosopher's god" (*ND* 2.32) and in writing to Atticus Plato is "that god of ours" (*Att.* 4. 16. 3). This admiration is clearly evident in Cicero's work: he imitates the Platonic dialogue—an innovation in Latin—borrows some of Plato's scenes,[17] and presents himself as the author of works entitled *Republic* and *Laws.* He compares his own situation in regard to Caesar with that of Plato confronting Dionysos of Syracuse (*Att.* 9. 13. 4). Simply put: "No other individual philosopher is cited by Cicero as fully and as frequently."[18] Among the works Cicero quotes or alludes to most often are the *Phaedrus* and the *Republic* (Long 1995, 44), which present, respectively, the elaborately developed images of the charioteer and helmsman. Since both authors treat the helmsman and charioteer as largely discrete images, they will be discussed separately here. The goal of this chapter is to develop an understanding of Cicero's readings of these two images in Plato, which requires a study of their particular use in Plato and will begin with the oldest and best established political image of the helmsman and the ship of state.

Plato: the Democratic Ship of State

In the opinion of Polybius "the Athenian demos is always in the position of a ship without a captain" (6.44), which is to say, its direction and leadership is uncertain or constantly vulnerable and threatened. Perhaps this uncertainty is reflected in much of the Greek tradition of the ship of state, where a storm-

---

[17] From the *Phaedrus* in *De Oratore* 1. 28; from the Cephalus of Plato's *Republic* in *De Senectute* 7; from *Phaedrus* 230b in *De Legibus* 2.6.

[18] Long (1995), 44, cites the principal Platonic texts that Cicero translates or alludes to (44, n. 14) and what we would know of Plato if Cicero were our only evidence (44-45). See also DeGraff (1940), 143-53.

tossed ship alone may express the state.[19] Alcaeus in two of the earliest uses of the image (6 and 326, early 6th c.) creates a vivid sense of the destructive threat of the storm through the first person narrative of the sailors in the midst of the storm: "This wave is higher than the first; we'll have a job to bale it out…," (τὸδ' αὖτε κῦμα τὼ προτέρω νέμω/στείχει, παρέξει δ' ἄμμι πόνον πόλυν/ἄντλην, 6. 1-2);[20] "…the waves toss on this side and that and we in the midst are carried violently along with our black ship…" (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται, /τὸ δ' ἔνθεν, ἄμμες δ' ὂν τὸ μέσσον/νᾶϊ φορήμμεθα σὺν μελανίᾳ, 326. 2-5). Like Horace's later "ship of state" (*Od.* 1. 14), the encouragement to read these poems metaphorically in the absence of a helmsman comes from an ancient commentator, in this case Heraclitus, *All*. 5, who cautions that the first impression, in which the lines depict an actual storm at sea, is not to be trusted. Using the poems as examples of allegory, he asserts they are about Myrsilus and his "tyrannical" conspiracy against the Mytileneans.[21]

A more elaborate ship of state appears in the Archaic Theognid corpus (667-82):

> … I should have seen better than many of my fellow-townsmen, that now, with our white sails lowered, we are carried through the murky night from out of the Melian Sea, and bail they will not, though the sea washeth over both gunwales; O but great is our jeopardy that they do what they do! —they have stayed the hand of the good steersman (κυβερνήτην… ἐσθλόν) who had them in the keeping of his skill (ἐπισταμένμς); and they are plundering by force (ἁρπάζουσι βίῃ); order there is none, and fair division for all is no more; the menial porters are in command, and the bad above the good (κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν καθύπερθεν).
> I am afraid the waves may swallow up the ship. Let this, well hidden, be my riddling message for the noble (ἀγαθοῖσιν), though a base man (κακὸν) too may understand (γινώσκοι) it, if he is clever (σοφός).[22]

The context is still the storm threatening the state, but the speaker, now first person singular, while aboard the ship and knowledgeable, is not a part of the struggle against the forces of the sea. In fact, no one is, for the crew is aiding and abetting the effects of the storm, by stopping the helmsman and plundering the

---

[19] Frequent in tragedy: Aeschylus, *Sept.* 208-10, 758-60, 769, 795-9; Sophocles, *Ant.* 163-4, 584-9; *OT* 22-24, 101; Euripides, *Rhes.* 249-50. See the full treatment of the ship of state in Brock (2013), 53-82, 85-86, 113-14, 117, 121, 150-52, 156.

[20] On the textual crux the first line presents see Campbell (1968), 288-89.

[21] Quintilian (8. 6. 44) interpreted Horace's *Od.* 1.14 as political allegory. Campbell (1967), 6, notes that the presence of the word μοναρχίαν among the fragments in the last few lines of the poem (line 27) and mention of Myrsilus in a marginal comment support Heraclitus' interpretation.

[22] Translation by Edmonds (1961). See Brock (2013), 63, n. 13, on the divergence of opinion as to the authorship of these lines (Euenus of Paros or Theognis).

cargo with force. The storm, instead of causing anxiety on the ship, seems to derive from the chaos onboard. The factional strife Megara suffered in the 6th century is here represented in the terms of class strife later common in 5th century Athens—the base (κακοί) and the noble (αγαθοί, 11).[23] Theognis, who writes from the aristocratic standpoint, knows better than most and the nobles, by implication, will easily understand his message, but the base man, only if he is clever. The deckhands have stopped the helmsman, clearly one of the nobles because he is described as both good and skillful or knowing (a frequent meaning of ἐπισταμένος). In contrast, the qualities the crew expresses are brute force, lack of discipline and lack of fairness. Instead of the crew working against the forces of the storm collectively as in Alcaeus' poems, they are partisans of the storm and both alike threaten the well-being of the other passengers (Theognis) on the ship. The usurping of the position of a knowledgeable and good helmsman by a violent and undisciplined crew will reappear, as we will see, in Plato's *Republic.*

The image of the ship of state Socrates describes to his interlocutors in Plato's *Republic* (middle period: c. 387-c. 367, 488a-489c) also represents a state gravely threatened, but without even the suggestion of a storm.[24] Perhaps Plato is allowing the long poetic tradition (and, more particularly, the Theognidean intertext he seems to be engaged with) to suggest the storm. For the sailors on Plato's ship, whose nature and behavior are at the heart of the image, are likewise ignorant and passionate and have taken over the ship. However, Plato elaborates their negativity more fully and forcefully, since, as we will see, he identifies the sailors as the current politicians, who have no time for philosophers, the true helmsmen, and their knowledge.

Although Kallipolis, described in books 2-5 of the *Republic*, is an ideal city, near the end of book 5 (473b-d) Socrates identifies the smallest change, and one that is possible and would enable an existing city to move toward this ideal constitution: for philosophers to rule as kings. Adeimantus, a friendly interlocutor, expresses shock at Socrates' suggestion, since the majority of philosophers "become cranks, if not rascals, and…useless to society" (6. 487d). To defend his assertion, Socrates resorts to an image

[23] Unless otherwise noted all dates are B. C.

[24] I am following the version of the general grouping of Plato's works into early, middle, and late in Kraut (1992), xii).

(εἰκών, 487e) because what the best philosophers experience in relation to cities is not comparable to any single experience. He begins (488a-b):

> Conceive this sort of thing happening either on many ships or on one. The shipowner (ναύκληρον) is bigger and stronger than everyone else on the ship, but he is hard of hearing and likewise a bit shortsighted, and his *knowledge* of seafaring is just as limited. The sailors engage in faction (στασιάζοντας) with one another about the steering (κυβερνήσεως) [of the ship], each one thinking that he ought to steer (κυβερνᾶν), though he has never *learned* the art (τὴν τέχνην) and cannot point out his *teacher* or a time when he *learned*. What is more, they claim it is not *teachable*, and are even ready to cut to pieces anyone who says that it is *teachable*.[25]

Keyt argues plausibly that the shipowner, who hires the helmsman and is responsible for who and what comes aboard the ship, represents the Athenian demos. He notes that the shipowner's description is "of a piece" with that "a few pages later of the big, strong, temperamental animal, to which the many 'when they are gathered together in a body' is likened" (193; 6. 493a, c). Neither he nor the sailors ("our current political rulers," 195; 6. 489a, c) respect knowledge or learning and reflect the view underlying Athenian political practices that political art is unteachable (*Protagoras* 319a-320b). The heavy repetition of teaching and learning words stresses the strength and thoughtlessness of the sailors' rejection of preparation for the role they would usurp, as well as their violent nature, signaled in their initial actions (στασιάζοντας) and fully expressed in their readiness to dismember anyone with a different opinion (488b-c). The hyperbolic violence of the crew expands into the next section of the metaphor. If others are more successful in persuading the shipowner to allow them to steer the ship, they too will be killed or thrown off the ship. Should one of the sailors get the job, they tie up and drug the shipowner and plunder the ship's stores, drinking and feasting (488c). In short, this is a ship of disorderly misrule.

But it is in the sailors' endorsement of manipulative rhetoric and the rejection of the true steersman that their disservice to the ship/polis becomes clearly evident (488c-e):

> Besides this, they praise the man who is *clever* (δεινός) at lending a hand in *persuading or forcing* the shipowner to let them rule and say that he is *skilled* (ἐπιστάμενον) in seamanship and in steering (κυβερνητικόν) and knows about ships, while the man not like this they condemn as useless. They *don't understand* that the true steersman (κυβερνήτου) must pay attention to year and

[25] The translation is by Keyt (2006), 190, whose in-depth analysis of Plato's ship of state informs mine.

> season and sky and stars and winds and all that belongs to his art (τῇ τέχνῃ), if he is to be really qualified to rule a ship.

Because of their appetite to rule, the sailors, who, as we have seen, have no knowledge of the art of steering, assess the man who persuades the shipowner to let them rule as "skilled in seamanship and in steering and (that he) knows about ships" (488c-d). Thus, the speakers who can through clever speech facilitate politicians' election, are *ipso facto* considered knowledgeable and skilled politicians. In this, as Keyt (2006, 195) notes, they resemble Plato's Sophist Gorgias who honored persuasion as the master art because of its acquisitive power (*Gorgias* 452d-453a). "They don't understand (ἐπαΐοντας)" both summarizes the description of the sailors' ignorant character and forms a transition to the brief depiction of the true helmsman—the true philosopher. As opposed to the very general areas of *supposed* knowledge of the sophistic man—seamanship, steering and knowledge about ships—the true helmsman pays attention to the very specific natural phenomena that enabled him to do his job—seasons, the sky and stars, and winds—all that belong to his art (488d), implying that there is, indeed, a skill to be learned. The knowledge of these aspects is both the most demanding to gain, since they are challenging in breadth or require considerable experience, but they also especially require the cleverness associated with μῆτις, that recognizes the opportune moment to act. But, the reiteration of the sailors' rejection of this possibility completes in ring fashion the image proper. Then Socrates brings the point of the figure back to the original question in asking Adeimantus (488e):

> When such things happen on board ships, do you not suppose that the man truly skilled in steering would in fact be called a sky-gazer and an idle babbler and useless (μετεωροσκόπον τε αὐ ἀδολέσχην καὶ ἄχρηστόν) to them by the voyagers in ships managed in this way?

"Sky-gazer" and "idle babbler" recall characterizations of Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (360, 1480) and subsequently are among the "first" Socrates imagines as the charges brought against him in the *Apology* (19b-c).[26] This is a final and particular indication that this metaphor reflects the contemporary

[26] Keyt (2006) 197-8, notes that "the disposition of contemporary Athenians to attach the two epithets to Socrates is mentioned or alluded to repeatedly" in Plato's dialogues (references given) and occur too in Xenophon.

Athenian polis and its attitude toward Socrates.[27] In their subsequent discussion of the image Socrates agrees with Adeimantus that "the finest spirits among the philosophers are of no use to the multitude," but the circumstances on the ship indicate that it is not the philosophers' fault, but that of those who do not know how to use them (489b).

The *Republic*'s ship of state is particularly static. With no reference to storm or even waves or sea and the actions being that of the crew—pestering and tying up the shipowner, threatening to kill, drinking and feasting—which are more common to city than sea, this ship of state is actually more easily imagined as tied up in port. The centrality of the crew's behavior stresses the failed morality of the Athenian polis—the torpor of the demos and the selfish and violent leaders, who not only reject the idea that statesmanship is a teachable art, but also seem opposed to learning and knowledge in general. Instead of truth, these politicians value rhetoric and its power to persuade toward selfish ends.

While ignorance and drunkenness remain characteristic of mortal helmsmen and crews in Plato's later works (365-47: *Politicus* 302a; *Laws* 641a),[28] the same is not true of immortal helmsmen. In the *Politicus* the god who made the universe (273d) is represented as a helmsman who initially guides the cosmos, then steps back when the first earth-born race had been used up:

> …then the helmsman of the universe dropped the handle of the tiller (τότε δὴ τοῦ παντὸς ὁ μὲν κυβερνήτης, οἷον πηδαλίων οἴακος ἀφέμενος) and withdrew to his place of outlook, and fate and innate desire made the earth turn backwards (272e).[29]

A shock and destruction of all sorts of things follow, but then a calm arises and the world goes on its course, exercising care and rule at first, but soon growing forgetful of the teachings of the Creator as disorder prevails (273a-b). Perceiving that the universe is in dire trouble, God again takes his place as

---

[27] Keyt (2006) argues that since Socrates consistently identifies himself in other dialogues as a seeker of wisdom and not, as the philosopher kings are characterized, a possessor of wisdom, he cannot be considered one of the "true philosophers." But there is strong contextual encouragement to equate Socrates with the true philosophers: "But you will make no mistake in likening our present (νῦν) political rulers to the sort of sailors we were just describing, and those whom these call useless and star-gazing ideologists to the true pilots" (489c).

[28] Real mortals certainly were praised as exemplary helmsmen: Pindar's *Pythian* 1. 85-91 in honor of Hieron of Aetna's victory in the chariot race of 470: "…do not pass over noble things. Guide your people with a rudder of justice; on an anvil of truth forge your tongue…do not grow too tired of spending, but let out the sail, like a helmsman, to the wind."

[29] Translation by Fowler (1914/1962).

helmsman, sets the world in order and makes it immortal and ageless (273d-e).[30] The gods as helmsmen exhibit even more personal concern for mortals in the *Critias* as they guide mortal souls:

> Once upon a time the gods were taking over by lot the whole earth according to its regions…they received each one his own, and they settled their countries; and…they reared us up, even as herdsmen rear their flocks, to be their cattle and nurslings; only it was not our bodies that they constrained by bodily force (πλήν οὐ σώμασι σώματα βιαζόμενοι), like a shepherd guiding their flocks with stroke of staff, but they directed from the stern (ἐκ πρύμνης ἀπευθύνοντες) …laying hold on the soul by persuasion, as by a rudder (οἷον οἴακι πειθοῖ ψυχῆς ἐφαπτόμενοι), according to their own disposition; and thus they drove and steered (ἐκυβέρνων, 109b-c).[31]

The association of the soul with divine guidance and specific separation of the gods' role from the forceful guiding of the physical (animal) recalls the association in the *Republic* of the true helmsman with knowledge and the sailors or false helmsmen with violent physicality. The differentiation of the gods—"each one his own (country)…laying hold on the soul by persuasion…according to their own disposition"—gives the impression of even greater individualized treatment of mortal souls and suggests that this kind of persuasion could be like the protreptic Socratic rhetoric of the *Phaedrus,* lofty in purpose and tailored to the disposition of the mortal soul as well.[32] Thus while the human helmsmen in Plato's words are unable to steer and maintain order even on one ship and are never concerned with the benefit of their crew, Plato's divine helmsman both makes and steers the universe and maintains its movement, while the individual gods nurture the souls of mankind, suggesting that, like the helmsman of the *Republic*, a true philosopher, the ideal Platonic helmsman would guide communities of men toward values exemplified in Kallipolis.

But in rhetorical imagery from the real political arena, storms and the vagaries of fortune, as in the earliest poetic Ships of State are very often fundamental elements in the metaphor, as is the case in Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown*, given in 330 to defend his public policies and actions against the

---

[30] In contrast to this beneficence, *Prometheus Bound*'s harsh portrait of Zeus and Prometheus' painful and long lasting punishment convey an ominous darkness to "the steersmen that rule Olympus" (147-9) and "steersmen of necessity," the Fates and Furies (515).

[31] Translate by Bury (1966).

[32] Mortal souls modeling their behavior on the god they follow and pursue souls like their god (*Phaedrus* 252d-e), individualizing persuasion to the listener (271d-272a).

charges of Aeschines. Demosthenes, unlike either Socrates or Plato, and very much like Cicero, lived a public life in the courts and politics and arose to prominence through his speech writing and oratorical gifts. Cicero extensively justifies his choice of Demosthenes as the best Athenian orator and his own stylistic model in his *Orator* and *Brutus*;[33] furthermore, Cicero saw significant parallels in the circumstances of his and Demosthenes' life (cf. *Philippics*), and is known to have translated this speech into Latin (Ramsey, 2003, 17-18). Thus, Demosthenes' ship is an additional likely intertext for Cicero's ships of state. Demosthenes here (194) attempts to refute the charge that in proposing and effecting Athens' alliance with Thebes he bears the responsibility for the resulting defeat by Philip in 338:

> If the *hurricane* that burst upon us has been too strong, not for us alone, but for every Hellenic state,—what then? As if a shipowner (ναύκληρον), who had done everything in his power for a prosperous voyage, who had equipped his craft with every appliance he could think of to ensure her safety, should encounter a *great storm*, and then, because his tackle was overstrained or even shattered, should be accused of the crime of *shipwreck*! "But" he might say, "I was not at the helm (οὔτ' ἐκυβέρνων τὴν ναῦν)" —nor was I in command of the army— "and I could not control fortune, but fortune controls all."[34]

In contrast to the metaphor of the *Republic*, Demosthenes' foregrounds the tremendous forces of nature (hurricane, i.e., Philip; great storm, the battle at Chaeronea) that destroy a ship, which has been painstakingly prepared for the journey by a conscientious shipowner, Demosthenes, in the metaphor. By implication, the metaphor is a ship of state ("for every Hellenic state"), but by making the helmsman the commander of the army, Demosthenes essentially transforms the ship of governance into one of war, both suggesting the dire circumstances that threaten Athens and disengaging himself from any responsibility in the defeat. The great advantage to equating Philip with a hurricane and storm at sea, of course, is that since forces of nature are beyond human control, culpability is distanced from Demosthenes. However, the shifting of the helmsman from the political leader of the state to a general, represents but a variation on Polybius' Athenian ship without a captain.

---

[33] *Brutus* 35; *Orator* 23, 104; *Opt. Gen.* 6

[34] Translate by Vince (1926/1963).

Cicero: The Republican Ship of State

Storms (*tempestates*) and resulting shipwrecks (*naufragia*) are among the most consistent features of the Ciceronian ship of state, his preferred image of the Roman *res publica.*[35] Cicero employs the figure in all genres of his writing—speeches, rhetoric, philosophy and letters—and periods (c. 86-43). In fact, many occurrences of the word *gubernare* (to "pilot," "direct") have become dead metaphors, indicating the ubiquity of its use.[36] Yet, at the same time the image in Cicero reaches its "fullest scope in a political context,"[37] which is accomplished largely through a broadening of the context and an increase in the *dramatis personae*—evident in his earliest use of the image in *De Inventione*, a largely technical oratorical handbook written in his youth (c. 86).

In the preface to the work Cicero attributes the origins of civilization to a primal orator, *quidam magnus videlicet vir et sapiens*, who gathered men scattered in fields and sylvan retreats and through reason and eloquence persuaded them to engage in useful and honorable occupations. But subsequently, cunning and shrewd men misused their eloquence to stir the mob and in this way they came to power:

> cum ad *gubernacula rei publicae* temerarii atque audaces homines accesserant, *maxima ac miserrima naufragia* fiebant. Quibus rebus tantum odii atque invidiae suscepit eloquentia, ut homines ingeniosissimi, *quasi ex aliqua turbida tempestate in portum*, sic ex seditiosa ac tumultuosa vita se in studium aliquod traderent quietum (1. 4).
>
> Whenever rash and bold men had taken up steering the republic great and disastrous wrecks occurred. Under these circumstances eloquence sustained such odium and unpopularity, that men of the greatest talent left a life of strife and tumult for some quiet pursuit, as if for refuge for a port from some raging storm.

Like the Platonic Ship, this scene presents unworthy helmsmen, characterized, as most of Cicero's adversaries (Clodius, Catiline, Antony) will be, with the violent adjectives *temerarius* and *audax*;[38]

---

[35] Schofield (1995), 68-69, notes that a distinguishing characteristic of 'res publica' is "its quite extraordinary capacity to attract metaphor," many of which are found in the *Pro Sestio* and his other post exilic orations.

[36] Fantham (1972), 24, gives an "extreme" case in a letter to Atticus (6.1.2): *nunc autem domus mehercle nulla tanto consilio aut tanta disciplina gubernatur…quam tota nostra provincia;* and points out that other forms from this root (*gubernator, gubernatio, gubernacula*) are usually true metaphors. But also note Brock's (2013), xiii, opinion that "images often dismissed as 'dead metaphors' can continue to have communicative power."

[37] May (1980), 259.

[38] For the political significance of *audax* in Cicero's writings see Wirszubski (1961), 12-22 and McDonnell (2006), 59-60, for its positive and negative valence in Cicero, Caesar, and Sallust.

but, as opposed to the Platonic sailors who implicitly continue their drunken sail (they "make the sort of voyage you would expect of such people" 488c), in this case misrule causes tangible and significant results: *maxima ac miserrima naufragia*. The destructive nature of this poetic consequence for the citizen body is clearly alluded to with the adjectives *seditiosa* and *tumultuosa,* both of which derive from words of armed revolution (*seditio*: insurrection; *tumultus*: uproar, the sudden outbreak of civil war). Here too, as in Plato, the men capable of rule, yet excluded nonetheless, are intelligent (*ingeniosus*: clever, talented, gifted), in contrast to the violent men on board, but the consequences for these men are brought within the metaphor as they seek refuge in port from the raging storm. Thus, while the behavior of the Platonic sailors was much more specifically and fully described—both their actions and words—as opposed to the mere use of two adjectives in Cicero, the image suggests more narrative action: voyages ending in shipwreck, storms and sailing toward a quiet port; at the same time the compression of characterization draws immediate attention to the opposing types of helmsmen.

The first use of the ship of state in Cicero's orations,[39] extends the narrative of the image even further. It occurs in a speech given in defense of Lucius Murena (*Pro Murena* 4-5) against the charge of bribery in his successful campaign for the consulship of 62, the year immediately following Cicero's consulship. Cicero spoke while he was also in the midst of his efforts to expel the revolutionary, Catiline, from the city (between the 2nd and 3rd Catilinarian). In justifying why it is appropriate for him to defend Murena, Cicero describes the transition from one consul to the next as the coming to port of one ship and the exit of another, implicitly representing himself as a helmsman:

> But if those who have but just come into port from the open sea are very eager to give to those setting out an accounting of the winds, the pirates, and the coasts…how should I, who after a terrible storm am just now seeing land, feel toward him who, I see must undergo the severest of political tempests?

What Cicero has figuratively described in miniature is the full cycle of the consul's year in office. Although Cicero says his motivation for defending Murena stems from a natural desire to assist those

[39] My analysis will center on the metaphors of the ship of state in the orations because they are more elaborate (than those in the letters or the *Republic*) and seem to have a certain evolution. In addition, because "…Cicero's engagement in the *Republic* with the question of the best constitution for the *res publica* is intimately connected with his involvement in the politics in Rome…" (Schofield, 1995, 69), an initial study of the orations seems logical.

"who are entering the same perils we have undergone," the more important reason he gives is that "the state is calling the consul to defend the common safety (*ad communem salutem defendendam*)," by assuring the uninterrupted transition from one consul to the next. The idea of the helmsman's responsibility for the well-being of the collective represented in the crew/passengers of his ship, inherent in the image of the ship of state and frequently emphasized by Cicero, will become in his speeches after his return from exile (*post* reditum) a very dramatic aspect of the metaphor.

The strong polarization between the good and bad helmsmen evident in Cicero's youthful *De Inventione*, which was generalized in the *Pro Murena* into the storms and pirates Cicero had faced in his consulship, will return more forcefully in the *post reditum* speeches, in which the bad helmsmen represent those particular leaders responsible for Cicero's exile. For example, Aulus Gabinius, consul in 58, along with his colleague Calpurnius Piso approved the exile of Cicero before an assembly of the people in the Circus Flaminius and also opposed his recall. After Cicero's recall from exile, he excoriates Gabinius in the *Pro Sestio* of 56, Cicero's speech in defense of one his supporters,[40] a very large portion of which concerns the wider significance of Cicero's exile:

> quis enim clavum tanti imperi tenere et gubernacula rei publicae tractare in maximo cursu ac fluctibus posse arbitraretur hominem emersum subito ex diuturnis tenebris lustrorum ac stuprorum, vino, ganeis, lenociniis adulteriisque confectum? … qui non modo tempestatem impendentem intueri temulentus, sed ne lucem quidem insolitam aspicere posset (20).
>
> For who would think that a man who had suddenly emerged from a long stay in the dark, from senseless debauchery, a man worn out with wine, gluttony, lewdness, and adultery could hold the realm of so great an empire, and guide the rudder of the republic, amid the highest waves, …he who in his drunkenness was not only unable to see a threatening storm, but could not even endure to look at the light, for him an unfamiliar sight?

Between the seemingly inevitable storms of any consul's time at the helm (*fluctibus, tempestatem impendentem*) lurks the anti-helmsman, creature of the dark (*diuturnis tenebris, ne lucem…apsicere posset*). In addition to the drinking and feasting of Plato's sailor/helmsmen Cicero intensifies the

[40] The nautical imagery in the *Pro Sestio* is especially rich. See the studies by Fantham (1972), 125-28; and May (1980), 259-64. There is precedence in Cicero's use of both good and bad helmsman in fourth-century Greek orators presention of themselves as being in charge of the ship of state and in their denouncing of opponent's helmsmanship (Brock, 2013, 156).

depravity of this helmsman by the addition of sexual excess and by emphasizing the persistence of the activities (*diuturnis*: long*, confectum*: exhausted, destroyed, *insolitam:* unaccustomed). The dark/light contrast in the figure likewise expresses the moral depravity of Gabinius. For Clodius, the tribune directly responsible for Cicero's exile who never attained the consulship, Cicero apparently developed a new character for the ship of state image, the pirate.

Already in the *Pro Murena* Cicero listed pirates among the dangers of his voyage the returning helmsman would want to share with his successor (*praedonum,* 4).[41] Pirates were a serious threat to sea travel in the first century, as Pompey's special command to rid the sea of pirates (*Lex Gabinia* of 67) and Julius Caesar's famous capture and ransom attest (Suetonius, *Divus Iulius* 4). Fantham and May have pointed out that Cicero's development of the pirate replaces the generality of the threats such as storms, which are "acts of God," with a volitional evil human, which is much more suited to Cicero's purpose of demonizing a particular agent (Fantham, 1972, 127; May, 1980, 262). The pirate, without country, lawless, and motivated only by greed, characterizes Clodius as so completely disengaged from the Roman community, that he has become its predator. Cicero describes Clodius' violent take over of the ship of state in *De Domo Sua* of 57:

> …in illis rei publicae tenebris caecisque nubibus et procellis, cum senatum a gubernaculis deiecisses, populum e navi exturbasses, ipse archipirata cum grege praedonum impurissimo plenissimis velis navigares—
>
> …when in the darkness and blinding clouds and storms, assailing the republic, when you had hurled the senate from the helm, thrown the people from the ship, and yourself, like a pirate chief, with your filthy crew of robbers, sailed forth with fullest sails.

As in the Theognidea's (667-82) description of the insurrection of the crew (above, p. 20), the storms are the tempestuous context for the violence of the crew or here pirates (*deiecisses, exturbasses*). What is distinctive in this metaphor is the very strong expression of the collective state (*rei publicae, senatum, populum*), which Clodius has usurped. Clodius' position as *archipirata* as he sails forth on the ship of

[41] For pirates Cicero uses both *pirata* and *praedo,* the basic meaning of which is "robber," but was regularly extended to the robbers of the sea, as Habinek (1998), 191, n. 10, notes in his study of a related topic: "Cicero and the Bandits" (69-87).

state, a new addition to the suggested narrative of the metaphor, implies that he is a perverted helmsman. It is the magnitude of the threat pirates imply that becomes an essential element in Cicero's "fullest and most artistic expression" of the ship of state in the *Pro Sestio* (May, 1980, 260).

Cicero chose to shape his arguments in his defense of Publius Sestius, a tribune in 57 who worked for his recall from exile, around the events of his own exile, a favorite Ciceronian tactic (May, 1980, 261; May, 1988). Sestius, who was accused of public violence (in support of Cicero's welfare), could not be guilty (the logic goes), if Cicero's welfare could be shown to be indistinguishable from the commonwealth's.[42] The most elaborate version of Cicero's Ships of State in the *Pro Sestio* supports just this link between Cicero's welfare and the state's and, at the same time, presents his exile as a personal sacrifice endured for the sake of the community. The *Pro Sestio* metaphor is "based on a common theme of the rhetorical schools" (Fantham, 1972, 126; Kaster, 2006, 220), an example of which occurs in the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a work roughly contemporary with Cicero's *De Inventione* and formerly attributed to Cicero. Although here the metaphor is used mechanically as part of a demonstration of how a simple idea can be developed in a "multiple manner (*multiplici ratione*)," the rudimentary nature of metaphor and the clarity of its context reveal both the inherent value of the image for Cicero's purpose and the effect of his amplifications.

The simple idea to be developed to illustrate a treatment with many parts (*septem partibus*) in book 4. 57 of the *Ad Herennium* is an argument based on logic for a citizen's heroic death on behalf of the republic:

> The wise man (*sapiens*) will, on the republic's (*pro re publica*) behalf, avoid no peril, because it may often happen that if a man refuses to perish for his country (*pro re publica*), it will be necessary for him to perish with her (*cum re publica*).

The insistent repetition of *re publica*, while characteristic of the author's style, makes clear the political nature of the theme, into which the implicit ship of state fits naturally:

---

[42] Cicero repeatedly equated his welfare with the commonwealth's in public statements after his return from exile (Kaster, 2006, 27, with references; May,1988, 90-105). In Cicero's political thought the helm rightly belongs to the Senate, or to the consuls as representatives of the Senate, or to himself and the *principes civitatis* as representatives of all true *optimates* (Fantham, 1972, 127, n. 22).

> He who in a voyage pefers his own to his vessel's (*navem*) security (*incolumem*), ought to be scorned. No less blameworthy is he who in a crisis of the republic has concern for himself in preference to the common safety (*communi saluti*). For from the wreck of a ship **many** escape unharmed (*incolumes*), but from the wreck of the fatherland (*ex naufragio patriae*) **no one** can swim to safety (*salvus*).

At this stage of the exercise, in which concern for the community has moved from the domain of logic and self-interest to that of morality ("contempt…blameworthy") and community interest (*communi saluti*), the image of the ship of state dramatizes the isolated, collective vulnerability of the people in the community of the state. In fact, those in the state (implicitly a ship too [*naufragio*]) are even more vulnerable than those on the ship (*navem*), emphasized by the numerical oppositions ("many…no one"). The immediately following final part before the demonstration's brief conclusion encourages sacrificial patriotism with a famous historical *exemplum* of *devotio ducis*, a rite in which a commander dedicates (*devoveo*) both himself and the enemy army to Earth and the gods of the underworld in order to procure the safety of the state and his own army—"clearly a scapegoat ritual."[43] P. Decius Mus, who in 295 flung himself upon the weapons of the Samnites and by this act brought victory to the Romans, "gave his life and received his country in exchange. He lost his life, and gained glory, which…shines more and more…" Thus, while the demonstration is peopled largely with general and representative types, it concludes with a specific historical heroic deed of a general. This ship of state, although lacking helmsman, rudder, storms, ports or pirates, takes a distinctive approach in looking into the mind of a traveler on the ship, and seeing the potential for anyone on the ship to act based on concern for the whole community onboard. The example that immediately follows of the Roman general Decius, however, suggests this "anyone" would be restricted to members of the Roman elite. It is into Decius' role that Cicero attempts to place himself in the *Pro Sestio*, with modifications that allow his sacrificial act for the community to be metaphorically onboard the ship of state.

In his goal of presenting his welfare as equal to the state's in the *Pro Sestio* Cicero responds to a hypothetical question asking why he didn't refuse to go into exile, instead, and meet death fighting (45-46):

---

[43] Dyck (2004), 306, in an especially useful article on this concept in Cicero's *post reditum* speeches.

> As to this, I call you to witness, you, you, I say, my country, and you ancestral Gods of our State, that it was for the sake of your shrines and temples, for the salvation of my fellow-citizens (*salutem meorum civium*), which has always been dearer to me than life, that I avoided fighting and slaughters. For if it had happened to me, jurors, when sailing on some ship with my friends (*amicis*), that many pirates (*praedones*) from a number of places …threatened to attack that ship with their fleets, unless my friends surrendered me alone (*me unum*) to them, if the passengers (*vectores*) refused to do so, and preferred death with me to handing me over to the enemy (*hostibus*), I would rather have cast myself into the deep to save the others (*iecissem ipse me potius in profundum, ut certeros conservarem*), than I would bring those loving friends (*cupidos*)…not only into certain death, but also into the great crisis their lives. But when this ship of state (*rei publicae navem*), after the helm had been torn from the grip of the Senate (*ereptis senatui gubernaculis*), tossed about on the deep by the blasts of sedition and discord, seemed about to be attacked by many an armed fleet, unless I alone were given up (*ego essem unus deditus*); when prosciptions, murders and plunder were threatened…should I have fought it out…with danger to you and your children, rather than alone take upon myself and submit to, on behalf of all, that which was threatening all (*id quod omnibus impendebat, unus pro omnibus suciperem ac subirem*)?

Cicero too, as in the two-part sequence of the *ad Herennium,* presents first the general situation of the ship at sea (*in aliqua nave*), followed by the "real" ship of state (*in hanc rei publicae navem*). Here, however, both are considerably more elaborate: the first, to dramatize Cicero's strong emotional commitment to the state which some share; the second, to elaborate the impending destruction of the republic. Both strategies support the impression that the magnitude of Cicero's sacrifice of going into exile, even though specifically not on the battlefield or fatal, was as beneficial for the state as that of the military general Decius.

The high emotional intensity of the introductory sentence in this complex ship of state metaphor is signaled by an initial apostrophe to the fatherland and its gods, calling on them to be witnesses to his high purpose in leaving the city:

> de quo **te, te**, inquam, patria, testor et **vos**, penates patriique dei, **me vestrarum** sedum templorumque causa, **me** propter salutem **meorum** civium, quae **mihi** semper fuit **mea carior vita**, dimicationem caedemque fugisse.

The numerous short words and phrases, anaphora of the personal pronouns of the fatherland and gods, as well as strong alliteration prepare for the most important theme of the long passage: the reasons for Cicero's leaving are the physical preservation of the city as expressed in her religious shrines and the

safety of the citizens. The insistent insertion of the first person pronoun and adjectives express the strength of Cicero's personal concern, which is forcefully asserted particularly regarding the safety of his fellow citizens, which "was always dearer to me than my life."[44] The emotional strength of this expression could be intended to diminish the cowardly implications inherent in the main clause (*dimicationem caedemque fugisse*), postponed to the very end. In the hypothetical (*si…accidisset*) first ship metaphor a suggestion of the reciprocity of affection (his friends on the ship are *mei tam cupidos*) recalls the intensity of Cicero's commitment, which is dramatically demonstrated in his willingness to die for these friends (*ut ceteros conservarem*). The pirates (still implicitly Clodius, the cause of Cicero's exile) reappear in greater force than in the *De Domo Sua* (*multi ex multis locis praedones*) and their threat suggests a military one of total annihilation (*classibus eam navem se oppressuros minitarentur…hostibus*). To prevent this they want only Cicero to surrendered to them (*me unum sibi dedidissent*). This imagined scenario becomes ever more intense with the passengers refusing to surrender Cicero and wanting to die with him. Cicero would resist this, he insists, and to save them would "cast myself into the deep." The retention and great expansion of the simple "first ship" in the *ad Herennium* ("He who in a voyage prefers his own to his vessel's security, deserves contempt…") allows Cicero to continue the emotional intensity of his opening sentence by conjuring a frightening human drama of life or death. The emotional involvement of the jury, as Cicero taught (*de Orat.* 2. 185-211), was paramount especially in his goal in this passage of convincing his audience that his withdrawal into exile should be viewed as comparable to a general's sacrificial death.

The very similar expressions of Cicero's self-sacrifice (*me unum sibi dedidissent; ego essem unus deditus*) form the most important connection between the first ship and the true *rei publicae navem*. The classic components of the Roman ship of state as storm-tossed and now bereft of the good helmsmen (*rei*

[44] The past tense recalls Cicero's protection of the city during his consulship from Catiline's insurrection, which was, and will be again in this speech, presented as a rescue of the city: "So then I saved (*servavi*) the Republic by quitting Rome, gentlemen; by my own grief and sorrow I kept off from you and your children devastation, fire, and rapine; alone I twice saved the Republic (*unus bis rem publicam servavi*), once with glory, the second time with misery to myself" (49).

publicae navem ereptis senatui gubernaculis fluitantem in alto tempestatibus) appear,[45] but in Cicero's preface to a long section recreating the tempestuous times in Rome before his departure, the storms are revealed to be those of sedition and discord (*seditioum ac discordiarum*) and the reappearing fleets are now armed, apparently to attack (*armatae tot classes…incursurae viderentur*). In fact, Cicero recalls there was talk of proscriptions, murder and plunder, so dire was the situation.[46] Cicero returns to the emotional tone of the beginning emphasizing the magnitude of the possible consequences for the citizens of Rome and their children and the sacrifice that he alone endured for all their sakes (*quod omnibus impendebat unus pro omnibus susciperem ac subirem*). All the essential elements of the *devotio* are present—the group to be saved, the "enemy," Cicero himself and his sacrifice—but here the context is civilian, not military, as Dyck (2004, 313) notes. The connection suggested here between the Cicero and the general Decius, called upon as historical example of *devotio* in the *ad Herennium* exercise, becomes overt in section 48, in which Cicero in his fearlessness claims community with Decius. Thus, by an act tantamount to committing suicide (Dyck, 2004, 313), Cicero withdrew into exile and saved the republic from the cataclysmic upheaval that would have resulted from any attempt to fight and which he has tried to portray with a most elaborate metaphor of the ship of state.

In this Roman development of the ship of state, the helmsman's role seems to be replaced by the single citizen who has the capacity to save the ship. The visualization of a ship with its crew as a venue for individual sacrificial acts on behalf of the whole state is both a cohesive image of community that suggests the members of a collective and encourages trust in the efficacy of an individual's sacrifice. The helmsman alone, after all, steers even a large ship, which by the first century could carry huge

---

[45] The helmsman here is expressed in the collective senate (*senatui*) in which Cicero had been a member for years by now, and as an exconsul, a member with some prestige.

[46] At this point a long elaboration of the reasons why some people opposed Cicero, omitted from the passage quoted on p. 27, emphasizes the diverse strength of the opposition to the patriotic citizens. Although represented in the metaphor by *armatae tot classes*, only some seem to belong to Clodius' crowd, and therefore the list seems to attempt to recreate the volatile discord in Rome. This catalogue has considerable weight in the metaphor (although a single *cum* clause it contains six *alii* clauses within it and nearly one fourth of the total word count) with the intention, not, I believe, to emphasize the diversity (and size, implicitly) of the opposition to Cicero, but rather the strength of the forces moving towards utter chaos, unless Cicero leaves. Kaster (2006), 222, who refers to other similar lists in the *post reditum* speeches, finds the catalogue not fully consistent with the impression Cicero otherwise gives that only the corrupt consul, Clodius, and his hirelings oppose him.

crews.[47] No other version of the ship of state, somewhat ironically, has activated more effectively the passengers/crew the ship of state carries than Cicero's presentation of his exclusive sacrificial act for the welfare of the collective state. While the basic concept of a naval sacrifice allows for the possibility that anyone could have the opportunity to save the state, in the case of Cicero his role is not sharply separate from that of the helmsman. As mentioned, he was a prestigious member of the senate from which, in the metaphor, the helm was snatched. It was when he was consul, helmsman of the state (cf. *Pro Murena*), that he saved the city from Catiline and in the process facilitated the execution of the five conspirators, the official act for which he is being exiled. In his speech against Piso in the following year (*In Pisonem*, 55) Cicero joins within the ship of state metaphor both his consular rescue of the state from Catiline in 63 and his saving of the state by going into exile. The wisdom and experience he had gained in bringing the ship of state safety to harbor through the Catilinarian storms were what enabled him to foresee that the storms of Clodius in 57 would be similarly destructive and to sacrifice himself again to save the republic.[48] Thus, even though within the metaphor the sacrificial victim would accomplish little for the travelers if he left them without a helmsman, Cicero clearly was attempting to present his going into exile as a logical extension of his heroic service to the country in his consulship when he was the helmsman.[49]

---

[47] Casson (1994), 91, "We know that (at the battle of Actium) Antony had a heavy fleet ranging from triremes right up to 'tens' (deceres)." The numbers refer to the number of rowers in a vertical unit. Triremes had three horizontal levels of rowers, but no ancient ship went beyond three levels. A vertical unit of 10 would be arranged in either two or three levels, with multiple rowers to an oar. The Roman quinqueremes at the battle of Ecnomus carried a crew of 420 (Polybius) and an exceptionally large octeres built by Lysimachus (360-281) required 1600 rowers (Memnon of Heraclea).

[48] *In Pisonem* 20-21: … (*ego*)*…in maximis turbinibus ac fluctibus rei publicae navem gubernassem* ***salvam****que in portu conlocassem…alios ego vidi ventos, alias prospexi animo procellas, allis impendentibus tempestatibus non cessi sed* ***bis unum me pro omnium salute*** *obtuli.* Toward the end of his year as consul, Cicero sees one of the responsibilities of the consul is to foresee ways in which the public safety may be jeopardized: "So if it is the part of a conscientious (*boni*) consul…to foresee what will be done, I shall show elsewhere how important it is for the common safety that there should be two consuls in the state on January first" (*Pro Murena* 4).

[49] Later in the *Pro Sestio* the suggestion that Cicero in leaving was a helmsman turning his ship aside a little, occurs in the reported speech of Lucius Cotta in support of Cicero's recall (73): *L. Cotta dixit …magna rerum permutatione impendente declinasse me paulum et spe reliquae tranquillitatis praesentes fluctus tempestatemque fugisse.* (L. Cotta said…that when a great political upheaval was imminent, I had turned aside a little and, in the hope of finding calm hereafter, had avoided the stormy waves before me). May (1980), 262, assesses this passage: "…Cicero becomes the helmsman or, in a sense, the ship itself, the ship identified with the *res publica,* the State of Rome," which seems too categorical.

Cicero enriches the descriptive narrative in the final ship of state in the *Pro Sestio* and he also delineates more fully than anywhere else in his writing the nature of the good helmsman and his goals. In a didactic summary of ideal political practices Cicero poses the following rhetorical question (98):

> What then has been proposed for those who guide the helm of state, upon which they ought to gaze (*quod intueri*) by which they ought to direct their course (*cursum suum derigere*)? It is that which is far the best and especially desirable for all who are sound (*sanis*), and good (*bonis*) and prosperous (*beatis*); it is peace with honor (*cum dignitate otium*).

While this goal, "peace with honor", is broad and diversely understood,[50] its foundations (*fundamenta*) and elements (*membra*), which "our leaders ought to protect and defend even at the risk of life itself," are concrete (98):

> …religiones, auspicia, potestates magistratuum, senatus auctoritas, leges, mos maiorum, iudicia, iuris dictio, fides, provinciae, socii, imperii laus, res militaris, aerarium.
>
> …religious observances, the auspices, the powers of the magistrates, the authority of the Senate, the laws, ancestral custom, criminal and civil jurisdiction, credit, our provinces, our allies, the prestige of our government, the army, the Treasury.[51]

Cicero continues, "To be a defender (*defensorem*) and advocate (*patronum*) of so many and so important interests (*rerum*), requires an exalted spirit, great ability, and great resolution (*magni animi… magni ingenii magnaeque constantiae*)," particularly when there are great numbers of men (*magna multitudino*) who "seek to cause revolutions or changes in government (*novus motus conversionesque rei publicae*)." Because of these men

---

[50] Kaster (2006), 32, translates the phrase as "tranquility with worthy standing" and glosses it as "a personal and communal state in which the best men serve the public interest and enjoy the appropriate reward of personal prestige." According to Wirszubski (1954), 1, the political import of this statement is vague "due to the variety of different meanings of which both *dignitas* and *otium* admit." For example, it isn't clear whether *dignitas* is meant in a political or moral sense, nor whether the *dignitas* is that of individuals or the State. *Otium* could be private leisure or public tranquility. After considering the views of E. Remy, H. Wegehaupt and P. Boyancé, Wurszubski argues (9) that Cicero had "primarily in mind the tranquility of all and the dignity of the 'best.'" Kaster, 32-33, n. 70, provides numerous further references.

[51] Kaster (2006), 323, "Most of these components have been mentioned several times over in the speech or are otherwise obvious goods of the civil community, for which a patriot should be willing to sacrifice." The sequence of the elements seems significant: religious practice and the auspices, which enable the power of the magistrates and the authority of the senate, and the laws they promulgate, are clearly the most determinative in the state's direction. *Mos maiorum* guides all that precedes it in the list as well as the jurisdictions of the law. Generally, the more material components end the list.

> …storms (*fluctus*) are stirred up in the republic, so that those who have claimed the helm of state (*gubernacula patriae*) must watch and strive with all their knowledge (*scientia*) and devotion (*diligentia*), without any damage to those foundations and elements of which I have just spoken, to hold their course and to reach the port of "peace with honour" (99).

Thus, Cicero's good helmsman is a sound and prosperous defender of Roman religious and governmental institutions and their material wealth and prestige, which he will protection with both skill (*magni ingenii; scientia*) and determination (*constantiae; diligentia*).

In summary, Cicero's ships of state sail in a context: they depart and return to port, are storm tossed, meet shipwreck or are seized by pirates. Every aspect of this metaphor carries symbolic content redolent of the drama of first century Roman politics. Likewise, although Cicero pursues the Platonic ethical focus of contrasting helmsmen—the unworthy, morally corrupt helmsmen who reflect current politics and the true helmsmen whose only concern is the well-being of the community—Cicero's personal involvement carries additional emotional charge. Nevertheless, in both authors the primary energy of the image resides in the corrupt usurpers. At times Cicero, like Plato, elaborates on the dissipation of bad helmsmen (Gabinius in the *Pro Sestio*), but he seems to be continually searching for more dramatic ways to incorporate them into the metaphor: they are the cause of shipwrecks or part of the storms of sedition and tumult that always threaten the ship of state.[52] Apparently inspired by the demagogue Clodius, Cicero developed the roles of the pirate and his gang who threaten or take over the ship of state in a perversion of the good helmsman's concern for the well-being of the community. The pirate extends his selfish greed to include the consumption of an entire state. By the inclusion of himself as sacrificial victim within the scene of the pirates' threatening assault of the ship of state, Cicero implies that his decision to go into exile, a political humiliation, was in fact a singular patriotic act, on a level with the *devotio* of a general, that saved the republic, as he had done before when consul. In the polarity which almost always forms the conceptual center of Cicero's ship of state metaphor, the good helmsman's characteristics are frequently only implied as the opposites of the "bad" helmsmen. Although skill and knowledge are at

[52] Fantham (1972), 128, notes instances in which Cicero's adversaries are themselves storms: Gabinius and Piso are (*Ses.* 25) *duo rei p. turbines,* just as Clodius is *tempestas rei p.* (*Vatin.* 33) *procella patriae, turbo ac tempestas pacis atque oti* (*Dom*. 137).

times associated with the good helmsmen (*De Inventione* 4, *Pro Sestio* 98) as these qualities had been in Plato's *Republic*, their moral superiority is everywhere implied and is explicit in the *Pro Sestio* both in their description as *integri* (97) and in the "foundations" for the goal of the helmsman ("peace with dignity," 98), which the helmsmen "ought to protect and defend even at the risk of life itself," and foremost among which are the religious practices and auspices, priorities which, as we will see, are shared with the *Aeneid*'s ship of state. If the promoters of sedition and tumult are most frequently associated with storms, their conceptual opposite in the Ciceronian metaphor would be the port of "peace with dignity" toward which the good helmsmen sail. In this sense Kaster's translation of *cum dignitate otium* as "tranquility joined with worthy standing" contrasts perfectly with the turbulence of a storm at sea. A comparison between the ethical and corrupt leader in the ship of state will also be central in Cicero's *Republic*.

Shortly after Cicero's successful defense of Sestius in 56 "he gave in to the domination of the dynasts" (Pompey, Caesar and Crassus), defending their supporters, abstaining from active politics, and devoting himself to writing (Zetzel 1995, 2). The *De Republica,* written between 54 and 51 (with books 3-5 of the six now severely fragmented) consciously invokes Plato's *Republic* in the earliest surviving and certainly most influential Latin dialogue.[53] Cicero's choice of the distant past—Scipio Aemilianus converses with friends in 129 during the crisis over the legal power of the Gracchan land commission—for the time of his dialogue, was in his own words (in a letter to his brother, Quintus [*Q. Fr.* 3. 5. 2]) "to avoid giving offence in any quarter," a confirmation of his assessment of the dire state of affairs in Rome (Zetzel 1995, 3-4). While similarities between Cicero's and Plato's *Republic* are evident and Cicero frequently recalls Plato's style, Plato's *Republic* "is more of a foil than a model."[54] Cicero's description of the best form of government is largely a reflection of the Roman republic, while *Kallipolis* is a socially

[53] Zetzel (1995), 5, "The jurisconsult M. Brutus seems to have written his *responsa* in the form of a conversation with his son, and Varro's *Menippean Satires*, some in dialogue form, were probably written before C.'s dialogues." The *de Oratore* written during this same time likewise follows the model of a Platonic dialogue (*Phaedrus*).
[54] *Ibid*, 13: "each concerns the relationship between citizen and state; each discusses the nature of justice; each offers a theory of constitutions; each contains an elaborate discussion of education, and each concludes with a vision of an afterlife designed to reaffirm the ideas set out in the work itself." For literature on the comparison see Zetzel 13, n. 34.

innovative ideal city. Although "what the two works have most in common is a shared concern with justice and moral behavior,…Plato is interested in individual morality, while for Cicero the justice of an individual has no meaning apart from the state to which he belongs" (Zetzel, 1995, 15). This is evident in what remains of the preface to Cicero's first book in which he addresses the love of virtue implanted in men by nature, which manifests itself as the desire to defend the commonwealth through the practice of political life (Connolly, 2007, 91). As in his speeches, this concept will likewise be central in the ship of state metaphors in the *Republic.*

When the narrative of the first preface resumes after the loss of about ten pages the importance of political involvement is being argued by means of a refutation of the Epicurean philosophers' advocacy of political disengagement. The only exception to this stricture Epicureans are willing to make is in the case of an emergency, represented as so often in his speeches by storms (*excitatis maximis fluctibus*). In his argument against this exception Cicero uses the ship of state for the first time (1. 11), a use that is characteristic of his allusions to Plato's republic:

> maximeque hoc in hominum doctorum oratione mihi videri solet, quod, qui tranquillo mari gubernare se negent posse, quod nec didicerint nec umquam scire curaverint, iidem ad gubernacula se accessuros profiteantur excitatis maximis fluctibus.
>
> It has always seemed especially amazing to me of all the teachings of learned men (i.e., Epicureans) that they deny they can steer when the sea is calm, having never learned the art nor cared to know it, but these same men assure us that, when the waves dash highest, they will take the helm.

Focusing on a distinctively Platonic and central concern in the intertext's image—the Athenian rejection of the idea that governing is a skill that can be learned—Cicero ironically accuses Epicurean philosophers—a future variety of Plato's true helmsmen—of the major fault of his violent sailors in recognizable Platonic diction: "having never learned the art or cared to know it" (cf. "though he has never learned the art and cannot point out his teacher or a time when he learned," 488b). Thus Epicureans, who consider the knowledge of statecraft "unsuited to learned or wise men (*non doctis hominibus ac sapientibus*, 1.11)," are themselves brought down to the level of Plato's ignorant sailors. There is further irony in the philosophers' rejection, based on their lofty knowledge, of the role Plato specifically

advocated for them because of their knowledge of the craft of governing. Even if philosophers follow their plan of serving only in emergencies, Cicero argues, they "ought by no means to neglect this science of politics (*hanc rerum civilium…scientiam*)," in case called upon. By implication, Cicero holds Plato up as a model for contemporary philosophers:

> …let them for a few moments listen and attend to those whose authority and reputation among learned men is greatest; for even if they have not governed the state themselves, nevertheless, since they have investigated and written about the state, I think they have performed a certain service of their own for the state (1. 12).[55]

After bringing in the example of the Greek Seven Sages, most of whom "took an important part in the affairs of government," Cicero concludes his argument against the Epicureans with a striking assertion:

> For there is really no other concern (*res*) in which human virtue approaches more closely the majesty (*numen*) of the gods than that of founding (condere) new states or preserving (*conservare*) those already founded.

As Zetzel (1995, 12.4) notes, that humans should try to make themselves like god is a Platonic idea (cf. *Tht.* 176b), but it is modified here by the political context in which Cicero uses it. Plato's writings were at times strongly critical of contemporary politicians as can be seen in the very ship of state metaphor Cicero alludes to. Yet, by supporting the Platonic thesis—knowledge of statecraft is a prerequisite to political office—in his metaphor, Cicero both invokes Plato's authority and at the same time suggests an improved situation in Roman politics: the implicit knowledge with which Roman politicians (helmsmen) function.[56]

The initial presentation of the helmsman who represents the ideal statesman in the *Republic* follows a discussion of Tarquinius Superbus' reign and an excursus on tyranny. Iconic in its simplicity, viewed together with its context its close affinity to the oratorical ships of state will be evident:

---

[55] *Ibid*., 12.2: "C. is probably referring above all to Plato, but also to philosophers in general, particularly the Peripatetics, who wrote extensively on political theory."

[56] An apparent variation on Plato's metaphor is found in a fragmentary speech of Scipio's in support of aristocratic rule when he says "If [the State] leaves [the selection of its rulers] to chance, it will be as quickly overturned as a ship whose pilot should be chosen by lot from among the passengers (*vectoribus*)" (1.51). Upheaval due to unskilled helmsmen taken from the unqualified onboard was the focus of Plato's image, however, Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.9, also criticized the use of the lot in democratic governments, with the parallel of the helmsman.

> sit huic oppositus alter, bonus et sapiens et peritus utilitatis dignitatisque civilis, quasi tutor et procurator rei publicae; sic enim appelletur quicumque erit rector et gubernator civitatis. quem virum facite ut agnoscatis; iste est enim qui consilio et opera civitatem tueri potest.
>
> With him (the tyrant) we may place in contrast that other type of ruler, a good, wise, and skillful sort of guardian and protector of the practical aspects and of the self-respect of the citizens of the state; for in this way he will be called whoever is the guide and pilot of a nation. Make sure that you recognize such a man, for he is one who can look after the state both by counsel and by action (2. 51).

Completely devoid of action, even the initial phrase (*sic huic oppositus alter*) suggests a schematic paradigm of the qualities of the good statesman, chief among which is the idea of protection from danger, both physical and emotional, inherent in the words *tutor, procurator* and *tueri. Tutor* is the legal term for a guardian, *procurator* the administrator of an estate; both terms, as Zetzel notes, are used elsewhere in Cicero to describe consuls and both suggest "the *caritas* and almost parental qualities of the good king in 1.64.3."[57] This idea recalls Cicero's expression in the *Pro Sestio* 45, that concern for the safety of the citizens of Rome, "*semper fuit mea carior vita*." Likewise, the modifiers of *tutor* and *procurator,* recall qualities associated with the good helmsman in the *Pro Sestio.* The moral rectitude (*bonus*) and wisdom or knowledge (*sapiens*) of the helmsman are either overtly mentioned (*Pro Ses.* 98, 99) or implied by contrast and recalls Cicero's description of the good statesmen in *De Orat.* 1. 8, who were those able to direct and steer the state by their advice and wisdom (*consilio et sapientia qui regere et gubernare rem publicam possent*). *Peritus* ("skilful") is a variation on *ingeniosus* (*De Inv.* 4, *Pro Ses.* 99), with an emphasis on ability gained by experience. The word order *peritus utilitatis dignitatisque civilis, quasi tutor* emphasizes both the statesman's knowledge of and concern for the citizens material concerns and dignitiy. *Dignitas* recalls the goal of the good helmsmen in the *Pro Sestio* 98-99, *cum dignitate otium,* a personal and communal state in which the best men serve the public interest and in return enjoy personal prestige (Kaster, 2006, 32). Whoever (*quicumque*) has these characteristics will be the "guide and pilot" of the state.[58] Scipio concludes his characterization with the admonition to his listeners to recognize this

---

[57] Zetzel (1995), 51. 1: *tutor* describes consuls at *Red. sen.* 4, *Red. pop.* 11, *De Orat*. 3. 3; both terms at *Off.* 1. 85.

[58] While *gubernator* has a long lineage of use as the metaphorical statesman and a relatively restricted range of meanings, *rector* is new in this context and its root *rego* is broad in possible connotations. Nevertheless, slightly

ideal statesman because he is the one who is able to "keep safe" the state with his judgment (*consilio*) and actions (*opera*), summarizing the major concepts in his description: fatherly protection and informed guidance of the state. The insistent repetition of the civil object of the statesman's concern (*dignitatis…civilis, rei publicae, civitatis, civitatem*) emphasizes strongly the contrast with the tyrant's selfish goals, as we will see, and recalls Cicero's self-presentation in the *Pro Sestio*.

The metaphor of the statesman is, in a sense, an intrusion in Scipio's narrative of the history of Rome's government, as he indicates in his fragmentary comments following the passage (2. 51).[59] The purpose of this premature appearance seems to be motivated by the desire to juxtapose pointedly the tyrant and the ideal statesman: *sit huic oppositus alter*. Tarquinius Superbus' rule is a demonstration of Scipio's observation that monarchy is the form of government most liable to change, because one man's vices can turn it easily toward utter destruction (2. 43).[60] The fascination with the power of a single individual to save or destroy the state, familiar from Cicero's speeches, is operative here as well: the state which Tarquinius destroys, Brutus rescues. Based on the narrative of their actions the discourse moves into the consideration of the characteristics of a good king, a tyrant, and then the ideal statesman, a variant of the good king. This moral dichotomy recalls the one that Cicero has represented in his good and bad helmsmen from his earliest treatment in the *De Inventione*. 4, in which the *temerarii atque audaces homines* shipwreck the state, driving the *homines ingeniosissimi* from the helm. Although the treatment of Tarquinius' rule is fragmentary, his salient features seem evident: he is an unjust and cruel master (*illi iniusto domino atque acerbo*, 44), who comes to power spattered with the blood of the excellent king he murdered, a deed which disturbs his mind and makes him eager to be feared.[61] Successful in war,[62] his

---

later writers use *rector* as a synonym for helmsman (*Aen.* 5. 176; Ovid, *Meta.* 6. 232; Lucan, 8. 167; Juvenal 12. 33; and Quintilian *Inst.* 7.3), as does Cicero (*Div.*1. 24). See Zetzel, *ibid*., 2. 51 and 2.23 on the relative rarity of *regere* in this sense.

[59] "As, however, this subject has not been very fully treated so far in our conversation, and as this type of man will have to be considered rather often later in our discourse…" (book 5 appears from its extant fragments to have been devoted to the statesman).

[60] *ea autem forma civitatis mutabilis maxime est hanc ob causam, quod unius vitio praecipitata in perniciosissimam partem facillime decidit.*

[61] *Rep.* 45*:nam rex ille de quo loquor, primum optimi regis caede maculatus integra so mente non erat, et cum metueret ipse poenam sceleris sui summam, metui se volebat*.

selfish and inappropriate reaction is strongly censored: *victoriis divitiisque subnixus exultabat insolentia* (45). Arrogance is his identifying quality and, despite the fragmentary state of this section, is mentioned pointedly both here (*insolentia*) and as a reason for his expulsion (*recordatione superbiae Tarquinii*, 46). He is unable to control himself or the lustful desires of his family (*neque suos mores regere poterat neque suorum libidines*, 45), the most famous example of which is his oldest son's (Sextus Tarquinius) rape of the excellent Lucretia (*...Lucretiae…vim attulisset*, 46). Cicero's strongest censure of the tyrant, Tarquinius Superbus being the prime example, appears in the summary of the characteristics of the tyrant (48):

> qui quamquam figura est hominis, morum tamen inmanitate vastissimas vincit beluas. quis enim hunc hominem rite dixerit, qui sibi cum suis civibus, qui denique cum omni hominum genere nullam iuris communionem, nullam humanitatis societatem velit?
>
> For, although he is human in form, yet he surpasses the most monstrous of wild beasts in the savageness of his nature. For who can rightly call him a human who desires no community of justice, no fellowship with his fellow-citizens—even with any kind of human.

Far from the fatherly concern for the citizens of a good king[63] or the ideal statesman, the tyrant wants no communion with humans.

While Tarquinius' deeds in the *Republic* are at times extreme, they have significant affinities with the bad helmsmen and pirates in Cicero's ships of state. Heedless of the safety of their ships (and its passengers), their piloting wrecks the ship of state. Like Tarquinius' (and his family's) lack of control and lasciviousness, the bad helmsmen (Gabinius, for example), are dissolute in drunkenness and illicit sex, while the pirates express by their forceful seizure of the ships and thrusting out of the passengers, a violence similar to that of Tarquin and his family. Tarquin's excessive pride and arrogance is comparable,

---

[62] *Rep.* 44: "For even that unjust and cruel master occasionally enjoyed good fortune in his undertakings." In addition to his conquests, Cicero mentions his building of the Capitol with the spoils of war (fulfilling a vow made to his father), the establishment of colonies, and the gifts he sent to Apollo at Delphi.

[63] *Rep.* 47: *nam regem illum volunt esse, qui consulit ut parens populo conservatque eos, quibus est praepositus, quam optima in condicione vivendi* ("For they [the Greeks] maintain that the title of king should be given only to a ruler who is as solicitous for the welfare of his people as is a father for his children, and maintains in the best possible conditions of life those over whom he is set.") This brief characterization both recalls Cicero's saving of the republic in the *Pro Sestio* (45) and *In Pisonem* (20-21) and anticipates the guardian like protection of the ideal statesman (*Rep.* 51).

as mentioned, to the rash and bold helmsmen of Cicero's first ship of state, and to the role of pirate *per se*. On the other hand, the qualities, of Lucius Brutus, rescuer of the state and implicit prototype for the ideal helmsman, share the quality of the good helmsmen in Cicero's first ship of state and those of the other helmsmen in Cicero's speeches, who are devoted to the welfare of the state.

The definitive actions of Brutus in Cicero's account arise even more directly from Lucretia's rape and honorable suicide than in Livy's version of the story (1. 55-60):

> Therefore, when his [Tarquinius'] older son had taken Lucretia by force…and this virtuous and noble woman had inflicted death upon herself because of this wrong, Lucius Brutus, a man pre-eminent in intellect and courage, freed his fellow-citizens from the unjust yoke of cruel servitude (…*depulit a civibus suis iniustum illud durae servitutis iugum*). And though Brutus was only a private citizen, he sustained the whole government, and was the first in our State to show that no one is a private citizen when the liberty of the citizens needs protection. On his initiative and under his leadership the citizenry…banished the king himself and his children (2. 46).[64]

While *virtus* was not a quality of the Ciceronian helmsman, which is here used partly as appropriate for the armed rebellion Brutus led, *ingenium* (*ingeniosissimus*) described both the helmsmen in *De Inventione* (*homines ingeniosissimi*; "men of the greatest ability," 4), and those in the *Pro Sestio* (*defensorem… magni ingenii*; "defender…of great ability" 99), the two passages which give attributes of a good helmsman. From Brutus' individual act of bravery which freed the Romans from the yoke of servitude (i.e., their role as horses, to the implied charioteer, Tarquinius) viewed retrospectively,[65] stem many other historical exempla of individual sacrifice and heroism on behalf of the state, including Cicero's in the case of Catiline (*non facile hanc tantam molem mali a cervicibus vestris depulissem*, *Cat.* 3. 17) and more aptly Brutus and Cassius' (*patriae liberators urbe carebant ea cuius a cervicibus iugum servile deiecerant*, *Phil*. 1. 6). However, the solitary nature of Brutus' action (*primus, neminem*), its execution on behalf of his fellow citizens (*a civibus suis, civium*) with the attendant result of their being saved (*in*

---

[64] *itaque cum maior eius filius Lucretiae…vim attulisset, mulierque pudens …sese ipsa morte multavisset, tum vir ingenio et virtute praestans L. Brutus depulit a civibus suis iniustum illud durae servitutis iugum. qui cum privatus esset, totam rem publicam sustinuit, primusque in hac civitate docuit in conservanda civium libertate esse privatum neminem. quo auctore et principe concitata civitas… exulem et regem ipsum et liberos… esse iussit.*

[65] See below, Ch. 3, p. 133, on the characterization of the charioteer's rule in Aeschylus' *Septem* as oppressive in terms of the yoke of slavery.

conservanda civium libertatem [proleptically looking forward to the fact]), parallels Cicero's self-presentation as the sole savior of his fellow citizens as helmsman in the *In Pisonem* (*rei publicae navem gubernassem salvamque in portu cconlocassem,* 20; *bis unum me pro omnium salute obtuli*, 21) and as former helmsman in the *Pro Sestio* (*iecissem ipse me potius in profundum, ut ceteros conservarem*, 45). The use of *princeps* in conjunction with Brutus' action on behalf of the citizens just described "makes Brutus an example of the *rector*… who is the subject of the entire work and is described more fully at 51. 1," the helmsman passage previously discussed (Zetzel, 1995, 46. 3). The fact that the historical example of Tarquinius is reintroduced immediately before the description of the helmsman, after the excursus on tyranny which intervenes (47-50), supports this association, as do the helmsman's final qualities (*consilio et opera,* 51) that recall the primary qualities of Brutus (*ingenio et virtute*, 46). The parallel juxtaposition of the historical individuals, Tarquinius Superbus and Lucius Brutus, with that of the type of the tyrant and ideal statesman, follows the general organizational pattern "that informs the entire structure of *Rep.,*" that of "the antithesis between theory and history, between the general and the particular" (Zetzel, 1995, 16).

After the loss of about four pages of the text following the ideal statesman, Scipio is in the process of explaining why, in contrast to Plato's "shadowy commonwealth of the imagination," he will use the real Roman state to show the causes of every political good and ill (52). This more concrete approach is a major distinguishing characteristic of Cicero's the ship of state and this quality as well as the good helmsman's concern for his crew contrast with Plato's use of the figure in the *Republic.* As we saw, Plato's ship of state is one passage that comments on the behavior of current democratic practices in Athens, but always within the boundaries of the image. A compelling picture of the politicians' mindless violent competition for election and dissipated and wasted time in office is described to explain the philosopher's ill-repute and the true helmsman's—who appears in a cameo near the end of the metaphor—lack of opportunity to serve, even though he knows how to govern. Cicero's helmsman, representing the ideal statesman, is likewise separated from vivid action; in fact, he appears to have entered the discourse at this point only to present the moral antithesis to the tyrant. As emblematic as his

presentation is, his defining characteristics are in keeping with Plato's philosopher—he is good, wise and skillful—with one exception, his care and concern for those he governs; in this aspect he resembles only the divine helmsmen in Plato's *Critias* (273d-e, see above, p. 19), where, although the references to the governed are frequent in the brief passage, they do not have the tangible presence that they have in the ship owner of Plato's metaphor in the *Republic*. Here, the ship owner, though big and strong, lacks vision and knowledge and allows himself to be harassed by the sailors. Victimized by the sailors, he is successfully manipulated to allow their destructive captaining of his ship. The demos, thus, passively facilitates the misrule of their leaders and are likewise objects of Plato's criticism. Although Cicero maintains Plato's primary focus on the forces of misrule in his ships of state, be they unworthy helmsmen, pirate, or tyrant—all his adversaries, he presents a concern for innocent fellow citizens as the central characteristic of his good helmsmen. The addition of this trait strengthens the Platonic moral dichotomy between false and true helmsmen because it foregrounds concern for one's fellowman, in contrast to ambitious self-concern on the part of bad helmsmen. In most cases, the characters in Cicero's ships of state, in contrast to Plato's, are specific real individuals—even in the *Republic* the real historical Tarquinius and Brutus are the prototypes—who are generalized to present the strongest moral contrast, perhaps indicative of Cicero's deep moral convictions. Did the values associated with the good helmsman continue to be active in Cicero's political language as the Roman republic further declined and did the key players in that drama—Caesar, Pompey, Antony and Octavian—ever appear as helmsmen? A brief consideration of this question, certainly relevant for an understanding of the reception of Cicero's helmsmen in the twenties when Vergil wrote, will conclude this section.

A letter to Atticus (*Att.* 8. 11) written in 49 recalls the last brief reference to the helmsman in the *Republic* 5.5 and in its expansion of the original demonstrates Cicero's strong commitment to his state's well-being in the reality of the contemporary circumstances.[66] In the midst of Caesar and Pompey's war Cicero asks Atticus if he remembers the standard his ideal statesman applies to all his actions:

---

[66] *Republic* 5.5: "and he (the statesman) must not be ignorant of the civil law, but his knowledge of it should be like the pilot's knowledge of the stars (*astrorum gubernator*), or a physician's knowledge of physics."

> This is what Scipio says in Book 5, I think: 'Just as a fair voyage is the intention of the helmsman, health of the physician, victory of the commander, *so this statesman's goal is the happy life of his countrymen*—that (their lives) may be strong in resources, rich in wealth, great in reputation and honored for their courage. *This is the task I want him to accomplish, the greatest and the noblest among men.'* Our Gnaeus has never thought about this before and least of all in the present context. *Both of the pair* (i.e., Pompey and Caesar) *have sought personal domination, not a happy and honored state...both want to reign.*[67]

The standard then for the ideal statesman, and one Cicero personally claimed to have followed, was the priority of concern for the well-being of his citizens, which Cicero has consistently associated with the good helmsman in opposition to the forces which threaten the Republic, here, with the tyranny (*dominatio* is despotism) of Caesar or Pompey.[68] A considerable number and variety of contemporary individuals have been suggested as possible candidates for Cicero's ideal statesman, his good helmsman.

Zetzel (1995, 27-8), whose opinion Fantham (2004, 318) strongly endorses, rejects all of what he calls "pragmatic interpretations," because the ancients classified politics as an ethical branch of philosophy, and therefore the *Republic* should not be read as a practical work.[69] Nevertheless, Cicero's own tendency, as evidenced in his letter to Atticus above, to view the ethical and practical as integral and his relentless incorporation of contemporaries into his polarized moral world, seem to have contributed to many "practical" answers to the statesman question. Zetzel summarizes them well: "in this century *Rep.* has been interpreted as an anticipation of the principate or a plea for Pompey to become dictator; as a call for an extra-constitutional charismatic leader; or most recently, as a blueprint for the restoration of the conservative Roman constitution of the middle Republic." Zetzel agrees that Cicero was "appalled by the decay of Roman institutions from the virtuous Republic of an earlier generation," but he thinks that what

---

[67] *nam sic quinto, ut opinor, in libro loquitur Scipio, 'Vt enim gubernatori cursus secundus, medico salus, imperatori victoria, sic huic moderatori rei publicae beata civium vita proposita est, ut opibus firma, copiis locuples, gloria ampla, virtute honesta sit. huius enim operis maximi inter homines atque optimi illum esse perfectorem volo.'* [2] *hoc Gnaeus noster cum antea numquam tum in hac causa minime cogitavit. dominatio quaesita ab utroque est, non id actum beata et honesta civitas ut esset…uterque regnare vult.*

[68] Dunkle (1967), 152, notes the interchangeability in Cicero of the Greek loan words *tyrannus, tyrannis, tyrannicus*, with *rex, dominus, regnum, dominatio, dominatus, regnare, dominari, regius,* and *regie* to refer to a Roman "despot."

[69] Zetzel (1995), 28, does list other reasons, but admits that they add up to a failure to read the *Republic* as a work of philosophy.

Cicero is primarily interested in is an ethical reform of individuals, which will in turn transform the state, not unlike Augustus' attempts to restore traditional Roman ethics.

In fact, once in power after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at Actium, Augustus restored the republic along what many have called Ciceronian lines. Galinsky (1996, 74) maintains that phraseology and conceptual parallels abound, among which are the restoration of the *mores* for the optimum condition of the state, the close relationship between the character of the *res public* and its rulers, and a leader of the state—defined as *gubernator, rector* or *moderator*—who governs by his *auctoritas*, and only incidentally by his *potestas*. And yet, Galinsky cautions that these ideas were "in the air" and that Augustus "did not need to study Cicero's *Republic* to chart his course." However, in one important instance Galinsky does see Augustus recalling "Cicero's memorable rendition" of events—the first sentence of his *Res Gestae* 1.1-3:

> Annos undeviginti natus exercitum privato consilio et privata impensa comparavi, per quem rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem vindicavi.
>
> At the age of nineteen on my private initiative and at my private expense I raised an army, with which I redeemed into liberty the *res publica* when it was oppressed by the tyranny of a faction.

Writing near the end of his life,[70] Augustus recalls his raising of an army from the mutinous legions of Antony, consul at the time (the fall of 44), and marching to Rome, where he asked for and received from the senate the office of praetor, membership in the senate and the voting privileges of a former consul. His arrival in Rome with troops (a completely unconstitutional act), forced Antony to leave the city. Cicero interpreted this in his *Third Philippic* 3-5, delivered before the senate on the 20th of December, 44, as the freeing of the Republic from the plague of Antony:

> C. Caesar adulescens, paene potius puer, incredibili ac divina mente atque virtute, cum maxime furor arderet Antoni cumque eius a Brundisio crudelis et pestifer reditus timeretur, nec postulantibus nec cogitantibus…firmissimum exercitum…comparavit patrimoniumque suum effudit…in salute rei publicae

[70] In the final paragraph (35) Augustus writes that he was in his seventy-sixth year when he composed the *Res Gestae*, i.e., between September 23, 13 a.c. and August 19, 14 A.C., when he died. Opinions vary as to whether this should be taken literally or as referring to the final product, begun much earlier and edited through the course of his life. Cooley (2009) assumes the former.

> collocavit…Qua peste rem publicam privato consilio…Caesar liberavit: qui nisi in hac republica natus esset, rem publicam scelere Antoni nullam haberemus.
>
> Without our asking or thinking…a young man, or rather almost a boy, Gaius Caesar, with incredible and superhuman thought and courage when Antonius' fury was blazing with force and we feareded his cruel and destructive return from Brundisium, raised a very strong army and lavished his patrimony…(or rather) he invested it in the salvation of the Republic…From that plague (Antony) Caesar by his private initiative…delivered the Republic: had he not been born in this Republic, through the crime of Antonius we would no longer have a Republic.

Galinsky (1996, 45) notes the "obvious parallels" in the two texts: "the private initiative, the private army, the deliverance from Antony's oppression, the clause endings *comparavi/comparavit* and *in libertatem vindicavi* and *liberavit*,[71] and the repeated emphasis on the *res publica* (three times in *RG* 1, five times in one paragraph in the more expansive *Philippic* [3. 5])." In addition, many of these themes are central in Cicero's good helmsman as represented in the texts we have considered, foremost among which is the focus of the statesman on the *salus rei publicae*. The capacity of an individual to rescue the Republic is a prominent theme of the ship of state as a rhetorical commonplace in the *Ad Herennium* and as a dramatic episode in the *Pro Sestio.* Cicero may in particular be alluding to Rome's original liberator, Lucius Brutus in the *Republic* (46), whose example demonstrated "that no one is a mere private citizen when the liberty of his fellows needs protection" by freeing his fellow citizens from the unjust yoke of cruel servitude under the tyrant, Tarquinius Superbus. In referring indirectly to Antony as "the tyranny of a faction, (*a dominatione factionis*)," the *Res Gestae* "echoes Cicero's extreme language in attributing tyrannical designs to Antony" (Cooley, 2009, 108), whose position as consul was far more legitimate than Octavian's and in so doing presents events in terms of the moral polarity active especially in the case of Brutus in the *Republic*, but also in many other Ciceronian Ships of State. Both Brutus and Octavian manifest dual capabilities: mental excellence (*ingenio*, *incredibili ac divina quadam mente*) and courage (*virtute*). While Cicero's use of these characteristics in his description of Octavian in the *Philippics*

---

[71] Syme's (1939/1960), 155, comments on the vagueness ("it is a vague and negative notion—freedom from the rule of a tyrant or faction") and ubiquity of *libertas*' invocation ("At Rome all men paid homage to *libertas*") are amply proven by the examples he refers to: Pompey raised a private army and rescued Rome from the tyranny of the Marian party (*Bell. Afr.* 22.2); Caesar turned his arms against the government to liberate the Roman people and himself from the domination of a faction (*BC* 22.5).

suggests that this cluster of concepts is not exclusive to the helmsman in Cicero, but are the defining qualities of his patriotic leader, Augustus' use of this paradigm near the end of his life as explanation of and justification of his founding acts, demonstrates his attentiveness to Cicero's language and paradigm of leadership.

Cicero and the *Phaedrus*

As we will see in the next chapter, the piloting of a ship was very often compared to the driving of a chariot in ancient literature, including in the *Aeneid* (5. 144-47). But a much broader tradition in ancient literature developed around each individually, and in the case of the charioteer some themes crossed generic boundaries. For example, although the *Iliad*'s charioteers are largely divine, warrior kings or aristocrats, Himmelhoch has shown how pervasive the theme of the liminal ephebic charioteer is.[72] Similarly, the charioteer with his horses of the *Phaedrus*, famously represents the soul and its inner dynamics, but its connection with the questing young charioteer of Parmenides has recently been demonstrated.[73] The charioteer kings of tragedy very often become tyrants,[74] just as actual victorious charioteers threaten tyranny to their polis[75] and the Roman *triumphator* mimics Jupiter and so needed to be reminded he is human.[76] Consequently, although focusing on the charioteers in Plato and Cicero, this section will also include exploration of the related topics of the tragic tyrant and the Roman triumph. Both Plato and Cicero associate the charioteer with the soul and, alternatively, with the hubristic leader or tyrant. The most developed image of the charioteer in either author is that representing the soul in Plato's *Phaedrus,* a work of demonstrable significance to Cicero (see above, p. 13 and n. 17). Discussions of

---

[72] Himmelhoch (1997), 41: "The chariot in Homer… repeatedly demonstrates its potential to represent not only a character's liminal state as a warrior, but his liminal eroticism as well. He is in bloom, at the peak of his youth, a potential husband or newly married, and perhaps, too, recently embroiled in an *erastes*/*eromenos* relationship." And earlier (34): "The chariot-champion's liminal ties… are pronounced enough that even in situations where he is not ephebic the text's diction and imagery may still temporarily subsume him into this category by reason of analogy."

[73] Slaveva-Griffin (2003).

[74] Himmelhoch (1997), Ch. 6; Seaford (2003), 95-115.

[75] Kurke (1993), 132-55, describes the special powers thought to accrue to victorious charioteers and how the polis conceived of the resulting benefits. Himmelhoch (1997), 422, discusses the tyrannical threats of the victors.

[76] Versnel (1970) 56-57, describes the elements of the ceremony including the *servus publicus*, who holds the *corona triumphalis* over the triumphator's head and says *Respice post te, hominem te esse memento*. On the problematic relationship between the triumphator and Jupiter see Versnel (1970), Ch. 2 and Beard (2007), Ch. 7, and below pp. 68-69.

rhetoric in Plato hardly ever lack relevance to the politics of the polis, but the image of the soul as a charioteer and two contrasting horses describes the interior process of successful persuasion. In Cicero's response to the Platonic image the context is more obviously political, but he shifts the focus of the question of governing from the individual's responsibility toward the collective, which the ship of state image developed, to that of the morality of the individual soul as an indicator of worthiness to lead or its lack. He likewise shifts the emphasis from Plato's central training of the pair of antithetical horses to concordant obedience to a more negative representation of the charioteer who follows the predilections of the dark horse.

The *Phaedrus* consists of a discussion Socrates and Phaedrus had one scorching hot summer day outside Athens about the art of speaking.[77] Socrates meets Phaedrus on his way out of Athens to the country where he is going to practice a brilliant speech he had heard Lysias deliver the day before. Like Phaedrus, Socrates also has a passion for speeches and so he accompanies him to a grove, shaded by a plane tree on the far side of the river Ilissos. The structure of the dialogue consists of three speeches on love and a long discourse on the art of rhetoric. Lysias' speech and Socrates' first speech both are intended to prove the thesis that the beloved should grant favors to non-lovers, not to lovers. But Socrates with the help of his daimon becomes convinced he has insulted Eros and gives a speech of retraction, the palinode, in which he praises the lover and expounds upon the genuine type of love, the love of soul and of truth. Within the palinode is the description of the soul as a chariot team.

At the very beginning of the palinode after explicating the soul's immortality, Socrates describes its form (246a-b):

> Let us liken the soul to the innate power of a winged team of horses and a charioteer. All of the gods' horses and charioteers are themselves good and from good stock, but the situation of other horses and charioteers is mixed. For us men, first of all, a charioteer rules over and guides a pair of horses, and secondly, one of these horses is noble and good and from like stock, but other is the opposite and from opposite stock. So, for us chariot-driving must be difficult and irksome.[78]

---

[77] Asmis (1986) 167-68, n. 17, outlines the history of the dating of the *Phaedrus*, which used to be considered an early work, but is now considered to be in Plato's middle period c. 387- c. 367. She herself dates it "about 374-370."
[78] All translations of the *Phaedrus* are by Scully (2003).

Although in a previous existence mortals followed the charioteers of the gods around the vault of heaven as initiates in the rites of the gods, after a time the mortal charioteers were unable to control their horses and the mortal souls lost their wings and fell to earth. However, according to Socrates, mortal souls "can become winged once more and return to the rites of the gods if their charioteers succeed in the difficult task of controlling their ill-matched teams while the soul is under erotic madness."[79]

With the re-introduction of the charioteer and his team the challenge of this difficult task is described (253d-e):

> One of the horses, we said, was good, the other not (τῶν δὲ δὴ ἵππων ὁ μέν, φαμέν, ἀγαθός, ὁ δ' οὔ). But we haven't discussed the exellence of the good one (ἀρετὴ δὲ τίς ἀγαθοῦ) or the vice of the vicious one (ἢ κακοῦ κακία). We should do that now…One stands in the position of greater beauty (i.e., on the right), in form erect and well-jointed, high-necked, hooked nose, white to behold, black-eyed, a lover of honor with a sense of moderation and shame and a companion of true opinion, (τιμῆς ἐραστὴς μετὰ σωφροσύης τε καὶ αἰδοῦς, καὶ ἀληθινῆς δόξης ἑταῖρος) without the need of the whip, ruled by command and word alone. But the other is crooked, bulky, poorly slung together, stiff-necked, thick-necked, snub-nosed, black-skinned, cloudy-eyed, hot-blooded, a companion of wantonness and insolences, (ὕβρεως καὶ ἀλαζονείας ἑταῖρος) shaggy about the ears, obtuse, and scarcely obedient to whip or goad.

The moral opposition the two horses represent is stated twice and further emphasized in the second statement by the adjective/noun doubling of the quality. The white horse would seem to have the purest of moral pedigree, as suggested by its physical features and confirmed for the most part by the qualities it loves. That it stands in the position of greater beauty (ἐν τῇ καλλίονι) links it with the vision of heavenly "beauty in its radiance (250b)" and earthly access (via beauty's namesake) to heavenly beauty. Although its characterization as a lover of honor (τιμῆς ἐραστὴς), could qualify its purity, because the lovers described later who live in a more coarse manner are described as lacking philosophy, but loving honor (ἀφιλοσόφῳ, φιλοτίμῳ, 256b),[80] the qualities that accompany this love are among the most excellent in the Palinode. Its association with moderation carries a suggestion of the ultimate heavenly goal, for it is σωφροσύνη standing along with beauty on a holy pedestal that the charioteer is reminded of when he

[79] Belfiore (2006) 185, summarizes.

[80] Scully (2003), 38, n. 93, points out that in the *Republic* (549a), "love of honor is the first indicator that a soul is no longer harmoniously arranged."

looks upon the boy he pursues. Shame (αἰδοῦς) together with reason (λόγου) of the charioteer and good horse will oppose the bad horse's lust in the future description of the beloved's resistance to the temptation of sex (256a). While "true opinion" is not as clearly positive as knowledge or reason, the fact that this horse will respond to just a word (λόγῳ can also mean "reason") without need of a goad, suggests rationality. The reader has been well primed for the thoroughly negative presentation of the black horse—nearly a caricature—from the description of the mortal chariots' attempts to climb with the immortal chariots to the summit of heaven to gaze upon "things outside the heavens (i.e., a vision of the forms)." At this point the failure of mortals to reach the summit is attributed to their black horse only (247b):

> The vicious horse (ὁ τῆς κάκης ἵππος) is heavy and to the extent that it is not trained well it sinks earthward and weighs the charioteer down. At this point, the soul experiences extreme toil and struggle.[81]

The black horse's moral inferiority is visually expressed in the discussion of his vices (253d-e), by the physical features set nearly point for point against those of the white horse. The addition of the adjective "hot-blooded (ὕφαιμος)" suggests that the full manifestation of his vice will have a large physical component, which is amply confirmed by his future behavior, but also by his befriending of ὕβρις, which is wanton violence arising from pride of strength or passion. Pride is also implied in ἀλαζονεία, which can mean vain-boasting. Unlike the white horse that responds to verbal commands, this horse is scarcely obedient to the physical commands of whip and goad. The expectations raised by this description of the antithetical horses are fulfilled in the pursuit of the beloved.

After the charioteer has seen the beloved and the whole soul is filled with desire, the black horse compels by force (βίᾳ 254a) the white horse ("constrained as always by sense of shame, αἰδοῖ, 254a) and the charioteer to approach the beloved and mention the pleasures of sex. When they draw near the

---

[81] It should be noted, however, that in the description of various different chariots failed attempts (248a) the horses are generally blamed ("this soul gets confused by the horses…another soul harassed by the horses…") and even the charioteer is a cause of failure ("...some souls being maimed because of the charioteers' wrongdoing (κακᾴ 248b)." κακᾴ also appears at 253d as a characterization of the black horse, where Scully translates it as "vice." He allows at 248b (2003, 29, n. 74), that it could also be translated as "cowardice" or "wickedness." H. N. Fowler in the Loeb edition translates the charioteer's κακία as "incompetence" (248b), but that of the black horse as "badness" (253d).

charioteer sees his beauty and remembers the true beauty he saw in a previous existence and he experiences reverence and fear and then retreats (254b). The white horse obeys willingly, the black horse reluctantly and after they retreat the black horse, once he recovers from his pain, becomes angry and abusive and in a fury (ὀργῇ 254c) accuses its yokemate and the charioteer of cowardice and lack of manliness (δειλίᾳ τε καὶ ἀνανδρίᾳ 254d). The black horses's violence and passion are further demonstrated in the second approach which he again forces on the other two but this time becoming more bestial as he snarls while dragging them (βιαζόμενος, χρεμετίζων, ἕκων 254d) and when he approaches the boy, "biting on the bit, he pulls shamelessly (μετ' ἀναιδεία 254e). The charioteer's response is correspondingly violent (254e):

> ὁ δ' ἡνίοχος ἔτι μᾶλλον ταὐτὸν πάθος παθών, ὥστερ ἀπο ὕσπληγος ἀναπεσών, ἔτι μᾶλλον τοῦ ὑβριστοῦ ἵππου ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων βίᾳ ὀπίσω σπάσας τὸν χαλινόν, τήν τε κακήγορον γλῶτταν καὶ τὰς γνάθους καθῆμαξεν καὶ τὰ σκέλη τε καὶ τὰ ἰσχία πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἐρείσας ὀδύναις ἔδωκεν. ὅταν δὲ ταὐτὸν πολλάκις πάσχων ὁ πονηρὸς τῆς ὕβρεως λήξῃ…
>
> Even more resentful than before, the charioteer falls back as if recoiling from a starting gate, still more violently yanking back on the bit in the wanton horse's mouth. Bloodying its abusive tongue and jaws, he presses the legs and haunches of the horse hard upon the ground in pain. Only when it has suffered this same treatment repeatedly does the despicable creature cease its wanton excess.

Ferrari has noted that the charioteer and the black horse exchange roles, because the black horse uses rational language in its persuasion, while here the charioteer, in addition to being compared to a racehorse, uses violent force (Ferrari, 1987, 185-90).[82] However, the black horse's language is only partly rational and largely abusive and the violence exhibited by the charioteer ("violently," "bloodying," "pain") can also be taken as an expression of the extreme recalcitrance of the black horse, who requires repeated

---

[82] Ferrari (1987), 192, stresses the importance of the agency of the black horse in moving the soul toward the beloved and others have agreed (Scully, 2003, 96: "If the black horse were not disobedient, neither the bashful charioteer nor the modest white horse would ever approach the boy). It is true that the soul as described in the *Phaedrus* lacks the "spirited" component of the *Republic*'s schema (appetitive, spirited, and rational, with the spirited able to link up with either of the other two parts, 435c-441c) and the black horse fulfills this function, but it is not clear that the charioteer would not have responded if he had not been pulled along ("he begins to feel a tickling and a desire for the goad" 254a), nor does the black horse's impetus receive any positive comment. It would seem the more positive valence given to the black horse's agency, the more difficult it is to accept the charioteer's violent reprimands (Scully, 2003, 96 implies by his question "Why does the charioteer treat the black horse so violently?" that there is no reasonable answer). A more important question to consider would seem to be why Plato has constructed a soul with such polarized parts for this particular work.

violent discipline until "humbled in the end it follows the charioteer's plan," which is that "the lover's soul follows the darling with awe and a sense of shame (αἰδουμένην τε καὶ δεδιυῖαν 254e)." As the friendship progresses eventually the opportunity for sexual relations arises and is circumvented, but not without some action on the part of both their unbridled horses (ἀκόλαστος ἵππος 255e, 256a), and in the end "they have enslaved what enables viciousness (κακία) and they have liberated what allows excellence (ἀρετή 256b)". And thus the initial passionate attraction to the beauty of the beloved is a means to the development of a love of wisdom, which is accompanied by a checking of physical desire.

The charioteer and his two horses, a metaphor of the soul in the *Phaedrus,* reappear with the same purpose in Cicero's *Republic*, but in quite an altered form: instead of a charioteer and two horses, Cicero describes a driver and his mahout or elephant. Between the summary and conclusion of book 2 Scipio presents an analogue for the ideal government considered in the abstract, i.e., without reference to the Roman model. After a gap of considerable but uncertain length Scipio appears to be discussing the ideal statesman and, in particular at this point, he is looking for a man with good sense (*prudentem,* 67). Scipio suggests a man, whom both he and Laelius had seen sitting upon a huge and monstrous beast (*immani et vastae insidens beluae* [an elephant]) in Africa, who guides this animal (*coercet et regit beluam*) in what ever direction he wishes by gentle word or touch (*levi admonitu aut tactu inflectit*). Scipio then makes a comparison between the driver's job and that of reason in the mind (2. 67):

> ergo ille Indus aut Poenus unam coercet beluam, et eam docilem et humanis moribus adsuetam; at vero ea quae latet in animis hominum quaeque pars animi mens vocatur, non unam aut facilem ad subigendum frenat et domat [beluam], si quando id efficit, quod perraro potest. namque et illa tenenda est ferox…
>
> Well, that Indian or Carthaginian governs a single animal which is gentle and accustomed to the ways of man; but that power which is hidden in men's minds and forms a part of them, and is called reason, controls and subdues not merely one animal, or one which is easily mastered—that is, if it ever does accomplish that which is rarely possible; for that fierce [beast] must also be held in check…

The metaphoric representation of the mind as two beasts of opposing nature—easily controlled or fierce—which are held in check by a driver, strongly suggests the figure of the soul as described in the charioteer ensemble in the *Phaedrus*, especially given the implied struggle impending. Although the

description of the beasts here is schematic, the implicit rationality and willingness to be submissive to the driver of the one beast[83] contrasts with the wild and more passionate difficulty of the other.[84] The *Phaedrus* already suggests the applicability of its discussion of the soul to politicians, first in the initial description of the human charioteer as ἄρχων (ruler, chief, king; "the ruler of our soul drives a pair" [ἡμῶν ὁ ἄρχων συνωρίδος ἡνιοχεῖ, 246b]), although he typically is a ἡνίοχος (literally "one who holds the reins," often "charioteer," 247b, e, 248b, 254a, b, c, e, etc.). Further, in a description of a sort of hierarchy of souls within the Palinode (based on the amount of pure Being they witnessed prior to birth) Plato includes three categories of political figures among the nine: the second best—a law abiding king, a military man, or a ruler; third best—a political man; and the worst—a tyrant (248d-e).[85] Plato's charioteer is associated with forethought (or foresight, προνοίᾳ), which the black horse eventually follows (254e); this is precisely the quality Scipio is looking for in his statesman (*prudentem*, contracted from *providens*=foreseeing, 2. 67).[86] Unfortunately, in the *Republic* a page or more is lost from what follows the metaphor of the soul of which there are five tantalizing fragments (2. 68).[87] The first fragment seems to continue an elaboration on the fierce beast:

> …[a beast] which feeds on blood; which exalts so in every sort of cruelty that it can hardly be sated even by the harshest killings of men…,

but the last appears to be considering the necessity of proper preparation, conceivably in a metaphor of governing such as Cicero used of the helmsman to describe the Epicurean philosophers discounting of

---

[83] (*docile*=teachable; *unam aut facilem ad subigendum frenat et domat*; cf. Plato's white horse who is "guided only by word of command and by reason" 253d)

[84] Although *ferox* is the only clear attribute of the black horse's analogue (corresponding to the violence of Plato's horse, i. e. "he springs wildly forward" [σκιρτῶν δὲ βίᾳ φέρεται, 254a]), that he is difficult to restrain seems implicit in *et illa tenenda est*; cf. the black horse which is "hardly obedient to whips and spir" (μάστιγι μετὰ κέντρων μόγις ὑπείκων, 253e) and "no longer heeds pricks or whips of the charioteer" (ὁ δὲ οὔτε κέντρων ἡνιοχικῶν οὔτε μάστιγος ἔτι ἐντρέπεται, 254a).

[85] The souls who have witnessed Being the most are lovers of wisdom or beauty or of something musical or erotic.

[86] Plato's charioteer is not as clearly identified with reason as Cicero envisions his ensemble, being primary faced with the challenge of driving the pair, but the charioteer's role as driver and guide would easily suggest the association and commentators frequently assume it: Rowe (1986), 247d, 6-8, "the charioteer is intellect or mind."

[87] The other fragments: "…but to one who is greedy and acquisitive and lustful, and who wallows in sensual pleasure…and in the fourth place, anxiety, prone to sorrow, ever grieving and torturing itself…to have been afflicted by anguish and suffering, or degraded by fear and cowardice…"

learning at the beginning of the *Republic* 1. 11 (see above, p. 33), but now it is the charioteer who suffers the consequences:

> …ut aurigae indoctus e curru trahitur, opteritur, laniature, eliditur…
>
> …as an unskilled charioteer is dragged from his chariot, trampled, lacerated, dashed to pieces…

What the exact relationship between this charioteer passage and the drivers and beasts of the other fragments was, unfortunately now is not clear. But as in Plato the images used here are concerned with the great challenge of maintaining internal self-control figured as a driver's struggle with two animals of contrasting dispositions. Cicero seems to find this figure particularly attractive for representing individuals who are unable to maintain internal control, which is also suggested in circumstances where the image is used in its quintessential form, that of maintaining control of the "reins" (*habenas*).[88] Whereas in Plato's *Phaedrus* the focus of the figurative story is on the successful charioteer who is commonly aligned with the "good" horse, Cicero has more interest in representing the story of failure: the charioteer who cannot or will not control his dark horse, typically reducing the story to a metaphorical fixed character trait, with the implicit alignment now between bad charioteer and horse. In what has been called a "reinterpretation of Plato's charioteer analogy" in the *Phaedrus*,[89] Cicero employs this metaphor (*effrenatus* "unbridled") to emphasize an individual's lack of control over negative aspects of their character, suggesting that they would make at least poor politicians, if not, as I will argue, tyrants. In making this move toward the dark side of the ensemble Cicero had an abundance of literary tradition to draw from, including, as we will see, Plato in the *Republic.*

---

[88] *De republica* 1. 9: "They (Epicurean philosophers) maintain a wise man should not attempt to take the reins (*habenas*), as he cannot restrain the insane and untamed fury of the common herd…" and 2. 58: "And indeed not even the disciplinary system of Lycurgus was able to hold his subjects, though they were Greeks, under bridle and bit (*frenos*). *Frenum* refers properly to a horse's bridle or harness (including the reins and bit), but it is also used to refer just to the reins.

[89] Graver (2002), 142, in making this evaluation refers specifically to Stoic texts (Galen, Stobaeus) in which a lack of control in the soul is expressed by analogy with a horse that "throws off the reins." However, she compares this to Cicero's use of unbridled (*effrenatus*) desire. I have not found clear evidence that Cicero is alluding to Plato in his use of *effrenatus*, but Plutarch's Life of Antony, in which he likens Antony to what he identifies as Plato's unmanageable beast ἀκόλαστον, the Greek equivalent of *effrenatus,* (See below, p. 52), suggests it may generally have been understood as belonging to this heritage.

The Unbridled Dark Horse and Charioteer

In the *Phaedrus* when the two lovers have the opportunity to have physical intimacy, the pairs' unbridled horses (ἀκόλαστος ἵππος 255e) can be restrained by their charioteers and the obedient horses: "the other horse and the charioteer oppose all this with modesty (αἰδοῦς) and reason (λόγου, 256a)." There is, however, a second-best scenario imagined, one in which the lovers live a life less noble and at some point when they have been drinking, their two unruly horses (τὼ ἀκολάστω) "…seize upon and accomplish that which is by the many accounted blissful" (256c). Because they have been temperate in this activity these lovers too ultimately after death receive their wings (immortality), but this rehabilitation is precluded in Cicero's use of the unbridled horse (*effrenatus*), whether, as is most common, it is used to describe an aspect of a man's soul, or the multitudes of Rome. Most applications of the adjective in Cicero have the primary purpose of discrediting the figurative charioteer who implicitly refuses to control his horses.[90] One of the most vivid uses of the figure is in the opening rhetorical questions of *In Catilinam* 1:

> Quem ad finem sese effrenata jactabit audacia?
>
> To what lengths will your unbridled boldness go?

Nearly every word in this brief question invokes the horse, from *finem,* which can mean the end of a horse race, to *sese…iactabit*, which more often has the figurative meaning "to boast," but the root meaning of which ("to throw oneself about," as horses commonly do) is strongly suggested here. Nevertheless, since the *audacia* in question is an aspect of Catiline's character that he does not control, in this question he is also being represented as an inept or bad charioteer, since he is failing to restrain the passions of his soul. Himmelhoch has labeled this phenomenon already present in Greek literature—bad charioteers also being bad horses—"transitivity," but it seems logically inherent in the meaning of *effrenatus.* Her study of the

---

[90] *Ver.* 2. 1.62. 2; 2. 5. 139. 11; *Clu.* 15. 3; *Cat.* 1. 25. 2; *Red. Pop.* 11. 18; *Dom.* 115. 2; *Har.* 2. 11; *Sest.* 82. 2; *Cael.* 35. 12; 76. 12; *Pis*. 44. 8; *Mil.* 76. 12; 77. 4; *Phil*. 5. 22. 4; 11. 4. 5; 12. 26. 13; 14. 26. 5; *Brut.* 269. 3; *Rep.* 1. 53. 3; 1. 65. 20; 6. 1. 17; *Tus.* 3. 11; 4. 12; 4. 15. The first two examples in the *Republic* are the Roman *multitudo* (with interesting parallels with the storm in *Aen.* 1) and *populi.* The quality that is most frequently described as unbridled is lustful passion (*cupiditas, libido*), which may suggest a Phaedran connection.

Greek charioteer ensemble shows that almost from the beginning of its use both good and bad charioteers are presented and very frequently the bad are configured as tyrants, as we will see, they also are in Cicero.

Whether the bad charioteers are heedless of wise advice because they are exulting in their success, impious in resisting a god's guidance, or glorying in their wealth, they represent individuals of selfish excess. In the *Iliad* both the Trojan Asios and the Greek Patroclus ignore the wise advice a worthy counselor (Poulydamas, Achilles) has given them and at a fateful point in the narrative they are described as exalting in their chariot and horses (Asios, 12. 113) or in war (Patroclus, 16. 91). Both are characterized as foolish (νήπιος 12.114, Patroclus three times in book 16. 8, 46, 686) and together form "a recognizable thematic association between the governing of a chariot and the expression of a given character's restraint or wisdom (Himmelhoch, 1997, 129)."[91] To these qualities (restraint and wisdom) the archaic Athenian aristocrats added that of excellence to define the aristocratic nature in an attempt to distinguish themselves from the new landless wealthy (Himmelhoch, 199-200). In her analysis of Theognis 847-50 Himmelhoch sees the misrule the aristocrats attributed to "usurpers and tyrants" represented and the demos in the position of dumb brutes, susceptible to the manipulations of the morally corrupt single leader. The aristocrats by implication are "the constructive, civilizing force in the polis," which can be undermined by the demos and the demagogic tyrant.[92] In Pindar's charioteer imagery Himmelhoch (350) reveals a new aspect—that of the mortal as the obedient or disobedient steed of an immortal charioteer:

> Sometimes the god directly guides mortal performance by literally taking the reins of the mortal's fate in his (or her) own hands. The success of this particular mortal-to-immortal interaction depends entirely upon the piety of the mortal charge…

---

[91] Himmelhoch (1997), 111-14, first develops the positive characteristics in Nestor and his son Antilochus who represent the charioteer ensemble as "a sign of wisdom and self-restraint," which she characterizes as "the most insistent" figurative use of the ensemble.

[92] Himmelhoch (1997), 216-21. Her translation of Theognis 847-50:

> Grind the people under your heel, strike them with
> a sharp goad, and place an uncomfortable yoke about their neck,
> for you will never find a *demos* fond of despots in this way,
> not of all the men the sun looks down upon.

Although some interpret the yoke as an indication of oxen, Himmelhoch argues that the *kentron* (goad) is used exclusively in Homer with horses (217).

Interestingly, Himmelhoch notes (351) that, "the qualities which make the good figurative charioteer also identify him as an excellent divine charge. The traits are transitive." This is also true in the case of the "bad" charioteer/steed. In *Pythian* 2, for example, the poetic *persona* "implies that Hieron's fate is guided by a divine charioteer, and that Hieron's piety makes him a desirable steed," but two kinds of equine reactions are described (89-95):

> Yet, it is ill to strive with God
> who upholds now one faction, now to the other gives
> great glory…
> To bear lightly the neck's yoke
> brings strength; but kicking
> against the goad is the way
> of failure.[93]

Here we see the intemperate individual equated with a rambunctious horse, which implies that intemperance is impious (Himmelhoch (355). A similar use of transitivity appears in Attic tragedy, but tragedy inverts the Pindaric valuation of the tyrant. Whereas Pindar had successfully redefined "the figure's traditional disposition towards 'improper' governments such as tyranny (cf. the pious Hieron above)," in tragedy "every Attic charioteer…abuses his power" (Himmelhoch, 228 and 385).

In her analysis of the tragic charioteer Himmelhoch focuses on the works of Aeschylus in which she finds the figure's "most politically charged deployment…a phenomenon most likely due to the historical circumstances in which he wrote (394)." The defeat of the Persian tyranny, which personally engaged most of the demos of Athens (including Aeschylus), clearly motivated Aeschylus' *Persae.* In this play the evils characteristic of the Persian empire are primarily evoked by the chariot ensemble (Himmelhoch, 398), of which the most elaborate presentation is found in the dream of Xerxes' mother, Atossa, in which the horses of Xerxes' chariot are women representing Greece and Persia (181-97):

> There seemed to come into my sight two finely dressed women, one arrayed in Persian, the other in Doric robes, outstandingly superior in stature to the women of real life, of flawless beauty, and sisters of the same stock: one, by the fall of the lot, was a native and inhabitant of the land of Greece, the other of the Orient. I seemed to see these two raising some kind of strife between themselves; my son, perceiving this, tried to restrain and calm them, yoked them under his chariot,

[93] Translation by Lattimore (1976).

> and passed the yoke-strap under their necks. One of them, thus arrayed, towered up proudly, and kept her jaw submissively in harness; but the other began to struggle, tore the harness from the chariot with her hands, dragged it violently along without bridle or bit, and smashed the yoke in half.[94]

In this double layer of figuration—the countries are women who themselves are horses— because an oppressive tyrant is the charioteer, the rebellious horse ("unbridled" ἄνευ χαλινῶν, 196) is here the "good" horse, Greece. This image of rebellion demonstrates forcefully within an overt chariot context the constraining import of the yoke and bridle and the "human" rejection of these burdens as emblems of the tyrant's power.

In contrast to the symbolic clarity of the chariot ensemble in Atossa's dream, the ensemble in Aeschylus' *Oresteia* is both more complex and somewhat unstable, although its association with tyranny remains strong. Agamemnon is primarily a charioteer, but he is also in other scenes implicitly a horse, but in this case the "rebellious" horse represents the negative tyrannical character.[95] When the chorus describes the dilemma that Agamemnon faced at Aulis, his acceptance of the "yoke-strap of necessity," suggests his acquiescence to divine fate as a willing steed. But his sacrifice of his daughter, ("the bridle choking her voice," 238), to accomplish his military ambitions, the "crushing yoke" he cast upon Troy and the desecration of her temples (527-31), argue that he became instead an impious, erring steed, as well as charioteer. These same negative qualities appear in the central scene in the *Agamemnon* when he arrives on stage driving his chariot with his prize, Cassandra, beside him. Although Agamemnon conforms to many of the Athenian stereotypes of the tyrant—the charioteer and the wealth to race in the various games signified a potential threat,[96] an aspiring general suggested ambitions for personal power,[97] sexual excess (the displaying of Cassandra as apparent bride, but actual rape victim), at the same time, being easily dominated by women (losing to Clytemnestra in the tapestry argument)—his reference to Odysseus in his speech, as his only loyal comrade, completes the figurative presentation of a tyrant, since

---

[94] Translation by Sommerstein (2008).
[95] I am following Himmelhoch's analyses, 414-46.
[96] On Alcibiades see Thucydides, 6. 15-16.
[97] Himmelhoch (1997), 423; Podlecki (1986), 99-100; Plato *Rep*, 566e; Aristotle *Politics*, 1313b28-1314b22.

he describes Odysseus as "his yoked trace-horse" (841-42).[98] Thus, Agamemnon returns from a costly and morally questionable victory, displaying in his chariot evidence of sexual excess, and allows his wife to convince him to walk on costly material, fit only for the gods. In Himmelhoch's view his acceptance of the "yoke of necessity" near the beginning of the *Oresteia* furthered his selfish and, ultimately, tyrannical goals. Although Himmelhoch does not consider Platonic charioteers, one clear example of a bad charioteer is prominent in the *Republic.*

The popular leader, when he is fully transformed to a tyrant in Plato's *Republic* stands in the chariot of the city (ἐν τῷ δίφρῳ τῆς πόλεως, 566d). Although Adams is of the opinion that the inclusion of this "common" figure was suggested by the Homeric allusion within which it is presented,[99] Plato's clever reversal of the Iliadic intertext (Cebriones' fall from the chariot) gives particular emphasis to the presentation of the newly made tyrant in the chariot. Plato has recently asserted that "the position of popular leader (προστάτης, literally, 'one who stands in front') is the sole root from which he (the tyrant) springs" (565d). After describing his killing of one citizen and raising a faction against others, he concludes (566c-d):

> Ὁ δέ δὴ προστάτης ἐκεῖνος αὐτὸς δῆλον δὴ ὅτι μέγας μεγαλωστὶ οὐ κεῖται, ἀλλὰ καταβαλὼν ἄλλους πολλοὺς ἕστηκεν ἐν τῷ δίφρῳ τῆς πόλεως, τύραννος ἀντὶ προστάτου ἀποτετελεσμένος.
>
> As for this popular leader of ours, he clearly does not lie on the ground "mighty in his might," but, having brought down all those others, he stands in the chariot of the city as a complete tyrant instead of a popular leader.[100]

The expression "mighty in his might" refers to Hector's charioteer Cebriones, who, after being slain by a stone thrown by Patroclus, "like a diver fell from the well-made chariot" and lay on the ground "mighty in his might, forgetful of his horsemanship" (*Il*. 16. 742-3, 776). The long build up in Plato's sentence to the transformed manifestation of the tyrant consists of a tricky play on the literal meaning of the word for

---

[98] μόνος δ' 'Οδυσσεύς, ὅσπερ οὐχ ἑκὼν ἔπλει,/ζευχθεὶς ἑτοῖμος ἦ ἐμοὶ σειραφόρος ("Only Odysseus, the one who sailed against his will, proved himself once yoked, my willing right hand man" lit., trace horse; translation by Sommerstein, 2008). Agamemnon is standing in the chariot throughout his entire stage appearance, until he finally descends the carriage and walks into the house with Clytemnestra. Himmelhoch (1997), 425, n. 65, further notes that Aigisthos' use of the term ("yoke," 1641), is thoroughly despotic.

[99] Adams (1902/1963), 566c, d.

[100] Translation by Reeve (2004).

popular leader προστάτης which could be paraphrased as "Mr. standing up isn't lying down (mighty in his might), but having brought others down, he is standing up," which emphasizes that, although the action initiators in the stories (Patroclus, the popular leader) both bring someone down (Cebriones, all those others), their actions in relation to the chariot are the opposite: Patroclus knocks someone out, the popular leader himself gets into the carriage. The goal toward which the sentence leads is the moment of transformation in the chariot: ἐν τῷ δίφρῳ τῆς πόλεως, τύραννος ἀντὶ προστάτου ἀποτετελεσμένος, the complete tyrant in place of the popular leader. The chariot is essential for all of the ups and downs and the sense of the textual allusion to be complete and it is the goal of Plato's overarching argument—tyrants develop from popular leaders.[101] If the chariot is used here as symbolic of the tyrant, neither this image nor Plato's initial one of the wolf, which gives pointed expression to the developing tyrant's bloodthirstiness toward his enemies (565d-e), are continued in the more detailed descriptions of the evolution of the tyrant's character in book 9. Here the future tyrant's friends implant a powerful ruling passion as the popular leader of his profligate appetites (572e). This popular leader adopts madness (μανίας) as his bodyguard and is stung to frenzy (οἰστρᾷ) until it has purged the future tyrant of temperance (σωφροσύνης).[102] While sharing qualities of the stage tyrant, true to the Platonic exploration of various political types, his analysis focuses more on the soul than the actions of the tyrant.

This Greek poetic tradition of the tyrannical charioteer would have been a contributing factor in the development of Cicero's unbridled villains that worked synergistically with the Platonic representations of the soul in the *Phaedrus* and the tyrant in the *Republic.* The Greek tyrant, which Roman audiences first became familiar with through adaptations of Greek tragedies starting in the second century,[103] appeared as a subject of a rhetorical exercise first in Cicero's *De Inventione* 2. 144, (c. 86), and subsequently informed

---

[101] Brock (2013), 121, discusses the use of the chariot of state in Aristophanes (*Kn.* 1109; *Eccl.* 466), Sophocles (fr. 683) and elsewhere in Plato (*Plt.* 266e; *Leg.* 905e, 906e) and specifically identifies the use of the image here and in reference to fifth-century politicians as negative (159, 186, n. 127).

[102] According to Plato, this process explains "why Passion has long been called a tyrant" (573b). Madness, passion and frenzy are the tyrants defining qualities in book 9, although he is also described as a drunkard, melancholic, envious, untrustworthy, unjust, friendless, impious and, in sum, a host and nurse to every kind of vice (πάσης κακίς πανδοκεῖ τε καὶ τροφεῖ, 580a). Plato's tyrant is indeed "a monster without a single redeeming feature of any kind" (Adams 573c).

[103] The earliest extant use of the word *tyrannus* occurs in Accius' (170-c. 85) *Atreus* (Dunkle [1967], 154.

Livy's representation of tyrants (Dunkle, 1971, 16-17). His portrait of Hieronymus (24.4.3-5), the youthful tyrant of Syracuse, employs "many conventional elements of the standard representation of the tyrant," including driving a *quadrigae.*[104] The portrait of the Greek stage tyrant was also a source, as Dunkle (1967) has shown, for Roman political invective in the late Republic.[105] Chief among the targets of this invective were Verres, Clodius, Piso and Antony—precisely the men who were most often described as unbridled in their *cupiditas, libido, furor, audacia, violentia* or *scelera,* qualities which in general overlap with the most common terms of abuse in political invective: *vis, superbia, libido* and *crudelitas* (Dunkle, 1967, 151, 168-9). Because of the excessive abundance of one or more of these qualities, Cicero accused all of these men of aspiring toward the position of tyrant over the Roman people or provinces, Verres being "the most fully delineated" (Dunkle, 1967, 160), but Antony, perhaps, the most insistently.[106] Because the Greek stage tyrant was a figure of selfish excess without limit whose passion, expressed in violence, cruelty and lust, was a defining feature, and who was frequently presented as a bad charioteer or steed, allusions to the stage tyrant stereotype would and did strengthen the desired impression that an individual who was unbridled in lust, frenzy, boldness or violence was of so dissolute and destructive a character that they threatened the well-being of all and should never hold office.

Cicero's allusions to the image of the soul in the chariot ensemble of Plato's *Phaedrus* pay particular attention to aspects of *ethos* which elucidate the struggle within the soul of mastering the unruly, unbridled horse as seen in the *Republic*'s contrasting beasts. In his political life his interest centers on those who lose the battle with the unruly horse (*In Verrem, In Catilinam, De Domo sua, Pro Caelio, In*

---

[104] "Now they saw royal purple, the diadem, the armed attendants—even at times, the young king driving from the palace behind four white horses, like Dionysus the tyrant of old."

[105] Dunkle (1967), 155, maintains that Roman audiences were in the habit of reading parallels to the current political situation at Rome into these tragedies—particularly in the matter of tyranny. In support he cites the incident that occurred at a performance of a tragedy in 59, when the lines "*nostra miseria tu es magnus*" caused a great disturbance because the audience applied them to Pompey (described in *Att.* 2. 19. 3).

[106] Dunkle (1967), 160-62, discusses Cicero's treatment of Verres; (163-64), Clodius; (163-4), Piso; he notes (164), that in the *Philippics* Cicero attacks Antony's *crudelissimus dominatus* (an equivalent of *tyrannicus*, Dunkle, 152; 3. 29) and later describes his domination as cruel and arrogant (*crudelem superbamque dominationem,* 3. 34). Other references to Antony's tyrannical behavior are cited: 1. 36; 2. 8, 15, 19, 62, 71, 99, 107; 3. 3-5, 8-10, 23, 28; 4. 3, 12, 14; 5. 10, 21-22, 42, 44; 6. 3; 7.15, 27; 8. 12; 12. 12; 13. 5, 18-19; 14. 9, 25. Also see Stevenson (2008), 101: "The argument for Antony as tyrant (in the *Philippics*), then, is pervasive, elaborate and overwhelming."

Piso, Pro Milone, Philippicae). In their selfishness and uncontrolled appetites and violence these men are the antithesis of the good statesman whose primary concern is the well-being of the citizens. Not surprisingly, those men noted for their unbridled passion, boldness, etc. are also bad helmsmen who shipwreck the state and/or pirates. But the unbridled nature has a personal lack of restraint suggestive of gross excess that Cicero represents as frightening.[107] The association of a lack of restraint in past and contemporary literature with tyrants both further confirms the need to fear the unbridled and predicts the consequences if their lust for power is fulfilled.

The Case of Marc Antony

At the close of his life the unbridled nature of Antony and, as noted above, what Cicero perceived as his tyrannical aspirations caused Cicero the greatest consternation. In *Phil.* 12. 26 Cicero imagines all the dangers he would have encountered if he had gone on the embassy to Antony at Mutina in 43: "I know the fury (*furorem*) of the man, I know his unbridled violence (*effrenatam violentiam*)." To register his outrage at Antony's execution of soldiers threatening to defect from him in 44 Cicero focuses on his recklessness, literally his "unbridledness," one of the few uses of the noun: *quae effrenatio impotentis animi*, which is a difficult phrase to translate since every word except *quae* can and probably is intended to express lack of restraint or control ("What an ungovernable outburst of fury!"). The specific association of "unbridledness" with Antony and even its association with Plato's *Phaedrus* may have been developed elsewhere in Cicero or other contemporary authors, as a passage in Plutarch's life of Antony suggests.[108]

Plutarch's narrative finishes the account of the conference of Octavian and Antony at Tarentum (37), at which Octavia facilitated gestures of goodwill between the two men—an exchange of ships and men (35). Octavian turns to the war with Pompey, while Antony returns to Asia (36):

---

[107] See Corbeill (2008), 240-54, who shows that Cicero did, in fact, mean to characterize Clodius, Catiline, Piso, Gabinius and Antony as bizarre and awful prodigies, "whose very existence threatened the safety of the state" (241).

[108] Among Plutarch's sources for the life of Antony, Pelling (1988), 26-28, mentions the use of the following ones which were approximately contemporary with Antony's life: Augustus' *Autobiography*, Cicero's second *Philippic*, C. Asinius Pollio's history of the Civil Wars, and the work of Q. Dellius. See Beard (2007), 269, for the view that some of Plutarch's views reflect Octavian's propaganda. Pelling (4) estimates that *Antony* was written between 110 and 115 C. E.

> But the dire evil which had been slumbering for a long time, namely, his passion (ἔρως) for Cleopatra, which men thought had been charmed away and lulled to rest by better considerations, blazed up again with renewed power as he drew near to Syria. And finally, like the stubborn and unmanageable beast of the soul, of which Plato speaks (ὥσπερ φησὶν ὁ Πλάτων τὸ δυσπειθὲς καὶ ἀκόλαστον τῆς ψυχῆς ὑποζύγιον), he spurned away all saving and noble counsels and sent Fonteius Capito to bring Cleopatra to Syria.[109]

The Greek word ἀκόλαστον, (frequently used in Plato's account [256a, c]), which is here translated as "unmanageable" is the equivalent of the Latin *effrenatus* "unbridled." As in the Platonic account the "bad" horse is associated with passion, which motivates the simile directly comparing Antony to Plato's unbridled horse. Plutarch, of course, is capable of directly alluding to Plato on his own, as he seems to earlier in the life (29. 1), but horse imagery in Plutarch's life of Antony is recurring, which could reflect a Ciceronian inclination. Antony adopted the Asiatic style of oratory that bore a strong resemblance to his life, which "was swashbuckling (φρυαγματίαν, literally "snorting") and boastful, full of empty exultation (γαυριάματος, literally "prancing) and distorted ambition" (2. 8). After the triumvirate was formed he returned to his old life of pleasure (ἡδυπαθῆ) and dissipation (ἀκολάλαστον, literally, "unbridled" [21. 1]). The Egyptian seer told Antony his guardian genius was spirited (γαῦρος "skittish) and lofty by itself, but fearful around Octavian's (33. 3). Antony's spirited and unbridled equine nature seems to have been to some extent traditional.

Antony, then, is neither a good steed nor charioteer, as is further implied by Cicero's description in *Phil*. 2. 58 of his abuse to his office of *tribunus plebes pro praetore* in 49 when Caesar had left for Spain and left Italy under Antony's control (57-58):

> Where in the world has so great a disgrace, such great baseness, so great a dishonor, ever been heard of? As tribune of the plebs, he used to ride about in a two-wheeled carriage (*essendo*); lictors decked with laurel went before him, and in their midst a mime actress was carried in an open litter…then followed a carriage full of pimps, Antonius' utterly worthless entourage (*comites nequissimi*). His mother relegated to the rear (*reiecta*), followed her worthless son's mistress as if a daughter-in-law.

[109] Translation by Perrin (1959).

Cicero chooses to represent Antony in this description simply as *tribunus plebis* with no acknowledgement of the propraetorian aspect of this, apparently, ad hoc position,[110] which facilitates the presentation of Antony's progress through Italy as a travesty of a triumph, suggested initially by the carriage and the laurel with which the lictors were decked. Laurel was associated closely with the triumph since both the *triumphator* and his soldiers wore laurel garlands.[111] According to Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom*. 81) tribunes were not entitled to have lictors or to be absent from Rome overnight, neither could they use a horse or carriage or indulge in any luxury. The *essendo* was originally a Gaulish war chariot, but as adopted by Romans for travel "it was regarded as a luxurious and effeminate means of transport" (Ramsey, 2003, 58. 33) and so suits the ironic triumph perfectly. The lictors are part of a triumphal procession, but here they are inappropriate to a tribune and even more so to the nature of the group. An important part of the triumph both for the army and for the national celebration of a triumph was the presence of the soldiers, yet these *comites* are "pimps" (*leonibus*), his "utterly worthless entourage." Family members were frequently a part of the triumph, especially sons and in the empire daughters as well.[112] However, they either rode in the chariot with the *triumphator* or on a horse walking beside the chariot. Roman adult women were not part of the triumphal procession, with the exception of the infamous Messalina who riding in a *carpentum* followed Claudius' triumphal chariot in 44 A.D. (Suet. *Cl.* 17. 3; Beard, 2007, 239). The presence of a mime actress in an open litter would be inappropriate for any magistrate's journey. Antony's procession, thus, mocks ancient traditions of marriage, family, and state as represented in the carefully defined ritual of the triumph. Likewise, Antony is reported to have broken with tradition and offended the Romans by celebrating a triumph in 34 over the Armenian king

---

[110] Ramsey (2003), 58. 25: "during his absence in Spain, Caesar placed Italy and his military forces under the command of Antony with the title *tribunus plebis pro praetore.*" At 58.33 Ramsey notes, "by calling Antony merely a tribune, C. paints a discordant picture."

[111] Ramsey (2003), 58. 33, "When a governor was hailed *imperator* for a military victory, it was customary for laurel to be wound round his *fasces*…and as we can conclude from this passage…apparently the lictors wore laurel as well." The hailing of the general as *imperator* was the first stage in the process toward being awarded a triumph. Although Ramsey provides a rational explanation for why the laurel has a legitimate reason to be there (in honor of Caesar's Gallic victories), in Cicero's hostile representation it seems ironic. Also see Beard (2007), 244-45, and 246 for various theories on the origins of its use.

[112] Beard (2007), 20, 82, 91, 224-5, for children. In Germanicus' triumph in 17 a.d., according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 2. 41), all five of his children rode with him in the chariot (Beard, 109-10).

Artavasdes in Alexandria. According to Plutarch the Romans "felt as if all the honours and solemn observances of their country were, for Cleopatra's sake, handed over to the Egyptians" (*Ant*. 50. 4).[113] Whether Plutarch reflects Antony's intention or Octavian's propaganda against Antony, as has been suggested (Beard, 2007, 269, and others cited), the passage seems relevant to some contemporary perceptions of Antony, especially one which represented him as uncontrolled in his passions and inclinations, heedless of Roman traditions and laws, and eager to rule tyrannically. Antony's alleged abuse of the triumph ceremony both conforms to his profile as an unruly steed and a bad charioteer and represents the failure of the traditional balance maintained in the triumph between the glory of the individual, apparent in their dress and the *quadrigae* they drive, and that of the Roman state, present in the army and magistrates of the procession and the very locus of the triumph (Sumi, 2005, 29).

The Roman Triumph

In this section it will be argued that Augustus shared Vergil's and Cicero's awareness of the legitimacy and power of the symbolism of the triumph, but also of its association with the tyrant and that he took great care to distance himself from the latter implications. The *triumphator* is, of course, the most famous Roman image of the charioteer ensemble and, although it could be argued that it is predominantly a military honor, political implications also adhered to the celebration throughout its history. A number of factors necessitate at this point an investigation of the political connotations of the triumph, particularly in the first century BC. Many of historical Romans in the *Aeneid*, most notably Augustus on the shield of Aeneas and the pageant of Roman heroes in the underworld, celebrated triumphs, and the similarity between this program of famous men in the *Aeneid* and those in the Forum of Augustus,[114] where the *princeps* himself was prominently represented driving the chariot of the triumph, would seem to indicate Vergil's acceptance and utilization of the charioteer ensemble as the most positive political image to be

[113] In addition to Plutarch, Dio Cassius 49. 40. 3-4, Velleius Paterculus 2. 82. 3-4 and Strabo 11.14. 15, report the incident and "are less direct, but still focus on various elements of the show that echo triumphal ritual and symbolism" (Beard, 2007, 267-68).

[114] Geiger (2008), 50-51, notes, in discussing the connection between the *Aeneid* and the Forum, that "the combination (in the *Aeneid*) of the kings of Alba Longa, the Iulii, the kings of Rome and the heroes of the Republic is highly significant," although he also points out that such a list had been in the air for some time.

associated with his patron—certainly a problem for any argument of the significance of the exclusive chariot's use with the Latin side in the second half of the *Aeneid.* However, we will see that the triumph developed in the context of early Latin and Etruscan monarchies and was often abused by tyrants and again later by the first century dynasts, and became the symbol *par excellence* of the sole rule of the emperor, largely through the reforms Augustus initiated. Vergil's censoring of the hubristic *triumphator* is suggested in the *Georgics* and overtly evident in the prominent punishment of Salmoneus in the *Aeneid'*s underworld. The sensitivity of both Vergil and Augustus on this issue is reflected, I believe, in the description of Augustus' triumph on the shield of Aeneas. Hence, just as Neptune's chariot in *Aeneid* 1, which he drives over the becalmed sea has essentially no relationship with that of Achilles' in the ecphrasis of Juno's temple, so the triumph of Augustus on the shield of Aeneas, in which the description of chariot and horses is completely elided, likewise is isolated from the Latin chariot and Turnus' in particular. After considering relevant stories of hubristic excess in the triumphs among the early Latins and Etruscans, I will consider the first century celebrators' tendency toward similar inclinations (especially Pompey's),[115] Vergil's treatment of the triumph in the *Georgics*, and Augustus' triumph policy. As suggested above, we will see that Cicero's view of the triumph is in harmony with Vergil's and certainly consonant with his use of equine imagery discussed in this chapter.

The triumphing general could be seen as challenging traditional boundaries in two interconnected ways that suggested excess power: he both led an army (i.e., had *imperium*) within the pomerium of Rome (otherwise forbidden) along the *Via Sacra* to the city's most sacred temple (Jupiter Optimus Maximus) and did so in the guise of Jupiter.[116] Controls to keep this suggested more-than-human power in check existed in the form of the necessity of senatorial approval for the triumph (not a forgone

---

[115] Within the ranks of the *bona fide* triumphing generals in the first century, individuals were increasingly tipping the balance of the ceremony heavily toward creating greater impressions of their power and divinity (Sumi, 2005, 35; Beard, 2007, 15-17, 233, 238).

[116] Beard (2007), 199-214, "Arguing the Case," describes the procedures by which the general requested permission from the senate to celebrated a triumph, both via letter from the field and in person before the senate, assembled outside the pomerium (201). If his request was successful, an assembly of the people formally granted the general *imperium* within the city only for the day of his celebration, since "according to Roman law, that military authority was normally lost when the *pomerium* was crossed and was only extended by this vote on a special and temporary basis" (202).

conclusion) and symbolically in the procession itself by the slave who stood behind the general in the chariot, whispering "Look behind you. Remember you are a man."[117] Whether, the degree to which, and at what times the *triumphator* was looked upon as a divine manifestation are matters still debated. However, derivation of the ceremony from Etruria is generally accepted and it is in that context that Versnel argues divine associations were strongest, where "a human being acting the part of a god did not give offense" (Versnel, 1970, 90). By wearing the *ornatus Iovis* (a purple toga), the *corona Etrusca* and red lead paint on his face, the *triumphator* is characterized as the representative of Jupiter and, in Versnel's opinion (92), the army's exclamation of *Triumphe* proves that he was looked upon as the god manifesting himself.[118] However, as often in the history of the triumph, the Etruscan tradition recognized the susceptibility of the divine aspects of the *triumphator* to human abuse. Versnel's discussion of the stories associated with the early Etruscan king Mezentius suggests that good and bad charioteers may have been a part of early Latin literature of triumphing kings and that one of the prime indication of the bad charioteers was their usurping of the rights proper to Jupiter alone.

While the Etruscan king Mezentius seems not to have celebrated a triumph and in the *Aeneid*, for example, confronts Aeneas astride his horse Rhaebus (10. 861-908),[119] his story has close parallels with "bad" triumphing charioteers, including in the *Aeneid*'s Underworld. In demanding the *primitiae*, the first fruits of the wine harvest the part usually reserved for Jupiter, in exchange for his aid in the war against Aeneas, Mezentius goes too far. It is apparently one thing to look like Jupiter and quite another to

---

[117] Beard (2007), 81-2, gives a "generally agreed picture" of the celebration of a triumph, as does Versnel (1970, 56-57). Both Beard (202) and Sumi (2005), 32, stress that the voting on the triumphs was politically charged and that "some of the most contentious meetings of the senate involved debates over whether a general should be granted a triumph" (Sumi).

[118] Versnel (1970), 92, believes that the robes of the *triumphator* were originally the state robes of the Etruscan king, but with time turned into those of Jupiter. On the day of the triumph the robes were taken back together with other characteristics of Jupiter, such as the red lead. Beard (2007), 231-32, considers the evidence in Pliny the elder (*Nat.* 33. 111-2), even though "derived explicitly from reports in an earlier first-century antiquarian writer, Verrius Flaccus, a 'false lead' and 'tenuous evidence.'" But this is a little too dismissive of the evidence the text provides: "Verrius gives a list of authorities—and trust them we must—who state that on festival days it used to be the custom for the face of the statue of Jupiter to be coated with cinnabar, so too the bodies of those in triumph" (33. 111). Versnel's (1970) entire first chapter is devoted to the meaning and derivation of the expression *triumphe*.

[119] Versnel (1970), 287, however, suggests that Mezentius did triumph, since he believes that on the occasion of victory he claimed the honor of Jupiter for himself, "forms the first indication of the Romans becoming familiar with the triumph."

attempt to act like him. "The legend describes the pretension of an Etruscan king who demanded the same rights as the supreme god…put himself on a level with Iuppiter" (Versnel, 1970, 286). In some accounts Aeneas vowed the vintage to Jupiter and thus won the war.[120] Versnel relates Mezentius' story to another "presumptuous man who imitated Zeus," Klearchos of Heraklea, of whom it is reported he had his captives tortured "in an atrocious manner" (cf. Mezentius *Aen.* 8. 485-8) during his triumph. In some sources Mezentius' positive analogue must have been King Latinus, for on the cista Pasinati,[121] as Versnel reports, he is represented both as *Iuppiterfactus Latiaris* in combat against Mezentius, and also shown triumphing. "What the Etruscan king was denied, fell to the share of the Latin: triumph in the highest sense of the word, identification as the highest god!" (Festus 212 L). Jupiter *Latiaris* was the counterpart of Jupiter *Optimus Maximus* and his sanctuary on the summit of Mons Albanus was the center of an annual celebration of the *feriae Latinae* and the end point for an alternative triumph the *triumphus in Monte Albano,* one of which Julius Caesar celebrated in 44.[122] In fact, the *quadrigae,* some have argued is as much the chariot of the Italic kings as an imitation of Jupiter's on the Captioline (Versnel, 1970, 78; Helbig, 167-72). Versnel finds Mezentius comparable to Salmoneus who imitated Zeus by throwing thunderbolts and even pretended to be Zeus (Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 1.9.7). Salmoneus' case is relevant to this study due to his prominent role in the *Aeneid'*s Tartarus, where he drives a *quadrigae* as he triumphs (*ovans* 6. 587, 589).

Salmoneus is given particular importance in Tartarus due to the fact that he is the most elaborately and the only individual human sinner described among a rather select group; in addition to the iconic figures of the section of judgment in the Underworld—Tisiphone, Rhadamanthus, the Hydra, the Lapiths, Ixion, Pirithous, Theseus, and Phlegyas—only the sinners Salmoneus (6. 58594) and the giant Tityos (6.

---

[120] Wiseman (2004), 112, gives this account; Versnel (1970), 285, reports the Latins promised the vintage to Jupiter. Wiseman, 325, gives the following sources on Mezentius: Cato, *Orig.*, fr. 12P (Macrobius 3.5.10); Varro in Pliny, *Nat.* 18. 284; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.65.2; Ovid, *Fast.* 4. 879-900; Plutarch, *Mor.* 275e.

[121] *Mon. Inst.* IX, pl. 24-25; *CIL* 1^2 569. The present location of the cista is unknown.

[122] Beard (2007), 267; Sumi (2005), 196; Versnel (1970), 115, 287, n. 4. Both the *ovatio*, a lesser triumph, in which the general processed to the Capitoline on foot or horseback and was crowned with myrtle instead of laurel, and the *triumphus in Monte Albano*, which was used by some generals who had been turned down by the senate, were listed in the *Fasti Triumphales*, originally a complete list of those who had celebrated a triumph from Romulus to L. Balbus in 19. Currently more than two hundred names survive (Beard, 2007, 61-63; see Degrassi, 1954).

595-600) are described in any detail and Salmoneus is described first and at length, despite the fact that his presence is considered an anomaly ("Salmoneus…is by no means a well-known figure;" Williams, 1972, 548-627). The Sibyl is recounting briefly to Aeneas what she has seen within Tartarus (he may not proceed within), covering quickly the Hydra, the Titans and the sons of Aloeus, Otus and Ephialtes, who also made an assault on heaven, but she lingers on Salmoneus:

> vidi et crudelis dantem Salmonea poenas,
> dum flammas Iouis et sonitus imitatur Olympi.
> quattuor hic invectus equis et lampada quassans
> per Graium populos mediaeque per Elidis urbem
> ibat ovans, divumque sibi poscebat honorem,
> demens, qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen
> aere et cornipedum pulsu simularet equorum.
> at pater omnipotens densa inter nubila telum
> contorsit, non ille faces nec fumea taedis
> lumina, praecipitemque immani turbine adegit.
>
> I saw Salmoneus suffering cruel punishment (incurred)
> while imitating the flames of Jupiter and the rumblings of Olympus.
> Through the peoples of Greece and the city of Olympia he was
> driving his four-horse chariot triumphing and brandishing a torch.
> He kept demanding for himself the honors of the gods, out of
> his mind to imitate the storm and the inimitable thunderbolt
> with the rattle of his horses' hooves on bronze. Through
> the thick clouds the all-powerful god hurled his weapon—
>
> not torches or flames of smoky pine for him—
> and drove him headlong in a terrifying whirlwind.

While the subsequent grisly description of Tityos' punishment lacks any reference to his sin (an assault on the goddess Latona), Salmoneus' sin is not only thoroughly described, but also appears to occur simultaneously with his punishment (585-6): "Salmoneus is described as struck with vengeance in the very midst of his impious triumph" (Conington and Nettleship, 6. 586).[123] The punishment of Salmoneus encloses the passage—in its ongoing aspect in the beginning (585) and by the swift, mighty single act at the end (592-94), at the same time, the central section alternates between the truly divine and the human imitation of Jupiter's thunderbolt and attendant storms,[124] all of which pivot around the central outrage of

[123] But see Austin (1977), 585f.

[124] Words of and references to imitation are rich in the passage: *imitatur, non imitabile, simularet, non ille faces nec fumea taedis lumina.*

Salmoneus' act (589-90). He is out of his mind to such an extent that even in the course of his triumphal ride he demands the honor due only to the supreme god. That Salmoneus rides in triumph, is suggested both by the implicit *quadrigae* (*quattuor hic invectus equis*) and by the participle *ovans*, which can, and given the context of the *quadrigae*, here does imply a triumph,[125] bestowing a quasi-Roman aspect to his outrage. More spectacularly than even Klearchos of Heraklea, the bad charioteer who tortured prisoners as he triumphed, Salmoneus affronts the ruler of gods and men. The verb *ovare*, which can mean "to rejoice" and is so used often in the *Aeneid*, when it is used to describe Turnus, as we will see, foreshadows his dire fate.[126] Mary Beard, in her discussion of Pompey's triumphs in particular, makes the contemporary relevance of Salmoneus' hubristic triumphing evident.

In contrast to Versnel, who sees the joining of *triumphator* and Jupiter as an essentially ancient Etruscan phenomenon, Beard (2007, 238, 253-56) considers it an exclusively late Republican development, appearing first in Plautus' *Amphitruo* and then increasingly suggested by the manner of the triumphs of late Republican dynasts until it becomes a natural part of the divinity of the emperor. Pompey was particularly aggressive in both his seeking of triumphs and the ostentation with which he celebrated them and also was duly criticized. He audaciously asked Sulla to be able to celebrate a triumph for his victory over King Iarbas of Numidia, even though he was still in his twenties and had held no magistracy and therefore was not even a member of the senate.[127] Pompey attempted to stage this same triumph with African elephants rather than horses pulling his chariot, perhaps to emphasize the far-flung nature of his conquest and "to cast a divine light over the conqueror." The god Bacchus often was depicted as

---

[125] According to the OLD, *ovare* occurs chiefly as a present participle with the primary meanings "to celebrate a minor triumph or ovation" or "to exult, rejoice," but a subsidiary meaning is as "referring to full triumphs." Antony's and Octavian's ovations (for making peace with one another at Brundisium) are both listed in the official *Fasti Triumphales* (Sumi, 2005, 196; Beard, 2007, 267, although she also notes, 62-63, that ovations differed from triumphs primarily in the absence of the chariot).

[126] Of the 15 occurrences of forms of *ovare*, 5 are used to describes instances of the joyful forward movement of the Trojans toward their final destination (3. 189, 3. 544, 4. 543, 4. 577, 5. 563), 5 describe successful troops in battle (usually the Trojans and their allies) and 4 seem related to negative boastfulness or foreshadow death—derivatives of the extreme example of Salmoneus (Nisus: 5. 331, 9. 208; Turnus: 10. 500, 12. 479).

[127] Beard (2007), 15-16, who lists Plutarch, *Sert.* 18. 2; Cicero, *Man.* 61; Pliny, *Nat.* 7. 95; and Valerius Maximus 8.15.8 on Pompey's lack of status. Beard, (206-214), however, makes a good case for instability of "rules" governing most aspects of the triumph, including who can celebrate them.

returning in triumph from India in a wagon drawn by elephants. In any event, the elephants were too big to go through one of the gates, which prompted later moralists to warn generals against getting above themselves (Beard, 2007, 17, 316-7). Another exceptional triumphal award occurred to Pompey in 63, when he was granted, according to Velleius Paterculus, the right to wear "the golden crown and full triumphal costume at all circus games." Although "he did not have the nerve to use this honor more than once," Velleius concludes that even this "was once too often."[128] Cicero mocks Pompey for his obsession with the triumphal paraphernalia, quipping in a letter of January 60 to Atticus that Pompey was absent from the senate's debate regarding land for his veterans, because "he's safeguarding that dinky little triumphal toga of his by keeping quiet."[129] Pompey was a model Octavian sought to emulate (Galinsky, 1996, 48, 51, 53, 166, 315), at least in part because of the extent of his conquests and the youth at which he accomplished them. Initially, in his struggle to gain power Octavian seemed inclined toward aggressive, if not excessive, public display, following the example of Pompey, but even more so that of Julius Caesar who celebrated four triumphs at one time, riding into the city four different times, and aspired more openly toward the divine.[130] Pompey had celebrated victories over fourteen different nations, but all on one day (Weinstock, 1971, 76).

However, Augustus in his later career as *princeps* honed a policy of partial restraint, particularly concerning triumphs, to preserve his monopoly of power. Because Augustus is described sacrificing after his triple triumph of 29 on Aeneas' shield (8. 714-16) and was the patron of the *Aeneid,* both his triumphs and his attitude and policy toward triumphs are highly relevant and form an appropriate conclusion to the Ciceronian charioteer. A concern for the Republican aspect of Augustus' principate, which resembles if it does not derive from Cicero's ideal state, as we have seen (see above pp. 31-33), seems to motivate Augustus' triumphal moderation.

---

[128] 2. 40. 4, cited and translated by Beard (2007), 30. See also Dio Cassius 37. 21. 3-4.

[129] Cicero, *Att.* 1. 18. 6, cited and translated by Beard (2007), 31.

[130] While Weinstock (1971), 76, argues that Caesar's use of four white horses in his quadruple triumph of 46 was "a claim to divinity," the issue is still debated (see Ch. 5, p. 294, n. 514), but that aspects of the celebration gave offense, particularly his display of depiction of his civil war victims and suicides, seems certain.

Octavian, whom Cicero had represented in the *Philippics* (3. 3-4, 39) of 44 as having freed the republic from the tyranny of Antony, by the date of Vergil's reading of the *Georgics* to him,[131] had not yet celebrated a triumph. He had, however, been granted three honorific ceremonies (a formal procession in which he wore the dress of a *triumphator* for the defeat of L. Antonius in 40; an *ovatio* for his reconciliation with Antony in the same year; and an *ovatio* in 36 for his defeat of Sex. Pompey).[132] Perhaps, as Vergil may suggest in the *Georgics* (1. 503-4), concern for the full honor and prestige of the triumph preoccupied Octavian excessively:

> iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
> invidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos
>
> The courts of heaven,
> Caesar, have long begrudged us your presence,
> and complained that you care for mortal triumphs.[133]

Although the praise of Octavian in the invocation of the poem is fulsome (with the suggestion that, already a divinity, he may choose his part of the universe—earth, sky or heavens—over which to rule), that he is still somewhat of an unknown quantity as a leader may be implied by the choice given him and is surely overtly stated in *consilia incertum est* (1. 25). Therefore, the disquieting uncertainty about the future with which the final prayer of book 1 ends, has some precedent (1. 498-514):

> di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater,
> quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas,
> hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
> ne prohibete. satis iam pridem sanguine nostro
> Laomedonteae luimus periuria Troiae;
> iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
> invidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos,
> quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem,
> tam multae scelerum facies, non ullus aratro
> dignus honos, squalent abductis arva colonis,
> et curuae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.
> hinc movet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum;

---

[131] According to Donatus' life of the poet (*Vita Vergil*, 91-95), Vergil read the *Georgics* to Octavian on his return from the victory at Actium over four continuous days.

[132] Hickson (1991), 125. The *ovatio* Antony and Octavian celebrated was highly unusual, as it involved no military action.

[133] See Nappa (2005), 64, for the implied warning to Octavian expressed here: "…Vergil is also warning the *princeps* that…concern for the trappings of power and prestige, such as the ritual of the triumph, bring with them their own dangers."

vicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes
arma ferunt; saevit toto Mars impius orbe,
ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae,
addunt in spatia, et frustra retinacula tendens
fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.

Gods of our fathers, Heroes of our land,
And Romulus, and mother Vesta, who preserves
the Tuscan Tiber and Roman Palatine,
Do not keep at least this youthful man (*iuvenem*)
From saving our age in ruins: long ago
we have paid enough with our blood for the perjury
of Troy's Laomedon. The courts of heaven,
Caesar, have long begrudged us your presence,
and complained that you care for mortal triumphs;
For right and wrong are turned around; everywhere
there are so many wars, so many appearances
of crime; no due honour attends the plough,
with no tillers the fields are all scraggly,
and the curving pruning-hook is forged into
a straight hard sword. Euphrates here,
there Germany stirs war, and neighbour cities
break agreements and fight; through all the world
impious War rages. As when chariots break forth,
from the starting gate and increase speed
from lap to lap, and a charioteer
pulling in vain on the reins is swept along
by his horses and the chariot heeds not the reins.

From a god who is able to choose his realm in the beginning of the book Octavian is here presented as simply a young man ([500]; the *Georgics* were written between the mid-30s to the early 20s, well before Octavian's 45th year—the technical limit of *iuvenis*), but a young man who is implicitly capable of saving the world. The ancient gods invoked are those most closely associated with the Roman state, but the implications of the crisis stretch far back in time to the Rome's Trojan forbears—Laomedon's failure to pay Neptune for building Troy's walls (502)—and across nearly the extent of the world (*Euphrates, Germania* 509). Yet, the focus of the poet's anguish is the Italian lands (506-8, 510-11), which are uncultivated, lawless, and whose communities bear arms against each other—justification for describing Mars as *impious* (Mynors, 1990; Williams, 1979; Nappa, 2005, 65). Because of the extent of Roman rule this civil war rages throughout the world. As broad as the scope of this war is, Vergil utilizes the implicit chariot of Octavian's triumphal longings and the chariot of the concluding simile as a means of focusing

the concern of the universe on the uncertain commitment of Octavian. Between the mortal triumph Octavian aspires to and the chariot he (implicitly) has lost control of, the chaos of the war-torn world is erupting. The horses and the chariots, which pour out from the starting gate are the proximal vehicle of the simile (war, Mars, and its effects the tenor),[134] but the single charioteer (*auriga*, 514), holding the reins in vain since his horses are out of control, suggests dangerously ineffective leadership and thus a world on the brink of disaster. Despite the fact that the chariot is the key means of focusing on Octavian's leadership, its negative connotations draw attention to the rural chariot—the unused plough—between the two chariots (*triumphos, currus*),[135] which alone is worthy of honor (*dignus honos*, 507) and due to the circumstances of war is bereft of function and thus honor. The charioteer simile may complete yet another ring, that initiated by the perjury of Laomedon.

In considering why Vergil has given Laomedon's perjury such prominence in this passage, Mynors (1990) speculates that perhaps it was "to invest the civil wars with something of the dignity and horror of an inherited curse in early Greek poetry, like that which haunted the house of Atreus…."M. Dewar's (1988 and 1990) idea that the charioteer with an out of control team in the concluding lines alludes to Orestes in the *Choephoroi* (1021-25), where driven crazy by the Furies he compares himself to a charioteer with a runaway team, adds support to this hypothesis. The tragic model suggests the impiety of Octavian, who like Orestes uses the justification of his murdered father to attack/kill his mother, in Octavian's case, of course, his figurative mother.[136] Nappa (2005, 66-67) expands this idea in a positive direction, noting that the trial in Athens acquitted Orestes and thus he is a positive model in that his act

---

[134] The terms "tenor" and "vehicle" are those recommended by I. A. Richards (1936/1965), 97, to distinguish between the element in the narrative (tenor) to which the metaphor or simile (vehicle) is likened. His definition: The tenor is "the underlying idea or principal subject which the vehicle or figure means."

[135] See Wilhelm (1982) on the linking of the image of the plough and chariot as a joint symbol of political order.

[136] Dewar (1988), 563-5, argues that Vergil is referring generally to the tragic topos of Madness as a charioteer and specifically to the *Choephori,* 1021-5. To Dewar's list of parallels between Orestes and Octavian—the avenging of their murdered fathers, with attendant guilt (for Octavian, from the proscriptions and civil war)—add the still fuller list of Hölscher quoted by Green (2007), 44, who discusses the importance of Orestes at Diana's sanctuary in Aricia. He was the legendary founder of the cult of the *rex nemorensis* (45) there and his bones were brought to Rome by Octavian "as part of his conscious adoption of Orestes as a mythic hero on whom to model himself and his actions" (43-44). Green (45) points out that Augustus seems to have encouraged even visual identification between himself and Orestes, for Pausanias (2. 17. 3) saw a statue of Augustus at Argos that was said to be, in fact, Orestes.

led to a lessening of the uncivilized forces of the Furies. Both explanations seem relevant, because it is the moment of Orestes' temporary state of mind that is alluded to and the previous suggestion of inherited curse—the perjury of Laomedon—underscores the importance of this moment. Octavian has figuratively killed his mother (countrymen), but he could move on to establish peace and prosperity, as Vergil hopes. The allusion to Orestes, as interpreted by Nappa, partially mitigates the otherwise foreboding implications of the simile.[137]

The most elaborate triumphal imagery in the *Georgics*, that of the proem to book 3 at the very center of the work, presents Vergil as victor over Greek poetry, announced through an allusion to Ennius (3. 8-9):

> temptanda via est, qua me quoque possim
> tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora.
>
> I must find a way that I am able
> on my own to lift myself above the ground
> And 'fly victorious on the lips of men.'

Combining both literary and triumphal imagery Vergil, returning to Mantua, will lead back the Muses from Helicon carrying Idumaean palms.[138] The building of a temple ("And in green meadows raise a marble temple," 13) follows the Republican tradition of the sponsoring of a temple as thank-offering after a military victory (Mynors, 1988, 13; Balot, 1998, 90). Although Vergil's role as *triumphator* is forcefully expressed in line 16 ("Myself as victor in resplendent purple"), a conflation of various traditions—triumphal, Greek and Roman games—is represented in the description of Vergil, bringing

---

[137] Gale (2000), 35, sees an allusion to the flight of Phaethon in the charioteer, suggested first by the juxtaposition of the chariot simile with the image of the mourning sun (466-8) and second by the reference to the Eridanus (482), the river near which Phaethon fell. The sun mourns the death of Julius just as the sun mourned the death of Phaethon, but to relate this reading to the charioteer, she maintains that Julius Caesar is also the sun. Considering the context of the passage, Julius Caesar as the sun seems overly bright, at the same time Phaethon's cataclysmic death would bode an overly dark end for Octavian.

[138] Williams (1979), 11, "the imagery is that of a conquering general (*victor,* 9) returning (*rediens*) in triumph with his captives in procession (*deducere*)…" and, 12, "again a reference to a triumphal procession with the general bearing the victor's palm: Idumaea was in Palestine in an area famous for palm-trees."

gifts, leading the procession and observing the sacrifice of the bulls and theatrical performance (22-25).[139] In the ecphrasis of the temple's decoration (3. 26-39) Vergil thematically visualizes his future epic (Williams, 1979, 26; Thomas, 1988, 1-46; Mynors, 1990, 16), which will involve Octavian prominently ("In the middle of the shrine, as patron god, I will have Caesar placed," 16), and his exploits (26-31), as well as Trojan forbears (34-36). A double triumph, as if accomplished, will also form part of the imagery (32-33):

> et duo rapta manu diverso ex hoste tropaea
> bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentis.
>
> …and two trophies snatched from far separated
> enemies, a double Triumph from two far apart nations.

Thomas and Mynors agree that these triumphs should not be understood as specific, but rather representative of the expanse of Roman domain.[140] This emblematizing and the pointed absence of specific references to Octavian's triumphs in the echrasis of the building maintain the proem's focus on the poet's poetic triumph rather than that of the patron he praises. But there are close affinities between Vergil's literary triumph here and that of Octavian's suggested in the *sphragis* at the end of the poem, as Balot has shown.[141]

Again Octavian and Vergil appear together in the conclusion (4. 559-66) and, although they are more intimately joined both by the brevity of the passage and by framing of patron's lines by poet's, their roles contrast more:

> Haec super arvorum cultu pecorumque canebam
> et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum 560

---

[139] Both Williams (1979), 17-18, and Mynors (1990), 17, note the possible relevance of Augustus' Actian games after the founding of the temple of Apollo there. Both a triumphing general and the president of the games would wear purple. Also see Beard (2007), 281-4, on "the galaxy of theories on the links between the games and the triumph."

[140] Thomas (1988b), 32-3, "V. envisions successes both in the East and West, alluding to the areas mentioned in 25-31;" Mynors (1990), 32-3, "They must be victories over enemies at the opposite ends of the world, 'from sea to sea,' that the Romans of those days were always expecting." I am inclined to side with Mynors, who considers the triadic nature of Octavian's triple triumph of 13-15 August 29 to rule out the possibility of this double triumph as "clear reference to Octavian's triple triumph" (Thomas). Balot's (1998), 91-92, opinion that the proem "foreshadows Octavian's victorious return to Rome" seems more justified.

[141] Balot (1998), 88-89, mentions shared vocabulary (*victor/victor, viam/via*) and the idea of rising aloft in the sky.

fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

I was singing of the cultivation of crops and herds
And fruit-trees, while great Caesar was thundering
beside the deep Euphrates in war, and as a victor
establishing laws for grateful peoples
and setting his course for Olympus. At that time
sweet Parthenope was nourishing me, Vergil,
in the studies of inglorious ease, who played songs
of shepherds and with youth's boldness sang of you,
Tityrus, under the shade of a spreading beech-tree.

As a signature to both the *Georgics* (559-60) and the *Eclogues* (563-66) Vergil has chosen to represent himself at ease in humble leisure singing songs of the countryside, this time in vivid contrast to Caesar's distant serious pursuits of war and state. While in these lines Vergil brings artistic closure to his early literary career, the passage it encloses through the clear echoes of the prayer at the end of book 1 (498-514) resolves the suspenseful uncertainty surrounding Octavian and Rome's future. Whereas previously the gods lamented Octavian's concern with human triumphs as an impediment to his longed for deification (1. 503-4), here Caesar in sparse language without reference to any triumphal pomp is simply *victor* (561) and at the same time he is giving laws to grateful people (*volentis / per populos*, 561-2), foreshadowing the more famous words of Anchises in *Aeneid* 6 (851-3; Thomas, 1988, 561-2). In addition to representing Sumi's ideal balance of personal and communal accomplishment in a triumph, the giving of laws rectifies the previous collapse of state at the end of book 1 (*vincinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes/arm ferunt*, 510-11) with the restoration of order. The arena of war, the Euphrates (*Euphraten*, 561), representative of the Near East (Williams, Mynors), also recalls the situation described in book 1. 509 (*hinc movet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum*), but again the war implicitly is resolved victoriously and the peoples of this area could be seen among those who gratefully receive laws. Some would see these lines as ambivalent in their attitude toward Octavian's power, since *fulminat* (561) is a

verb used here for the first time with a human subject and Caesar is making his own way to Olympus (562), and thus perhaps implicitly supplanting Jupiter.[142] But Octavian's future, if not current, deification has been suggested already in the grand invocation of book 1 and his central presence in Vergil's metaphorical temple (3. 16) and the shared diction, but transformed context, between the end of book 1 and the end of the work argues for a positive interpretation of Octavian's power here.

Vergil in the *Georgics* thus exhibits three different attitudes toward the triumph, attitudes that are shared by Cicero, and to a large extent it seems, by Augustus. As the ceremony that celebrates the pinnacle of Roman individual and collective accomplishment (*G.* 4. 560-2) it can be seen as the supreme Roman Republican honor. Cicero in his mocking of Piso's professed distain for triumphs in his oration *In Pisonem* maintains that a well-earned triumph carries distinction (*honor*) and dignity (*dignitatem*) and that it represents "true fame which is the creditable reward of genuine merit (*Pis*. 57).[143] In suggesting ironically that Rome's greatest statesmen generals were fools to have celebrated triumphs,[144] Cicero affirms the ceremony's deep and long-standing inherence in the Republic's values. The immediately recognizable suggestions of supremacy present in triumphal language and imagery encouraged its use in other contexts, both in literary (cf. Vergil *G.* 3. 8-25; Propertius 3. 1. 9-12; among many) and material arts (numerous coins, statues and arches). Cicero, too, fashioned both his return from exile and the celebration following the battle of Mutina, in which the people led him with great gladness to the Capital, as triumphs—as factual events with, in Cicero's account, some features in common with triumphs, but nevertheless, only figurative triumphs.[145] As we have seen, Cicero was sensitive to the abuse of the

---

[142] Thomas (1988b), 560-1, notes *fulminat* is used for first time with a "personal subject other than Jupiter," and as supplanting of Jupiter. However, Mynors (1990), 561, maintains that "it would be a mistake to see an allusion here to Jupiter the thunder-god, any more than in *A*. 12.654, where 'fulminat Aeneas armis.'" Nappa (2005), 217, emphasizes the ambiguity in these lines: "It is possible to read the sphragis negatively as a suggestion that he will hubristically challenge Jupiter. More positively, he may be on his way to join the gods—the deification promised through out the poem now complete."

[143] *…iustam gloriam, qui est fructus verae virtutis honestissimus, repudiare.*

[144] *O stultos Camillos, Curios, Fabricios, Calatinos, Scipiones, Marcellos, Maximos! Amentem Paulum! rusticum Marium! Nullius consilii patres horum amborum consulum, qui triumpharint!*

[145] The celebration following the first battle of Mutina is the most clearly triumphant as recounted in *Phil.* 14. 12: *Quanto enim honore, laetitia, gratulatione in hoc templum ingredi debent illi ipsi huius urbis liberatores, cum hesterno die propter eorum res gestas me ovantem et prope triumphantem populus Romanus in Capitolium domo*

triumph, both in terms of its dishonoring (Antony) and the egotistical obsessive attachment of some to its prestige (Pompey). Vergil seems to be hinting at this sort of heightened concern for triumphs in the young Octavian in book 1. 504, when the gods complain that he cares for triumphs. Scattered throughout the life and work of Cicero these three attitudes—respect, sensitivity to both its signifying power and potential for corruption—could be representative or typical attitudes among contemporary Romans. However, Vergil's use of the triumph in a single work—the *Georgics*—in some of its most strategic passages, appears programmatic: in them Vergil advises Octavian that the proper political triumph should celebrate the reestablishment of order in Italy and the world and the poet also in his own triumph recommends his superlative capacity for monumentalizing Octavian's accomplishments. The care and caution with which Augustus deployed the triumph as he embarked upon his principate demonstrates his awareness of both its positive and negative signifying power.

Augustus, who finally did celebrate a full triumph in his triple triumph on three successive days in 29 (for victories in Dalmatia, Actium and Egypt), magnified his triumphal persona by assuming the name *imperator* as a *praenomen*, the name by which soldiers on the field would acclaim their general which would then initiated the process of senatorial approval for a triumph.[146] He also established the precedent of triumphs being the exclusive right of the emperor and his family,[147] eliminating the opportunity for rival leaders to court popular support. His representation driving the *quadrigae* was prominent atop three arches and probably within the Forum of Augustus (*R. G.* 35), whose temple to Mars Ultor was

---

tulerit, domum inde reduxerit? ("For with what great honor, and joy, and exultation ought the deliverers of this city themselves to enter into this temple, when yesterday, on account of the exploits which they have performed, the Roman people carried me in an ovation, almost in a triumph from my house to the Capitol, and back again from Capitol to my own house?") In this case of his own quasi-triumph Cicero associates (14. 13) the "true and just triumph (*iustus triumphus ac verus*)" with a public acclamation of the benefits the state and Roman people have received. Cicero's description (recounted many times *Att.* 4. 1; *Ses.* 131; *Dom.* 75; *Red. sen.* 38*; Red. pop.*18; *Pis*. 51-2) of his reception upon his return from exile at Brundisium and his subsequent welcome by all Italy and Rome as he is led to the Capitol and from there home, because it follows much of the triumph's road with great celebratory crowd, imitates a triumph.

[146] Hickson (1991), 132, "Whatever broader connotations it may have evoked, the image of *triumphator* was unquestionably present—a general who by virtue of his *imperium* and prowess has earned an imperatorial acclamation."

[147] See Hickson (1991), 127-30, on the process. The last non-imperial celebrant was Cornelius Balbus in 19.

consecrated in 2.[148] However, in two important ways Augustus pointedly associated himself with the Republican tradition of the triumph, one of which is visible in the sculptural program for the Forum of Augustus where "the most concentrated use of the triumphal theme appears."[149] Marble statues of the great men of Rome's past stood in the colonnades running the length of the Forum and in the niches of the walls curving out in hemicycles on either side of the temple. Although according to Suetonius all the statues in the porticos were presented *triumphali effigie* (*Aug.* 31.5), this seems to be an over generalization. Nevertheless, as Geiger (2008, 97) notes, "If enlarging the empire of the Roman people and earning triumphs were not the only criteria for inclusion in the list, they were certainly fundamental for it."[150] Thus in this permanent public gallery of successive *summi viri* of Rome's largely Republican ancestors Augustus is presented as the culmination of that tradition. Augustus' concern for Republican precedents also seems to have been a primary motivating factor in one apparently paradoxical triumphal policy: his refusal of all triumphs offered to him by the senate after his triple triumph of 29 (as he himself says in the *Res Gestae* 4. 1). Although there is no evidence for the exact number of times this happened, Hickson (1991, 126) discusses the three most likely occasions (for victories in Spain in 25, in the Eastern provinces in 19, and for Tiberius' victories in Germany in 8 A. D.). In considering Augustus' motivation for the paradoxical policy of both exploiting and monopolizing the image of the triumphing general and at the same time refusing to triumph Hickson suggests, in addition to focusing "the triumphal propaganda of the Principate" on his triple triumph of 29, that maintaining the number of three triumphs was significant.

---

[148] Hickson (1991), 134-35, notes the following arches: In 29 the Senate erected an arch honoring his victory at Actium (Dio 51. 19) on top of which Augustus was represented riding in a triumphal carriage drawn by four white horses. Arches were also erected to celebrate Augustus' repair of the Via Flaminia in 27, one of which was on the Tiber bridge, another was in Ariminum (Dio 53. 22. 2). Even so, coins indicate that both these arches had references to Actium: one had a *quadrigae* with horses flanked by ships' rostra, the other a chariot drawn by two elephants, normally a reference to an Eastern victory, here to Actium. In 20 the Senate decreed an arch in honor of Augustus' successes in Parthia (Dio 54. 8. 3), which also supportd a statue of Augustus in a horse-drawn *quadriga.* Hickson mentions that there is no direct evidence of the *quadrigae* Augustus refers to in the Forum, but Zanker (1988), fig. 149, and Galinsky (1996), 200, and fig. 111, assume it.

[149] Hickson (1991), 133-4, discusses other triumphal associations of the Forum: future meetings of the Senate to discuss triumphal honors, where future *triumphatores* would dedicate their crown and scepter, and a wall painting of *Triumphus* (Pliny, *Nat.* 35. 27).

[150] Geiger (2008), 129-62, is the most thorough consideration of the statues in the Forum and their program and includes a detailed catalogue of the identified statues, the majority of which were *triumphatores.*

Only three men listed on the *fasti triumphales* celebrated more than three triumphs and they were all dictators.[151] By refusing to celebrate more than three triumphs Augustus located himself firmly within the republican tradition.[152] Utilizing just such astute perceptivity Augustus restored the Republic and monopolized power. In precisely the same way that Augustus could have formulated his restoration of the Republic in 27 without the help of Cicero, so clearly he could have developed his policy toward triumphs without the suggestions of Vergil's *Georgics.*

Nevertheless, there is a similarity both in content and in emphases in Augustus' policy and Vergil's presentation of the triumph in the *Georgics*: an awareness of the great importance of celebrating triumphs of positive, political benefit for the Roman people (*victorque volentis per populos dat iura*, 4. 561-2), an appreciation for the capacity triumphal imagery possesses to signify supreme power (*victor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus,* 3. 17-18), and an acknowledgment of the seductive power of the experience to lead to destructive excess (*iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar, invidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos*, 1. 503-4). By focusing Rome's attention exclusively on his victory at Actium and those attendant to it, Augustus imprinted on its collective mind the great benefits of restored order and prosperity which accrued through his victories—the ideal balance of the republican triumph between individual and state glory.

By its very nature the triumph tempts the soul of the *imperator* to dangerous hubris, a personal weakness, which, nevertheless, because of the general's army, could have consequences for the state. Latin literature preserves examples of those whose souls could not withstand the seduction of the crowd's adulation—Salmoneus, Antony, Julius Caesar—with the almost predictable slip into or toward absolute

---

[151] Hickson (1991), 137, n. 64, provides their names and the numbers of triumphs: M. Furius Camillus and M. Valerius Corvus (4) and Julius (5).

[152] Noonan (2007), 87, has argued that Vergil's development of the civic aspect of Aeneas' *pietas*, was one of the historical influences (along with Ptolemaic propaganda, Roman republican ideology, "Augustus' own manipulation of symbols like the civic crown and Golden Shield") in the development of the concept of the emperor as *Conservator*, which first occurred in reference to Tiberius (*CIL* 2. 2038). Noonan, 86-87, includes (without elaboration) as one of the points comprising this political *pietas* that "military victories should de-emphasize triumphalism, though victories and triumphs will still occur, but the record of victory ought to stress the preservation of peace and the saving or restoration of citizens' lives instead of emphasizing the aggrandizement of the emperor's personal repute."

domination. They are bad charioteers in the Phaedran sense because they have failed to hold back the influence of the passionate dark horse in their soul. Cicero, indeed, seems to have used the Phaedran chariot ensemble in discussing the soul of the ideal statesman in the *Republic*, but his personal variation on the Platonic metaphor—the unbridled demagogue—seems to have been his preferred method of representing a lack of personal self-control. The great advantage of this term—*effrenatus*—is that the individual so described becomes simultaneously a failed charioteer and horse, but it is unquestionably in Cicero an indication that the individual has permanently lost the struggle within the soul, if they ever actually had wielded the reins. Should these unbridled men come to power, without a doubt they would rule as tyrants because, incapable of self-restrain, they care only for the satisfaction of their lusts. While both the unbridled individual and bad triumphing charioteer could be characterized as 'mad' (Salmoneus: *demens*; Antony: *furorem…effrenatam violentiam*) and were associated with tyranny (Antony; Julius Caesar), the unbridled tyrant in Cicero continues a type familiar from Plato's tyrant in the *Republic,* whose bestiality and lack of control seem limitless.[153]

In the case of both the image of the helmsman and the charioteer Cicero's treatment exhibits their Platonic heritage and his aesthetic preferences and moral values, wedded as they are to the Roman political world. Yet their manner of deployment differs greatly—in frequency, length and relative importance, degree of elaboration, and political significance—which carries some relevance for their meaning in the *Aeneid*.

Plato's ship of state in the *Republic* is a metaphor of misrule in which violent sailors, having forcefully persuaded the owner (representing the *demos*) to give one of them the helmsman's job, drink and carouse in their time at sea, plundering the ship's stores. Their behavior and ignorance of the knowledge of navigating all argue for the necessity of the true helmsman, the currently rejected option. Over the course of Cicero's numerous examples of the metaphor bad helmsmen also frequently appear,

---

[153] The distinction Cicero makes between Julius, the five time *triumphator*, and Antony in *Phil*. 117, seems apt: after listing Caesar's gifts and accomplishments, he concludes "In your lust for despotic power I can compare you with him, but in all other respects, there is no comparison" (*Cum illo ego te dominandi cupiditate conferre possum, ceteris vero*, *rebus nullo modo comparandus es*).

but in the guise of contemporary politicians. Instead of descriptions of debauched living while on board, more often their time at the helm, real or potential, is expressed in the "tangible" consequences it will have for the state—shipwreck. The primary concern of the Ciceronian good helmsman, stated or implicit, is the well-being of the passengers, the safety of the state. The *populus Romanus* in this figure never receives the denigration of the shipowner in Plato's *Republic*; their benefit is the helmsman's chief responsibility. One of the oldest elements in the ship of state—the active role of the environment in the threatening forces of storms and winds—appealed very much to Cicero for suggesting both the advent of approaching misrule and the political challenges to the ship of state and seems to have been commonly employed, the now familiar metaphor of the ship of state implicit. Not only does Cicero's ideal helmsman rescue the state from the real threats of tyranny (Catiline, Clodius, Antony), but in the *Republic* the *gubernator* in the figure of Brutus liberates the Roman people from the historical tyranny of Tarquinius Superbus. In contrast to Plato's ship of state where the majority of the action occurs on deck, Cicero's ships travel and encounter action: they are buffeted by storms, threatened by pirates, shipwrecked or brought safely to port. The governed people—in Plato represented by the single figure of the shipowner, large, oafish, and abused by the politicians/sailors—are represented in Cicero as almost sacred cargo, worthy of the sacrificial death of the helmsman. Whereas Plato's metaphor focuses on navigational knowledge as the requisite criterion for helmsmen/philosopher-king, in Cicero it is morality—a selfless concern for the well-being of the ship, in contrast to the selfish bad helmsmen, greedy for power and pleasure. Cicero's use of the figure suggests the entire drama of Roman politics and his view of the highest ideal of Roman leadership and goal for human accomplishment.

Cicero's employs the ship of state throughout his career from its earliest appearance in *De Inventione* (86) to a final jocular use in a letter to Cornificius written in 43 (*Fam.*12. 25). However, it is used most extensively during the 50's in the *post reditum* speeches, *De Oratore*, and *De Republica,* a period of time in which Cicero was concerned both with exonerating his withdrawal into exile and his career as a statesman, as well as with the theoretical expression of the ideal statesman and state. The most dramatic and extensive uses of the ship of state are in those speeches (*Pro Sestio*, *In Pisonem*) in which

Cicero argues that his withdrawal from Rome was essentially a sacrificial rescue of the state from pirates and enemy, recalling his saving the state as consul from Catiline's rebellion. These metaphors elaborate and concentrate on Cicero's singular service to the state. The centrality of the helmsman, thus, in Cicero's presentation of the ideal statesman in both *De Oratore* and *De Republica* is almost predictable. Because of its association with Cicero and the ideal statesman, if not because of its frequent and persistent use, he must have particularly esteemed the ship of state as the most apt image of the Roman Republic.

While Cicero's intimate knowledge and appreciation of the *Phaedrus* is certain, the dialogue's core metaphor of the soul as an ensemble of charioteer and two horses of opposite natures can only be linked to one fragmentary section in the *Republic,* not, as in the case of the helmsman, to a long series of examples throughout his corpus.[154] Yet in this one example the metaphor's essential integrity as an analogue for the soul is retained. And in Cicero the much more frequent variation of the Phaedran charioteer ensemble, the unbridled horse/charioteer, is likewise a manifestation of the soul, which is unbridled most frequently in regard to passion. No longer a paradigm of a process of training toward a goal of balance, *effrenatus* is a character trait, and thus to a large degree fixed,[155] and suggests a combustible, animalistic, violent energy, one that is also well suited to describe the Roman mob. But, *effrenatus* more frequently in Cicero is an attribute of politicians with predictable ramifications in this sphere: the man with an unbridled nature who cannot even rule himself obviously should be precluded from political office. Cicero bestowed this attribute on his greatest political adversaries—Verres, Catiline, Clodius, Piso, Gabinius, and Antony—as a means of warning his fellow senators and citizens of the great threat these volatile, passionate and destructive men posed to the state. It is especially

---

[154] Perhaps the *Phaedrus*' model of the soul was philosophically incompatible. Graver (2002), xix, 141-2, describes Cicero's representation of the mind as essentially a Stoic unified version, not partitioned into reason and emotion: "Despite the awkward language of twofold division at 4. 10, Cicero is now (4. 22) quite clear that the rebellion against reason is not a rebellion of a lower, non-reasoning part of the mind against a reason part, but a rebellion in the reasoning mind as a whole against right, i.e., normative, reason (141)." Cicero (*Acad.* 1. 38-9) attributes to Zeno a denial of the bi-partition of the mind.

[155] May (1988), 6, "The Romans believed that character remains essentially constant in man and therefore demands or determines his actions. Since character does not evolve or develop, but rather is bestowed or inherited by nature (*De Off.* 1. 107-14), an individual cannot suddenly, or at will, change or disguise for any lengthy period his ethos or his way of live."

suggestive that in the case of Marc Antony Plutarch likens his inability to resist Cleopatra to "the stubborn and unbridled beast of the soul, of which Plato speaks" (36)—a clear allusion to the charioteer ensemble of the *Phaedrus*—and that elsewhere in the life he gives Antony equine characteristics. Could this reflect now lost Ciceronian or contemporary representations of Antony? If so, this enriches the already tantalizing relation between the equine Antony and Turnus, the chief Latin charioteer, who in exaltation at the coming war is likened to a horse which has broken his bonds (*Aen.* 491-7).[156] Although the word *effrenatus* does not belong to a larger metaphor of government, nevertheless the circumstances in Rome when Cicero delivered the *Philippics* in 44 and 43 against Antony, reflected precisely the scenario Cicero had envisioned all of his similarly unbridled adversaries to be engaged upon, the destruction of the Republic and this project devolved directly from their depraved character.

Not surprisingly, then, these same individuals—Verres, Clodius, Piso, Gabinius and Antony—are likewise associated with tyrants, the character of which in Cicero, Plato and much Greek literature is defined by a personal lack of restraint and passionate excess, which is expressed in the cruelty of their governance. Charioteers also seem to have been part of the stereotype of the tyrant in Greek drama and to a more limited extent in Livy. The attendant connotations of tyranny in *effrenatus*, as the form of government most despised by Cicero, suggest that its political valence contrasts completely with the good helmsman who is associated with the Republic. As the advent of a tyrant's rule by definition was nothing but the self-promoted, often violent, interjection of an individual who is subject to no constitutional constraints, the focus on the character of one man's soul is *the* requisite consideration for that form of government.

The triumphing charioteer at times drives dangerously close to this territory of personal power, particularly in the late Republic. The celebration itself is fraught with connotations of extreme power—a general leading his army within the sacred *pomerium* of the city, driving the *quadrigae* of kings and wearing royal or divine dress and embellishments. Gratitude for the degree of good fortune the general

---

[156] Johnston (2006), 21, notes that the adjective *liber*, "appears only four times in the *Aeneid*, mainly in reference to Turnus and/or horses, with which he (as opposed to Aeneas) tends to be closely linked."

brings to Rome justifies this license. However, this balance between the celebration of individual glory and accomplishment and the well-being and prosperity won thereby for the state (which empowered the individual), begins to tip with the dynasts in the first century—especially Pompey and Caesar—who are greedy for triumphs and excessive in their celebration, in a time when the divine connotations of the *triumphator*, perhaps, became more prevalent. In the years following Octavian's victory at Actium as he developed his agenda for the principate, couched as a restoration of the Republic, he seems to have taken great care with his policy toward the triumph. While he clearly utilized the implicit connotations of supreme power both visually and persistently in his assumed name of *imperator* and eventually protected his monopoly of this honor, he likewise restricted his actual celebration of triumphs in an apparent attempt to project his triple triumph of 29 as a spectacular restoration of the Republic's peace and prosperity and to maintain the illusion of the continuation of the balance between individual and state characteristic of Republican restraint, but not of the dictatorial exceptions. Augustus' famed restoration of the Republic, as we have seen, reveals a significant Ciceronian heritage.

Cicero, a man devoted to the Republic (φιλόπατρις), as Augustus himself is reported to have said later in life (Plutarch, *Cicero* 49. 3), found in the ship of state a metaphor which effectively expressed the leader's chief role, that of guarding the welfare of the citizens. He could imagine his adversaries as bad helmsmen who would or did shipwreck the state, but his later development of these figures into pirates who wrongly threaten or usurp command of the ship seemed more aptly to reflect his demonized view of his opponents. Many of these same men (Clodius, Piso, Gabinius, Antony) were also represented as unbridled charioteer/horsemen. But in this case there seems to have been no positive analogue; no charioteer of state controls his obedient team. The unbridled announce their unsuitability to rule, which in either figuration implies a balanced steering and guiding. The related concept of the triumphing general is instructive, but for the Republican Roman he certainly cannot be an ideal statesman, however much military accomplishments were joined with political power. His is a temporary extraordinary honor based on personal accomplishment but it is bestowed by the state. Augustus the first emperor with great caution and care made this honor permanently his and as such the triumphing emperor aptly reflects

the state of affairs in an empire. This was, of course, after Cicero was gone. For Cicero the ideal triumph was a gift of the Roman people as he described their impromptu celebration of gratitude after the battle of Mutina: *me ovantem et prope triumphantem populus Romanus in Capitolium domo tulerit, domum inde reduxerit.*

CHAPTER 3

Helmsmen and Charioteers in the Greek Literary Tradition

When the ships cutting furrows in the sea at the start of the ship race in *Aeneid* 5. 142-47 are likened to chariots dashing over the plain, Vergil participates in a long poetic tradition that represents the ship and chariot as comparable. Similarly, when Aeneas as helmsman finally brings his ship to shore at Cumae (6. 1-2), he loosens the reins (*habenas*) of the fleet; his role is thereby conflated with that of charioteer in a metaphorical expression of royal power used elsewhere in the *Aeneid* to describe Aeolus' control of the winds (1. 62-63) and Latinus' power over his subjects (7. 600). To see helmsman and charioteer as analogous is common to epic and tragedy and in both genres it applies most frequently to heroic mortals, who are leaders, warriors and rulers, *in esse* or *in posse*. While the ephebic charioteers in book 11 of the *Iliad*, four of whom Agamemnon defeats alone on foot, emphasize the weakness and youth of Agamemnon's opponents (Himmelhoch, 1997, 81-4), their use in tragedy draws attention to their problematic, even transgressive, relation to community. A distinctive aspect of Vergil's charioteers in the *Aeneid* is the prominent incorporation of the youthful and transgressive charioteer from the tragic tradition into his epic on the Latin side and, as a consequence, my study of analogous charioteers and helmsmen, will consider both epic and tragic. What precedents in tragedy does Vergil engage with in creating his youthful charioteer and what are the implications of this innovation? On a more basic level, I hope to determine why these only generally similar activities of charioteering and navigating were seen as analogous and how and with what effect the poets, including Vergil, used these figures.[157] The overlapping double domains of the Greek gods Athena and Poseidon—those of horses and ships—in

[157] See Brock (2013), 86-87, who notes that although the helmsman and charioteer came to be interchangeable, "they are far from being homologous. The helmsman controls the ship, rather than the crew…and while he commands the latter, he does so with their consent…By contrast, the charioteer directly controls the chariot and its horses using the physical constraint of the reins and the goad."

poetic expression help to explain why these, not obviously similar activities (driving a chariot and steering a ship), came to be seen as analogous.

In addition, within the tradition of works which compare charioteers and helmsmen as analogous, are tragic and epic examples, always concerned with civil or internecine war, in which chariot and ship also represent one side of the conflict, by means of actual employment in the narrative and/or metaphorically. In this chapter I will explore why and with what connotations poets have used this strategy. This discussion of a specialized subset of the comparable helmsmen and charioteers, those I have labeled interactive (see above, p. 5), supports the principal argument of my dissertation (Chapters 3-7), that Aeneas and Turnus in a type of civil war are associated exclusively with ship or chariot, each bearing diverse political connotations. But the first stage in this argument must be to determine how and why each action was thought to be similar, the poetic contexts in which these figures are used, and the connotations implied, which, as mentioned, Athena, goddess of μῆτις or cunning and Poseidon, god of both the sea and horses, determine in part.

The Epic Tradition: The Domains of Athena and Poseidon

Nestor in his speech of advice to his son Antilochus before the chariot race in the *Iliad* presents the clearest and most emphatic point of comparison between charioteer and helmsman in Greek literature (23. 306-48). His is the voice of authority concerning horses and horsemanship as his epithet, "the Gerenian horseman" (Γερήνιος ἱππότα) indicates in both the *Iliad,* in which his recollections in book 11 of his youthful exploits provide an internal standard for the handling of a battle-chariot (Himmelhoch, 1997, 29), and in the *Odyssey* (3. 324-26; 478-85), where he provides Telemachos with chariot, horses and driver. After pointing out to Antilochus that his horses are the slowest of those participating in the chariot race of the funeral games, Nestor praises Antilochus' cunning (μῆτις) and extols its value (311-18):

> τῶν δ᾽ ἵπποι μὲν ἔασιν ἀφάρτεροι, οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοὶ
> πλείονα ἴσασιν σέθεν αὐτοῦ μητίσασθαι.
> ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δὴ σὺ φίλος μῆτιν ἐμβάλλεο θυμῷ
> παντοίην, ἵνα μή σε παρεκπροφύγῃσιν ἄεθλα. 315
> μήτι τοι δρυτόμος μέγ᾽ ἀμείνων ἠὲ βίηφι:
> μήτι δ᾽ αὖτε κυβερνήτης ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ

> νῆα θοὴν ἰθύνει ἐρεχθομένην ἀνέμοισι:
> μήτι δ᾽ ἡνίοχος περιγίγνεται ἡνιόχοιο.
>
> The horses of the others are swifter, but the men know not
> how to devise more cunning counsel than you do.
> So come, dear son, lay up in your mind cunning of every sort,
> so that the prizes do not slip away past your grasp.
> By cunning, you know, is a woodman far better than by might;
> By cunning too does a helmsman on the wine-dark deep
> guide rightly a swift ship that is buffeted by winds;
> and by cunning does charioteer prove better than charioteer.[158]

Of the range of meanings μῆτις can convey (skill, scheming, cunning, counsel, plan),[159] "cunning" allows for the broadest range of license in the interpretation of Nestor's advice which specifically concerns strategy and skill as the rest of his speech demonstrates: he advises Antilochus to hug the turning post (a stump of oak or pine, 328), the shortest distance around the marker, and thereby gain the upper hand.[160] What is generally interpreted as Antilochus' execution of Nestor's advice, the forcing of Menelaus' chariot off the path as he tries to avoid wrecking (417-41), requires the more devious connotations of "cunning" to correspond to Nestor's words.[161] From both the example of the woodcutter and even more so of the helmsman, it becomes clear that μῆτις involves a knowledge that is able to respond in every situation with the best method of succeeding at the task. The knowledge of the counter-intuitive ways of

---

[158] Translations of the *Iliad* are by Murray and Wyatt (1999).

[159] Detienne and Vernant (1978), Ch. 1, deal extensively with the meaning of μῆτις in this context, which they prefer not to translate. Lattimore (1951) and Fagels (1990) translate μῆτις as "skill," while Lombardo (1997) uses "strategy." Detienne and Vernant, 13-21, find in this paradigmatic story four defining characteristics of μῆτις: the possessor of μῆτις often wins against superior "power," reversing normal expectations; the man of μῆτις, compared to his opponent, displays a greater grip of the present, more awareness of the future, and richer experience accumulated from the past; μῆτις is multiple and shifting so that it can adapt itself constantly to changing events as they succeed each other; and, finally, μῆτις operates through disguise assuming a form which masks its true being.

[160] That skill is involved is clear (334-41): "Pressing hard on it drive your chariot and horses close, and yourself lean in your well-plaited chariot a little to the left of your pair, and to the off horse give the goad, calling to him with a shout, and give him rein from your hand. But let the near horse draw close to the post so that the hub of the well-made wheel seems to graze the surface—but avoid touching the stone (two white stones are placed on either side of the stump), lest perhaps you wound your horses and wreck your chariot."

[161] See Chapter 4 for the interpretation of Mnestheus' speech to his crew as an implicit negative commentary on Antilochus' to his horses.

moving a ship to insure its stability and progress in response to every changing blast of the winds,[162] Nestor presents as analogous to the charioteer's cunning in guiding his horses.

Although Athena's favorite in this race and the ultimate winner is Diomedes (driving Aeneas' stolen chariot and team), the skill of all three craftsmen to whom Nestor refers is a gift of Athena, the goddess most closely associated with μῆτις. In fact, both the helmsman and the ship as well as the charioteer, chariot and its team all belong to the domain of Athena due to her possession of either μῆτις or τέχνη. Both the chariot (*Hom. Hym. Aphr.* 13) and the ship were inventions of Athena (whether the vessel of Jason and his companions or of Danaos).[163] Athena presides over all the phases of working with wood, which is relevant to the construction of chariot, plough, or ship (Detienne and Vernant, 1978, 235) and where the chariot and ship are concerned her role also encompasses the skill of driving. As we have seen in Nestor's advice to Antilochus in the *Iliad*, the pilot, like the charioteer, is recognizable for his possession of one major quality, his μῆτις. In the chorus of Sophocles' *Antigone*, 334-38, which praises man's advancement over nature thanks to his technological advancements, the art of navigation is placed at the head of the list of enterprises undertaken by this resourceful man (παντοπόρος, 360). "To find a *poros* (path…), to plot against the wind, to be forever on the alert, to foresee the most favorable opportunity for action are all activities…which demand, a many-sided intelligence" (Detienne and Vernant, 1978, 225), the "exceedingly wise mind" (γνώμα…πολυβούλῳ, *Isth*. 4. 73), which Pindar ascribes to the pilot. Danaos, the first navigator and pilot, is as prudent as he is foreseeing (Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 176-79). Finally, Athena provides the means of control, the bridle for the horseman Bellerophon to control Pegasus (Pindar, *Oly.* 13. 63-87), but also more generally in the control of chariot or ship, by guiding them straight and making the most of favorable opportunities (Detienne and Vernant, 1978, 206, 237).

---

[162] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 20, associate the multiple and shifting quality of μῆτις particularly with the helmsman who "pits his cunning against the wind so as to bring the ship safely to harbour despite it."

[163] For Jason, see Apollonius, *Arg*. 1. 19, 111-14, 526-27, 551, 723-24; 2. 612-14, 1187-89; 3. 340; 4. 582-3; and for Danaos, see Apollodorus 2. 1. 4; Hygienus, *Fab.* 277; Eust. 25, 27.

A factor that further binds the chariot and ship together is the overlapping of Athena's domain with Poseidon's in precisely these two areas. The analyses of Detienne and Vernant (1978, 204) have clarified "the various ways in which (Greek) religious thought seeks to express the opposition and complementarity of two powers interweaving within the same domain(s) but each with a distinctive mode of operation." The horse is the creature of Poseidon: he both fathers horses (Pegasus, Areion) and at times mates in the form of a horse (with an Erinys, Harpuia, and Demeter).[164] The qualities of the horse associated with Poseidon are its fiery nature, its mettle, and "everything about it which needs to be controlled by the bit."[165] By means of various formulae of participation, Poseidon *Hippios* and Athena *Hippia* are active together in myths, but their opposition in this domain is most clearly expressed in the contests that pit natural strength against cunning.[166] Similarly, while Athena gives specific help to the pilot navigating the storm, when Poseidon intervenes to save ships, his "action is in keeping with his fundamental character as a marine power. He calms the violence of the sea; he restrains the anger of the waves…the role played by Poseidon in navigation is as passive as Athena is active" (Detienne and Vernant, 1978, 231-32). Both in the domain of the horse and of the sea, Poseidon's power stops where artifice takes over. In Cook's (1995, 128) opinion "Poseidon and Athene reify the Greek polarization of nature and culture."

Poseidon's distance from artifice may explain why the Phaeacians, people of Poseidon in the *Odyssey*, have been granted ships with incredible swiftness and with the ability to journey without pilot or rudder (*Od.* 8. 557-58). In the land of the Phaeacians "there is no place for Athena and her *metis*" (Detienne and Vernant, 1978, 241). Previously in the epic these two gods had fulfilled their respective

---

[164] Gantz (1993), 62.

[165] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 197-8 and 191, where they note, that "in Greek thought the Gorgon symbolised one essential aspect of the horse. Many features of its behaviour—such as its highly strung nature, its neighing, its sudden moments of panic, its meddlesome disposition, its unpredictability, the foam at its mouth and sweat on its flank—reveal the horse to be a mysterious and disquieting beast, a daemonic force."

[166] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 204: "…we have distinguished three formulae: in the case of a horse mounted by a rider the animal belongs to Poseidon and the bit to Athena; in the case of a chariot with its team of horses, either each power is represented by one horse in the team or else the chariot and horses as a whole are placed under the power of Poseidon while the driver is inspired by Athena." The fourth formula is the contest between strength (Poseidon) and cunning (Athena).

roles related to seafaring: Athena had both procured and personally piloted a ship for Telemachus' journey to learn about Odysseus ("Athene went first and took her place in the stern of the ship, and close beside her Telemachos took his place," 2. 416-18), while Poseidon used his power over the sea to avenge the injury Odysseus had caused his son Polyphemus by pummeling the hero attempting to navigate his way home with a tremendous storm. Poseidon has been persuaded to allow Odysseus to reach Ithaca (Zeus: "Poseidon shall put away his anger…" 1. 77-78) and now with no god in sight, Odysseus finally makes his way home, having fallen asleep as the Phaeacians row him to Ithaca, as if to emphasize the magical power of their ship which can perceive its passenger's desired destination even when he sleeps. Immediately the movement of the ship is compared to that of a chariot (13. 81-89):

> ἡ δ', ὥς τ' ἐν πεδίῳ τετράοροι ἄρσενες ἵπποι,
> πάντες ἅμ' ὁρμηθέντες ὑπὸ πληγῇσιν ἰμάσθλης,
> ὑψόσ' ἀειρόμενοι ῥίμφα πρήσσουσι κέλευθον,
> ὣς ἄρα τῆς πρύμνη μὲν ἀείρετο, κῦμα δ' ὄπισθε
> πορφύρεον μέγα θῦε πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης. 85
> ἡ δὲ μάλ' ἀσφαλέως θέεν ἔμπεδον: οὐδέ κεν ἴρηξ
> κίρκος ὁμαρτήσειεν, ἐλαφρότατος πετεηνῶν.
> ὣς ἡ ῥίμφα θέουσα θαλάσσης κύματ' ἔταμνεν,
> ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μήδε' ἔχοντα:
>
> While the ship, as in a field four stallions drawing
> a chariot all break together at the stroke of the whiplash,
> and lifting high their feet lightly beat out their path, so
> the stern of this ship would lift and the creaming wave behind her
> boiled amain in the thunderous crash of the sea. She ran on
> very steady and never wavering; even the falcon,
> that hawk that flies lightest of winged creatures, could not have paced her,
> so lightly did she run on her way and cut through the sea's waves.
> She carried a man with a mind like the gods for counsel.[167]

The ship's progress is not described before it is compared to four horses yoked together and swiftly traversing the path in a field (ἐν πεδίῳ τετράοροι…ἵπποι…ῥίμφα πρήσσουσι κέλευθον, 81-83). Just as the chariot that the horses draw is only suggested by the horses being yoked, the charioteer's strokes of the whip are all that suggest his presence. Rather, the horses' coordinated (ἄρσενες…πάντες ἅμ, 81-82) and

[167] Translation by Lattimore (1965/1991).

upward-lifting (τετράοροι,[168] 81…ὑψόσ᾽ἀειρόμενοι, 83) action dominates the simile and is immediately echoed in the narrative by the short description of the ship's lifting (ὣς ἄρα τῆς πρύμνη μὲν ἀείρετο, 84). However, the further elaboration of the ship's context emphasizes the contrast between the sea's volatility (κῦμα δ᾽ ὄπισθε πορφύρεον μέγα θῦε πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης, 84-85) and the stability of the land encompassing the horses in the simile (ἐν πεδίῳ…κέλευθον, 81, 83). The ship's steady speed (86) both recalls the speed of the horses (ῥίμφα, 83) and introduces a second simile, that of the hawk, swiftest of birds. The repetition of the word ῥίμφα (88), now describing the ship in the narrative, draws the interweaving lines of text and similes together before the narrative returns to focus on the sleeping Odysseus. In the absence of a helmsman this analogous simile (ship/chariot) primarily concerns the elemental forces of the horses, goaded into their upward leaps by whiplash, and the surging sea that lifts the ship. In both cases Poseidon's domains of the power and force of sea and horse are evoked in this final stage of Odysseus' journey to Ithaca where he, "devious (ποικιλομῆτα) and never weary of tricks" (13. 293), will be welcomed by Athena, "famous for wit (μήτι) and sharpness" (13. 299). Together they will plot to depose the suitors.

In summary, the *metis*/elemental opposition that Detienne and Vernant (1978) developed in their analysis of Athena and Poseidon has particular applicability to the Homeric Epics. *Metis* is the quality Nestor dwells on in his instructions to Antilochus before the chariot race in the *Iliad*, where he presents the charioteer, helmsman and carpenter as dependent on *metis*. Although in this context Athena herself has no part, in the *Odyssey* she is involved both in ship building and piloting. Where Poseidon is active as the elemental power of the sea or the source of pilotless ships, Athena waits. Thus, while the comparison of charioteer to helmsman in the *Iliad* is overtly focused on the skill of each, the *Odyssey*'s simile compares the dynamic action of ship and horses, the ship being devoid of helmsman. Comparisons in tragedy, not surprisingly, concentrate on the human guider most often, around whom the drama unfolds, thereby providing a rich opportunity to investigate the relationship between simile and character, both

[168] τετράοροι, which means "four-yoked together," is a compound of τετρα- and ἀείρω, the verb that means to lift, raise up, or carry.

youths and mature men. Among the analogous types of comparisons in tragedy those in Euripides' *Hippolytus* are of particular relevance for the *Aeneid*.

The Youthful Charioteer: Hippolytus

In a scene of great dramatic intensity, the ephebic charioteer Hippolytus' struggle for his life at the climax of Euripides' play, as he tries to control his terrified horses, is compared to that of a helmsman steering his boat.[169] While this simile clearly focuses upon and prolongs Hippolytus' immediate individual struggle, this is not without important communal ramifications, as we will see. In a play in which the plot derives from Hippolytus' antithetical conceptualization of the goddesses Aphrodite, whose realm and activities (including even marriage) he eschews ("Since I am pure I greet this one from afar," 102; "And to that Kypris of yours I say good riddance," 112), and Artemis, to whom alone his celibate life is devoted ("For I alone of mortals have this privilege: you are my companion and I converse with you," 84-85), with reason one could expect that polarity to be the motivation behind the doubling of the charioteer's efforts with the helmsman's, especially given that the sea, as Segal has demonstrated, is pervasively associated with Aphrodite throughout the play.[170] Interpretations of the nautical imagery typically see its presence as expressive of the threat directed against Hippolytus from the sea,[171] but while this has a general validity, it seems to oversimplify. As we will see, the aspects of the simile Euripides

---

[169] Euripides won first prize for the *Hippolytus* in 428. A previous play, *Hippolytus Veiled*, survives only in 19 fragments, none longer than four lines, but it featured a very different kind of Phaedra from the character in the surviving play, one intent on adultery. How much Seneca's *Phaedra* reflects this first Euripidean play is debated (Halleran, 1995, 25).

[170] Segal (1965), 118: Aphrodite is born from the sea, 120; her ambiguity is like the sea, 121; Aphrodite states the basic opposition between herself and Hippolytus in terms of the sea in the prologue, 122; the death to which Phaedra's (Aphrodite's pawn) self-starvation is leading her is described as a shipwreck (a recurrent metaphor in the play), 134; in the "Escape Ode" the destructive power of the sea is made explicit as Phaedra becomes a boat swamped with water; Theseus' curse against Hippolytus is expressed in terms of the sea, 143-44; Poseidon, god of the sea and Theseus' father, grants his son's request to "make an end of my son" (888-89) and causes a giant bull to emerge from a mammoth wave to terrify Hippolytus' horses, which leads to his death, 155; the grief of the citizens of Troezen for Hippolytus is expressed in terms of the rhythmical sound of the oars of a trireme entering the water.

It should be noted that, in as much as the chariot wreck can and has been interpreted as the shattering of Hippolytus' divided self (Zeitlin, 1985, 77-78,81,95), any way in which he is represented as double is suggestive of that divide between Aphrodite and Artemis within him.

[171] Segal (1965), 143, "The imagery here suggests the total engulfment by the sea: he is literally as well as metaphorically, no longer upon the familiar sheltered land he knows. It has all become sea." Halleran (1995), at 1218-22, "the nautical image…is especially appropriate since the monster comes from the sea."

chooses to employ emphasize the technical competency of Hippolytus and the cultural gifts of Athena he utilizes in a struggle against the powerful forces of nature.

After the messenger describes to Theseus the circumstances that give rise to the chariot wreck—"a supernatural wave fixed towards the heavens…swollen and foaming much froth (ἀφρὸν πολὺν, 1210-11) around it, with a blast of the sea…advances toward the shore where the four-horse chariot was. And along with its very swell and triple crest the wave spewed forth a bull, a savage monster"—he details Hippolytus' fruitless attempt to control his frightened horses and the ensuing disaster (1218-39):

εὐθὺς δὲ πώλοις δεινὸς ἐμπίπτει φόβος.
καὶ δεσπότης μὲν ἱππικοῖσιν ἤθεσιν
πολὺς ξυνοικῶν ἥρπασ᾽ ἡνίας χεροῖν,
ἕλκει δὲ κώπην ὥστε ναυβάτης ἀνήρ,
ἱμᾶσιν ἐς τοὔπισθεν ἀρτήσας δέμας:
αἱ δ᾽ ἐνδακοῦσαι στόμια πυριγενῆ γνάθοις
βίᾳ φέρουσιν, οὔτε ναυκλήρου χερὸς
οὔθ᾽ ἱπποδέσμων οὔτε κολλητῶν ὄχων
μεταστρέφουσαι. κεἰ μὲν ἐς τὰ μαλθακὰ
γαίας ἔχων οἴακας εὐθύνοι δρόμον,
προυφαίνετ᾽ ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν, ὥστ᾽ ἀναστρέφειν,
ταῦρος, φόβῳ τέτρωρον ἐκμαίνων ὄχον:
εἰ δ᾽ ἐς πέτρας φέροιντο μαργῶσαι φρένας,
σιγῇ πελάζων ἄντυγι ξυνείπετο,
ἐς τοῦθ᾽ ἕως ἔσφηλε κἀνεχαίτισεν
ἁψῖδα πέτρῳ προσβαλὼν ὀχήματος.
σύμφυρτα δ᾽ ἦν ἅπαντα: σύριγγές τ᾽ ἄνω
τροχῶν ἐπήδων ἀξόνων τ᾽ ἐνήλατα,
αὐτὸς δ᾽ ὁ τλήμων ἡνίαισιν ἐμπλακεὶς
δεσμὸν δυσεξήνυστον ἕλκεται δεθείς,
σποδούμενος μὲν πρὸς πέτραις φίλον κάρα
θραύων τε σάρκας,

And at once a terrible panic falls upon the horses; and my master, very familiar with the ways of horses, snatched the reins in his hands (1220) and he pulls them, the way a sailor does an oar, leaning his body backwards on the reins. But biting on the fire-forged bits with their jaws, they carry him against his will, heedful of neither the helmsman's hand nor the harness nor the well-made chariot (1225). And whenever, holding the tiller, he steered their course toward the soft ground, the bull would appear in front to turn them back, driving the four-horse team mad with fear; and whenever with their minds maddened they rushed towards the rocks (1230) it would follow nearby in silence alongside the rail until it finally tripped up and overturned the chariot, smashing the rim of its wheel against the rock. Everything was mixed together: the wheels' hubs and the axles' pins were leaping up, (1235) and the wretch himself, bound up in the reins' inextricable

> bond, is being dragged, smashing his own head against the rocks and shattering his flesh...[172]

The gigantic wave and savage monster of a bull, sent by Poseidon in response to Theseus' request to his father for Hippolytus' death, effectively terrify Hippolytus' horses. His response to their extreme panic is based on the knowledge he has gained over a long period of time, as ἱππικοῖσιν ἤθεσιν (he was accustomed to the horses' ways) and πολὺς ξυνοικῶν (he lived together [with them] for a long time) emphasize. Based on this knowledge Hippolytus recognizes that the frightened horses require forceful action. He, therefore, grabs the reins in his hands and leans back, pulling with the whole weight of his body to stop their frantic fright. In this mechanical execution of effort—hands to reins (1220), body backwards on the harness or reins (1222)—Hippolytus shares the major and emphatically placed verb of pulling, ἕλκει, with the sailor to whom, pulling on an oar, he is compared (1221). In both instances, charioteer and sailor, hand-fashioned tools are employed to accomplish the identical task of pulling, but with the opposite goal: one of stopping the other of forward motion. This emphasis on the technical continues to an even greater extent in the next section (1223-26), in which the horses (identified as mares: αἱ…μεταστρέφουσαι 1223, 1226) resist every other aspect of the chariot ensemble (οὔτε…οὔθ'… οὔτε…), each expressed with a suggestion of Athena's involvement in the formation or use. The horses fight against the force Hippolytus has exerted to control them with their own (βίᾳ, 1224), "biting on the fire-forged bits with their jaws, they carry him (off)." The bit, to which the adjective "fire-forged" (πυριγενῆ, 1223) alludes, is an invention of Athena, created by her specifically to enable Bellerophon to control Pegasus (Pindar, *Oly.* 13. 63-87).[173] A similar reference seems to be encoded in the adjective "well-made" (κολλητῶν, 1225) to describe the chariot, which, as we have seen, with the plough and ship is likewise an invention of Athena, material components of culture, for the destruction of which

---

[172] All translations of the *Hippolytus* are by Halleran (1995).

[173] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 187-91. Within the context of this passage in which the elements of Athena contributing to culture and those of Poseidon (and Aphrodite) expressive of natural power are contesting, the numerous expressions of material objects and their ultimate degradation are paramount. However, the horses participate in both sides of the debate. Thus, Segal's (1965), 143, opinion that the fire in the bits alludes to Eros' fire in the first stasimon of *Hippolytus*, and therefore indicates that the bits "no longer (serve) as a check or control, but only add to the breaking forth of elemental violence," is likewise apt, since the horses are very shortly the instruments themselves of Hippolytus' violent death.

Poseidon's bull and sea are enlisting the aid of the passion of the horses, their Poseidonian nature. Hippolytus' hand recurs in the final position of line 1224, but it is now the metaphorical hand of the helmsman (ναυκλήρου, 1224), which also activates Athena's domain of μῆτις, applicable to either helmsman or charioteer, as we have seen, in their role as an intelligent guide, who is able to foresee and contrive to avoid danger. This theme recurs, again metaphorically and more fully expressed, in the beginning of the next section in which the bull closes in on the chariot: whenever Hippolytus steers their course, holding on to the helm (οἴακας, 1227), the bull appears. Hippolytus' skill is to no avail, however, as the bull's close presence drives the horses mad (ἐκμαίνων, 1229; μαργῶσαι φρένας, 1230), resulting in the wreck of the chariot (1232-1235), many individual parts of which are either smashed (the rim of a wheel) or mixed together, leap upwards (the wheels' hubs, and the axles' lynch pins). The poor wretch himself, bound up in the reins of his vehicle is smashed and torn up on the rocks,[174] as his own horses (reared in my stable, 1240, fed by my hand, 1355-56) destroy him. Thus, the comparison of Hippolytus and his chariot ensemble with the helmsman and sailor's maritime tasks broadens and emphasizes the impression that man's inventiveness evident in both the material products of civilization and the μῆτις of the charioteer/helmsman are no match for the power of nature. Poseidon's domain, which is also Aphrodite's, crushes that of Athena. But since Athena plays no significant role in this play dominated by the realms of Aphrodite and Artemis,[175] the importance in this passage rests on her contributions to human civilization in the form of intelligence and the creative and useful material products. But why are these aspects of civilization associated with Hippolytus, who, as numerous scholars have noted,[176] transgresses against the foundations of human culture and therefore suffers death? A consideration of some

---

[174] A central theme of the *Hippolytus*, binding and loosening, is expressed most intensely in this passage by the many words relating to bonds, including reins (ἡνία, 1220, 1236), harness (ἰμᾶσιν, 1222) and bonds (the word for harness at 1225, ἱπποδέσμων, which literally means "horse bonds" occurs only here in Greek; line 1237 is framed by bonding words: "bound up in the reins inextricable bond) and by the closeness of Hippolytus' body to the reins, either in hand or, finally, entwining around him (1236), and the final breaking and tearing of his flesh (1238-39), to which the meaning of Hippolytus' name, "loosened by horses" refers (Zeitlin, 1985, 59; Halleran, 1995, 21).

[175] Near the beginning of the play, her name locates the temple of Aphrodite in Athens, 29-30: "And before coming to this land of Trozen she (Phaedra) set up there a temple of Cypris beside Pallas' very rock." Near the end, Theseus bewails the lands that will be deprived of Hippolytus, 1459-60: "Famous Athens and the boundaries of Pallas, what a man you will lack!"

[176] Zeitlin, (1985), 71; Goff (1990), 114; Mitchell-Boyask (1999), 44.

political/cultural aspects of the play, will delineate the ways in which some of Hippolytus' values cohere with polis culture and the significance of his chariot wreck for Troezan.

When the messenger comes to report Hippolytus' chariot wreck he summons Theseus in his political or social capacity as ruler of the land (1153) and the disaster is presented as personal, but also as political, as Charles Segal (1965, 142) notes: he has a matter of importance to relate "to you and the citizens who dwell in the city of the Athenians and the limits of the Troezenian land" (1158-59). Thus, the ruler and the ordered society he represents are confronted by Poseidon and Eros (as agent of Aphrodite), who embody powers "outside of civilization, which civilization is forced, with pain, to recognize" (Segal 1985, 142). Just as the sea overwhelms the land, it also overwhelms human control and reason. Segal, thus, closely associates Hippolytus' fate with that of his city, which, given the particular emphasis in the chariot wreck on Athena's cultural gifts and Theseus' important role in Athens where he was also king,[177] seems fully justified. Nevertheless, it is true that Hippolytus rejects both politics (986-9) and sex (1004) and "thus renounces any claim to full adult participation in the life and propagation of the *polis*" (Goff, 1990, 116). However, in his moral elitism, what Zeitlin (1985, 70) has described as his "aristocratic idealism," he reveals a cultural refinement suggestive of polis life. Goff (1990, 86) notes the pervasive intellectualism of Greek moral vocabulary, especially apparent in the virtue Hippolytus is certain that he possesses,[178] σωφροσύνη—"moderation" or "self-control", the verbal form of which (σωφρονεῖν) contains the verb "to think" (φρονεῖν). In his primary pursuit, training his horses, Hippolytus is likewise associated with the city. In the third stasimon the chorus describes the shore of his horse-racing as πολιήτιδος (1126), associating it "with man's life, the life of the *polis,*" which, as Segal emphasizes, is quite separate from the shore "beyond this land, already toward the Saronic sea" (1199-1200), fully exposed to the "savage, open sea" where Hippolytus is killed (Segal, 1965, 143). This ambiguity in Hippolytus' relation to the polis, being of it, but not fully participating in it, finds an

[177] Theseus, according to Euripides, *Hipp.* 35, had been exiled from Athens for a year for purification from the *miasma* incurred from the spilled blood of the Pallantidai, the sons of Pallas, the brother of Aegeus, Theseus' father. See also Gantz (1993), 276-77.

[178] In his prayer to Artemis in the beginning of the play, Hippolytus says that only those "in whose nature moderation has been allotted in everything always" (80) may enter her meadow.

analogue is his relation to his horses, which through out the play are "ambiguously connected both with Hippolytus' virgin pursuits and with sexual desire" (Segal, 1985, 146).[179] These points of contact between Hippolytus and the polis, at the same time they suggest a relationship which is only "tangential even before his exile" (Goff, 1990, 115), also indicate, together with his actions in the chariot wreck, his engagement with some areas of polis life, especially those which involve τέχνη and μῆτις. In the chorus' final words (1462-67), the collective grief of the citizens of Troezen at Hippolytus' death is expressed with diction that recalls the sea imagery used throughout the play, including "most poignantly…the description of the doomed Hippolytus as a steersman who has lost control of his ship" (Segal, 1965, 156):

> κοινὸν τόδ᾽ ἄχος πᾶσι πολίταις
> ἦλθεν ἀέλπτως.
> πολλῶν δακρύων ἔσται πίτυλος:
> τῶν γὰρ μεγάλων ἀξιοπενθεῖς 1465
> φῆμαι μᾶλλον κατέχουσιν.
>
> This grief to be shared by all the citizens came unexpectedly.
> There will be a splashing of many tears; for sorrowful tales
> about the great hold greater sway.

As Segal points out, although πίτυλος (which he translates "rhythmic plashing") is used figuratively of the rhythmic beating of breasts or fall of tears in lamentation, "literally (it) denotes the regular sound of the oars produced by the coordinated efforts of the rowers as on a trireme." Its use, therefore, is especially appropriate here "to mark the human social world." The use of the metaphorical helmsman at the height of Hippolytus' struggle to control his horses, because of the attention that it draws to man's attempt to master his environment through the use of his intelligence and creativity, on one level expresses a central collective significance to Hippolytus' story, which is that regardless of man's accomplishments and

---

[179] Although his horses, under the influence of the savage forces of Poseidonian virility, are traumatized into killing Hippolytus, their inherent passionate nature is evident within the play in their leaving of the scene of the wreck with the bull, itself an obvious sexual symbol, and in the equine imagery with which feminine passion is expressed (546, 1425), as well as by the horse's association with Poseidon *Hippios*, god of horses and of male sexuality and fertility. Segal (1965), 144-45, points out connections of the horse outside the play with "wild exuberant male sexuality:" the horse-tailed ithyphallic satyrs on 6th and 5th century vases; the lecherous violent centaurs on the west pediment at Olympia and on the Parthenon metopes, and Nessus the centaur in tragedies (*Trachiniae* 1095-96; Euripides, *H.F.* 181) and Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.41. Partly because of the ambiguous connotations of his horses, Hippolytus in the process of the chariot wreck imitates literally the model of the conflicted self, associated earlier in the play with women (161-63), (Zeitlin, 1985, 77).

capabilities he is ultimately powerless against the uncontrollable forces of nature. On another level, however, because of Hippolytus' close association with women, the ephebic and marginalized figures (his mother was an Amazon),[180] he is only fully integrated into the polis by his death, after which, a cult is established in his honor by Artemis, in which maidens before they marry will cut off locks of their hair to honor him. Their participation in the rite brings them into conformity with "the expectations of society, such as Hippolytus failed to meet" (Goff, 1990, 114). However well Hippolytus knew the ways of horses and wielded the technology to control them, his extreme purest ideals, which isolated him from the polis, induced similarly extreme punishment.[181]

Hippolytus' comparison to a helmsman prolongs the moment of struggle the young charioteer is engaged in to control his terrified horses and in so doing it dramatizes the inability of experience, skill and products of culture (the domains of Athena) to defeat the power of nature. Because of the pointed association in Euripides' play of Aphrodite, the goddess enraged at Hippolytus' neglect, with the sea, his struggle against the effect of the bull Theseus sends from the sea, also manifests the consequences of willful neglect of another god who also sponsors the polis, but in a different way. The suppression of the generative life force inevitably eventually also kills culture. The artifacts of culture that Hippolytus so expertly weilds—the chariot and gear—and he himself are ultimately crushed, but his horses, now Poseidonian agents of passion, survive, disappearing with the bull. Hippolytus' personal crisis is at the heart of Euripides' play, but because of his rejection of marriage, he also represents a significant threat to the polis. His reincorporation into the polis via the ritual performance of maidens before marriage permanently and publicly redresses this lack in his life. Even though the inner personal struggles of this individual youthful charioteer give rise to the chariot ride that is lethal for him, his death has a salutatory effect on the community.

---

[180] Cairns (1997), 56-57, notes that Hippolytus fits the typology of the ephebe in several important aspects, on which see below Chapter 5 for a considerations of these in relation to Virbius, Hippolytus' son, in book 7 of the *Aeneid.*

[181] Zeitlin (1985), 106, notes that in Greek myth "one extreme attitude or form of behavior is countered exactly by its equally unacceptable reverse."

In Hippolytus' case charioteer and helmsman refer to one and the same person and neither role is privileged over the other. However, in two texts, which are broadly philosophic in nature, the helmsman is associated with greater competency or loftier thought than the charioteer. This section will both complete the analogous comparisons (because the context raises expectations for such an analogy) and form a transition to the second half of this chapter (the interactive charioteer and helmsman) because the comparison establishes a difference, but not as obviously or elaborately as the true interactive examples.

Lucretius briefly recounts the story of Phaethon (5. 396-406, [55]) to debunk the irrationality of myth and to embellish his description of the power of the sun, which like the other elemental forces has the potential to destroy all.

> ignis enim superavit et ambiens multa perussit,
> avia cum Phaethonta rapax vis solis equorum
> aethere raptavit toto terrasque per omnis.
> pater omnipotens ira tum percitus acri
> magnanimum Phaethonta repenti fulminis ictu
> deturbavit equis in terram, Solque cadenti
> obvius aeternam succepit lampada mundi
> disiectosque redegit equos iunxitque trementis,
> inde suum per iter recreavit cuncta gubernans,
> scilicet ut veteres Graium cecinere poetae.
> quod procul a vera nimis est ratione repulsum.
>
> For fire prevailed and went round burning up many parts, when far from his course the furious might of the sun's horses whirled Phaëthon throughout the sky and over all the earth. But the almighty Father, stirred with fierce anger, crashed down ambitious Phaëthon from his car to the earth with a sudden thunderbolt, and the Sun, meeting his fall, caught up from him the everlasting lamp of the world, and bringing back the scattered horses yoked them in trembling, and then guiding them on their proper path, restored all again—that, you know, is the tale the Grecian poets sung. But this is all very far indeed removed from true reasoning.[182]

As Monica Gale (2009, at 396-404) notes, the "ironic, mock-heroic tone in which the story is told (....*omnipotens,... magnanimum,* ...and *aeternam* all conspicuously inappropriate in the context of a story of narrowly-averted calamity...)" foreshadows Lucretius' rejection of the mythological account (405-6). Even in the myth, the natural forces of the horses and the sun dominate. Phaethon is completely passive, reduced to his name and ironic boldness, as he is first seized (*rapax, raptavit*) and swept around the extent

[182] Translation by Rouse and Smith (1975).

of the universe (*aethere...toto terrasque per omnis*) by the power of the horses and then, having raised the keen anger of Jupiter, he is ejected by a sudden thunderbolt. The Sun by contrast executes multiple restorative acts (*succepit, redegit, iunxit, recreavit*) and finally steers or controls all (*gubernans*), implicitly as helmsman. The passage is remarkably free of technology—no chariots, reins, ships, helms—and charioteer or helmsman designation. Instead the energetic power of the horses and the Sun's demonstrable ability to engage their power for the accomplishment of the essential cosmic task contrasts with Phaethon's subjugation to the horses. Phaethon is defeated and destroyed in his attempt to be a charioteer, while the true charioteer, after having restored order to the chaos of the ensemble, as a helmsman guides all.

The same hierarchy between charioteer and helmsman appears in Plato's *Phaedrus*, but in a very different circumstance. Recall that Plato's image of the soul in the *Phaedrus* as a charioteer driving two horses applies to both immortal and mortal souls, but the horses of men are of diverse temperaments. This difference has consequences not only on earth in the soul's pursuit of the beloved, but also in heaven where, with the souls of the gods, human souls also attempt to ascend to look on the region beyond heaven where the soul "beholds and feeds upon...eternal verities," some of which are "absolute justice, temperance and knowledge" (247d-e). While the ascent to the edge of heaven and the viewing of these verities is untroubled for the immortals, mortal charioteers have great difficulty due to their unmatched teams, which results in "the greatest confusion and sweat of rivalry" with little to no chance to look beyond (247c, 248b-c). Clearly what is to be seen beyond heaven is of essential value and therefore the ability to gaze beyond represents an important distinction between mortals and gods.[183] It is precisely when the mind is looking upon this region that it is characterized as the helmsman of the soul (247c-d):

> ἡ γὰρ ἀχρώματός τε καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος καὶ ἀναφὴς οὐσία ὄντως οὖσα, ψυχῆς κυβερνήτῃ μόνῳ θεατὴ νῷ, περὶ ἣν τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιστήμης γένος, τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τόπον.

[183] Although, since some mortals are capable of receiving the images (247d), the distinction is not absolute. Nevertheless, mortal vision is limited and the description of the general chaos resulting from the attempt by mortal chariot teams to ascend (248a-b), suggests the rarity of achievement of even the position to view.

> For the colourless, formless, and intangible truly exiting essence, with which all true knowledge is concerned, holds this region and is visible only to the mind, the pilot of the soul.

Only here in the *Phaedrus* is the soul implicitly a ship with the mind of the soul as its helmsman. While the charioteer, in the more frequent image, is not explicitly designated "the mind of the soul" in the *Phaedrus*, his actions justify this designation and commentators assume it.[184] For the soul gazing on "the truly existing essence" Plato has chosen the figure that he has used for the god who makes and orders the universe (*Politicus* 272e), for the action of various gods on human souls (*Critias* 109b-c) and for the philosopher, the true helmsman of the *Republic* (488e-489b). What seems of greatest importance in the *Phaedrus* and that which elevates the image, so to speak, from charioteer to helmsman, are the qualities contained in this region beyond heaven, which are of such value that they appear to ennoble the mind as it beholds them. Thus, while the charioteer and the helmsman in a clearly analogous manner represent the rational faculty of the soul, the object of its sight while looking beyond heaven elevates the status of that aspect of the soul, which is indicated by its designation as helmsman. Both Lucretius and Plato, then, in different contexts and manners, take advantage of the established tradition of the analogy between helmsman and charioteer to suggest the superiority of the helmsman.

So why, then, have charioteers and helmsmen appeared as analogues? The abiding and most important similarity between helmsman and charioteer in poetry from the time of the Homeric epics lies in the similar mental capacity required to succeed at both tasks, which consists of a combination of skills acquired through long and persistent practice and the ability to take quick and effective action in an arena of multiple shifting and fast changing circumstances. Nestor in the *Iliad* most emphatically associates this combination of abilities with μῆτις, the scheming and conniving sense of which are not entirely captured in the Latin equivalent *ars*. However, the popularity, strength and persistence of the comparison seems to have originated in the many-layered interconnections between the domains of Athena and Poseidon, both of whom are associated with charioteers and helmsmen and their vehicles—at one time the

[184] Rowe (1986), at 247c 6-8: "...νῷ is in apposition to κυβερνήτῃ: the charioteer is intellect or mind." Ostendfeld (1989), 325, argues for the essential similarity in the tripartite division of the soul in the *Phaedrus, Republic* and *Timaeus.*

primary means of transportation on land and sea. Poseidon, god of the sea and father of the horse, represents the conflation of land (his epithet in the *Iliad, Odyssey,* and *Theogony* is "Earth Shaker") and sea when he drives his horse-drawn chariot under and through the sea, as well as on top of the waves (*Iliad* 13. 23-38; *Aeneid* 1. 155-6; 5. 817-19). Most often Poseidon is associated with the power and passion of both the sea and horse, while Athena constructed both the first chariot and ship, as well as providing the first bridle/bit and, equally important, she, daughter of Zeus and after him chief possessor of μῆτις, is patroness of helmsmen and charioteers in this regard. The frequency and familiarity of the comparisons of chariot and ship ensembles encouraged a creative complicating of expression through the use of metaphors within similes and metonymical alternatives for parts of the ensembles, a tendency especially noticeable in Roman examples. This appetite for variation is likewise evident in the expressive purposes for which poets utilized comparisons between chariot and ship.

The chariot and ship analogies often undergird central themes or moments in their respective works. The fundamental dichotomy in the *Odyssey* is arguably that between savagery and civilization. Odysseus' experiences on his voyage home represent the most powerful encounters with savagery and violence, all of which occur on or near the sea and a large number with descendants of Poseidon (Cook, 1995, 49-53, 71). Odysseus' final voyage from Scheria to Ithaca, in which his pilotless ship's motion is compared to that of horses pulling a chariot, precedes the accomplishment of the goal of his journey, the return to Ithaca, where he and Athena, "the two shrewdest minds in the universe" (13. 296-7), put those minds to work plotting revenge on the suitors, which is to say the simile occurs precisely at the transition from Poseidon's world to Athena's. Likewise, in Euripides' *Hippolytus* Poseidon, as an elemental force of nature aligned with Aphrodite and representative of the aspect of life Hippolytus rejects, pursues the tragedy's hero, in this case, to total annihilation. This consistency in Poseidon/Neptune's aspect contrasts utterly with his important role in the *Aeneid* where, as we will see in the next chapter, he calms the Junonian roused storm and insures Aeneas' safe sailing to Italy.

When the drivers are the subject of the simile, the narrative recounts the dramatic crisis of an individual charioteer's life in the moments preceding his death. And so, while the scope of the story is

narrower than epic, the centrality of the comparison is, if anything, heightened by the dramatic intensity of the moment. In a general sense, the youthful charioteer Hippolytus is guilty because he holds himself in such high regard, but more particularly Hippolytus scorns Aphrodite. The strangeness of Hippolytus' life choices—the absence of reproduction and the institution of marriage—potentially has devastating consequences for mankind. The context of his demise on the shore along the sea suggests the whole uncontrollable realm of Aphrodite, tempests, waves and winds and is the source of Hippolytus' death. When Hippolytus is compared to the helmsman, the sea begins its fatal encroachment. In the tragic tradition youthful charioteers are compared to helmsmen as part of their poetic preparation for death. Whereas helmsmen, fewer in number, are less overtly compared to charioteers (Ennius' helmsman "turns his horses" in a shiprace or Aeneas as helmsman "loosens the reins," for example) and appear to participate largely in the poetic *variatio* of an established topos.

Finally, two philosophical texts—Plato's *Phaedrus* and Lucretius' *De rerum natura*—develop a hierarchy in their use of the two images. While the souls of both gods and men move up to the edge of heaven in the form of the charioteer ensemble, when they arrive and are able to look beyond at the eternal verities (for humans very briefly, if at all), the soul's mind perceives in the image of the helmsman—only a word in the text, but because of the importance of the objects viewed, worthy of attention. Lucretius, in the context of mocking belief in mythology, represents the young charioteer Phaethon as the plaything of the Sun's horses, but the Sun, once he has gathered and calmed his team, as a helmsman guiding all. Again, the story is briefly told—Phaethon has only one distinguishing characteristic—and joins a number of similar passages debunking mythology, nevertheless, Lucretius' example and that of Plato represent the potential for the traditional analogy to be altered to express contrast. It is this potential which Aeschylus fully develops in his play the *Seven Against Thebes,* in which Polynices and the forces attacking Thebes are associated with chariots and horses, while his brother Eteocles, the king of Thebes, represents himself as its helmsman.

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: The Ship of State

As the last and only surviving play in a Theban tetralogy, the *Seven Against Thebes* (hereafter *Septem*) commences with many unanswered questions for the modern reader. Based on the few fragments of the first two plays and *Septem,* the *Laius* included the birth of Oedipus and the killing of Laius, while the *Oedipus* dealt with the revelation of Oedipus' identity, his blinding and the curse upon his sons, Polynices and Eteocles.[185] But the exact nature of the curse and, more importantly, the circumstances of Polynices' banishment from Thebes are obscure. The chorus suggests illusively that cruel-hearted Iron, will allot the brothers land to dwell in, "as much as is given to the dead to possess" (727-33) and later in the play, after the brother's have killed each other, the chorus confirms that Iron and harsh Ares, "have made the father's curse come true" (944-46). Many variations of the arrangement for the brothers to rule Thebes exist in the literary tradition and Polynices' departure or expulsion and subsequent seeking of the support of king Adrastus and the Argives to gain the Theban throne form some of the most ancient versions of the tale.[186] Almost all commentators remark on the surprising reticence of Aeschylus concerning the immediate background of the Argive attack. As Gantz (1993, 503) neatly summarizes, "It is, of course, clear that Eteokles has the kingship and that Polyneikes wants it, but we do not learn the basis of the former's tenure or the latter's claim."

Leaving the realm of the uncertain to consider the extant play, we are met with some interesting idiosyncrasies. Although the seven warriors leading the attack on Thebes are a vital part of the mythic tradition, the locus of Aeschylus' play is relentlessly within the walls of Thebes; the warriors' action and speech are all reported by a scout or messenger. And so, even though *Septem* was famously said to be "filled with Ares" or war (Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 1021), in fact, "not one thing happens in the course of its action" (Fowler, 1970, 24); more action is implicit in the fearful cries of the Theban women in the chorus ("The great host of horse is pouring forward at the gallop!" 80) than in the messenger's description of the

---

[185] Hutchinson (1985), xxiii-xxx. The *Sphinx*, the satyr play, dealt with Oedipus' deliverance of Thebes from that monster. The tetralogy was produced in 467 (see Hutchinson, xvii, for the fragmentary hypothesis) and won first prize and, thus, *Septem* is a relatively early play—only the *Persians* (472) preceded it.

[186] Gantz (1993), 502-519, treats all early Greek variants and notes (502) that the *Thebais*, an epic devoted entirely to the brothers' story, begins "Sing, goddess, of thirsty Arogs, when the lords..."

major actions of the war ("the champions with whom we reinforced the gates proved reliable in single combat," 797-980).[187] Further, the feud between the brothers, the source of the war, is largely suppressed until the middle of the play—Polynices is not even mentioned until line 577 in a play barely over a thousand lines—and instead the attack is represented as one of foreign aggression;[188] the attackers are called Argive or Achaean (28, 59, 120, 324), their foreign speech is commented on (170), and they are represented as barbaric (Torrance, 2007, 89-91). But the most unexpected feature of the *Septem* is its singular focus on only one of the brothers, Eteolces. The play opens with his address to the Theban citizen warriors, presents his many interaction with the chorus of frighten Theban women, and the shield scene (the longest scene constituting about one third of the play, 369-719) reveals his thoughts on each of the seven warriors described by the messenger and the Thebans he chooses to oppose them. Eteocles' position within the walls of Thebes forced to contend with the distraught chorus' fears recalls that of Hector when he has gone within Troy's walls and is beset by Andromache's pleas to have concern for her welfare (*Il.* 6. 407-39; Torrance, 2007, 106, 64-65). Hector's concern for the well-being of Troy and its citizens resembles Eteocles' love of his city and respect for moral excellence.[189] By contrast Polynices receives very little mention and what there is largely presents him in a negative light. Although the wide gulf apparent in the character of the brothers becomes non-existent once Eteocles decides to fight his

---

[187] All translations of *Septem* are by Sommerstein (2008), with only occasional modifications.

[188] Hutchinson (1985), xliii, argues that the last scene of the play (1005-78) was adopted from Euripides' *Phoenissae* in the 4th century, but this scene has been considered suspect since the late 19th century (see Hutchinson at 1005-78). Also later, in Hutchinson's opinion, are lines 861-74, the entrance of Antigone and Ismene. Torrance (2007), 19, points out that thematically their presence makes no sense in a trilogy in which "the threat has always been the *complete extinction* of the Theban house, dating back to the oracle received by Laius" and they also upset the gender balance developed between Eteocles and the chorus.

[189] Although Hutchinson (1985, xxxvi) maintains that "a love for one's city and a respect for moral excellence may not in themselves seem distinctive qualities," a Roman audience would probably not agree, as these represent important aspects of *pietas* and *virtus*. Lawrence (2007) argues at length for Eteocles' positive morality and moral awareness. Torrance (2007), 106, on the other hand, in her comparison of Eteocles to Hector within Troy emphasizes "the great difference in the attitudes of Hector and Eteocles toward women. For Hector they are to be revered and respected, for Eteocles they are to be silenced and repressed." However, Herrmann (2013), 43-4, 66-67, considers the allusions to Hector of paramount importance in Aeschylus' portrayal of Eteocles as "a model of both citizen virtue and courage and *sophrosyne*."

brother and after their death their sameness predominates,[190] a consideration of this strange imbalance of treatment will form part of my analysis of the imagery of the charioteer and helmsman. The analysis will begin with a study of Thebes as ship with Eteocles its helmsman, proceed to consider the persistent association of the chariot ensemble with the Argive cause, and conclude with a discussion of the evidence that the two systems of imagery were meant to be seen as related or interactive.

The opening speech of Eteocles to the armed citizens of Thebes reviews the responsibilities of ruler and ruled to their polis, represented metaphorically as a ship (1-24, 28-35):

> Κάδμου πολῖται, χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια
> ὅστις φυλάσσει πρᾶγος ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως
> οἴακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν ὕπνῳ.
> εἰ μὲν γὰρ εὖ πράξαιμεν, αἰτία θεοῦ:
> εἰ δ᾽ αὖθ᾽, ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, συμφορὰ τύχοι, 5
> Ἐτεοκλέης ἂν εἷς πολὺς κατὰ πτόλιν
> ὑμνοῖθ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀστῶν φροιμίοις πολυρρόθοις
> οἰμώγμασίν θ᾽, ὧν Ζεὺς ἀλεξητήριος
> ἐπώνυμος γένοιτο Καδμείων πόλει.
> ὑμᾶς δὲ χρὴ νῦν, καὶ τὸν ἐλλείποντ᾽ ἔτι 10
> ἥβης ἀκμαίας καὶ τὸν ἔξηβον χρόνῳ,
> βλαστημὸν ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πολύν,
> ὥραν τ᾽ ἔχονθ᾽ ἕκαστον ὥστε συμπρεπές,
> πόλει τ᾽ ἀρήγειν καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων
> βωμοῖσι, τιμὰς μὴ 'ξαλειφθῆναί ποτε:
> τέκνοις τε, Γῆ τε μητρί, φιλτάτῃ τροφῷ:
> ἡ γὰρ νέους ἕρποντας εὐμενεῖ πέδῳ,
> ἅπαντα πανδοκοῦσα παιδείας ὅτλον,
> ἐθρέψατ᾽ οἰκητῆρας ἀσπιδηφόρους
> πιστοὺς ὅπως γένοισθε πρὸς χρέος τόδε. 20
> καὶ νῦν μὲν ἐς τόδ᾽ ἦμαρ εὖ ῥέπει θεός:
> χρόνον γὰρ ἤδη τόνδε πυργηρουμένοις
> καλῶς τὰ πλείω πόλεμος ἐκ θεῶν κυρεῖ.
> νῦν δ᾽ ὡς ὁ μάντις φησίν...
> μεγίστην προσβολὴν Ἀχαιίδα
> νυκτηγορεῖσθαι κἀπιβουλεύσειν πόλει.
> ἀλλ᾽ ἔς τ᾽ ἐπάλξεις καὶ πύλας πυργωμάτων 30
> ὁρμᾶσθε πάντες, σοῦσθε σὺν παντευχίᾳ,
> πληροῦτε θωρακεῖα, κἀπὶ σέλμασιν

[190] Even one of the most positive evaluators of Eteocles' motivations, Stuart Lawrence (2007), 337, concedes that his ethical interpretations of events are authoritative only "until his climactic conflict with the chorus over the fratricide." Hutchinson (1985), xxxviii, sees a turn toward "fatalism and despair" at this point (after 652). Torrance (2207), 31-2, discusses the duality of the brothers' fate and the interdependence of their existence, pointing out that this is emphasized in the "repeated occurrences of compound words prefixed by *auto-* 'self-'," and the mutual fratricides being "referred to as *autoktonia* 'self-killing/ suicide'... (as well as by the) ...exploitation of the Greek dual."

πύργων στάθητε, καὶ πυλῶν ἐπ᾽ ἐξόδοις
μίμνοντες εὖ θαρσεῖτε, μηδ᾽ ἐπηλύδων
ταρβεῖτ᾽ ἄγαν ὅμιλον: εὖ τελεῖ θεός. 35

Citizens of Cadmus' land, he who guards the city's fortunes, controlling the helm at its stern, never letting his eyes rest in sleep, has to give the right advice for the situation. For if we should be successful, the responsibility would be god's, but if on the other hand disaster were to strike (which may it not!) then Eteocles' name alone would be repeatedly harped on by the citizens throughout the town amid a noisy surge of terrified wailing—from which may Zeus the Defender, true to his title, defend the city of the Cadmeans! This is the time when every one of you—including both those who have not yet reached the peak of young manhood, and those whom time has carried past it and who are feeding abundant bodily growth—must have a care for your city, as is right and proper, must come to its aid, to the aid of the altar of its native gods so as never to let their rites be obliterated, to the aid of your children, and to the aid of your Motherland, your most loving nurse; for when you were children crawling on her kindly soil, she generously accepted all the toil for your upbringing, and nurtured you to become her shield-bearing inhabitants and be faithful to her in this hour of need. And thus far, up to this day, god has inclined to the right side: we have been besieged within our walls all this time, but for the most part, thanks to the gods, the war is turning out well for us. But now, as the prophet states that... a great plan for an attack by the Achaeans upon the city is being discussed this night. So get moving, all of you, to the battlements and gates of the walls, stand firm at the gate entrances, have good confidence, and don't be too afraid of this horde of foreigners. God will bring success!

Eteocles begins and ends the first section of his speech (1-9) with a reference to his city, Thebes, whose people are normally referred to in verse by the name of its founder Cadmus (1, 9). That the polis is intended to dominate these introductory lines is further evident by its continued verbal presence (πόλεως, 2; πτόλιν, 6; ἀστῶν, 7), and by the avoidance of any overt noun of leadership, the apparent focus of these lines. Instead, the appropriate actions of any leader (ὅστις, 2) are emphasized by the strong verbal presence describing these actions in the first three lines (λέγειν, φυλάσσει, νωμῶν, μὴ κοιμῶν). The importance of the leaders' speaking in the immediate critical moment, an act which he is performing before the whole citizen body assembled on the stage,[191] is stressed by the primary position of λέγειν and its framing with the words of necessity (χρή) and critical time (καίρια). But the interweaving of the metaphorical actions of a helmsman within the ongoing affairs of the polis (ὅστις φυλάσσει πρᾶγος ἐν πρύμνηι πόλεως, "whoever guards from the stern [of the ship] the affairs of the polis") makes vivid the

[191] Hutchinson (1985), 1-77, argues for this likelihood.

essential qualities of a leader (2-3).[192] Vigilance and mental foresight begin and end these lines with special emphasis placed on the eyes (βλέφαρα μή κοιμῶν ὕπνωι, "nor closing his eyes in sleep," 3) through litotes, the doubling of the negation of sleep ("not falling asleep in sleep), and the initial position of βλέφαρα, outside of its clause.[193] The actual referents to the helmsman are expressed in the concrete nouns of commanding position on the stern (πρύμνηι) and the means by which the helmsman guides, (οἴακα, "rudder" or "tiller"), placed emphatically first in the line, although Eteocles does not refer to himself explicitly as helmsman.

Eteocles refers to the immediate circumstances challenging the polis first only generally and their possible outcomes in two potential conditions. The hoped for outcome is expressed concisely in one line (4), using the only first person plural verb in the passage, which unites ruler and ruled: εἰ μὲν γὰρ εὐ πράξαιμεν, αἰτια θεοῦ ("If we should be successful, the responsibility would be god's"). But the negative possibility fills over three lines, amplifying especially the consequences for one specifically and now named individual, the speaker himself, Eteocles. A negative outcome would seem to be a slight possibility (γένοιτο, συμφορά, and τύχοι, all have aspects of chance in their meaning), but the repetition of εἰ at the beginning of line 4 and 5 within a μέν…δέ construction, belies this impression—the outcomes are equally possible. If misfortune follows, Eteocles alone (εἷς) will bear the consequences, carried on throughout the city (κατὰ πτόλιν, 6) by the very citizens he rules (ὑπ' ἀστῶν, 7). The aspects of leadership expressed in the first 3 lines are reversed in lines 6-9. Instead of speaking (λέγειν) and guiding the ship of state, he will be spoken about (ὑμνοῖθ'), and, figuratively, he will be buffeted by waves (ῥόθος the second half of πολυρρόθοι, 7, means "a rushing noise," but can mean specifically "the roar or dash of waves"),[194] the abundance of which is expressed both in the repetition of πολύς (lines 6 and 7) and by the verb ὑμνοῖθ,' which can mean to "tell over and over." That Eteocles will bear the sole responsibility for

---

[192] Cf. Pindar's *Pyth.* 1, 86-7, nearly contemporary ode (on the occasion Hieron's victory in the chariot race in 470): νώμα δικαίῳ πηδαλίῳ στρατόν "Guide your people with a rudder of justice," lines addressed to Hieron's son, the ruler of Aetna, recently founded by Hieron (476/5).

[193] Awareness of the critical moment and foresight regarding the appropriate action to take are qualities associated with μῆτις, for a discussion of in regard to the helmsman see above, pp. 93-94.

[194] Perhaps this is an early suggestion that the storm threatening Thebes (64, 114, 208-10, 652, 759) will ultimately separate the fates of Eteocles and the city.

misfortune is emphasized in the paradox εἷς πολὺς and fully expressed in that the repetition of his name will essentially be the lamentation (οἰμωγμασίν, 8). Immediately attendant upon the thought of possible misfortune is a prayer to Zeus asking him to be true to his name ("guardian," ἀλεξητήριος) and protect the city of the Thebans against this outcome.

Although the citizen body will ultimately be incorporated into the figure of the ship of state (32), their duty to the polis, made parallel to the leader's by similar construction (χρὴ λέγειν [1]; χρὴ...ἀρήγειν [10-14]), is figured first as that owed by thriving and vigorous offspring to their mother, the source of their strength.[195] Just as the never-sleeping eyes were singled out as the quintessential organ of the leader (3), suggesting his perceptive mental acuity in guiding the polis, in an analogous position in its section, the body (σώματος), framed by words of increase and growth (ἀλδαίνοντα…πολύν,12) is designated as the aspect of the citizens, which is vitally important to the polis. The sole action the polis is in need of from its citizens is aid and support (ἀρήγειν, 13). The city is given importance both by its primary position and close association with the verb, but also participates in a vertical emphasis with other entities in need of support, which are arranged to fall at the beginning of three successive lines (13-15): the city, the altars of the gods, and children, representatives of families.[196] Concluding this enumeration and incorporating all previous entities, the motherland receives special emphasis, even before its further elaboration (17-20), as "your most loving nurse."[197]

---

[195] The citizens are divided into groups by their age (young, old, and in the prime of life), but invariably in terms of their relation to the freshness of youth (βης, ξβον) or the springtime of life (ὥραν). This repetition stresses the vigor of the whole group, but the adjective ἀκμαίας, (11), which describes the freshness of youth as "in full bloom" and the full line (12) describing those in their prime as "nourishing (ἀλδαίνοντα, also "to make grow" or "increase") the abundant growth (βλαστημὸν, a word that repeats the concept of increase and means primarily "bud, sprout, leaf") of their body," suggests that the strength of the group is inherent, natural, and at the acme of its power. Although Herrmann (2013), 41, insists that the adult male citizens are not among those addressed here, the textual support he cites for the proof that they are already deployed, 21-23, does not seem convincing as it could apply to anyone in the city (πυργηρουμένοις, 21).

[196] Hutchinson (1985) 14-16, notes "such appeals as these were commonplace in speeches of exhortation," and cites Thuc. 7. 69. 2, as evidence that appeals invoking wives, children, and ancestral gods were conventional, but he thinks that convention in Eteocles' speech increases its solemnity.

[197] Country/city, gods, and family raised in close proximity in this important opening scene would not go unnoticed by a Roman audience or reader for whom these entities are united in the one concept of *pietas,* Aeneas' defining attribute.

When Eteocles finally reveals what the current situation is—as he describes it, an imminent "attack by the Achaeans...this horde of foreigners" (28, 34-5)—the words exhorting the armed citizenry to patriotic action appear to be justified. The polis—leader and citizens—besieged by foreign forces, is preparing to defend itself. Thus, when the figure of the ship of state, presented in lines 2-3, reappears near the end of the speech in Eteocles' dismissal of the citizen soldiers ("take your stand on the platform [σέλμασιν means 'decks' or 'rowing-benches'] of the walls" 32-33), the simplicity of the situation, i.e., its exclusively political nature, is reasserted: Thebes, united under a strong leader, will confront the Argive attack.[198] Consequently, Eteocles' use of the ship of state metaphor, presenting himself as a vigilant and astute guide of the polis and its citizenry, is a means of expressing the legitimacy of his position as ruler of Thebes, as opposed to the contender against his brother for just that position. His evident concern for the polis both here and throughout most of the play is a defining characteristic of Eteocles.[199] But at the same time his initial distancing of himself from the office of helmsman (in the use of the general ὅστις, 'he who' 2), perhaps acknowledges the vulnerability of his position. The singularity with which the citizens would blame Eteocles in the case of defeat (5-8), likewise seems to allude to his share of responsibility for the impending attack. Nevertheless, Eteocles' initial expression of his position as helmsman and, thus, the legitimate ruler of Thebes will be reaffirmed by others, most explicitly by the scout.

---

[198] Fowler (1970), 29, 31-32, points to a series of passages in *Septem* (also 758-63 and 795) that relate Thebes' city walls to the sides of the figurative ship of state and suggests the particular relevance of this conjunction of walls and ships for the contemporary Athenian audience. According to Herodotus (7. 141) the oracle at Delphi had advised the Athenians before the battle of Salamis (480) to take refuge in a wooden wall, which some correctly realized referred to the fleet. T. C. Tucker (1908), *The Seven Against Thebes,* Cambridge, xlii) has argued (and Fowler, *Ibid,* concurs), that *Septem,* produced in 467, implicitly supports Cimon's building of the Long Walls, begun in 468. The fullest expression of the conjunction of city walls and ship's walls may be the chorus' description of the course of the war at 759-63: "Now the sea, as it were, is bringing waves of trouble; the first one subsides, but it raises up another of triple strength, which breaks loudly around the very poop of the city (πρύμναν πόλεως); and for protection, in between, stretches the slim breadth of this wall (πύργος)." The same collocation appears after the war (795-97): "...as in fair weather, so too when much buffeted by the waves, the city has let no water into her hull. The wall has held."

[199] Lawrence (2007), 344, points out that in his selection of champions to oppose the seven, Eteocles "has been motivated by a desire to save the city. In this basic orientation his heroic ethic functions in the context of the polis." His ethos is "a collective political one" as opposed to "an individual martial ethos" (n. 25). Herrmann (2013), 44, interprets Eteocles' implicit likening to Hector as a means of highlighting his close association with the polis.

All that the audience learns of the attacking forces and the battlefield, with the exception of the briefest post battle summary of a messenger (24 of the lines 791-819), is reported by the scout in an initial short general description of their battle preparations in the prelude (39-68) and in the central extended presentation of the individual seven warriors and their shields (369-719). At the conclusion of both sections the scout describes Eteocles as the helmsman (62, 652) of the polis, which emphasizes his perception by the citizens as king and the expectation that he will accept the responsibility to act on information delivered. The Scout's initial account of the Argive camp characterizes the aggressors by means of their actions—the famous pre-battle oath of the seven and the adorning of the chariot of Adrastus, king of Argos, his first and only appearance in the play[200]—and also in its imagery initiates the association of chariots and horses with the seven and simultaneously incorporates the attacking forces into the image of the ship of state.

After assuring Eteocles that he was a personal witness of what he will relay, the scout describes the oath that the seven warriors took. "Seven...bold (θούριοι) leaders of companies… swore an oath…that they would either bring destruction on the city, sacking the town of the Cadmeans by force or perish…" (42-48). The forceful and duplicated expression of the warriors oath to destroy Thebes (πόλει κατασκαφὰς θέντες λαπάξειν ἄστυ Καδμείων βίᾳ) or die presents an intimidating, perhaps, "terrifying" impression of the resolve of the attackers (Hutchinson, 1985, xxxiii).[201] A singular cameo appearance of Adrastus, king of the Argos, as the presence of his chariot suggests, momentarily diverts attention from the destruction of Thebes the warriors intend to their apparent belief that they will die in the process (49-51):

> μνημεῖά θ' αὐτῶν τοῖς τεκοῦσιν ἐς δόμους
> πρὸς ἅρμ' Ἀδράστου χερσὶν ἔστεφον, δάκρυ
> λείβοντες: οἶκτος δ' οὔτις ἦν διὰ στόμα.

---

[200] Adrastus is also referred to later in the play (575) in Amphiaraus' railings at Tydeus: "'Adrastus' counsellor in these crimes,'" but no further reference to his presence occurs.

[201] Hutchinson (1985), 42-56, still characterizes the tone of the passage as "complex" due to a change he perceives from the "chilling" tone of the oath to the description of the leaders "shedding tears" as they place "mementoes of themselves to take home to their parents" on Adrastus' chariot, which "soften[s] the poetry and alters our attitude toward them." He also notes, however, that the stress on their "formidable spirit" returns at 52.

> And with their own hands, shedding tears, they were adorning
> the chariot of Adrastus with mementoes of themselves to take
> home to their parents. But no word of pity passed their lips.

At this point in the narrative it is not clear that Adrastos will not, as in other accounts (Euripides, *Phoen.* 1134, for example), be among the seven who attack the gates and because the advancing army is identified as Argive (59), his unique (thus far) association with the chariot suggests his leadership role.[202] Cameron points to the significance of the chariot, not just horses, in the first appearance of the horse imagery, "for the subsequent development of the series will be used to symbolize the struggle for control."[203] The Argive nature of the attacking force and their association with horses and chariots receives special emphasis in the scout's description of their now advancing forces (59-61):

> ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἤδη πάνοπλος Ἀργείων στρατὸς
> χωρεῖ, κονίει, πεδία δ᾽ ἀργηστὴς ἀφρὸς
> χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἱππικῶν ἐκ πλευμόνων.
>
> The Argive army, fully equipped, is already coming close, raising the dust,
> and white foam from the horses' lungs is dripping and staining the soil.

The description of the Argive approach is made vivid by its striking physicality—dust, the horses' implicit panting, dripping foam that stains the soil—but at the same time it activates interlocking strains of symbolic imagery. The whiteness of the horses' foam (ἀργηστὴς ἀφρὸς), by a "common play on the Argive name (Ἀργείων;" Dawson, 1970, 59), draws attention to Argos and looks forward to the forces' characterization as a wave (64).[204] That the foam is characterized as dripping and staining the soil recalls the warriors vow to take Thebes or "mix their blood into the soil of this land (48)" and looks forward to the brothers' slaughter when "the dust of the earth drinks up their dark red clotted blood" (735-7;

---

[202] Both Dawson (1970), 49, and Hutchinson (1985), 49-51, identify Adrastus as the "leader of the expedition," which is implied when Tydeus (575) and Polynices (585) are blamed for their persuasion of Adrastus. Because in all accounts that include Adrastus he always survives, his exclusion from those attacking the gates in *Septem,* has been attributed to Aeschylus' desire to have all seven of the attackers die (Torrance, 2007, 90; Sommerstein, 2009, 158). See Gantz (1993), 514-17, on the varying number and identity of the warriors who assault Thebes. Pausanias 2. 20. 5, suggests that Aeschylus reduced the number of attacking warriors to seven, but Gantz discusses some possible antecedents. Torrance (2007), 58-59, assesses various theories of the significance of the number seven.

[203] Cameron (1971), 74-5, notes that Homeric associations of horses with Argos—the usual epithet for Argos is ἱππόβοτος "horse-pasturing Argos" and its king, Diomedes, is called ἱππόδαμος "horse tamer" —serve Aeschylus in developing the horse imagery to convey the threat of invasion."

[204] Hutchinson (1985), 60: "The foam of speeding horses is not often mentioned in Greek poetry before Callimachus" making this detail "more striking than it would be in Roman poetry, where it is frequent."

Torrance, 2007, 46]). Finally, πλευμόνων (61), the lungs, as the organ of breath, recalls the image of war as a noxious wind.[205] The explosive threat of the Argive army advancing in their (implicit) chariots contrasts with the static picture of Adrastus in his chariot, which is an emblem foreshadowing the future failure of the Argive cause.[206]

Immediately following the description of the rapid approach of the Argive horses, the scout turns to Eteocles with advice (62-65):

> σὺ δ᾽ ὥστε ναὸς κεδνὸς οἰακοστρόφος
> φράξαι πόλισμα, πρὶν καταιγίσαι πνοὰς
> Ἄρεως—βοᾷ γὰρ κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ—
> καὶ τῶνδε καιρὸν ὅστις ὤκιστος λαβέ:
>
> Be like a good helmsman and make the city tight,
> before the squalls of war assail her—for this army is like
> a roaring land-wave—and take the very quickest
> opportunity of doing this.

In the most expanded single statement of the ship of state within the context of war, the scout first urges Eteocles as a good helmsman to make the city secure, then incorporates into the simile the war, the breath of Ares, figured as a storm assailing the ship of state, and lastly brings the Argive army into the image as a constituent part of the storm, a roaring land wave. The bellowing noise of the wave initiates the series of reactions to the loudness of the Argive army by the fearful maidens of the chorus and in the scout's later reports of the boastful, impious character of some of the seven (Tydeus, Capaneus, Eteoclus, Hippomedon).[207] The Argive army's employment as an aspect of a figurative storm battering the state suggests the storms of sedition in some of the earliest ships of state in Alcaeus, Theognis and the related rhetorical tradition. The scout's first speech makes clear the artistic sense of associating both the chariot and horse and the waves of the storm assailing Thebes with the Argives: the puffing, blowing, and dripping of Ares, the men, and the horses translates easily into the winds and waves of a storm battering a

---

[205] As Torrance (2007, 41) notes, words translated as "breath" and "blast" all form part of a connected system of imagery that represents breath "as an infectious wind of war."

[206] As we will see, the chorus' frequent references to the sounds of the approaching chariots (122-3, 151, 203-5) make clear the presence of numerous chariots.

[207] On the connection between noise, the seven and their horses see Cameron (1971), 77-78, and Bacon (1964), 28-29, for the importances of hearing and seeing in this play and Sophocles' Theban plays.

ship, a translation facilitated by the use of foam (with the equine imagery).[208] Before his final comments attendant to his departure promising to continue his faithful watching and reporting (66-8), the scout urges Eteocles to take the "quickest opportunity (καιρὸν... ὥκιστος)" to make the city tight, thereby recalling the first line of the play and the helmsman's task of attending to the opportune moment (τὰ καίρια) for action.

Thus, the scout's first report of the enemy outside Thebes' walls amply confirms Eteocles' initial assessment that the city will face an Argive attack (28). The only individual member of the army mentioned is Adrastus, king of Argos, prominently associated with his chariot, suggesting his leadership of the expedition, with no mention of Polynices, the actual instigator of the attack, a Theban and Eteocles' brother. The extreme nature of the leaders' resolve—their oath to win or die—and of their intentions—to utterly devastate Thebes—carries the greatest weight in the report because of its expression in a solemn, but grisly oath suggestive of their potential cruelty.[209] The nature of the words used to characterize the leaders (bold, steel-hearted spirit, blazing with courage, like lions with the light of war in their eyes, 52-53) and the frequent use of the name of Ares in the speech (45, 53, 64) suggest that they, like Ares, "actually like wars and fighting" (*Il.* 5. 891). As the army approaches (identified as Argive, 59) it is their horses who are singled out—raising the dust, staining the plain with their dripping foam—as they will be again numerous times, both with the leaders and with their chariots. An analogy is suggested between the men and their horses, both expressing life fluids in their efforts to destroy Thebes, and the horses and waves of the sea, both rolling and thundering toward Thebes. As waves of the sea, the army is likewise incorporated into the now broadened ship of state imagery as a "roaring land-wave," a part of the storm besetting the ship of Thebes. The scout confirms the appropriateness of Eteocles' role as the helmsman of Thebes, even recommending it to him as a model for his actions. In turn, his report elicits from Eteocles a

---

[208] Cameron (1971), 79: "By the use of the word ἀφρὸς these lines (60-61) at the very outset of the play link the horse theme with the imagery of the sea." He further sees these same lines as "full of associations which bring together the major themes of the play: the sea and horses as symbolizing the threat to the city; the pollution of blood which is the cure of the curse of the house of Laius...the staining of the land with the blood of the two brothers." Also see Hutchinson (1985), 62-4, on the combination of horse and sea images.

[209] They slaughter a bull and touch their hands in its blood before taking the oath (43-44).

prayer that the free land and city of Cadmus may never be bound by the yoke of slavery (71-5), implying that the brutal nature of these aggressors is such that this extreme outcome is possible.

The helmsman role continues to be the image through which the scout represents Eteocles' function, even as the Thebans leave to engage with the attackers: the scout's concluding remark to Eteocles at the end of the description of the last warrior, Polynices, confirms (651-52):

> σὺ δ'αὐτὸς γνῶθι ναυκληρεῖν πόλιν.
>
> Now you yourself must decide how to command
> (lit., "be ship-captain of") the city.

The scout's exit following this comment breaks the previous consistent pattern, whereby each of his descriptions of the attacking commander and his shield is followed by Eteocles' response, assigning a Theban to meet them at one of the seven gates, to both of which the chorus responds in five lines, usually of prayer (that after Capaneus is a wish, after Hippomedon a confident assertion that Zeus [on Theban Hyperbius' shield] will conquer Typhon on his shield). This disruption prepares for the importance of Eteocles' acceptance of the defense of this last gate, what he perceives as the fulfillment of his father's curse (655), and for what is generally seen to be a significant change in Eteocles' demeanor, if not character, to which we will return. The shield scene, worthy of the abundant scholarly interest it has attracted,[210] provides a good opportunity to assess Eteocles' behavior as the helmsman of Thebes, for although the figure of the ship of state recurs later, in both instances where it does, Eteocles is no longer the helmsman. Individual members of the seven will return later in the further discussion of charioteer/equine imagery. My concern at this point is the larger patterns of ethico-religious behavior (the adjective is Lawrence's, 2007, 343) evident in the Theban warriors as described and in Eteocles' responses, with a view toward determining the connotations that may be inherent in the figures of the helmsman and charioteer in Aeschylus' *Septem.*

Pride and arrogance toward the gods are the chief characteristics of the Argive warriors in the scout's report. Tydeus, raving, is boastful in his armor (391); Capaneus' boasts show a pride beyond human limit

[210] Torrance (2007), 68, describes with references the different theoretical perspectives from which the scene has been interpreted: hermeneutic, semiotic and structuralist.

(425); the goddess Pallas hates Hippomedon's arrogance (501-2); and Parthenopaeus "stands there with savage pride"(536-7). The stem κομπ- (boast) appears eleven times in the descriptions, which "builds up a strong impression of their extreme self-confidence and pride."[211] Loud noise and clashing are also connoted by this stem, a quality that Tydeus, who is described screaming twice (381, 392), manifests especially.[212] Their impiety is pronounced: Capaneus will sack the city, "god willing or unwilling" (427-8); Eteoclus' shield carries the words: "Not even Ares can throw him off the wall" (469); Parthenopaeus reveres his spear more than a god (529-30); and according to the Argive prophet Amphiaraus, Polynices will devastate his fatherland and its native gods (582-3). The warriors whom Eteocles chooses to face the Argive foes, by contrast, in his descriptions manifest love of their homeland and respect for the gods, who will also be their allies.[213] Polyphontes will have the goodwill of Artemis and the aid of all the gods; appropriately, Eteocles says, Hermes brings Hyperbius with Zeus on his shield to face Hippomedon, whose shield carries Typhon (Zeus overpowers the attack of the monster Typhon, Hesiod, *Th.* 820-68). Eteocles' piety is also evident in his general statements: "If the gods are willing, what I speak will be the truth" (562), after he predicts Actor's victory; and "...mortals' good fortune is a gift of the god"(625), he concludes Lasthenes' send off. To further underscore the clear differentiation between the Argive "superb and outrageous confidence in their own powers and defiance of the gods" and "the wholly admirable patriotism" that motivates the Theban army (Hutchinson, 1985, xxxvii), the Argives also are

---

[211] Hutchinson (1985), 391, for the eleven instances: 391, 404, 425, 436, 473, 480, 500, 538, 551, 554, 794.

[212] His equipment also makes a racket: "...on the underside of his shield bells of beaten bronze make a terrifying clang" (385-6).

[213] Patriotism is manifested by Melanippus (415-16) of whom Eteocles says that the just duties of kinship send him to protect the mother that bore him (Thebes) and Megareus, who will either, "by his death, pay his full debt of nurture to this land, or else will adorn his father's house with booty after conquering two men and the city on the shield" (477-79).

As Lawrence (2007), 343, indicates, the characterization of the warriors has a particular slant: "As the messenger describes each warrior in ethico-religious terms, Eteocles responds in similar terms, so that the audience are discouraged from applying secular, realistic criteria of the kind that are insisted on in the equivalent scene of Euripides' *Phoenissae* (697-755)."

cast as barbarians, evoking the recent threat of Persian domination and enslavement (Torrance, 2007, 89-91).[214]

But the words of Amphiaraus, the coerced warrior,[215] form the most condemning assessment of the attackers of Thebes because he too is Argive and a prophet. At the same time, Eteocles' sympathy for Amphiaraus "evinces his own nobility and largeness of vision" (Hutchinson, 1985, 568-630). The moral polarization that dominates the scout's report and Eteocles' response commences with the scout's characterization of Amphiaraus as "a man of the highest virtue (σωφρονέστατον, 568) and Amphiaraus' criticisms of Tydeus that represent him as debased (572-75):

> τὸν ἀνδροφόντην, τὸν πόλεως ταράκτορα,
> μέγιστον Ἄργει τῶν κακῶν διδάσκαλον,
> Ἐρινύος κλητῆρα, πρόσπολον φόνου,
> κακῶν τ᾽ Ἀδράστῳ τῶνδε βουλευτήριον.
>
> "Murder", "wrecker of your city", "Argos' great instructor in evil",
> "arouser of a Fury", high priest of Carnage", "Adrastus' counselor
> in these crimes."

Amphiaraus sees Tydeus and, as we will see, Polynices as the chief instigators of the campaign against Thebes,[216] but Tydeus receives the most vituperation. He is two times a murderer (ἀνδροφόντην, φόνου) and counsellor of evils (κακῶν διδάσκαλον, κακῶν...τῶνδε βουλευτήριον), a traitor to his own city, and a summoner of the Fury that will accomplish Oedipus'curse (Hutchinson, 1985, 574). Eteocles confirms

---

[214] Capaneus' shield which shows a naked man carrying a torch and the words "I will burn the city" (432-34) "would surely have struck a chord with an Athenian audience who had recently endured the ravages of fire at the hands of the Persians during their siege of Athens in 480" (Torrance, 2007, 73, with bibliography). As mentioned previously, the attacking army is "of alien speech" (170), "the primary meaning of the Greek word 'barbarian'" (Torrance, 89), even though as Argive they spoke Greek. Eteoclus' horses "whistle in a barbarian manner" through their proud nostrils (463-4). His barbarian associates are further accentuated when the scout says, "you must send someone who can be relied on to keep off the yoke of slavery from the city" (470-1). The image of the yoke as a metaphor for slavery occurs prominently in Aeschylus' *Persians*. Finally, Torrance, 2007, 91, notes that wealth in gold is associated in the Greek mind with barbarians and two of the attackers, including Polynices, have symbols on their shields made of gold. Because the warrior on his shield is cast in gold, Torrance argues "this shows that Polynices has been corrupted by a greed for wealth and material possessions, and that the attackers as a force are reminiscent of the Persian king Xerxes' 'gold-adorned army' (*Persians* 9)."

[215] Amphiaraus' wife Eriphyle was the sister of Adrastus; after an earlier quarrel with Adrastus, Amphiaraus had sworn that in any future dispute between the two men he would abide by her decision. When he was reluctant to join the expedition against Thebes (knowing, as a prophet, that it was doomed to disaster) Polynices bribed Eriphyle with the necklace of Harmonia, and she, invoking Amphiaraus' oath, instructed him to go on the expedition (Sommerstein, 2009, 214-15, n. 86).

[216] Tydeus gathers troops with Polynices in *Il.* 4. 375; "this happens to be the only passage where we hear of him as the chief author of the campaign" (Hutchinson, 1985, 575.

this assessment of Amphiaraus when he bewails the fate that "visits mortals and links a righteous (δίκαιον) man with his impious inferiors (δυσσεβεστέροις, 598). Amphiaraus contrasts with the godless and evil men he is with in the praise Eteocles gives him: he is "a virtuous, upright, courageous and pious man, a great prophet... joined together against his will with impious men of arrogant speech..." (610-12). Although Eteocles waxes philosophical in his sympathy for Amphiaraus' plight and thereby reveals their shared values, the moral he deduces is that the good when joined with the bad will suffer the same consequences.[217] But given that Amphiaraus was deified and worshiped as a divine oracular hero with a shrine near Thebes that was famous throughout, and even beyond, the Greek world,[218] his assessment of the immorality of the attack on Thebes would be trustworthy and confirm the validity of Eteocles' interpretation of the godlessness and arrogance of the attackers as a group.

It is exactly in these qualities that the scout's description of Polynices at the seventh gate sets him apart from the other six Argive leaders. Although he does pray to join battle with his brother Eteocles and either kill him and die beside him, or, if he survives, to punish him with banishment (636-8),[219] he also appears pious when he "calls on the ancestral gods of his fatherland to look favourably on his prayers in every way" (640-41). His shield, unlike the other six, which lack divinities or bear monsters,[220] incorporates the goddess Justice (644-48):

---

[217] Amphiaraus concludes his speech "Let us do battle: I expect an honourable death" (589) and Eteocles still hopes that "Zeus willing, he will be dragged down with them" (614).

[218] Herodotus 1. 46, 49, 52; 8. 134. Also see Dawson (1970), 588.

[219] Stehle (2005), 118, argues reasonably that it makes no sense for Polynices to pray that he kill Eteocles and himself be killed. She concludes that this is evidence of the Oedipus' curse also breaking into Polynices' speech.

[220] Tydeus' shield carries "a blazing firmament, full of stars. Conspicuous in the centre is the full moon, greatest of the stars, the eye of night" (388-90), which both Zeitlin (1982), 61, and Torrance (2007), 71, interpret as an arrogant assertion of his primacy: "Tydeus presents himself as greatest among warriors in the same way as the full moon on his shield is said to be 'the greatest of the stars' (390). Capaneus' shield bears "a naked man carrying fire: the torch with which he is armed blazes in his hands, and in golden letters he declares 'I will burn the city" (432-34). On Eteoclus' shield "a fully-armed soldier is climbing a scaling ladder to the top of the enemy's wall, aiming to sack the city; and he too is crying out in written syllables, saying that not even Ares can throw him off the wall (466-69). "Typhon emitting dark smoke, the many-colured sister of flame, from his fire-breathing lips" appears on Hippomedon's shield, which is also "floored with coiling snakes" (493-96). Parthenopaeus wields "our city's disgrace, the Sphinx, eater of raw flesh...and under her she bears a man, one of the Cadmeans" (537-43) on his shield. In contrast to the aggressive boldness of these six, Amphiaraus' shield bears "no image; for he desires not the appearance of excellence but the reality..." (590-92).

> One beholds a man-at-arms, made of gold, led by a woman who walks ahead of him with modest (σωφρόνως) gait. And as the writing proclaims, she says that she is Justice (Δίκη), "and I will bring this man back from exile, and he will possess his father's city and the right to dwell in his home."

While Dike in Aeschylus is associated with the government of the universe and the order of Zeus, she also "honours, dwells with, and fights for individual mortals--the one feature not met before Aeschylus."[221] Her domain and "modest gait" link her to the values Eteocles attributed to Amphiaraus ("virtuous, upright" σώφρων δίκαιος, 610). However, neither Eteocles, as would be expected, nor Amphiaraus consider Polynices just. Eteocles is explicit (664-71):

> But in fact, neither when he escaped the darkness of the womb, nor when he was growing, nor when he reached adolescence, nor when his chin was gathering hair, did Justice ever set eyes on him or hold him in any honour; nor now, surely, when he does harm to his own fatherland, is she standing close by him, I image. Truly Justice would be utterly false to her name if she consorted with a man with so utterly audacious (παντόλμῳ, equivalent of *audax*) a mind.

Eteocles' vehemence and passion are evident in the "remarkable" number of negatives and in the pursuit of his adversary through every stage of life, a standard technique of defamation in orators.[222] But in the more dispassionate challenges of Amphiaraus, in words that significantly influence the audiences' perception of the scout's report to Eteocles, the justice of Polynices' cause is also attacked (576-84):

> καὶ τὸν σὸν αὖθις προσθροῶν ὁμόσπορον,
> ἐξυπτιάζων ὄμμα, Πολυνείκους βίαν,
> δίς τ᾽ ἐν τελευτῇ τοὔνομ᾽ ἐνδατούμενος,
> καλεῖ. λέγει δὲ τοῦτ᾽ ἔπος διὰ στόμα:
> "ἦ τοῖον ἔργον καὶ θεοῖσι προσφιλές, 580
> καλόν τ᾽ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ λέγειν μεθυστέροις,
> πόλιν πατρῴαν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς
> πορθεῖν, στράτευμ᾽ ἐπακτὸν ἐμβεβληκότα;
> μητρός τε πηγὴν τίς κατασβέσει δίκη;
>
> And then again he loudly addresses your brother, turning his name

---

[221] Hutchinson (1985), 645-8, (*Supp*. 344; *Ag*. 772-5, *Ch*. 497). "Other passages in Aeschylus show her to be concerned with cities as well as individuals, and to embrace the whole of morality (fr. 530, *Supp*. 608-709)." Although she does punish sin with vengeance in Aeschylus (*Ch*. 310, 952), she is not in the least demonic.

[222] Hutchinson (1985), 664-9, cites as examples Lys. 14. 25-8; Dem. 18. 257-66, 19. 199, and Cic. *Phil.* 2. 44ff. One of the most frequently used adjectives to describe Antony is *audax.* In the *Philippics* alone *audax* and *audacia* describe Antony commonly: 2. 1, 4, 19 (3 times), 43, 44, 64, 68, 90; 3. 2, 23, 18, 28, 31; 4. 10; 5. 42; 6.2; 8. 21; 9. 15; 12. 15; 13. 12, 28; 14. 7. On *audax* as political in Cicero see Wirszubski (1961), on Antony in particular: 12, 16.

> inside out and dwelling on its significance,[223] and these are the words
> he utters from his lips: "Is an act like this really smiled on by the gods,
> is it an honourable thing for posterity to hear and tell of, to devastate one's
> fatherland and its native gods by bringing a foreign army to invade it? What
> claim of justice can quench the mother-source."

Amphiaraus too represents the attack on Thebes that Polynices has initiated as an invasion of a foreign army, asking in disbelief if the gods could possibly favor his plan to devastate his homeland and native gods, a question which clearly implies the impiety of his actions. Amphiaraus' final question also challenges Polynices' motivation (584), his claim that he is seeking justice in attacking Thebes, a point that, I believe, Sommerstein's translation obscures. A translation more in keeping with the context would be "What (sort of) justice dries up (a possible meaning for κατασβέννυμι) the source of the motherland?" which is to say, "How can you call your cause just when it could eliminate the population of your city?"[224] This imagery recalls Eteocles' opening speech in which he called on the Thebans to come to the aid of their "Motherland, your most loving nurse" because when they "were children crawling on her kindly soil (as if sprung from the earth), she generously accepted all the toil of (their) upbringing" (16-18). Thus, Amphiaraus' criticism of Polynices, because of the power given his voice through his apparent impartiality and the pious patriot Eteocles' praise of him, seriously undermines Polynices' claim to be led by Justice. As Lawrence (2007, 338) has noted, "There is a glaring discrepancy between Polynices' behavior and the blazon on his shield...For not only does he wish to defeat his brother, if necessary, in mutual fratricide, but he also fails to distinguish his attitudes toward brother and city."

What has been alleged against Eteocles, of course, is that, devoted to the city, he suppresses any thought of his *genos*: "Eteocles has made it his lifelong practical aim to dissociate himself, in imagination and feeling, from the family that bore him, regarding himself simply as a citizen and the city's helmsman"

---

[223] Polynices means "much strife;" Eteocles makes a similar reference: "For this man so well named—Polynices, I mean—" (658).

[224] See also Hutchinson (1985), 584: "μητρός is readily understood as a metaphor for the native land...πηγήν κτλ.: 'What legal claim...can dry up the spring?' πηγή often denotes source or origin of something..." Torrance's view (2007), 36, that "When Amphiaraus asks 'What claim of justice can quench the mother source?' (584), the implication is that, although Polynices is going too far in attacking his own *polis*, he does have a claim to justice," does not seem warranted. Her own opinion at another point, 31, ("Amphiaraus rebukes Polynices...for attacking...(584-5) 'the spring of his mother'"), seems to contradict this statement.

(Nussbaum, 1986, 39).[225] However, the presentation of Polynices as the attacker at the seventh gate makes the concerns of *genos* unavoidable. Eteocles greets the scouts report (653-55):

> ὦ θεομανές τε καὶ θεῶν μέγα στύγος,
> ὦ πανδάκρυτον ἀμὸν Οἰδίπου γένος:
> ὤμοι, πατρὸς δὴ νῦν ἀραὶ τελεσφόροι.
>
> O my family, driven mad and greatly hated by the gods, my family so full of tears, the house of Oedipus! Ah me, my father's curse is truly fulfilled!

Even though he attempts to control himself, appealing to propriety ("But it is not proper [πρέπει] to cry or lament"), he no longer does so in the interest of defending the city as in his opening speech,[226] but lest cries or laments "give birth to grief even harder to bear" (657). It is as though his self-deceptive illusion that the attack Thebes faces is one of foreign, even barbarian foes, is shattered. Having determined to face Polynices at the seventh gate he concludes his speech (674-5):

> ἄρχοντί τ᾽ ἄρχων καὶ κασιγνήτῳ κάσις,
> ἐχθρὸς σὺν ἐχθρῷ στήσομαι.
>
> I will stand as ruler against ruler, brother against brother, enemy against enemy.

The simple stark juxtaposition of titles fully acknowledges the realities of the situation, foremost among which is the brothers' apparently equal claim to rule. This is the only time the term ἄρχων (ruler) is used in the play and its absolutely balanced presentation, like the designation "brother," suggests Eteocles' recognition of their equal claims,[227] despite the lack of justice in Polynices' cause and his "utterly

---

[225] Zeitlin (1982), 34: "Eteocles' flight from woman...replaces the biological mother with the symbolic mother of the collective city." Torrance (2007), 28: "Eteocles' opening speech ...shows him investing all his energies into leading the *polis* while rejecting his own *genos* by attempting to present himself as being of common ancestry with his citizens."

[226] This is the time when everyone of you...must have a care for your city, as is right and proper (ὥστε συμπρεπές)" (10-14).

[227] Both brothers receive military titles: the messenger in his report of the outcome of the battle refers to them as "chiefs, the leaders of the two armies" (οἱ δ᾽ ἐπιστάται, δισσὼ στρατηγώ, 815-6) and the chorus calls the brothers "warlords" (πολεμάρχους, 828). After the fact, both brothers are said to have seen 'bitter monarchies" (881), but the absence of any such title for either brother while alive is noteworthy, especially for Eteocles. His figurative title as helmsman alleviates the need for a real title, which may have been part of its attraction. Although Sommerstein (2008), 211, notes that "the passage (674-76) as transmitted is corrupt, he omits from his translation only "several words that were originally annotations (Polyneices' name, δίς, ἐν τελευτῇ). Herrmann (2013), 76, n. 36, however, excludes lines 674-76 from discussion because they are "spurious."

audacious" mind (670-71). Authors have noted the irony of the fact that all of Eteocles' careful planning to save the city, which turns out to be successful, has the side effect of causing his death.[228]

In summary, the first five Argive fighters as described by the scout are presented as arrogant, boastful men who, like the Cyclopes in the *Odyssey* (275-6), don't care about Zeus and the rest of the gods because they think they are better than the gods. The Thebans sent out by Eteocles to confront each Argive are matched to their adversary based on the virtues they have which, with the help of the gods, are expected to enable them to defeat their Argive foe. Strong confirmation of the validity of this moral dichotomy appears in the person of the Argive prophet, Amphiaraus, who condemns the instigators of the attack—Tydeus with excoriation, Polynices by discounting his claim to have a just cause and implying the gods' disapproval. Eteocles' praise of Amphiaraus facilitates the impression of the Theban ruler's impartiality and love of virtue. Thus, up to the scout's departure before Eteocles' response at the seventh gate (652), Eteocles has been a good and virtuous helmsman of Thebes. On the other hand, the virtue of Polynices and his cause have been undermined both by his own sides' prophet, Amphiaraus, and by the immorality of his comrades. However, Eteocles' decision to fight his brother because "who else has a better right to?" (673), Hutchinson characterizes as "hideously inappropriate," an assessment with which the chorus in their reaction would seem to concur.[229]

---

[228] Lawrence (2007), 343, for example, "the gods are using his (Eteocles') righteousness and ethico-religious insightfulness both to save the city and to destroy his house." Also see Bacon (1964), 35; Stehle (2005), 120; Lloyd (2007), 11. In this regard Lloyd's summary of von Fritz' article on Eteocles (141-73) in this edited volume, 10-11, characterizes his position as "a modified version of the *Opfertod* (sacrificial death [cf. Roman *devotio*])," on which see von Fritz (2007), 142, who shows that this view was already challenged by Wilamowitz in 1914, since he does not think there is "an explicit and supernatural requirement that Eteocles must die to save the city…but that is in practice how things work out." But see Herrmann (2013), 46 and 67, who argues that Eteocles knows from the beginning of the play that the curse will be fulfilled in his death, which is necessary to save the city.

[229] So also do most modern commentators, although there have been numerous variations and permutations. Older scholarship (summarized in Von Fritz, 2007, 141-54**)** viewed the character of Eteocles as consistently positive in his concern for the well-being of the city, with some even arguing that his was a sacrificial death, voluntarily undertaken to save the city (see previous note and Torrance, 2007, 34, who argues that there is "no hint of sacrificial vocabulary" and "no obvious evidence for this assumption"). Others argue regarding the degree of choice he had in making the decision to meet his brother, i.e., he was possessed by the Fury of Oedipus' curse or not, or even if he was possessed, he retained his freedom of choice (Torrance, 2007, 63, with references: "We must conclude that it is a combination of both divine and human agency which causes the Curse to manifest itself"). Lawrence (2007), 341, argues that Eteocles acts under the influence of the curse only at this stage of the play, while Stehle (2005), 113, maintains that evidence of the curse's influence have been present in Eteocles' speech from the beginning of the play.

While in their initial response to Eteocles' decision to fight his brother, the chorus of Theban young women concurs with Eteocles' assessment of the lower morality of Polynices' words,[230] they also interpret Eteocles' decision as similar in morality to his brother's (677-78):

> μή, φίλτατ᾽ ἀνδρῶν, Οἰδίπου τέκος, γένῃ
> ὀργὴν ὁμοῖος τῷ κάκιστ᾽ αὐδωμένῳ:
>
> No, dearest of men, son of Oedipus, do not let your passions
> make you like that utterer of evil words!

They continue to characterize his decision as passion driven and to urge him not to run the risk of committing pollution that "can never grow old" (682).[231] While Eteocles does not disagree with their comments, he explains his reasons for his decision: to avoid the shame of not fighting and because he sees the fulfillment of the curse as inevitable, a thought first expressed with nautical imagery (689-91):

> ἐπεὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα κάρτ᾽ ἐπισπέρχει θεός,
> ἴτω κατ᾽ οὖρον κῦμα Κωκυτοῦ λαχὸν
> Φοίβῳ στυγηθὲν πᾶν τὸ Λαΐου γένος.
>
> Since the god is plainly hastening things to their
> conclusion, let it run before the wind, the whole
> house of Laius, hated by Phoebus and consigned
> to the waves of Cocytus.

Eteocles represents the house of Laius as a ship without a pilot (running before the wind) because he sees the inevitable ("consigned"; "the god is plainly hastening") end fast approaching. As the helmsman of the ship of state Eteocles represented himself as guarding, controlling, and giving the right advice (1-3), a vital servant of the polis, but now he is forced to choose between the ship of state (the polis) and the ship of his *genos* (Torrance, 2007, 33). In assuming control of his *genos* he condemns it: he and his whole house isolated from Thebes are now simply swept along to Hades.[232] The ship of his *genos,* "consigned to

---

[230] Hutchinson (1985), 678: "αὐδωμένοωι ("utterer") refers to Polynices' name."

[231] Examples of passion: "Why this mad passion, child?" (686); "Cast out the root of this evil desire!" (687-88); "An all too harshly stinging lust is provoking you to perpetrate a homicide" (692-3).

[232] Arguments that Eteocles irresponsibly "abandons the tiller" (Thalmann, 1978, 35), as Torrance suggests (2007, 33), are common. Cameron (1971), 59, 76, in particular, criticizes Eteocles' decision: "...the theme of control will figure in the down fall of Eteocles, he opens the way to his own doom by abandoning the center of control where the steersman *should remain*;" "Eteocles at his center of control, the rudder of the ship of state *must* maintain control of the city." Also see Rader (2011), 480, who sees this choice of Eteocles as "a reflection of character, not forces...his desire to murder his brother is so murderous that he is willing to claim—and there is no doubt he believes—his

the waves of Cocytus," marks the change of his focus. As if to confirm Eteocles' nautical premonition, the chorus responds to the news of the brothers' deaths with imagery that transforms the ship of the *genos* into Charon's boat: "Friends, with the wind of lamentation in your sails ply in accompaniment the regular beating of hands on head,[233] which is forever crossing the Acheron, propelling on a sacred mission from which there is no return, the black-sailed ship on which Apollo Paean never treads..." (854-59). This image completes Eteocles,' for the ship he described as already consigned to Hades ("to the waves of Cocytus") and hated by Phoebus, now as a ship of death (Torrance, 2007, 33), unimaginable for Apollo to touch, is in route to Hades ("crossing the Acheron"), from where it will never return.[234] By expanding the nautical imagery to include an inverted ship of state—no helmsman and thus no choice in direction, an inevitable and undesirable port only for the house of Laius—Aeschylus emphasizes Eteocles' shift from his active concern for the polis to a more passive acceptance of fate.

This change in role is confirmed by Eteocles' absence from the last two appearances of the ship of state. After he leaves the stage to confront his brother the chorus envisions new waves of trouble breaking around the poop of the city (758-61) and the house of Laius as cargo that must be thrown overboard from the stern, implicitly, for the safety of the polis (771).[235] Thus Eteocles, in a relatively short span of lines (652-769), goes figuratively from being the helmsman of the polis, contributing the

---

hand has been forced by his father's curse. But the chorus sees right through this dubious and (self-) destructive logic."

[233] πίτυλος, the measured plash of oars or falling drops, we have encountered in a similar mourning context at the end of Euripides' *Hippolytus,* 1464-66, "There will be a rhythmic plashing of many tears for the stores of the great that are worthy of grief are more wont to endure," (See above p. 97, for its recollection of the helmsman motif). Segal (1965), 161, n. 62, refers to this use in *Septem* as "the best and fullest elaboration of the connection between the rhythmic beating of oars and lamentation." Here (855-56), as Sommerstein (2009), 212, glosses, "hand-beating, a common gesture of mourning, is...compared to the rhythmic beat of a ship's oars." It is actually this mourning that conveys the boat of Charon (ὅς...ἀμείβεται, 856).

[234] This abbreviated discussion of a beautiful and rich image (854-60) obscures its complexity, for the ship is a conflation of Charon's ship and that the Athenians sent to Delos annually in honor of Apollo and to commemorate the ship Aegeus sent to Crete (the τριακοντόριον). The cult of Apollo on Delos in particular must have nothing to do with death: Peisistratus removed all the graves that were in view of the temple (Th. 3. 104. 1). Hutchinson (1985), 856-60.

[235] 772-77: "For what man was so much admired by the gods in their shared abode and by the much-trodden meeting-place of mortals as in those days they admired Oedipus who removed form the land the man-snatching demon?" Hutchinson (1985), 769-71: "The fortunes of the house—and especially the fortunes of Oedipus—have flourished too highly; as a result...it is meeting with destruction." He adds that this cause (of destruction) "need not exclude others."

most to its well-being, to being so great a liability to the city's existence that he and his family must be thrown overboard. Because they are thrown from the stern of the ship (πρόπρυμνα, 769), the helmsman's place, the Labdacids are ejected as rulers of Thebes. The ship of Thebes does survive the brothers' deaths, as the messenger's succinct summary of the battle announces (793-996): "This city has escaped the yoke of slavery. The boast of mighty men have fallen to the ground, and as in fair weather, so too when much buffeted by the waves, the city has let no water into her hull." The brothers in death are described as having fulfilling their father's curse.[236] Their sameness—the chiefs, the leaders of the two armies—is stressed and will be to the play's end.[237]

Thus Eteocles' figurative presence on a ship evolves through the course of the *Septem* from the crucial position of helmsman at the stern guiding the ship of the polis through the storm generated by Ares and the Argives, to being a helpless passenger along with the rest of the Labdacids swept along to Hades, and finally, after the battle, mourned with his brother as their death ship actually carries them to the Acheron. Nevertheless, Eteocles' position on the ship of state has by far the greatest dominance of all these ships due to its initial placement, extensive elaboration, and the civilized values associated with it. In the opening lines of the play Eteocles presents himself as the helmsman in his speech before the citizen army, but also shows himself to be just such a man, as he performs the actions necessary for the moment. As leader he encourages the best motivations in his citizens' actions—the bringing of aid to the city, its gods and their families—and they, in turn, are brought into the image of the ship in his directions for their deployment. The appropriateness of Eteocles' self-presentation as helmsman is strongly endorsed by the scout, who urges this role upon him at the end of both his reports. In both cases this prompt follows the description of the forces of the Argives, who are, in large part, represented as savage godless men, who

---

[236] (815-19):

> The city is fairing well, but its chiefs (ἐπιστάται), the leaders (στρατηγώ) of the two armies, have had the whole possession of their inheritance divided between them by hammered Scythian iron: they will have so much of the land as they will take in burial, having been swept away to an evil fate in accordance with their father's curse.

[237] Torrance (2007), 32: "So Eteocles and Polynices are a 'pair of blood brothers' (681), a 'double pair of generals' (817) and a 'pair of rulers' (921). They 'lie together' (810) and their fate is 'common to both' (812)."

contrast with the upright character of Eteocles. Even though Polynices is separated from the extreme degree of pride and godlessness of his compatriots, his virtue is undermined both by their company and Amphiaraus' condemnation of his attacking his homeland and gods. The Argives are brought into the ship of state image as waves of the storm that assail it, seen as always from the Theban perspective.

With Eteocles' decision to fight his brother at the seventh gate his moral excellence from the perspective of the chorus fails, although his perception is that this outcome was inevitable, due to the curse. However, this course of action also yields the beneficial effect for the city of freeing it from the Labdacids, making Eteocles' death a sort of *de facto* sacrificial death (Von Fritz, 2007, 160). Certainly, at the very least his death is tragic, since the planning and preparation Eteocles puts into the defense of Thebes, which saves it, also leads to his death. Attendant with the choice of fighting his brother, Eteocles departs from the ship of state for the ship of his *genos,* also personally announcing his implicit change of figurative ships. His premonition of its doom is fulfilled in the intratextually linked ship of death. The chorus underscores this migration from ship of state to doomed ship of *genos*, by reinterpreting the Labdacids' role on the polis' ship as cargo to be jettisoned and in the messenger's coverage of the war, the ship of state lacks a helmsman and Eteocles' acts on behalf of the polis are written out of the record. A final assessment of Eteocles requires some consideration of his interactions with the Chorus of Theban maidens, which will be explored in conjunction with their equine language.

As we have seen in the scout's initial report of the seven warriors, they function figuratively both within the ship of state as the threatening storm of war and at the same time their horses' presentation was joined with the imagery of the sea. I would like to turn now to a further analysis of the system of chariot and horse imagery, the manifestation of which clusters around the Argive warriors and, in very different ways, the Theban chorus. Finally, Cameron's formulation of the contrasting political implications of the charioteer and helmsman imagery will be revisited and somewhat revised in preparation for the study of Vergil's intertextual activation of *Septem* in the *Aeneid.*

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: The Chariot Ensemble

The fearsome nature of the Argive force, already stressed in the scout's initial report to Eteocles, is raised to another level of implicit brutality via the chorus of young Theban maidens' expressions of frenzied fear in their opening song (78-181). They have rushed to pray to the city's gods in complete disarray and, as Eva Stehle's careful analysis has shown, struggle throughout the parados to achieve a coherent and propitious prayer, finally accomplished near the end (164-181).[238] Through their numerous detailed references, primarily to the sounds of the approaching Argive army (horses' hooves, bits, cheeks, the rattle of chariots, squealing of axles, clatter and clashing of shields, of spears and stones on the battlements), they create the off stage space of battle (Torrance, 2007, 103). They react most often and particularly to the Argive horses and their chariots' noise, apparent at the very beginning of their song (78-86):

> [Ah, ah,] I cry for great, fearful sufferings!
> The army has been let loose, it has left its camp!
> This great host of horse (πολὺς ὅδε λεὼς...ἱππότας)
> is pouring forward at the gallop!
> The dust I see in the air shows me it is so,
> a voiceless messenger, but true and certain!
> The soil [of my land]
> struck by hooves, sends the noise right to my ear!
> It's flying, it's roaring like an irresistible mountain torrent!

Horses are mentioned first and, in the course of the parados, will be mentioned and elaborated upon most frequently,[239] which has the effect of prolonging the enemy approach and the young girls' intense anxiety. Much in the chorus' agitated reactions recalls the scout's previous account of the Argives on the move: they are advancing quickly, raising dust, and likened to rushing (or swelling) water. The chorus later will use the scout's image of a wave to describe the army ("A wave of men...breaks loudly over the city" 111). When the chorus attempts to pray to the gods, from which their fears cause them to digress twice (151,

---

[238] Stehle (2005), 104-8, identifies εὐφημία, "speech of good omen" as the primary quality required of prayer.

[239] During the parados and subsequent scene with Eteocles the chorus comments on the shields and spears of the enemy three times each (90, 100, 161; 103, 126, 155); stones twice (159, 213); and their war cry (89), helmets (111) and arms in general (121) once each. By comparison horses and their equipment appear 6 times and of those three are, like the previous items, restricted to a single line (151, 153, 245), but three are considerably longer and are prominently placed and/or strikingly expressed (80-86, 122-23, 203-7).

159), they address Poseidon as "lord of horses and ruler of the sea" (ὅς θ' ἵππιος ποντομέδων ἄναξ, 131), grounding both the Argive equine and nautical imagery in the realm of Poseidon, which, as we have seen, concerns the elemental passion and turbulence of both the horse and the sea. Even the chorus' frequent references to the horses' bits and chariots and their various parts, although aspects normally associated with Athena, in the chorus' descriptions of the sounds these working parts are made into expressions of the passions of the horses and, indirectly, their charioteers, especially noticeable in the chorus' digression from an attempt at prayer as the events of the battle break in again: The bits (χαλινοί) in the horses cheeks "give forth a piercing whine that tells of slaughter" (122-3). These interruptions become more intrusive: "I hear the rattle of the chariots (ὄτοβον ἁρμάτων) around the city! O Lady Hera! The sockets of their heavy-laden axles are squealing! Beloved Artemis!" (1521-4). While the chorus in their parados reminds the audience of the continued association of the Argive advance with the passion of both waves of dashing water and horses, in their repeated terrified responses to the sounds of the horses, their bits and chariots, these aspects, already vividly associated with the Argives by the scout, become more emphatically imprinted on the attackers, as is the increased negativity suggested by the terror they inspire in the Theban maidens. These qualities will be underlined again in the following interaction of the chorus with Eteocles, in which he will join his use of nautical imagery to their equine references. However, at least a brief discussion of the strikingly abrasive initial speech of Eteocles to the chorus and their distinctive contributions to the broader elucidation of Eteocles' character, is required.

Just as the chorus has finally achieved an orderly, propitious prayer to the gods (166-181, Stehle, 2005, 107-8), Eteocles re-enters and berates the maidens for advancing the cause of the enemy with the panic they are spreading among the citizens (191-4). Although most see at least some justification for the harshness of his comments,[240] that he threatens them with death by stoning (and anyone else who behaves

[240] Stehle (2005), 102, is an exception. She analyzes Eteocles speech in terms of its degree of εὐφημία, "speech of good omen," which she finds to be devoid of this quality, but rich in its opposite (δυσφημία "ill-omened speech), which she explains as the workings of the curse, as do a minority of scholars (see her note 8). Stehle (102) also discusses briefly the majority view that "Eteocles shows himself to be a practical and committed king of Thebes." Hutchinson (1985), 182-286, concludes: "the situation, the submission of the chorus, and the structure of the sections of dialogue ensure that we should feel Eteocles to be essentially in the right." Torrance (2007), 97, who

like them, 195-99) certainly seems excessive (a punishment "reserved only for the most abhorrent crimes like high treason" Torrance, 2007, 98) and could associate him in an Athenian's mind with a tyrant.[241] In view of the fact that the general tenor of Eteocles' speech to the chorus (extreme in its negative misogyny), contrasts completely with the positive ethical demeanor of his opening speech and that in the shield scene (up to the seventh gate), Stehle's argument (2005, 109-117) that he manifests δυσφημία (ill-omened speech) as intermittent manifestations of his father's curse both here and in his prayer invoking the curse immediately before he last exited (69-77), seems fully justified.[242] Although a man under a curse suffers from "long term madness," according to Padel's study of Greek tragic madness, "...what fifth- and fourth-century examples imply is chronic susceptibility to obvious, temporary mad fits,"[243] which appears to be the case with Eteocles, who alternatively manifests sane, good leadership qualities (1-38, 375-651), and moments of peculiar expression and δυσφημία (in his prayer to a Curse, 70), abusive language (with the chorus, 182-202), and an impassioned resolution to meet his own brother's challenge to fight to the death (in exchange with the chorus 686-719). Nevertheless, even after Eteocles' initial

---

sees Eteocles as largely misogynistic in this scene, still concedes that, "he is surely right to claim that the Chorus' hysteria will do nothing to help the resistance against the attackers."

[241] So argues Torrance (2007), 98, despite the fact that Eteocles says "a vote of death will be passed against them" (198), since the vote is treated as a foregone conclusion and she further notes that "the reference to a vote here exploits the language of Athenian democracy...[since] ...Eteocles has absolute rule." Hutchinson (1985), 198, agrees: "probably the king's decision, since his rule is emphasized in 196." Both Hutchinson and Torrance refer to Creon in *Antigone* as analogous where the people will do the stoning (30), but it is decreed by the ruler (here called a tyrant, 60), but for Torrance the Sophoclean text also gives evidence that excessive threats of violence are "characteristic not only of the tyrant, but as a family trait in the *genos* of Eteocles." Lawrence (2007), 342, in direct opposition to Stehle's view, sees Eteocles' distinction "between the right and wrong way to involve the gods" as accurate, and the point of his exchange with the chorus as showing that "women do not behave very well in this kind of situation," although at the climax of the shield scene, which this scene prepares for, the "horrifying one-sidedness of a male perspective is highlighted by female sensitivity to the claims of kin" (343).

[242] In many ways the chorus, unusual in tragedy for their young age and gender, serves as the only character that truly interacts with Eteocles and as such, they play a large number of roles in the play's complex system of themes and images. As Torrance (2007), 94, rightly points out, "...the Chorus' identity is crucial for heightening the impact of the great threat which looms against Thebes," and they also represent the city of Thebes itself, unable to produce healthy offspring until the house of Laius is extinct. They represent the *genos* of Eteocles with their fear for its impact on Thebes (764-65), but also with great sympathy (822-860). As the curse takes full possession of Eteocles and he determines to face his brother, the chorus representing the *genos,* try to dissuade him from his course of action (686-719), acting as mature advisers to him in a scene that pointedly reverses their roles in this first scene. And they lead the mourning for both brothers (822-74). Bacon (1964), 31, with some justification, argues that the female signifies destruction for the Labdacids and Zeitlin (1985), 156, associates the chorus with the Fury of the curse in the first half of the play and goes so far as to say "they (the women) have always also been the Erinys, no matter what their discourse," downplaying severely their positive representation in the second half of the play.

[243] Padel (1995), 35, quoted by Lawrence (2007), 340-41, to explain Eteocles' behavior when he announces his intention to meet his brother.

outburst at the women's potentially destructive behavior, his exchanges with the chorus are more a sincere attempt to alter their behavior, as we will see.[244]

The chorus is at first stunned into silence by Eteocles' speech, but when prompted by him to respond, they defend themselves first by referring again to the terrifying noise of the enemy chariots (203-207):

> ὦ φίλον Οἰδίπου τέκος, ἔδεισ᾽ ἀκού-
> σασα τὸν ἁρματόκτυπον ὄτοβον ὄτοβον,
> ὅτε τε σύριγγες ἔκλαγξαν ἑλίτροχοι,
> ἱππικῶν τ᾽ ἀπύαν πηδαλίων διὰ στόμα
> πυριγενετᾶν χαλινῶν.
>
> Dear son of Oedipus, I was frightened when I heard
> the sound of the rattle, the rattle of chariots,
> and the noise of the whirling sockets of their wheels,
>
> and when the fire-fashioned bits that are horses'
> steering-gear howled in their mouths.

By referring so expansively to the terrifying sounds of the horses and their equipment, the chorus creates the impression of the signal value of the equine to represent the impending attack and, perhaps, justify their pandemonium. Their language, as Cameron has noted, prepares a transition to Eteocles' nautical rejoinder, for both the Greek words for "steering-gear" (πηδαλίων) and "bits" (χαλινῶν) were employed in the world of the chariot and ship, which subtly links the two systems of imagery.[245] To the chorus' characterization of the sounds from real and present horses and chariots, Eteocles asks them to consider an analogous hypothetical situation (208-10):

---

[244] That the chorus and Eteocles reverse roles when they later council him not to follow his decision to fight his own brother (677-719), interpreted by most as a moral failing, lends some support to the legitimacy of Eteocles' efforts to turn the chorus toward a more positive, communally oriented demeanor. Zeitlin (1982), 145-6, best summarizes the reversal between these two scenes of interaction: "There (that is, this earlier encounter 182-286) Eteokles tried to dissuade them from their panic which is inimical to the city; here (677-719) the women attempt to deter Eteokles from his decision because of the danger to Thebes. There he called women a hateful *génos* with whom no one can associate (188, 256); here he invokes the whole *génos* of Laios, despised by the gods (691; cf. 604). There the aurgument was focused upon the women's fatalistic dependence upon the gods; here he succumbs to the *daimon* and the will of the gods, to the exclusion of all else."

[245] Cameron (1971), 77. Most often the πηδάλιον is used to refer to the two large steering rudders of a ship (*Od.* 3. 281; 5. 255). χαλινός more commonly refers to the bit or bridle, but can mean the "rudder cable" (Appian, *Hal.* 1. 229; 1. 191; 5. 91)

τί οὖν; ὁ ναύτης ἆρα μὴ ᾽ς πρῷραν φυγὼν
πρύμνηθεν ηὗρε μηχανὴν σωτηρίας,
νεὼς καμούσης ποντίῳ πρὸς κύματι ;

So what? A sailor can't, can he, when his ship is in distress
in heavy seas, find an escape from danger by fleeing from
the stern to the bows?

Just as the chorus had recalled an earlier theme in their defense, Eteocles harkens back to his initial ship of state image to suggest another perspective from which the chorus might view the impending threat—one in which they are within the city, with a responsibility toward those within the walls/sides of the *polis*/ship and one in which the pointlessness of running around or fleeing and its threat to the safety of all those on board is patently obvious. Eteocles had just told the chorus that by their "running around in all directions" they are advancing the cause of the enemy and causing the city to be "sacked by its own people from within" (191-94)! Utilizing both the analogies that the text had already established between equine and nautical imagery (11, 131, 206-7) and the most salient difference (their are no human workers within the chariot ensemble), Eteocles attempts to represent a place for the chorus within the city, refocusing their attention and representing the attack in a less physically visceral way, that is, as a storm.[246] However, the chorus seems reluctant to leave the threatening horse world, as they interject into their exchange with Eteocles "Listen, I can hear the neighing of the horses!" (245), for they have internalized a way in which they could be forced to relate to the charioteers—as their horses, their chattel—a figurative view of the women that Eteocles also assumes at times.

[246] Most scholars tend to view Eteocles' use of this analogy as applicable to himself as helmsman, despite the use of ναύτης, since the helmsman is the only one who "is obliged to occupy the stern" (πρύμνηθεν, 209), even though, as Hutchinson points out, this makes the comparison surprising, since "the women can only sit in their homes, the helmsman is the most important figure on the ship" (Hutchinson, 1985, 208-10). Hutchinson further notes within the context the sailor represents the chorus, who have been rushing about, and who respond appropriately with a defense of their rushing to the images of the gods. The Greeks seem to have had an idiomatic use of "stem and stern" equivalent to "the sum total" (so Cicero reports: *mihi prora et puppis, ut Graecorum proverbium est, fuit a me tui dimittendi ut rationes nostras explicares, Fam.* 16. 24. 1), which allows for the possibility that πρῷραν φυγὼν πρύμνηθεν could be equivalent to "fleeing all over the ship." The passage is most frequently referred to after the fact, when Eteocles goes to meet his brother and "abandons the center of control, the tiller of the state, rushing from his post at the stern (208-10) to become merely an oarsman (283)...that he opens the way to his downfall" (Cameron, 1971, 101). See also Thalmann (1978), 35 and Torrance (2007), 33.

Every Theban in the play—Eteocles, the chorus, the scout and the messenger—fear enslavement as a result of an Argive victory and represent the possibility of being enslaved as being yoked, that is, as figuratively becoming a horse.[247] All three men, in prominent passages in the play (Hutchinson, 1985, 471), wish to avoid being "yoked" in servitude: Eteocles in his prayer following the scout's initial report: "Never bind this free land and this free city of Cadmus with the yokestrap of slavery" (74-75, ζεύγλησι δουλίοισι)! After his description of the Argive Eteoclus, the scout advises: "Against this man too you must send someone who can be relied on to save this city from the yoke of slavery" (470-71, δούλιον ζυγόν). Finally, the messenger announces the Theban victory as an escape from "the yoke of slavery" (793, δούλιον ζύγον). While the young women of the chorus do not use the yoke in the expression of their fears of slavery (109, 253), they specifically represent themselves as horses, forced to yield to the brutal handling of the Argives. Immediately following their first encounter with Eteocles in the first stasimon the chorus sings (321-328):

> οἰκτρὸν γὰρ πόλιν ὧδ᾽ ὠγυγίαν
> Ἀίδᾳ προϊάψαι, δορὸς ἄγραν
> δουλίαν ψαφαρᾷ σποδῷ
> ὑπ᾽ ἀνδρὸς Ἀχαιοῦ θεόθεν
> περθομέναν ἀτίμως,
> τὰς δὲ κεχειρωμένας ἄγεσθαι,
> ἔ ἔ, νέας τε καὶ παλαιὰς
> ἱππηδὸν πλοκάμων, περιρ-
> ρηγνυμένων φαρέων.
>
> For it is pitiful that so ancient a city
> should be cast down to Hades, the enslaved plunder
> of the spear, contemptuously ravaged
> and turned to flaky ashes
> by an Achaean man, with divine permission,
> while the women are taken captive and led away—
> ah, ah!—young and old together,
> dragged by their hair like horses,
> their clothes being torn off.

[247] Himmelhoch (1997), throughout her study uses the presence of the word "yoke" as an automatic indicator of a yoked horse, even though the yoke can imply either horses, mules or oxen put to the plough or carriage. Given that the Argives are so frequently associated with their horses and chariots in the *Septem*, I have assumed that horses, primarily, are implied by yoke.

The chorus here makes the connection between the Argives, enslavement and horses explicit: when Thebes is conquered by the Argives (324), they will be enslaved (323), which for the women will mean that, as horses, they will either be driven by the Argive charioteers, or, since the Argives, as we will see, are themselves represented as horses, as lustful stallions they "will cover the frighten mares" (Cameron, 1971, 82), both scenarios being alluded to in this passage.[248] The women of the chorus serve to expand the image of the advancing chariots of the Argives, just as the Argives completed the ship of state image by becoming the storm threatening the ship, but their vulnerability, dependency and frantic emotions cause them to represent themselves as horses, which will be driven and abused by their captors. In the equine system of imagery the chorus is far from being a threat to the Argives. Rather, they are a threat to Thebes itself, since they figure themselves as conquered. Within Thebes equine imagery predominates in the expression of the citizens' fears of slavery. But, considering the fact that Polynices is himself a Theban and his allies, although Argive, are also Greeks, why do the Thebans fear enslavement in a country and time when the vast majority of slaves were non-Greek and only the occasional "savage decision of the victors" would lead to Greeks enslaving Greeks (most notably the Athenian enslavement of the Melians during the Peloponnesian War)?[249]

Apparently the Thebans are assuming that the Argives as victors would make just such a "savage decision," that is, they would behave like barbarians, whose subjects were typically seen as the slaves of their king. Torrance (2007, 88-91) has identified a number of ways in which the attackers in *Septem*, who the chorus early in the play say are "of alien speech" (170), are cast as barbarians.[250] Perhaps the clearest

---

[248] The chorus figure themselves as horses once again when they respond to the scout's description of Capaneus by asking that he be stopped by a thunderbolt before he "plunders me by arrogant force from my maiden abode" (πωλικῶν... ἑδωλίων, 454-55). Here given its secondary meaning of "maiden," πωλικός is chiefly used to designate foals or fillies. At the same time ship imagery adheres to ἑδώλια, "abode," which also can refer to rowers benches, suggesting the women are figuratively cast off the ship (Cameron, 1971, 83).

[249] Fisher (1993), 36, adds that the enslavement of Greeks by Greeks was often temporary.

[250] Torrance (2007), 89-91, in addition, points to the threat of fire from Capaneus as evoking the burning of the Acropolis in Athens by the Persians in 480, the suggestion that the attackers represent a threat to the Thebans native gods, and the prominent use of gold in the decoration of several of the seven, as typical of barbarians in Athenian minds.

link between a "barbarized" attacker and the threat of slavery can be seen in Eteoclus, who is "characterized through his horses" (Torrance, 90). As the scout describes (461-64),

> ἵππους δ᾽ ἐν ἀμπυκτῆρσιν ἐμβριμωμένας
> δινεῖ, θελούσας πρὸς πύλαις πεπτωκέναι.
> φιμοὶ δὲ συρίζουσι βάρβαρον τρόπον,
> μυκτηροκόμποις πνεύμασιν πληρούμενοι.
>
> He is circling with his horses, who are snorting in their
> harnesses, eager to fall upon the gate; their muzzles,
> filled with the breath of their proud nostrils,
> are whistling in a barbarian manner.

The horses (which, based on their plurality, are pulling an implied chariot) have been given characteristics common to the seven warriors. The verb ἐμβριμάομαι, when used with horses, means "to snort with rage," which suggests a passionate disposition similar to that of Tydeus, who is twice described as screaming (381, 392) and Hippomedon, who rages for a fight like a Maenad. The stem κομπ- (boast, pride), which, as mentioned earlier (p. 43), is used numerous times in the descriptions of the seven, here describes the horses' nostrils (464). The sound of the horses' breath was apparently amplified by the attachment of short tubes to the φιμοὶ (muzzles or nose bands, 463), which were in contact with the nostrils (Hutchinson, 1985, 461-4). This amplification of noise also characterizes Tydeus, whose shield is equipped with bronze bells that "make a terrifying clang" (385-6). Hutchinson (1985, 384-6) suggests that the bells would be frightening "because the device is wild and barbaric." When the scout concludes his description of Eteoclus, he cautions, as we have seen, that Eteocles must send someone against this man who can save the city from the yoke of slavery (470-71). In this way Eteoclus, via the description of his barbarian horses, confirms the Theban fearful assumption that defeat would result in their servitude. The displacement of the barbarism from the charioteer onto the horses, allows an easier connection to be made between the Thebans' figuration of themselves as horses when enslaved and the real threat the attackers pose as they drive their chariots toward Thebes. That Eteoclus, is a substitution for Adrastus, a more common member of the seven, and may possibly be an invention of Aeschylus,[251] suggests the particular

[251] Torrance (2007), 90, 139, n. 42, discusses this hypothesis and its critics and concludes (reasonably) that "it is uncertain," [but] "at the very least...we can be sure that Aeschylus exploited the figure of Eteoclus for his own

importance of the scout's description of him for the themes and images of *Septem.* While clear differences between the female chorus' and the males' reactions to the possibility of slavery are apparent, all Thebans are unified in the expectation that, if they are defeated, the barbarian nature of their attackers is such that they would yoke them in slavery.

Thus, in the scout's very first report from the battle front, Adrastus' chariot, the king of Argos and head of the Argive assault and the fiery nature of the horses' advance first link horses and chariots with the Argives in the context of their terror inspiring oath, but the chorus' frequent frenzied responses to the sounds of the approaching horses, even their chariots and equipment, when extended to the nature of the charioteers advancing on Thebes, strongly reinforce the impression of Argive brutality. When Eteocles attempts to show the chorus the divisive impact on the rest of the polis of their running around and loud expressions of impending doom, the chorus justifies their behavior by restating their fears of the sounds of the chariots and horses, as if this explanation alone could make their behavior understandable. Eteocles counters this paradigm of power—the charioteer in control of the horse—with that of the ship of state, in which a sailor's running around has dire consequences for the rest of the ship. The women, whose role in the state is severely limited, making them seem unable to relate to Eteocles' community image, remain fixated on their fears of rape and enslavement. In fact, the male characters—Eteocles and the scout—also fear that the yoke of slavery will follow an Argive victory and, thus, that they will be forced into the subservient role in the Argive equine imagery, but it is the chorus, again through their more emotional and vivid imagination, which expresses their fears with greater dramatic force—they imagine they will be dragged away by their hair, like horses. Finally, enslavement, figuratively imagined as a yoked or dragged horse, participates in the barbarization of the Argives, most notably in the warrior Eteoclus, who is characterized by his horses and, therefore, simultaneously barbarized. Others of the

---

purposes." Torrance (90) describes Eteoclus' mythological status as "hazy," while Hutchinson (1985, 47-85) points out that he is "one of the less stable elements in the list of the Seven" with a family tree that is "unstable too." It has also been suggested (Zeitlin, 1982, 78) that, as a substitute for the leader who would have been Eteocles' counterpart, Eteoclus is a "mirror image" for Eteocles, but the tremendous imbalance in the degree of characterization (next to none versus the primary character) limits the productivity of this observation.

seven attacking Thebes, as described by the scout, confirm that the chorus' fears of being treated like horses by the Argives are justified.

No character is more strongly identified with the horse, brutality and the barbarian than the warrior Tydeus, the Argive leader excoriated by the prophet Amphiaraus. Even before the scout reveals the immediate cause of the anger between Tydeus and Amphiaraus—the sacrifices that would allow the crossing of the river Ismenus and commencement of the war are not giving good signs, which causes the prophet to forbid Tydeus to cross over and begin the war—Tydeus presents his most persistent feature of making vocal noise. Here he "is already growling near the Proetid Gate" (377-78); he screams like a hissing snake (381),[252] screams again by the banks of the river (392) and shouts insults at Amphiaraus (382-84). His vocal racket is accompanied by the bronze bells on his shield, as we have seen, which "make a terrifying clang" (384-86). The bombastic sounds Tydeus produces are but one indication of his extreme battle lust, which is overtly expressed at both the beginning and end of the scout's report, in each case accompanied by a simile likening him to an animal (380-81; 391-94):

> Τυδεὺς δὲ μαργῶν καὶ μάχης λελιμμένος
> μεσημβριναῖς κλαγγαῖσιν ὡς δράκων βοᾷ:
>
> Tydeus, lusting madly for battle, is screaming
> like a snake hissing at midday...
>
> τοιαῦτ' ἀλύων ταῖς ὑπερκόμποις σαγαῖς
> βοᾷ παρ' ὄχθαις ποταμίαις, μάχης ἐρῶν,
>
> ἵππος χαλινῶν ὣς κατασθμαίνων μένει,
> ὅστις βοὴν σάλπιγγος ὁρμαίνει μένων.
>
> Raving thus in his boastful armour,
> he screams by the banks of the river, longing
> for battle like a horse panting against the
> force of bit and bridle and impatiently
> awaiting the sound of the trumpet.

[252] It is difficult to see how these two sounds could be analogous, although the range of sounds κλαγγή—any sharp, quick sound—can connote is broad: the twanging of a bow, barking of a dog, grunting of swine, and the hissing of snakes. βοάω, does not seem to have many overlapping meanings—to cry aloud, shout, roar, or howl. Hutchinson (1985), 381, maintains that "the poet makes the comparison, not because the cry of Tydeus especially resembles the hiss of a snake, but because the snake is a terrifying thing."

Tydeus' lust for battle is intensified by a near duplication of the idea of mad raving for battle in both passages (μαργῶν καὶ μάχης λελιμμένος, 380; τοιαῦτ' ἀλύων... μάχης ἐρῶν, 391, 392), depends on the main verb of "screaming" (βοᾷ, 381, 392), in the act of which he is likened to a "snake hissing" (381) or "a horse panting" (393), animals which together connote deadly agility and passionate willful strength. In Tydeus Aeschylus creates "a powerful image of a crazed aggressor hungry to attack its prey" (Torrance, 2007, 70).[253] The equine imagery (393) is anticipated earlier in the passage when Tydeus is described shaking the three crests of his helmet, which is restated as "the mane of his helmet" (κράνους χαίτωμ', 385). The greater elaboration of the horse simile, its final position, and the previous references to the Argive horses by both the scout and the chorus emphasize its importance. Those features of the horses and chariots that the chorus fear, are here represented in such a way that the Argives both as charioteers and as horses can easily be seen as likely fulfillers of the chorus' projections for their future. Tydeus' lust, amplified via its comparison to the horse's panting and impatient chafing (κατασθμαίνων, 393; ὁρμαίνει, 394), recalls and confirms the legitimacy of the chorus' fears of rape ("while the women are taken captive…dragged by their hair like horses, their clothes being torn off" 324-29). At the same time the simile, in describing the horse's "struggling against the bit and bridle" (a frequent meaning of κατασθμαίνων, 393) and "impatient chafing" (ὁρμαίνει, 394), although not the focus of the comparison, is a reminder of just that subservient role of the horse that suggests slavery in the Theban mind, as we have seen. Commentators find Tydeus' prideful arrogance, suggested by his "boastful armour" (391) and his disrespect toward the prophet Amphiaraus (382-3), most boldly announced in his shield design which represents "a brilliant full moon, the greatest of the stars" (389-0), implying that he is the greatest among warriors (Torrance, 2007, 71).[254] Thus, the scout's report of the first of the seven warriors, not only justifies and corresponds with the frenzied fears of the enemy expressed by the chorus, but does so in their equine figurative language.

---

[253] Dawson (1970), 380, more succinctly: "Tydeus is, in fact, little more than an animal."

[254] Zeitlin (1982), 59: "The appropriation of a celestial emblem corresponds quite literally in the spatial code to an attitude of spirit which, not knowing mortal limits, reaches too high in thought and word" (ὑπέρφρον, 387, 410; ὑπερκόμποις, 391).

As the "inaugural scene" in the description of the warriors, the scout's report of Tydeus expresses "founding properties" for all the warriors (Zeitlin, 1982, 59). Aeschylus encourages this perception by joining the first and the last warrior (Polynices) in important shared aspects: both are sons-in-laws of Adrastus and both have pressured him to undertake the attack on Thebes, as we have seen in Amphiaraus' criticisms (571-86; Torrance, 2007, 72). As Zeitlin (1982, 59) argues, Tydeus is himself a founder "of his own Argive system that is coded in its gestures, language, and images as the negation of the civic values of those who justly defend their city from external attack." Tydeus' shield device reveals "transgressive qualities" in that the full moon in its center is "the symbol of the imperial design of the blazon in its claim to totality and mastery." In sending Melanippus, a descendent of one of the original autochthonous citizens of Thebes, Eteocles offers a crucial opposition in the political code "one between single sovereignty and political community."[255] In a similar fashion, to the chorus' anxious fears when they hear the rattling, whirling and howling of the Argive chariots and horses, we have seen Eteocles offer the alternative model of the ship of state, a communal enterprise (203-10). Just as the scene of Tydeus is "inaugural" for the rest and carries significant horse imagery, that of Hippomedon has been identified as "pivotal" and likewise contributes to the Argive association with the horse (Zeitlin, 1982, 83).

Hippomedon's name, which means "ruler of horses," was anticipated by that of the Iliadic hero Diomedes, "tamer of horses" and king of Argos, which itself is called in the *Iliad* ἱππόβοτος ("horse-pasturing" *Il.* 2. 287; 5. 415),[256] however, in the context of the narrative, that is, following the scout's report of Eteoclus, whom we have seen to be associated with barbarian enslavement largely through the characterization of his horses, Hippomedon's name would probably have functioned to extend the barbarian resonance. Like Tydeus his battle lust is extreme: "he is possessed by Ares, and he rages for a

---

[255] Zeitlin (1982), 62, elaborates: "As Tydeus' attack upon Thebes is elevated to a hybristic appeal to cosmic beginnings, Eteokles' rejoinder founds the political order of the city which is literally rooted in the myth of its origins." Melanippus (he of the Black Horse) may reply to the negative night of Tydeus' shield and to the horse to whom the raging Tydeus is compared, but in Zeitlin's (61-62) opinion the political opposition he implies is "more crucial."

[256] To a certain extent, then, as Cameron (1971), 74, notes, "we are prepared for the horse imagery even before the play begins." Also see Cameron, 75, n. 1, for further references to Argos and Diomedes as ἱππόβοτος and ἱππόδαμος respectively.

fight like a maenad" (497-98).[257] The pivotal nature of this scene, however, derives from his shield design, which features Typhon, the monster who was the last threat to Zeus's power in Hesiod's *Theogony* 820-80. Only in the case of this warrior's antagonist, is a Theban's shield described, "the iconic counterpart" of Hippomedon's shield (Zeitlin, 1982, 83): on his shield "resides Father Zeus, standing with his flaming bolt in his hand" (512-13). Eteocles elaborates on the juxtaposition of Hippomedon's Typhon with Hyperbius' Zeus: "...we are on the side of the winners, they of the losers..." (516). Here, with the fourth and, therefore, central warrior of the seven, the true ethos of each side is manifest in these two shields, an "irreducible antithesis,"[258] that places Thebes on the high ground. Thus, the presentation of Hippomedon, like that of Eteoclus and Tydeus, reveals particularly through his association with the horse, his potential for fulfilling all of the Thebans' fears, expressed via equine imagery, of rape and enslavement. Equine imagery in Aeschylus' *Septem*, like nautical imagery, clearly has political implications, and like the shield designs of Typhon and Zeus, they represent confronting political values, as Cameron argued a number of years ago.

Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*: Figurative Interaction

In several ways Aeschylus invites his audience to see the two systems of imagery as comparable, but also as contrastive, what I have called interactive. Very early in the play, as we have seen in the scout's first report, the Argives are associated both with chariots and horses and with the Theban ship of state, as the figural storm threatening it (Cameron, 1971, 74). The chorus in their prayer to Poseidon describe him as, "Lord of horses, ruler of the sea" (130), and thus "The two great symbols of control, the control which the steersman exercises over his ship and the control which the horseman exercises over his steed, are brought together" (Cameron, 1971, 76). Further, language that functions in both the equine and

[257] As Torrance (2007), 75, notes, the possession of Hippomedon, by both the spirit of Ares and "also by the spirit of savage dismemberment, the Dionysiac *sparagamus,*" is extreme.

[258] Zeitlin (1982), 83, characterizes the shields as representing the antithesis between the two civic systems of Argos and Thebes, but, in fact, the values of the warriors, despite the persistent characterization of Thebes' adversaries as Argive, would seem to be in many cases distinct from those of Argos, as the evidence of Amphiaraus' criticisms of Tydeus and Polynices suggests, as does the absence of Adrastus from combat.

nautical worlds appears in a number of places.[259] Perhaps of greatest importance in Cameron's argument that the equine imagery connotes a particular kind of power, is the interrelationship between the chorus' fears of enslavement, expressed in equine imagery, and the general savage barbarity of the Argives, who are relentlessly associated with the horse (Cameron, 1971, 80-83). Cameron argues that "the see-saw of the struggle for control is seen in the two symbols of the steersman with the tiller and the horseman with the reins" (101). The nature of Argive rule, as expressed in the language of the charioteer and his team of horses, would be harsh (84):

> The Argives threaten to wrest control of the city out of the hands of Eteocles, impose the yoke of slavery, lead off the women like horses to be broken for their chariots, subdue all of Thebes to their will by taking the reins of government, and rule the Thebans as they rule their horses.

Cameron's treatment of Eteocles in the role of helmsman focuses on the necessity of his maintaining that position and the mistake he makes in relinquishing it.[260] He seems less interested in contrasting Eteocles' rule, as seen throughout the play, with the expected rule of the Argives, although he does allow (102), that "Eteocles with his careful guiding of the defense keeps the Argives under control as a rudderman in a sense controls the sea." But because he seems to be constrained in his comparison of the two sets of imagery by seeing the analogue of the charioteer's horses as the sea, which the helmsman "in a sense" controls, that is, by Aeschylus' characterization of Poseidon as "lord of horses and ruler of the sea," I believe, he misses one of the major points of the comparison, which is that the helmsman only can control in any sense the men on his ship, but that dynamic between human and human (as opposed to human and beast) allows for the expression of a higher level of communication and community,[261] which is exactly

---

[259] Cameron (1971), 77, πηδαλίων (206); χαλινοί (207). Cameron also notes that οἴαξ, "tiller" can be used as a harness, citing as support, *Il.* 24. 269: the yoke for Priam's mule wagon was "well fitted with guiding rings (οἰήκεσσιν, pl. of οἴαξ)."

[260] Cameron (1971), 101: "It is when he abandons the center of control, the tiller of the ship of state, rushing from his post in the stern (208-10) to become merely an oarsman (283), when he becomes, that is, merely one of the champions at the gates instead of the general directing the battle from the center of the city, that he opens the way to his downfall." See the contrasting view of Herrmann (2013), who argues that Eteocles knows his death is inevitable and necessary for the city to survive.

[261] Brock (2013), 86, more accurately characterizes the control of the helmsman as being over the ship rather than the sea, but he also stresses that the helmsman can only command the crew with their consent (based on the assumption that the ship of state is modeled on a merchant vessel). Nevertheless, the image of the helmsman is

what Aeschylus has done with the ship of state. More can be said about Eteocles as the helmsman of Thebes' ship of state.

All the positive actions and words Eteocles undertakes for the city of Thebes are affilitated with his helmsmanship of its ship of state.[262] While Eteocles' role as helmsman is strictly limited to the first 652 lines of the *Septem*, it is his defining role, which he assumes immediately, is confirmed in by the other major male speaking character, and fulfills successfully for the survival of Thebes. In the opening lines of the play he defines the role of the helmsman as one that utilizes the full range of a leader's competency: guarding, controlling and advising for the needs of the moment, all of which can be seen in his actions. He encourages his citizen army toward devotion to the polis, its gods and their own families that extends to self-sacrifice in their defense. In the shield scene Eteocles expresses devotion to the gods and a high standard of morality in his selection of Theban warriors to meet the hubristic largely godless Argives, yet he can appreciate the virtue of Amphiaraus, and draws a lesson to be learned from his example of joining with bad comrades. Eteocles not only sees himself and his citizens in general as part of the ship of state, but recommends this image to the chorus of young women who are fixated fearfully on the terrible sounds of the Argive horses and chariots in one of the most important juxtapositions of the two imagery systems. In essence he asks them to consider, not their possible future role as horses for an Argive master, but their current role as sailors on a ship; their actions have repercussions for all those on board. Even before Eteocles leaves to confront his brother, the ship he is associated with becomes that of his *genos*, which soon becomes the joint ship of death for the two brothers. But the ship of state image remains for the polis of Thebes, even when it no longer has a helmsman, a sign of hope for the city's

---

sometimes framed "with the appealing implication that its ultimate aim was the preservation of the community" (56, no specific examples are cited at this point). Brock also stresses that the superiority of man over beast in the charioteer ensemble is explicit in the use of the reins and goad: "The image of the chariot therefore carries associations with mastery over and taming of animals which…imply a more openly authoritarian attitude to those who are ruled: the frequently used motif of the 'handing over' of the reins or goad of the state implies that while the holder of the reins may change, it is natural and desirable that the demos should remain in harness, under control" (57).

[262] Brock (2013), 55: "The use of the helmsman image by both Eteocles and the messenger promotes a uniformly favourable view of the king in the first two-thirds of the play: the peole of Thebes look to him as an experienced commander and sole possible savior, while he in turn is duly aware of his duty and responsibilities."

future without the Labdacids. Thus, Eteocles, as long as he fills the role as helmsman, represents and advocates positive civic values, with the important exception of the intermittent evidence in his speech of Oedipus' curse (in the mention of the curse in his prayer and in his outburst at the chorus).

Because the chariots are most prominently presented as equipment of war and their drivers as the enemy forces, the anti-polis values they represent and their potential for harsh governance are not immediately evident. However, the chorus of maidens plays the largest role in shaping the impression of the Argives in the frequent, fearful and emotive descriptions of the sounds of the horses and the chariots and they intensify the negative connotations of the charioteers as future leaders. The young girls' frantic presentation of the Argives as charioteers seems constructed to contrast with Eteocles' calm, commanding self-presentation as helmsman. Their fears of enslavement, in which they envisage themselves as horses, nevertheless, are also held by every male speaker and turn out to be justified in the scout's report of the seven warriors, especially so in those specifically associated with the horse. Arrogant toward the gods, proud and boastful, noisy, frenzied, raging, or lusting, they represent values that are antithetical to the polis-centered values expressed by Eteocles as they often appear in conjunction with connotations of barbarity. Indeed, the evidence does suggest that the Argives, were they to win the battle, would "rule the Thebans as they do their horses." But does Polynices, the instigator of the attack, play any role in this antithetical system of imagery? The issue at stake between the two brothers is who will rule Thebes and with Eteocles' prominent presentation as the helmsman, it would be reasonable to expect Polynices to be associated with the charioteer.

Polynices' initial presentation in the play is negative: he is criticized by the upright prophet Amphiaraus, who characterizes Polynices' attack on Thebes as a plan to devastate his homeland and its native gods by bringing a foreign army to invade it (580-83). The scout clearly suggests that he participated with the rest of the seven in placing some memento on Adrastus' chariot (49-50)—no reason to disassociate him from all of the general references to the Argive horses and chariots. Nevertheless, his shield proclaims the justice of his cause, and the transgressive qualities prominent among the other five warriors are absent from the scout's report of Polynices. Moreover, as an individual, he is never

associated with either horse or chariot. Just as Aeschylus avoids describing the actual confrontation of Polynices and Eteocles because, in Hutchinson's opinion, Eteocles would appear to occupy the morally higher ground as a defender of the city,[263] Aeschylus eschews pointedly fixing on Polynices the negative side of the polarity suggested by the imagery used for the Argive and Theban sides. Polynices is still compromised by his associates' negative values, as Eteocles' disquisition on evil company (597-608) spoken about Amphiaraus' joining with the evil company of the Argives, clearly suggests. If Polynices, like Amphiaraus, has "joined together...with impious men of arrogant speech," unlike Amphiaraus he did not collaborate "against his will" (611-12), but instead initiated the attack. If we consider the future of Polynices' rule, if the Argives had been victorious, as Amphiaraus does ("If your fatherland is conquered by the spear thanks to your incitement, how can you expect it to be your ally?" 585-86), what indication is there that he could prevent the kind of mayhem the characterizations of Tydeus, Capaneus, Eteoclus and Hippomedon would lead us to expect of them? In fact, the Argive side appears remarkably leaderless. Adrastus, the king of the Argives, is there with his chariot, but he has apparently been coerced into being there and plays no active role in the war. Further, there is ample evidence of disagreement among the seven. Certainly, this power vacuum makes it appear likely that the Argives will lose, as Amphiaraus' sacrifices suggested. But the absence of a strong leader also focuses more attention on the seven individual warriors, airing their arrogance and lack of real cohesion. In the end there is no positive evidence for Polynices's ability to lead, but rather, as Von Fritz (2007, 158) suggests, the implications are negative: "Is it possible that this Polynices could be a good ruler, when the majority of his six helpers want not so much to conquer the city for him as to raze it to the ground? Could this sort of man ever have been a good ruler?"

Thus, despite the consistent sameness of the treatment of the two sons of Oedipus after their duel, Eteocles is the focus of Aeschylus's interest. Eva Stehle (2005, 120), who has carefully analyzed the

---

[263] Hutchinson (1985), 792-821: "After Eteocles' exit, the two brothers are no longer contrasted or distinguished morally: both become simply fratricides and sons of Oedipus. A detailed narrative must inevitably have reminded us that one was assaulting, the other defending, his native land."

evidence of the curse in Eteocles' performative speech, has suggested a productive way to look at this imbalance:

> ...by making the curse manifest itself through performative speech, Aeschylus solves a problem. *He presents Eteokles as the legitimate king of Thebes and the morally responsible brother*. Yet in Aeschylus' plays a curse does not just drive *a good person* to death, but drives that person to do ill. By using performative speech as the medium through which the Erinys works, Aeschylus creates an Eteokles whom the audience sees from the beginning as both the *admirable military leader* and an accursed presence endangering the city. (italics mine)

Aeschylus' *Septem* is surely Eteocles' tragedy, a fact made more poignant particularly through his prominent presence in Thebes' ship of state, which survives after his death, as the ship of death carries him with his brother to Cocytus.

Few of the numerous elements that constitute the environment of the charioteer and helmsman suggested comparability to ancient poets in the beginning of the tradition; rather, the skill and knowledge necessary for a driver to accomplish his task successfully was the relevant point of comparison, as Nestor's advice to Antilochus in the *Iliad* indicates. For those poets comparing the drivers, this scene was paradigmatic, in that the vast majority of charioteers in ancient literature are youths or young men and the direction of the comparisons most frequently move from the narrative charioteer to the image of the helmsman. Although Nestor's inclusion of the woodcutter first among the three men he paratactically lists as exhibiting μῆτις implies no special bond between charioteer and helmsman, a bond surely developed subsequently. The gods Athena and Poseidon both came to be associated with horse and ship, suggesting a similarity between these vehicles, but in such a way that the gods' essential and differing qualities were also preserved. The *Odyssey*'s elaboration of the worlds of Athena, the daughter of μῆτις and thus patron of builders, navigators and schemers, and Poseidon, the god of the sea and father of the horse and Polyphemus, constitutes the clearest expression of this interpenetration of realms. At the point of tangency between the two realms, as Odysseus approaches in the Phaeacians' boat the shore of Ithaca where he will begin to plot with Athena against the suitors, the motion of the boat is compared to that of horses, since Poseidon expresses the power that moves both, and Odysseus is on the point of departure from the sea and Poseidon's punishing. The poetic tradition of comparability that developed was ever

more sensitive to any similarity between the ensembles of chariot and ship, as Aeschylus' use of the ambiguous words for riggings, benches, and foam demonstrates, and ever more complex in the expression of the comparisons, effortlessly doubling back in a simile to its tenor metaphorically, as we have seen Euripides and others do. The appreciation of the strength of the bond between the ensembles of charioteer and helmsman seems to have been requisite for the contrastive or interactive use of the images in narratives of political strife.

Aeschylus' *Septem* uses this firm basis of comparability, almost interchangeability, between charioteer and helmsman, I have argued, as a means of subtly suggesting the immorality of Polynices' attack on his homeland of Thebes and his brother, which transgresses sacred bonds, unities that should not be broken—thus the introduction of Poseidon, lord of sea and horse, early in the play and the frequent ambiguous language of chariots and ships. However, from the first line of the play the ship represents the polis and Eteocles its helmsman, who expresses and espouses to the citizens virtues associated with Roman *pietas*: dutiful respect for and protection of family, fatherland, and gods. Polynices' side, consistently referred to as Argive, increasing the impression that they are foreign aggressors, are exclusively the charioteers whose values oppose the responsible civic virtues of the Thebans: they are violent, lack a respect for the gods and suggest to the Thebans that they would rule them as tyrants. Still remaining within their contrastive image, the Argives antagonistically interpenetrate the Thebans' figurative realm: they represent the sea and storms assailing the ship of Thebes and are fearfully represented by the chorus as their future charioteers. However, once Eteocles determines to face his brother at the seventh gate, he is no longer helmsman and after their death the brothers both sail on a ship of death to Hades. Thus, the interaction between the images is activated by war, as it will most obviously be in the *Aeneid.*

In view of the shared importance of Athena and Poseidon in the development of the comparability of charioteer and helmsman, it is interesting that Athena plays no significant part either in Euripides' *Hippolytus* or Aeschylus' *Septem* despite the centrality in both plays of the threatened polis, a place strongly associated with her civilizing gifts of crafts and cultivation. Athena's absence, for whatever

reason (neither play takes place in the goddess' chief polis of Athens), seems to have facilitated the presentation of a more negative charioteer. In Euripides' play the opposition between Artemis and Aphrodite dominates much of the action with Hippolytus devoted solely to the woodland goddess and in his celibacy rejecting Aphrodite. In as much as Aphrodite represents the generative life force, the survivial of the polis depends on devotion to her. Hippolytus' militant celibacy in that sense is a threatening assault on the polis. While particular divinities do not intercede in *Septem*, piety and its lack are important differentiating aspects of the charioteers and Eteocles, the helmsman. Amphiaraus represents Polynices' attack on his native city as impious and implicitly outrageous and the charioteers as a group are represented as potential enslavers. The transgressive youthful charioteer as reprented in Parthenopaeus and Hippolytus will have a significant allusive presence in Vergil's Latin charioteers as will impious and violent charioteers, Tydeus, Capaneus, Eteoclus and Hippomedon, in an epic that also provides Pallas (Minerva) a small role.

CHAPTER 4

The Developing Political Dialogue: Charioteers and Helmsmen *Aeneid* 1-6

Unlike Aeschylus' *Septem*, which commences with Thebes already at war and the helmsman Eteocles rallying his troops to face the attack, the *Aeneid*'s Italian war only begins at the midpoint of the epic (book 7), where the roles of helmsman and charioteer begin to be associated with protagonist and antagonist and to interact with contrasting political connotations. Nevertheless, far more than preliminary preparation for this interaction occurs in the first half of the *Aeneid.* The initial scenes in the narrative, Juno's stirring up of the storm at sea to harass the Trojans and Neptune's restoration of order to his realm, are paradigmatic in establishing the salient forces and some of their significance for the epic (*furor* versus *pietas*). But these same scenes, due to Neptune's prominence, god of sea and horse, also activate the analogous tradition of equine and nautical imagery in an overtly political context, Neptune's comparison to a Roman politician. But Juno too is a charioteer as her chariot in Carthage, Greek cult practices and her chariot rides with Athena in the *Iliad* testify, the latter of which are relevant intertexts for Anchises' interpretation of the four horses sighted at Castrum Minervae. Further, in the *Aeneid*'s first book the goddess is securely identified with the future charioteer-driving side through her agent Aeolus, the epic's first figurative charioteer and storm rouser, and more insistently in her affiliation with Achilles, who is joined with her in the savagery of their hatred of the Trojans both in the *Iliad* and insistently in the ecphrasis on Juno's temple in Carthage, where his chariot and defeated Trojan charioteers are central. Trojan and Roman chariots in the Underworld are noteworthy because of their nostalgic distancing or apparent suppression—although the majority of heroes among Aeneas' descendants celebrated triumphs only one is identified as such for a campaign that is presented as a redress of Trojan defeat. It is likewise consequential that the only human sinner who is punished in Tartarus and described at length is the hubristic Greek charioteer, Salmoneus. Iliadic intertexts are central to Vergil's shaping of the distinctive aspects of the Junonian chariot and its significance in the first half of the epic and, although Vergil

replaces the chariot race of the *Iliad* with a ship race, through his intertextual dialogue with Homer's chariot race he reveals his motivation for rejecting the chariot for the Trojans in the *Aeneid.* But the characteristics of the helmsmen Mnestheus and Aeneas recall those of the dutiful city defender Eteocles in Aeschylus' *Septem*. Finally, at the end of book 5 Aeneas loses his helmsman Palinurus and assumes that position himself. Why does Neptune require the sacrifice of Palinurus who meets all the traditional requirements for a good helmsman and how does his loss shape the meaning of Aeneas' helmsmanship? In an intertextual *tour de force* Vergil's narrative engages Homeric, Ennian and Ciceronian texts to shape the figure of Palinurus as a complex selective amalgamation of aspects of Odysseus, Remus and Cicero. The figure of Aeneas in a similar intertextual dialogue reveals traces of Odysseus, Romulus and Augustus in a unified and unique presentation of the Vergilian helmsman. While the political implications of the *Aeneid*'s helmsman will become evident largely from the discussion in this chapter, the focus on the values of the charioteer in the first half prepares for their political implications developed in the second.

Opening Scenes: The Storm

At Juno's behest, Aeolus has released the winds, producing tremendous waves and whirlwinds for Aeneas and the Trojans (1. 87-98):

> Insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum.
> Eripiunt subito nubes caelumque diemque
> Teucrorum ex oculis; ponto nox incubat atra.
> Intonuere poli, et crebris micat ignibus aether,
> praesentemque viris intentant omnia mortem.
> Extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra:
> ingemit, et duplicis tendens ad sidera palmas
> talia voce refert: 'O terque quaterque beati,
> quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis
> contigit oppetere! O Danaum fortissime gentis
> Tydide! Mene Iliacis occumbere campis
> non potuisse, tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra...
>
> The shouting of the men insued and creaking of the riggings,
> and then, suddenly, clouds stole the daylight
> from the Trojans' eyes. Night lay black upon the sea.
> The heavens thundered and flashed with lightning,
> and everywhere men saw the presence of death.
> Aeneas' limbs suddenly went slack with cold.
> He groaned and, lifting both palms to heaven, said:
> "Three times, four times luckier were those

> Who died before their parents' eyes
> under Troy's high walls! O Diomedes,
> bravest of the Greeks, why could I not have died
> by your right hand on Ilium's plain..."

Although onboard ship, his future locus of power, Aeneas does not enter into the narrative of the epic in a position of any control, but rather as a suffering and fearful victim at the mercy of the forces of nature. In fact, the special drama of the scene is due to the suppression of the details of his location: he is only onboard a ship by implication and, in this moment, is isolated from his crew. Two lines at the very beginning of the epic's narrative indicate that the Trojans are at sea near Sicily (34-35), but their return to the narrative here suggests only their utter domination by the environment of that storm. Since their ships provide them no security against the enormity of the storm, Vergil notes only sounds—the men's shouting, the riggings creaking and Aeneas' voice—and their fear. With the exception of the presence of the men (an important difference), Vergil's source in *Odyssey* (5. 291-312) shares the broadly described terrifying heavens, the slackening of the hero's knees, and the speech expressing the desire to have died at Troy ("Three times and four times happy those Danaans were who died then in wide Troy land, bringing favor to the sons of Atreus, as I wish I too had died at that time...." 306-08).[264] While this scene in the *Odyssey* is also near the beginning of Odysseus' entry into the narrative, the audience has seen him pining for home on Calypso's island, constructing his raft with the goddess's help and, packed up with provisions, taking the tiller and steering by the stars on his way home. Clearly Vergil has invoked this important scene in the *Odyssey* to invite his audience to compare the two heroes and suggest the *Odyssey*'s significance as an intertext in general, but what other positive creative consequences derived from initiating the hero's story with a scene of such weakness and no real grounding of place?

---

[264] The speech of Odysseus is longer (5. 299-312; he wonders what will happen to him ["Ah me unhappy, what in the long run will befall me?"], fears that Calypso's prediction that he would go through more hardships before he reached home was right, and describes the circumstances of the storm before he expresses the wish to have died at Troy) and, partly due to that fact, seems less emotional than Aeneas' simple wish to have died at Troy (1. 94-101). Otis (1964/1995), 231-32, sees Aeneas in his despair as revealing nostalgia for Troy that is tragic in that unlike Odysseus he cannot go home. Perkell (1999), 40, argues that it is "melancholy attachment to persons of worth and sensitivity, to family and place, that inspires Aeneas' first speech, not the practical or self-serving issue of burial" (which motivates Odysseus).

The condition of Aeneas and the Trojans at sea are presented as the logical result of Juno's anger, which Vergil chose as the motivator of his epic. The exclusive focus on his voice and physical attitude draws particular attention to the powerful emotional impact of Juno's anger on Aeneas. True, the first words of the *Aeneid* concern Aeneas and his mission to found a city, but Juno's agency in his suffering appears in lines 3 and 4 and becomes the central concern of the invocation turned into a question of theodicy (8-11):

> Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso,
> quidve dolens, regina deum tot volvere casus
> insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores 10
> impulerit. Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?
>
> Muse, recall for me the reason why the queen of the gods
> was so aggrieved, her godhead so offended,
> that she forced a man distinguished in his devotion
> to undergo so many misfortunes, to endure so much hardship.
> Can there be anger so great in the hearts of gods on high?

Aeneas' defining *pietas* appears first in the epic enveloped by Juno's anger and the misfortunes (*casus*) and the labors of the hero that derive from it. In contrast to the presentation of Eteocles and his evident dutifulness at the beginning of Aeschylus' play, Aeneas' *pietas* is dwarfed by Juno's anger. In the remaining lines of the proem her anger takes on monumental dimensions in temporal and spatial extent and participates both in the mythological and historical implications of the poem. She has both numerous grudges deriving from the Trojan War and its circumstances, and is intertwined with Rome's greatest historical enemy, Carthage. Her association with anger (lines 4, 11, 25, 29) and war (14, 16, 23) are insistent. After the proem, the narrative also follows Juno and her anger in the opening speech of the epic expressing outrage at her slighted dignity (37-49), her journey to Aeolia and her bargaining with the wind god Aeolus (50-80). Juno does not return to the narrative until book 4 (with the exception of her vignette the last night of Troy, calling the Greeks from the ship, 2. 612-14), but her characteristics, values and concerns, as well as the actions they motivate, have been forcefully presented.

The choice of Aeneas' entrance as a victim of Juno's anger facilitates the startling role of Neptune as calmer of the storm at sea, which he accomplishes in part by driving his horse-drawn chariot atop the

waves of the sea. His role is unexpected because it inverts that of Poseidon in the *Odyssey*, who, stirred by anger, sends the storm that causes Odysseus' knees to "give way for fear" (5. 291-97). Rather, Neptune in the *Aeneid* is the divine antagonist of Juno and what she represents—anger, war, chaos, and destruction, in a word *furor*. In his calming of the storm he both intensifies and broadens the political implications of the storm sequence, which have been an important aspect since its inception.[265] His speech to the winds is one of outrage at the intrusion of a lesser god into his domain (*non illi imperium pelagi saevumque tridentem, / sed mihi sorte datum*, 138-39). But this celestial power struggle takes on wider significance by means of the first simile in the epic, which compares Neptune calming the sea to a man who calms the tumult of a crowd with his authority and words, linking Neptune's actions with Aeneas and also with contemporary Roman politics. Both before and after the simile Neptune's chariot is described (145-56):

> levat ipse tridenti;
> et vastas aperit syrtis, et temperat aequor,
> *atque rotis summas levibus perlabitur undas*.
> Ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est
> seditio, saevitque animis ignobile volgus,
> iamque faces et saxa volant—furor arma ministrat;
> tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
> conspexere, silent, arrectisque auribus adstant;
> ille regit dictis animos, et pectora mulcet,—
> sic cunctus pelagi cecidit fragor, *aequora postquam*
> *prospiciens genitor caeloque invectus aperto*
> *flectit equos, curruque volans dat lora secundo*.
>
> Neptune himself lifted them up with his trident,
> and opens the vast shoals, and eased the swells,
> *his wheels skim the tops of the waves*.
> Riots will often break out in a crowded assembly
> when the rabble are roused. Torches and stones
> Aare soon flying—Fury provides weapons—
> But then all eyes light upon a loyal citizen,
> a man of respect. The crowd stands still
> in hushed expectation. And with words

[265] Juno is motivated to action by the slights to her as queen of the gods (*at ego, quae divum incedo regina*, 44). Aeolus is the scepter holding king of the winds (52, 57), who rules them with *imperium* (54), and has been made king by Jupiter, *pater omnipotens* (60), in a fixed agreement (*foedere certo*). Juno in her request to Aeolus reminds him that Jupiter has given him rule over the winds (65-66) and Aeolus replies exclusively in political terms: he owes his power (*potentem*, 80), kingdom (*quodcumque hoc regni,* 78) and scepter (78) to her as his queen (76) and therefore will comply with her orders (*iussa*, 77).

> He masters their tempers and calms their hearts.
> So too all the crashing of the sea fell, *as its lord*,
> *surveying the waters afterward, drove his chariot*
> *Under a clear sky, giving the horses free rein.*

The actions of the rabble relate first to the sea, which Neptune has calmed, but in diction there is a more obvious connection with Juno (*saevitque animis,* 149; cf. *saevique dolores / excidernat animo,* 25-26, *saevae... Iunois*, 4; *faces,* 150; cf. *his accensa*, 29; *furor arma ministrat*, 150; cf. *hic illius arma*, 16). Likewise, the *pietate gravem ac meritis ... virum* (151) of the simile is the obvious analogue of Neptune, but shares Aeneas' *pietas.* Thus, while Aeneas in the storm scene is the passive object of divine actions, the particular representation of Neptune establishes the contemporary political relevance of Aeneas' story and also suggests the fundamental universality of the polarities represented in Juno and Neptune's actions. The storm sequence concluding with this simile becomes "an expression of the symbolic relation between nature and politics, myth and history, which is at the heart of the *Aeneid*" (Pöschl, 1962, 23) and an instance of the dominant thematic pattern of the epic, the opposition of *pietas* and *furor,* which will recur throughout the poem (Otis, 1963, 229-30). The tendency toward the symbolic or emblematic in the *Aeneid*, as Galinsky (1996, 23-24) maintains, is always held in tension with the individual and "is one of the primary creative tensions in the *Aeneid*." Thus, he argues, as we will see, the figure of Neptune driving his chariot across the sea cannot simply be equated to Augustus.

Neptune calms the storm with prominent help of his chariot and horses (147, 155-6). In the *Iliad* (and *Odyssey*) Poseidon's chariot is exclusively his special means of transport,[266] but in the *Aeneid* Neptune's chariot seems to be more than his distinctive conveyance. When introduced (147), it concludes a list of concrete actions Neptune takes to restore calm to the sea, as if its gliding over the tops of the waves was one way order was accomplished. This line's concluding and summarizing of Neptune's actions corresponds to the single and final line of the simile (with identical meter) describing the two

---

[266] In the *Iliad* his chariot and two golden-maned horses with bronze hooves are kept at Aegae, "where his famous palace was built in the depths of the sea" (βένθεσι λίμνης, 13. 21-24). There Poseidon harnesses his horses, drives over the waves (ἐπὶ κύματ᾽) and leaves them with golden hobbles in a cavern, again, in the depths of the sea between Tenedos and Imbros, while he facilitates the Greek cause at Troy (23-38). In the *Odyssey* Poseidon's chariot is only mentioned when he departs from the scene of his storm in his horse drawn chariot (5. 380-1), after seeing Odysseus forced to swim for land.

actions the statesman takes to calm the throng (*regit, mulcet,* 153), an impression further encouraged by the description of Neptune's departure which begins in the next line and concludes the entire storm sequence. Neptune is described looking out over the sea (*aequora...prospiciens,* 154-55), as he had been initially (*alto/ prospiciens*, 126-27), but now the sea has become quiet, the sky is clear and Neptune, flying onward, guides his horses, giving free rein to his willing chariot.[267]

The contemporary political relevance of just this particular scene can be documented most clearly by an intaglio showing Octavian as Neptune driving a horse drawn chariot over the sea (Galinsky, 1996, fig. 2; Zanker, 1988, fig. 82). The scene of Octavian/Neptune driving his chariot represented on the intaglio lends itself readily to comparison with this passage, as others have noted (Vollenweider in Galinsky, 1996, 21-22). Four rearing hippocamps dominate the scene, lifting bent legs above the water and tossing their heads in different directions; they are as unstable as the water swirling around them (and the head of Sextus Pompey or Antony, dangerously close to the hooves).[268] Their dynamic action, with manes streaming back at a right angle to their neck, and their curling lower fish bodies contrast with the upright near frontal nude figure of Octavian, who holds all four rearing horses in check with only one hand, while the other grasps a trident. The impression of frontality and stability derives primarily from the position of his broad and well-muscled chest, from which extends the straight arm holding the reins. The order and calm in his position in contrast to the dynamism of the horses and water is an apt visual representation of the Neptune/Junonian confrontation in the storm sequence, yet it is also an overt expression of an identifiable contemporary political figure. Nevertheless, despite the comparison that "readily suggests itself" between the Vergilian simile and this intaglio, Galinsky is reluctant to limit its contemporary relevance to Augustus, both because the *pietate gravem...virum* cannot be restricted to any particular individual and because Neptune was the patron of many contemporary politicians (Galinsky,

---

[267] Although the basic meaning of *flecto* is to bend, it like *rego* (153) can mean to guide (*OLD* 7)

[268] The intaglio is in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, inv. 27. 733. Although Galinsky (1996), 21, thinks Marc Antony is the more likely candidate (after his Actian defeat [31]), thus far sufficient criteria to distinguish between Antony and Sextus Pompey (defeated by Octavian in the battle of Naulochus in 36) are lacking.

1996, 21-23).[269] Yet, the political relevance of Neptune in his chariot to Augustus calming the stormy sea for contemporary Romans after Vergil's death in 19 seems likely.[270]

Thus in contrast to Aeschylus' *Septem*, which begins with the protagonist Eteocles in the image of the dutiful helmsman within the stability of Thebes' city walls encouraging his men, and only later in the play develops more obviously the image of the storm of the Argive attackers and their equine and violent associations, the anger and violence of Juno as expressed in the storm is the point of departure for the narrative in the *Aeneid* and determines Aeneas' initial appearance as a suffering victim, a further expression of her vengeance in action.[271] The power opposing Juno is, instead, the god Neptune, the god of both the horse and the sea, raised to far greater prominence than in *Septem*, not only in terms of the vivid pictorial presence he is given in his sea chariot, but especially in the role he plays of introducing that cluster of qualities associated with *pietas*—quiet restraint, firm control, order and rationality—in opposition to the anger, passion and *furor* powerfully presented in the figure of Juno and the storm. The

---

[269] It has been suggested that an actual historical event informs Vergil's simile, most frequently an episode in 54 at which Cato the younger calmed a mob (Austin, 1971, 148 ff), but that of Popililus Laena (mid-fourth century) would also fit the scene (Galinsky, 1996, 21).

Octavian also erected a statue of Neptune at Nicopolis, his camp at the battle of Actium and he is again represent as Neptune on coins (Galinsky, 1996, 22-23, fig. 147; also see Zanker, 1988, fig. 31a and 82-85, on the nature of Augustus' visual allusions to Actium, which were in general non specific, but abstract symbols: "ships or parts of ships (*rostra*), marine creatures, dolphins, and the figure of Victory on the globe"). Neptune was famously associated with Sextus Pompey, who was "accustomed to donning a sea-blue chlamys instead of the purple toga of a Roman commander and calling himself the son of Neptune" (Sumi, 2005, 197). A crowd gathered probably at the *Ludi Plebeii* in 40, cheered the statue of Neptune on the grounds that it represented Sextus and when Octavian refused to let the statue be display at subsequent games, the crowds hurled stones at the magistrates and pulled down the statues of Octavian and Antony (Sumi, *ibid*; recounted in Dio 48. 31. 5; 48. 48. 5; Suet. *Aug.* 16. 2, and Appian *BC*, 5.100. 416-17). In fact, Octavian may have borrowed many aspects of his political self-presentation from Sextus Pompey including not only the association with Neptune, but also with *pietas*, in the context of which Sextus' father Pompey was invoked (Powell, 2002, 119-29). Brutus and Casca, murders of Caesar, also presented Neptune on their coins and Antony and Cleopatra appear in a quadriga with horses as Neptune and Amphitrite on a sestertius dated 36-35 (Galinsky, 1996, 22-23, fig. 4).

[270] Wilhelm (1983/4), 77, does not share Galinsky's reluctance: "The devotion of Augustus to Neptune following the battle of Actium was exemplary, visual and political, and the Vergilian manifestation of the chariot driving god as restorer of peace mirrors Augustan supremacy of the sea."

[271] Although from a slightly different perspective the opening storm sequence in the *Aeneid* represents literally (i.e., in the narrative) the figurative opening scene in *Septem*. Aeneas, already identified as *insignem pietate virum* (1. 10), as Eteocles advocates dutifulness in the beginning of *Septem*, and characterized as *Teucrorum rex* by Juno (1. 38), sails in his ship in the opening narrative just off the coast of Sicily, carrying "Troy into Latium," (so Juno to Aeolus, 1. 68), thus, in effect, his ship is a ship of state. It is assaulted by a savage storm, driven by the equine winds of rebellious Aeolus (bribed by Juno), as the Theban ship of state was by the Argive storm of charioteers initiated by traitorous Polynices. Brock (2013), 85-86, in discussing the ship that might have been the source of the ship of state, notes that the ships of the colonizers, such as Aeneas' is, were an attractive possibility, since "a handful of ships could literally constitute the whole of a community."

actual quality of *pietas,* attributed to Aeneas in the proem (10) and to the statesman in the simile (142), has no play in the actions or speech of the epic until the narrative finds Aeneas and his men in Africa and is not obviously evident in Neptune's actions, which, as far as the reader knows at this point, are only motivated by the slight to his power (in his later speech to Venus, 5. 802-10, we find out otherwise). And it is the foregrounding of power in the narrative that prepares for the surprising simile in which an immortal is compared to a suggestively modern mortal. Thus it is fair to say that the image of Neptune driving his horses over the sea, straddling the domains of land and sea, chariot and ship, is prominently presented in a highly charged political context that actually initiates one of the most distinctive aspects of the epic, its carefully crafted blending of mythology and history, and at the same time participates in the programmatic and paradigmatic expression of the epic's values and themes. But if Neptune's chariot expresses the comparability of chariot and ship, Juno's chariot (mentioned first in line 17) is decidedly partisan in its Greek affiliations in both *Iliad* and *Aeneid*, as well as in Carthage and Latium.

Juno's Chariot

As first mentioned in the *Aeneid* Juno's chariot is clearly associated with war (1. 12-20):

> Urbs antiqua fuit, Tyrii tenuere coloni,
> Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
> ostia, dives opum studiisque asperrima belli;
> quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
> posthabita coluisse Samo; hic illius arma,
> hic currus fuit; hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
> si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque.
> Progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
> audierat, Tyrias olim quae verteret arces;
>
> There was an ancient city, Carthage,
> Tyrian colonist inhabited, opposite Italy
> and the Tiber's mouth far across the sea;
> a city rich in resources, fierce in war,
> and favored by Juno more than any other
> place on earth, even more than Samos. Here
> were her arms, here her chariot; this was the city
> the goddess cherished and strove to make
> capital of the world, if the Fates permitted.
> But she had heard that an offspring of Trojan blood
> would someday overturn the Tyrian citadels;

Somewhat unexpectedly, Vergil moves from his invocation to the muse, with an ecphrastic introduction (*Urbs antiqua fuit*), to the city of Carthage. The future enmity between Rome and Carthage is represented in the immediate juxtaposition of *Karthago, Italiam* (13) and suggested in the following word *contra*.[272] While the city's reputation for wealth receives first mention (*dives opum,* 14), the expression of its fierceness in war (*studiisque asperrima belli,* 14) carries more weight due to its more extended expression with superlative qualification. Juno's hopes for Carthaginian political dominance will be threatened by the future Romans (17-18), a people likewise endowed with martial capabilities (*belloque superbum*, 21) and fated to be the destroyers of Carthage (*sic volvere Parcas*, 22). Thus the presence of Juno's weapons and chariot in Carthage (16-17) strongly suggests their use in war to maintain or protect ascendant political power (*hoc regnum...gentibus esse,* 17). As we will see in the *Iliad*, Hera's chariot has special prominence and elsewhere it is an integral part of her early cult worship.

With the exception of Argos, Samos had the earliest (Geometric period, 10th century) sanctuary of Hera.[273] Built on the site of the shrine of a Bronze Age goddess, it became the region's center of culture with festivals that included choral and athletic competitions. Although disputed by the Samians, the sanctuary of Hera was reputed to have been founded by the Argonauts, who brought her statue from Argos.[274] Hera's 6th century sanctuary at Samos was the largest Greek temple built and its massive altar to Hera was not superceded until the Hellenistic Great Altar at Pergamon.[275] As Austin (1971, 16) implies, the prestige of the temple and altar, together wtih the antiquity of the site, could alone account for the Vergilian reference. However, several early cult stands from this site (720-700) indicate that Hera's cult

---

[272] *Contra* with the knowledge of the subsequent words here has its primary meaning, "opposite" or "facing," but its second and fourth meanings (*OLD*), "directed at, facing (an enemy)," "against," would likely occur initially to a listener or reader.

[273] My discussion of Hera and her chariot depends on O'Brien's study (1993), 9.

[274] O'Brien (1993), 12, who adds that "the remarkable similarities between Argive and Samian bindings at trees or columns and the prominence of river gods at both sites suggest that...Argive influences at the Samian Heraion must have been early, perhaps even in the Late Bronze Age."

[275] Although never completed, "the Heraion at Samos is the largest of all Greek temples (179 x 365 ft.;" Lawrence, 1983, 93, fig. 130, begun c. 525). Herodotus commented that it was the greatest of all the temples he had seen (3. 60. 4). The previous temple of Hera at Samos was the earliest known hekatompedon (hundred foot temple) dated from the early 8th to the early 7th century. This same temple was surrounded by the earliest known peristyle of wooden columns (O'Brien, 14).

statue was carried in processions on horse-drawn "chariots,"[276] although this practice is also attested at Argos, where the worship of Hera dominated the area before the epic period.[277] Bronze Age tombs at Prosymna, site of the Geometric Heraion (7 km NE of Argos) and the goal of a procession in honor of Hera's sacred shield, feature a female wearing a Hera-like headdress and seated on a chariot behind a shield-like front. O'Brien (1993, 147, fig. 19) deduces from these figures that they suggest a Mycenaean priestess riding to the shield festival. O'Brien's work, necessarily speculative due to the antiquity of the material, clearly documents the ancient association of Hera with chariots and horses, which is also apparent in the *Iliad.*

Hera both harnesses and drives her elaborately described chariot in book 5 (719-777) and again, more briefly, in book 8 (381-437) of the *Iliad* in situations where she has noticed that the Argives are faring poorly in war and asks Athena to join her in aiding their favorites. In book 5, Ares has rallied the Trojans to perform great exploits against the Argives, leading Hera to say to Athena "But come, let us two also take thought of furious valor" (718). The episode as it unfolds associates Hera with the horses and chariot, while Athena dresses and arms for war, a division of labor repeated in book 8. Hera harnesses the horses of golden frontlets (720-21), as her daughter Hebe assembles a magnificent chariot constructed of bronze, silver and gold (722-31). Hera then "led beneath the yoke the swift-footed horses, and was eager for strife and the war cry" (731-32). Meanwhile in Zeus' house Athena has put on his tunic, flung around her shoulders the tasseled aegis with the Gorgon's head, and donned a golden helmet (733-44). She then steps onto the fiery chariot (ὄχεα φλόγεα, 745) with her spear "heavy and huge and strong, with which she vanquishes the ranks of men" (745-47). Hera "swiftly touches the horses with the whip" (748), the gates of heaven swing open and they drive out, stopping to consult with Zeus, "on the topmost peak of many-ridged Olympus" (753-4). Hera stays the horses (755) and asks Zeus if he will be angry if she strikes Ares painfully. Zeus suggests that she rouse Athena against Ares, because she "is especially used

[276] O'Brien (1993), 45, fig. 5. Parts of nine or ten votive horses were also found at this site.

[277] O'Brien (1993), 121, notes that there are no archaeological signs of cult practice for Zeus in the Geometric period in the Argolid, although evidence of his early cult exists in Nemea. Her thesis is that Hera is the principle deity of the Argive plain both in the Mycenean and in the Dorian archaic period.

to bringing him evil pains" (762-66). Hera continues to drive the chariot ("touched the horses with the whip", 768), stays the horses at the confluence of the Simois and Scamander rivers and "loosened them from the chariot, and shed thick mist over them." While Hera's action is restricted to shouting at the Argives in the likeness of Stentor of the brazen voice, which "roused the force and spirit of every man" (784-85, 792), Athena drives Diomedes in his chariot back into action and guides his spear thrust into Ares' belly (835-39; 855-59). When the goddesses return "to the halls of great Zeus" at the end of book 5 they simply go (νέοντο) with no mention of their chariot and horses (907-909). Their preparation for a second joint foray from Olympus has the same division of labor, but the description is greatly reduced, particularly of the chariot, which is mentioned only once at the beginning (as the "fiery chariot," 389) and end (ἅρματα, 435) of the episode. In fact, Zeus is so angered by their intention to help the Greeks that upon seeing them from mount Ida, he sends Iris to warn them that (416-19):

> γυιώσειν μὲν σφῶϊν ὑφ᾽ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους,
> αὐτὰς δ᾽ ἐκ δίφρου βαλέειν κατά θ᾽ ἅρματα ἄξειν:
> οὐδέ κεν ἐς δεκάτους περιτελλομένους ἐνιαυτοὺς
> ἕλκε᾽ ἀπαλθήσεσθον, ἅ κεν μάρπτῃσι κεραυνός:
>
> He will maim your swift horses beneath your chariot,
> and yourselves will he hurl form the chariot, and will break
> the chariot in pieces; nor in the space of ten circling years
> will you be healed of the wounds which the thunderbolt inflicts;

One of the consequences of restricting the references to the goddesses' chariot in their preparations is that the rhetoric of Zeus' threatened violence to them, centered on their chariot (mentioned three times), increases the chariot's importance as a symbol of the goddesses' journey. Hera is immediately subdued, and turns back her horses (427-32). Upon their return to Olympus the Hours, who were entrusted in the earlier passage with opening and closing the gates of heaven (5. 749-51), unyoke and tether the horses at their ambrosial mangers, and lean the chariot against the wall (8. 433-35), as if to signal the end to further forays by the goddesses, who now sit on their golden thrones "troubled at heart" (436-7). Thus in these two episodes Hera is especially associated with the chariot and its horses; her daughter assembles the "fiery chariot," Hera harnesses the horses, drives the chariot, tethers the horses at Troy and in the aborted second trip, drives them back to Olympus. Could the mention of her chariot in the *Aeneid* (1. 17), carry

connotations of her frequent resistance to Zeus's will in the *Iliad* and his threatened destruction of her chariot?[278]

The possibility of the intertextual undercutting of the power of her personal chariot, seems more likely in view of the initial reference to Juno's arms in Carthage (1. 16), because, as great as Hera's hatred is for the Trojans, unlike Athena, she wields no arms against them. In the *Iliad* Hera inspires Achilles to call an assembly, opposes and argues with Zeus on Olympus, sends Athena, Iris and Hephaestus to aid the Greeks, but the only physical attack she personally perpetrates is that against Artemis—with that goddess' own bow and arrows "smiling the while, she beats her about the ears" (21. 491), a picture of feminine nastiness, not exactly warlike belligerence. When these same two goddesses are invoked through prayer at Castrum Minervae in book 3 of the *Aeneid,* Pallas is described as "sounding with the clash of arms" (*armisonae*, 544), while Juno is simply *Argivae,* the traditional supporter of the Greeks, but I will argue that her role as belligerent charioteer against Troy is also evoked and contributes to the undermining of Anchises' prophecy.

As the Trojans are about to leave behind the east coast of Italy, which they have been warned to steer clear of due to the hostile Greek inhabitants (3. 396-98), they catch sight of Italy for the first time and cheer joyfully (523-24); Anchises immediately proceeds to pray to the powers of the sea (with an immediate positive effect, 530), from a specific place on the ship: "Standing on the ship's high stern" (*stans celsa in puppi*, 527), a phrase used only two other times in the *Aeneid*: it describes Augustus as he is about to face Antony and Cleopatra at Actium, the central scene on Aeneas' shield (8. 680), and Aeneas, as he raises this very shield, sailing toward his first engagement in the Latin war (10. 261)—the first refers to the decisive battle for the establishment of the Augustan principate, the second to the commencement of the final stage of Aeneas' mission in the *Aeneid,* the war which will ultimately lead to the founding of Rome. The significant intratextual links between the later two passages will be considered in chapter 6, but their importance for Anchises resides in the clear implications of imminent

[278] Even in Zeus' speech that Iris relates to Hera and Athena in their chariot, Zeus is not as angry at Hera because "she is *always in the habit of thwarting him* in whatever he has decreed" (8. 421-22).

war, a war with consequences for Italy.[279] While Anchises is in the act of praying, lacking the aura of stars, flames and selection that accompany Augustus and Aeneas, the threatening nature of the landscape, the sign of the four horses and the reference to the Iliadic Athena and Juno argue that his location, *celsa in puppi*, also portends war.

As the favoring breezes carry the Trojans closer to a port on the coast of Italy, a temple of Minerva on the citadel appears, the goddess who is turned away from the beseeching Trojan women on the ecphrasis of Juno's Temple in Carthage (1. 482), the facilitator of the Trojan horse (2. 15), and seen most recently, in her only real appearance in the epic, sitting atop the citadel of Troy, shining from a cloud and terrifying with her Gorgon (shield, *nimbo effulgens et Gorgone saeva,* 2. 615-16).[280] The landscape also threatens (3. 533-36):

> portus ab euroo fluctu curvatus in arcum,
> obiectae salsa spumant aspergine cautes,
> ipse latet: gemino demittunt bracchia muro
> turriti scopuli refugitque ab litore templum.
>
> The harbor
> curved in a bow away from the eastern wave,
> hidden behind rocky crags that foamed with salt spray.
> Towering cliffs let down arms in a double wall and
> the temple retreated back from the shore.

The metaphorical "bellicosity" of the landscape becomes stronger as it progresses from the *arcum* that could be a weapon, the crags (*cautes*) that oppose or, simply, are opposite, to the more clearly menacing towering cliffs (*turriti scopuli*); the metaphorical meaning of *scopulus* is "danger" or "ruin." The landscape alternates between threatening projections (*arcum, objectae cautes, gemino muro, turriti scopuli*) and the suggestion of a need to hide (*latet, refugit...templum*): "The temple itself 'flees back' (*refugit*, 536), as if apprehensive of attack."[281] The omen of the four white horses, which Aeneas reports

---

[279] Putnam (1995), 59, of *stans celsa in puppi*: "It is a posture of power and a rhetorical prognostication of wars near and far, fought on Italian soil or by Italians."

[280] Spence (1999), 149 and n. 3, identifies this as Pallas' only appearance as a character or agent. "While Pallas is represented with relative frequency through out the work, it is always as part of a secondary, mediated medium, such as ekphrasis."

[281] Putnam (1995), 59-60: "Even the coming of dawn, red, with stars put to flight, intimates through metaphor an innate bellicosity which the landscape bears out." Putnam, 70, n. 22, points out that of the two other uses of *turritus*

seeing and Anchises interprets, has generally been read as a strictly balanced sign, similar to the horse in Carthage (war and prosperity, 1. 444-45) and related to Anchises' description of Roman arts (establishing peace by warring down the proud and sparing the humble, 6. 851-53), however, in this context the hope for peace may be an illusion.

Although Anchises interprets the four horses as both signs of war and peace, the surrounding implications of war are so pervasive that Anchises in this instance seems overly optimistic in his interpretation.[282] The four white horses would have immediate connotations of the Roman triumph,[283] particularly in association with the rhetorical stress Anchises places on war (537-43):

> quattuor hic, primum omen, equos in gramine vidi
> tondentis campum late, candore nivali.
> et pater Anchises 'bellum, o terra hospita, portas:
> bello armantur equi, bellum haec armenta minantur.
> sed tamen idem olim curru succedere sueti
> quadripedes et frena iugo concordia ferre:
> spes et pacis' ait.
>
> I saw there our first omen, four snow-white horses
> Grazing on the broad plain. And Father Anchises:
> 'War, you bring us war, O hosting land.
> Horses are armed for war. And yet,
> horses sometimes bear under yoke concordant reins.
> There is still hope for peace.'

The triple anaphora of *bellum,* clustered closely together in two lines (539-40), recalls the even more insistent anaphora just fifteen lines before of *Italiam* (523-24), suggesting almost an equation of the two.[284] When Anchises begins to expound the peaceful second meaning of the horse, the implications of the triumph (the chariot and *quadripedes*, different in meaning, but suggestive of *quadrigae,* as are the four horses), a victory in war, within this "peaceful" interpretation, lessen the opposition (*sed tamen*).

---

in Vergil, that at 8. 693, describes "the *turritis puppibus* on which the Romans attack the followers of Antony and Cleopatra at Actium."

[282] O'Hara (1990), 52, optimistic prophecies "rhetorically tell Aeneas what he wants or needs to hear in order to be confident enough to continue on his mission," not "what is going to happen."

[283] Williams, 1972, 537; Horsfall, 2006, 537: "The number of the horses is clearly significant, as is widely remarked; it corresponds to the *quadrigae* of the *triumphator.*" Although Horsfall provides evidence for the view that white horses were standard in triumphs, he considers white to have been an exception. Also see below, Ch. 5, p. 294 and n. 514, for conflicting evidence on implicit divine connotations of four white horses.

[284] The anaphora of *bellum* will be echoed in another prophecy, by the Sibyl, once the Trojans gain land (*bella, horrida bella,* 6. 86), their only consolation being Evander's help.

The adjective *concors* is normally related to peace, as is implied here, but because in its only other use in the *Aeneid*— to describe souls of Caesar and Pompey only now in the Underworld *concordes* (6. 827), but soon to be reborn to wage civil war (*ne pueri...patriae validas in viscera vertite veris*, 6. 832-33)— impending war immediately follows (Putnam, 1995, 60), its pacific implications are compromised. The Trojans then honor two goddesses, they pray to Athena and make offering to Juno (543-47):

> tum numina sancta precamur
> Palladis armisonae, quae prima accepit ovantis,
> et capita ante aras Phrygio velamur amictu,
> praeceptisque Heleni, dederat quae maxima, rite
> Iunoni Argiuae iussos adolemus honores.
>
> Then we prayed
> to the holy power of the goddess sounding with the clash of arms,
> Pallas, who first welcomed our rejoicing, veiling our heads with
> Phrygian robes before her altar. And, we duly offered the sacrifices
> to Argive Juno that had been ordered by the instructions of Helenus.

That the Trojans address only these two goddesses here in the context of horses, chariots and war implies the relevance of the Iliadic chariot rides of Hera and Athena to aid the Greeks. The adjective which describes Pallas, *armisonae* (544), is a Vergilian creation (Horsfall, 2006, 544), which associates the goddess with the horses of Anchises's bellicose interpretation (*bello armantur equi*, 542) and recalls that in the preparation for the goddesses' descent, Athena's arming and arm-clad entrance to the chariot are described twice (*Il.* 5. 733-47; 8. 384-91), while Hera prepares the horses and yokes them to the chariot (*Il.* 5. 720-21, 731-32; 8. 382-83) before she drives them (5. 767-68, 748; 8. 392). Furthermore, Zeus recommends Athena to Hera as the more effective wielder of arms. A desire to correlate Pallas with the war and weapon half of Anchises' interpretation, could partially explain why Juno, the only other divinity worshipped here, whom Helenus pointedly specified as the first divinity the Trojans should address, is here worshipped second.[285] That Juno, only here in the *Aeneid* called 'Argive' (as she is prominently in

[285] Horsfall, 2006, 437, glosses *primum* to signify "in order and importance," and notes that at 543 "the Trojans first pray to Minerva." Julia Dyson (2010), 44-46, identifies this as one of the *piacula* of Aeneas, an incorrect sacrifice, which would certainly have negative consequences from the gods.

the *Iliad* returning to Olympus from her chariot-empowered day of war at the end of book 5. 908),[286] is worshipped second has two significant consequences, most obviously the ritual impropriety of not following Helenus' instructions. But naming Juno second also suggests a relationship between her and the second half of the omen, as Athena is to the first. In the second half of his interpretation Anchises focuses on the harness (*frena*) and yoke (*iugo*, 542), Juno's particular concern in the *Iliad*. However, the very different context of her yoking in the *Iliad* again undercuts the Anchises' positive interpretation of yoke and reins (*Il.* 5. 731-32):

> ὑπὸ δὲ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν Ἥρη
> ἵππους ὠκύποδας, μεμαυῖ' ἔριδος καὶ ἀϋτῆς.
>
> Hera led beneath the yoke the swift-footed horses,
> and was eager for strife and the war cry.

In this near side of Italy, which Helenus has warned the Trojans to avoid due to the hostile Greeks and cautioned them to cover their heads at sacrifice lest it be ruined by the gaze of an enemy, and from where they are eager to leave because of the Greek homes and suspicious lands (*Graiugenumque domos suspectaque linquimus arva*, 550), little suggests peace. Juno, whose name is surrounded by references to the instructions of Helenus, suggesting the Trojans were following them precisely (*rite*, 546), is demoted to second-place consideration, contradicting a significant aspect of Helenus' instructions and facilitating her allusive incorporation into Anchises' interpretation of the four white horses, with connotations of war against the Trojans. Anchises' position on the ship, *stans celsa in puppi,* while it does not immediately precede a significant war, does precede an omen portending war, which he interprets too favorably. Anchises is "a dubiously leader at best earlier in the book" (Putnam, 1995, 59), whose prophecies O'Hara (1990, 171) concludes are often "more optimistic than truthful." I have argued that the narrative context of his interpretation of the sign of the horses and the Iliadic intertexts for the two goddesses saturate the prediction with war. Anchises' questionable prophecy severely undermines his appearance in the position of helmsman (*stans celsa in puppi*), which suggests his inadequacy as figurative helmsman of the Trojans'

[286] Horsfall, 2006, 547. Hera is throughout the first chariot episode concerned about the Argives (5. 712, 779, 787, 833), as elsewhere in the epic.

proto-ship of state. Aeneas' sacrifice to Juno, not surprisingly, fails to prevent her attempted destruction of the Trojans in the cataclysmic opening storm that follows soon after (O'Hara, 1990, 29).

Thus, in the *Iliad* Hera harnesses horses, cares for her own horses and drives them pulling her spectacular and lavishly described fiery chariot to bring support to the Greeks with Athena. Her chariot is given further vivid textual presence in Zeus' threat to shatter it into pieces with his thunderbolt. Therefore it is not surprising that Juno's chariot is mentioned in Carthage, where, given the reference to that city's future wars with Rome, a general bellicose connotation is reasonable. Juno's interference with the peaceful half of Anchises' interpretation of the four horses due to her Iliadic charioteering with Athena, the first goddess prayed to at Castrum Minervae, is considerably less overt. But in the context of the Trojans' failure to pray to Juno first as Helenus had instructed, the likelihood that her previous bellicose associations with the chariot in the *Iliad* will again be directed against the Trojans becomes almost expected. And in the subsequent storm Juno stirs up against the Trojans she continues her association with the chariot in her engagement of Aeolus, the epic's first figurative charioteer.

Juno's Charioteers: Aeolus and Achilles

In instigating the opening storm in the *Aeneid* Juno as usual employs an agent, here Aeolus, king of the winds. His winds are figurative horses ("he curbs (them) within the confines of their cell;"[287] *vinclis et carcere frenat*, 54) and so participate in the poetic tradition of associating the speed of horses with that of the winds.[288] But Aeolus' winds will be centrally involved in the question of the limits of his rule, which is here presented figuratively as that of a charioteer (60-63):

> Sed pater omnipotens speluncis abdidit atris,
> … regemque dedit, qui foedere certo
> et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas.

---

[287] The implication of prison are equally strong (*vincula* can be translated as "bonds", but also are "chains"; *carcer* means both "prison" and "starting gate" for a horse race. *Freno* comes from the noun *frenum,* the horse's reins.

[288] Aeneas describes the North Wind becoming a dark-maned stallion to cover the mares of king Erichtonius (*Il*. 20. 223-24; cf. Zephyrus *Il.* 16. 150). The fillies produced from this mating, "would run over the top-most ears of ripened corn and break them not.... and over the topmost breakers of the gray brine" (226-39). The ancients accepted the siring of horses by the wind as a fact of nature (Aristotle *HA* 6. 18 [572a18-19], Varro 2. 1. 19, Col. 6. 27. 7, Pliny 8. 166; Mynors, 1994, 271-9, on the mares in the *Georgics* 3. 274-75, which become "miraculously pregnant by the wind"). The three-year old horse in the *Georgics* 3. 193-5, wants to challenge the winds, but also suggests a wind: "skimming over the open plain, as if released from the reins, (he leaves) scarce a trace in the dust."

> But the all-powerful father buried (them, the winds)
> in black caves…and provided a king, who
> by a fixed agreement would know when ordered
> how both to check and let lose their reins.

This figurative representation of power receives greater prominence by its involvement with the larger question of Juno's power relative to Jupiter's, which is brought up in her opening speech (37-49).[289] Juno immediately concurs with the narrator's description that Jupiter has given Aeolus power over the winds (65-66), but in his reply to her request Aeolus gives all the credit to Juno (*tu mihi quodcumque hoc regni, tu sceptra Iovemque concilias*, 78-79). When Neptune, fully aware of Juno's deceit (*nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae*, 130), tells the winds to return to their home, his message to Aeolus that he has overstepped his bounds again represents the winds as horses: "Let Aeolus rule in the closed chambers (*carcere*, 141) of the winds." This first figurative charioteer, ally of Juno, clearly carries implications of power and rule (the reins of power), a figure used by Cicero and one that will be used only once again of King Latinus (7. 600), a most reluctant agent of Juno.[290] Aeolus' chariot is clearly placed in opposition to that of Neptune and to all the values associated with his calming of the storm. Further, it is the epic's first expression of the symbolic juxtaposition of charioteers and destructive storms, an Aeschylean motif in *Septem.*

Aeolus' horses are the first among a series of malevolent horses directed against the Trojans in the early books of the epic. Dido's people establish their city at the sign of a fierce horse head (*caput acris equi,* 444) that Juno had shown them (*Iuno monstrarat*, 443-44),[291] a harbinger of future animosity. Vergil textually links the Trojan horse together with Sinon's treachery, the cause of Troy's demise (2. 195-98), to Aeolus' winds. The actual movement of the horse into the city begins: *scandit fatalis*

---

[289] Juno complains about her relative powerlessness against her enemies the Trojans. Pallas can impale her enemy Ajax, while Juno, queen of the gods and both wife and sister of Jupiter (45-46), has waged war for years against her enemy the Trojans.

[290] Cic. *De or.* 1. 226: *(senatui*) *populus… regendi sui postestatem quasi quasdam habenas tradidit*. Cic. *Rep.* 1. 9: the Epicureans maintain "that a wise man should not attempt to take the reins (of government);" (*neque sapientis esse accipere habenas.*)

[291] The two main types of Carthaginian coins are those showing Juno (Tanit, the equivalent goddess) and those showing a horse or horse head (Bayet (*Ibid,* 172-76); Austin, 1971, 444; Williams, 1972, 443)

machina muros / feta armis, ("The deadly machine climbs our walls, teeming/pregnant with armed soldiers" 2. 237-38) and recalls the description of Aeolia, which is a place *feta furentibus Austris,* "teeming with the south winds" (1. 51).[292] When Paschalis (1997, 19-20) generalizes that Vergil concentrates on the violence of the horse, "the trampling of bodies...and their part in the dragging or dismembering of heroes," he is referring to the Greeks in the Trojan War and the Latin side in the future war. And it is the most notorious desecrator of the heroic body of Hector, the charioteer Achilles, whose role and association with Hera in the *Iliad* are invoked in book 1 of the *Aeneid.*

Although Hera in the *Iliad* interacts directly with Achilles' chariot and horses in the scene in which she gives speech to the divine horse Xanthus, possibly part of an epic tradition of Hera giving horses to heroes,[293] Vergil draws immediate attention to their association with wrath. In the *Iliad* Hera and Achilles share a particular intensity of hatred for the Trojans that is characterized by their desire to eat them raw; Zeus characterizes Juno's anger (χόλον, 4. 36) as only capable of being healed by her devouring "Priam raw and the sons of Priam and all the Trojans besides" (35-36), while Achilles, in response to Hector's dying request that Achilles return his body to his parents, says that he wishes his wrath and fury (μένος καὶ θυμὸς, 22. 346) might drive him to carve Hector's flesh and eat it raw because of what he has done (ὥμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷα ἔοργας, 347). Achilles' dragging of the corpse of Hector behind his chariot is likewise linked to the verbal form of μένος (μενεαίνων, 24. 22, 54, 114, 135) and Apollo compares him in the wildness of his heart (ἄγρια οἴδεν, 42) to a lion that "goes out against the flocks of men to win himself a feast" (24. 41-43), thus suggesting a link between the brutalizing of Hector's body and the omophagia with which Achilles threatened him. While the "blessed gods" have pity on Hector (23), Hera, Athena and Poseidon persist in their hatred, because of "the folly of Alexander" (25-28), the Judgment of Paris, mentioned this single time in the *Iliad.* Only Hera, stirred to

---

[292] The description of Laocoon's hurling of a spear into the side of the Trojan horse (2. 50-52) utilizes the same and similar expressions as those describing Aeolus striking the side of the mountain to release the winds (1. 81-83).

[293] Johnston (1992), 86-87, has suggested that there was an epic tradition of Hera giving heroes horses, one of which is endowed with speech. From fragments of Alcman (Alcm. fr. 25) and Stesichorus (Stesich. fr. 1 Diehl = fr. 178 Campbell) she has pieced together a story according to which Poseidon, having sired a horse named Xanthus and his brother Cyllarus, gave them as a gift to Hera, who gave them to the Dioscuri. Like Achilles, they used their horses in battle and this Xanthus spoke to Castor, as Achilles' Xanthus did to him.

anger (χολωσαμένη, 55), speaks up to argue against the return of Hector's body, based on his lack of divinity and her special relationship with Achilles, but Zeus counters Hera's wishes by telling her not to be "utterly angry" (πάμπαν ἀποσκύδμαινε, 65) with the gods and he asks for Thetis to be sent to him so that she can tell Achilles to accept ransom for Hector. And so, while Achilles' wrath does end in a meal shared with his enemy Priam, Hera's vehement hatred persists, with only Paris' insult as justification (24. 29). As we will see, Vergil echoes the close association in wrath of Hera and Achilles, but dwells upon and expands the consequences of Juno's wrath, of which Achilles' chariot becomes an indirect expression.

Vergil initially presents Juno's anger in the abstract ("because of the mindful anger of savage Juno" 4), but he then develops her love for Carthage and fear of future Roman dominance over her city and only finally, adds her older grudges against Troy. But in contrast to the *Iliad* where the insult to her perpetrated in the Judgment of Paris is only mentioned succinctly in the final book of the epic (24. 28), Vergil's elaboration of Juno's resentments is long and, positioned near the end of the introduction to the epic, prominent (23-28):

> Id metuens, veterisque memor Saturnia belli,
> prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis—
> necdum etiam causae irarum saevique dolores
> exciderant animo: manet alta mente repostum
> iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae,
> et genus invisum, et rapti Ganymedis honores.
>
> Saturnia was fearing this, and mindful of the old war,
> which she had waged before at Troy on behalf of her dear Argives—
> the causes of her anger and savage grief had not yet
> left her mind: the Judgment of Paris remained, stored
> deep in her mind and the injury of her scorned beauty,
> and the hated race and the honor (given) to ravaged Ganymede.

Recalling the diction and meaning of her initial characterization (*saevae*: *saevi*; *memorem*: *memor*, *necdum etiam*, *manet*, *alta mente repostum*; *iram*: *irarum, invisum*), Vergil weaves these ideas into the situation and circumstances of the Trojan war and further emphasizes them. It is Juno's savage anger that stands in opposition to *pius* Aeneas' mission to found Rome and constitutes a major stimulus to the plot

throughout the epic.[294] But, in the first half of the epic, beyond the obvious aggressive interventions in the plot of the storm and torching of the Trojans' ships in book 5, it is primarily through Juno's association with Achilles and his barbaric treatment of Hector, which she alone vocally supported in the *Iliad*, that her animosity toward the Trojans is given a vividness analogous to Allecto's presence in the second half.

Juno's affiliation with Achilles is understated initially. In the conclusion of the proem, which forms a transition to the narrative, his name appears first (29-31):

> His accensa super, iactatos aequore toto
> Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli, 30
> arcebat longe Latio,
>
> Inflamed about these things [the Trojan War, Judgment of Paris, etc.],
> she was keeping the Trojans, the remnants of the Greeks and merciless Achilles,
> tossed all over the sea, far from Latium...

That Achilles is characterized as *immitis*, without pity, focuses on his fighting fury in books 21-22 of the *Iliad* and connects him with the relentlessness of Juno's hatred as represented in the proem (4, 23, 25, 26). His far-from-essential mention at this point prepares an audience to hear an aural allusion to the first line of the *Iliad*:

> μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
> The wrath of Achilles, son of Peleus, sing, Muse

in the first line of Juno's opening speech (37):

> haec secum: 'Mene incepto desistere victam,
> ...these things to herself: "Am I, defeated, to be kept from my plan...?

In his note drawing attention to these parallel beginnings, Levitan (1993, 14) characterizes this as a "bilingual pun" and a "trick of language," both phrases suggesting humor, but in characterizing Juno as a "savage goddess, whose wrath does not forget," he acknowledges that however subtle this allusion is there are significant similarities between the anger of Juno/Hera and of Achilles, developed in the *Iliad*

[294] In addition to starting the storm in book 1, Juno contrives to bring Dido and Aeneas into the cave in book 4, sends Iris to stir the Trojan women to burn the ships in book 5, together with Allecto ignites the war in book 7, strengthens and protects Turnus in books 9 and 10 and enlists the help of Juturna to break the treaty and support Turnus in book 12. Books 1 and 7 have the most frequent references to her (14 and 11) and her most significant interventions in the plot.

and, by this allusion, apt for Vergil's epic as well. After visiting Aeolus Juno does not return to the narrative until book 4, but her wrath against the Trojans and it's association with Achilles, horses and chariots are recalled in several ways before book 4. In Carthage, particularly at her temple, Juno and the fierceness of Achilles are linked most obviously and it is via the image of horse and chariot.

The narrative of Aeneas'and Achates' movements in the midst of Carthage begins in the central sacred grove of the city (*lucus in urbe fuit media*, 1. 439), where the Carthaginians had dug up the sign indicating they should found their city, the head of a fierce horse (*caput acris equi,* 444). Apparently, Juno had both shown them (*Juno monstrarat*, 443-44) where to dig and had interpreted the sign: they would be a nation outstanding in war and "prosperous in their way of life (*facilem victu*, 445)." In omitting the first stage of their exploration of the land recounted by Servius, that they had first found an ox head, but that this suggested servitude, causing them to look further and find the horse head (Williams, 1972, 443),[295] Vergil opts to emphasize the horse head and the resonance its interpreted meaning has with the initial qualities associated with Carthage (*dives opum studiisque asperrima belli*, 14).[296] The lavish temple of Juno (rich in gifts and enriched with bronze threshold, beams and doors, 447-49), that Dido is in the process of completing, makes manifest the goddess' protection of the Carthaginians and their gratitude and devotion to her. As the ecphrasis of the scenes unfolds the reader/audience can't help but notice how many of the scenes connote hopeless defeat for the Trojans and, thus, would be content appropriate to Juno's perspective on the war.[297] The dominance of Achilles and savagery in general in the scenes on Juno's temple has not gone unnoticed.[298]

---

[295] Austin (1971), 445, allows for a broader interpretation of *facilem victu:* "' ready of livelihood'; this could suggest either a fertile soil…or prosperity...Virgil, omitting the tradition that an ox's head was originally found…seems to have transferred its symbolism of fine plough-land (and hence prosperity) to the horse, ownership of which would involve personal wealth and an availability of good provender."

[296] Although Bayet (1941): 189, considers the connection made between these two phrases over hasty. The only common point is the antithesis between peace and war, as is true of Anchises' interpretation of the four horses at Castrum Minervae (*Aen.*3. 539-41), the order of the terms is reversed and the meanings of *dives opum* and *facilis victu* are not the same.

[297] Johnson (1976), 103, comments on both the combination of grief and inarticulate joy that Aeneas feels "and we with him" while looking at the frescoes and on the way in which Juno's enmity, apparent in this "kind of victory monment to Juno," eludes him "and some readers."

[298] Williams (1972), 418; Clay (1988), 204-5; Lowenstam (1993), 41; Putnam (1998), 37.

Achilles is present in all three sections of the ecphrasis, beginning with the initial general introduction (456-58):

> ...videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas,
> bellaque iam fama totum volgata per orbem,
> Atridas, Priamumque, et saevum ambobus Achillem.
>
> He saw the Trojan battles in order, the war now
> famous throughout the wide world.
> There were the sons of Atreus, there Priam,
> and there Achilles, savage towards each of them.

Even in this reduced description Achilles accounts for what there is of narrative content and he is characterized solely by his savagery with the word programmatically used to describe Juno's anger, *saevae* (1. 4; 2. 612, *saevissima*), the attitude he demonstrates to the three most important kings in the war, both on the Trojan and on his own side. The ecphrasis proper begins with a balanced description of the fighting in general at Troy in which Achilles is the only individual described (466-68):

> Namque videbat, uti bellantes Pergama circum
> hac fugerent Graii, premeret Troiana iuventus,
> hac Phryges, instaret curru cristatus Achilles.
>
> For he saw how they were fighting around Troy.
> Here the Greeks were fleeing with the Trojan youth pressing.
> Now crested Achilles bears down on the Trojans with his chariot.

Following the introductory line establishing place and circumstances, the very balanced construction of the following two lines—correlatives expressing flight by each side followed by first the Trojan youth pressing and then Achilles (*premo* and *insto* here have similar meanings)—suggests that Achilles alone is a match for all the Trojan youth. His strength is further suggested by the forceful cluster of spondaic words with harsh alliteration (*instaret curru cristatus*). The only aggressive instrument associated with Achilles in the ecphrasis is his chariot, a fact of greater significance than may first appear since he is responsible for the deaths of most of the characters described—Troilus, Hector, Memnon and Penthesilea. Achilles' chariot in this reference does not have quite the instrumental specificity of Turnus', which "tramples the battle lines" (*agmina curru proterit*, 12. 329-30), but this is only the first example of three chariots in the ecphrasis, all of which are associated with Achilles. In the individual scenes of the

ecphrasis Achilles and the chariot are prominent in the depiction of Troilus and of Hector, scenes that are suggestively interrelated.

Although the first two episodes in the ecphrasis, those of Rhesus and Troilus, both represent prophecies about the survival of Troy in the process of being unfulfilled and therefore are strongly interconnected,[299] the scene of Troilus also has many thematic connections with that of Hector, which are enhanced by their placement before and after the central scene of the women of Troy's unsuccessful supplication of Pallas (474-87):[300]

> Parte alia fugiens amissis *Troilus* armis,
> infelix puer atque impar congressus *Achilli*,
> fertur equis, *curru*que haeret resupinus inani,
> lora tenens tamen; huic cervixque comaeque trahuntur
> per terram, et versa pulvis inscribitur hasta.
>
> Interea ad templum non aequae Palladis ibant
> crinibus Iliades passis peplumque ferebant,
> suppliciter tristes et tunsae pectora palmis;
> diva solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat.
>
> Ter circum Iliacos raptaverat *Hectora* muros,
> exanimumque auro corpus vendebat *Achilles*.
> Tum vero ingentem gemitum dat pectore ab imo,
> ut spolia, ut *currus*, utque ipsum corpus amici,
> tendentemque manus Priamum conspexit inermis.
>
> In another part the unlucky boy Troilus in flight,
> having lost his weapons and not equal to combat with Achilles,
> clings on his back to his empty chariot as he is carried away by his horses,
> yet somehow he holds the reins. His neck and hair are dragged
> along the ground and the dust is inscribed by his turned spear.
>
> Meanwhile the Trojan women were going to the temple of unfair Pallas
> and with disheveled hair they were bearing a robe,

---

[299] Austin (1971), 469, "...an oracle had said that if (Rhesus') horses cropped Trojan grass or drank of the Trojan rivers, the city could not be taken...the detail of the oracle...is preserved by the Scholiast on *Il.* 10. 435," where the story of the night ambush is told. Austin, *ibid,* 474: "In linking Troilus with Rhesus, Virgil no doubt had in mind the legend that Troy's fate depended on Troilus' safety." The *First Vatican Mythographer*, 1. 210, preserves the tradition of the oracle: "It had been said to Troilus that if he reached the age of twenty, Troy could not be overturned."

[300] The scene of the Trojan women's supplication is numerically central, whether the general introductory lines (466-68) are included or not and distinguished from all but the introductory lines in focusing on the Trojans as a group. Its thematic distinctiveness is more significant: this is the only scene incorporating an immortal, whose reaction to the emotional appeal of the Trojan women all but seals their fate.

> sadly suppliant, they were beating their breasts with their hands.
> Turned away, the goddess was holding her eyes fixed on the ground.
>
> Three times around the Trojan walls Achilles had dragged Hector,
> and he was selling his lifeless body for gold. Then truly Aeneas
> heaved a great groan from the bottom of his heart, when he
> caught sight of the spoils, the chariot, and the corpse of his friend
> and Priam extending his unarmed hands.

In the central section the tragic hopelessness of Troy's fate is emphasized both in the persistence of the Trojan women's appeal to Pallas (*ibant, ferebant*), her refusal to help (*non aequae Palladis, fixos oculos aversa tenebat*) and in the full expression of the women's sadness (*crinibus...passis, tristes et tunsae pectora palmis*).[301] The scenes on either side of this sad tableau are variations on a theme: the death of a son of Priam at the hands of Achilles, made more brutal in its association with the chariot, and words of hopelessness and suggestive of defeat are cluster within these three sections of the ecphrasis.[302] The part the two sons play in the *Iliad* contrasts; Hector is one of the main characters and Troilus is mentioned only once in the final book, when Priam is lamenting the death of his "best" (ἀρίστους, 255) sons to the base ones (κακὰ τέκνα, κατηφόνες, 253) who remain: "I begot sons the best in the broad land of Troy, yet of them I say that not one is left, not god-like Mestor, not Troilus the warrior charioteer (ἱππιοχάρμην),[303] not Hector who was a god among men, nor did he seem the son of a mortal man, but of a god" (24. 255-59). Nevertheless, the similar structure of the Troilus and Hector passage invite comparison: the first two lines in each section (474-75; 483-84) end with the fifth-foot dactyl containing the brother's name followed by a similar sounding two-syllable concrete noun in the first line and Achilles' name as the last

---

[301] Thomas, (1983): 175-84, traces Vergil's sensitivity to the principle of centrality in his ecphrases and argues that, although this scene lacks the typical *in medio* marking of centrality, Vergil uses a subtler means (allusion to the *peplos* as itself a site for ecphrasis) to mark its central position. On the importance of Pallas in the *Aeneid,* her allusive, but significant presence, see Spence (1999).

[302] *Amissis...armis, infelix, impar inani, versa, non aequae, tristes, aversa, exanimum, inermi.* Putnam (1998), 37, notes Achilles' "...treatments of Troilus and Hector, which have their similarities. The first, ambushed and forced into unequal combat, is towed, moribund, behind his chariot. The second, before the scene of ransom, had been dragged three times around Troy's walls, a dramatic change from the *Iliad*, where he is drawn only around the bier of Patroclus."

[303] Unfortunately, the exact meaning of ἱππιοχάρμην is uncertain (LSJ "dubious sense"). Although it is frequently translated as "one who fights from a chariot" or "horseman," the sense of charioteer must depend on the context, since χάρμη means simply, "fighting, battle, one's spirit of fight, the art of fighting."

word in the second line; and the presence of the chariots (in identical metrical positions in their respective lines, 476, 486) in both cases linked with their deaths.[304]

In fact, the scene of Troilus in the ecphrasis fulfills many functions, including the implied representation of Achilles' torture of Hector's corpse. Although Troilus clearly has been bested in an encounter with Achilles, Vergil offers no clarity on when, where or how they met (474-75):

> Parte alia fugiens amissis Troilus armis,
> infelix puer atque impar congressus Achilli,

In the literary and artistic tradition of this encounter, Achilles lies in wait for Troilus and slays him unarmed outside the walls of Troy in the Thymbraion precinct of Apollo.[305] Sixth-century vases show Troilus mounted on one of two horses standing side by side, and an armed Achilles, either pulling Troilus from his horse by his hair, or running after him as he flees on horseback.[306] In some scenes Achilles slays Troilus with a sword and decapitates him,[307] and in several instances he even throws his head at the Trojans.[308] Vergil eschews this tradition of the overtly treacherous, even bestial Achilles, perhaps allowing the reader to imagine it, choosing instead to represent the result of the encounter with Troilus precariously in a chariot, an apparent innovation.[309] With the dearth of analogous presentations of Troilus and the difficulty of relating what is represented in this scene and the surviving tradition, some critics have found greater importance in the relation of this scene (and others in the ecphrasis) with episodes in the last four books of the *Aeneid.* Troilus' encounter with Achilles, a younger, weaker man (here boy) and an older, more experienced man has been seen as a "paradigm" (Putnam, 31) for those of Pallas with

---

[304] In stressing the locus of Achilles' fierce aggression against Troilus in the boy's chariot, I do not mean to minimize the obvious associations of Troy in the *Iliad* with fine horses and horsemanship. Indeed, the last word of the *Iliad,* which describes Hector, is ἱπποδάμοιο, "horse-taming." As Himmelhoch (1997), 25-26, argues, in the *Iliad* fighting was unthinkable without the chariot. Vergil maintains this picture in the *Aeneid*; Troilus drives a chariot and the famous Trojans Aeneas encounters in the Underworld, as we will see, still enjoy their horses and chariots.

[305] Gantz (1993), 599-602, in a summary by a commentator on Ibycus' *Polycrates*.

[306] Gantz (1993), 598-99, both Corinthian and Attic examples: Kanellopoulos Coll 1319, Oympia B 3600, the François Krater (NY 01. 8. 6), SL 66: tripod B, Louvre E703. Some versions include Polyxena who is getting water at a fountain.

[307] Gantz (1993), 600, two Tyrrhenian amphoras of about 570 (Florence 70993; Munich 1426).

[308] Gantz (1993), 600, PrColl, Basel, London B326, Louvre E638.

[309] Austin (1971, 475), suggests *impar congressus* "must mean Troilus at first put up some kind of token resistance before dropping his *arma.*"

Turnus and Lausus with Aeneas in book 10, as well as bringing to mind Turnus, who appears to the Rutulians as he stands at the altar with Aeneas in book 12. 218 as *non viribus aequos* (unequal in strength).[310] In fact, Vergil's artistic choices in the Troilus scene seem to encourage a multivalent reading. In the next two lines Troilus becomes part of the tradition of youthful charioteers whose horses are running out of control (476-77):

> fertur equis, curruque haeret resupinus inani,
> lora tenens tamen;

Williams ("Pictures," 148) aptly likens Troilus' situation to the young charioteer to which Octavian is indirectly compared at the end of book 1 of the *Georgics* (513):

> et frustra retinacula tendens
> fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.
>
> and a charioteer
> pulling in vain on the reins is swept along
> by his horses and the chariot heeds not the rein.

Not only are both charioteers being carried off by their horses, but their relation with the reins is pivotal in the expression of their situations—Troilus is, despite his precarious position, still somehow holding the reins (and therefore not yet dead),[311] while the charioteer in the *Georgics*, struggling though he is with the reins, accomplishes nothing—and even their chariots are useless to the charioteers. In the case of Troilus the emptiness of his chariot, participates in the diction of hopelessness prevalent in the ecphrasis, but also expresses the precariousness of his situation (no one is there to help), while in the *Georgics*, the chariot—metonymical horses—literally does not heed the reins. Their situation, as Williams also suggests,[312] is not

---

[310] Lowenstam (1993), 39-40 and Reed (2007), 47-48, are primarily interested in this connection, while Clay (1988) 201, 203, and Putnam (1998), 45-46, note this important connection among other aspects. Putnam, *ibid*, points out that the only two uses of *impar* in the nominative refer to Troilus and Turnus and Reed, *Ibid,* further notes their shared youth and beauty, although this aspect is only part of the Troilus tradition not the ecphrasis, as we will see below.

[311] Lowenstam (1993), 39, among others, refers imprecisely to Troilus in the ecphrasis as "slain by Achilles."

[312] Williams (1960b), 148, "He has fallen out back-wards from his chariot, perhaps wounded, perhaps because one of his horses has been wounded and cannot be controlled. But he still grasps the reins, still tries to regain control...In this piece of the description Virgil is thinking partly perhaps of Soph. El. 746 f. and Eur. Hipp. 1236 f. (where the drivers are dragged behind their chariot)..." Sophocles wrote a lost play entitled *Troilus*, about which a Scholia to the *Iliad* "tells us that in this drama Troilus was ambushed while exercising his horses near the Thymbraion," (Gantz, 1993, 601), which recalls Hippolytus' exercising his horses and references to that activity in Euripides' *Hippolytus.*

unlike similar young princes of tragedy—Hippolytus or Orestes in Sophocles' *Electra*—whose death follows a chariot wreck and entanglement and dragging with reins. The literary tradition of Troilus' beauty could likewise be activated via his association with these youthful charioteers.[313] And it is also suggested in the concluding lines of this passage, whereby the inevitability of Troilus' death is also assured via the clear allusion to the mistreatment of Hector's corpse in the *Iliad* 22. 401-5.[314] After Achilles' horses first move forth:

> τοῦ δ' ἦν ἑλκομένοιο κονίσαλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
> κυάνεαι πίτναντο, κάρη δ' ἅπαν ἐν κονίῃσι
> κεῖτο πάρος χαρίεν..
> ὣς τοῦ μὲν κεκόνιτο κάρη ἅπαν
>
> And from Hector as he was dragged the dust rose up,
> and on either side his dark hair flowed outspread, and
> all in the dust lay the head that was formerly so fair...
> So was his head all befouled with dust;

The difficulty of imagining Troilus' position, how it is that he can be clinging to an empty chariot, hanging on to the reins and, yet, at the same time, have his neck and hair dragged along the ground,[315] contrasts completely with the certainty Homer has given his audience of how Hector came to be dragged ("the tendons of both his feet behind he pierced from heel to ankle," 396-97). Nevertheless, the description of Troilus, concluding with the narrowing of focus to his hair dragging along the ground and his spear inscribing the dust, surely evokes the horrible moment of the desecration of Hector's head, "formerly so fair." While Homer emphasizes the ignominy of the mistreatment of the corpse through the anaphora of dust (κονι- stem, 401, 402, 405), Vergil's movement from the tremendous physical upheaval of Troilus last moments to the point of his spear in the dust, suggests the direction of all Troy, specifically evoked via his name. Thus in the figure of Troilus, who clearly will die before he reaches the age of twenty, Vergil has woven a distinctive combinations of themes together, which both look forward in the

---

[313] Gantz (1993), 597, notes that in Ibykos' Polykrates poem Troilus' beauty was stressed (282a. 40-45 *PMG*) and "a line from an unnamed play of Phrynichos speak(s) of 'the light of love glowing on his reddening cheeks' (3 fr 13 Sn)."

[314] Williams (1960b), 148, in reference to *Il.* 401-3, remarks, "This is the source of Virgil's *huic cervixque comaeque trahuntur/ per terram."*

[315] Austin (1971), 476, "*haeret*: how? one hand apparently held a spear, the other the reins: he must have been entangled somehow in the reins; cf. *Hipp.* 1236 f."

Aeneid to the future death of other young men at the hands of older men in Latium—Pallas, Lausus and, especially, Turnus—and back to the savagery of Achilles, particularly toward Hector, in the *Iliad* and to the literary tradition of tragic young princes, who, as charioteers, are likewise dragged to their death. In this last aspect, Troilus like Penthesilea, who anticipates Camilla in the Latin catalogue, looks forward to the figure of Virbius.[316] But the strategy of this vivid momentary anticipation of the dragging of Hector in the Troilus scene, allows for a more general reference to the mistreatment of Hector's corpse in the next scene, which still emphasizes the cruelty of Achilles by means of the chariot, but expands the scene to include Hector's father Priam and Aeneas' most involved response to the ecphrasis.

Williams (1960 150) notes two ways in which Vergil departs from the Iliadic version of Hector's end in the first two lines of his passage in the ecphrasis (483-84) "in order to emphasize the cruelty of Achilles":

> Ter circum Iliacos raptaverat *Hectora* muros,
> exanimumque auro corpus vendebat *Achilles*.

While in the *Iliad* Achilles drags Hector's body around Patroclus' tomb (*Il.* 24. 14-16), Vergil adopts "the later even more disgraceful version" that he was dragged around the walls of Troy and, whereas in the *Iliad* Achilles treats Priam with compassion, here "he is coldly inhuman," as he is described selling Hector's body for gold. Nevertheless, the description is more succinct, surely in part, to incorporate Aeneas' strong emotional response to this scene—he "heaved a great groan from the bottom of his heart" (485)—as a means of intensifying the pathos and protracting the scene with the anaphora of *ut* enumerating each item Aeneas' eyes gaze upon: the spoils, the chariot, the very corpse of his friend, and, finally, simply Priam extending his unarmed hands (486-87). By distancing and generalizing the

[316] In this regard it is interesting that Troilus, like Penthesilea, was also supposed to have been loved by Achilles. In seven lines preserved from the third century play by Lykophron (307-13) we learn that Achilles had fallen in love with Troilos, who remained "unwounded" by the one he conquered. "The erotic motif occurs too in Servius (*Aen.* 1. 474), where Achilleus in his desire lures Troilos to him by offering doves; on trying to take them the boy is seized, and dies in Achilleus' embrace [how or why not said]"; Gantz, 1993, 601-2. The vivid descriptions in the passages of Troilus and Penthesilea are also the only two in the ecphrasis in which all the main verbs are present tense.

moment of Hector's maltreatment behind Achilles' chariot (*raptaverat*),[317] Vergil brings together father and son in a scene that is "the climax of Greek cruelty as well as of Trojan doom" (Williams, *ibid*) in the ecphrasis and grants Aeneas' a dominant focalizing presence.[318]

Thus in the ecphrasis of the Temple of Juno in Carthage, founded at the sign of a fierce horse, the savagery of Achilles is expressed with the chariot. Singled out in the first mention of the monument's decoration (*Atridas Priamumque et saevum ambobus Achillem*), its effects are evident in the opening general scene, in which he is the only individual named and he presses the Trojans with his chariot, also in Troilus' precarious final moments in his chariot, in the scene focused on Hector's corpse, which had already been dragged around the city three times, and, finally, his savagery is latent in the last two figures of the ecphrasis, whom the reader/audience know will die at Achilles' hands (Memnon and Penthesilea). The central three scenes of the ecphrasis—Troilus, the Trojan women, and Hector—contain the strongest portrayals of Troy's fated fall and the instrumentality of Achilles' fierceness and the chariot in that fall. The greater vividness and complexity of the description of Troilus, anticipates the importance of youthful charioteers in the second half of the *Aeneid*, at the same time the negative connection of Achilles with the chariot is strengthened. The most obvious development of Juno's chariot and arms at Carthage appears on the decorations of her temple, where her Iliadic favorite dominates the scenes with his chariot, a symbol of Trojan suffering.

---

[317] At the same time, this more subdued treatment of the dragging of Hector, insures that the power of his dramatic presentation in book 2 (270-79), when he appears to Aeneas as he sleeps during Troy's final night to tell him to leave Troy, will not be diluted. The description of his physical state "as he was formerly when dragged off by the chariot" (*raptatus bigis ut quondam*, 272)—black with bloody dust (*pulvere*, cf. *pulvus inscribitur*, 1. 478), straps piercing his swollen feet, filthy beard, hair matted with blood and bearing the many wounds he had received around his country's walls (*muros...patrios,* cf. *Iliacos...muros*, 1. 483)—draws forth a vivid emotional response from Aeneas (274-76, 285-86).

[318] By focalization I mean, as suggested by Fowler (1990), 42, simply that aspect of point of view that answers the question "who sees?" independent of whether a character speaks or not. Although the term is borrowed from narratology, like Fowler, I do not address here the other propositions of Dutch narratology ("the basic story/narrative division that [Mieke] Bal proposes").

Chariots in the Vergilian Underworld

Mortal Chariots

The most spectacular example of a charioteer in the Underworld is surely the delusional imitator of Jupiter, Salmoneus, the only individual mortal who is described being punished in Tartarus, as we have seen in Chapter 2, (pp. 66-68), is made especially memorable, despite his relative unfamiliarity among Underworld sinners, by the vivid description of his punishment by Jupiter. By contrast, the chariots of the Trojans in the Elysium fields are a source of enjoyment in a context that implies the value of their owners' heroism in the defense of Troy.

With the exception of Orpheus and Museus, traditional figures of the Underworld since their appearance in Socrates' imagined afterlife (*Apol.* 41a), all the occupants of the Elysian Fields in its initial description (638-665) are Trojan. This fact and their even more unexpected devotion to the care and enjoyment of the instruments of war—arms, chariots and horses—form the center (648-55) of the passage:

> hic genus antiquum Teucri, pulcherrima proles,
> magnanimi heroes nati melioribus annis,
> Ilusque Assaracusque et Troiae Dardanus auctor.
> arma procul currusque virum miratur inanis;
> stant terra defixae hastae passimque soluti
> per campum pascuntur equi. quae gratia currum
> armorumque fuit vivis, quae cura nitentis
> pascere equos, eadem sequitur tellure repostos.
>
> Here is the ancient race of Teucer, a people most fair,
> great-hearted heroes, born in better times,
> Ilus and Assaracus and Dardanus, Troy's founder.
> Aeneas wonders at their arms and empty chariots, a little way off;
> Their spears stand fixed in the ground and the horses unyoked
> graze throughout the plain. The pleasure they had
> in chariots and arms while living, the care they took to feed
> their shining horses, followed them below the earth.

The idea of the extension of earthly pleasures into the afterlife was a common ancient thought. More common are the enjoyment of athletics, depicted in the Etruscan wall paintings (Austin, 1977, 642f) and implicit in the Pindar's poems that ask that news of sons' victories be taken to gladden the hearts of their fathers in the Underworld (*Ol.* 8. 77, 81; *Nem.* 4. 88) and the example of Cimon, who had his winning

team of four mares buried across the road from his tomb (*Hdt.* 6. 103).[319] Athletics, in fact, are the first activities described here in the *Aeneid* ("Some are at exercise on the grassy wrestling ground, some contend on the yellow sand," 642-43), which is followed by those singing and dancing to the accompaniment of Orpheus' lyre (644-46). But the double expression of weapons, chariots and horses (Austin, *Sextus,* 654) gives considerable weight to the pleasure (also voiced twice *gratia, cura*) that these implements of war provide. The other activities are also an extension of earthly pleasure, but the instruments of war are the locus for the expression of this principle. Likewise, the close association of the famous Trojans (648-50) immediately preceding this section suggests a particular relevance to them of the weapons, chariots and horses. It is noteworthy that in the initial statement all three are specifically "disengaged" (*currus...inanis, defixae hastae, soluti...*equi), suggesting peace, nevertheless, the juxtaposition and reiteration of these three as sources of enjoyment is disquieting. In this Underworld setting not only the Trojan reputation for equine preeminence is honored,[320] but also their reputation as heroic warriors, which implicitly has won them their place here in Elysium (*hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi*, 660). The chariots' prominent representation certainly is a reminder of their use in the Trojan War, but the hopelessness of the Trojan cause (and charioteers) has already been "visually" elaborated in the scene of Troilus' demise on the temple of Juno as well as in the ecphrasis as a whole and in both cases (Troilus and here in the Underworld) the chariots' usefulness on earth is a thing of the past. Nevertheless, the Trojan chariots in Elysium represent a strong positive contrast with the Salmoneus' sacrilegious ride through the Greek cities.

---

[319] Note too Socrates' depiction of the just receiving their rewards after death at the end of the *Republic* 10. 621b as "victors in games collecting prizes."

[320] Jones (1970), 244, who cites the excavation reports of Blegen, argues that from the time of the first level of Troy VI (c. 1800), the Trojans were masters of the horse and horse breeding was the primary industry of the Troad. The Trojan equine preeminence is obvious in the *Iliad.* Ἱπποδάμυς is an epithet conferred on nine individual heroes and, while some are Greeks, when entire peoples are considered, only the Trojans are ἱπποδάμοι, their commonest epithet (applied in 19 passages, Jones, 244). Likewise, the adjective ἔυπολος "having fine foals" belongs only to Ilium.

Why Mummius?

Like the statues of *summi viri* in Augustus Forum, with which the parade of heroes in the *Aeneid* is sometimes compared, the majority of the heroes whom Anchises shows Aeneas celebrated triumphs.[321] Nevertheless, L. Mummius, sacker of Corinth in 146 (6. 836-37) is the only hero so described. Among so many worthy candidates, why is the triumph of only this man mentioned? To be sure the structure of the parade which supports its major themes—foundational moments and threats to the state's stability—play a part in the reduced presence of triumphs.

The order granted the one hundred and twenty-eight lines of the succession of heroes is neither chronological nor honorific; in fact, many are only named (Capys, Numitor, the Decii, Drusii, great Cato, Cossus) and even some of the most famous are given only a few words (Torquatus, Camillus, the Gracchi, and the Scipios). Instead, after beginning chronologically with Aeneas' son, Silvius, and kings of Alba Longa, an eleven-line section devoted to Romulus and Rome (777-87) is followed by an eighteen-line section on Augustus (788-805), emphatically breaking the chronology to suggest his role as a new Romulus. Anchises' narrative continues to alternate between rapid reviews and individuals he dwells on longer and more emotionally, namely, the first consul Brutus—a wrenching account of conflicting claims of *pietas* (7 lines, 817-23), Caesar and Pompey—asked not to turn their force against vitals of the fatherland (10 lines, 826-35), the climactic section devoted to the recently deceased son of Octavia and Augustus' expected heir, Marcellus (27, 860-86), and his ancestor, the Punic war hero M. Claudius Marcellus, consul in 222 (855-59, a combined 32 lines). Nevertheless, Mummius' importance as a *triumphator*, while greater, perhaps, than some of the other *summi viri*, surely could not be any greater than those of the Scipios, and pales beside the excesses of Pompey and Caesar's triumphs (see Chapter 1), obviously avoided in the context of Anchises' strong denunciation of their civil war (827-35).

[321] See Ch. 1, p. 78-79, on the *summi viri.* The majority of the men who appear are listed in the *Fasti Capitolini* (Degrassi, 1954) or, due to lacunae in the list, are known to have triumphed from other sources, the exceptions being Numa and Brutus.

There is only one context in which Mummius' triumph is more important than any other Roman triumph: in the eyes of a Trojan. Mummius' triumph is presented in precisely these terms, as a resolution of the Trojan War (6. 836-37):

> ille triumphata Capitolia ad alta Corintho
> victor aget currum caesis insignis Achivis.
>
> This man, having triumphed over Corinth and
> honored for the Achaeans he has killed,
> for this victory will drive his chariot to the lofty Capital.

Neither the name of Mummius appears nor, more understandably is any reference to the spoils in his especially lavish triumphant procession included (Austin, 1977, 836). Rather, the encapsulated description of the Mummius' triumph suggests by the mere use of the Homeric word Achaeans (*Achivis*, 837), prominent in the second line of the *Iliad* (Ἀχαιοῖς) and throughout to refer to the Greeks,[322] that restitution has finally been won for the defeat suffered by the Romans' ancestors at Troy. The subsequent lines alluding to the victory of L. Aemilius Paullus over Perseus in 168 more clearly reveal the archaizing of a relatively recent Roman victory (838-40):

> eruet ille Argos Agamemnoniasque Mycenas
> ipsumque Aeaciden, genus armipotentis Achilli,
> ultus auos Troiae templa et temerata Mineruae. 840
>
> (Aemilius) will overturn Argos and Agamemnonian Mycenae
> and Aeacus (Perseus) himself, descendant of Achilles powerful in arms,
> having avenged the fathers of Troy and the violated temple of Minerva.

Argos and Mycenae are used for "Greece" in general, the actual battle having taken place in Macedon at Pydna (Austin, 1977, 838), but with the effect of representing Aemilius' victory, like Mummius', as a redress of the imbalance created by Troy's defeat. The ponderous adjective *Agamemnoniasque* (838), the reference to Achilles, Troy and the violated temple of Minerva recall earlier references in book 1 to these aspects of the war, especially in Jupiter's assurance to Venus that a time will come when Rome (the house

[322] Originally the term referred to a tribe from the northern Peleponnesus, but like the term Danaans (from Danaus, founder of Argos) in the *Iliad* was used to refer to the Greek side in general (cf. *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli*, 1. 30).

of Assaracus, grandfather of Anchises) will crush Pythia, Mycenae and Argos (1. 283-85).[323] The lines devoted to conquests in Greece are noteworthy as a unit for their relative length (5 lines), expression in Homeric terms and suppression of both Roman generals' names, giving the section greater ideological impact and less individual heroic praise of the generals. But in a sense Mummius' chariot, the only one driven in the parade of heroes, is also, like the chariots of the Trojans in Elysium, made into a thing of the past, as he celebrates an antiquated Trojan version of a triumph.[324]

Divine Chariots

The chariots of the two gods in the parade, Cybele and Bacchus, are remote in belonging to immortals and occur within similes, but are nonetheless of great thematic importance: Rome is compared to Cybele, and Augustus to Bacchus. A strong Trojan cast develops in the description of Romulus, which expands to include an excursus on the city he founded (777-787):

> quin et auo comitem sese Mauortius addet
> Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater
> educet. viden, ut geminae stant vertice cristae
> et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?
> en huius, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma
> imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo,
> septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces,
> felix prole virum: qualis Berecyntia mater
> invehitur curru Phrygias turrita per urbes
> laeta deum partu, centum complexa nepotes,
> omnis caelicolas, omnis supera alta tenentis.
>
> Then a son of Mars will join his grandfather—
> Romulus, born to Ilia from the line of Assaracus.
> Do you see how a double crest stands on his head,
> and the Father of Gods already honors him
> As one of his own? Under his auspices,
> my son, Rome will become renowned for its empire
> among the lands and her spirit will rise to Olympus.

[323] Williams, 1972, 840; Austin, 1977, 840: the violation of Minerva's temple refers to that by Ajax, son of Oileus, who violated Cassandra there, noted at *Aen*. 1. 41; 2. 403.

[324] Mummius' feat also participates in the minimalizing of the triumph that is associated with Augustus. As we have seen in Chapter 2 (pp. 78-79), after celebrating his triple triumph in 29, Augustus refused triumphs, when he had the opportunity to celebrate more, perhaps to avoid the excess associated with tyrants, but, at the same time, he also denied triumphs to others to insure his power. Martino (2008, 423-24) has argued that a similarly motivated suppression of *spolia opima* by Augustus is reflected in its restriction in book 6 to only one of the three who had received this exceptional honor, M.Claudius Marcellus, the ancestor of Augustus' nephew, with whom the parade dramatically concludes.

> She will enclose seven hills together within her wall
> and will be fruitful in her offspring of men
> As the Berecynthian Mother
> Is blessed with her brood of gods, riding
> In her chariot through Phrygian towns,
> Wearing her turreted crown, and embracing
> A hundred grandsons, all of them gods,
> All of them dwelling in the heavenly halls.

Romulus' divine father Mars is invoked in the first line, but his mother's (Rhea Silvia) Trojan derivation is doubly emphasized in the second by the Trojan form of her name and her descent from Assaracus. From Romulus' marks of distinction from the father of the gods (779-80) the narrative moves quickly to Rome, which is compared to the mother of the gods, Cybele, a comparison Austin (1977, 784 ff) characterizes as "bold and even startling."[325] Anchises attributes Rome's renown to the extent of its rule (*imperium terris*, 782), loftiness of its spirit (*animos aequabit Olympo*, 782), size and strength of the city itself (783) and its good fortune in the men she has produced (*felix prole virum*, 784). The most apparent relevance of Cybele to Anchises' Rome is in her offspring: *laeta deum virum,* who are emphatically gods (repeated in a *tricolons*) and, like Rome's offspring, are abundant (*centum complexa nepotes*, 786). The placement of this simile between the presentation of Romulus and Augustus, whom some senators wanted to take the name Romulus instead of Augustus,[326] clearly "reminds readers that some of these men...have become or are destined to become gods" (Nauta, 2005, 111). But the comparison also imbues Rome with a distinctly Trojan antiquity since Cybele's worship was imported to Rome from Mt. Ida in the Troad (Berecynthus, [784] another Phrygian mountain with a cult site) and her divinity has been and, in later books of the *Aeneid,* will be even more closely tied with Aeneas and the Trojans. Aeneas was born on Mt. Ida (*Il*. 2. 820-21, *Theog.* 1010), and we have seen him withdraw after Troy to Mt. Ida, where he and the Trojans build their fleet (3. 5-6), which Cybele herself later will reveal to have been made of trees

---

[325] Cybele is more commonly referred to as the Magna Mater in Latin or *Mater Deum Magna Idaea,* "the Idean Great Mother of the gods." Her name first appears in Phrygian inscriptions of the 7th century where she is addressed as *Matar*, Phrygian for "mother." In two instances among the early inscriptions there is an accompanying adjective, *kubileya* (Cybele), "a word that appears to have meant 'of the mountain' (or it could be the name of a particular mountain) in the Phrygian language" (Roller, 1999, 2). While as Cybele the goddess occurs widely in poetry, "it is never used in religious texts such as hymns and votive dedications," in which she is simply "the Mother" (Roller, *ibid*).

[326] Austin, 1977, 788ff; Suetonius *Aug.* 7. 2.

from her sacred grove (9. 85-89). But Cybele's crown and chariot activate further connections between goddess and city.

Cybele, like Aeneas, also made a journey from Troy to Rome, her statue and cult arriving in the midst of the Second Punic War (204). The transfer was prompted by a passage in the Sibylline Books prophesying that the foreign enemy (i.e., Hannibal) would be driven from Italy if the Idaean Mother were brought to Rome (Livy 29. 10. 4). The consequences of her arrival and Hannibal's subsequent exit to Africa in 203 and defeat in the following year, were that Cybele became a victory-bearing goddess,[327] a temple was dedicated to her on the Palatine near the ancient hut of Romulus[328] and a major festival was established in her honor called the *Megalesia,* which included sacrifices, banquets, theatrical performances, chariot races and a public procession in which the statue of the *Magna Mater* (Cybele) was carried through the streets of the city in a chair all, according to Cicero, *maxime casti, sollemnes, religiosi* (*Har. Resp.* 24).

Vergil develops Cybele's political and contemporary importance by integrating her presentation with that of Augustus. The placement of the Cybele simile in Vergil's text between the passages concerning Romulus and Augustus actually reproduces the relative positions of Romulus' hut, Cybele's temple, and Augustus' house on the Palatine (Wiseman, 127-8; Wilhelm, "Cybele," 93).[329] Augustus not only built his house next to her temple, which he rebuilt after it was destroyed by fire in 3 A. D. (Nauta, 2005, 111), but he lived within the precinct of the small temple of Victory, Cybele's first home before her

---

[327] Wilhelm, (1988), 83-84, documents the numismatic evidence for this in the late Republic, the most famous example of which is the denarius of 100 to commemorate the aid of Magna Mater to Marius in defeating the Cimbri and Teutones. Cybele's mural crown, variously interpreted, is associated with victory by Lucretius 2. 606-07: "They have surrounded the top of her head with a mural crown, because embattled in excellent positions she sustains cities." Austin (1977), 785, implies that Cybele's turreted crown, became that of the *dea Roma*, but the mural crown was a common attribute of city goddesses and of other divinities such as Tyche.

[328] On April 10th, 191 by Marcus Junius Brutus. See Wilhelm (1988), 81 and note 16.

[329] Magna Mater's cultic importance for Augustus is also reflected in cameos and sculpture in which Livia is represented with attributes of the goddess. Wilhelm (1988), 93-95, discusses several examples including the Malibu Statue of Cybele (pl. 2-4), concerning which see Bieber (1968), *passim*, who argues for an Antoinine date for the statue (8-17), and below Chapter 6. However, Wilhelm's identification of Livia as Cybele on the *Gemma Augustea,* while possible, is uncertain. The figure is in the position of a victory holding a laurel crown above Augustus' head and is generally interpreted as Oecumene, the personification of global empire (Galinsky, 1996, 120).

own temple was built (Wilhelm, "Cybele," 93; Livy 29. 14. 13). Thus the incorporation of the simile comparing Cybele to Rome, in addition to acknowledging Rome's Trojan ancestry, suggesting the divine nature of Rome's offspring and the rapid expansion of Rome's empire, localizes the goddess's solemn cult worship in Rome and even more narrowly on the Palatine between Rome's deified first founder and the soon to be divine second founder. Further, Vergil represents Cybele's chariot, like Neptune's aquatic chariot, as closely associated with Rome and Augustus and like Neptune's chariot her's too will become an analogous emblem (implying the reciprocal nature of chariot and ship), as we will see in book 9 and 10 where her lions appear as figureheads on Aeneas' ship.

The yoked lions that traditionally draw Cybele's chariot and the tigers of Bacchus to whom Augustus is compared, are symbols of the civilizing power of these two gods, yet another means of relating Cybele and Augustus. Both Ovid (*Fasti* 4. 215-18) and Lucretius (2. 604-5; "They have yoked wild beasts, because any offspring however wild ought to be soften and vanquished by the guidance of the parents") represent Cybele's lion-drawn chariot as civilizing and Austin (1977, 785) suggests it, despite the suppression of the lions here. Just such a use of a chariot in a simile, driven by Liber (Bacchus) and pulled by tigers (*qui pampieneis victor iuga flectit habenis / Liber, agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris,* 804-5), occurs at the conclusion of the Augustus passage, following closely upon and clearly related to the Cybele simile. As part of a double simile with Hercules (801-03), who brings peace to the places where he has killed beasts, Liber's tiger-drawn chariot, like Cybele's chariot, emphasizes both the extent of Augustus' rule and its civilizing influence.[330]

And so the moral dichotomy apparent in the chariots of Juno and Neptune recurs in the chariots of the Underworld, but transformed in its expression, for the chariots of mortals are the chief conveyors of morally opposing valence and with slightly altered significance: they are symbols of arrogant hubris or nostalgic Trojan *pietas*. Salmoneus in Tartarus arrogantly drives his chariot in an attempt, like those of the Titans and the Giants, to usurp Jupiter's power, an arguably more heinous crime than Achilles'

[330] Williams (1972), 804-5: "The yoking of tigers suggests the power of civilization over wild nature (cf. Hor. *Odes* 3. 3. 13f)."

excessive brutality, especially when linked to the divine archetypes of this sin. In Elysium the chariots of the Trojans become a source of continuing pleasure in the afterlife, along with their weapons and horses, which are represented as possessing inherent value because of their use in the protection of the fatherland. Thus, the Trojan chariot of Troilus and Hector represented on Juno's temple as the site of loss and victimhood, in the Underworld receives honor, but is also distanced through its linking with the older generations of Ilus, Assaracus and Dardanus. A similar distancing moves the triumph of Lucius Mummius, the only charioteer in the parade of Roman heroes and one whose presentation is rich in Roman triumphal diction (*triumphata Capitolia...victor aget currum*, 836-7), back into the world of the Trojan War, as his name is suppressed and his victory, like those of Aemilius Pallus, next in the parade, is turned into a conclusive victory in that war. Even Augustus, whose tremendous expansion of the Roman empire was accomplished militarily, only is indirectly credited with victory, via his divine analogue, *Liber victor*, whose chariot, like Neptune's which calms the savagery of the sea, constrains wild tigers to his yoke (*iuga flectit habenis,* 804) and thus brings civilization to the extensive lands he traverses.

Cybele's location on the western end of the Palatine hill between the house of Augustus and the hut of Romulus, echoed in her placement in the parade of heroes, expresses her significance in the history of Rome and her current importance for Augustus. At the same time her Trojan heritage (*Berecyntia, Phrygias*) is a reminder of her origins and trip from the Troad to Rome in the dark days of war, mirroring Aeneas's trip, which was followed by her integration into the major Roman divinities and the honor of a major festival. Neptune's role as supporter of the Trojans is concentrated in the first half of the *Aeneid*, with the exception of his guiding of their ships beyond Circe's shores (7. 23-24). In a sense Cybele takes over Neptune's role in the second half of the *Aeneid* as an expression of the analogous nature of chariot and ship, as well as that of Trojan protector. Juno for her part in the second half will find a new Achilles in the person of Turnus, whose chariot will also becomes an instrument of brutal slaughter (12. 328-30).

The Ship Race and Communal *Pietas*

As Neptune's calming of Juno's storm that assails the Trojan fleet in book 1 presents his aquatic chariot as both the means of establishing order and an emblem of the analogous nature of ship and chariot,

the ship race in book 5 provides the conceptual basis of and an important explanation for Vergil's symbolic use of the ship of state in the *Aeneid*. The race takes place shortly before Aeneas loses his helmsman Palinurus, which prompts him to take the helm for the final leg of their ocean transit and all subsequent voyages of the flagship. The exploration of the motivation for the inclusion of Palinurus as a model helmsman, as seen in piloting episodes in book 3, and for his subsequent sacrifice, as his death is clearly represented, a topic which has stirred much interest, will follow upon the study of the ship race, which will provide the necessary context.

The choice of a chariot race for the first and by far the longest of the competitions in the funeral games for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23, evolves naturally from the chariot's use in the immediately preceding funeral. Achilles specifically associates the race both with himself and with his beloved friend in his speech introducing the games (*Il.* 23. 274-82), as he assures the Achaeans that, were he to participate, he, Achilles, would win the race due to his divine horses, but that he and his horses will stay by the side "such is the high glory of the charioteer they have lost." The horses mourning for Patroclus are then described, as they had been more elaborately in book 17 (426-55). By contrast, the ship is the unifying motif in *Aeneid* 5, in which the funeral games for Aeneas' father Anchises are celebrated, and therefore also draws upon the *Argonautica* as an important intertext.[331] The book both begins and ends with Aeneas and his helmsman Palinurus on board ship in the final stages of their seven year long journey to Hesperia, features a ship race as the first and longest race in the funeral games for Anchises, and focuses on ships consumed by fire as the overt manifestation of the crisis in the Trojan community. And so, although Vergil alludes frequently to the funeral games of Patroclus throughout those for Anchises, this major divergence—from chariot race to ship race—would appear to be purposefully integrated into the structure of the whole. I will suggest that this change of vehicles represents a symbolic shift away from

[331] Nelis (2001), 216, notes the important structural relationship between the Argonauts' voyage from Pagase to Colchis and home again with the Trojans' departure from Troy to the double "turning post" of Carthage and Sicily and back "home" to Italy (original land of their founder Dardanus). Nelis, 210, argues that "the naval contest functions as a microcosm of both the entire *Argonautica* and of the first half of the *Aeneid*" and that the variation from chariot to ship race facilitates this link. The Trojans' journey from Sicily past the Sirens to Latium passes through the same place that Jason and Medea do, but in reverse order (189-90).

the *kleos* driven Homeric hero toward a leader in charge of a joint project, placing the collective ahead of himself.

As many have noted,[332] Vergil maintains a shadow trace of the chariot race in the narrative of the ship race. The prizes for the ship race are placed before the spectators' eyes *circo…in medio* (109-110; the *circus* is both the place for and, eventually, the name of the chariot races). The rock that Aeneas chooses to mark the turning point for the ships is referred to frequently in the narrative as the *meta*, the turning post for the chariot races. But the most overt reference to chariot races is the simile opening the ship race in which the initial shouting and action of the sailors and their ships churning the water are compared to chariots streaming from the starting gates and charioteers shaking the reins (*Aen.* 5.139-47):

> non tam praecipites biiugo certamine campum
> corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus,
> nec sic immissis aurigae undantia lora
> concussere iugis pronique in verbera pendent.
>
> Not so headlong do chariots sweep across the field in a race
> For paired teams, and rush pouring out of the starting gate.
> Nor do charioteers shake the waving reins so, when the teams are
> Let loose and they hang forward over them with the whip.

The simile alludes to the first four lines of the *Iliad*'s chariot race (23. 362-65), which likewise emphasizes the speed of the competitors, as the preceding narrative describing the ships does not (140-143), and the charioteers' use of the whip and shaking of the reins. Other aspects of the Iliadic narrative occur in the description of the sailors' eagerness (138; cf. *Il.* 370-71). Although the distinctive Latin word for the starting gates (*carcere*) insinuates the Roman racecourse into the simile, the importance of the major intertext of the *Iliad*'s chariot race is clearly signaled. The simile is also a reminder of the

---

[332] Chief among whom is Feldherr (1995): 246-47, who goes so far as to assert: "These narrative choices add up to an attempt not just to allude to the contemporary circus *but to refashion the events described as circus spectacles* both for the Trojan and Sicilian spectators and for the poet's audience" (my italics). While there is clearly no doubt that chariot races, both that in the *Iliad* and those of contemporary Rome, are important intertextual aspects of the ship race, neither the ancient history of horse racing in Rome, nor Augustus' improvements to the Circus Maximus, many of which Feldherr cites occurred after Vergil's death (obelisk 10bc), can turn the ship race into a chariot race. R. Dunkle (2005), 153-78, discusses the Iliadic texts for all the events and also delineates the representation of Aeneas' voyage in book 3 (from 362 onward) as a chariot race for which Helenus promises him a victory (439-40); among the valuable contributions Briggs (1975), 275, makes to the literature on the ship race is the distinctive nature of Augustus' sponsorship of ship races at this time: two honoring the victory at Actium, the *Ludi Actiaci* at Rome in 28 and the *Aktia* at Nikopolis. He concludes (276): "It is significant that the only naval race we know of from this time was given by Augustus at these games."

comparability of chariot and ship indirectly but prominently evident in Neptune's sea-chariot, but first suggested by Nestor as he advices his son Antilochus before the chariot race (*Il.* 23.313-18): "It is by skill that the sea captain holds his rapid ship on its course…by skill charioteer out passes charioteer." Is this suggested interchangeability of chariot and ship at the heart of Vergil's selection of ship race over chariot race—traveling by ship, chariotless, it was the expedient option or is this related to a developing of distinction between the symbolic connotations of ship and chariot? When the drama of the ship race is compared to the narrative of Homer's chariot race, it will become clear that the change of vehicle relates to distinctions made between charioteer and helmsman that have political implications.

The winner in the Iliadic chariot race is determined early, as the narrative jumps from the beginning of the race to "the last of the race-course back" (373-74), when the gods intercede in the action. Apollo, angry at Diomedes, who is about to take the lead from his favorite, Eumelos, dashes Diomedes' whip from his hand and Athena in retaliation smashes the chariot yoke of Eumelos, who is thrown from the chariot and out of the race (382-97). In this relatively brief exchange, Diomedes takes the lead that he never gives up. The result is that the drama develops around Antilochus, both with his father Nestor before the race, who counsels him to drive skillfully close to the turning-post and slip by an opponent (306-48), during the race in his speech goading his horses on to greater speed and his edging out of Menelaus in a narrow part of the road to win second place (402-41), and at the end of the race in his complaints about the prizes (539-62), in Menelaus' challenge to his integrity (566-95), and even in Nestor's speech closing the narrative in ring fashion (624-50).

This focus on the single warrior, his skill and his prizes, finds no place in Vergil's narrative of the ship race.[333] Rather, the ship race is both more complex in its narrative—the lead changes three times—more diverse in characters, and more expansive in time and space. As the captains and their ships are presented, Rome and specific future Roman families are engaged—the Memmii, Sergii and Cluentii (116-23). The one ship for which no future family is identified (the Chiamera) alludes to Rome more indirectly

[333] A similar debate about the prizes, however, does occur at the end of the footrace (340-61).

by its bulk: it is *urbis opus* (119), "the size of a city."[334] While these allusions engage the future mission the Trojans are drawing closer to initiating, they also emphasize the collective nature of the participants; this is a team sport, the only sport event in an epic that involves teams, not individuals (Briggs, 269).[335] The negotiation of the turning point is used as a means to differentiate the leadership and character of the captains and one of the pilots and their actions elicit frequent and varied response from the spectators, who are expanded from the Trojans to include the surrounding peoples.[336] Their collective responses engage the surrounding hills (148-50; cf. 181-82, 227-28). Why this emphasis on the collective and what do ships have to do with it? In the very center of the ship race the impassioned speech of the captain Mnestheus to his crew, by an overt allusion to its analogue in the *Iliad,* reveals an answer.

The similar circumstances and content of the speeches of Antilochus and Mnestheus draw attention to Vergil's allusion (*Il.* 23. 403-16; *Aen.* 5. 189-200). Both are in third place and see no chance of winning. Nevertheless, they ask for speed from their respective teams to avoid the disgrace of being last.[337] However, a closer look at their motivating strategies reveals considerable difference.

Antilochus attempts to motivate through mocking shame and by inspiring in his team both fear of death and confidence in his ability as a charioteer to utilize their efforts:

> ἔμβητον καὶ σφῶϊ: τιταίνετον ὅττι τάχιστα.
> ἤτοι μὲν κείνοισιν ἐριζέμεν οὔ τι κελεύω 405
> Τυδεΐδεω ἵπποισι δαΐφρονος, οἷσιν Ἀθήνη
> νῦν ὤρεξε τάχος καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ κῦδος ἔθηκεν:
> ἵππους δ᾽ Ἀτρεΐδαο κιχάνετε, μὴ δὲ λίπησθον,

---

[334] Paschalis (1997), 30-31, demonstrates how the semantic units of Ship and City merge during the voyage of the Trojans to Italy, "...partly because Aeneas' ship carries the Penates, the embodiment of innermost, sacred City-Space." In addition to Juno's description of the Trojans as "carrying Ilium to Italy" (1. 68), Tiberinus welcomes Aeneas as the man who has brought back to Italy in his ships the city of Troy (8. 36-37). *Ilioneus* merges City and Ship (Ἴλιον + ναῦς).

[335] Dunkle (2005), 160, n. 37, too, stresses the importance of teamwork in the ship race.

[336] While Williams (1960a), 133, maintains that, "Each ship has its captain, its helmsman (*rector*, 161), and its rowers," only Gyas' helmsman, Menoetes, is mentioned, and while he plays a significant role (161-82, see below), the impression that the captains (*ductores*) are the helmsmen is almost inescapable, because they frequently are described as the executors of the ships' actions (ex. *Mnestheus agit...Pristim*, 116; *spatioque subit Sergestus iniquo*, 203; *ratem Sergestus agebat*, 272). Cf. Dunkle (2005), 163, Sergestus "who seems to be piloting his own ship..."

[337] Dunkle (2005), 162, notes the basis of Mnestheus' speech on Antilochus, but characterizes the difference as lying in the greater seriousness of Mnestheus' speech, which shows that the "games are tests of character with serious consequences for the future." He also contrasts Antilochus' behavior with that of Cloanthus, see below, n. 380.

καρπαλίμως, μὴ σφῶϊν ἐλεγχείην καταχεύῃ
Αἴθη θῆλυς ἐοῦσα: τί ἢ λείπεσθε φέριστοι; 410
ὧδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, καὶ μὴν τετελεσμένον ἔσται:
οὐ σφῶϊν κομιδὴ παρὰ Νέστορι ποιμένι λαῶν
ἔσσεται, αὐτίκα δ᾽ ὔμμε κατακτενεῖ ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
αἵ κ᾽ ἀποκηδήσαντε φερώμεθα χεῖρον ἄεθλον.
ἀλλ᾽ ἐφομαρτεῖτον καὶ σπεύδετον ὅττι τάχιστα: 415
ταῦτα δ᾽ ἐγὼν αὐτὸς τεχνήσομαι ἠδὲ νοήσω
στεινωπῷ ἐν ὁδῷ παραδύμεναι, οὐδέ με λήσει.

"Get moving now, you two as well; strain to your utmost speed. With those steeds, though, I do not order you to strive, with the horses of battle-minded Tydeus to which Athene has now given speed and granted glory to himself. But the horses of the son of Atreus overtake quickly, and be not outstripped by them, lest shame be shed on you by Aethe who is but a mare. Why are you outstripped, good steeds? For thus will I speak out, and surely it will come to pass: no provisions will there be for you two with Nestor, the shepherd of men, but at once he will slay you with the sharp sword, if through your heedlessness we win but a lesser prize. But come along and hurry as fast as you can, and this will I myself contrive and plan, that we slip past them in the narrow road; it will not escape me."

After assuring his horses that he doesn't expect them to contend with the doubly divinely-endowed team of Diomedes (taken from Aeneas in battle, 5. 319-28), he says, "but the horses of the son of Atreus (Menelaus) overtake quickly, and be not outstripped by them, lest shame be shed on you by Aethe who is but a mare"(404-6). Then, perhaps because this tactic failed ("Why are you outstripped, good steeds?"409), Antilochus adds a harsh threat: "For thus will I speak out, and surely it will come to pass, no provisions will there be for you two with Nestor…but at once he will slaughter you out with the sharp sword, if through your heedlessness we win but a lesser prize" (410-13).[338] For his part, Antilochus assures his team, he (ἐγὼν αὐτός) being the brains of the outfit, "will contrive and plan, that we slip past them in the narrow road. He (it) will not escape me" (415-16). The horses appear to respond only to the threat: "seized with fear by the rebuke of their master, they ran more quickly on," but only "for a little time (ὀλίγον χρόνον, 418)." In the end, whether following his father Nestor's advice to use 'skill' or not is

[338] Dunkle (2005), 162, n. 42, cites these words as an example of the "comic overtones" of Antilochus' speech, but the high level of equine human interactions in the *Iliad* (for example, Achilles' dialogue with his horse Xanthus at the end of book 19), I believe undermines this interpretation.

debated,[339] Antilochus soon sees a narrow place in the road where Menelaus is driving his team and squeezes in front of him, applying the goad as Menelaus shouts abuse at him.

Antilochus' counterpart in the *Aeneid*, Mnestheus, vying to move out of last place, uses a different approach in motivating his team of rowers (5.189-200):

> hortatur Mnestheus: 'nunc, nunc insurgite remis,
> *Hectorei socii*, Troiae quos sorte suprema
> *delegi comites*; nunc illas promite viris,
> nunc animos, quibus in Gaetulis Syrtibus usi
> Ionioque mari Maleaeque sequacibus undis.
> *non* iam prima peto *Mnestheus neque* vincere certo
> (quamquam o!—sed superent quibus hoc, *Neptune*, dedisti);
> extremos pudeat rediisse: hoc uincite, *cives*,
> et prohibete nefas.' olli certamine summo
> procumbunt: vastis tremit ictibus aerea puppis
> subtrahiturque solum, tum creber anhelitus artus
> aridaque ora quatit, sudor fluit undique rivis.
>
> Mnestheus exhorts: "Lean on those oars, men!
> Comrades of Hector, men I handpicked
> For Troy's last stand—show me the strength,
> The spirit you had in the shoals off Carthage,
> In the Ionian Sea and Cape Malea's currents!
> We can't win this race, we're not shooting for first,
> (If only!—but Neptune decides the winners)
> But coming in last is a total disgrace. Your victory, citizens,
> Is not to let that happen!" And they fell on the oars
> With a supreme effort. The bronze-beaked ship
> Shivered under their strokes, and the sea
> Slipped away beneath them as they panted for breath,
> Mouths dry, sweat pouring down their bodies in rivers.

He restricts the request for speed to the powerful first command—*nunc, nunc insurgite remis* (189) (compare Antilochus at 403, 409, 414)—and eliminates any specific reference to other competitors (compare Antilochus lines 404-409), associating shame only with being last *extremos* (196). But of

[339] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 12, call Antilochus' manoeuvre "more or less a cheat," but maintain that he was "following the advice of his father." See also Roisman (1988), 117: "It seems that Antilochus did not pass Menelaus all that fairly, but rather closed in on him enough to force him to move out of the way and let him go by;" and N. R Richardson (1993), 418-24, "it is clear from the sequel that Antilochus is engaging in dangerous and unfair tactics, even if he never quite admits that he is guilty." Himmelhoch (1997), 138-58 with bibliography, argues that Antilochus' chariot ride constitutes a successful coming of age ceremony in which he follows Nestor's advice and in his first public speech in the defense of his second place finish cleverly assuages Menelaus' anger and is able to keep his prize too. Although this is certainly a plausible reading, I am arguing that this is not the reading that Vergil's engagement with the text of the *Iliad* supports.

greater interest, in place of Antilochus' four lines of fear producing threats (410-413), Mnestheus appeals to the collective heroic past he shares with his men in four lines (190-93): allies of Hector and chosen as comrades by Mnestheus they fought in the final hours at Troy, a point forcefully expressed in the first two words of consecutive lines: *Hectorei socii / delegi comites* (allies and comrades, 190-91). Mnestheus reminds his crew of their proven performance, pointing to both the physical (*viris*) and mental (*animos*) strength they showed in the most challenging waters they navigated (191-93). But by far the most important differences between these two speeches are found at the end, where the quality of *pietas* is most evident in Mnestheus' speech. In contrast to Antilochus' self-confident assertion of his own ability to contrive and plan the means to accomplish his goal, Mnestheus struggles to negate his personal hopes, nearly eliding himself in the middle of line 194 between two negatives—*non iam prima peto Mnestheus neque vincere certo*. Despite this realistic assessment of his ship's chances of winning, in a parenthetical aside, Mnestheus reveals his fighter's spirit implying in the aposeopesis (*quamquam o!*—) "O, if only it might be granted to us to win." Quickly realizing that the circumstances don't call for speculation, he represses his personal wishes and piously prays: "Let those win to whom you, Neptune, have granted it." In his concluding entreaty to his crew to avoid the ignominy of last place, Mnestheus calls his men *cives* (196), literally "citizens," not a familiar word in this context, nor strictly accurate. But we have seen already that the ship race has been closely connected with the future Roman city and Mnestheus' speech from the beginning has emphasized the collective experience he has shared with his men in Troy and on board ship. Saved for the end, Mnestheus uses their collective role, yet to be regained, as the ultimate motivator of action. The effectiveness of his speech is immediately evident in the "supreme effort" of his crew with attendant panting and rivers of sweat (197-200). Mnestheus' ship would have won, if when they drew up level with the first place ship, its captain Cloanthus had not capped Mnestheus' speech with a pure act of *pietas*, a prayer to the gods of the sea (235-38), who insured his victory.[340]

[340] Dunkle (2005), 161, based on the slowness of Antilochus' horses and Cloanthus' ship, compares the ethics of these two and arrives at a similar conclusion, that Cloanthus' models *pietas*, while Antilochus employs stratagems, maneuvers and tricks to gain second. Although he notes the parallels between Mnestheus' and Aeneas' speech to his men, he considers Cloanthus "clearly a surrogate for Aeneas in the ship race...a contest that suggests Aeneas' sea

Thus in a similar situation where the supremely confident charioteer Antilochus used belittling and cruel threats to urge his horses to greater efforts, the captain Mnestheus inspires his crew through recalling their shared heroic past, chosen state and proven performance, humbly acknowledging Neptune's power in his domain, and evoking their future civic state, the goal of the epic. The resemblance of Mnestheus' speech to that of Aeneas' more famous speech to his crew shipwrecked on the coast of North Africa (1.198-208) has not gone unnoticed:

> "O socii—neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum—
> O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.
> Vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis
> accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopea saxa
> experti: revocate animos, maestumque timorem
> mittite: forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.
> Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum
> tendimus in Latium; sedes ubi fata quietas
> ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere Troiae.
> Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis."[341]

Likewise stressing a shared heroic past (198-202) and a belief in divine guidance (199, 205), Aeneas also offers in conclusion the reminder of their ultimate goal of reestablishing citizenship, of moving Troy to Latium, as a means of rekindling hope (205-06). Noonan (2007, 84) has argued that "there is a particular civic dimension to Aeneas' *pietas* as leader," one that is concerned with defending his followers and bringing them to safety (68) and that here in his first directive to his men he is concerned with their

---

voyage," noting the similarities between Cloanthus' promises in his prayer during the race and the rites Aeneas later performs (5. 774-76; 165). The major point of his analysis of the ship race is that Vergil shows a concern with the "moral worthiness" of the contestants, which is apparent from his "interplay with Homer's chariot race," with which I am in complete agreement.

[341] Men, we have not been untouched by evils before.
We have endured worse things. The god will also give an end to these.
We have approached the Scyllean madness and the deeply sounding cliffs
And experienced the Cyclops' rocks: Restore your spirits and send away
Gloomy fear; Perhaps one day it will be pleasant to remember even these things.
Through various misfortunes, through so many situations of crisis we are
Making our way into Latium, where the fates are showing a peaceful dwelling;
There the kingdom of Troy is to rise again. Endure and save yourselves for
Happier times.

preservation for the sake of their future success (78), the founding of their community.[342] Inasmuch as Mnestheus mirrors Aeneas' speech in his, he models the hero's values, which are presented in dialogical conflict with those of the Iliadic charioteer, Antilochus. Further support for Mnestheus as a "stand in" for Aeneas as the positive helmsman is that his speech urging his crew to more effort is given in order for his ship to overtake that of Sergestus, whose shipwreck on the rocks has been seen since the nineteenth century as an allusion to Catiline's failed revolution, a shipwreck of a bad helmsman.

Servius noted the most infamous member of Sergestus' future Roman *gens* was Catiline and the arguments that the episode in the ship race alludes to his conspiracy have been steadily accruing. They are summarized and augmented by Muse (2007, 591-98) most convincingly. His ship hangs on the rocks (*inlisae prora pependit*, 5. 206) as Catiline hangs in Tartarus on Aeneas' shield (*Catalina, minaci/ pendentem scopulo*, 8. 668-69). The rock that Sergestus wrecks into Vergil calls murex (*acuto in murice*, 205), shell-fish from which purple dye was obtained, also used metonymically for the dye. Muse argues, however, that murex is here used for the first time to mean "the jagged edge of a rock," a defamiliarization to suggest an allusion to the purple stripe of high office ("Catiline wrecked his career on his lust for purple," Muse, 593).[343] His ship's name *Centaurus*, has connotations of unrestrained appetites and impulses associated with Catiline (Nicoll, 1985, 134-5). The half-dead snake, still *ferox ardensque*, (277), generally assumed to refer to Sergestus' wrecked ship (and Catiline's crushed conspiracy), Muse (596) argues is an allusion to Catiline himself, who in Sallust (*Cat.* 61. 1-5) is found on the battlefield "still breathing a little and maintaining in the expression of his face that ferocity of spirit (*ferociamque animi*) he had when he was alive." Sergestus as he rashly attempts the maneuver of squeezing his ship between Mnestheus' and the rock is similarly described as *furens animi* (202).

---

[342] Noonan (2007), 70, also notes that the first use of the "pious Aeneas formula" follows closely after this speech, as he groans for the possible loss of his leaders Orontes, Amycus, Lycus, Gyas, and Cloanthus: *Praecipue pius Aeneas nunc acris Oronti, nunc Amyci casum gemit*…(1. 220-22).

[343] Also see Muse (2007), 593, n. 34 on R. Meyer (1970), *The History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (Brussels), 37-47, who notes that wearers were liable to charges of ambitious affectation and that Cicero inveighs against followers of Catiline *qui fulgent purpura* (43; Catil. 2.5).

In addition, the two captains are intentionally placed together in a manner that invites comparison. Hope inflames them both as they bring up the rear in the race (*extremis...duobus*, 182), they are described as rivals (*rostro premit aemula Pristis*, 187) and the accounts of their negotiation of the turning point in the race are intertwined.[344] After Mnestheus' ship rounds the rocky *meta*, compared to a dove on wing as it moves into the open sea (213-17), he leaves Sergestus behind calling in vain for help (*Sergestum...frustraque vocantem*, 221).

Consequently, as Vergil suggests intertextually the ethical superiority of Mnestheus' helmsmanship to Antilochus' charioteering, he simultaneously represents an example of a failed helmsman. But if Cicero's use of the ship of state image informs Vergil's use at all, the presence of both a good and a bad helmsman here should almost be expected. In the development of the ship of state image in political literature (Ch. 2. p. 32) we have seen that for both Plato and Cicero the primary energy in the image resides in the "bad" helmsman and that Cicero, in particular develops his good helmsman, who is devoted to the safety of his crew as citizens, in contrast to the corrupt usurpers—Clodius, Gabinius and Piso—and he even describes himself, when consul in 63, as helmsman rescuing the ship of state from Catiline (*In Pisonem*, 55*;* see Ch. 2, p. 29 and n. 45). This represents an increase in the complexity of the Aeschylean paradigm used in *Septem*, which maintains only the positive ship of state in connection with Thebes and the negative charioteers with the Argive aggressors, but it should be noted first that, although attention is focused in Mnestheus' speech on the good helmsman's characteristics through an intertextual dialogue with the *Iliad*'s Antilochus, the qualities themselves are also in accord with those of Eteocles in *Septem*. Just as Eteocles, the helmsman of the ship of state, is associated both with the city and the values that promote the well-being of the city/state—a sense of devotion to the gods and responsibility toward the safety of the state and its families—Aeneas, who literally becomes the helmsman of his ship, personally represents these values and has as his mission the founding of a city. Vergil's use of Aeschylus'

[344] They are described together as they approach the turning point, with Sergestus slightly ahead (183-87); Mnestheus gives his speech of encouragement to his crew and they react (188-200), which is followed immediately by the description of Sergestus' ship running into the rocks (201-209) and Mnestheus' issuing into the open sea (210-12).

interactive leadership emblems varies from the original for a multitude of self-evident reasons—difference in genre, narrative, culture, etc.—but the *Aeneid*'s high degree of intertextuality frequently expands in complexity or new directions the presentation, as I believe it does here, with the addition of the bad helmsman. Just as Cicero represented Rome's ship of state as susceptible to being steered by both good and bad helmsmen, Vergil's proto-Roman Trojan helmsmen suggest a Republican possibility of choice. But it is the qualities represented in Menestheus' speech that have been and will continue to be the basis of Aeneas' helmsmanship.

Both Antilochus and Mnestheus finish second in their races, but Vergil again sharply distinguishes between their attitudes, this time in regard to prizes. When Achilles wants to reward Eumelus, "far the best" with the second-place prize, in sympathy for his bad luck thanks to Athena, Antilochus angrily protests at the robbery of his prize, saying: "He should have prayed to the immortals" (23. 546-7). Of course, Eumelus' demise is due to the special care of a god and; moreover, a second irony, Antilochus himself never prayed to the gods, confident as he was in his own powers. Nevertheless, Achilles lets him keep his prize, a mare, and finds another for Eumelus (555-62). Menelaus has a more legitimate complaint against Antilochus and asks him to swear an oath that he did not of his own will hinder Menelaus' chariot by guile (δόλῳ, 23. 585). Antilochus, implicitly acknowledging his guilt, does not take the oath, but in a flattering speech (587-95), offers to give Menelaus the prize and seems to achieve his goal when Menelaus relents. By contrast, Mnestheus is said to have won second place through his *virtute* (*At qui deinde locum tenuit virtute secondum,* 258) and is awarded a breastplate which Aeneas had stripped from Demoleos in the Trojan War (259-261). *Virtus*, the Roman virtue of manliness, employed particularly to describe courage and valor in war, does not seem quite apt to describe Mnestheus' speech to his crew; in fact, translators often omit it. C. Day Lewis' translation "whose stout heart had given him second place" conveys well the quality Mnestheus exhibited in his speech which is completely translatable into the circumstances of war, and, as Dunkle (2005, 162) points out, is done so by Vergil in book 9 where, with a similar fortifying speech, Mnestheus fires up the Trojans to force raging Turnus out of their camp (9. 781-87). Mnestheus' potential for martial heroism is implicit in the description of his

prize, the breastplate of Demoleos, which is so heavy his attendants can barely carry it between the two of them, but by implication Mnestheus will be able to chase after his enemy with the ease Demoleos showed (lines 263-5). Again in marked contrast to the prize-giving scene in the *Iliad*, in which Antilochus' name (10 times) and voice are frequent, Mnestheus not only is never named in this section, but he is only referred to indirectly. In the first line he is reduced to *qui* to draw even more attention to *virtus* and in the middle of the passage (262), he is appended to one of the numerous appositives of the breastplate, which for him is a source of honor. Mnestheus' humility, evident in his speech, persists here where he is, nevertheless, surrounded in the text by heroes, notably Aeneas, once again.

Even before the ship race gets underway, Vergil alerts his reader to the possibility of a metaphoric level of meaning for the ships when he uses the striking phrase *urbis opus* to characterize the Chiamera. The identification of the captains as ancestors of famous Roman families furthers the impression that the ship race is looking toward the Trojans arrival in Italy and the founding of Rome. Menestheus' speech at the center of the narrative of the boat race itself calls attention to its Homeric model in the speech of Antilochus to his horses by its close adherence to the sequence of topics in the speech, in order to distinguish the values of Mnestheus from those of Antilochus. Vergil's use of the ship race in place of the chariot race facilitates the concept of the competitors as a small community working toward a common goal. The commander as leader reminds the citizens, as he calls the crew, of their noble heritage, their chosen nature, and past accomplishments and asks them to show the same meddle in mastering a new challenge. Although Mnestheus does not himself call on the gods, he recognizes their determining power. Significantly, divine participation in carrying Cloanthus smoothly to victory, is engaged by his pious prayer. In the *Iliad* the winner is determined by the unsolicited intervention of two gods, Apollo and Athena, on behalf of their individual favorite, an intervention initially aimed at handicapping the other god's favorite, divine models for Antilochus' tactics. In contrast, the *Aeneid* represents the relation between the ship's captain/helmsman as an effective community suggestive of a city, whose citizens collaborate to achieve a common goal with the help of the gods, whose aid they actively solicit. That

these values are specifically identified with a narrative ship, will facilitate Vergil's presentation of Aeneas' ship as a ship of state.

It seems evident that in the ship race Vergil had the image of the ship of state in mind,[345] because Mnestheus, one of the captains (*ductores*, 133, 251), the proper motivator of men, is placed in dialogue with the charioteer in Homer's chariot race. His role as "helmsman" is facilitated by the suppression of any real helmsman on his ship and by his lack of status descriptor in the passage of his speech.[346] Just as Mnestheus' speech on the decks of the *Pristis* echoes Aeneas' to his men after they have barely survived a devastating storm at sea, the proto-statesman diction of Mnestheus' address prepares for Aeneas' both real and metaphorical position as helmsman of the Trojan flagship.[347] The ship race especially celebrates the Trojan heritage of modern Rome and its citizens, particularly Augustus, whether through the references to circus games or the regattas which Augustus sponsored (n. 332) or in the intratextual reference near the beginning of the race (*totumque dehiscit / convulsum remis rostrique tridentibus aequor,* 142-3) to the battle of Actium on Aeneas' shield,[348] where Augustus is located in the position of helmsman (*stans celsa in puppi*, 8. 680). Thus the ship race not only prepares the way for the metaphorical ship of state, but it activates the contemporary world of Augustan Rome, whose *princeps*, as we have seen, is celebrated in the Underworld parade of Roman descendants.

In establishing the fundamental dichotomy between the charioteer and helmsman Vergil begins with the intertextual dialogue Mnestheus' speech to his crew activates with Antilochus' to his horses.

---

[345] Nicoll, (1988), 469.

[346] He is, however, clearly located onboard in a position where he could not be the real helmsman (*at media socios incedens nave per ipsos*, 188). Casson (1971), 300, indicates the double meaning inherent in the Greek word for helmsman, *kybernetes* (literally, "steerer"), which represents the role as mechanical, while Plato's explanation of the term (*Rep.* 341c-d) "the true *kybernetes* is… the leader of the crew…He is called *kybernetes* not for his navigation but for…his leadership of the crew," emphasizes leadership. Casson, *ibid*, summarizes: The term *kybernetes* is ambiguous inasmuch as, alongside the specialized sense of "commanding officer," it retains its original sense of "man at the tiller." A similar ambiguity exists in the Latin derivative, *gubernator*, between executive officer and navigating officer (Casson, 1971, 310, 316-18).

[347] Nicoll, 408, and Putnam (1966), 75-76, have demonstrated in detail how the sequence of events in Aeneas' ship, in which he is forced to take the helm because of Palinurus' loss, is both anticipated in the interaction between Menoetes and Gyas and pointedly differentiated from it.

[348] The beginning of the confrontation in the sea battle (8. 689-90): *una omnes ruere ac totum spumare reductis convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor*. Moskalew (1982), 124, notes that the race is envisioned in terms of a sea battle and "that is probably why a line from it recurs in the description of the battle of Actium."

The Trojan/Roman helmsman through this intertext and the Romanization of the ship race represents a leader who is concerned primarily with community and fostering its well-being under divine sponsorship.[349] By contrast, Antilochus' efforts are expended with no higher moral purpose and solely for his own benefit, toward the accomplishment of which he uses fear inducing threats, cheating, boasts and no prayers. It is the cluster of these qualities in a leader that are activated and rejected in the speech of Mnestheus. The portrait of the helmsman/leader that emerges from the ship race in book 5 is Ciceronian in more than its suggestion of the ship of state motif. At every stage of Cicero's engagement with the image of the ship of state the helmsman's distinguishing characteristic is his concern for the safety of all (*Pro Murena* 4-5*, Pro Sestio* 45, *In Piso* 20-21, *Rep.* 2. 51) and Cicero frequently represented his actions as being motivated by just this concern—famously in his decision to go into exile, but such claims are ubiquitous.[350] His definition of disfunction or even depravity is isolation from community,[351] which he often represented figuratively in the ship of state in the person of the pirate, the bad politicians angling for leadership who would shipwreck the ship of state, an example of which Vergil alludes to in the wreck of Segestus. The frequency and narrative vividness of Cicero's use of the Republican helmsman and ship of state also suggest the relevance of his thought to the development of Vergil's use of the figure.[352]

Should there be any doubt regarding the primacy of community in the *Aeneid*'s value structure, the nature of the spirits consigned to the punishments of Tartarus and to the enjoyment of the Elysian Fields

---

[349] Mnestheus' reminder to his crew of what they have collectively suffered and accomplished, honors the same sense of dutifulness and responsibility that Eteocles encourages his soldier-citizens to be motivated by in the fight against the Seven. Eteocles in *Seven* (5-8) expresses very similar feelings about the gods' all powerful impact and the ignominy of defeat, although with a more directly personal concern in a real circumstance of war.

[350] And he represented Octavian's motivation that way as well, at least at one point (*patrimoniumque suum effudit…in salute rei publicae collocavit, Phil*. 3. 3).

[351] So Tarquinius Superbus in *De Republica* 2.48: "for, though he bears a human form, yet he surpasses the most monstrous of the wild beasts in the cruelty of his nature. For how could the name of human being rightly be given to a creature who desires no community of justice, no partnership with his fellow-citizens—even with any part of the human race."

[352] Pöschl, 1962, 23, suggests the closeness of Vergilian and Ciceronian political thought: "The conviction that Roman order is founded in the same divine whole from which it derives its grandeur...is also basic to the interpretation of the Roman *res publica* in Cicero's *de Republica.* Vergil adheres to Cicero's philosophical views. He accepts the Platonic idea of the unity of Cosmos and Politeia from which came the Ciceronian idea of the unity of world order and true *res Romana.*" Galinsky, 2008, suggests the relevance of Cicero's *gubernator rei publicae* for a discussion of Aeneas' helmsmanship.

argues the case emphatically. All crimes of mortals punished, with the exception of Salmoneus, are breaches of community: sins against fathers, parents, spouses, daughters, sons, masters, clients, slaves, heirs, and country (6. 608-614; 621-24). While the blessed manifest more abstract purity (*sacerdotes casti, pii vates et Phoebo digna locuti*, 661-2), sacrifices for the country and acts that enrich life for others still dominate (*ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi; inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artis /* quique *sui memores aliquos fecere merendo,* 660, 663-4). By the choice of representing the longest race in the funeral games for Anchises as a regatta, which yet engages so overtly with the Homeric chariot race, Vergil makes the clearest statement of the analogous nature of ship and chariot and clarifies the differences relevant to the *Aeneid*, which are ethical. At the same time attention is focused throughout the ship race on leadership, both good and bad, but most prominently and paradigmatically, due to its resemblance to Aeneas' speech to his shipwrecked crew, in the speech of Mnestheus. The placement of the ship race in close proximity to the shift in helmsman from Palinurus to Aeneas prepares for the political and symbolic significance of his place at the helm.

The Good Helmsman: Palinurus and Aeneas

By far the most interesting aspect of Aeneas' helmsman Palinurus is that his reluctant death at the end of book 5 fulfills the one stipulation Neptune required for the Trojans to be able to reach the shore of Italy safely (5. 814-15),

> unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres;
> unum pro multis dabitur caput.
>
> One man only will be lost at sea,
> one life given for many.

and that Aeneas himself takes over the helmsmanship from him; the real helmsman is replaced by what will develop to be a distinctive blend of a real and figurative helmsman. Vergil has prepared for this climactic moment by suggesting via allusions within and without the *Aeneid* that Aeneas and Palinurus are comparable or analogous so that the helmsman's death has consequences for Aeneas in that role. The solutions to the question of what these ramifications might be have been insightful, but are not completely successful, I believe, because they require seeing Palinurus as deficient or flawed in some way that would

justify his death, when, in fact, Vergil identifies him as innocent and he is a model helmsman. Instead, as Sergestus' shipwreck alludes to the failed revolution of his Roman descendant Catiline, I will argue that Palinurus' fall alludes to the death of Cicero, who repeatedly presented himself as a good helmsman and one willing to sacrifice himself for the good of his fellow citizens. In the end he was a casualty in the civil war that ultimately brought Augustus to power in a purported restoration of the Republic, which had noticeable Ciceronian aspects. A review of how Vergil presents Palinurus and Aeneas as comparable and a consideration of previous interpretations of Palinurus' sacrificial death will serve as grounding for my discussion of the allusion to Cicero.

Despite the dramatic storm at sea with which the *Aeneid* commences, the helmsman of Aeneas' ship does not enter the plot until well into book 3 (201), at which point the Trojans, sailing between Crete and the Strophades, have encountered the only other storm at sea they suffer (200-04). Like Aeneas Palinurus enters the narrative in a storm of such magnitude that it also gets the better of the helmsman ("even Palinurus couldn't tell the difference between day and night"), emphasized by the duplicated words for wandering and blindness (*erramus,* 200, 204; *caecis...undis,* 200, *caeca caligine*, 203), his inability to see (*discernere,* 201) or remember (*meminisse*, 202) and the overarching darkness of the passage, which begins with a brooding thunderhead settling in above them (194). Also like Aeneas, Palinurus is not specifically located on the ship, as he will be later when he is able to execute his job proficiently (*puppis* 3. 519; 5. 12, 841, 858). The similar first appearances of Aeneas and Palinurus, has led Nicoll (1988, 461) to posit an intentional "parallelism" between the two characters and he finds further confirmation in the more positive second appearance of both characters (462): Aeneas, in his speech to restore the spirits of his men after the storm, encourages his men to look toward Italy (1. 205), while "Palinurus' confident competence leads directly to the sighting of Italy itself" (3. 523-24).

As Palinurus surveys the natural world for indications of fair sailing conditions for the journey from the coast of Greece to Italy he does exhibit, "confident competence," the salient characteristics of a good helmsman (512-20):

necdum orbem medium Nox Horis acta subibat:
haud segnis strato surgit Palinurus et omnis
explorat ventos atque auribus aera captat;
sidera cuncta notat tacito labentia caelo,
Arcturum pluviasque Hyadas geminosque Triones,
armatumque auro circumspicit Oriona.
postquam cuncta videt caelo constare sereno,
dat clarum e puppi signum; nos castra movemus
temptamusque viam et velorum pandimus alas.

Night, driven by the Hours, has not yet reached
the middle of her orbit when Palinurus
rises quickly from his couch, examines all the
winds, and with his ears catches the breeze.
He marks all the stars that glide through silent skies:
Arcturus, the rainy Hyades, and the twin Bears
and he gazes on Orion armed with gold; and seeing all
are manifest in a tranquil sky, loudly
he signals from the stern. We break up camp
and try our course spreading wings of canvas.

The alacrity (seen in both the earliness of the hour and the quickness of his rising: *haud segnis*) and care of Palinurus are evident in the numerous verbs in the passage, many of which duplicate the sense of seeing or hearing (*notat, circumspicit, videt; explorat, captat*).[353] The group action his clear signal initiates (*movemus, temptamus, pandimus*) demonstrates his importance to the whole fleet. Palinurus fulfills Plato's requirements for a "true" helmsman: "the true steersman (κυβερνήτου) must pay attention to year and season and sky and stars and winds and all that belongs to his art (τῇ τέχνῃ), if he is to be really qualified to rule a ship" (*Rep.* 6. 488d). But Vergil engages with a closer and more directly

[353] The particular attention given to the wind (513-14) may derive from his name, for which "successful etymologies ....have not been proposed..., but it is difficult to deny that Rom. readers heard..πάλιν or οὖρις in the name" (Horsfall, 2006, 201). Horsfall (2006), 513/14: "When Paschalis (1997, 134) hears οὖρις, a fair wind, in the steersman's name and points to *ventos* following so closely (a 'signal', indeed), he might...be in harmony with ancient ways of reading...the passage." Almost all variant interpretations of his name include "wind," the most literal being that of Nicoll, 464, n. 16: "If Virgil saw in it (his name) the idea of a wind which blows the ship back again this would fit the fact that the helmsman urges a return to Sicily and abandons hope of reaching Italy in the face of the storm (5. 17ff)." Brenk, (1984), 777, employs a slightly different interpretation of πάλιν, his name suggests "the contrary wind," a name given to windy headlands in the Greek world, since Palinurus' name does grace a promontory along the southern coast of Italy, as the Sibyl predicts (6. 378-81). However, Paschalis' study provides convincing evidence that names of characters from the time of Homer, frequently have multiple etymologies, and he analyzes the meaning of names based on their semantic environment (3-4). In the case of Palinurus, Paschalis, 202-3, demonstrates that even in one passage (3. 827-71), based on the two different meanings which οὖρις can have (wind or watchman), aspects of the narrative engage with his name as "fair wind," "watchman" and "return."

pertinent intertext in the *Odyssey,* one that describes Odysseus on the raft Calypso has helped him make for his journey home (5. 269-75):

> Glorious Odysseus, happy with the wind, spread sails
> and taking his seat artfully with the steering oar he held her
> on her course, nor did sleep ever descend on his eyelids
> as he kept his eye on the Pleiades and late-setting Boötes,
> and the Bear, to whom men give also the name of the Wagon,
> who turns about in a fixed place and looks at Orion,
> and she alone is never plunged in the waves of the Ocean.

Odysseus has just commenced sailing and is seated at the steering oar, but otherwise he exhibits similar helmsmanship to Palinurus'. He shuns sleep (271), checks the winds and studies the stars (his vision is also referred to twice), having been advised by Calypso to keep the Bear on his left hand (277). While the constellations that the two gaze on are not identical, both texts mention four of which two are the same (the Bear [s] and Orion), and the brightest star in Boötes is Arcturus. Although Palinurus is being compared to δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, he is actually more commanding in his role, since he initiates the action of a whole fleet, and Odysseus, of course, is alone on a handmade raft. However, this particular imbalance draws attention to a similar imbalance in the weight of the characters, which is in the reverse direction: Palinurus is not the hero of the epic, but the hero's helmsman. When we recall that episodes in the *Odyssey* featuring Odysseus have most commonly been alluded to in the *Aeneid* as a means of engaging comparisons of Aeneas with the Homeric hero, we may surmise that this three-way interplay subtly encourages viewing Aeneas and Palinurus as interchangeable or, in some ways, synonymous.[354] But by far the most intriguing Odyssean allusion, which Aeneas and Palinurus share in the final scene, is that to Odysseus returning to Ithaca on the Phaeacians' ship.

Neptune's request for one to be given for the Trojans to proceed safely to Italy is fulfilled almost immediately via the agency of Somnus, in the darkness of the night which has so often surrounded Palinurus (5. 837-41):

---

[354] Although Nelis (2001), 222, notes the similarity between this passage in the *Aeneid* (3. 512-20) and the time and sequence of events as Tiphys, helmsman of the Argonauts, is "the first to awake at dawn, notes the favourable breezes and rouses his comrades to set sail from Pagasae" (1. 519-23 and similarly at 1. 1280-82), the relationship between the helmsmen in the *Argonautica* and Jason lacks any suggestion of the interchangeability developed via the three-way intertextual dialogue between Aeneas, Palinurus and Odysseus.

cum levis aetheriis delapsus Somnus ab astris
aera dimovit tenebrosum et dispulit umbras,
te, Palinure, petens, tibi somnia tristia portans
insonti;

...when Sleep
Drifted down from the stars of heaven,
Parting the shadows as he moved through the air
Seeking you, Palinurus, bringing grim dreams
To your innocent soul.

Somnus takes on the familiar appearance of Phorbas and attempts to entice Palinurus to put his head down and take a rest (*pone caput fessosque oculos furare labori*, 845). Palinurus resists valiantly, showing both his knowledge of the ways of the sea and his loyalty to Aeneas (848-51):

'mene salis placidi vultum fluctusque quietos
ignorare iubes? mene huic confidere monstro?
Aenean credam (quid enim?) fallacibus auris
et caeli totiens deceptus fraude sereni?'

Are you asking me to forget what I know
About a sea that looks calm? Asking me
To trust this monster? What, entrust Aeneas
To the vagaries of wind and weather?
I've been fooled too often by a calm, clear sky.

But in the end Somnus has his way and Neptune's requirement is fulfilled (857-63). After Palinurus' exit the fleet sails safely (*currit iter tutum...classis*, 862), even past the "formerly perilous" cliffs of the Sirens (864-66), at which point Aeneas takes action (867-71):

cum pater amisso fluitantem errare magistro
sensit, et ipse ratem nocturnis rexit in undis
multa gemens casuque animum concussus amici:
'o nimium caelo et pelago confise sereno,
nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena.'

When Aeneas sensed the boat was drifting
Without its master, he steered it himself
Through the midnight waves, sick at heart,
Lamenting the loss of his friend: "O Palinurus
You trusted the sea's calm too much, and now
Your corpse will lie naked on an unknown shore."

Aeneas moves into the position of helmsman in a scene of serenity marred by his sadness at the loss of one he calls a friend and mourns in words of epigrammatic lament.[355] He takes charge of the ship, (humbly referred to literally as a raft [*ratem*], a common poetic metonymy, but here perhaps assuring simplicity), indicated by the verb (*rexit*), which has the root meaning "to maintain a straight line," obvious relevant here since the ship without its helmsman is wandering and wavering (*fluito* means to flow, but also to waver or wobble). In the sense of "control (of the tiller)" the verb and the related noun *rector* are used with helmsmen (Menoetes, Gyas, Palinurus and Aeneas),[356] but its political sense of ruling or governing seems to be carefully restricted to Jupiter (twice), Dido, Latinus and Saturn.[357] However, its programmatic use with the statesman who calms the mob in the epic's first simile (*ille regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet*, 1. 153), Neptune's analogue (whose chariot has recently appeared again, 5. 817-20), suggests that the use of *rego*, both times it occurs with Aeneas (5. 868; 10. 218), carries political connotations. Aeneas assumes figurative power amid painful personal loss and sadness (as the diction of 869 stresses). This pathos obscures somewhat, perhaps intentionally, the fact that Aeneas steers the ship (*ipse ratem...rexit*, 868) without a steering oar, which Palinurus took as he fell ("along with part of the stern and the rudder he still held" 858-59).[358] But, it is precisely this circumstance that suggested

---

[355] Dinter (2005): 158, notes that Vergil "imitate(s) here the style of an epigram for those who die at sea and whose name and origin are not always known in detail" and that the epigrammatic passages of Misenus and Caieta along with Palinurus', each of which give their name to places along the western coast, from the Trojan perspective, make Italy no longer an unknown land, because it now bears Trojan names. In addition, "the epigrams of all three of these minor heroes are distributed so as to demonstrate Aeneas' *rite de passage*" (160). Tueller (2010), 347-48, demonstrates close resemblances between Aeneas' words of lament for Palinurus and a number of Hellenistic epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina* and contends that "with the participle *lacrimans*, Aeneas casts himself in the role of the bereaved kin." Thomas (2004), 269-75, analyzes Vergil's intensive engagement with the tradition of the shipwreck epigram, "Embedding it into his larger narrative, and so creating an expansion and appropriation of the genre, as he blends it into the Homeric genre model" (270).

[356] Menoetes, 5. 161; Gyas, 5. 176; Palinurus 6. 350; Aeneas 5. 868, 10. 218. The verb is also used one time in the sense of controlling the reins: Juturna, 12. 624.

[357] Jupiter, 1. 230; 8. 572; Dido, 1. 340; Latinus, 7. 46; Saturn, 8. 325.

[358] One scholar has questioned the authenticity of precisely these words (*cum puppis parte revulsa/ cumque gubernaclo*, 858-59), but it seems much more reasonable, as Dyson (1990), 74-77, has argued, to view them as a later addition by Vergil, in an attempt to harmonize the two variant stories of Palinurus' demise—the one in book 5. 833-71, the other in book 6. 347-71. The inconsistencies between the accounts are reviewed by Williams (1960), xxv-xviii, and even more succinctly by Tueller, (2010), 345-46, (likewise, Thomas, 2004, 273):

Aeneid 5	*Aeneid 6*
* Somnus throws P. overboard	* no divine actor present
* Calm sea	* Stormy sea

meaningful analogies in the parts of Odysseus' journey in which his ship is carried by mysterious powers particularly in his return to Ithaca.

As we have seen (Ch. 3, pp. 91-92), the Phaeacian's ship carrying Odysseus home has no helmsman but steers intuitively where the mind of the voyager intends (13. 76-113; Putnam, *ibid,* 101; Nicoll, 468, n. 26; Dyson, 77-78). This allusion to Odysseus' ship conveys significant implications for Aeneas'. Even though Aeneas also steers with no mechanical means, as Dyson points out (1990, 78), "the *Aeneid* transforms the *Odyssey* which it imitates:"

> Odysseus sleeps through his final voyage, whereas Aeneas wakes and assumes responsibility; Odysseus alone survives his travels, but Aeneas brings the majority of his men to their new home in safety. It is the group, not the individual, which is benefited by the security bestowed upon the fleet by Neptune: Palinurus dies that the many might survive (5. 815)...the calm with which the final stages of the voyage are blessed is a response to a vision of political as well as cosmic order...and are a function of Neptune's protection...

This interpretation re-presents the confrontation of individual versus collective values evident in the intertextual dialogue between Mnestheus, the helmsman/captain in the ship race, and the Iliadic charioteer, Antilochus, however, with a significant difference: the subject of these values is the hero of the epic. The

---

*Aeneas thinks it an accident
* Event occurs between Sicily and Italy
* The trip lasts just one night
* Aeneas speaks of divine cause
* Virgil speaks of *Libyco cursu*
* P. tells of swimming for three nights

Resourceful and some also reasonable arguments have been made to reinterpret these differences as the result of something other than the unfinished state of the text, but most ultimately see the necessity of straining to accommodate the differences as too great. Tueller (346), summarizes "that clearing up the inconsistencies in these parts may have been the only major change Vergil would have made in his planned revision of the poem."

The steering oar, while essential to Palinurus' story in the Underworld, as he clings to it for three days and nights until he reaches Italy's shore, is difficult to integrate into the sequence of events in book 5, which has Somnus first loosening Palinurus' eyes into sleep and then relaxing his limbs (856-57), effects which could not have facilitated Palinurus' maintenance of his grip. Dyson (75) characterizes the argument that the god's action in thrusting the body overboard caused the damage as "realistically acceptable," but as not in keeping with "the mood of serenity that has been created." Aeneas makes no comment about the loss of the rudder and implies that Palinurus fell asleep and slipped off the ship. Dyson's final argument rests on the incompatibility of the first 2 lines of book 6, particularly the phrase *classique immittit habenas,* with this last section of book 5, to which, according to Servius (on 5. 871 and 6.1), they were once joined. This expression, "he gives free reins to the fleet," which suggests an increase in speed, Dyson argues (75-76) is inconsistent with the state of Aeneas's ship, without part of the stern and the rudder. Even simply drawing attention to the familiar equivalent of the steering oar with *habenas* seems unlikely, unless the rudder were there. Thus, Vergil seems to have added *cum puppis parte revulsa / cumque gubernaclo*, 858-59, at a latter stage than the original writing of book 5.

solemnity and mystery of this moment, a defining one for Aeneas' helmsmanship, encourages an awareness of metaphorical levels of meaning, the most salient being the ship of state.[359]

But the intertext of Odysseus' return is also relevant to Palinurus, through one significant detail. The Phaeacians prepare the ship with provisions, but they also prepare a place for Odysseus to sleep in the stern, where, if they had one, the helmsman would be (13. 72-81):

> ...then (they) spread out a coverlet for Odysseus, and linen, out on the deck, at the stern of the ship's hull, so that he could sleep there undisturbed, and he himself went aboard...and upon the eyes of Odysseus there fell a sleep, gentle, the sweetest kind of sleep with no awakening, most like death...

Charles Segal analyzes this scene as a partial death to be followed by Odysseus' rebirth as he returns to Ithaca and Putnam (1966, 101) has suggested similar implications in this intertext for Aeneas ("so now Aeneas, figuratively speaking, must die to arrive at the land of the dead as well as to be reborn into vitality of purpose..."),[360] but the pertinence clearly extends to Palinurus as well, whose swimming eyes Sleep loosens (5. 856) before hurling him headlong to his (apparently immediate) death.[361] The intertextual echoes between Palinurus and Odysseus increase in his Underworld account to Aeneas of the days he drifted in the ocean, hanging on to, not a raft as Odysseus does (5. 325) before reaching Scheria, but to his steering oar (*gubernaculum*, 6. 349), clinging by his clutching fingers (*uncis manibus*) to the mountain crags as he craws out of the sea (360; cf. Odysseus 5. 428-29, who, now on Scheria, "frantically caught hold with both hands on the rock face and clung to it"), and, finally, when he is killed by a *gens*

---

[359] Although Schauer, 2007, 201-06, emphasizes Aeneas' role as helmsman as simply one of his roles as leader and one in which his performance alone legitimatizes him—he takes over when a man is needed and he holds the post so long as there is need—he also documents the unusual nature of Aeneas' selection for the job among other treatments in epic. Schauer notes that Vergil demonstrates in the case of Gyas' taking over from his helmsman and falling behind in the ship race due to his lack of expertise that captains did not commonly have the know-how to steer their ships. Furthermore, the Argonauts only consider men already possessing the required skill for helmsmen, nevertheless, the anomalous nature of Aeneas assumption and guiding (*rexit*) of a rudderless ship, does not incline Schauer toward any degree of metaphorical reading of the incident, although he notes scholars who have (206, n. 508).

[360] Segal (1994), 47: "The transition is also ambiguous: it is a recovery of what has been long sought, but also a loss of the fantasy world, a 'death' of the part of Odysseus that has been wandering in return for the rebirth of his fully human self, the renewal of his mortal life on Ithaca."

[361] For both Palinurus and Odysseus death and sleep are present, figures that are associated mythologically from Homer onwards (most memorably [and noted by Brenk, 1984, 786-87] as the bearers of Sarpedon back to Lycia for burial, *Il.* 16. 671-72) and their semantic components in the *Aeneid* "are almost identical" (Paschalis, 1997, 32).

crudelis who ignorantly think he will be a prize (*praedam,* literally, "booty"), as Odysseus feared he might become if the beasts in the woods attacked him ("I fear I may become spoil [ἕλωρ, used in the same contexts of war as *praedam*] and prey [κύρμα] to the wild beasts," 5. 473). In this series of Odyssean allusions, Palinurus' experiences, while comparable, differ in that they all lead to his death, while for Odysseus they are suggestive of recovery, rebirth and selection for survival and, because of Aeneas' participation in this three-way dialogue, they can simultaneously suggest the type of rebirth Putnam has posited for Aeneas. Thus the same Odyssean intertext foregrounds rebirth for Aeneas, but death for Palinurus, with the result that what was first presented as a sacrificial death for the community (*unum pro multis*, 815) within the context of their shared intertexts and exchange of roles appears to have particular relevance for Aeneas. But what is the significance of his death in terms of Aeneas' helmsmanship?

Because Palinurus' is the only death (*unus...unum*) "on behalf of the many" that Neptune requires for safe passage of the whole Trojan fleet, Quint's (1993, 83-91) idea that his death represents Aeneas' distinctive personality that now must be sacrificed as a function of his assuming leadership of the collective community in Italy, carries a basic logic that accords with, not only Neptune's requirement, but also the collective implications of the earlier ship race. Both Quint (83) and Putnam (1966, 218, n. 38) before him stress that Palinurus' death is but the last in a series of deaths at the end of previous books that began with Creusa's and was followed by the deaths of Anchises and Dido, all of which represent a form of self-sacrifice in the great personal loss they constituted for Aeneas. Quint (1993, 83, 86) argues that Palinurus is "a surrogate for Aeneas in the hero's capacity as leader, as head of the ship of state" and that his death signifies that "Aeneas is not allowed to transfer affective ties except to a collective Roman future; he is asked to give up the ties that constitute individual personality and will." As a corollary, Quint (92) maintains the *Aeneid* associates fortune (or chance) with the individualist in the epic (represented by Palinurus), but destiny (or fate) with the leader of the collective (Aeneas). Even setting

aside the difficulty of rigidly distinguishing between fortune and fate in the *Aeneid*,[362] there is a logical inconsistency in burdening Palinurus with representing individuality, implicitly "the Homeric ethos that individuates the hero at the expense of others." He is as dutiful as Aeneas, as his presentation before and after his fall amply demonstrate.

Nicoll (1988, 466-70) offers a different interpretation suggested by an Ennian allusion behind Neptune's words of election, which implies the death of Remus in Palinurus' fall and the future Romulan deification of Aeneas, as a type of archetypal civil war. The Ennian echo occurs near the beginning of the *Annales* (book 1, fr. 33 Sk.) in the council of the gods,[363] when Jupiter is most likely predicting the future deification of Romulus to Mars:

> unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli
> templa.
>
> There will be one, whom you will bring
> into the heavenly temples of the sky.

This fragment has obvious relevance to prophecies of Aeneas' future deification by Jupiter, in book 1 to Venus (*sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli/ magnanimum Aenean,* 259-60) and in book 12 to Juno (*indigetem Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris/ deberi caelo fatisque ad sidera tolli,* 794-95), but the diction and circumstances also relate to Neptune's words to Venus regarding Palinurus (*unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres,* 5. 814). Although the outcomes for *unus* in the two different texts contrast utterly, in both cases a supreme god is reassuring the divine parent about the future prospects of their offspring. The particular relevance of this Ennian text for this line in book 5, Nicoll (1988, 467) argues, is the likely presence of Remus in the original passage, which Ovid's *Fasti* 2 (85-88; February 17th) suggests, with the likely point being that "one of the twins would become a god, while the other

---

[362] While Quint (1993), 93, concedes that "Virgil himself plays with the tendency of the two terms to slide into one another," he nevertheless makes a distinction: "Fortune denotes short-term contingency as opposed to the historical long run that is Fate," possibly following Nicoll (1988), 463, who makes similar cautions and also associates *fortuna* with Palinurus.

[363] Sk=Skutsch (1985).

would die."[364] This would deepen the significance of the Ennian intertext because its relevance would extend to include Aeneas, who like Romulus, will become a god, while Palinurus shares the fate of Remus. In the contemporary Augustan context the murder of Remus could easily be interpreted as an archetypal precedent for the civil wars.[365] However, nothing in the narrative of the *Aeneid* suggests anything remotely like a struggle for power between Aeneas and Palinurus and, as Nicoll notes (1988, 468), Aeneas does not murder Palinurus. While Vergil's allusions are always dialogues with the original text, something of the essential relationship of the characters involved should still be present. An allusion to the death of Cicero, whose writings seem to have informed Vergil's presentation of the helmsman and who initially supported Octavian against Marc Antony, would more closely parallel the relationship between Palinurus and Aeneas.

The connotations of weighty loss and sacrifice in the death of the helmsman Palinurus may have suggested to contemporary minds the death of Cicero, who throughout his writing career, but especially in his later years, identified himself with the Republic and, in particular, saw himself as its helmsman, willing to sacrifice his life for the well-being of the Roman citizens. The nature of the allusion I am suggesting would not be unlike the case of Aeneas and Dido, who, like Aeneas and Palinurus, also share so many aspects in their histories, characters and aspirations that they could be seen as "doubles" and are linked via numerous allusive literary couples—Odysseus and Nausicaa then Penelope, Apollo and Diana, Jason and Medea, Hector and Andromache—but at the same time suggest the contemporaries Antony and

---

[364] Nicoll (467) also points to Skutsch's, *Annales*, 205, argument that "the emphatic *unus* in Ennius makes it likely that some reference to the other brother also occurred," as further evidence for Remus' presence. Hardie (1993), 6, also accepts Skutsch's logic and Nicoll's argument: "Palinurus himself functions as a kind of twin of Aeneas; his death is a substitute for the latter's death and precondition for his fated success (as the success of Romulus arose out of the death of his twin)," 33.

[365] Nicoll, 469, cites Horace *Epod.* 7. 17-20 as evidence, as does Oglivie (1985), 1. 6. 3-7. 3, who also notes (1. 7. 9) that Augustus had considered taking the name Romulus in 27, but rejected it as "possessing unfortunate associations" (Suetonius, *Aug.* 7; Florus 4. 66; Dio 53. 16).

Cleopatra.[366] Arguing that Palinurus is part of Vergil's allusion to Cicero's ship of state imagery, even to the person of Cicero, is perhaps a comparable cluster of textual echoes.[367]

Book 5 and 6 of the *Aeneid* have the most sustained and frequent allusions to recent and contemporary Rome—its families, their famous ancestors, Roman values and recently established celebrations. The ship race in particular evokes contemporary Rome and Mnestheus' speech, we have seen, shares much with Cicero's representation of the ship of state, with its emphasis on the collective and the helmsman/captain's address of the crew as citizens. Few contest the relevance of Ciceronian thought, in particular the *Somnium Scipionis*,[368] for the general scenario of Aeneas' meeting with Anchises in book 6—an encounter of a descendent with his deceased parent (grandparent), who encourages the younger man to a life of service to the state with an excursus on the Platonic soul (*Rep.* 6. 25-26) and the promise of heavenly rewards. And Zetzel (1996, 311) has argued that *De Republica* has "a much larger role in Virgil's thinking;" that it animates his "vision of Rome's role in the world."[369] Because of the extended frequency of the ship of state metaphor in Cicero's speeches, correspondence and political philosophy I am suggesting that one possible connotation of the helmsman Palinurus' sacrifice is an allusion to Cicero's death as a similar sacrifice in the process of the transition from the traditional Republic to the Augustan version of republicanism. The specific textual cue that could be interpreted as an allusion in symbolic language to Cicero's death is again Neptune's words to Venus (5. 814-15): *unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres; unum pro multis dabitur caput*. Neptune's words may be enriched by the suggestion of similar words in Cicero's speeches (*Pro Sestio, In Pisonem*), which represent his departure for exile as a form of *devotio*, his life, alone, given for all: *me unum...ego essem unus deditus...id quod*

---

[366] Fowler (1997b), 17, labels these allusive contributors to the construction of a Vergilian character a "superset."

[367] Nelis (2001), 223, contributes additional possible echoes in Palinurus' story beyond Phrontis, Odysseus and Elpenor, from the *Argonautica* Butes, Hylas and Tiphys. However, none of these characters are the suggestive analogue for the major protagonist of the epic, as Palinurus is for Aeneas.

[368] See especially Feeney (1986), on the Platonic, Ciceronian, and distinctively Vergilian aspects of Anchises' revelations.

[369] Zetzel (1996), 315, gives as one reason that he links *De Republica* and the *Aeneid* "that Virgil is so obviously indebted to Cicero for his depiction of the cosmic order and his promulgation of the idea that Roman rule and Roman governance are according to nature and divinely ordained destiny." He further argues that Vergil's tendency to undercut these ideas is also owed to Cicero.

omnibus impendebat... unus pro omnibus (*Ses.* 45-46), "for the safety of my fellow citizens which has ever been dearer to me than life" (45; see above Ch. 2, pp. 27-29). While the fragment from the *Annales* mirrors the first two of Neptune's words and the form of the relative clause, in Cicero's rhetoric extreme repetition of personal pronouns and possessive adjectives is common, analogous to Vergil's *unus...unum*, as is antithesis (*unus...multis*), devices that occur particularly in his presentation of his figurative *devotio* onboard ship.[370] Cicero had recently returned to the center of power in the wake of Julius Caesar's assassination, had encouraged and supported the young Octavian for a time,[371] and, of course, was ultimately sacrificed in the proscriptions (See below). The loss of Palinurus/Cicero as Aeneas assumes control of the ship of state represents a shift in leadership, but suggests the maintenance of communal values, because of the nature of Aeneas' leadership as it has been seen in the first half of the *Aeneid,* particularly in the funeral games for Anchises, and also suggests Augustus' recovery of Cicero's Republican collective ideal in his principate.[372] Indeed, what Noonan (2007, 76) has identified as the distinctively public aspect of Aeneas' *pietas*, his concern for the safety of his followers, is a quality Cicero associated with Brutus (*conservator rei publicae*), the optimates, and himself, as we have seen.[373]

If Palinurus' enforced fall at the end of book 5 suggests that of Cicero, Palinurus' narration of his actual death at the hands of a *gens crudelis* in book 6 (349-62) may have brought to mind aspects of

---

[370] One clause of the period describing his *devotio* has both forms of *unus* and *multus* in particular, although not with the *pro* phrase: *ut multi ex multis locis praedones classibus eam navem se oppressuros minitarentur nisi me unum sibi dedidissent*.

[371] See Ch. 2, pp. 42-43, on Cicero's fulsome praise of Octavian in *Phil*. 3 (3-5) and the presence of Ciceronian diction at the beginning of Augustus' *Res Gestae* 1. 1-3. Galinsky (1996), 46, notes that Octavian "once more appealed to his mentor's vanity and ambition by proposing both Cicero and himself for a joint consulate, a proposal the senate rejected" (Appian 3. 337-39; Dio 46. 42. 2-3; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 53.4).

[372] Hardie (1993), 3-5, analyzes a similar representative aspect of Aeneas—the "synecdochic hero," an individual "who stands for the totality of his people present and future, part for the whole." He also relates this concept to Palinurus, who inverts the Odyssean theme of the one survivor, while Aeneas, whose shield alone (*unum*) will stand against all the weapons of the Latins (*omnia contra tela Latinorum,* 8. 447-8), represents the Achillean side. The manifestation of the outstanding figure of Fabius Maximus at the end of the catalogue in book 6 (*ille Maximus ille es, unus qui nobis cunctando resitutis rem*, 845-6) "in a parade that centers on Augustus...seeks to justify by precedent the place within the Roman state of a supreme individual, an *unus homo*, by reference to one of the staunchest upholders of Republican values." Cicero's tendency to blur the distinction between himself and the Republic and to argue in his *Republic* from the example of individual historical figures (as we have seen in Ch. 2, Tarquinius Superbus and Brutus) exhibits an inclination ripe for development in the manner Hardie is suggesting.

[373] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9. 3. 86, reports Cicero's description of Brutus; the optimates *Sest.* 98; Cicero applies the term to himself in *Vatin.* 3. 7, but the concept is clearly behind his self-presentation as a willing sacrifice for the Republic developed in the *Pro Sestio* (see above).

Cicero's assassination, although, again, not obviously.[374] Even though Palinurus is thrown overboard into what, in this account, is a rough sea, the loyal helmsman is still greatly concerned for the safety of Aeneas' ship (351-54). After three days of clinging to the helm and drifting in the stormy sea, he catches sight of Italy from the top of a wave (358-61):

> paulatim adnabam terrae; iam tuta tenebam,
> ni gens crudelis madida cum veste gravatum
> prensantemque uncis manibus capita aspera montis
> ferro invasisset praedamque ignara putasset.
>
> I was gradually swimming toward land and would have reached safety,
> if a cruel band, ignorantly thinking I was a prize, had not attacked
> me with a sword, as I, sodden with wet clothes, was grasping
> the rough peak of a cliff with my finger tips.

Thus, in the end not forces of nature, but savage human greed destroys Palinurus; as he is about to escape from his exhausting Odyssean struggle with the sea, he is run through with a sword—a complete turn about from the mysterious, dream-like quality of his fall in the previous book and also from Odysseus' survival on the shores of Scheria in the Homeric intertext. For Brenk (1984, 795) this end constitutes a "devastatingly pessimistic fate" and even the Sibyl characterizes his lot as "harsh misfortune" (*duri...casus*, 377). Nevertheless, the Sibyl's prediction of long lasting renown ("The neighboring peoples...will build a tomb...and forever the place will be called Palinurus," 378-81), immediately relieves the helmsman's cares and gladdens his heart and his name and burial mound becomes the first tangible

[374] Arguing that Vergil's episode of Palinurus could have suggested to contemporaries the death of Cicero can only be highly speculative because all texts describing his death post date the *Aeneid* (Plutarch, *Cic*. 47. 3-49. 4; Appian, *BC* 4. 19-20; Dio, *HR* 47. 8, 11) and such a reading can only be a part of the multiple layers of meaning of a richly suggestive passage. Even Livy's version of Cicero's death, which would have been closest in date to the *Aeneid*, almost certainly was published after Vergil's death (the first pentad of the 142 volume *ab urbe condita libri* was completed by 27; Luce, 2009, 46. Cicero's death is described at the end of book 120 and survives only in the summaries, *Periochae*. The summary for the following book, 121, contains the heading: *qui editus post excessum Augusti* dicitur, which suggests that the previous book was written in the Christian era) and survives only in Seneca's *Suasoriae* 6. 17. In addition, Vergil is thought to have read book 6 to Augustus, whose reaction toward any overt reference to Cicero's death, despite Plutarch's (*Cic.* 49) famous description of Augustus' praise of him in later life (to a grandson: "A learned man, my child, a learned man and a lover of his country," φιλόπατρις), would probably not have been sympathetic. The sources for Cicero's death are given fully in Dyer (1995), 292-93, who argues that because there is insufficient narrative motivation for the burial of Aeneas' nurse ("It is absurd to state that a nurse, of obscure history in local legend and no importance in the *Aeneid*, "in dying gave immortal fame to our shores."), the way in which Vergil refers to Caieta applies more aptly to Cicero, whose death the name of Caieta would have immediately suggested in the years in which Vergil was writing.

mark of the Trojan presence in Italy. But the grisly end that Palinurus meets as a prelude to the renown of his name forms a stark contrast to otherworldly mystery of his selection and fall.

Cicero's grisly end was not unexpected,[375] since he was fleeing his proscription; however, like Palinurus, he seems to have been close to escaping his fate, having had the opportunity to leave Italy by boat, but either indecision (Plutarch), seasickness (Appain) or weariness (Livy) caused him to close that avenue. Cicero's assassination happened on a path between his villa at Formiae close to the sea (*quae paulo plus mille passibus a mari abest*, Livy in Seneca, *Suas*. 6. 17) on the western coast of Italy near Caieta,[158] the reputed burial site of Aeneas' nurse (*Aen*. 7. 1-4; 60 miles north of the Bay of Naples; promontory of Palinurus 115 miles south). Livy's account of Cicero's death preserves aspects of what was relevant to Vergil's helmsman of the ship of state (and to Cicero's) and also may reflect something of his presentation of Palinurus:

> First he fled to his estate at Tusculum, then cross-country to his house at Formiae, intending to take ship at Caieta. He put out to sea several times, but sometimes the winds were against (*venti adversi*) him and forced him back, sometimes he himself could not put up with the tossing of the vessel as it rolled on the dark ground swell (*caeco volvente fluctu*). Finally he grew weary of flight and of life, and, returning to the inland villa, which is little more than a mile from the sea, he said: I shall die in the country I so often saved (*moriar...in patria saepe servata*)...It was Cicero himself who ordered (his slaves) to put down the litter and suffer calmly the compulsions of a harsh fate (*quietos pati quod sors iniqua cogeret*). He leaned from where he sat, and offered his neck without a tremor; his head was struck off (*caput praecisum est*). The soldiers, in their stupid cruelty (*stolidae crudelitati militum*), were not satisfied. They cut off the hands...the head was taken back to Antony, and on his orders, placed between his two hands on the rostra...The Romans (*cives*) could scarcely lift eyes wet with tears (*lacrimis*) to look on his mutilated body.[376]

Coming back from the sea Cicero, like Palinurus, is met by a cruel band (*crudelitati militum,* cf. *gens crudelis*, 6. 359), who strike his head off, surely with a sword, as Palinurus had been attacked (*ferro invasisset*), and suffered a similar harsh fate (*sors iniqua*; cf. *duri...casus*, 6. 377). *Venti adversi*, is a

---

[375] Livy's account makes that clear: T. LIVI. M. *Cicero sub adventum triumvirorum urbe cesserat pro certo habens, id quod erat, non magis Antonio (se) eripi quam Caesari Cassium et Brutum posse*.

[376] Translation by M. Winterbottom (1974).

possible translation of Palinurus' name (so Brenk, 1984, 777, construes it "contrary wind"),[377] while *caecus* is an adjective that predominates in the storm of Palinurus' entry into the epic (3. 200, 203), as does darkness and night in general in this episode,[378] although both expressions could be coincident with the natural circumstances.[379] All the texts describing the orator's death include the decapitation and the transfer of the head and hands to the rostra. Perhaps the textual focus on Palinurus' head, whose life (*caput*) is demanded with this word (*unum pro multis dabitur caput*, 5. 815, not an unusual use of the word [*OLD,* 4]) and who falls headlong (*praecipitem,* 5. 860; *praecipitans*, 6. 351), is relevant to this famous aspect of Cicero's death (*caput praecisum est*). Only Livy excludes reactions from Antony at the sight of the severed members, that seem to increase in savagery over time, and only he mentions a sympathetic sorrow on the part of the Roman citizens,[380] which suggests a reciprocal appreciation for Cicero's devotion to the Republic. Missing likewise from Livy, which may bear upon the particular *gens crudelis* who thought Palinurus could be *praeda* for them, is any reference to the financial reward that both Appian and Dio suggest, motivated Cicero's killers. They identify Popillius Laena, a centurion, as the soldier who killed Cicero and maintain that he received an extra monetary reward beyond the usual amount for Cicero's head—according to Appian, a crown from Antony and 250,000 drachmas beyond the stipulated reward (ἆθλον); in Dio, "more than the price offered."[381] Beyond the military and hunting connotations of *praeda* ("booty" or "prey" 6. 361),[382] it is the root word for *praedo*, a "robber" or "pirate,"

---

[377] See above, n. 353 on the various etymologies proposed for Palinurus' name.

[378] Brenk (1984), 782, describes the darkness of night and the Underworld as the context of Palinurus' story.

[379] The relevance of the later accounts of Cicero's death is based on the assumption of their use of earlier sources (among which were probably the Asinius Pollio's lost *History* for Appian and Augustus' *Memoirs* for Dio; Gowing, 1992, 40) that may reflect details not contained in Livy's brief account.

[380] Plutarch's (44. 1-2) Romans shudder at the sight because "they thought they saw there, not the face of Cicero, but an image of the soul of Antony," a suggestive mirroring of slayer in the slain.

[381] In Dio's account additional money was added when Antony saw the statue that Popillius Laena had set up of himself "sitting crowned beside his victim's head with an inscription that recorded his name and the deed" (*HR* 47. 11). Dio's account emphasizes the savagery of Antony, who demanded to see every head of those slain, and greed, noting that he and Fulvia spared some "from whom they got more money than they could expect to obtain by their death" (47. 8).

[382] Discussed above (p. 209-10) in connection with the Odyssean intertext (5.73) when the hero arrives on the island of the Phaeacians and fears he may become prey for wild animals.

the word frequently used in Cicero's ship of state images to refer to Clodius and others of his enemies.[383] The sequence of events as told by Palinurus seems somewhat unlikely (6. 359-61): in the very act of pulling himself over the cliffs on the water's edge, dripping wet, he is killed because some "highwaymen" think he might have something of value on him. Murder perpetrated by greed occurs elsewhere in the *Aeneid*—Sychaeus by Pygmalion (1. 346-50) and Polydorus by the Thracians (3. 55-57)—and is condemned, but in both instances the murderers know there is money to be gained. By abbreviating the narrative and expressing it in archetypal terms—*gens crudelis...prensantemque...capita aspera montis ferro invassisset praedamque ignara putasset*—and by locating the event on an, as yet, unidentified shore of western Italy, Vergil creates an open suggestiveness that would encourage thoughts of Cicero's death, particularly if they had already been activated by Neptune's request. As Feeney has noted, the patriotic parade of future descendants at the end of book 6 has recurring darker turns and concludes with the premature death of young Marcellus.[384] A discernible but unobtrusive allusion to the death of Cicero would be wholly in keeping with references to the Republic's darker hours.

Allusions to Cicero's life and imagery in the Palinurus episode would support its more obvious political connotations, which also do not overshadow those aspects stressed in book 6: the aetiological importance of Palinurus and his place of burial and his interview with Aeneas as a distinct part of the hero's past. But, primarily, Palinurus is a means of drawing attention to the politicization of Aeneas' role as helmsman and an expression of the sacrifice attendant to the foundation of Rome and, implicitly, that of the principate. Certainly Neptune's role in the pronouncement of Palinurus' sacrifice, with the reappearance of his order establishing sea chariot, stirs political expectations. Even if Palinurus plays Remus to Aeneas' Romulus in the founding of Rome, as Nicoll argues, the simultaneous suggestion that

---

[383] *Pro Murena* 4, *praedonum; De domo sua* 24, *archipirata cum grege praedonum*; *Pro Sestio* 45, *multi ex multis locis praedones*. See Ch. 2, pp. 21-31, for a discussion of the ship of state in these speeches.

[384] Feeney (1986), 6: "Whole sections of the speech treat openly of dark and painful matters—the civil wars of Pompey and Caesar (826-35), Brutus' execution of his children (820-3), and Marcellus' funeral (868-86)...the glorifying impetus of the speech as a whole is checked and intermittently retarded by countervailing tendencies of dubiety, mourning, even disparagement."

he represents Cicero to Aeneas' Augustus in the foundation of the empire,[385] maintains the inequity in weight between Palinurus and Aeneas, but more importantly, suggests a potential ideological continuity with the past in the regime of the new helmsman.[386] And the core of that ideology is Ciceronian. Initially expressed in Mnestheus' speech in the ship race to his crew, the *cives* of his ship of state, this ideology assumes the primary importance of the collective and the leader's role as one of service to that community. This is one of what Johnson would call the good myths of the City, which Vergil and Cicero share, as they do their patriotism.[387] We have seen that one of the primary characteristics of Cicero's helmsman of the ship of state is his concern for the well-being of the whole ship, that quality he found lacking in Julius Caesar and Pompey (*Att*. 8. 11; ch. 2, pp. 41-42). So central a tenet of his philosophy is this quality that he considers it to be inborn just as the need for virtue is (*Rep.* 1.1):

> unum hoc definio, tantam esse necessitatem virtutis generi hominum a natura *tantumque amorem ad communem salutem defendendam* datum, ut ea vis omnia blandimenta voluptatis otique vicerit.
>
> I will content myself with asserting that Nature has implanted in the human race so great a need of virtue and *so great a desire to defend the common safety* that the strength thereof has conquered all the allurements of pleasure and ease.

As Connolly (2007, 166) comments: "*Amor* is what makes the citizen passionate for the state," a juxtaposition that calls to mind Aeneas' hard words to Dido that characterize the divine call to return to his mission: *hic amor, haec patria est* (4. 347). The Ciceronian leaning of Vergil's ship of state is fully expressed in Mnestheus' speech, which, through its intratextual evocation of Aeneas' speech on the

---

[385] It seems likely that Livy originally planned the death of Cicero "the death of this last fighter for the republic" to conclude his history (Stadter, 2009, 105).

[386] Noonan's (2007), 70, study of the history of the term σωτήρ ("the epithet I [Noonan] argue best anticipates the 'protectiveness' that is incorporated into Aeneas as the the figuration of a 'pious' ruler,") shows that its earliest use is in greetings of Poseidon and the Dioscuri as saviors of ships (*Hymn. Hom.* 22. 5, and 33. 6). Although before Cicero I have not found evidence that links this "protectiveness" with the helmsman, the antiquity of the association with divine patrons of helmsmen, suggests it may have had a long tradition in literature before Cicero. Certainly, the idea of the good helmsman of the ship of state that Cicero develops in the *Pro Sestio* is specifically concerned with the safety of the state. His motivation in going into exile was *propter salutem meorum civium* and in the imaginary confrontation with pirates he throws himself into the water *ut ceteros conservarem* (45).

[387] Johnson (1976), 178, n. 141, elaborating on "the good myths (and the bad myths) of the Cosmos and City" (150), adds "that is to say, a loyalty to...the ideals of reason and freedom that were vanishing as the consensus of his fellows about their validity vanished. He shows a patriotism that it would be both heartless and stupid to ridicule, even as it would be...to ridicule that patriotism, that grieving nostalgia in Cicero."

shores of North Africa, implies the relevance of its content to Aeneas. An allusion to Cicero's *post reditum* speeches, in which he claims to have cast himself into the deep to save the others (*iecissem ipse me potius in profundum, ut ceteros conservarem, Ses.* 45; cf. Palinurus who is *liquidas proiecit in undas*, 5. 859), would recall the theme of sacrificial guardianship in his speeches and suggest its relevance for Aeneas' time at the helm, which begins a few lines later (869).

Thus the implications Vergil has woven into the relatively minor figure of Aeneas' helmsman are rich and interrelated, but they center on, his close relationship with Aeneas, the intertextual dialogue they both have with Odysseus, the sacrificial nature of his death, and the political implications of the helmsman. The allusions of Aeneas to Odysseus, some while he is helmsman, are important preparations for Aeneas' assumption of that role and, because of their frequent inversions of the original, also may signal a departure from the Homeric hero, as Quint has suggested.[388] The words of Neptune (*unum pro multis dabitur caput*) predict a sacrifice, which, in its fulfillment, echoes Laocoon's sacrifice, Neptune's priest, with its cataclysmic civic consequences. The extended description of Neptune and his retinue as they depart immediately after his pronouncement (5. 817-26), recalls his first appearance in the epic, the order his sea chariot reestablished and his comparison to a distinguished and effective Roman politician. This would not only give readers a sense of the approaching end of the Trojans' sea journey, but would also effectively alert them to the likelihood of political imagery. I have argued that the most recent civil war may be evoked through the figure of Palinurus as Cicero, which allows for the decidedly personal moment (*multa gemens casuque animum concussus amici*) of Aeneas actually assuming the helm, simply and naturally: *ipse ratem nocturnis rexit in undis,* a naturalism strengthened by the epigrammatic lament for Palinurus.

Whereas Aeschylus' *Septem* begins with Eteocles' speech in which he presents himself as the helmsman of the polis of Thebes in the first few lines and the herald in the next speech describes the Argives both as charioteers and as the assailing winds of the storms attacking Thebes, images soon

[388] Noonan (2007), 70, correctly notes that the wanderings of Aeneas resemble those of Odysseus in so many details that their difference in attitude toward their men, their civic or public *pietas*, is "not emphasized as it should be." But see above, p. 208, where Dyson draws precisely this distinction.

affirmed by the chorus, Vergil develops his interactive charioteer and helmsman gradually over the course of the first six books of the *Aeneid*. Nevertheless, the first expression of the potential for this dialogue, the sea chariot of Neptune, commands the readers' attention by virtue of its powerful counteraction of the turbulent chaotic force of Juno, out to destroy the Trojans as the narrative begins and due to the key role he and his chariot play in activating the political and historical levels of the epic. The startling nature of the epic's first simile—comparing a god to a mortal, a mythological figure to a Roman, chariot to words, its engagement with the values of the hero and evocation of recent political turmoil assure that Neptune and his chariot will be remembered, if the very similar image of Octavian as Neptune on cameos didn't. The long tradition of Neptune's dual role with ship and chariot aptly represents the frequently expressed division of Roman *imperium* over land and sea. Neptune's chariot restores order to the storm tossed sea in this paradigmatic sequence of events and this occurs to protect the pious hero in his ship with whom Neptune is indirectly compared. There is, of course, another chariot—Juno's, but it has only been mentioned, although with insistent assertiveness (*hic illius arma, hic currus fuit*), as an expression of her fierce belligerence toward Trojans and their possible future descendants.

The chariot and horses are an integral part of Juno/Hera's history in cult and literature, as the reference to Samos and her chariot at Carthage recall. In the first half of the *Aeneid* Vergil directs attention to this heritage in the *Iliad* of her joint forays with Athena against the Trojans and of her alliance with Achilles. This history is recalled subtly at first—references to *immitis Achilles*, Aeolus' equine winds—but when Aeneas stands before the Temple of Juno at Carthage, the circumstances (the horse head) and images activated by Aeneas' gaze remind the reader, if not Aeneas, of the extremity of her hatred of Troy and her support of even Achilles' most bestial mistreatment of Trojans. In the ecphrasis of the temple scenes *saevus* Achilles dominates with his chariot, implicitly dragging both Troilus, apparently never before associated with a chariot, and Hector to their deaths on either side of the central scene of Pallas Athena's rejection of the Trojan women's prayers. The fall of Troy, a land formerly known for the horses it raised, finally occurs by the stratagem of the Greek horse and its chariots, represented by the chariot of Troilus, become the sight of defeat. Juno's past association with the chariot projects a similar

hostility not only to the Trojans' descendants in the Punic Wars, but also at Castrum Minervae for the Trojans in their not too distant future. With the exception of Juno's chariot in Carthage, its tradition and significance of hostility against the Trojans enters the text indirectly, but insistently.

Like Aeneas, his helmsman Palinurus first appears in the epic in the grips of an overpowering storm in book 3 (201-4), the first of many such implicit comparisons between the two. Encompassing the longest time of the epic, the seven years of voyaging recalls Odysseus' wanderings in many of the places visited, but among the many differences is that leadership among the Trojans is diluted between the aged Anchises, whose advice falters at times, and his son Aeneas. Thus, when the competent picture of Palinurus, rising quickly in the night, checking the winds, studying the stars and signaling for the Trojans to set sail for Italy alludes intertextually to Odysseus fulfilling well the same role, the allusion initially seems to imply too heroic a role to Palinurus. But his apparent security is undercut intertextually by the storm in the *Odyssey* that subsequently wreck's Odysseus' raft and casts him adrift. The series of allusions to Odysseus and his voyage that commences with Aeneas' first speech in the epic and expands in book three, five and six to include Palinurus, draws careful attention to the role of helmsman as leader and how it differs in the two epics and prepares for Aeneas' assumption of that role. While in transit Aeneas' ship lacks a metaphorical helmsman, although in an approximate meeting of helmsman and charioteer at Castrum Minervae, Anchises stands *celsa in puppi*, exactly as Aeneas and Augustus will as helmsmen, before he interprets the meaning of the four white horses, yoked to a chariot or armed. But the Iliadic intertext of Athena and Hera's chariot ride to war and the impropriety of the Trojans' praying to Juno second after Pallas subverts his interpretation and disproves the legitimacy of his metaphorical helmsmanship. In the Trojans' experience in the *Aeneid* horses yoked to chariots have never suggested peace.

Book 5 presents the conceptual basis of the Vergilian ship of state and its helmsman, beginning the explication through an intertextual dialogue with an Iliadic charioteer. Nothing more overtly expresses the analogous nature of a helmsman's steering of the ship and the charioteer's of his chariot team than Vergil's ship race, which commences with a simile comparing the ships to horses in a race, thus alluding

to Homer's Iliadic race, allusions to which continue to occur throughout. Furthermore, most of the decisive action in the race occurs around the *meta*, the turning post of a chariot race. Vergil's choice of a ship race in place of the chariot race was a radical decision on the poet's part, unique in all ancient epic, which can hardly have been done simply to show the poet's cleverness or to be dismissed as insignificant (they lacked chariots, it expresses the past seven years of wandering, etc.). Instead, Vergil intensifies his intertextual dialogue with Homeric texts as his story nears the end of the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid* to draw attention to what is distinctive in his epic's heroic code, as Dunkle and Quint have suggested. The ship race, in particular, largely because crews determine the ship's action, provides the opportunity to foreground leadership and, in the speech of Mnestheus to his crew, contrast the Vergilian leader/helmsman with the Homeric charioteer. The egotism of Antilochus in the *Iliad*'s chariot race is fulsome: he expresses all confidence in his abilities, never considers praying for help, intimates and induces fear to motivate his horses, endangers the safety of Menelaus and his horses and argues for prizes. In all aspects Mnestheus provides a positive moral contrast but most significantly in appealing to his mens' collective memories of heroic struggles and accomplishments and by reminding them of their ultimate goal of a civic home.

The return of Neptune in his sea chariot in book 5 inevitably recalls his initial beneficial and politicized act of calming the stormy seas, so that the Ciceronian concept of the ship of state with its good helmsman overseeing the safety of all, already activated in Mnestheus' speech, could easily have been more particularly communicated in Neptune's request for the sacrifice of one for the safe passage of the many. Neptune's phrase, *unum pro multis*, also expresses succinctly the distinctive ethic of the *Aeneid*'s leader. The careful intertextual preparations suggesting the interchangeability of Aeneas and Palinurus when combined with Neptune's sacrificial request facilitate both the recognition of the Ennian intertext which most likely alluded to both Romulus and the death of Remus and simultaneously, via Ciceronian intertexts and contemporary events, allusions to Augustus and the death of Cicero. Ciceroian intertexts of the ideal helmsman help to solidify Mnestheus' code as the expected blueprint for Aeneas' helmsmanship. Although the simple quiet ending of the book with Aeneas' lament for Palinurus may suggest his death is

simply a continuation of the sacrifices Aeneas' mission has necessitated (Laocoon, Anchises, and Dido), Palinurus' death is the first with particular political relevance for contemporary Romans, even if its expression is highly understated.

For mortals, chariots in the Underworld are either the site of the potential for overweening pride or an outdated war engine. Among the sinners described in Tartarus the only human, Salmoneus, achieved his place by driving a *quadrigae* among the Greek people—a perversion of the civilizing chariots of Cybele and Liber—and, pathetically aping Jupiter, was driven to Tartarus by that god's thunderbolt. Although the chariots of the Trojans in the Elysian fields are a source of pleasure, their presence among older ancestors suggest that they and their weapons, placed at rest, are artifacts of the past. And in the long parade of future descendants, the vast majority of whom were in life *triumphators*, only Mummius drives a triumphing chariot and his victory over Corinth is archaized into a recovery of Trojan ascendancy. Even the *princeps* himself only indirectly celebrates a victory via the simile that compares him to *Liber victor* in his tiger-drawn chariot, which like the chariot of *Magna Mater*, Cybele, also implies a civilizing capacity. Cybele's position in the parade between Romulus and Augustus recalls her topographical location between the hut of Romulus and Augustus' home on the Palatine and reemphasizes the centrality of her cult at Rome. That she arrived in Rome, like Aeneas, from mount Ida via a long sea journey, finally sailing up the Tiber, links goddess and hero together as the events in book 10 will further testify. The distancing of the chariot from the Trojans in book 6 prepares for the Latins' exclusive assumption of the chariot with its Junonian associations, as we will see in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

Latium, its King and Charioteers: The Beginning of the War

While the chief quality of Aeneas as the helmsman of the ship of state—his sense of dutiful responsibility to the well-being of the community akin to Ciceronean helmsman—has been developed in the epic's first half, as well as the chariot's association with Juno, Achilles and Trojan loss, the Latin charioteer is only introduced in book 7 in the circumstances leading up to the war between Trojans and Latins, just as Aeschylus uses both figures during war in *Septem*. But the clarity of the confrontation between helmsman and charioteer at the beginning of the Greek tragedy is complicated in the *Aeneid* by the development of the war as a second Trojan War again over a woman (the Iliadic intertext), the typological recurrence of Juno's book 1 storm attack (intratextual allusions) and the innovative development, aided by the allusive presence of the *Argonautica*, of the highly ambivalent kingdom of Latium and especially of its leader, Latinus. All three of these enriching elements bear directly upon the nature of the Latin war and its charioteers, the central focus of this chapter.[389]

Vergil's Latinus, a godly man and with some qualifications of a good king, who first, with divine guidance invites Aeneas to marry his daughter, but then is overwhelmed by his subjects' demand for war and acquiesces to their wishes, departs from the previous tradition in which he typically sides with Aeneas, fights in the war and dies or, also well attested, is deified as Jupiter Latiaris. Of central importance in the *Aeneid*'s Latinus is his relation to Circe, a bestially transforming goddess, who in one of two genealogies is Latinus' grandmother. Her relevance to the topic of charioteers derives from the mysterious chariot and fire-breathing horses, which she crossbred from her father Sol's horses, and which Latinus gives Aeneas in a gesture of good will. No further comment on these fantastic beasts is given, although the fact that they are also linked to the fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, indicates the

[389] See Appendix A on the considerable increase in the numbers of chariots in the second half of the epic.

central importance of this gift to Aeneas and his future father-in-law and explains the attention given to Latinus, Circe and this particular chariot and horse team in this chapter.

The description of the environment also gives mixed signals from the very beginning of the book, when the restrained animals' growls and cries from Circe's home as the Trojans sail by at night, contrast with the paradisal description of the mouth of the Tiber the next morning. As the Trojan delegation first approaches Latinus' town they see youths driving chariots and exercising in a sort of Campus Martius and the description of his palace has many affinities with the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, both peaceful, but also bellicose, including the spoils of war affixed on its walls, with chariots mentioned prominently. Intratextual allusions to the Trojans first meeting with Dido and the generous welcome she offers them, both reinforce the kindness of Latinus' response to the Trojans, but also suggest oncoming tragedy, the first of many allusions to book 1 which underlie all three of book 7's subdivisions: the arrival of the Trojans, the outbreak of war, and the catalogue of troops, a tripartite schema this chapter will follow.

The *Aeneid*'s engagement with the third book of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, as Nelis (2001) has demonstrated, begins early in book 7. Similarities of plot may appear basic—a hero, having traveled from a distant land, asks a favor of a local king and finds a life-threatening challenge instead—but numerous more specific points of comparison help to delineate the character of Latinus and elucidate the significance of his fire-breathing horses. Although the sequence of Juno's speech, her summoning of Allecto, and the figurative storm they release, is the most prominent echo of book 1 in its intensified version of Juno's initial wrath-inspired act, Vergil's dialogue with the *Argonautica* also continues, in an important storm simile within the narrative of Jason's meeting of the fire-breathing bulls, which by contrast brings out Latinus' weakness in facing the stormy onslaught of his subjects clamoring for war, and prepares for his figurative abandoning of the ship of state and the reins of the charioteer at the end of the scene. His divided allegiance is represented by successive images of power, reflecting his initial affinity with Aeneas and his subsequent yielding to the forces for war. His lack of control, as helmsman

and charioteer, is the antithesis of Neptune's conflated water chariot, which restores order in the midst of chaos.

In a return to a consideration of the charioteers in the catalogue, it now becomes clear that in addition to sharing with the Aeschylus' warriors in *Septem* the actual use of the chariot in the narrative, the Latin warriors share both of their figurative associations: the horse and assailing storms. The lengthy presentations of charioteers are a thematic expression of the immaturity and distractibility of the young Latin charioteers in the war. The strong presence of figurative horses in the catalogue, which we have seen are also present among the Argive charioteers in *Septem*, belongs to a tradition in which Turnus participates. The importance of the horse in the characterizations of the last three leaders in the catalogue draws them together as a unit, which the associations with the barbarian otherness and transgressivity of Virbius and Camilla reinforce since their positions in the catalogue frame Turnus. Both Turnus and Camilla in different ways echo important themes and images from the beginning of the book related to Circe and the fire-breathing horses sent to Aeneas, keeping alive the question of the meaning of that strange gift.

Because the program of decoration on Turnus' and Aeneas' shields express important aspects of their motivation in fighting the upcoming war and of their leadership the chapter will conclude with a comparison of their shields' programs.

The Arrival of the Trojans in Latium: Conflicting Signs

Between the apostrophe to Aeneas' nurse, Caieta, which begins book 7 (*Tu quoque...Caieta*) and the somewhat delayed invocation to the Muse Erato, (*Nunc age...Erato*, 37), Neptune continues to fulfill his promise to Venus of bringing Aeneas safely to Italy. First, he explicitly prevents the pious Trojans from suffering under the hands of Circe (*quae ne monstr pii paterentur talia Troes,* 21), then he stops the winds and makes the sea sluggish and difficult to row (27-28), so that Aeneas notices the paradisal woods surrounding the Tiber running out into the sea. It is a Vergilian innovation that the Trojans land on the shores of the Tiber rather than those of the sea and, even though the Trojans only land near the river's

mouth, this is an important change.[390] Vergil's choice of the Tiber also facilitates the continuation well into the second half of the epic of the association of Aeneas with the ship. In fact, the most significant presentations of Aeneas as helmsman are as he sails along the Tiber to Rome and returns from Caere to the camp at the mouth of the Tiber. It is worth noting that Neptune essentially brings Aeneas to the river, for he is the god with whom contemporary political connotations first entered the epic and who will largely disappear from the epic, with the exception of his presence at the battle of Actium on Aeneas' shield.[391] Neptune both protects Aeneas and the Trojans from Circe's threatening shores and guides them to the welcoming Tiber river, areas representative of the dual picture of Latium and the Latins the Trojans will encounter.

Vergil indicates that these contrasting programmatic passages should be considered together by beginning and concluding the two passages as a whole with Aeneas in charge of the ship (*tendit iter velis*, 7; *flectere iter...imperat*, 36), while Neptune's actions surround the coming of Aurora's rosy chariot in the middle (*Neptunus ventis impelvit vela secundis*, 24; *cum venti posuere*, 27). As Horsfall has noted (2000, 25-36), the balance in this contrast is "rich, studied and perfect," but in purely physical terms, darkness and light, the quality of animal sounds, and freedom and naturalness versus confinement and monstrosity are salient. After having buried his nurse, Caieta, Aeneas sets sail at night (Horsfall, 2000, 8; Fordyce, 8), the difficulty and insecurity of which is suggested by the moon's litotic guidance (*nec candida cursus/ luna negat*, 8-9) and its unstable light (*tremulo sub lumine*, 9). By contrast, the coming of Dawn, which initiates the section describing the Tiber, is resplendent with light and color (25-26):

> Iamque rubescebat radiis mare et aethere ab alto
> Aurora in roseis fulgebat lutea bigis,
>
> And now the sea was becoming pink with rays of light and high in the sky
> crocus-yellow Dawn was shining brightly in her rosy chariot.

---

[390] For Romans the Tiber had "a massive charge of legendary and historical associations," (Horsfall, 2000, 25-36), which this move a small distance up the coast and into the river activates. For example, the story of Romulus and Remus, but also, as we have seen in Chapter 4, that of Cybele's approach to Rome from Mt. Ida, famously recounted by Livy (29. 10. 4).

[391] Neptune is also less noticeably present in the formulaic expression of his paternity of Messapus (7. 691=9. 523=12. 128; 12. 550), leader of tribes from southern Etruria (7. 695-97) and Turnus associates the walls of Troy with Neptune (9. 145, *moenia Troiae / Neptuni fabricata manu*).

The Tiber, too, described with its "favourite adjective" (*flavus*, 31; "golden," Williams, 1972-73) adds bright color. While in the Circean section the winds blow (*aspirant aurae,* 8; *ventis implevit vela*, 23) and the ships move along (*tendit iter velis*, 7; *raduntur*, 10; *fugam dedit*, *praeter...vexit,* 26), the winds emphatically stop and the sea itself seems to prevent the movement of the ships at the mouth of the Tiber (27-28):

> cum venti posuere omnisque repente resedit
> flatus, et in lento luctantur marmore tonsae.
>
> When the winds became calm and every gust suddenly settled
> and the rowers struggled in the sluggish sea.

As Segal (1968, 429) notes, Vergil "virtually eliminates the positive human side of Circe" evident in the *Odyssey*, where she is both an enchantress, but also a lover and, ultimately, an indispensable supporter of Odysseus' return home. Even in her initial description in Homer, she sings "in a sweet voice" (ὀπὶ καλῇ, καλὸν ἀοιδιάει, 10. 221, 227), while in Vergil her singing is simply incessant (*adsiduo*, 12) and there is no imagined divine product of her weaving as in Homer (10. 222-24), but rather Vergil attends to the unattractive sound from the shrill (*arguto*, 14) comb she uses in her weaving. But the most compelling and frightening sounds associated with Circe's domain in Vergil emanate from her savage beasts (lions, hogs, bears and wolves, 15-18): angry groans, roars, raging, and howls from the trapped beasts ("struggling with their bonds," *vincla recusantum*, 16; "in cages," *in praesepibus*, 17), made horrific by the concluding revelation of the beasts original human form (19-20). Segal (1968, 430-31) points out the particular emphasis Vergil has given to *saevus* (fierce) in this passage (17-19, not only through anaphora: *saevire, saeva,* but also in the repetition of the *-ae* dipthong: *saetigerique*, *praesepibus, formae*) and throughout book 7,[392] a word strongly associated with Juno and Achilles in book 1 and with Juno (287, 592) and Allecto (329, 511) in this book. The transformation of the men becomes the climactic conclusion to the description of Circe's shores:

---

[392] Segal (1968), 431, n. 20, lists further occurrences of *saevus* words, "a dominant note" in book 7: 84, 222, 287, 329, 461, 511, 568, 592, 608, 664, 719.

quos hominum ex facie dea saeva potentibus herbis
induerat Circe in vultus ac terga ferarum.

With powerful potions from their human form Circe,
the fierce goddess, had buried them in the features and hides of beasts.

The graphic detail of *vultus ac terga* and the "pointed chiastic opposition, *hominum ex facie...terga ferarum,*" stress "the horror and eeriness of the metamorphosis from men into wild beasts" (Segal, 1968, 432), a power that has encouraged critics to consider Circe as a symbol for book 7 (Segal, 1968, 430, 432; Putnam, 1970, 412-13) or even, due to the central placement of this passage in the epic, for the whole of the *Aeneid.*[393] Hardie relates Circe's bestialization to a general Italian proclivity in book 7 to confuse man and beast and,[394] as an agent of debasing metamorphosis, Circe prepares for and is similar to the Fury, Allecto (Segal, 1968, 430; Putnam, 1979, 415-16), the sole catalyst of the war. On the other hand, as Aeneas gazes on the Tiber its agreeable beauty (*fluvio...amoeno*, 29) is conveyed most convincingly by the abundance of birds frequenting the river and its surrounding woods (32-34):

variae circumque supraque
adsuetae ripis volucres et fluminis alveo
aethera mulcebant cantu lucoque volabant.

Above and around a variety of birds,
at home in the banks and channel of the river,
were making the air sweet with their song
and flying in the forest.

The animal life in the environs of the Tiber is represented by the birds, which, although of many types (*variae*, 32), are united in their freedom (suggested in *circumque supraque, adsuetae,* "accustomed," "at home" [Horsfall, 2000] and *volabant*), in contrasted to Circe's caged beasts, and in their apparent contentment with their life implied by their sweet song (*aethera mulcebant cantu*), similar to the Homeric Circe's song (ὀπὶ καλῇ, καλὸν ἀοιδιάει, *Od.* 10. 221, 227), but neither comparable to that of Vergil's

[393] Hardie (1992), 61-62, points out that this passage is at the major dividing point of the whole *Aeneid* and that "the corresponding position in the *Georgics* is occupied by the poetic temple of Caesar." Further, the incidence of miraculous change is greater than in either the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.

[394] *Ibid*, 63, in addition to Circe's magic, other means of confusing the divide between man and beast are: dressing up as an animal (Aventinus wears a lion skin, 666, and the troops of Caeculus have helmets of wolfskin, 688), the figurative bestialization of epic simile (Messapus' men compared to swans, 699; Catillus and Coras to centaurs, 674) and both Aventinus (the Hydra) and Turnus (Chimaera, Io as a cow) bear the emblem of beasts on their shields.

Circe or to the roars and howls of her transformed humans. Understandably, Aeneas, still in command at an unspecified place on board ship, orders (*imperat*, 36) his comrades to change their course and turn the prows of the ships toward land and, reflecting the bright welcome evident in this view of the Tiber, he joyfully approaches the shady river (*laetus fluvio succedit opaco*, 36).[395] This more positive impression of Latium will be picked up in aspects of Latinus' kingdom, but the Circean threat of bestial metamorphosis will also recur and will be fully expressed in the transformation of the Latins into creatures rabid for war.[396]

Latinus, his Palace and the first Latin Charioteers

Certainly the initial description of Latinus' reign over "tranquil cities in abiding peace" (*urbes...longa placidas in pace regebat*, 45-46), his descent from Saturn (49) and his description to Ilioneus, in receiving the embassy of Trojans, of the continuation of the Golden Age freedom from the need for laws among his peoples (202-04), seem to justify Aeneas' rejoicing (*laeti,* 130) at the unexpected fulfillment of the prophecy of eating their plates (107-27), the sign that they should build their first home.[397] But the joy Aeneas encourages his men to have as they reconnoitre the countryside, is undercut by one of the many echoes of book 1 in the description of the approach to and meeting with Latinus that recall Dido's welcoming of the Trojans and suggest connotations of its tragic consequences.[398] Similarly, as Aeneas begins work on his city's walls, after sending one hundred chosen men to King Latinus with peace offerings (152-55), he builds walls typical for a camp, surrounded by merlons and ramparts (*castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit*, 159), the first of many conflations of the characteristics

---

[395] Benario (1978), 7, maintains that *laetus* describes both "Aeneas' response to the scene but also Tiber's welcome," initiating the Trojans association in the second half of the *Aeneid* with the positive life–supporting fresh water of the Tiber, linked with land, as opposed to the destructive power of the salt-water sea, characteristic of the Trojans' experiences in their Odyssean wandering.

[396] Although Reckford (1961), 255, acknowledges the over-arching beauty and attractiveness of the Tiber here, he also notes, "there is latent symbolism of war in his entering the dark womb of the river (*fluminis alveo . . . fluvio succedit opaco*)." Also Pöschl, 144: "Only in the last word is there perhaps a slight premonition of danger."

[397] On the Golden age and agrarian, peaceful connotations of Latinus' genealogy in its first version (Saturn, Picus, Faunus and Marcia), see Rosivach (1980), 140-44.

[398] Cf. *quare agite et primo laeti cum lumine solis / quae loca, quiue habeant homines, ubi moenia gentis, vestigemus et a portu diversa petamus* (7. 130-32) with *At pius Aeneas.../ut primum lux alma data est, exire locosque/ explorare novos, quas vento accesserit oras,/qui teneant, nam inculta videt, hominesne feraene,/ quaerere constituit...*(1. 305-09) and Reckford (1961) on the intratextual allusions to books 1-4 in book 7.

of the Trojans' camp with those of a city (Hardie, 1994, 10-12), which at this point portends the future war. As he begins work on his walls Aeneas executes his last action in book 7; the alliance Latinus proposes with him—the attendant marriage with his daughter Lavinia with the implicit inheritance of the Latin kingdom (50-53), and the inciting of the war against Aeneas, occur wholly in his absence.

Among the important consequences of Aeneas' lack of involvement in the remainder of book 7 is that Latinus has the opportunity to offer him marriage to Lavinia (in Aeneas' absence, insuring his emotional distance). In addition, his absence provides narrative space to focus on the leadership of Latinus (and to a certain extent on that of Turnus, Cairns, 1989, 63). In previous accounts of the Trojans' arrival this marriage was sometimes ignored (apparently in Cato), but more often it preceded the battle (Livy, 1. 1. 4-10, Dio. of Halicarnassus, 1. 57-9).[399] Clearly, the unresolved offer from Latinus facilitates the further development of the ensuing war as another Trojan War, again fought over a woman, as the Sibyl had predicted,[400] but Aeneas' total absence minimizes his guilt in starting the war and also alleviates even the possibility of his personal interest in Lavinia, a very lightly sketched character, whom Aeneas never sees. While Vergil does develop the character of Latinus, his forcefulness would appear to be considerably less in the *Aeneid* than in most accounts, in which he clearly sides either with Turnus (Cato) or, more often, with Aeneas (Livy, Dio. of Halicarnuss), and usually fights and dies in the war. Even the city of Latinus, which functions importantly several times in the narrative, is left nameless (Horsfall, 2000, 62), partially because Lavinium, the city with which "Latinus is connected throughout the tradition," from the beginning of the *Aeneid* is associated with Aeneas (*Aeneid*, 1. 2, 270).[401] The figure of Latinus gains increasing complexity in the context of the Trojans' embassy, in which chariots and Circe reenter a narrative darkly enriched by allusions to Apollonius' *Argonautica.*

---

[399] Heinze, 142-4, discusses the *Aeneid*'s plot relative to previous versions of the story. Cato's version is deduced from Servius (on *Aen.* 11. 316) and frag. 8 Peter.

[400] By contrast Cato's version (Heinze, 142) spreads the war over three separate engagements in the first of which Latinus dies, in the second Aeneas vanishes and in the culminating battle Ascanius kills Mezentius in a duel.

[401] See Alföldi (1965), 238, and 250-65, on Lavinium as the traditional site of the Trojans' landing, consuming of their "tables" (and relation to ancient ritual there), the pact between Aeneas and Latinus (263), and later Roman officials' obligation to offer yearly sacrifices there (261).

The pacific and pious Latinus, descended from gods (Saturn, Faunus and Marcia) and ready to confirm and follow the omens indicating his daughter should marry a foreigner, is not absent from his speeches to Ilioneus, leader of the Trojan embassy.[402] Nevertheless, the preceding descriptions of the activities outside his palace (162-65) and of the palace itself (170-91), while manifesting many parallels with Roman topography and buildings, also reveal a tradition of martial involvement that seems to have persisted up to the narrative present.

As the embassy of Trojans approach Latinus' city they catch sight of boys and youth engaged in driving chariots, stretching bows, throwing javelins and competing with each other in running and boxing (160-65):

> iamque iter emensi turris ac tecta Latinorum
> ardua cernebant iuvenes muroque subibant.
> ante urbem pueri et primaevo flore iuventus
> exercentur equis domitantque in pulvere currus,
> aut acris tendunt arcus aut lenta lacertis
> spicula contorquent, cursuque ictuque lacessunt:
>
> And now having traversed the distance, the young men
> saw the towers and lofty buildings of the Latins and approached the wall.
> Before the city boys and youth in their prime train horses
> and master their chariots amid the dust, or they stretch taut bows
> or forcefully hurl pliant javelins, and compete at running and boxing.

After the Trojans see the significant material presence of Latinus' city (*turris ac tecta...ardua...muro*), the first Latins they see are boys and young men who appear to be practicing for war before the city. Most prominent among their activities, because mentioned first and at greatest length, is the training of their chariot teams.[403] Bows and javelins function in both hunting and war and, while running and boxing are standard among athletic competition (cf. 5. 291-361; 363-484), blows (*ictu*) at close range are certainly

[402] He welcomes him with words characterized as peaceful ("calm" or "kindly," *placido...ore*, 194), sympathizes with the hardships of sea voyaging, knows who the Trojans are and where they are from and even that the founder of Troy, Dardanus, immigrated from Italy and expresses the conviction that he is now a god (205-211).

[403] Horsfall (2000), 163, concludes that, due to the limited use of cavalry on Latinus' side (Camilla's is the only contingent), Vergil with both actions (*exercentur* and *dominant*) most likely refers to chariots (via hendiadys).

part of war (the greatest number occur in book 12 associated with Turnus),[404] as can be running. Witness, for example, the chasing of Turnus by Aeneas (12. 742-65) that is compared to a race (764-65) and, in fact, also occurs before the city of Latinus, i.e., in this same place (*hinc ardua moenia cingunt*, 12. 745). The Trojans seem to have arrived at a sort of Campus Martius (Horsfall, 2000, 162), which derived its name from an ancient altar dedicated to the god of War (Livy 2. 5) and from Rome's earliest time was used for military drills and troop assembly before war (Livy 1. 16, 3. 27, 3. 69), although athletic competitions also occurred there and continued in Vergil's day (Suetonius, *Aug.* 43).

The building in which Latinus receives the Trojan embassy (170-91) likewise manifests both martial and Roman features, although its numinous qualities initially predominate (170-72):

> Tectum augustum, ingens, centum sublime columnis
> urbe fuit summa, Laurentis regia Pici,
> horrendum silvis et religione parentum.
>
> There was a sacred building, on the city's heights, huge
> and lofty with a hundred columns, the palace of Laurentine Picus,
> awe-inspiring because of its woods and the reverence of the generations.

The awe-inspiring nature of the Laurentine palace both in terms of its size (*ingens, centum sublime columnis*) and location (*urbe...summa*), and also in the devotion, which it inspires and has over the years (*augustum, horrendum*, *religione parentum*), dominates the beginning of an extensive ecphrasis.[405] The prominence of the religious is completely consistent with previous descriptions of Latinus' actions and his buildings,[406] even if much both in this passage and in the subsequent lines seems to contradict or at least vary the impression of Latium developed so far.[407] A general consensus sees Vergil's double version

---

[404] Of the 24 occurrences of *ictus* in the *Aeneid* 7 occur in book 5 (mostly in the boxing contest) and 8 in book 12 of which 6 are associated with Turnus (106, 713, 732, 740, 907, 926). The highest number that any of the other books has is 2: book 7, and 9.

[405] Both Horsfall (2000), 153, and Fordyce, 153, attend to Servius' gloss on *augusta* at 153 (*augurio consecrata*) which suggests the omens taken for founding the city and give a stronger than usual translation of *augustus*, "sacred" and "what has received divine blessing," respectively.

[406] His palaces walls are *augusta* (153), the only other use beside *tectum augustum,* above, of this redolent adjective in the epic and Latinus, a descendant of gods (47-49), is their worshipper (61, 72, 82-3, 93) and dutiful follower of their instructions (81, 103-5).

[407] For example, the relationship between this palace attributed to his grandfather, Picus, to the one Latinus founded (*cum conderet arces*, 61) has been a source of controversy, complicated by Picus' attribute, *Laurentis*, an adjective

of Latium—rustically peaceable and yet experienced in war—as intentional.[408] This palace is referred to variously (*tectum, regia, templum, sedes*), a reflection of its diverse uses, every one of which is shared by the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill in Rome, as Camps has argued.[409] The combination of the political—the investiture of the king, scepter and *fasces* (173-4), the meeting of the senate (174), statues of ancestors (178-82, 187-91)—and religious spheres of the city—sacred banquets (175-6), statues of the gods (180)—and the celebration of the deeds of valor (spoils affixed to the building, 183-86) and sacrifices on behalf of the country (182), elaborated in some detail, are important parallels.[410] Although the references to war do not appear until just past the midpoint of the ecphrasis, the section's length and the manner in which it prepares for the last section, the full description of Picus, who is thus separated from the other ancestors by the bellicose section, give added weight to the connotations of war in the complex, to which captured chariots contribute.

The line which shifts the focus of the ecphrasis from the values and traditions of the community to its wars concludes the brief descriptions of the statues of ancestors and kings (177-81) and is followed by a substantial list of the spoils of war hanging in the palace (182-87):

Latinus was said to have given his people, based on the laurel tree he dedicated to Apollo and, apparently, built his house around, Odysseus-like (62-63).

[408] Rosivach (1980) argues convincingly for a carefully crafted Vergilian ambiguity, Moorton (1988), for no substantial inconsistencies, while Horsfall (2000), 170-91, agrees with Rosivach, that the inconsistency between war and peace is present and deliberate, but wonders "whether the very scope of the two passages is not sufficiently different to eliminate the need for any specific explanation." Bleisch, 2003, 89-109, accepts this ambiguity as fully intentional.

[409] Camps (1969), 153, n. 14, notes "the correspondences between this building (*Aeneid* 7. 170-86) and the Capitoline temple are both numerous and precise." The temple of Jupiter was vast and majestic (cf. *augustum, ingens,* 7. 170), stood conspicuous on a hill, was fronted with a triple row of columns (Dion. Hall. *Ant. Rom.* 4. 61), and was adorned with spoils of war (Liv. 40. 51), statues of former kings (Appian, *BCiv.* 1.16) and heroes (Suet. *Calig.* 34). It was the scene of meetings of the senate (Liv. 24. 10; Cic. *Dom.* 14) and of the ritual banquet called *epulum Iovis,* in which the senate took part (Val. Max. 2. 1. 2; Gell. 12. 8). The consuls of the Republic assumed office there, where their lictors first carried *fasces* (Ov. *Fast.* 1. 79-82). Horsfall (2000), 172, also notes evidence for *silvae* on the Capitoline (Liv. 1. 8. 5; Ov. *Fast.* 3. 431).

[410] Bleisch (2003, 97-98) notes that many of these same uses and features also characterized Augustus' Palatine complex—size, grandeur, and lofty location, decoration with spoils, use as temple and meeting place of the senate, images of ancestors, but many of the uses only developed later in Augustus' rule—Augustus held meetings of the senate, for example, "in his declining years" (Suet, *Aug.* 29)—and the temple of Apollo was only recently dedicated (28) and, therefore, may not have (or could not?) come as easily to mind as the age-old temple on the Capitoline. Galinsky, 1996, 213, notes that, although the Apolline area was given several additional functions overtime, "it is doubtful that these were pre-planned at the time of its construction."

> ... Martiaque ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.
> multaque praeterea sacris in postibus arma,
> captiui pendent currus curvaeque secures
> et cristae capitum et portarum ingentia claustra
> spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis.
>
> (And statues of those) who had suffered wounds in wars,
> fought on behalf of the fatherland (stood in the hall) and,
> moreover, there were weapons on the sacred doorposts;
> captured chariots hang and curved axes, the crests of helmets
> and great bars from gates, javelins, and shields and rams torn from ships.

This transitional line (182) is also noteworthy because it nearly reproduces the first of the lines that characterize the virtuous in the Elysian Fields (*hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi,* 6. 660), which had been preceded by the description of the Trojans enjoying their weapons—arms, chariots, spears, and horses (651-55), suggesting a shared valuing of patriotic valor by Trojans, Latins and Romans alike, as well as foreshadowing, in the immediate circumstance, the approaching opportunity for similar suffering for both Trojans and Latins. Certainly, Picus' palace displays a particularly wide variety of *spolia*, suggesting their involvement in numerous types of warfare, from chariot battles, close engagements, and assaults of strongholds, to naval battles.[411] By comparison, the evidence suggests that the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline displayed only captured shields and standards,[412] although an over abundance of statues seems to have been common at times (Livy, 40. 51). However, chariots, mentioned first among the variety of *spolia* on Picus' palace, were perhaps even more evident at the Temple of Jupiter, where a statue of Jupiter driving a *quadrigae*, appears to have crowned the temple's summit from its earliest days,[413] and in 192 a number of gilded chariots—*quadrigae* and even a 6 horse chariot—were

---

[411] Bleisch, 103, analyzes *rostra* as "a final image that perfectly encapsulates the negation of the Golden Age in Italy," since "ships represent greed and mercantilism, captured ship-beaks represent warfare, and the word *rostra* conjures up associations of litigation and the recourse to law—that is, the absence of spontaneous justice."

[412] In 180 Lepidus, as censor, took from the columns of the temple "shields and all manner of military standards attached to them" (Liv. 40. 51). Horace *Carm.* 4. 15. 6-8, and *Ep.* 1. 18. 56, refers to the return of the Roman standards, "torn from insolent Parthian porches," to the Temple of Jupiter.

[413] A short time before his expulsion Tarquin is said to have commissioned from the potters of Veii a clay chariot to be placed on the roof of the Temple of Jupiter. The story of its swelling in the oven while baking, indicating increasing power to the possessors of the statue, Veii's attempt to keep the statue and the subsequent sign indicating the statues proper owner (a charioteer, after winning a race in Veii, was carried away by his horses who ran off with him to Rome and threw him before the city's gates), is told by Plutarch, *Publ.* 13 and referred to by Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 28. 4 and 35. 45. In 296, according to Livy (10. 23. 12), a statue of Jupiter in a *quadrigae* was set up on the

installed on the Capital (Livy, 35. 41. 10; 38. 35. 4), and, of course, *triumphatores,* dressed in the guise of Jupiter, ended their *quadrigae* procession on the top of the Capitoline before his temple. The association of chariots with the Latins, however, may be further strengthened in "the one detailed description in the entire ecphrasis, that of the palace's founder," Picus (Horsfall, 2000, 187).

By concluding his ecphrasis of Picus' palace with the description of its founder Vergil unifies the passage in recalling the initial phrase (*Laurentis regia Pici*, 171), but also distinguishes Picus from the other ancestor/god statues by more than intervening lines (186-91):

> ipse Quirinali lituo parvaque sedebat
> succinctus trabea laevaque ancile gerebat
> Picus, equum domitor, quem capta cupidine coniunx
> aurea percussum virga versumque venenis
> fecit avem Circe sparsitque coloribus alas.
>
> And Picus himself with the Quirinal staff and girt
> in the short cloak was seated, holding a sacred shield in his left hand;
> the tamer of horses, whom his wife, Circe, consumed by desire,
> struck with her golden wand and with potions changed
> and made (him) a bird, and she sprinkled his wings with colors.

Like the ecphrasis as a whole, the description of Picus initially and overtly emphasizes his religious role: he holds an augur's staff, which like the short cloak, was associated with Romulus (*Quirinali*), is seated (unlike the preceding ancestors, *astabant,* 181), a privilege allowed to augurs (and kings, Horsfall, 2000, 187; see further below), and holds a sacred shield (*ancile*), the figure eight shield carried by the Salii, priests of Mars and Quirinus (Horsfall, 2000, 188). But with this last attribute, his association with Mars and the future war begin to take over the end of the ecphrasis. Like Lausus and Messapus in the Latin catalogue that concludes book 7, Picus, is a horse tamer, a term used only of the Latin side in the war. The *Iliad* applies the equivalent epithet (ἵππόδαμος) to both sides (Diomedes and Hector, most prominently—the last word of the epic describing Hector), but as we have seen, the Argives in Aeschylus' *Septem* were exclusively described as charioteers, with domineering political connotations, and one warrior's name, Hippomedon, has an equivalent meaning, ruler of horses. At this point in the *Aeneid*,

---

roof of the temple. Gjerstad (1960), 186-87, figs. 117-18, argues that both the frieze and raking cornice of the original temple of Jupiter were decorated with charioteer ensembles, the frieze with a procession (which "has a symbolic connexion with the triumphal procession") and the raking cornice with a race.

horses have largely connoted war and aggression (Aeolus' winds, the Trojan horse, Achilles' chariot), but that horses with chariots will be a distinguishing characteristic of the Latin side in the war, only begins to emerge in the catalogue of troops. However, the linking of this *equum domitor*, with Circe, as we have seen in her earlier appearance (10-20) a prefiguration of Allecto, instigator of war, and her transformative bestialization of Picus by means of her potions (190) into a woodpecker,[414] the bird associated with Mars (and sometimes even the theriomorphic manifestation of the god; Rosivach, 142, n. 9, "as leader of the *ver sacrum*"), signifies the approaching war, one which, as here suggestively (*percussum*), will be motivated overtly by passions (*capta cupidine*, 189).[415] In these last lines of the ecphrasis Circe is ominously insinuated into the family of Latinus,[416] as will be pointedly recalled in Latinus' gift of horses to Aeneas.

Thus, in what is presented to the reader of Latinus' town and the palace where he welcomes the Trojan embassy, his peoples' capability in war is announced—in the youths practicing for war, in the honoring of dead heroes by the dedication of numerous trophies of war, and in Picus' affinity with the war god, Mars—and the chariot has a place in every section (the first activity of the youths described), the first of the spoils catalogued, and in Picus's epithet, *equum domitor*. Along with the religious and political characteristics the palace shares with the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline, the martial associations are noteworthy. The most important building in both states honored tangibly the contributions of its warriors with statues and dedication of captured booty, within a religious context.

---

[414] Both Picus and Latinus are presented from the perspective of antiquarian history, but with intermittent mythological or "magical" intrusions involving Circe. Williams (1973), 189, f, characterizes the "transition from legend and antiquarian history (in the description of Picus) to mythology" as "strange and fascinating." Hardie (1992), 63, describes Circe's effects as "magical."

[415] Segal (1968), 430, characterizes Circe as "an obstruction who symbolizes the lure of hidden passions" and she "foreshadows the violence, passion and chthonic magic of Allecto, with whom she shares the themes of *venea* (7. 341, 354) and *monstra* (7. 348, 376)." Putnam (1970), 417, comments on the irony of the invocation to the muse of love poetry, Erato, (37), because "no love enters this world as a result of Aeneas' arrival," and all the uses of *amor* in book 7 are distortions of love: Amata's *miro amore* (57) for her would-be son-in-law; Turnus' *amor ferri* (461); the Italians fired *insani Martis amore* (550); and Iulus' wounding of Silvia's pet *eximiae laudis amore* (496).

[416] While it is certainly true that taking *coniunx* without any proleptic sense (Horsfall, 2000, 189: as occurs elsewhere in the *Aeneid,* 3. 331, 9. 138; 10. 722), makes Circe's actions mysterious ("the phrase that ostensibly explains her reasons...*capta cupidine coniunx* [7. 189], is most mysterious of all" Segal, 1968, 435) or even perverted ("the only way that Circe's lust can keep love is to transform it into bestial form" Putnam, 1970, 414), that Sol, Circe's father, is later referred to as Latinus's ancestor (*avus* 12. 164) suggests the actuality of the marriage of Picus and Circe. See further below.

While we have seen Rome and its families interwoven into the Trojan ship race as a tribute to Romans' Trojan ancestry, in the affinities between Rome and Latinus' city, the Latins likewise are acknowledged as part of Rome's treasured heritage.[417] This strategy, of course, furthers the impression of an impending civil war, a less fortunate and frequent part of Rome's past. It is through Juno-inflamed passions (via Allecto) that the Latins are goaded into war, which occurs immediately after the Trojans return from their meeting with Latinus bearing his gifts and the good news of the proposed marriage.

Circe and the fire-breathing Horses

Even within this environment indicative of both current and past wars, Latinus' words never suggest anything but peaceful intentions as he meets with the Trojans. He responds joyfully to Ilioneus' request (259), after he has perceived Aeneas' significance as the fulfillment of the oracles for his daughter's marriage. But the gifts he bestows on the Trojans as an apparent indication of his good will and intentions, nevertheless, suggest war (274-83), a not infrequent observation:[418]

haec effatus equos numero pater eligit omni
(stabant ter centum nitidi in praesepibus altis);
omnibus extemplo Teucris iubet ordine duci
instratos ostro alipedes pictisque tapetis
(aurea pectoribus demissa monilia pendent,
tecti auro fulvum mandunt sub dentibus aurum),
absenti Aeneae currum geminosque iugalis
semine ab aetherio spirantis naribus ignem,
illorum de gente patri quos daedala Circe
supposita de matre nothos furata creavit.

Having spoken, the father chose horses from his whole herd
(Three hundred sleek ones were standing in high stalls)
and ordered that swift-footed steeds, caparisoned in purple
and embroidered tapestry, be led out immediately for all the Trojans
(gold collars hung down on their chests; covered with gold,
they champed on tawny gold between their teeth).
For the absent Aeneas a chariot and matched team, from a divine seed,

[417] Not to be forgotten is the fact that in some accounts Latinus and Aeneas fought together, see above p. 230. Alföldi (1965), 250-78, documents the antiquity of ritual importance for Rome of Lavinium, the town frequently associated with Latinus, and near where the Trojans in most accounts were thought to have landed (251).

[418] Nelis (2001), 367; Paschalis, 250; Quint, 63; Putnam (1970), 415, n. 8. Although Horsfall (2000), 274, notes that the horses given to the Trojans are symbolic, not practical, since they don't ride into war on the horses, he is tentative in assessing the meaning of Latinus gift to Aeneas (282): "Is Circe now as menacing as she was at 10ff.? Are (her) horses charged with threat?"

> breathing fire from their noses, from the race of those hybrids, which
> clever Circe bred from a mare, put with one stolen from her father [Sol].

The horses given to the Trojans initially seem to be primarily a sign of Latinus' generosity and royal wealth. The king has many horses, which are well-kept (*nitidi*) in spacious stalls (*praesepibus altis*). He doesn't hesitate to cut his herd down by a third, sending them off in royal purple and triple gold. But as Quint (63), notes, while the Trojans receive the gift of horses, almost, as a rule: (Dido 5. 571, Helenus 3. 470, Latinus, Evander 8. 551-53), the only need they have for them "is waging war, as Anchises indicates in his interpretation of the omen of the four horses." Latinus' gift, in a sense, is the exact fulfillment of Anchises' interpretation of that omen:[419] the horses initially seem to be only a friendly gift meant to suggest the most pacific intentions, but within the wider imagery of the epic and its intertextual engagement, they clearly imply war, however oblivious Latinus appears to be to this connotation.[420] Paschalis' work also supports the bellicose implications of horses: Vergil focuses on horses' "violent, furious, and uncontrolled 'impetus,' the trampling of bodies...and their part in the dragging or dismembering of heroes" (19-20).[421] Furthermore, triple gold accoutrements in the *Aeneid* appear in circumstances of impending death—Dido as she rides out to hunt with Aeneas (4. 138), the Gauls attacking the Capitoline on Aeneas' shield (8. 659) and Chloreus (11. 774), whose gold leads Camilla to her death. Yet, the Trojans' gifts remain within the realm of realism; the same cannot be said for Aeneas'

---

[419] Nelis (2001), 287, "When the Trojans first sighted Italy at 3. 537-43, they saw horses which Anchises interpreted as representing both war and the hope of peace, an ambivalence played out here, where peace will soon give way to war."

[420] So, in fact, whatever Latinus' intentions, the horses signify war, just as the peaceful implications of the four horses that Anchises perceived were undercut, by Juno's presence with Minerva/Athena, that, in the context, implied the horses' bellicose activities even when yoked to the chariot. See Ch. 4, Juno's Chariot.

[421] There are some significant exceptions to this, certainly, particularly in those passages where horses' capacity to grieve for their master (Pallas' horse; *post bellator equus positis insignibus Aethon/ it lacrimans guttisque umectat grandibus ora*, 11. 89-90) or demonstrate courage (Mezentius' horse, Rhaebus; *neque enim, fortissme, credo,/ iussa aliena pati et dominos dignabere Teucros*, 10. 865-66).

Nor do horses imply this degree of violence when Aeneas, in his sole equestrian appearance, rides to Caere on a gift horse from Evander, covered with a golden lion skin (8. 552-3). Evander's Arcadians are represented as largely without experience of ships—they are terrified of the sight of Aeneas' ship and are shut off or hemmed in by the Tiber. Their gift to Aeneas, in addition to his horse, is restricted to Pallas and four hundred cavalry and the knowledge of Tarchon's availability with his troops. This brief ride from Pallanteum to Caere (despite the unmentioned logistical problem of crossing the Tiber [See Fordyce, 8. 497]) provides an opportunity to extend the suggestion of Aeneas' affinity with Hercules (8. 177) and a memorable exit of the troops from Pallanteum with Pallas, focused on through simile, riding with Aeneas and the mothers of Pallanteum watching anxiously as the troops ride out of town. Once the goal of Caere is reached, Aeneas has no further contact with "real" horses.

fire-breathing horses, which, like Picus' transformation into a woodpecker, occur in the magical realm of mythology, and are an image requiring interpretation.

The emblematic nature of Latinus' gift of fire-breathing horses is strengthened beyond their fantastic pyrotechnical capacity by the narrative space around them.[422] As is clearly emphasized, Aeneas is cut off from the giving of the horses, (the description begins with the phrase *absenti Aeneae,* 200), and will be as well from the reception, nor does he ever attempt, as charioteer, to master this pair. The brief two-line summary of the Trojans' return (284-85), riding high on their horses and reporting peace, ironically abuts directly on the return of *saeva Iovis coniunx* (287) and the stirring up of war. Nor, in fact, does the text insist on Latinus' close association with Aeneas' gift, omitting a connective to the originating verbs *iubet...duci,* (276) 4 lines previous to the gift (280). Nevertheless, Vergil carefully provides indications that Latinus not only owns these horses, but has a closer relation with Circe than at first seems evident. While the better-known version of Circe's lust for Picus is that found in Ovid (*Met.* 14. 312), in which Picus is already married to Canens, remains faithful to her and therefore suffers Circe's wrath, this Circean inspired gift and Latinus' possession of the crown of Sol, his *avus*, (12. 164), suggest that "horses of the stock of Circe's father, the Sun, were in Latinus' possession and that implies a Circe not at all spurned but who rather became, by Picus, mother of Faunus, Latinus' father."[423] But the fire-breathing horses and chariot may also have implications for Aeneas, who has a similarly scheming relative, as the major intertext activated by this passage shows.

In the *Iliad* Aeneas' father Anchises resorts to subterfuge of a similar nature to acquire his phenomenal horses, two of which Aeneas drives into war and lost to Diomedes (5. 323-27). Zeus had given King Laomedon, in recompense for taking his son Ganymede, the gift of "the best of all horses that are beneath the dawn and the sun," (*Il.* 5. 268-69):

---

[422] As Horsfall (2000), 274, has suggested about the gift of horses in general: "...this timely gift is symbolic, not practical, for they do not seem to ride into battle, though they have allied cavalry (11. 598).

[423] Horsfall (2000), 191, following Fordyce, 189. Moorton (1988), 253, sees these two horses as descendants of the mare bred to the horses of the Sun. Bleisch, 2003, 106, is categorical on Latinus' involvement: "The implication is that this herd was passed down to Latinus from Circe as an heirloom. Latinus is Circe's scion; Latinus' hospitality toward the Trojans is Circean."

> τῆς γενεῆς ἔκλεψεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγχίσης
> λάθρῃ Λαομέδοντος ὑποσχὼν θήλεας ἵππους:
>
> From this stock the lord of men Anchises stole,
> putting his mares to them while Laomedon knew nothing of it.

The closeness in phrasing between these lines and *Aeneid* 282-3 suggests the importance of the Iliadic intertext (Fordyce, 283). Particularly significant is the clear attribution of thievery in both (ἔκλεψεν, *furata*) and the placing of the mare under the divine/divinely given horse (῾υποσχὼν θήλεας ἵππους, *quos...supposita de matre*). This textual closeness seems to imply that even though Aeneas never rides these horses, they may in someway "fit" him. The narrative structure in these two stories are close, implying the relevance of the gift for both Latinus and Aeneas, but the horses obtained in the hybridization schemes differ especially in their realism. What do the fire-breathing horses connote?

As descendants of Sol's team of horses, fire-breathing, which appears in Pindar *Ol.* 7. 71 (πῦρ πνεόντων ἀρχὸς ἵππων) and later in the *Aeneid* (12. 115), can simply be understood as inherited.[424] However, given the Circean context Vergil develops in book 7, a greater sense of foreboding seems likely in Latinus' gift. Although the imagery of fire is both common in the *Aeneid* and also occurs with both negative (the burning of Troy) and positive connotations,[425] it is especially associated with Turnus,[426] as is fire-breathing, a much less common phenomenon in the *Aeneid.* In the catalogue of Latin forces careful attention is paid to Turnus' arms, his helmet and shield (785-92). The connection of his helmet's chimaera with the war is directly and vividly expressed (787-8):

> tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera flammis
> quam magis effuso crudescunt sanguine pugnae.
>
> The more she (chimaera) rages, fierce with dire flames,
> the more the battles become wild with the flow of blood.

---

[424] The horses of the Sun are described simply as "fiery" in Euripides (*IA,* 159). Ovid, *Met.* 2. 84, 154-55, in the story of Phaethon's disastrous attempt to drive Sol's chariot, describes the horses as breathing out fire from their mouth and nose (*ore et naribus efflant,* 84), echoing Vergil's description of Sol's horses, which "blow forth light from their upturned noses" (*lucemque elatis naribus efflant, Aen*. 12. 115), on which see below.

[425] Some examples: Iulus' hair licked by flames (2. 682-84); Aeneas, whose helmet and shield pour forth flames (10. 261-2, 270-71) and two columns of flames pour from Augustus' forehead (8. 680-81), both of which are largely positive, but tinged with some negativity (see Ch. 6). Likewise, Lavinia's burning hair implies both positive and negative aspects—her own future would be bright, but her people would endure a great war (7. 79-80).

[426] Pöschl, 102-3; Hardie (1993), 731-5; Gale (1997), 185, 195, n. 43; Horsfall (2000), 785.

That Latinus' gift horses breath forth fire (*spirantis naribus ignem*) in identical construction and position in the line to the chimaera (*efflantem faucibus ignis*) reinforces the martial implications of the fire-breathing horses and tends to confirm Circe's sinister implications.[427] Monsters, which are emblems of chaos, destruction and war, breathe fire in the *Aeneid* (Cacus, in addition to the chimaera) and, I believe, Circe's horses function similarly. But Vergil has also engaged in a dialogue since the beginning of book 5 with Apollonius' *Argonautica* that enriches the initiation of war and helps elucidate more particularly the meaning of the fire-breathing horses for Aeneas and Latinus.

In his in-depth study of Vergil's allusions in the *Aeneid* to the *Argonautica*, Nelis considers the complexity of the Homeric and Apollonian intertexts, but argues persuasively for the fundamental importance of book 3 of the *Argonautica* in both the structure of book 7 and in numerous details, among which is the parallel between the fire-breathing bulls and Latinus' fire-breathing horses—the bulls a narratively real obstruction to Jason's goal of obtaining the golden fleece, the horses an emblematic representation of the war standing between Aeneas and his mission of founding Rome (Nelis, 2001, 287). As their primary threat the fire the brazen-footed bulls blast from their mouths occurs frequently in the narrative of Jason's agon,[428] but the initial and nearly identical two references are closest to the description of Latinus's horses (*spirantis naribus ignem*, 7. 281). When Aeetes first describes the challenge, the bulls "are puffing flames from their mouths" (στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντες, 3. 410) and Jason repeats the phrase in recounting the challenge to his comrades (στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντας, 495). What this allusion to Jason's confronting of Aeetes' challenge suggests, as Nelis has argued, is that Aeneas too will have a similarly violent and gigantic hero's test to overcome before he can achieve his goal of founding Rome, the equivalent of the Golden Fleece for Jason. It is not only the mythological imagery of the famous

---

[427] The Chimaera's Aetnian fires (786) allude to the Typhon, her (grand)father, the giant buried under Mount Etna for assaulting Zeus, and the allegorical tradition that interpreted the Chimaera as a volcano. See Hardie (1986), 85-90 and 125-43 on the political symbolism of the gigantomachy in the *Aeneid.*

[428] Medea describes the ointment for Jason to smear on "against the irresistible on rushing of flame from the deadly bulls" (οὐδ᾽ ἄσχετος ἀίσσουσα φλὸξ ὀλοῶν ταύρων, 1048-49). In the actual contest the bulls emerge "puffing forth flames" (πυρὸς σέλας ἀμπνείοντες, 1292) and "shortly their mouths exhaling quick blasts of flame, roared, and a murderous fireball engulfed Jason" (ὣς ἄρα τώγε θοὴν φλόγα φυσιόωντες ἐκ στομάτων ὁμάδευν, τὸν δ᾽ ἄμφεπε δήιον αἶθος, 1303-5) and, again, "All this time the bulls raged on in monstrous fury, breathing their fierce fire against him" (οἱ δ᾽ εἵως μὲν δὴ περιώσια θυμαίνεσκον, λάβρον ἐπιπνείοντε πυρὸς σέλας, 1326-7).

sequence in the *Argonautica* that Vergil engages with, but with the roles of the human agents as well, in this case the hero. And so, although Vergil's expression also recalls Lucretian formulations, as Gale has argued in the case of the Chimaera on Turnus's helmet,[429] he does so to counter Lucretius's trust in human powers of rationality when confronted by the forces of passion. Rather, for the implications of what is approaching Aeneas, the scenario of Jason's battle with the fire-breathing bulls and his later confrontation with the earthborn men as a dire test of the hero, more aptly fit the situation Aeneas will be encountering. So too, at least in part, does Latinus' situation correspond to that of Aeetes: the king of the foreign land into which the hero, sailing from afar, arrives and from whom the hero requests a favor (Nelis, 2001, 282-87; Bleisch, 2003,106). Although events as they unfold in Latium quickly undermine this initial impression, that Vergil clearly alludes to an important manifestation of Aeetes, like Circe, child of the Sun, in Latinus' approach to the ceremony establishing single combat for the resolution of the war in book 12, reinforces Argonautic implications in Latinus' role in book 7 as well.

Latinus and Aeetes

The Sun figures prominently at the oath-taking ceremony in book 12, in the description of the god's horses as the day begins, as the source of Latinus' golden crown, and as the divinity Aeneas addresses first in his oath. The description of Sol's horses refers back both to Latinus' gift to Aeneas and to the Chimaera on Turnus' helmet (12. 113-115):

> Postera vix summos spargebat lumine montis
> orta dies, cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt
> Solis equi lucemque elatis naribus efflant:
>
> The following day, having just arisen, was sprinkling the tops of the mountains
> with light, when the horses of the Sun first lift themselves from the deep sea
> and blow forth light from their upturned noses.

[429] Horsfall (2000), 282, dismisses Nelis' argument that the allusion to Aeetes' bulls is threatening, because "the motif is common enough," and therefore, "not compellingly menacing," but the examples he refers to of the motif are Lucretian, which are alluded to as revision. For example, Vergil echoes Diomedes' man-eating horses, one of the labors of Hercules, likewise breathing forth fire from their noses (*spirantis naribus ignem, DRN* 5. 30), but Lucretius refers to the labors of Hercules to ridicule mythology in comparison to the real accomplishments of Epicurus ("But if you think the deeds of Hercules rival his [Epicurus], you will stray much farther still from true reasoning" 5. 22-23), an attitude toward mythology not consistent with Vergil's, whose larger positive engagement with Apollonius in book 7, in my opinion, is more dominant in the meaning of this motif.

"An extraordinarily vivid image," as Williams (1973, 115) notes, regarding the source of the sun's light (115), and in the conflation of the phrase describing the horses given to Aeneas (*spirantis naribus ignem*, 7. 281) with that describing the Chimaera on Turnus' helmet (*efflantem faucibus ignis*, 7. 786), the positive language in the lines describing the burgeoning new day (*summos, lumine montis, orta dies, primum, Solis, lucem*) seems to be undercut in a way that would justify this bestially dynamic image.[430] Further allusions subsequently to Aeetes, as Apollonius describes him arming and approaching to view Jason's contest with the fire-breathing bulls and earth-born men, will confirm the renewed fighting and bloodshed implied by the intratextual reference to the imagery of book 7.

At this belated first meeting of Latinus and Aeneas the terms of the war are reformulated to apply specifically to the outcome of the armed contest between Aeneas and Turnus. Both Aeneas and Latinus in their oaths express a commitment to peace, regardless of the outcome of the duel, but Juno once again, as she had in book 7, insures that war interferes with these good intentions. The immediate and obvious intertext for this scene of oath taking is that preceding the duel of Menelaus and Paris (*Il.* 3. 264-312), which was likewise ineffective in settling, in this case, the Trojan War. In the *Iliad* the analogue of Latinus, the Trojan king Priam, also arrives at the ceremony and departs in a chariot, which there is qualified as "beautiful" or "well made" (περικαλλέα...δίφρον, 3. 262, 312). However, in the *Aeneid* the description of Latinus' arrival, implicitly as charioteer, expands to elaborate his familial relation with the Sun (12. 161-65):

> Interea reges ingenti mole Latinus
> quadriiugo vehitur curru (cui tempora circum
> aurati bis sex radii fulgentia cingunt,
> Solis avi specimen), bigis it Turnus in albis,
> bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro.
>
> Meanwhile, the kings [arrive]; Latinus, whose
> shining temples were encircled with twelve
> golden rays (a sign of his ancestor Sol),

[430] Although Ennius seems to have contributed much to Vergil's expression here (Skutsch, 606, *elatis naribus,* with Servius *Aen.* 12. 115: *Ennianus...ait 'funduntque elatis naribus lucem*), the context in Ennius is, unfortunately, unknown.

> drives a massive four-horse chariot;[431] Turnus
> comes in a chariot with two white horses,
> holding two broad-bladed spears in his hand.

While the *quadrigae* can be associated with gods, kings, *triumphatores* and racing charioteers in the *Aeneid*,[432] Latinus' twelve-rayed golden crown, "a sign of his ancestor Sol," suggests that Latinus' *quadrigae*, Sol's typical means of conveyance (*EV* 1, 678; Horsfall, 2000, 26; Anderson, 1997, 153-55), further strengthens his association with the sun god (Tarrant, 162) and recalls the fact that Circe, Sol's daughter, also is Latinus' relative and the procuress of his fire-breathing gift horses. Evidence also attests to the tradition of a deified Latinus, that of Jupiter Latiaris,[433] as he appears on the late fourth- or third-century cista Pasinati,[434] triumphing in a *quadrigae.* However, if any of this tradition of immortality attends the initial appearance of Latinus in his *quadrigae,* his weak and somewhat dishonorable flight from the field when war breaks out sharply counters the impression (*fugit ipse Latinus pulsatos referens infecto foedere divos*, 12. 285-86). Far more important in Vergil's text, however, seem to be the king's familial relation to Sol and Circe and his textual interaction with the character of Apollonius' Aeetes. Latinus' crown in combination with his chariot clearly allude to Aeetes, king of Colchis and also a

---

[431] Tarrant (2012), 161-74, discusses the several indications of the unfinished nature of this passage, among which is the unclear referent of *ingenti mole*. As Tarrant notes, "it can hardly describe the aged and unimposing Latinus." The most reasonable explanation, that it is an ablative of description with *curru*, has both the support of the intertexts of the Iliad (Priam's chariot, see above) and the *Argonautica* (Aeetes' chariot is stout, εὐπηγέα, 3. 1235, and well-built, εὐτύκτῳ, 4. 219.) and the intratext of the similarly described Chimaera in the ship race (*ingenti mole Chimaeram,* 5. 118, 223), a distant, but important expression of the analogues of ship and chariot. The separation of *ingenti mole* from *curru* is problematic based on the precedent of this early example (and others), as Tarrant notes, but does not, I believe, obscure the intended referent of *ingenti mole* in *curru*.

[432] The term for a four-horse chariot (*quadrigae*, *quadriiugi*) is infrequently used in Vergil, and especially so in the *Aeneid,* where it appears only three other times—Aurora's chariot in book 6 (divinity/*triumphator*, 6. 535); the two *quadrigae* which tear the traitor Mettus Fufetius apart on Aeneas's shield (8. 642; king, see below, The Heroes' Shields) and the chariot and team of Niphaeus (charioteer, see below Ch. 6, Aeneas *Victor* and the Latin Charioteers), which Aeneas defeats merely by his terrifying presence (10. 571). However, Salmoneus' implied *quadrigae*, (*quattuor…equis*, 6. 587, king), and that of the four horses at Castrum Minervae (3. 537-43, *triumphator*/king) are likewise significant examples in this category.

[433] Alföldi (1965), 19-20, provides evidence for Latinus' deification both within the cult of the Latins at Mons Albanus and at Lavinium, as well as evidence for the persistent importance of these cults at Rome (32, 33, 258-65, 268-71).

[434] Versnel (1970), 287, n. 4. The scene shows Latinus in combat with Mezentius, who claimed the part of the grape harvest owed to Jupiter for his help in the war against Aeneas and Latinus (Macrobius *Sat.* 3. 5. 10), seen by some sources as an assault on Jupiter's divinity. See above, p. 66. Alföldi, 209-211, discusses the main sources on Mezentius.

descendant of Sol, as he arms and drives to watch Jason's contest with the fire-breathing bulls. After putting on his corselet Aeetes dons a golden helmet (3. 1234-36):

> χρυσείην δ᾽ ἐπὶ κρατὶ κόρυν θέτο τετραφάληρον,
> λαμπομένην οἷόν τε περίτροχον ἔπλετο φέγγος
> ἠελίου, ὅτε πρῶτον ἀνέρχεται Ὠκεανοῖο.
>
> and on his head
> he put the golden helmet, four-crested, equal in
> brilliance to the dazzling haloed luminescence
> of the Sun when first he climbs out of Ocean.[435]

While Vergil (12. 162-3) refrains from naming exactly the object Latinus wears on his head, focusing instead on the brilliance of the encircling light (*aurati bis sex radii fulgentia cingunt*) and its effect on the king's head (*templa...fulgentia*), and thereby suggesting the possibility of immortal luminescence,[436] the materiality of Aeetes' crown (however vague our understanding of τετραφάληρον, "four-crested," may be)[437] and the clarity of its placement (ἐπὶ κρατὶ... θέτο) are separated via simile from the encircling light of the Sun. Nevertheless, the similarity in diction between the two passages is obvious (χρυσείην/*aurati*; λαμπομένην/*fulgentia*; περίτροχον/*cingunt*; ἠελίου/*Solis*.[438]

Aeetes' father, Helios, continues to be evoked in descriptions of his chariot, at first rather subtly, when Phaethon is said to hold his chariot ready for Aeetes as he prepares to depart for the contest (3. 1236-40). Phaethon (1237) does not refer to the son of Helios, but rather to Aeetes' son, Apsyrtus, who "acts as his father's charioteer in contexts where Aietes' links with Helios are important,"[439] such as his

---

[435] Translations of the *Argonautica* are by Green (1997).

[436] Hunter (1989), 1228-30, notes that "from the fifth century on, Helios was represented with a halo or crown of brilliant rays," and he refers to Latinus' ("another descendant of Helios") crown of rays in the *Aeneid.*

[437] Hunter, *ibid*, "this Homeric epithet probably refers to four small disks which strengthened the front of some helmets...but we cannot be sure how A. understood it. He may refer to the four bolts where the cheek-piece joined the head-piece."

[438] This clear of an allusion to Aeetes in the *Argonautica* in the actual meeting of the leaders of the two sides, increases the likelihood that the horses of Sol, which, as we have just seen, are described "when they first lift themselves from the deep sea" (*cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt*, 115), are an echo of Helios, to whose early morning brightness Aeetes' helmet is compared (ὅτε πρῶτον ἀνέρχεται Ὠκεανοῖο, 1231). Hunter, *ibid*, notes, "Helios is at his brightest when he emerges, newly washed, from Ocean. This detail is also appropriate to the setting of the story in Colchis in the extreme east near Ocean."

[439] Hunter (1989), 242-6, who includes among the contexts, specifically 1235-6 and 4. 22-5 (see below) and also notes that the application of the name "Phaethon" to Apsyrtus is not original to Apollonius.

description when he addresses the Kolchians, after all have learned of Medea's treachery and the loss of the Golden Fleece (4. 219-21):

> ὁ δ᾽ εὐτύκτῳ ἐνὶ δίφρῳ
> Αἰήτης ἵπποισι μετέπρεπεν, οὓς οἱ ὄπασσεν
> ἠέλιος πνοιῇσιν ἐειδομένους ἀνέμοιο...
>
> There in his well-built chariot
> Aietes stood, high over them, drawn by the horses
> that Helios gave him, like gales of wind for swiftness.

Unlike Circe who has to resort to subterfuge to obtain horses from her father Sol, Helios has freely given them to her brother, Aeetes. Latinus' strong intertextual affiliation with Aeetes, materially via his radiant crown and *quadrigae* and conceptually via their mutual relation to the Sun, recalls the intertextual importance of the *Argonautica* for book 7, by which Aeneas is figured as another Jason, who will be tested in combat by a fire-breathing adversary. Whereas in book 7 this role for Aeneas is suggested by his fire-breathing horses and their similarity to the Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, in book 12 Latinus' initial affinity with Aeetes serves this purpose. However, the similarity between Latinus and Aeetes is, nevertheless, limited; he is neither as strong, nor as cruel as Aeetes (Nelis, 2001, 304). His flight from the field as war takes over is more comparable to Priam's far more dignified withdrawal in the *Iliad*, because he "cannot bear to look on my dear son doing battle with Menelaus" (*Il.* 3. 306-7). The initial powerful impression Latinus presents as he arrives for the oath taking ceremony in the regalia of Sol—*quadrigae* and golden-rayed crown—is refuted by his ignominious flight, with no chariot mentioned, this image of power essentially having disappeared from the scene. While he gladly welcomes Aeneas and remains opposed to the war in principle and by Cairns' standards he is a good king, lacking only in wisdom and foresight,[440] he cannot maintain his hold on power and as he flees in book 12 the text deprives him of his chariot.[441]

---

[440] Cairns (1989), 62-66, notes that Latinus is modeled on Nestor, Priam and Laertes, but he is also presented "as a second Anchises" and as such "can display the virtues of a good king more extensively, since he functions as, and is named king." Heinze, 228, also thinks that Latinus "represents the ideal king: pious, considerate, generous, just and mild of heart; he lacks only one quality, *constantia* (steadfastness)."

[441] Once Latinus withdraws, Turnus assumes the intertextual dialogue with the character of Aeetes, as Nelis (304-5) and Willimas (1993), 33-36, have argued. Both Turnus and Aeetes are inhospitable locals, who see their position

Thus, the fire-breathing horses given by Latinus to Aeneas place a noticeable emblematic strain on the narrative, which, in conjunction with Circe, force the reader to question the security of the peace Latinus extends. Circe's mention effectively recalls the figure of Picus and his transformation memorialized among the images within his palace, a building that celebrates a religio-political culture defended by patriotic heroism and recalls the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline in Rome. The fire-breathing horses and chariot particularly identify the good king Latinus as a member of a family and culture with the hidden potential for unleashing violence, a potential to which he appears to be blithely unaware. As Segal (1968, 436) observed, "Circe points to elements in Latinus' ancestry and environment which he proves unable to control." But she also represents the horrifying ease with which transformations of humans into beasts (or "beasts") can occur. Such a transformation Turnus undergoes to become the bearer of the fire-breathing Chimaera, a volcanic image of war, to which Latinus' gift horses are linked. Circe's fiery equine emblem is recalled in Latinus' radiant crown and *quadrigae*, the chariot of Sol, Latin kings, Jupiter and Roman *triumphatores,* confirming the importance of Circe's association with Latinus in book 7 and suggesting that a transformation from civility to passionate tumult similar to the first outbreak of war will reoccur.[442] Particularly because Aeneas is intertextually linked to owning and driving horses in the *Iliad* obtained via a Circean theft by his father, the fire-breathing horses, suggest Aeneas' susceptibility to fire, to a passion-driven transformation*,* to which he will at times succumb (Putnam, 1970, 415, n. 8, 426-28). Thus, while Latinus' state, and suggestively Rome's as well, is depicted as having a covert systemic proclivity toward violence, particularly as manifested in its rulers, primarily Aeneas' individual potential for violence is alluded to, although Latinus' relationship to it is

---

threatened by foreign challengers. Both are characterized by violent rage. At the meeting with the Kolchians following his first with the Argonauts (3. 576-93, 606-8) Aeetes "threatens to destroy the Argo and her crew as soon as Jason has been killed by the fire-breathing bulls," while Turnus urges the Latin people on to war "resembling Aeetes with his angry rhetoric against the Argonauts" (Nelis, 2001, 304).

[442] Aeneas' oath begins with calling upon gods as witnesses, first among which is Sol (176), perhaps as a courtesy to Latinus' relation (Tarrant (2012), 161-215). Even though there is some evidence of a linking of Aeneas, Jupiter and Sol in ancient cult at Lavinium and the derivation of the festival of *Sol Indiges* at Rome from Lavinium (Alföldi, 1965, 252-3, 265), Circe's prominent associations with *Sol* in book 7—she is first named *Solis filia* (7. 11)—and Latinus implies her relevance here in book 12.

also unsettling. This is, of course, not insignificant since Aeneas has demonstrated war frenzy in book 2 and, as Gale points out (1997, 190; also Putnam, 2011, 51-65), Allecto incites the war via individuals.

The intertextual importance of Apollonius' *Argonautica* in book 7 is broad, but this text particularly enriches the significance of Latinus' gift horses and chariot. Because they are isolated from the narrative, partly due to their magical fire-breathing nature, the allusion to the story of Jason's contest to obtain the Golden Fleece, in which the fantastic is naturally incorporated into the narrative, is a subtle means of broadening and deepening the importance of the mythologically fantastic elements like the fire-breathing horses without distorting the carefully controlled blend Vergil weaves of the symbolic and the real (Segal, 1968, 436), of image and narrative. Likewise allusion to Jason's quest for the Golden Fleece, via the fire-breathing horses, is a discreet means of suggesting Aeneas' quest to initiate Rome's future greatness is mythically heroic. At the same time, Vergil intertextually engages the character of Jason's adversary, King Aeetes as a means of representing the basically very different king Latinus, a kinder, but less powerful ruler, as the loss of his chariot in book 12 implies. The intertextual contributions of the *Argonautica* continue at times within the symbolic pattern of the rising storm of war frenzy in book 7, the culmination of which is Latinus' abandoning of the ship of state and letting go of the reins of power.

Ocean Storms of Latin War Frenzy

Juno (*saeva Iovis coniunx,* 287) reenters the narrative immediately after the return of the Trojan emissaries from King Latinus, riding high on their horses and bringing peace (285), and her reaction to the sight of their progress—on land, building walls, ships abandoned—is expressed in a speech of indignation, outrage and renewed determination to do harm to the Trojans (293-322). Much in the speech, both content and expression, recalls Juno's first speech in the epic (1. 37-49), although she is now angrier, due to the progress the Trojans have made despite her best efforts, and therefore the harm she now contrives—summoning the Fury Allecto from Hell to instigate war—is more devastating than the storm her agent Aeolus sent upon the Trojans.[443] Nevertheless, Juno's evocations of the storm sequence of book

[443] On the similarity between the opening scenes in book 1 and the scenes beginning with 286 as well as the greater intensity of the sequence in book 7 see Heinze (1903/1993), 148-149; Pöschl (1962), 28-33; Highet (1972), 161-64;

1 suggests that a comparisons between the war frenzy Allecto ignites and subsequent sea storms. Like the first storm, which culminated in a simile that added a level of political significance to both the storm and the restoration of calm, the sequence of storm similes in book 7 reaches a climax with Latinus' abandoning his realm's ship of state, the kingdom Aeneas will inherit,[444] but the figurative storms begin on a small scale.

The Storm within Turnus

Because the first storm reflects Allecto's impact on an individual psyche (Harrison, 1985, 100), in this case that of the epic's antagonist and chief charioteer, Turnus, its scale is small—water boiling within a bronze vessel, but alone in the series the simile joins water with fire and heat, qualities frequently associated with Turnus. This scene constitutes his entry into the narrative of the epic and the transformation Allecto produces in Turnus and this attendant simile have raised the question of whether there is any previous indication in Turnus' character of this passionate, war-crazed individual (Horsfall, 2000, 341-539). Up to this point in the narrative Turnus has been described as handsome (*ante alios pulcherrimus omnis,* 55), endowed with noble ancestors (*avis atavisque potens*, 56), bold (*audacis Rutuli*, 409) and young (*iuvenis,* 435; also used at 446, 456). His age is a distinctive part of his portrait, since it is unspecified in earlier accounts (Reed, 2007, 44). Among these qualities only *audax* gives any indication of a nature inclined toward war. Although in Vergil *audax* "is not of necessity morally negative... (it) is no commendation...in V.'s soberly Augustan conception of the virtues of the hero as public man" (Horsfall, 2000, 475) and Cicero associates this word (and *audacia*) in particular with Marc Antony in his *Philippics*.[445] Turnus is specifically described immediately after Allecto's departure filling

---

Horsfall (2000), 286-340. Horsfall's commentary notes the numerous parallels between Juno's opening speeches in book 1 and 7.

[444] Johnston (1981) and Harrison (1985) discuss the similes and their sequence. Johnston, (23), accurately sees the storm imagery developed in book 7 continuing to the end of the epic (See below, Ch. 8), but the close relation Vergil develops between the storms in book 1 and 7 argues that the immediate political consequence of the storm is also an end in itself for this group of similes.

[445] *Phil*. 2. 1, 4, 19 (x3), 43, 44, 64, 68, 90; 3. 2, 13, 18, 28, 31; 5. 10, 42; 6. 2; 8. 21; 9. 15; 12. 15; 13. 12, 28 (x2); 14. 7. Also see Chapter 2 on Cicero's other uses of *audax*. Turnus is also *audax* at 9. 03, 126; 10. 276, and famously recommends boldness to his troops when Aeneas and fleet approach the shore: *audentis Fortuna iuvat.*

the Rutulians with *animis audacibus,* (475), "their leader's principal quality" (Horsfall, 2000, 475).[446] Thus, this much about Turnus' character is known, he is *audax,* which at best is "potentially a merit in heroic war" (Horsfall, 2000, 475), but can also imply recklessness and rashness.[447] Nevertheless, that Turnus is initially disinclined toward war with Aeneas and that Allecto causes him to become berserk with eagerness for just that thing, this scene with Juno's minion makes abundantly clear.

Allecto in the guise of the old priestess of Juno, Calybe, appears to Turnus in his sleep (this only becomes evident at 458, *olli somnum ingens rumpit pavor*), and recounts to him the events that have recently occurred to his great disadvantage—the Trojan arrival, Latinus' offer to Aeneas of marriage to Lavinia and his loss of this opportunity for extended rule—emphasizing the injustice about to be done to Turnus, since he has fought with Latinus in his war efforts (Horsfall, 2000, 421, 423). Allecto/Calybe urges him to lead an army against the Trojans and in arms to threaten Latinus for marriage to his daughter, based on the authority of Juno (*omnipotens Saturnia iussit*, 428) and by appealing to his pride, claiming he has been made a fool of (*inrise*, 425). But in reply Turnus, assuring Allecto that he knows about the arrival of a fleet and feels secure in Juno's care, laughs at the priestess (*vatem inridens*, 435), dismissing her message as the babbling of an old woman (440-444):

> sed te victa situ uerique effeta senectus, 440
> o mater, curis nequiquam exercet, et arma
> regum inter falsa vatem formidine ludit.
> cura tibi divum effigies et templa tueri;
> bella viri pacemque gerent quis bella gerenda.

Camps (1969), 40 and n. 30, points out that Cicero also used *violentius, furens, furor,* and *violentia*, prominent describers of Turnus, in characterizing Antony in the *Philippics.*

[446] Horsfall (2000), 409, notes aptly that *audax* as applied to Turnus, "is precisely relevant to his eventual headlong reaction." Nevertheless, unlike Amata, who is already prejudiced in Turnus' favor before Allecto inflames her more, this is not clearly true of Turnus, who, especially in Feeney's (1991, 171) view, is stripped of characterization precisely to make it impossible to "develop a picture of why or how" the transition Allecto effects happens and to arouse "our horrified pity and shock, as we apprehend the chasm between rationality and murderous mania, two extremes embodied in the same individual within a dozen lines." While I agree with Feeney's assessment of "the generally low priority which the poem sets on characterization" and that this particular scene is not "revelatory of character-process" (172), Horsfall's view (1995, 158), that even with the little that has been revealed of Turnus character (*pulcherrimus, audax, iuvenis*), his reaction to Allecto's torch is "perfectly compatible with our expectations of how such a character might behave in such a crisis," is also apt.

[447] The first word the messenger in *Septem* uses to describe the Argives is similar, "bold" (θούριοι, 42), used exclusively of Ares in the *Iliad*, and also used to describe Xerxes in Aeschylus' *Persians,* 73, 718, 754.

> But mother, old age, warn out by decay and now incapable of truth,
> troubles you in vain with cares and deludes a priestess with false
> fears concerning the wars of kings. Your concerns are the images of
> the gods and looking after temples. Men, who have to wage wars,
> will deal with wars and peace.

The aptness of the narrator's assessment of Turnus' response (*inridens*) is affirmed by his dismissive and insolent (Horsfall, 2000, 436-44; Feeney, 1991, 168, "scornful") attribution of the priestess' views to the decrepitude of old age, which is, as he sees it, playing with her mind and making her look ridiculous. While this is not a particularly flattering introduction to the character of Turnus, his words certainly do not indicate any inclination toward war before Allecto reacts with fury to his response and, revealing her real identify, hurls a torch at Turnus that fixes in his breast with immediate effect. In terror, sweat covers his body and he is crazed for war, a state that is likened to a violently seething cauldron of water (460-66):

> arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit;
> saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli,
> ira super: magno veluti cum flamma sonore
> virgea suggeritur costis undantis aeni
> exsultantque aestu latices, furit intus aquai
> fumidus atque alte spumis exuberat amnis,
> nec iam se capit unda, volat vapor ater ad auras.
>
> Crazed he roars for arms, searches for them near the bed and
> in the room; love for the sword and the wicked insanity of war,
> as well as wrath, rage. As when branches burning with a great noise
> are heaped up along the sides of a boiling bronze cauldron and the liquid
> leaps up due to the heat; and the smoking stream of water within rages and
> gushes up on high with froth; the bubbling no longer stays within and the
> dark steam rises into the air.

The dramatic and immediate consequences of Allecto's torch on Turnus' behavior move his representation into the extremes of brutality and violence as presented in the *Aeneid*, the *Iliad* and Aeschylus' *Septem.* The very personification of war as *Furor*, that concludes Jupiter's prophecy in book 1, sits over savage arms and roars horribly with a bloody mouth (*saeva sedens super arma...fremet horridus ore cruento,* 295-96). In the opening of book 7 we have seen Circe's beasts both roaring and raving (*rudentum*, 16; *saevire*, 18) and forms of *saevus* are associated prominently with Juno, Achilles, and Allecto (see above, p. 227 and 230; Ch. 4, pp. 147, 173, 219). In addition, Aescyhlus' Tydeus is in

general loud, as we have seen (Ch. 3, p. 134), and in particular growls (βρέμει, 377-78, the Greek equivalent of *fremit*) near the Proetid gate. Turnus' love for the sword is foremost among the many ironic distortions of love in book 7, which commences with an invocation to the Muse of Love poetry (Putnam, 1970, 417) and it singles out and locates him solidly in the tradition of extreme warriors (Tydeus, Achilles and Ares).[448] Much in the simile elaborates on Turnus' madness (*amens*, *insania*) and anger (*ira super*) together with the verbs that suggest an attendant wildness and bestiality (*fremit, saevit*); the virtual storm within Turnus' psyche is suggested in the action of the water in the cauldron. The words meaning "boiling" (*undantis,* "an old word of the sea" Horsfall, 2000, 462) or "bubbling" (*unda*) more commonly describe the waves of the sea. *Amnis* most often means river, but it can be any stream of water, including the stream of Ocean. The height to which waves fly into the air in storms is often noted in the storms of the *Aeneid* (1. 104, 3. 423*,* 7. 529, the next storm simile), as it is here (*alte, ad auras*) and foam in the sea is an obvious result of the action of waves (*sumis*), all of which produces a "systematic and remarkably successful linguistic exaltation of the storm in the pot" which is "by the end entirely credible" (Horsfall, 465).

The suggestion of an ocean storm is further enhanced by two major Homeric intertexts for this simile, that in which the fire that Hephaestus sends against the raging river Xanthus, set its fair streams boiling, "as a cauldron boils within forced by a large flame" (*Il.* 21. 361-62) and in the *Odyssey* (12. 237-39) where the whole sea around Charybdis, like a cauldron over a strong fire, "would boil up in turbulence, and the foam flying spattered the pinnacles of the rocks in all directions." Vergil's simile integrates the cauldron more aptly with the narrative by including a reference to its sides (*costis*), a word that often refers to the human sides, and by the far greater emphasis on the inability of the cauldron to contain its contents (*exsultant, fumidus atque alte exuberat amnis, nec iam se capit unda, volat vapor*), both of which relate the simile more particularly to Turnus' state. The *flamma*, clearly referring to Allecto's *facem* and *taedas*, in a sense, is as terrifying an adversary for Turnus, as the fire-breathing

[448] Tydeus is "lusting for battle," *Seven,* 380; "longing for battle," 392; Agamemnon of Achilles, "For always strife is dear to you and wars and fighting," *Il.* 1. 177, repeated by Zeus to Ares (5. 891).

dragons were for Jason, but it now becomes a part of his nature, as *ira*, perceived by Lucretius as a fiery aspect of human nature, indicates.[449] The next simile in the sequence of storms, as if to confirm the implicit storm in the cauldron's boiling water, echoes many of its motives.

The Storm-tossed Ship of State

After Allecto has directed Ascanius' arrow into the pet deer of Silvia, daughter of Tyrrhus, the guardian of the king's herds, the country people come running to aid with rough clubs and stakes. However, once Allecto signals the call to arms with Tyrrhus' bugle, a loud call with the voice of Tartarus, the weapons the people carry are steel, whose bright shining is compared to the white caps on the waves as a sea storm begins to build (525-30):

> sed ferro ancipiti decernunt atraque late
> horrescit strictis seges ensibus, aeraque fulgent
> sole lacessita et lucem sub nubila iactant:
> fluctus uti primo coepit cum albescere vento,
> paulatim sese tollit mare et altius undas
> erigit, inde imo consurgit ad aethera fundo.
>
> But they contend with double-edged iron and
> the black field bristles far and wide with drawn swords,
> and bronze weapons struck by the sun gleam and
> throw light up to the clouds. As when the waves
> begin to grow white with the first winds, and the sea
> gradually begins to swell and raise its waves higher
> and then from the lowest depths it surges up to the heavens.

Now at the very point when angers produce war, the image of the sea expresses a storm in only its beginning stages, as *primo coepit* indicates, but one which is gathering momentum, suggested by the depths and heights (529-30). The reminders of the cauldron simile are evident in *albescere* (the foam, cf. *spumis*, 465), the rising of the water (*sese tollit mare et altius undas/ erigit*; cf. *alte...exuberat amnis,* 465), the waves, of course, (*undas;* cf. 463, 466) and the concluding motion toward the sky (*ad aethera*; cf. *ad*

[449] Gale (1997), 182 and 194, n. 27, draws attention to the relevance of Lucretius (3. 294-98) to this and later descriptions of Turnus: "But there is more heat in those whose keen hearts and angry minds easily blaze out in anger. A prime example is the violent character of lions, whose growling (*fremitu*) and roaring often bursts their breasts, and who cannot contain (*nec capere*) the surge of anger within their breast."

auras, 466). The sequence has moved from the leader to his army and now,[450] after the first deaths (531-35), the last storm simile incorporates representatives of the entire realm and reveals the political implications of the whole series of similes.

The peasants rush to the city carrying their dead and beseeching Latinus (573-76); Turnus increases everyone's fears by voicing the threat of Trojan rule (577-79) and, finally, the sons of the mothers who had raved in the woods with Amata (392-405), call for war (580-82). Immediately, before this final simile, the narrator vigorously condemns the war they clamor for (583-4):

> ilicet infandum cuncti contra omina bellum,
> contra fata deum perverso numine poscunt.
>
> At once all demand unspeakable war, against the omens,
> against the fates of the gods, with perverse inspiration.

The prominence of the very strong adjective *infandum* ("too horrible or shocking to speak of, monstrous, accursed" *OLD*), the anaphora of *contra,* and the generally confrontational word order contribute to the force of this statement and will be supported by Latinus' answer to the crowd's clamoring. The king and his palace are central in the final storm simile (585-90):

> certatim regis circumstant tecta Latini;
> ille velut pelago rupes immota resistit,
> ut pelago rupes magno veniente fragore,
> quae sese multis circum latrantibus undis
> mole tenet; scopuli nequiquam et spumea circum
> saxa fremunt laterique inlisa refunditur alga.
>
> Eagerly they surround the palace of king Latinus.
> He opposes them like an unmoving rock against the sea,
> like a rock against the sea with a great crashing coming at it,
> which is rooted by its mass, while many waves howl around;
> the cliffs and the foam covered rocks around roar in vain
> and the seaweed, dashed against its side, flows back.[451]

Very closely tied in diction to the first simile in the storm series (Turnus and the flame-stoked water in the cauldron, cf., *magno...sonore,* 462; *spumis*, 465; *fremit*, 460), this simile is distinctive for including

---

[450] The Trojan forces are also included in this simile because they are the last group described before the simile (521-22) and both Trojan and Latin forces are joined in a sea-storm simile again at 10. 356-59, but, I believe, this does not weaken the sense of a second Junonian, now figurative, storm sweeping through the Latin realm.

[451] I am following Horsfall's (2000), 586, argument in support of the dative endings for *pelagus,* instead of the genitive, as well as his translation of the dative.

virtually all the players of Latium in this dilemma caused by Juno and for the political significance signaled by the line preceding it. Those clamoring for war surround the palace of their king, the structure that we have seen singled out as *augustus* (153, 170), a temple of the gods (174, 192) and located at the top of the city (*urbe...summa,* 171). The near interchangeability of the king with his realm as represented in its structures, already seen in book 2 (554-58) with Priam and in book 4 (669-71) with Dido, again reinforces the increased significance of a ruler's actions for his realm. The unmoving rock that represents Latinus in the simile is part of a complex of cliffs (*scopuli*) and other rocks (*saxa*), in a sense, a supporting structure, which are said to roar "in vain," a transferred epithet of the sea (Horsfall, 2000, 589), although a suggestion of the dire consequences awaiting the realm may also be present. Significantly, Latinus will literally "surround himself with the palace" for protection (*saepsit se tectis*, 600), when he withdraws. But, clearly, the simile's focus is king Latinus, as the prominent *ille* and the repeated *pelago rupes* indicate. The rock's strong resistance, partly suggested by this same repetition, but also by *immota resistit* and *sese...mole tenet,* and made possible by its mass, is especially important, since it also expresses the implicit (*ille velut*) strong resistance of Latinus to his people's crazed desire for war. The simile emphasizes as well the power and noise of the waves and winds beating upon the rock, the only way a storm is suggested, until Latinus speaks a few lines later (*ferimurque procella!* 594). An individual's resistance to tumult figured as a storm also appears in the two most important intertexts for the simile: in the *Iliad* (15. 617-21), where the Greek army resisting Hector is compared to a wall or a towering huge sea cliff that "stands up against the screaming winds and their sudden directions and against the waves that grow to bigness and burst up against it;" and also, and more significant because the simile refers to an individual leader, to Jason besieged by the fire-breathing bulls, who confronts them as "a rockbound reef faces the waves whipped up by endless gales" (*Arg.* 3. 1294-95). The "rockbound reef" actually conflates two separate nouns, σπιλὰς, a rock against which the sea dashes, and πέτρη, a rock, and thus, while not a verbatim repetition like *pelago rupes,* it certainly increases the rock's presence within the short simile.[452] This allusive suggestion of future victory (the Greek army and Jason) in Latinus'

[452] The entire 140-line passage at the end of *Argonautica* book 3 (1278-1407) describing the test Aeetes has

stance, however, cannot relate to Latinus' more complex situation. In neither of these intertexts does the tenor have an analogue for Latinus' palace, i.e., these similes lack immediate political connotations of governance, precisely the arena in which Latinus is now challenged.

This simile marks in a monumental way Latinus' resistance to and strong disapproval of his country's frenzy for war and thus separates him from the moral depravity of the war, expressed immediately before the simile. In shaping this innovative figure of Latinus, Vergil makes very evident in what ways Latinus represents the values associated with the hero, *pietas*, in particular. However, this exalted position proves to be unstable, as Latinus, suddenly powerless to resist the war movement, withdraws into the palace. This move also undercuts the heroism implicit in the Argonautic intertext, where Jason so effectively overcomes his challenges. Nevertheless, Vergil problematizes to what extent the reader should hold Latinus responsible for his failure in resisting the emotions inspired by Juno.[453] The only agents effective against Junonian storms in the *Aeneid* are divine: Neptune, as we have seen in book 1, and Jupiter in book 10, where the windy storm of the gods' conversation after Juno speaks out against Venus' complaints, is checked (*eo dicente...premit placida aequora pontus*, 101-3) by a most powerful Jupiter (*tum pater omnipotens, rerum cui prima potestas*, 100). This expression, indeed, seems to suggest that it is only Jupiter who can subdue Juno in its echoing of the lines immediately following the recent simile (7. 595-92):

> verum ubi nulla datur caecum exsuperare potestas
> consilium, et saevae nutu Iunonis eunt res...
>
> But when no power is granted to overcome this misguided plan
> and affairs are going according to savage Juno's will...

---

arranged for Jason is heavily laden with similes (Hunter, 1989, 1278-1407: "A. portrays Jason's deed largely by means of simile; the result is an extended passage unlike anything else in the poem...and, through the dense clustering of similes, also unlike normal Homeric battle-narrative...A. has compressed a whole *Iliad* into this final section"), which includes a series of ocean storm similes in which the tenor in the narrative changes progressively so that the powerful force (expressed in the storm) moves from the bulls (and implicitly Aeetes) to Jason, the winner of the contest.

[453] Both Cairns (1989), 66, and Nelis (2001), 304, find fault with Latinus' leadership because of his failure to resist, although Nelis does note that his more successful counterpart in the *Argonautica*, Aeetes, is very cruel.

Yet, Latinus does become complicit with Turnus' war effort,[454] and in that, his position is, again, as ambivalent, as it was in the case of the gift of the fire-breathing horses, in view of what they connote.

It therefore is not unexpected that Latinus is the only character in the *Aeneid* who is presented almost simultaneously as a metaphorical charioteer and helmsman (593-600):

> multa deos aurasque pater testatus inanis
> 'frangimur heu fatis' inquit 'ferimurque procella!
> ipsi has sacrilego pendetis sanguine poenas,
> o miseri. te, Turne, nefas, te triste manebit
> supplicium, votisque deos venerabere seris.
> nam mihi parta quies, omnisque in limine portus
> funere felici spolior.' nec plura locutus
> saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas.
>
> The father called to witness the gods and empty air:
> 'Alas, we are shattered by fate and swept off in a storm!
> You yourselves, my miserable people, will pay the price
> with your sacrilegious blood. Your crime, Turnus, awaits
> you and harsh punishment and you will venerate the gods
> with prayers too late. I have obtained my peace and wholly
> on the entrance of the harbor, I am deprived only of a happy end.'
> He did not speak further, but closed himself in the palace
> and released the reins of power.

Latinus continues the themes of the narrator in this speech both in imagery and attitude toward the war. However, in his own figurative storm, Latinus allots himself a very different role from the solid, tenacious rock of the simile. As in the earliest uses of the image of the ship of state, Latinus speaks for all those on board the storm-tossed civic ship. Both Alcaeus and Theognis use a similar passive expression for their ships, images of the state under assault ("we...are carried (φορήμμεθα) violently along with our black ship," Alcaeus, 326, 4; "we are being carried (φερόμεσθα) out of the Melian Sea," Theognidea, 671). Although in referring to the Fates as agents of the collective destruction (*fatis*, 594) Latinus in a way includes all his addressees on the ship of state (Horsfall, 2000, 594), his immediate condemnation of the immorality of the war in the narrator's terms (*nefas, sacrilego,* cf. *infandum, contra omina*) and prediction of punishment for his people and Turnus, imply that there is a stronger sense of the royal "we" in the first

[454] Latinus himself explicitly reveals his culpability (12. 29-31):
> *victus amore tui, cognato sanguine victus*
> *coniugis et maestae lacrimis, vincla omnia rupi;*
> *promissam eripui genero, arma impia sumpsi*.

person plural verbs, that is to say, Latinus as the embodiment of the state, which would be highly appropriate for a ship of state. His palace, with which Latinus continues to be closely associated, has been described as the sacred seat of government and religion in Latium (170-192) and the image of the ship is a logical analogue of the palace, as we have seen Aeschylus specifically develop the city walls of Thebes with ambiguous terms (Ch. 3, p. 110). Latinus condemns the war frenzy rising around him and by his evident concern for both the physical and moral well-being of his subjects and his obedience to the gods, he shows himself to be a good helmsman. But his effectiveness is compromised by his age. Advanced in years, on the entrance to the harbor he has earned his rest (598). Cicero uses the image of the harbor in association with the withdrawal from public life (*Inv.* 1.4), the end of a consul's term of office (*Mur.* 4-5), and the end of life (*Sen.* 71), all of which, with the variation of office, apply to Latinus. To the extent that Latinus shares Aeneas' *pietas* and also intended to enter upon political alliance with him, the role of helmsman is apt, but his allegiance is divided and, in spite of his subsequent unwillingness to open the Gates of War (618-19), he will take up impious arms (*arma impia sumpsi,* 12. 31) against Aeneas. Thus, the narrator's concluding description of Latinus' withdrawal into the palace (*rerumque reliquit habenas*, 600) represents Latinus as the charioteer he had previously appeared to be in the description of his palace and in his gift horses and as he will be prominently in book 12. Vergil's allusion to Latinus' intertextual counterpart in Aeschylus' *Septem*, draws attention to the greater complexity of the Latin king's situation as well as his lack of resolution.

While Latinus manifests many of the helmsman's characteristics evident in Eteocles, who presents himself as the helmsman of Thebes at the beginning of *Septem* (1-3) and actively engages in her defense,[455] Latinus seems to be as helpless a helmsman as Eteocles became at the end, when the ship of his *genos* was swept along by the wind ("Let it run before the wind, the whole house of Laius," (691-2). In fact, his truer analogue in *Septem* is Adrastus, king of Argos, who appears in the play only once, before the engagement in his chariot, the first mentioned in the play (50), which suggests his leadership role in

[455] Eteocles follows the messenger's suggestion that he, "like a good helmsman...make the city tight, before the squalls of war assail her" (62-64).

the expedition (see above, Ch. 3, p. 112), as does the fact that Amphiaraus, the upright prophet, blames Tydeus ("Advisor to Adrastus of all these evils," 575) and Polynices ("Your fatherland destroyed by the spear which your own zeal impelled," 585-86) for persuading Adrastus to attack Thebes. His chariot is given particular attention because the warriors "with their own hands, shedding tears…were adorning the chariot of Adrastus with mementoes of themselves to take home to their parents" (49-51). Adrastus in other accounts actually is one of the seven warriors, but Aeschylus chooses instead to use his one prominent appearance in the play as a foreshadowing of the tragedy his acquiescence to the demands of his sons-in-law, Tydeus and Polynices, will cause for his city, which is represented in his chariot. In making Latinus' terrible moment of decision between the desire of Turnus, Amata and his citizens and his own conviction that the war is immoral the major focus of the king's story, Vergil maintains aspects of the tradition of the alliance between Aeneas and Latinus, but also expresses his weakness as a leader especially in his susceptibility to feminine influence, clearly of Amata, but implicitly of Circe as well. In his chariot appearance in book 12, his *quadrigae* is a reminder of both his descent from the Sun, but also of the tradition of his triumphing kingship, which the Latinus of the *Aeneid* cannot achieve, as his flight from the ceremony without chariot makes clear. Both images of leadership for Latinus, helmsman or charioteer, are are of failure.

The storms in book 7 of the *Aeneid* express the rising power of irrational frenzy for war, from its manifestation within an individual to its destruction of the fabric of a state. Vergil's comparison of Turnus' physical and mental state after Allecto's torch has pierced him, to violent boiling water in a fire-stoked cauldron has no parallel in the *Argonautica* and the Homeric intertexts, which, nevertheless, because they compare the sea and a large river to the action within a cauldron, enhance the suggestion of a real storm already present in the diction of Vergil's boiling water. The prominence of fire and heat in this simile maintains a connection with the Circean fire developed in the first third of the book and forges one with the *ira* and fire that will be associated with Turnus. These multiple allusions help to intensify an already dynamic description of the storm within Turnus. Soon the figurative storm moves to the gigantic arena of the ocean, when people first assume arms, the flashing of which is compared to the

white-capped waves of an incipient storm, a transition to the all encompassing storm of much greater intensity, representing all peoples of the realm clamoring for war before Latinus. Vergil allusively relates Latinus to the heroic Jason in his rock-like resistance to the vocal storm of his subjects demanding war, but while Jason has the benefit of divine assistance (Hera and Aphrodite and their agent Medea) in the challenge he faced, Latinus is contending against Juno and Allecto. The difficulty of his task is expressed figuratively through his being placed in the inverse of Turnus situation: Turnus experiences the intrusion within his body of a whole storm; Latinus alone faces a host of individuals similarly crazed. Vergil's progressive and varied imagery makes Latinus' final weakening before so violent and powerful a storm seem almost justified, but later events continue to show an absence of forcefulness in his leadership with negative consequences.

Just as the first section of book 7 (1-285) ends with Latinus—the Trojans' visit to his palace and its description, his proposal to the absent Aeneas of marriage with his daughter and the departure of the Trojans on his gift horses—the middle building storm section of the book (286-640) draws to a close with Latinus' speech and his withdrawal into his palace, a withdrawal repeated with an additional condemnation of the war (*refugit foeda ministeria,* 618-19), when he refuses to open the Gates of War (*et caecis se condidit umbris*, 619). This structural similarity invites comparison. Certainly the pious king, son of an oracle, center of a government with marked similarities to early Rome, persists into the central section. But features of his palace, likewise shared with Rome, indicate a tradition of wars and a revision of Latinus' genealogy, includes Circe, associated with bestializing transformations from the book's beginning, in his direct lineage—his grandfather Picus, changed by his wife Circe into Mars' woodpecker, now part of the palace's gallery of ancestors. Latinus' gift of a chariot with fire-breathing horses, grace of Circe, a clear sign of war, suggests that Circean connotations also have relevance for Latinus, which his appearance in book 12 driving a *quadrigae* and wearing a radiant crown, "a sign of his ancestor Sol," confirms. These sinister affiliations are not a part of his characterization in the culmination of the storm sequence. He is separated completely from any association with the tide of war, which he condemns along with the narrator, symbolically, as an unmoving force of resistance and then as its victim along with

his metaphorical realm. In this way, the Latin forces are represented both as the storm assailing the state of the good helmsman and, as we have seen in the catalogue and the subsequent war will show, as sometimes violent charioteers, which is to say, like the Argive forces attacking Thebes in Aeschylus' *Septem*. At the end of the middle section of book 7, the ambivalence of Latinus' position as leader is made clear in image. In as much as he is beneficent to his people and devoted to the gods and their oracles, including his own father, who directs him to bring the Trojans with their dutiful king into his realm, he is a good helmsman (*ferimur procella*, 594). But as a descendant of Circe and giver of her fire-breathing horses and chariot to Aeneas, he also is implicated as, at least, a potential or unconscious facilitator of the war and, thus, also appropriately as charioteer, he lets go of the reins of power (*rerumque reliquit habenas*, 600). This is not, I believe, a simple analogous use of an image from the chariot field in that of the ship (cf. the chariot racing simile at the start of the ship race, 5. 144-47, or Aeneas' giving the ships free rein as they sail toward Cumae, 6. 1-2), but rather an expression of real ambiguity in Latinus' leadership. His position is, perhaps, not unlike many in Rome in the last half of the first century, who easily recognized the heinous nature of civil war, but did not see that much of their political and religious structure honored individual military accomplishment excessively, bestowing fire-breathing horses heedless of the consequences.

The Latin Catalogue and Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*

It might well be that a Latin audience would only begin to recognize allusions to Aeschylus' *Septem* in the *Aeneid* with the Latin catalogue of troops, for even though the distinctive Latin character of many aspects of the catalogue is pronounced, some overarching fundamental similarities with *Septem*'s shield scene, I believe, would have been obvious to an educated Latin audience. The announcement of a scorner of the gods (Mezentius, 7. 647) as the first of those going to war establishes a fundamental likeness between the description of the seven and the Latin leaders, since Tydeus, although his description proper stresses his wild battle lust and rage at the prophet Amphiaraus (377-94), as we have seen, is later berated by Amphiaraus as a most savage perpetrator of evil (571-75), especially in his persuading of Adrastus to go to war. Tydeus, like Mezentius (8. 481-95), also has a personal agenda in waging war,

since he hopes to pursue the regaining of his lost kingdom after the attack on Thebes.[456] This aspect of Mezentius' story, is, "by clear Virgilian invention," an addition to the legend (Horsfall, 2000, 647), perhaps motivated partially by a desire to enhance the similarity between the Aeschylean and Vergilian godless heroes. Horsfall notes the close similarity between Mezentius' epithet, *contemptor divorum,* and Capaneus' description in *Septem* as having scorn for the gods (θεοὺς ἀτίζων, 441) or Parthenopaeus, who reveres his spear more than a god (529-30), but Tydeus' blatant scorn for the prophet and the implications of the sacrifices and his bestial battle lust are clear evidence of scorn. These two lists or catalogues of heroes (*Septem* and *Aeneid* 7) are eccentric in commencing with a hero in active defiance of the gods; the *Iliad*'s Greek warriors starts with the leaders of the Boeotians (not future major actors), progressing primarily by geographical location; the Trojans with Hector; the list of the Argonaut heroes in Apollonius begins with Orpheus; Statius' list of the seven in the *Thebiad* begins with Adrastus, king of Argos, and ends with Parthenopaeus, conversely related in age.[457] Furthermore, both *Septem* and *Aeneid* 7 represent as pendants, at the beginning and end, the two strongest proponents of the war: Tydeus and Polynices, brothers-in-law and both criticized for dragging Adrastus and Argos into war, and Mezentius and Turnus, both leaders with the strongest motivation for war and Turnus has pressured Latinus into fighting a war he does not want to pursue.[458] Turnus, like Polynices, is fighting, at least in part, to regain a political mandate (via his marriage to Lavinia), which he believes was unjustly taken from him.[459]

---

[456] Gantz (1993), 509, summarizing the plot of Polynices' and Tydeus' arrival in Argos and marriage to Adrastus' two daughters found in Euripides, *Hiketides, Hypsiplye,* and *Phoinissai*: "...to each of them he (Adrastus) promises restoration to their homeland, beginning with Polyneikes." This part of the story does not enter into Aeschylus' play.

[457] The order in Statius clearly emphasizes Adrastus and his family: Adrastus, Polynices, Tydeus, Hippomedon, Capaneus, Amphiaraus, Parthenopaeus. The Theban catalogue in book 8 begins with Dryas, a son of Orion. Lucan in book 1 of his *Bellum Civile,* instead of listing Caesar's leaders, lists the barbaric Gallic tribes left unguarded by Caesar's departure.

[458] Horsfall (2000), 641-817, concurs with Williams (1961, 149) that Mezentius and Turnus are balanced, although Camilla, another Vergilian, and thematically very important, invention (Horsfall, 2000, 641-817) at the very end of the catalogue, lessens the similarity between the two lists of warriors.

[459] Turnus clearly links the wedding with kingdom when he urges on the fury of the crowd after the death of Almo and Galaesus "by claiming that the Trojans were being invited to take a share in the kingdom; their own Latin blood would be adulterated by Phrygians while he was being turned from the door" (7. 758-9). The war he wishes to embark upon, like the attack on Thebes (379, 573-75, 580), "is against all the omens, against divine destiny and contrary to the will of the gods" (7. 583-4).

Among the many functions served by the *Aeneid*'s Latin catalogue, ample space is granted to description indicative of values, particularly at the beginning and end, where, as in *Septem,* a number of the leaders manifest transgressive or violently destructive inclinations. It is also the case that, as Aeschylus varied the degree of the presence of Tydeus' negative ethos among the six other warriors (including even his opposite in Amphiaraus), so too did Vergil vary the ethical valance of his Latin leaders: "The whole catalogue graphically illustrates the double-edged character of Virgil's early Italians, who are depicted as tough, sturdy, and frugal, but also as prone to lawlessness, violence, and cruelty" (Gale, 1997, 187).

Turnus' duality is suggested in the organization of his presentation whose twenty lines are evenly divided between the first ten relegated to the leader and the last ten to his troops and their place of origin, and further by the even division of the eight lines which describe alternately his helmet and decoration (the first four) and the scene on his shield. Although important aspects of his physical appearance—his fine physique and tallness—begin the passage (783-4), the description of his helmet and shield alone have been read as indicators of his character.[460] In Gale's (1997, 187) succinct summary, the image of Io on the shield presents a view of Turnus "as victim, whether of the gods or of his own passions," while the Chimaera on his helmet "impl(ies) that he is an enemy of reason, order, and the gods." The Chimaera, the more destructive aspect, however, is presented first (7. 785-88):

> cui triplici crinita iuba galea alta Chimaeram
> sustinet Aetnaeos efflantem faucibus ignis;
> tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera flammis
> quam magis effuso crudescunt sanguine pugnae.
>
> His lofty helmet, decked with triple (horse-hair) plume,
> holds the Chimaera exhaling the fires of Aetna from her jaws.
> The more she roars, fierce with her dire flames,
> the more the battle becomes savage with profuse blood.

[460] Horsfall (2000), 785, "Turnus we have already seen as fiery and destructive in his nature (456ff., 462., 577f.); the device on his helmet is therefore, in a sense, additional characterization."

Hippomedon's shield design in Aeschylus' *Septem* (491-94) has long been considered a primary intertext for this device:[461]

> ὁ σηματουργὸς δ᾽ οὔ τις εὐτελὴς ἄρ᾽ ἦν
> ὅστις τόδ᾽ ἔργον ὤπασεν πρὸς ἀσπίδι,
> Τυφῶν᾽ ἱέντα πύρπνοον διὰ στόμα
> λιγνὺν μέλαιναν, αἰόλην πυρὸς κάσιν:
>
> And it can't have been a cheap artist who gave him
> that device on the shield, Typhon emitting dark smoke,
> the many-coloured sister of flame, from his fire-breathing lips;

The Chimaera, the (grand) daughter of Typhon (Hesiod, *Theog.* 319), the monster buried under Aetna after his defeat by Zeus, was often rationalized as a real volcano (Hardie, 1986, 119; Gale, 1997, 186), thus she (786), as well as Typhon (493) are represented as fire-breathing. Hippomedon's shield, we recall, is in the very center of the description of the warriors and alone confronts an opposing shield from the Theban side, Hyperbius' with "Father Zeus standing with his flaming bolt," thus recreating the final battle challenging Zeus' authority. The Chimaera on Turnus' helmet through its presentation as the fire-breathing Mount Aetna, likewise represents the forces of chaos and disorder, which are opposed to the will of the gods. In as much as Turnus' behavior resembles the Chimaera "who is a 'fiery' character from the Allecto scene onwards, and 'roars' (*fremit*, 460) for arms just as the monster roars in the heat of battle" (*fremens*, 787, Gale, 185-6), he has been compared to the fire-breathing monster Cacus who is defeated by Hercules, a confrontation of the forces of violence and disorder versus those of peace.[462] As Turnus wears on his helmet the device that actually determines the degree of violence and blood-shed of the war at any given moment ("the more she roars...the more the battle turns savage," 787-88), he becomes the very epicenter of the war, and in that sense responds to the intensity of Mezentius' immorality as scorner of the gods.

---

[461] Hardie (1986), 119, identifies this insight as V. Buchheit's (1963), *Vergil über die Sendungs Roms.* Heidelberg. Horsfall (2000), 785, lists Hippomedon's shield as the primary "source" for Vergil's Chimaera.

[462] Hardie, *ibid*; Gale (1997), 185; Horsfall (2000), 785. Gale further analyzes the Hercules/Cacus encounter as a type for that between Augustus and Antony and Cleopatra on Aeneas' shield and the final confrontation between Aeneas and Turnus.

Especially in view of the barbarization (in the wake of the Persian invasion) and its attendant negative values that Torrance has elucidated in Aeschylus' *Septem*, Horsfalls' identification of the catalogue of Persians in Herodotus 7 and that in the parados of Aeschylus' *Persae* as important intertexts for Vergil's catalogue is suggestive.[463] Indeed, as we have seen, some affinities with transgressive aspects of Aeschylus' seven have already been noted, an aspect not found among the warriors in the catalogues of either side in the *Iliad*.[464] Most prominent among the transgressors in the *Aeneid*'s catalogue is, of course, the first leader named, Mezentius, "scorner of the gods" and one of the very few uncontested *tyrannus* in the epic (8. 483).[465] The twins Catillus and Coras, third and fourth in the list are identified as Argive, and in some sources Catillus is identified as the son of Amphiaraus (Horsfall, 2000, 670-77). The brothers are compared to two Centaurs (674-77) in half of the eight lines devoted to them. As Gale (1997, 187) points out, Centaurs are half-civilized creatures and they are listed first among the monsters slain by Hercules in the Salian hymn in *Aeneid* 8. 293-94. Caeculus, is son of Vulcan (679) and as such, is a brother of Cacus, the man-eating, half-human monster, whose final destruction by Hercules and rescuing of the people of Pallanteum Evander recounts to Aeneas (8. 188-270).

The presentation of Virbius, the longest entry in the catalogue and immediately preceding that of Turnus, would appear to be largely a tribute to the ancient site of of Diana at Nemi, famous for the rite of the *rex nemorensis*, its healing sanctuary, as the site of Latin political alliances for many years and, more recently, as the home of Augustus' mother.[466] Certainly its fame as a healing center has an important presence in the restoration of Hippolytus to life (767-69) through the love of Diana and the skill of Asclepius (Paeon, 769). Nevertheless, via the tragic heritage of Parthenopaeus in *Septem* and especially Euripides' Hippolytus, Vergil has added to the epic catalogue, the youthful androgenous, woodland

---

[463] Horsfall (2000), 641-817, identifies as significant contributors to Vergil's catalogue Aeschylus' *Persae*, Herodotus 7, the gazetteer of Italy in Varro *res hum.* 11, Homer, Apollonius and his contemporaries and Ennius (probably). The contributions of the *Persae* which he identifies—a "majestic *variatio* in the description of the Persian array and a handling of tenses (cf. 18, 25, 34, 41) closer to V.'s than either Hom. or AR"—are largely stylistic.

[464] With the notable exception of the Carians on the Trojan side in the *Iliad* 2. 867-74, on which see below, pp. 282-83.

[465] For discussion of the use of *tyrannus* in the *Aeneid*, see Ch. 6.

[466] For which see Green (2007).

dwelling charioteer, sons of Amazons, or Amazonian women; neither fully boys nor adults, women nor men, hunters who wrongly think they are warriors, from the regions of the other—trangressors *par excellence.*

Virbius enters the catalogue from the woodland shrine but also amid the context of his father, Hippolytus' life story, which dominates the entry. Himself son of an Amazon (either Hippolyte or Antiope), he rejects marriage and due to the vengeance Aphrodite exacts, his stepmother's passion (*arte novercae*, 765) ultimately causes his death. Distinctive in Vergil's account is the violence of his demise: "torn apart by his terrified horses" (*turbatis distractus equis*). As opposed to Euripides' entanglement in the reins, the horses enact the destruction, fully justifying the exclusion of horses from Diana's sanctuary (778-80), and making the introductory transition back to Virbius, "nonetheless" (*haud setius*, 781) obviously ominous: "Nonetheless, his son was exercising his fiery horses (*ardentis...equos*) on the level plain and rushing (*ruebat*) into war in his chariot" (781-82). To protect Hippolytus—Jupiter's wrath at his rejuvenation had already caused Ascelpius' death (770-73)—Diana hides him away, in isolation which receives strong emphasis (*secretis,* recondit, 774; *relegat*, 775; *solus, ignobilis*, 776) in the grove of the nymph Egeria, where Virbius is raised. Thus, Virbius issues from the most secluded silvan environment.

It is this isolated woodland home and mother from the wilds that initially link Virbius with *Septem*' Parthenopaeus, who is identified as "the offspring of a mountain-dwelling mother" (532), the Arcadian Atalanta of Calydonian boar hunt fame.[467] In addition, both Virbius and Parthenopaeus are of notable beauty (Virbius in the first line of Vergil: *Ibat et Hippolyti proles pulcherrima bello*, 761; Parthenopaeus: καλλίπρωρον, "fair-faced," 533; ὥρας φυούσης, "as he comes to the prime of beauty," 534) and youth, although the latter is more suggested in Virbius' case by his mother sending him (762), his implicit comparison with Hippolytus (now Virbius), who died as a *iuvenem* (780), and his description as *proles* and *filius.* On the other hand, Parthenopaeus is both by name "girl child" (his "maidenish name" παρθένων ἐπώνυμον, 536) and called man-child ("little more than a man," ἀνδρόπαις, 533). The

[467] Hutchinson (1985), 532, notes the important affinities Atalanta shares with Artemis. The father of Parthenopaeus is usually Melanion, however, Sommerstein (2008), 206-7, accepts Weil's conjecture Ἄρεως, which is also found in Apollodorus, 3. 9. 2.

combination of youth, beauty, a mountain or forest dwelling mother devoted to Diana and/or hunting, which is to say an Amazon-type of mother, would seem to produce androgynous sons, such as Hippolytus and, most overtly Parthenopaeus. However, unlike the tragic and relatively passive Hippolytus, who in Vergil's epic account is very much the recipient either as the victim of his father's and stepmother's passions (765-66) and or the object of Diana's love and sustenance (767-69, 774-77), the young sons of mountain mothers, Parthenopaeus and Virbius, are active agents with a fiery, passion for war. Parthenopaeus stands with savage pride (ὠμόν, literally "raw"; metaphorically "savage" or "cruel," 536),[468] has a "fierce eye" (γοργόν τ'ὄμμ'ἔχων, 537) and he "swears by the spear he holds, resolved to revere it more than a god…that he will sack the city of the Cadmeans by force," (529-31). Virbius drives fiery horses and rushes to war in his chariot (781-2). While horses are an explicit and central aspect of the Virbius passage both in his life and departure for war and in his father's history (767, 779, 782), in Aeschylus' treatment of Parthenopaeus horses are both a more diffuse presence, being generally associated with the Argive attack, and more indirectly, carried in a single phrase (γοργόν τ'ὄμμ'ἔχων, 537), but one which may have been an obvious equine allusion to the audience. The fierce eye of Parthenopaeus is literally "a Gorgon eye," an adjective suggesting the daemonic forces associated with the Gorgon in general, but also one which was particularly used to describe the fiery nature of the horse, especially visible in their eyes,[469] both as one characteristic of a pedigree horse and to suggest their unpredictable disquieting element of mystery.[470] Statius' development in the *Thebiad* (4. 262-329 and 9. 683-879) of Parthenopaeus' closeness with his horse may confirm this association as traditional. Vergil constructs powerful suggestions of inevitable doom for Virbius through the use of the chariot and horses

---

[468] Dawson (1970), 536, notes that ὠμόν links Parthenopaeus with the Sphinx on his shield, which is ὠμόσιτον, "raw-devouring" (541) and "holds beneath her a Cadmeian" (543).

[469] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 190: "...one of the characteristics of a pedigree horse is, as one of the lexicographers notes, an eye full of fire, *blémma gorgon.*"

[470] Detienne and Vernant (1978), 190-91, analyze the use of the adjective from its natural genesis to describe Pegasus, born from the Gorgon, to Xenophon's discussion of it in his *Treatise on Horsemanship* and conclude: "All this would suggest that in Greek thought the Gorgon symbolised one essential aspect of the horse. Many features of its behavior—such as its highly strung nature, its neighing, its sudden moments of panic, its mettlesome disposition, its unpredictability, the foam at its mouth and sweat on its flank—reveal the horse to be a mysterious and disquieting beast, a daemonic force."

in combination with fiery diction connoting a lack of control and of reason, suggesting to both Gale and Horsfall the charioteer with run away horses at the end of *Georgics* 1.[471] These young men, then, are from the woodland region beyond, sons of women who are devoted to hunting and Diana, and they too have pursued this life. They emerge from this context of otherness, which rejects the values associated with the city and civilization, and their youth and beauty suggests ephebic androgyny. They share this aspect of the "Adonis type" J. D. Reed (2007) has analyzed in other youth in the *Aeneid*—Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, Camilla—but they, like Camilla, are distinctive in their origin in the woods, devotion to Diana and association with horses. While the *Aeneid*'s catalogue ends, as did the Trojan warriors in the ecphrasis on the Temple of Juno in book 1, with the foreboding figure of a *virgo bellatrix*, the description of the seven in Aeschylus concludes with Polynices, who I have argued is in important ways the analogue of Turnus. However, the Rutulian leader is more overtly aligned with the forces of chaos and destruction than his Aeschylan counterpart, even though he remains, as Gale (1997) has argued, an ambiguous figure like Polynices.

While characteristics of these particular heroes—Mezentius, Turnus and Virbius—allude to *Septem*'s Tydeus, Polynices and Parthenopaeus, the general preponderance of horses and chariots in the catalogue, particularly since they are adversaries of the helmsman's side in the war, also suggests the intertextual importance of *Septem* in the Latin catalogue. In fact, the characters in the catalogue from the traditional legend of Aeneas (Mezentius, Lausus, and Turnus) and those known from other previous legends (Catillus and Coras, Caeculus, Halaesus, and Messapus) seem to have been consciously fortified by Vergilian invented characters with significant involvement with horses and or chariots: Aventinus, Virbius, and Camilla. Characters who are or will be closely associated with chariots and horses are concentrated at the beginning and end of the list of warriors, although Messapus (seventh) and Halaesus (ninth) continue the theme. The first warrior, the tyrant Mezentius, will behave most humanely to his

[471] Gale (1997), 187, n. 53: "But Hippolytus' son Virbius is apparently oblivious to the destructiveness of passion manifested in his father's death: he rushes eagerly into battle in a chariot drawn (significantly) by 'fiery' ('ardentis') horses (781-2). We have already explored the associations between fire and destructive passion, and between horses and war; and Virbius' chariot may remind us of the runaway chariot of war at the end of Georgics 1." Horsfall (2000), 780.

horse, Rhaebus (10. 861-66), upon which he engages with Aeneas on foot, in a confrontation fatal both for him and his horse.[472] His son Lausus, at his side, is *equum domitor,* (651, Latin for ἱππόδαμος) and is followed by Aventinus, son of Hercules, who "displays his palm-laden chariot and victorious horses in the fields" (655-57).[473] Messapus combines, as does the chorus in *Septem* (ὅ θ'ἵππιος ποντομέδων ἄναξ, 131), the horse and the sea, as he is "breaker of horses, son of Neptune" (691), which are, as Servius noted, linked epithets.[474] Helaesus (ninth), too, son of Agamemnon and an enemy of the Trojan name, joins horses to his chariot (724), before the final triad of leaders, Virbius, Turnus, and Camilla, who are all strongly linked with the horse (a topic discussed below). But, that Turnus, like Tydeus (393-4), will, in addition to his frequent chariot appearances, be compared to a horse (11. 491-7), suggests that the decoration of his helmet with a *triplici...iuba* ("triple mane", the primary meaning of *iuba* and used thus in Turnus' horse simile, 497) foreshadows his future close association with horse and chariot and may, in fact, allude specifically to Tydeus, whose triple crest is referred to as "the mane of his helmet" (κράνους χαίτωμ, 385).[475] If anything the association of the leaders in the catalogue with horses and chariots seems even more insistent than that in *Septem.*

In summary, the Latin Catalogue exhibits close affinities with *Septem*'s Argive warriors. In addition to the prominence of horses and chariots in the catalogue of Latin troops, like the shield scene in *Septem,* a large faction of the Latin warriors are rough and uncivilized, most prominently the first warrior, who clearly represents values which are antithetical to state and gods and both Tydeus and Mezentius have been driven from power. In both play and epic the chief warrior of the opposing side is presented as a pendant to the first warrior at the end of, or next to the end of, the catalogue. The chief grievance of

---

[472] The possible etymology of Mezentius' name from *mannus*, an Illyrian loan-word, related to ἱππόδαμυς (Horsfall, 2000, 648 and 651) would, perhaps, have been some suggestion of the importance of the horse for Mezentius.

[473] Horsfall (2000), 655-69, speculates on why Aventinus bears "the symbol of agonistic victory," ruling out the possibility of an allusion to the Nemean games. He concludes, "perhaps then Aventinus is presented as a famed charioteer in his own right," referring to the chariot driving of the young men before Latinus' city (161).

[474] *domitor...equorum quasi animalium a patre inventorum.*

[475] Horsehair crests per se are Homeric (*Il.* 19. 382), but when number is specified, it is usually four (*Il.* 22. 314-15; *Arg.* 3. 1228). Horsfall (2000), 785, is of the opinion that the triple plume identifies the troops as Italic, but Turnus' later comparison to a horse, the exclusivity of his triple horsehair helmet plumes in the catalogue and the fiery destructiveness of his helmet decoration (for which see below) argues that an allusion to Tydeus is strongly suggested.

Polynices and Turnus is that they have been unfairly usurped from the right to rule (accomplished via marriage to Lavinia for Turnus). Although exonerated from the worst values of their allies, both Turnus and Polynices are marked with darker characteristics, Turnus by his fire-breathing Chimaera, Polynices in attacking his homeland and gods. Both catalogue and shield scene present warriors of a distinctively transgressive nature: the beautiful ephebic warrior from the woodland, associated with horses either through their mother from the wilds, their name or actions. In the *Aeneid*'s catalogue this transgressive aspect is amplified in the figure of Camilla (see below). With Aeneas already established as a helmsman with Eteocles' polis-centered dutiful values, these allusions to *Septem*'s charioteers would be more likely to be apparent, with important consequences for Vergil's presentation of the war in Latium.

The traces of Aeschylus' play in the *Aeneid* at this point would begin to figure the future war in Latium not only as a second Trojan War, but also in some way an internecine war in the sense that the Latin and Trojan sides were destined to live together in peace (12. 503-4).[476] Aeneas' and Turnus' war is figured as a prototype of the deadly Roman inclination toward civil war and the contemporary battle of Octavian and Antony is represented on Aeneas' shield. The fight between the two brothers, Romulus and Remus, Rome's dominant foundation myth, which is suggestively evoked at the end of the *Aeneid,* like the fight of Eteocles and Polynices, is engaged in to determine apparently equal claims to rule. Thus in the case of both Rome and Thebes (the Spartoi) their states issued from internecine war. Vergil activates Aeschylus' distinctive development of the politically charged interactive helmsman and charioteer as a means to express the disruption of the state's, not original, but future and preordained unity. In fashioning the Latin side as the charioteers in the war, Vergil also suggests that, despite their established residential position (analogous to that of Eteocles' within the city of Thebes), they are the aggressors in the war.

In addition to this important Aeschylean intertext Vergil enriches the Latin charioteers and leaders in the catalogue with further intertextual complexity. In as much as Greek charioteers—Juno, Achilles and

---

[476] As expressed in a narratorial apostrophe to Jupiter, after Turnus, having decided to return to war when the truce has been broken, drives the chariot like Mars: *tanton placuit concurrere motu, / Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?*

Salmoneus—have been associated with savagery toward the Trojans and hubris, the frequent Greek descendants and participants in the catalogue, in addition to promoting the image of the war in Latium as a second Trojan War, precisely because of Troy's humiliating defeat by the Greeks, contributes to a certain demonizing of the Latin forces. In this regard it should be noted that all three charioteers are sons of famous Greeks, although only one of these fathers fought in the Trojan War: Halaesus, who is *Troiani nominis hostis* (723) and son of Agamemnon; Aventinus, son of Hercules; and Virbius, son of Hippolytus. Beyond this similarity the three charioteers each contribute to the catalogue and the epic in a different way.

It may appear at first that these charioteers are of very limited importance: two of the catalogue's charioteers (Aventinus and Virbius) never occur again in the epic and Halaesus, who does, has no chariot. Nevertheless, the characters of Aventinus and Virbius are Vergilian creations and Virbius' entry is the longest in the catalogue (22 lines), while only Turnus' entry (20) is longer than Aventinus' (15), which commences the catalogue after the leading position of Mezentius and Lausus (8 lines together), implying that these charioteers have significance. The phenomenon of single-appearing leaders is, in fact, a characteristic of epic catalogues and one that suggests a broader function for the catalogue than a simple list of the dramatis personae. Sammons' (2010) recent study of the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad* suggests that this catalogue interacts and comments on both the narrative and the poet's art in much more complex ways than the catalogue form has led readers to expect and that some of these exclusive catalogue leaders function significantly within this dialogue.[477] Aventinus and Virbius prepare for later episodes and characterize the Latin charioteers as impetuous, thoughtless and concerned with display and, therefore, not likely to be able to maintain their place in the chariot. Aventinus anticipates future and concluding moments in Turnus' charioteering, while each of these two charioteers manifest prominently negative types, which in their reappearance in other Latin charioteers will be defeated by Aeneas, thrown

[477] Sammons (2010), 137-8, notes that both the catalogue of ships and the catalogue of the Myrmidons that precedes Patroclus' entrance into battle (16. 168-97) in the *Iliad* include warriors who appear nowhere else in the epic and that this is a characteristic as well of the South Slavic oral tradition (n. 13).

from their chariot and die. On the other hand, Haleasus, lacking his chariot, in book 10 provides a heroic adversary to elevate the *aristeia* of Pallas, the last kill before he dies by Turnus' hand.[478]

Vergil carefully undercuts Aventinus' potential for success in war, despite the attributes of his father Hercules that he carries: the fierce hydra and snakes on his shield and his shaggy lion skin (*terribili impexum saeta,*667; *horridus*, 669). Aventinus' name is delayed until the third line of his entry in order to privilege his chariot and horses, which he is showing off (*ostentat* "need not imply proud and ostentatious display, but clearly does so here" Horsfall, 2000, 655), making his physical presence in the chariot especially vague (655-68):

> Post hos insignem palma per gramina currum 655
> victoresque ostentat equos satus Hercule pulchro
> pulcher Auentinus, clipeoque insigne paternum
> centum anguis cinctamque gerit serpentibus Hydram;
>
> After these the fair son of fair Hercules displays across the grassland,
> his chariot, distinguished with palm, and his victorious horses and
> he bears his father's emblem on his shield, a hundred snakes
> and the Hydra surrounded by serpents.

The chariot is "distinguished" or even "conspicuous" (*insignem*, 655), the first word of the passage proper, with the palm of victory and his horses are also described as victorious (*victoresque*, first word in the second line, 656), clearly an agonistic victory.[479] While the other Latin leaders in the catalogue are carrying weapons, calling their forces to arms or leading them (Mezenius, 648; Lausus, 652-53; Messapus, 694; Clausus, 706; Helaesus, 724-5; Turnus, 784; Camilla), or in their strength or fearlessness indicate their readiness for war (Catullus and Coras, 673; Ufens, 748; Umbro, 752), Aventinus is all show, either of his chariot racing victories or of emblems of his father's more challenging victories over monstrous

---

[478] *Halaesus,/ Arcadio infelix telo dat pectus inermum*, (10. 425). Perhaps his prowess reflects the reputation of his father Agamemnon, but, as Williams points out, "(this) is inconsistent with 10. 417," where Halaesus' father is merely *fata canens...genitor,* who attempts to hide Halaesus in the woods to avoid his predicted death. Horsfall (2000), 723, notes that Ovid refers to a Halaesus who is a bastard son of Agamemnon (*Am.* 3. 13. 31; *Fast.* 4. 73). Halaesus is *bellis acer* (10. 411) and demonstrates his fighting mettle in his own abbreviated *aristeia* (5, 413-16).

[479] Crouwel (2012), 64-65, notes that explicit illustrations of chariot races appear as early as the second half of the 6th century from different parts of Italy. As in Greece where chariot racing can be traced back to the late Mycenaean times (later 12th century), racing in Rome "seems to have had cultic origins, before becoming a primarily secular affair with strong political overtones" (66). Without reference to specific examples Crouwel, 107, notes in his conclusions that "both the chariot and its team of horses were suitable for lavish decorations, thus catering to the love of ostentation of an elite."

beasts. The apparent irrelevance of Aventinus' action in displaying his victorious team has led to speculation on whether this refers to agonistic victories of Hercules (Horsfall, 655, "no trace") or even indicates that Aventinus' team consists of some of Diomedes' man-eating horses, but a simpler explanation and one more appropriate to the manner of Vergil's presentation, is that Aventinus' victory proleptically looks forward to the chariot races of the future in the Circus Maximus below the Aventine hill, just as aspects of the the ship race evoke Rome. What Vergil seems to be attributing to Aventinus is an overvaluing of chariot racing, much like that of Euripides' Hippolytus, who chose racing over civic responsibilities.[480] At the very least, Aventinus appears to be so distracted by pride in his racing victory that he shows no awareness, other than carrying a shield, of the war he is embarking upon.

Virbius, a suggestive double of his father, Hippolytus, also functions in the concluding triad of leaders who share close associations with horses and a figurative equine nature, as do several of the Argive charioteers in *Septem* (Ch. 3, pp. 136-38). That this is a continuation of the theme of bestialization associated with Circe seems clear from the intratextual references within both Turnus' and Camilla's descriptions to the fire-breathing horses Latinus gives Aeneas earlier in the book. Furthermore, as the final leader in the catalogue Camilla's Amazonian transgressivity traditionally implies defeat and is anticipated in aspects of Virbius, with whom Camilla shares an allusion to the barbarian Nastes in the *Iliad*, decked out in gold and killed by Achilles. While Turnus, with the exception of his fire-breathing Chimaera, conveys the impression of a worthy leader in his presentation in the catalogue, the leaders who frame him, nevertheless, suggest his defeat.[481] Just as Turnus' future as a failing, disappearing charioteer

---

[480] As we have seen, Hippolytus renounces full participation in the life of the polis: "Was rule so sweet? Never, I tell you, Theseus, ...I would want to be first in the contests of the Greeks, but in the city I'd take second place." (Eur. *Hipp.* 1013-17).

[481] Sammons (2010), 161-63, 172-73, has shown the important implications of the placement of the leaders in the *Iliad*'s catalogue of ships. For example, Nireus, who, like Aventinus and Virbius, receives prominent attention in the catalogue and yet doesn't occur elsewhere and like Virbius is most beautiful (κάλλιστος, 2. 673; cf. *pulcherrima,* 7. 761), appears only one entry away from Achilles with whom he is negatively compared, overtly in his beauty and indirectly in his weakness. Ajax and Mnestheus are juxtaposed in the catalogue and both have descriptions which contradict their value in the *Iliad*: Ajax, second only to Achilles in valor receives no comment (2. 557-58), while Mnestheus, a nonentity, receives lavish praise (2. 552-55), which Sammons (173) interprets as an arrangement which questions whether the catalogue "communicates a *kleos* that is true poetic fame or unreliable rumor." Sammons (2010), 196, views this as just part of the catalogue's discourse that "establishes the poet's excellence over

is anticipated in the catalogue by the charioteers Aventinus and Virbius, made memorable by the narrative of their more famous fathers, and their analogues later in the war, Turnus' overt comparison to a horse awaits a scene of arming during the actual war.

Equine Finale: Virbius, Turnus and Camilla

In Aeschylus' *Septem* equine imagery consisted of two extremes: the brutish and loud domineering figurative horses among the Argive warriors (Tydeus especially) and those within Thebes afraid of being submitted to the yoke should the Argives win. While the equine imagery in the catalogue entries of the last three leaders in the *Aeneid* all relate in some way to the fire-breathing horses given to Aeneas by Latinus, the manner in which this is accomplished is unique to each leader. In addition to the intertextual precedent of the mingling of charioteers and figurative horses in *Septem*,[482] the significance of equine imagery is reaffirmed in the later narrative for both Turnus and Camilla. The centrality of the horse, however, is insistent in Virbius' entry, his only appearance.

Horses are a connecting theme throughout most of the long Hippolytus/Virbius passage: Hippolytus' name ("loosen by horses," see Ch. 3, p. 96, n. 174) is repeated three times (761, 765, 774), as are forms of *equus* (767, 779, 782) and everywhere horses occur they connote destruction: tearing Hippolytus apart, because of which they must be kept away from Diana's sanctuary, and figuratively on fire as they carry Virbius to war. In ritual at Aricia Virbius apparently had an even closer association with the horse, for an annual sacrifice of a horse was considered the embodiment of Virbius (Ambrose, *de vir.* 3. 4. 6; Horsfall, 2000, 778).[483] Because the horses that Virbius trains and drives into war are figuratively on fire, blazing (*ardentis*, 781), a frequent word in book 7 and almost always associated with war, they have a relation to Turnus' Chimaera, a few lines later (786), exhaling fire and a symbol of war. While the intratextual link between this Chimaera and the earlier Circean fire-breathing horses has been noted, the closeness of

---

and against others who do not follow his own disciplined ways." Putnam (1992), 16-17, has likewise argued for metapoetic implications in the *Aeneid*'s catalogue.

[482] See Ch. 2, pp. 53-54, on Himmelhoch's concept of transitivity between charioteers and figurative horses.

[483] This equation could possibly be hinted at in Virbius' rushing into war (*ruebat*, 7. 782), an action Niphaeus' horses repeat at the sight of Aeneas (*retroque ruentes,* 10. 573).

Virbius' blazing horses to Turnus' Chimaera also helps to reinforce the relevance of the gift horses for both leaders, now more clearly than ever, a symbol of the future war.

At this point in the narrative Turnus' presentation as a strong commander builds suspense for the coming war (783-802): the brief comment on his height and imposing physique (782-83), is augmented by the indirect praise earlier in comparison to Lausus' beauty (649-50). The central detailed description of his helmet and shield (785-92) gains importance by being the only arms decoration described, beside that of Aventinus (657-58), and by the apparently live action of the Chimaera. The devotion of half the passage (793-802) to the various places in Latium represented in the many troops following him ("A cloud of foot soldiers follow and the whole field is covered by the shield-bearing ranks." 793-94), strengthens his image as a leader. Turnus' arms decoration, are two separate programs, suggestive of two aspects of, and even perspectives on him: the fiery, destructive aggressor (the Chimaera on his helmet) and the victim of Juno (Io on his shield). Yet, even on his shield Circe is present, although more subtly. In Io's depiction the reality of her bovine state is emphasized, by her uplifted horns, anaphora (*iam...iam*) and the horror of her shagginess, which recalls Circe's beasts (*saetigerique sues*, 17). The transforming goddess is likewise recalled, among Turnus' troops, some of whom live on Circe's ridge (799). Even without allusions to Circe's fire-breathing horses, Turnus' affiliation with the horse is already implied by the horsehair crest on his helmet, his *triplici...iuba,* "triple mane", the primary meaning of *iuba* and used thus in the simile, comparing Turnus to a horse (11. 497), which this anticipates.

But in the *Aeneid*, no figure is more closely associated with the horse than Camilla, which is fully revealed in her first appearance in the epic at the end of the catalogue (803-817):

> Hos super aduenit Volsca de gente Camilla
> agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas,
> bellatrix, non illa colo calathisve Minervae
> femineas adsueta manus, sed proelia virgo
> dura pati cursuque pedum praevertere ventos.
> illa vel intactae segetis per summa volaret
> gramina nec teneras cursu laesisset aristas,
> vel mare per medium fluctu suspensa tumenti
> ferret iter celeris nec tingeret aequore plantas.

> After these came Camilla from the Volscian tribe
> leading cavalry ranks and crowds flowering in bronze.
> A warrior, her feminine hands were not accustomed
> to the distaff and basket of Minerva, but even as a maiden,
> she was tough enough to endure battles and in the running
> of her feet to surpass the winds. She would fly over the tops of a crop
> of untouched shoots and not have harmed the tender ears by her course
> or would make her way across the middle of the sea, suspended over
> the swelling waves and not touch her swift feet in the ocean.

As leader of the cavalry (*agmen agens equitum*, 804), noted at the beginning of the second line of the passage immediately after her name at the end of the first, Camilla follows in an Amazonian tradition dating back to the sixth century, as vase representations of them on horseback indicate (cf. "the son of the horse-loving (φιλίππου) Amazon, Hippolytus," Eur. *Hipp.* 581). Their associations with the horse, not mentioned in Homer (*Il.* 3. 189; 6. 186), probably developed from their geographic connection with Thrace, an area famous for its horses.[484] But Camilla's description as a horse, while subtle, is more extensive and surprising. Her two notable abilities are fighting and running faster than the wind (806-7), a quality frequently attributed to horses, some of which are offspring of various winds.[485] Not content to rest with this hyperbolic description of Camilla's speed, Vergil devotes the central section of the passage to more elaborate descriptive hyperbole that suggests Camilla can fly (808-11). According to Callimachus (frag. 723Pf), Camillus means Mercury in Etruscan,[486] perhaps relevant here, and an intratextual reference to Harplyce (*Aen.* 1. 315-17), an Amazonian type, whose horses surpass the speed of the river Hebrus, not only may strengthen Camilla's Amazonian credentials (Boyd, 230-31), but her equine as well. Nevertheless, it seems difficult to undervalue the importance of the major intertext for

---

[484] Blok (1995), 269-70. The Amazons were thought to sacrifice horses to Ares (Apollonius, 2. 1179), who also owed his origins to Thrace (264-69).

[485] On the "long and complex history" of the theme, see Horsfall (2000), 807. Winds, earlier in the *Aeneid* (1. 53-63) are likened to horses.

[486] Although Egan (2012), 49, n. 107, notes that Camilla's speed has been associated with her name, the importance of the word's etymological affiliation with a religious functionary (31-32) and with weapons (34, 37-49) are a greater part of his argument that the attributes of the historical Marcus Furius Camillus (who appears once in the *Aeneid*'s Underworld parade, 825, carrying back standards, implicitly from his Gallic campaigns) are "evoked through those of Camilla, his namesake and typological antecedent and counterfoil" that gives Camilla "a basis in Roman history to match her well-recognized foundations in mythopoetic tradition" (52).

these four lines, Aeneas' description in the *Iliad,* given to Achilles before they fight, of his ancestor Erichthonius' fillies (20. 226-29):

> αἳ δ' ὅτε μὲν σκιρτῷεν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν,
> ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀνθερίκων καρπὸν θέον οὐδὲ κατέκλων:
> ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ σκιρτῷεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης,
> ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος ἁλὸς πολιοῖο θέεσκον.
>
> These, when they bounded over the earth, the giver of grain,
> would run over the topmost ears of ripened corn and break them not
> and, when they bounded over the broad back of the sea,
> would run over the topmost breakers of the gray brine.

Although within this major and organizing intertext Vergil has interwoven additional allusions that both account for some variations from the Iliadic text and establish precedence for human subjects (male),[487] the primacy of Aeneas' digression in the *Iliad* on his ancestor's horses, still seems clear, due to the balanced presentation of their skimming over the tops of both grain and the sea, the feminine subjects and relevance to Aeneas. Born of the North Wind, an air-born deity, and, thus, semi-divine, Erichthonius' fillies could perhaps have performed up to Aeneas' claims, but to attribute this capacity to a human, even an Amazonian woman, seems immediately fantastic.[488] As in the case of the fire-breathing horses given to Aeneas by Latinus (recently alluded to in Turnus' Chimaera), which were of the stock Circe managed stealthily to pilfer—mimicry of Anchises' actions to obtain the fleet, but otherwise normal, horses Aeneas rides in the *Iliad*—a change from animal to bizarre beast in the *Aeneid*, the speeding wind-born horses Aeneas seems to boast of to Achilles, here have been transformed to an unnatural variation on the original, from filly to fleet-footed Amazonian warrior, from animal to uncanny human, who is herself simultaneously bestialized.[489] And just as the fire-breathing horses, with their Circean heritage, were an emblem of the war Aeneas will face, Camilla will be a formidable foe for the Trojan calvary. Once again

---

[487] Boyd, 232-33, has shown additional allusions in play in these lines: Hesiod (frag. 62 West) apparently suggested the idea of not harming (σινέσκετο, cf. *laesisset,* 7. 809), as opposed to the Iliadic not breaking (κατέκλων, 20. 227) of the ears of grain. Apollonius' (*Arg.* 1. 182-84) description of Euphemus in his catalogue of heroes as being so fast a runner that he was capable of skimming over sea and not wetting his feet (183; cf. *nec tingeret aequore plantas,* 811), likewise, appears to have contributed to line 811.

[488] Boyd, 233, characterizes Camilla as only "a figment crafted from words alone," partially based on the elaborate literary allusions in these lines (a "window device," R. F. Thomas' term, 231, n. 52) and the "correction of the mood of the scene from real (all intertexts to date) to simply possible."

[489] See above p. 230 and n. 394 on the general Italian proclivity to confuse man and beast.

the reader encounters a variation on the theme of a second Trojan war, but with the added twist of the Circean/Allecto bestializing transformation. When Diana in book 11 recounts Camilla's life story to Opis, previous experiences in her life (551-63; 571)—flying over the torrent of the river Amasenus wrapped to a spear and being fed mare's milk as an infant—and her subsequent running down in battle of the son of Aunus and his horse (699-724), somewhat naturalize her presentation here, essentially, as a horse.[490] But, in this final position of the catalogue of Latin warriors, the elaboration of her airborne speed instead of her ability to fight (*proelia virgo dura pati*, 806-7), heightens the impression of her as a marvel, as one of the ethnographic tradition's μέγαλα θαύματα, as Boyd (*passim*) has so aptly argued regarding her presentation in general.

Thus, the centrality of the horse in their presentation is an obvious common feature shared by the triad of leaders at the end of the catalogue, Virbius, Turnus and Camilla, which recalls and strengthens the equine associations of numerous leaders in the catalogue (Lausus, Aventinus, Catillus and Coras, Messapus, Halaesus), and, due to the disturbing associations of the horse in the Hippolytus/Virbius passage and the physical equation of human and horse in Camilla's case, the horse becomes emblematic of the Fury-inspired Latin cause, as first suggested in the fire-breathing horses, which was instigated by a particularly physical indwelling of fiery passion (Amata, Turnus), that transformed humans into beasts. In the catalogue Turnus' participation in these equine associations is restrained—his horsehair plume and the fire-breathing Chimaera, but it will become a more overt characteristic later. In a related affiliation of Hippolytus/Virbius and Camilla, their barbarian otherness, Turnus' association is always indirect, but due to their positions in the catalogue, at the end and on either side of him, the connotations of this feature are both broadly related to the Latin side and in particular to Turnus.

[490] Putnam (1970), 415, n. 8, notes two aspects of Camilla's portrait that she shares with the horses Latinus gives the Trojans: like Camilla the horses are fleet of foot (*alipedes*, 277) and they are caparisoned in purple and gold (*ostro*, 277 and 814; *aurea, auro, arum,* 278-80 and *auro*, 816).

Although Vergil's invention of Camilla cannot be reduced simply to her role as Amazon,[491] neither should her participation in the major characteristics of these women warriors and the cultural connotations associated with them be minimized. The text fashions Camilla as Amazon in her rejection of the classic feminine activity of weaving and assumption of the male's role of warrior (cf. Turnus to Calybe/Allecto: *bella viri pacemque gerent quis bella gerenda*, 7. 444) and does so in expression shared with the presentation of the Amazon Penthesilea on the frieze of Juno's temple: *bellatrix audetque viris concurrere virgo*, 1. 493; cf. *bellatrix...sed proelia virgo*, 805-6), to whom Camilla is later compared (*seu cum se Martia curru/ Penthesilea refert,* 11. 661-62).[492] In the Amazon's rejection of the feminine roles of wife within the home and within the walls of the city they were linked in the ethnographic tradition with groups living on the fringes of the civilized world—Thrace and Scythia; they represented an inversion of normal life.[493] While the mothers (and youths), who look on Camilla in the procession of leaders with wonder (*miratur, attonitis inhians animis*, 812-14) and later are said to wish for Camilla as daughter-in-law, may express some admiration, they also emphasize the oddity of her rejection of traditional femininity.[494] Furthermore, as Barbara Weiden Boyd (215) has argued, in placing a woman at the end of his catalogue of warriors Vergil seems to allude to Herodotus' precedent of placing Artemesia at the end of Xerxes forces (7. 61-99), a woman whose audacity even Xerxes saw as "ominous."[495] Certainly, the intratextual allusion to Penthesilea, also at the end of the scenes of Trojan war, who was

---

[491] Viparelli (2008), 12, argues that the values of Camilla "waver in a range spanning the extremes of praise and blame"; Horsfall (2000), 803-17, notes that Vergil calls her both "Volscian princess" and "Volscian warrior queen," (which does seem to imply that she is a member of a society consisting of men and women), and he characterizes the concluding scene of the crowds watching her progress as "an heroic recasting of the *adventus* of a great Roman magnate" (812), even suggesting that her purple cloak ("with marked antiquarian resonances at Rome") would have evoked the short cloak of purple and scarlet worn by the Roman cavalry (815). Blok (1995), 131, n. 267, however, refers to the gradual merging of Camilla with the post-Homeric story of Penthesilea.

[492] Boyd, 217; Keith, 27. Both women also lead forces (*ducit Amazonidum...agmina*, 1. 490; *agmina agens equitum*, 7. 804) and wear golden ornament (*aurea subnectens...cingula,* 1. 492; *fibula crinem/ auro internectat*, 7. 815-16).

[493] Tyrrell, 46-58; Blok, 268-69; Boyd, 215-16. Dowden, 98-116, provides a full discussion of the Greek sources, epic, ethnographical, and historical.

[494] The mothers' desires in book 11 are also expressed as hopeless: *multae illam frustra Tyrrhena per oppida matres/ optavere nurum,* 11. 581-82. As Boyd, 222, points out, Herodotus also identified Artemisia as a great marvel (7. 99.1) and in doing so he participates in the ethnographical tradition of the description of marvels and curiosities.

[495] Boyd, 215; Herodotus 8. 88. 3. Both Courtney (1988), 5-8, and Horsfall (1988), 31 and n. 6, had suggested the possible relevance of the catalogue in Herodotus.

killed by Achilles, bodes ill for Camilla and, in fact, Dowden (117) has argued "an important part of the mythical construct of Amazons in general, and of named Amazons in particular, (is) that they should die." So Camilla's entry at the end of the catalogue intensifies the sense of foreboding with which Virbius' entry also ends. But the closer links between the two figures are conceptual.

That Virbius is from the wilderness, the traditional region of the other, is progressively revealed by the references to Aricia, the grove of Egeria and, finally, to the altar of Diana (*pinguis ubi et placabilis ara Dianae*, 764), which refers to "a ritual still active in all its brutality" (Horsfall, 2000, 764).[496] Strabo (5. 3. 12) identifies the ritual as "a certain barbarian and Scythian custom" and Green (2007, 30-31) argues that in the first century the natural wildness associated with the sanctuary was "being recast in a more threatening image of social wildness, of barbarism" by the sanctuary leaders.[497] Homer likewise included barbarian forces in the Trojan catalogue, the Carians, lead by Nastes and Amphimachus in the next to the last position of his catalogue of the Trojan forces, which Boyd has shown helps to elucidate the implications of Camilla's presentation, but it also has relevance for Virbius as well (*Il.* 2. 867-75):

> Νάστης αὖ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων,
> οἳ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθιρῶν τ᾽ ὄρος ἀκριτόφυλλον
> Μαιάνδρου τε ῥοὰς Μυκάλης τ᾽ αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα:
> τῶν μὲν ἄρ᾽ Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Νάστης ἡγησάσθην,
> Νάστης Ἀμφίμαχός τε Νομίονος ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,
> ὃς καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχων πόλεμον δ᾽ ἴεν ἠΰτε κούρη
> νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ᾽ ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἐδάμη ὑπὸ χερσὶ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο
> ἐν ποταμῷ, χρυσὸν δ᾽ Ἀχιλεὺς ἐκόμισσε δαΐφρων.
>
> And Nastes again led the Carians, barbarous of speech,
> who held Miletus and the mountain of Phthires, dense
> with its leafage, and the streams of Maeandre, and the
> steep crests of Mycale. These were led by two leaders,
> Amphimachus and Nastes—Nastes and Amphimachus,
> the glorious sons of Nomion. And he came to battle
> all decked with gold, like a girl, fool that he was; but
> his gold could not protect him from woeful destruction,

---

[496] The *rex nemorensis*, the ruling hunter-priest in Diana's sanctuary, was killed by his successor, always a fugitive slave, in mortal combat and, thus, both *pinguis* and *placabilis*, could suggest this ritual human sacrifice (Horsfall, 2000, 764).

[497] Green (2007), 30-31, deduces this on the basis of a coin of 43, (fig. 5), with a triple Diana and bust of the goddess in archaic style chitons, which "surely reproduces an important statue group at Aricia," and that Diana is frequently described as "Scythian" (Ovid, *Met.* 14. 331; Lucan 3. 86, 7. 776).

> but he was killed in the river at the hands of Aeacus' grandson,
> swift of foot; and Achilles, wise of heart, carried off the gold.

While as the last leader Camilla's Lycian quiver (*Lyciam…pharetram*, 816) alludes to the final group in Homer's catalogue, led by Sarpedon and Glaucus (876-77), her golden hair clasp (*fibula crinem / aruo internectat*, 815-16) refers to the gold the Carian wears, assuming reasonably that ἠΰτε κούρη (872) implies ornamentation, not weapons. By means of this allusion to a warrior of "alien effeminacy" Vergil implies the prospect of destruction for Camilla, such as happened to Nastes brought by Achilles (Boyd, 220-21). But the combination of an androgynous youth from the remote woods is also part with a cluster of characteristics that we have seen Virbius shares with Aeschylus' Parthenopaeus.[498] Especially relevant to Virbius is the Carians' derivation from a wilderness "dense with its leafage" (868), the remoteness of which is enhance with barbarian connotations, as seems also to have been characteristic of the Arician sanctuary's contemporary image. That these ephebic youths from forested remote wilds, whose androgyny is heightened by the questionable sexuality of their mother (they are in the service of Diana—Aricia/Egeria, Atalanta—or Amazons themselves—Hippolyte) could be seen as analogous to Camilla, in her inverted sexuality and its negative implications, may be confirmed by Statius' modeling of his Parthenopaeus in the *Thebaid* on Camilla.[499] Both types—Amazon and Hippolytan ephebe—represent a failure or refusal to make the transition into adulthood,[500] as is represented in the parallel profiles of

---

[498] While Virbius himself lacks the overt characteristics of androgyny, everything in his context suggests it. As I have argued previously in discussing the similarities between Virbius and Parthenopaeus, the combination of youth, beauty, a mountain or forest dwelling mother devoted to Diana and/or hunting seems to produce androgynous sons. Furthermore, the Hippolytan tradition is replete with these connotations.

[499] Keith, 31, notes Camilla "is also an important model, along with Euryalus, for Statius' boy-hero Parthenopaeus...who shares with his precursors both speed in the footrace (6. 550-617)...and an androgynous beauty." Putnam (1992), 18: "[Parthenopaeus'] presentation throughout the epic is modeled in part on Virgil's Camilla." Ganiban, (2007), 130-31.

[500] Vidal-Naquet (1986), 119, refers to Melanion, in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* 781-96, who goes to the mountains rather than marry, as "an ephebe, but a sort of ephebe *manqué*—a kind of Hippolytus, in fact, as Wilamowitz makes clear in his commentary" (*Lysistrata,* 169-70). Dowden, (122-23) has suggested that the annual festival's weapons-and-shield dance the Amazon Hippo established at Ephesus (Callimachus, *Hymn to Artemis* 239-47) is part of the familiar world of Artemis and the initiation of girls into adulthood. All such rites of passage involve a period of transition, when the youths have been separated from their previous context and in which inversions of social roles and behavior is typical.

Melanion and Atalanta, who both resisted marriage by living in the mountains.[501] For Hippolytus and Camilla, their refusal to make the transition to marriage assures their death and, by implication, Virbius' as well. Ironically (but appropriately), in the *Aeneid* all three characters are bound together by the importance of the horse in their portraits, the animal whose lust is *ante omnes* (*G.* 3. 266).[502] The similarities between Hippolytus/Virbius and Camilla only become more overt in Diana's recounting of her life in book 11, in which we learn that Camilla was raised in the wilderness and dedicated in infancy to Diana, and delighted in the hunt.

If Camilla in the concluding position of the catalogue, through her fatal transgressive sexuality, predicts the future failure of the Latin side, the recognition that Virbius, on the other side of Turnus in the catalogue, also represents, now masculine, youth arrested in development, living on the wilderness frontier where laws can more easily be evaded or ignored, suggests, perhaps most importantly, that Turnus' war, which has been undertaken to win him the marriage he thinks he has been deprived of, will not achieve that goal. While Turnus does not here at the beginning of the war share these qualities obviously, the figures on either side of him imply that he may later. Vidal-Naquet (122) extrapolating upon the polarities evident between the ephebe and the adult, argues that they represent the twofold function of the warrior in Indo-European society: "on the one side was order, which later led to the development of the phalanx and the legion, on the other, disorder, and the exploits of the

---

[501] Vidal-Naquet (1986), 119-20, compares the pre-marriage profile of Melanion (in many sources the father of Parthenopaeus; Aeschylus, *Seven* 532, identifies his father as Ares) to that of Atalanta, "like Melanion, Atalanta was brought up in the mountains, suckled by a bear (Artemis's animal; cf. Camilla who is fed mare's milk)...'hated by Aphrodite' (Eur. F530 Nauck)—a social failing parallel to Melanion's," who as a youth flew to the mountains rather than marry (Arist. *Lys.* 785-7). Atalanta strides over the mountains, fleeing from the desire of marriage (Theognidea, 1291-94), and, like Camilla, she is swift-footed (Hesiod, FF 73.2; 76. 5, 20 Merkelbach-West). Although Melanion and Atalanta do eventually marry, in their prolonged transitional stage, their characteristics are nearly indistinguishable. Vidal-Naquet (1986), 114, further points to the frequency in the ephebic time of sexual inversions, another type of parallelism: "the transition between childhood and adulthood (the period of marriage and fighting) is dramatized both in ritual and in myth by what we might call the 'law of symmetrical inversion,'" citing the classic study by Arnold van Gennep, *Les Rites de passage* and "the whole of Lévi-Strauss's work" (125, n. 43). Examples of transvestism are seen in Spartan rituals for girls who are shaved and dressed in men's clothes and shoes and Athenian boys at the festival of the Oschophoria, in which the procession to the shrine of Athena Skiras was made up of boys led by two boys disguised as girls (115).

[502] The appropriateness of the horse for Hippolytus and Virbius is as agent of their (implied) destruction. While the horse per se does not destroy Camilla, rather it is her feminine love of (gold) booty (*femineo praedae et spoliorum ardebat amore*, 11. 782), in the *Aeneid* the vocabulary of lust, whether battle, sexual or material lust, merges.

individual...which derived from their *furor, lussa* (rage), *celeritas, menos* (strength, force), from their fighting spirit." In the *Aeneid* this polarity could be applied to the adult Aeneas, whose goal in war is for the sake of the Trojan community, and the youth Turnus, whose motivation is personal and presented to him as such by Allecto ("The king is denying to you the marriage and dowry sought by your blood" 7. 423-24). The fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, expressive of the *furor* and *lussa* that have already been seen in him, relates to Turnus and the goddesses who have inspired war against Aeneas and the Trojans and not to any higher positive value (cf. Aeneas' shield below). Likewise, Io on his shield represents individual suffering, as Turnus is also the victim of Juno, even though many others will also suffer as a result of him. Here in the catalogue, by means of the developed presence of Virbius, who leads no warriors, but in his closeness to the horse and his barbarian transgressivity is echoed in the final figure of Camilla, the relative ethical value of Turnus' goal and the future success of the Latin war effort are undermined. Turnus at this point does not drive a chariot (overtly; *vertitur* may suggest it), I believe, in order to maintain a balanced presentation of him as a heroic leader and worthy adversary for Aeneas and to allow suggestions of transgressivity and defeat to surround but only indirectly implicate him by association. The majority of Turnus' appearances in the chariot will be overtly negative, representing him as extremely brutal, tyrannical, or a braggart. With the important exception of the Chimaera, which affiliates him with Circe, bestiality and fire, Turnus' presentation is positive, as is Aeschylus' Polynices. But Aeschylus also took care to suggest his guilt in Amphiaraus' strong criticism of him for attacking his native land.

The importance of the horse unifies the last three leaders in the catalogue, the catalogue and book 7. Virbius, Turnus and Camilla have an essential horse nature: Virbius was embodied in the horse that was sacrificed annually at Aricia; Turnus, wearing horse hair plumes on his helmet, will later be compared to a horse, breaking his tether and running free (11. 492-97); and Camilla, who can run faster than the wind, also runs like a horse, detailed in the central section of her catalogue entry, and she too, like the horses Latinus gives the Trojans, is caparisoned in purple and gold (Putnam, 1970, 415, n. 8). Some of the equine associations connote power and strength, like the title of two of the leaders *equum domitor*

(Lausus, Messapus), who can master the unpredictable power of the horse, but, as we have seen, the only other character so identified, Picus, (189) is completely subdued by his wife Circe in his transformation to bird (189-91). Camilla, too, in the particular details of her fantastic speed, is reduced from human to horse and the horses recurring in the Hippolytus/Virbius passage, tear apart or throw Hippolytus from the carriage (*distractus*, *effudere*), for which they are punished, but promise to be no less dangerous for Virbius (*ardentis*). The horse in this sense more aptly expresses the destructively transforming power of Circe, Juno and Allecto, first represented in the Circean derived fire-breathing horses Latinus gives to Aeneas (280-83), animals present again at the end of the book in the fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet (785). Thus, Latinus' equine gifts to the Trojans are recalled sequentially in the last two figures of the catalogue, Aeneas' fire-breathing horses in Turnus' Chimaera and the Trojans' gold and purple caparisoned horses in the attire of Camilla.

Boyd has demonstrated Camilla's affiliation with the Amazon and the tradition of ethnographic writing about peoples on the borders of the unknown world that characterizes them as representing an inversion of civilized (Greek) culture. I have argued that Virbius also inhabits a wilderness that, despite its relative closeness to Rome, retained attributes of barbarian otherness in the sanctuary's association with Scythia, one of the alleged homes of the Amazon. The ties linking Virbius and Camilla are reinforced by the common intertext of the barbarian Carians in the *Iliad*'s Trojan catalogue and by the affiliations each have with Parthenopaeus—Virbius with Aeschylus' in *Septem*, Camilla with Statius' in the *Thebiad*. Camilla, Hippolytus and Virbius, implicitly, in their rejection of marriage, can be seen as representing a failed transition through the initiatory rites to adulthood, which implies their future death. These connections integrate Camilla into the catalogue, making her less "pendant" and direct some of the connotations inherent in Camilla and Hippolytus/Virbius onto Turnus, suggesting that he may be fatally arrested in his goal of marriage.

In this chapter we have seen that the description of Circe, her domain and terrifying powers at the beginning of book 7, suggesting the future bestialization of the Latins in their transformation into frenzied warriors, is balanced nearly point for point with the paradisal description of the Tiber mouth, the entrance

to the Trojans' long-sought home. Variations on this ambivalence pervade book 7, occurring even in the character of Latinus, who is largely a most beneficent and welcoming ruler with an inclination toward *pietas* that he shares with Aeneas. It is therefore, not surprising that Latinus is at the center of both the charioteer imagery in this book and that of the helmsman, as a reflection of the distinctive position Vergil has created for him in his telling of the Trojans' coming to Italy: Latinus both approvingly and even eagerly extends the offer of his daughter in marriage to Aeneas, with the attendant political implications, and yet, he is also incapable of resisting the war frenzy of Amata, Turnus and his subjects and, however passively, in the end he supports the war (*arma impia sumpsi*, 12. 31). After Aeneas sends the embassy to Latinus (152-55), he does not reappear in the action of book 7 and Latinus becomes the primary leader of rank and interest in the center of the book.

Even before the Trojans come into Latinus' presence, the description of the environs and palace, the most elaborate ecphrasis of a building and its functions in the epic, which shares numerous details with the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus at Rome, they receive clear indications of the Latins' use of the chariot both in preparation for war (the boys games outside the city gates, a proto-Campus Martius) and in war itself (the spoils hanging within the palace, likewise, in Jupiter's temple at Rome). While the suggestions of Roman place and practices at times have a distinctively positive valence (the war dead recall those in the Elysium fields in the Underworld), the conclusion of the ecphrasis with the statue of the palace's founder Picus places him within the Roman tradition of war (the woodpecker is the bird of Mars, his shield that of his priests) and also reintroduces Circe as an agent of bestializing transformation, which, as its object, belies Picus' dominating epithet (*equum domitor*).

Circe also appears to have some mastery over horses, for the unusual gift of a chariot and a pair of fire-breathing horses Latinus sends to Aeneas are from the race of those Circe stole by cross-breeding from her father Sol. Touching the narrative lightly, the fantastic fire-breathing horses have begged for and received emblematic interpretation, as a harbinger of the the future war, easily derived via the horse's general association with war in the *Aeneid* and the similarly fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, described as a symbol of war. Vergil provides textual connections between Picus and the description of

Latinus that immediately follows and thereby implies a similar inability in him to control the Circean elements in his environment, which is subsequently demonstrated. When Latinus later appears at the oath taking ceremony in the beginning of book 12, he drives a *quadrigae* and wears a twelve-rayed crown, a proof of his descent from Sol, which the *quadrigae* likewise suggests. But in the subsequent reigniting of hostilities Latinus powerlessly withdraws, as he had in book 7 and thus, despite the divine connotations of Latinus' *quadrigae,* he loses what control he brought to events at the ceremony. Although Latinus' crown and chariot refer intertextually to those of King Aeetes in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Circe's brother and a son of Sol, the comparison highlights more the differences between the kind but weak ruler and the bold evil king Aeetes. But the contest Aeetes drives his chariot to view has further relevance for book 7 of the *Aeneid.* The fire-breathing bulls Jason confronts to obtain the Golden Fleece suggest that the fire-breathing horses given to Aeneas are an emblem of the contest Aeneas will face in the war with Turnus to accomplish his mission of foundation.

Even though the storm imagery in book 7 of the *Aeneid* escalates to become one which threatens the state, it begins with a comparison of the effects of Allecto's war-igniting torches on Turnus to water boiling up and over the sides of a cauldron, a small scale storm appropriate to the emotions of an individual. Although he clearly has no inclination to go to war with Aeneas, he expresses this reluctance to the aged priestess Calybe (Allecto's disguise) insolently and both before and after this scene Turnus is *audax* or wields *audacia*, as leader his principal quality and one which is no commendation in the traditional Roman language of public life. Turnus next appears as one with the rest of Latium represented as a storm assailing Latinus in his palace, who, at first staunchly resists their entreaty like a rock in the ocean, just as Jason resists the blasts of the bulls, but unlike this young hero, who is able to endure and accomplish his goal and thus defeat king Aeetes, Latinus eventually can resist no longer. When he says, "We are carried off by the storm" (594), his location in the palace confirms that this image represents him as a powerless helmsman of the ship of state. But in his actual abandoning of resistance to the clamoring for war Latinus is a charioteer letting go of the reins of state (*rerumque reliquit habenas*, 600) and, thereby, Vergil maintains his predominant affiliation with the chariot at the point of his decisive act, but

describes Latinus' previous position of commitment to his proposed alliance with the Trojans in terms of Aeneas' identifying image as head of state, i.e., helmsman, a role which, like the alliance, Latinus abandons. Thus, just as the analogous storm sequence in book 1 ends with political imagery in the controlling sea chariot of Neptune, which conflates ship and chariot, ship and chariot imagery conclude the storm sequence in book 7, but partly because the leader in the narrative is now disempowered, the images do not adhere and Vergil represents the ambivalence of Latinus' position in separate and successive political images. On the other hand, the forces for war in Latium, which are initially figuratively represented as storms assailing the state, in the catalogue of troops, as actual charioteers and horse tamers, assume in addition the second emblematic association of the warriors against Thebes in Aeschylus' *Septem* which suggests that the impending war is in some way internecine.

Amid the wealth of brilliant imagery in book 7 the charioteer and helmsman are far from a dominant presence, as they are employed unobtrusively and with tremendous variation. Nevertheless, the occurrences are interrelated and balanced around the climactic scene of the crowd assailing Latinus to declare war and his successive portrayal as overwhelmed helmsman and charioteer. The Latin boys, the flower of youth (*pueri et primaevi iuventus*, 162), who like Virbius train their horses (*exercentur equis*, 163; *exercebat equos*, 781), anticipate the young charioteers in the catalogue, Aventinus, Virbius and Halaesus, who foreshadow what the war holds for those, who like Troilus are *impar*, not the equal of their adversary, and also like him in being emblematic of the loss their side will suffer in war. The spoils of war chariots hanging in the Latin palace predict this vehicle's centrality to the coming war effort and through the palace's many analogies with the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus suggest that war has had a centrality in Roman history as well. But it is the chariot with fire-breathing horses that Circe helped to produce that is the most disturbing. It is disturbing because it is a monstrous manifestation, which is an indigenous portent, preceding any input from Juno or Allecto, and appears to be unremarkable (perhaps beyond its treasured value) to Latinus as a gift to be offered to an esteemed guest. The ease with which Circe has controlled one *equum domitor* implies not only that Latinus is susceptible to her power, but also that the others in the catalogue could be as well (Lausus, Messapus). Circe's transformative

powers as expressed in the fire-breathing horses aptly represent war which deceives men into believing they can master its outcome. And therefore allusions to this important image occur as the catalogue reaches its climactic ending, in the blazing horses of Virbius, the fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, and more indirectly, in the equine Camilla. The dual images of charioteer and helmsman evident in Latinus as he is overwhelmed by the frenzy for war are central not only because they express the ambivalence of the king's dual allegiance to Latium and Aeneas, but also because they express precisely the combination of imagery apparent in Aeschylus' presentation of the opposing brothers in *Septem* and confirm the interactive political significance of the images in the *Aeneid.*

The Heroes' Shields: Io the Victim, Augustus the Helmsman

In the catalogue concluding book 7, Turnus' shield, representing his ancestress Io in the form of a cow, is described immediately after his helmet with Chimaera, which is to say, in a somewhat parallel position to the description of Aeneas' shield at the end of book 8, depicting Augustus at Actium and his subsequent triumph. While the political significance of the central scenes on Aeneas' shield for the hero and his mission has obvious relevance to the poetic images of helmsman and charioteer in the *Aeneid,* the same is not the case for Turnus' shield, which nevertheless reveals much about his motivation for fighting the Trojans. A consideration of the possible implications of these very different kinds of shield decorations for the two heroes will reveal that they are programs proper to the profiles of helmsman and charioteer. From among the rich program of images on Aeneas' shield,[503] I will focus in addition on chariot themes: the possible significance of Vergil's imaginative relocation of Augustus' triumph from the traditional Capitoline to the Palatine hill for the connotations of his triumph and, finally, on the meaning of Tullus Hostilis' chariots of brutal punishment in one of the surrounding scenes and why this scene has been included on the shield of helmsman Aeneas. As different as the two warriors' shield decorations are there is at least one important way that they are comparable: both express the potential significance a victory in the war would have for each warrior.

---

[503] McKay (1998), discusses the whole program of the shield and its relation to the route of the triumph procession.

Although Hardie (1986, 118-119), has made a convincing case for connecting the chthonic and the Gigantomachic Chimaera on Turnus' helmet with the Egyptian animalized gods of Cleopatra and Marc Antony that fight against the Olympian gods of Augustus, he has failed to mention Turnus' shield and been criticized for this neglect (Thomas, 1998, 286). However, his omission is understandable in that the description of Turnus' shield is brief and limited to only three characters (Io, Argus, and Inachus; 7. 789-92):

> at levem clipeum sublatis cornibus Io
> auro insignibat, iam saetis obsita, iam bos,
> argumentum ingens, et custos virginis Argus,
> caelataque amnem fundens pater Inachus urna.
>
> But Io, with lifted horns inscribed the smooth shield in gold,
> already shaggy with bristles, already a cow, a remarkable work,
> and Argos, the maiden's guard, and her father Inachus,
> pouring his streams from an incised urn.

Io, maiden beloved by Jupiter, does share more than an Argive heritage with Turnus, a Vergilian innovation in his story first mentioned as Allecto approaches Ardea's city walls ("a city said to have been founded by Danae and Acrisian [i.e., Argive] colonists," 7. 409-10). As Vergil's description implies and commentators have noted,[504] Turnus shares with Io a bestializing transformation executed upon them by Juno. As she appears on Turnus' shield her transformed bovine state is emphasized with allusions to Circe's beasts (*saetigerique sues*, 17). Beyond being an emblem of Turnus' personal heritage and its relation with book 7's theme of bestializing transformation, the scene is appropriate for Turnus to carry into war, since by Amata's logic his Argive ancestry legitimatizes Turnus' right to marry Lavinia as a non-native,[505] as required by prophecy (*externi venient generi*, 7. 98). The shield's decoration also reflects Turnus' most frequently stated motivation in fighting the Trojans: the perceived injustice of his loss of the right to marry Lavinia to Aeneas.[506] While political ramifications adhere to the marriage

---

[504] Breen, 64; Mackie (1991), 264; Spence (1991), 13; Gale (1997), 177-80; Thomas (1998), 286-90.

[505] *et Turno, si prima domus repetatur origo,/ Inachus Acrisiusque patres mediaeque Mycenae*, 7. 371-72.

[506] Allecto provides this motivation at the core of her first address to Turnus: '*rex tibi coniugium ...abnegat*' (7. 423-24); Turnus complains of his rejection before the palace in the crowd clamoring for war (*Turnus...terrorem ingeminat...se limine pelli*, 577-79) and escalates the injustice to the taking of his wife in a motivational speech to his troops (*coniuge praerepta*, 9. 138).

fought over, Turnus presents his case against Aeneas as constituting a second Trojan outrageous and rapacious greed for another's wife (*coniuge praerepta*, 9. 138), an affront to a warrior/king and only a community issue in as much as he can extend the logic of his own injustice potentially to the lives of his compatriots (*Teucros in regna vocari, stirpem admisceri Phrygiam*, 7. 578-79). Turnus' shield emphasizes not only the role of victim he shares with his ancestress Io, but also his narrowly individual cause.

By contrast, the import of Aeneas' shield is one of collective significance (*genus omne,* 8. 628). The representation of Augustus at the battle of Actium (centrally located on the shield), standing on the high stern (*stans celsa in puppi*, 8. 680), is figured in part as a ship of state with him as helmsman, since in this position Augustus leads into battle, in addition to the penates and all the gods, the senators and people (678-79). In recalling the moment of his father Anchises' interpretation of the omen of the four white horses upon first sighting Italy, when he also stands on his ship's high stern (3. 527), three different moments of impending war that are pivotal in the history of Rome are linked and honored, even though Anchises' interpretation of the omen was overly optimistic (See Ch. 4, pp. 161-63). Thus, as Aeneas picks up the shield (8. 729-31), he is indirectly related to his "proper" image of leadership and will later be more overtly so, aboard his ship returning to his first engagement in the war (10. 261). Further, the representation of Augustus' triple triumph (29) on the shield, the only triumph he ever celebrated, de-emphasizes both chariot and horses (*at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho/ moenia*, 714-15) and instead gives presence to his very sizable religious commitment, his "immortal vow to the gods of Italy," which was the dedication of three hundred shrines (715-16).[507] The recent argument that in his depiction of the triumph on the shield Vergil has actually moved the end point of Augustus' triumph from the traditional (and historical) climax before the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline to the Palatine temple of Apollo, both further separates the scene from the previous tradition of triumphs and

[507] The degree to which this passage (714-23) is given over to sacrifice and prayer is extensive and the importance of Augustus as priest is stressed in his sole main verb (in all but the last line and a half), *sacrabat*, (715) a verb of continuing action. The words for shrines and altars (*delubra, templis, arae, aras,*) and the abundance of each (*maxima ter centum totam…per urbem, omnibus, omnibus*) minimize the actual triumphal procession itself, which only comes through the walls of the city and is expressed in a participial phrase.

may add another level of importance to the many affiliations between Latinus/Picus' palace and the Capitoline temple.

Miller develops his thesis in the context of the importance given to Apollo in the victory at Actium, both on the shield, where the flight of the Egyptian and Eastern forces is motivated by terror at the sight of Apollo stretching his bow (704-706), and by Augustus in the imposing temple complex he raised adjacent to his home on the Palatine, which was dedicated in 28 (Miller, 2000, 412-13; 2009, 208-10). Vergil's presentation of Augustus before the temple is, therefore, anachronistic and imaginative (8. 720-23):[508]

> ipse sedens niveo candentis limine Phoebi
> dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis
> postibus; incedunt victae longo ordine gentes,
> quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis.
>
> Seated in the snow-white threshold of shining Apollo
> he reviewed the gifts of the people and fixes them
> on the proud doors; the conquered peoples proceed, in a long
> procession, as varied in language as in bearing, dress and weapons.

Both the affixing of booty (?) to the temple and the commander's review of the conquered occur at the endpoint of the triumph, which suggests that this artistic triumph concludes before the temple of Apollo on the Palatine.[509] Miller (2000, 409), in fact, associates this new location with Augustus' restricting of the triumph to his family: "The Palatine was becoming the imperial palace complex, the triumph a prerogative of the imperial family." We have seen that in addition to restricting triumphs to his heirs after 19, Augustus subsequently refused to celebrate triumphs the senate offered him, perhaps, to avoid

---

[508] Miller (2000), 409, notes that ancient evidence (Dio 51. 21. 9) indicates that Octavian actually celebrated traditional triumph processions in 29, with the exception that the other magistrates followed, rather than preceded him.

[509] It is not clear that *dona* does refer to booty, as the words *aptatque superbis / postibus* (720) may suggest because they recall the doors of Priam's palace at Troy which are *barbarico postes auro spoliisque superbi* (2. 504). The difference between *dona* and *spoliis* may not be significant for Miller's point, as he argues, (2009), 208: "Whether *dona...populorum* (721) are the ceremonial crowns that captives presented to the general or euphemistically denote battle spoils from various peoples, the act of affixing them to the shrine suggests that the triumph has reached its endpoint." However, the word is a decidedly less bellicose choice, which may be in keeping with the temple's main cult image of Apollo Citharoedus ("holding the lyre," Miller, 2009, 187; Prop. 2. 31. 5-6, 15-16), patron of the arts, represented at the sanctuary in two major statues. McKay (1998), 211, considers *dona* to be spoils, but he does not think they have the ominmous connotations some attribute to them (see 217, n. 40).

dictatorial connotations.[510] In Vergil's depiction of this famous triple triumph there is a similar kind of restraint: material accoutrements of the *triumphator*, chariot and horses, crown and palms, are completely eliminated. Miller (2000, 412), argues that "the new imperial complex on the Palatine, rising as Virgil writes, visually challenged the traditional symbol of Roman might located across from it," and he sees the moving of the Sibylline books from Jupiter's temple on the Capitoline to Apollo's on the Palatine as evidence of this intention and later poetic references and a Neronian triumph (likewise ending on the Palatine), as proof of its accomplishment.[511] Miller (2000, 213) further characterizes the first half of the description of Augustus' triumph on the shield (715-20), as "a sacral continuum which culminates... at Apollo's shrine," where Augustus, seated before the temple is "a representative or incarnation of the god," and he maintains (211), that Vergil's description of the triumph is in essence the inauguration of Augustus' religious renewal of Rome. Although Apollo's temple on the Palatine would eventually receive on its roof a representation of the Sun god in his chariot (Prop. 2. 31. 11), as the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline had had for centuries of its god, there is no reference to this in Vergil's description of the triumph,[512] just as concrete material evidence of the triumph itself are suppressed. Thus, in presenting Augustus' triumph as though its endpoint was the Palatine temple of Apollo, Vergil has essentially refashioned the traditional triumph into an expression of the gratitude toward the gods of the Roman people and its leader for his victories and his commitment to monumentalizing this gratitude and a

---

[510] See above Ch. 2, p. 77. The three Republican generals who had celebrated more triumphs (M. Furius Camillus, M. Valerius Corvus [4] and Julius Caesar [5]), Hickson (1991), 137, notes were all dictators. Also see below on Julius Caesar's triumphs of 46.

[511] Miller (2000), 210, and n. 13, points out that, although Dio (54. 17. 29) and Suetonius (*Aug.* 31) give later dates (18, 12) for the transfer of the Sibylline books, they must both be wrong, since both Vergil (6. 69-73) and Tibullus (2. 5. 17) assume they are already transferred. The Secular Games of 17 took place both at the Palatine Temple of Apollo and at the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline (Miller, 413). Ovid (*Tr.* 4. 2. 1-6) imagines an anticipated triumph of Tiberius and Germanicus occurring on the Palatine and in *Tristia* 3.1 Ovid's book asks, as it wanders in Augustus' house on the Palatine, whether it belongs to Jupiter (Miller, 2009, 211, 213-16). On Nero's ceremonial return from Achaia in December 67, in which he drove Augustus' chariot to the Palatine, see Miller, 2000, 414-18.

[512] Miller (2000, 414), following Hardie (1986), 355-56, maintains that the insistence on Apollo's radiance (*niveo cadentis...Phoebi*, 720), "calls attention to the image of the chariot of the sun god adorning the temple's roof just above where Octavian is sitting," but as these are not unusual adjectives or names for Apollo and there is no certainty when the chariot was put in place relative to when Vergil wrote, it seems forced to assume the poet was referring to this chariot to suggest "the common Roman *topos* of the universal empire comprising all the lands that the sun beholds in its daily passage from east to west," (Hardie, 356), which is, in any case, expressed in the divers peoples and places represented among the conquered (724-28).

celebration of the vast extent of the Roman empire due to these victories, which is, however, humanely expressed via the diversity of the peoples represented, who although conquered (*victae*), bring gifts to Augustus (*dona*). Thus, in the triumph on the shield of Aeneas the pride of the leader and overt military display give way to gratitude and piety. In a sense Vergil moves the balance, which Sumi (29) maintains always existed in the triumph between individual achievement and national honor, nearly exclusively to the side of the nation.

One possible ramification within the *Aeneid* of this new Apolline triumph is that the numerous points of comparison between the palace of Latinus and the Capitoline sanctuary may serve to associate the Latins indirectly with the traditional triumph (7. 170-91; see above p. 233), a celebration which in origin was linked with the early kings and in its endpoint, the Capitoline temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, with Rome's last king, the tyrant Tarquinius Superbus.[513] The Tarquin kings transferred the royal residence and the center of public activity from the Regia to the Arx on the Capitoline, which had before been used only as a refuge (Alföldi, 197), and Tarquinius Superbus constructed the original temple of Jupiter and commissioned the terra cotta chariot of Jupiter for the roof from Veientan artists (Alföldi, 323).[514] Even though the nature of what is known about this building indicates that Superbus "had designed the temple as a grandiose expression of his power and that of his régime...the cult became central to the new republic," a fact that Beard, North and Price (59) with reason find surprising, given the Republican hatred of kings and especially of Superbus. In addition to the investiture of new consuls every year, meetings of the Senate and the taking of auspices, including those of the general departing for

---

[513] Bleisch (2003), 95-98, argues that Latinus' *regia* is "polyvalent," evoking not only the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, but the Roman Regia in the Forum and Augustus' complex on the Palatine (the temple of Apollo, the library porticus, and Augustus's home). While the Roman Regia, thought to have been the first administrative center of the Roman kings, probably would have inevitably come to mind because of the similarity in nomenclature, as Bleisch notes (96), I believe contemporaries would have been less likely to think of Augustus' complex, because of the newness of the temple and libraries (temple dedicated in 28) and the gradual development of the complex's more diverse roles. The antiquity and longevity of the multiple analogous uses of the Capitoline sanctuary, in my opinion, would more reasonably come to the mind of a contemporary, when hearing/reading the description of Picus/Latinus' *regia.*

[514] Beard, North, Price (1998), 59, "The tradition is that the temple was built by the last Tarquin, finished by the time of his fall, dedicated by the very first college of magistrates of the Republic" (Livy, 2. 55. 1; Cic. *Dom.* 139; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.*5. 35. 3; Tac. *Hist.* 3. 72).

war, occurred before or in the temple of Jupiter as a regular part of the most significant state religious practices of the Republic and both the triumphing general and the celebrating magistrate of the procession before the Roman games (*pompa circensis*) were dressed as the cult statue of Jupiter, which had been the dress of the kings (Versnel, 100-107; Beard, North and Price, 59). The ecphrasis of the royal palace of Latinus/Picus highlights both the building's royal associations (*regia, regibus, aliique ab orgine reges*) and martial, by the extensive listing of spoils on its doors (occupying four lines and listing seven entirely different items, 182-86) and the final description of king Picus, who has been transformed by Circe into an emblem of Mars, the woodpecker. Both Picus, *equum domitor* and Latinus, as we have seen, are associated with horses and chariots.

Possible reasons for Augustus to develop the Palatine sanctuary of Apollo into a distinctive center of his power abound, from his birth on the hill and residence there to Romulus traditional association with the hill and Apollo's aid in Octavian's victories, especially Actium. In his re-presentation of the triumph Vergil reinterprets the focus of triumph to celebrate the positive novelty of Augustus' future rule which he projects to be one of piety and inclusiveness and, by implication, peace (cf. *aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis,* 1. 291). In the depiction of Augustus' triple triumph it is also possible that Vergil wanted in particular to disassociate it from those of Julius Caesar. Not only had he celebrated the most triumphs of any general and, like the other two generals who exceeded three triumphs, had become a *dictator*, but his triumphs of 46 for Gaul and his civil war victories, in particular, were rife with features that gave offense.[515] Some have argued that the four white horses decreed to Caesar for this triumph suggest that he was attempting to claim divine status, because chariots drawn by four white horses were regularly associated with Jupiter or Sol (Dio, 43. 14. 3; Beard, 2007, 234; Weinstock, 68-75), but it is not clear that white horses were a daring innovation.[516] However, the carrying of the young Egyptian princess Arsinoe

[515] According to Suetonius, *Iul.* 37, in 46 Caesar celebrated four triumphs in one month with a few days in between each: the Gallic, Alexandrian, Pontic and African. After defeating Pompey's sons in Spain he celebrated a fifth.
[516] Although Livy's (5. 23. 5-6) description of Camillus' triumph, perhaps written to establish some precedent for Caesar's, implies impropriety: "He himself was the most conspicuous object in the procession riding through the city on a chariot harnessed with white horses—an act that seemed not only too autocratic, but also inappropriate for any mortal man. For they took it as sacrilege that the horses put the dictator on a level with Jupiter and Sol" (Beard,

in chains on a bier "like a regular piece of booty" aroused pity in the spectators (Beard, 2007, 136-137; Dio, 43. 19) and the parading of paintings of the suicide deaths of his adversaries in the civil war, including Cato disemboweling himself, prompted the audience to groan at the pathetic sight (Beard, 2007, 145; Appian, *BC* 2. 101). Apparently the crowd also expressed displeasure at the number of lictors, symbols of authority, "since never before had they seen so many" (Beard, 2007, 240; Dio, 43, 19). While the star (comet) of Julius Caesar's deification in 44 is evoked here on the shield over Augustus head in battle (*patriumque aperitur vertice sidus,* 681), Anchises in the Underworld treats the civil war he fought against Pompey, as a horror he hopes will be avoided (*neu patriae validas in viscera vertite viris*, 6. 833). Two strategies that distance both Augustus (and Aeneas) from the memories of Julius Caesar's triumphs of 46 would be the relocation of Augustus' triumph to the Palatine where the focus of the event is a celebratory religious inclusiveness and the close association of Aeneas' adversary, but future father-in-law, with the Palatine hill and temple of Jupiter. Thus, the two central scenes on Aeneas' shield are expressive of the values of his helmsmanship as expressed thus far of a pious leader divinely inspired to guide his community through war to the establishment of a new home, where even in the celebration of victory, thanksgiving to the gods supplants personal pride.

But, if the chariot is, as I have suggested, precluded from Augustus' triumph because of the individual glory and power associated with it, why are the royal chariots of Rome's third king, Tullus Hostilius, present among the surrounding scenes on Aeneas' shield, performing a horrifying act of execution (642-45)?

> haud procul inde citae Mettum in diversa quadrigae
> distulerant (at tu dictis, Albane, maneres!),
> raptabatque viri mendacis viscera Tullus
> per silvam, et sparsi rorabant sanguine vepres.
>
> Not far from this, the swift *quadrigae* had pulled Mettus
> in two different directions (but, you should have kept your word, Alban),
> Tullus was carrying off the innards of the deceitful man through the woods,
> and the sprinkled briars were dripping with blood.

2007, 235), there is no ancient evidence for dark horses being the norm and plenty of references suggest white as typical: four white horses in the triumph of Romulus (Prop. 4. 1. 32), Aulus Postumius Tubertus (Ovid, *Fast*. 6. 723-4), and Messalla (Tib. 1. 7. 7-8) and as a standard part of the ceremony (Pliny, *Pan.* 22.1; Serv. *Aen.* 4. 543).

Mettus (or Mettius), the leader of Alba, which had recently become allies of Rome via an agreement, what Livy calls, "the oldest treaty on record" (*nec ullius vetustior foederis memoria est,* 1. 24), having secretly instigated a war against Rome with Fidenae and Veii, suddenly withdrew his troops from their position on the left flank of the Roman forces (Livy, 1. 27). Tullus, the third king of the Romans, was still able to overcome the forces of Fidenae and Veii, and resolved to make an example of Mettus, who he considered incapable of learning the importance of keeping an treaty (*fidem ac foedera seruare,* Livy 28). While Livy comments on the extraordinary brutality of the punishment ("All eyes were averted from the disgusting spectacle (*ab tanta foeditate spectaculi*)—never, in all our history repeated"), taking it as an opportunity to claim the generally more humane nature of Roman punishment, in the *Aeneid* the narrator's apostrophe to Mettus ("you should have kept your word, Alban," 643), implicitly condones the action with no mention of its brutality.

The question of how the particular choice of scenes represented on the shield relate to the central battle of Actium and Augustus' triumph has not yet produced a consensus of opinion and,[517] as Gurval has noted (221), the episode of Mettus most often is overlooked because it fails to conform to typically positive interpretations of the scenes. But as a severer of a treaty (*foedus*) Mettus relates not only to the breaking of the agreement in book 12 (Gransden, 642-5), but he also has relevance to Antony on the shield (685-88), who broke the treaty of Brundisium (McKay, 216, n. 22).[518] Likewise, this scene does feature one of the future descendants of Ascanius (*genus omne futurae stirpis ab Ascanio*, 628-29), who

[517] Accompanying scenes: the twins and the she wolf (630-34), the rape of the Sabine women with the war it gives rise to and the treaty that ends it (635-41), Mettus (642-45), the battle against Tarquinius and Porsenna (646-51), the assault of the citadel and temple on the Capitoline by the Gauls in 390 with scenes of celebration for Rome's successful resolution (652-666) and Catiline and Cato in the underworld (666-70).

[518] While a unifying theme of relevance to Antony's war does not apply to everyone of the historical scenes, its presence is predominant, as has been argued most thoroughly for the Gauls attacking the Capitoline as types of the barbaric easterners led by Antony and Cleopatra (Hardie, 1986, 120-56). Their reputed lust for gold (Livy 5. 51. 10; Gruval, 1995, 227), suggested by their triple gold ornaments and reinforced by the suggested presence of traitoress Tarpeia, finds a correspondence in the *ope barbarica* that attends Antony (685). Catiline and Antony were both treated as traitors, potential tyrants and lascivious by Cicero, as, of course, was Tarquinius Superbus. It is precisely as a liberation of the republic from the oppression of a faction that Augustus himself describes what he achieved for Rome in defeating Antony (*...exercitum...comparavi, per quem rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem vindicavi*, *RG* 1). Others have noted the suggestions of internecine war in the scene of the rape of the Sabines (connotations of revolution in *novum...bellum*, 637; fathers [*Tatioque seni*] against sons [*Romulidis,* 638]; Gurval, 1995, 219-20; Carins, 1989, 97-98).

founded Alba Longa,[519] although not a particularly illustrious one, which could perhaps explain the vehemence of the narratorial apostrophe. Zetzel (1996, 312) has argued that neither this scene nor that of the Rape of the Sabines are "consistent with the idea of Rome's virtuous rule" and he attributes the apostrophe affirming the appropriateness of Mettus' punishment to the narrator of the shield's ecphrasis, who has "a distinct point of view," one that "wants to show the perfection of Augustus' victory in a closed and perfect shield that reflects a closed and ordered universe" (314).[520] His is a positively slanted, prejudiced selection from all the scenes that Vulcan represented,[521] but, at the same time, Vergil also undercuts this optimistic view, in the scene of Mettus in particular, by means of intratextual allusions to the most brutal uses of the chariot in the epic, those of Achilles and Turnus.

The four lines describing Mettus' punishment move sequentially through evocations of first Hippolytus as victim, next of Achilles as abuser of Hector's body and finally of Turnus' chariot as weapon of slaughter, which collectively suggest that the punishment Tullus exacts from Mettus is beyond the limits of reasonable justice. The first two lines (*citae Mettum in diversa quadrigae/ distulerant*) recall the most brutal version of Hippolytus' death, in which he is torn apart by his horses (*turbatis distractus equis*, 7. 767), dramatizing his victimhood and the irony of his beloved horses acting as executioners. That the agents in Mettus case are not horses, but the chariots of a king,[522] that is to say, of government during this period, deepens the significance of the action. It was the privilege of kings to ride in chariots,

---

[519] Gurval (1995), 222, points out the irony: "The Alban king is not the faithless and foreign foe who breaks the solemn compact of alliance, rather he is part of that future stock descended from Ascanius and at the same time part of the wars...that the Romans must wage in Italy to become one race."

[520] Zetzel (1996), 313, notes that the apostrophes of the shield's narrator contrast with the typically sympathetic apostrophes elsewhere in the epic. For the shield's narrator, "however awful Mettus' end may have appeared to others, the narrator makes it clear that he deserved what he got; and he is, I think, an equally sanctimonious patriot in his apostrophe to Catiline and his comment on Cleopatra. He is untroubled by the negative aspects of what he reports; Rome' history and destiny appear to be, for him...positive and...harmonious." Zetzel maintains that all the major ecphrases in the poem are characterized by a narrator with a distinctive point of view, but curtails argument of his point as a digression.

[521] Zetzel (1996), 313, argues that the scenes are a selection based on the wording of the beginning of the ecphrasis proper, in which the first word of the line exactly repeats the verb of making from the introductory section, *fecerat* (628, 630), but the first verb has all inclusive objects (Italian affairs, the triumphs of the Romans, the whole race descended from Ascanius and the wars fought in order), while the second *fecerat* is followed by *et*, suggesting the meaning "he also had made," i.e., those described subsequently are a part of the whole. Vergil's characterizing of the scenes on the shield as a *non enarrabile textum*, "a fabric that cannot be told," alerts the reader to this strategy.

[522] *Quadrigae* in its primary meaning, is a chariot with its team of four horses (*OLD*). While it can also refer to just the four horses alone, as I argue below, the first meaning is more appropriate.

from which, in addition to its use in war, they performed tribunal functions (Helbig, 1903, 167-68), an echo of which survives in the official chair of Republican magistrates, the *sella curulis* (Weinstock, 273).[523] It is precisely because of the chariot's association with kings, that its use within the city in Republican Rome was prohibited, with the exception of those used in races and for generals celebrating a triumph.[524]

The chariots of Mettus' death already express, what becomes overtly evident in the next line, that this is an official execution decreed by Rome's highest official. Tullus, a king associated in particular with discipline and war as his cognomen, *hostilis*, and his description in the parade of heroes in book 6 stress,[525] is revealed as the agent of Mettus' punishment in the third line, as the description descends to details of the resulting gore, flesh and blood scattered through the woods. Although the only verb of Tullus' action, *raptabat* (to drag violently off) is the same verb used to describe Achilles' mistreatment of Hector's body, dragged behind his chariot, both in the ecphrasis in book 1 (*Iliacos raptaverat Hectora muros,* 1. 483) and as he appears to Aeneas in book 2 (*raptatus bigis ut quondam*, 2. 272), the brutal savagery of Tullus' act goes even farther than Achilles', as he is pulling only the soft inner fragments of the man behind his chariot.[526] In the last line the bushes drip with the man's blood (*sparsi rorabant sanguine vepres*, 645) "a perversion of nature" (Gurval, 1995, 223), which will be recalled in the description of the effects of Turnus' chariot in book 12, which tramples over men (*seminecis volvit multos aut agmina curru proterit*, 329-30) and the horses' hooves sprinkle a bloody dew (*spargit rapida ungula rores sanguineos*, 339-40). Once Turnus is inspired to bring war against Aeneas, he rages with love of

---

[523] In a procession on a sarcophagus from Cerveteri a married couple are preceded by a chariot and team and themselves follow an attendant carrying a stool which is often identified with the *sella curulis* of Roman magistrates. Crouwel (2012), 64, deduces that on this and other funerary monuments ("a long history of processional scenes involving chariots in Central Italy beginning in the later 7th century") the chariots were used for "civic purposes."

[524] See Weinstock (1971), 273-74, for a list of the exceptions, which he concludes by adding, "in general the prohibition remained the rule."

[525] "Then Tullus will follow him (Numa), who will interrupt the country's leisure and stir sluggish men to arms and regiments unaccustomed to triumphs" 6. 81215. Other than Mummius, Tullus is the only descendant associated specifically with the triumph.

[526] Gurval (1995), 222-23, notes the allusions to Achilles and also suggests that *per silvam* could refer to Silvius, the posthumous son of Aeneas and Lavinia.

warfare (461) and he presents characteristics of the extreme warriors Tydeus, Achilles and Ares, whose love of fighting is excessive. Achilles' mistreatment of Hector's body in the *Iliad* was condoned overtly only by Hera, who like Achilles was extreme enough in her hatred of the Trojans that she desired to eat them raw. Intratexts reveal, if the brutality of the act does not, that Tullus Hostilius belongs to this category of brutal warrior/general and that the punishment he exacts is excessive. Thus, although the narrator seems approving of Mettus' punishment, Vergil suggests an alternative critical view. While he presents Augustus overtly as helmsman of the ship of state in the middle of the shield and presents his triple triumph as an alternative Apolline celebration that deemphasizes the chariot, the scene of Mettus is an insistent reminder that Rome's leaders have at times manifested the excesses we have seen associated with the charioteer. Indeed, the very presence of opposing paradigms of leadership in the epic would seem to argue that both had been seen in the past in Rome and that either could recur. Mettus' brutal execution and the approving narrator are reminders of this fact.

In conclusion, while the fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet—a symbol of war and one of the monsters outside the underworld (*flammisque armata Chimaera*, 6. 288) and daughter of Typho, assaulter of the power of Jupiter and Olympus—relates Turnus both to Allecto in book 7 and to Antony and Cleopatra with their zoomorphic Egyptian gods, his shield not only announces the significance of his heritage, which derives from one of Juno's favored cities, but draws attention to the bestializing transformation of Io, like Turnus, victim of Juno's anger. By contrast, on the Roman side animals are instead humanized as benefactors, first in the scene of Romulus and Remus, where the she-wolf is a mother who bends her neck to lick the twins who have no fear of her (*pueros et lambere matrem impavidos,* 632-34), and then in that of the goose on the Capitoline, which warns the Romans of the Gauls' presence. We have seen Latinus essentially abandon his storm-tossed ship of state, but in the center of Aeneas' shield stands Augustus firmly on his ship of state, in the words used to describe Aeneas as he approaches his first engagement of the war and like the good helmsman his ship carries his community, on whose behalf he implicitly will fight. Even though Augustus celebrates a triumph for his victory at Actium, in Vergil's choreography of the event, the procession is reduced to a phrase, lacking both horses

and chariot, and the final destination on the Capitoline hill, where triumphs had previously always ended, is shifted to the Palatine temple of Apollo, next to Augustus' home, responding to Augustus' larger strategy of urban development of this site, but perhaps also with a goal of minimizing any association with Julius Caesar's triumphal excesses. As in book 7 Latinus' gift of a chariot and fire-breathing horses to Aeneas, among its rich connotations, implies a potential for a fiery Circean transformation in the pious hero, so the brutal execution of the treaty breaker, Mettus, demonstrates not only the possible consequences of traitorous behavior analogous to Antony's, but in its excessive royal violence, is a reminder of similar abuses in both Rome's distant and recent past, perhaps even perpetrated by Augustus. Nonetheless, in the central political image Vergil presents Augustus as a good helmsman in the Ciceronian image of a leader who sees his role as one of service for the well-being of his community, which he insures in part by acting as spokesman to the gods, as consuls throughout Rome's history had, but as suggested in the shield's triumph, now in an enriched and expanded way. Aeneas' shield affirms the great significance of the war he is undertaking for generations of Romans and his worthiness to assume leadership of the endeavor will soon be confirmed in his reappearance as helmsman, as we will see in the next chapter. By comparison, the relative smallness of Turnus' motivation for war finds expression in his arms and will be confirmed in his appearances, first as an Achillean charioteer, in book 10 (discussed in the next chapter) and again in book 12 as well as with Juturna in his last chariot ride (chapter 8).

CHAPTER 6

The Augustan Helmsman and Despotic Charioteer: Divergence and Unity

Aeneas' return to the besieged Trojan camp and final entry into battle in book 10 is preceded by the narrative of his nocturnal approach at the helm of the flagship leading the Etruscan fleet. Since the Trojan fleet arrived in Latium in book 7 and the exclusively land-based war broke out shortly thereafter, Aeneas' association with the ship in book 10 gives the appearance of being contrived for other than strategic reasons, which the fabulous intercession of his ship-turned-nymph Cymodocea alone seems to confirm. At the same time, Turnus' first appearance in the chariot immediately preceding the death of Pallas gives the appearance of being purposefully delayed, since although Iris recommends he use his chariot at the beginning of book 9 (12), he does not, even though he is fully engaged in battle throughout the book. By the beginning of book 10 then, Vergil has created the circumstances most like those at the beginning of Aeschylus' *Septem*—the instigators of war, the charioteers, actively engaged in attack, while the forces defending the city with their leader at the helm of the ship of state are poised to enter the war—and also presents Aeneas as helmsman and Turnus as charioteer in their most distinctive presentation, which are antithetical in their political connotations, as they are initially in *Septem*.

The decoration on Aeneas' prow—the miraculous message of his former ship transformed into a sea nymph and the image of Augustus on his shield, whose position Aeneas duplicates as he raises that shield—testifies to his divine selection, likely future victory and implicit fostering of the future Roman republic. In contrast, Turnus' cruel words to Pallas in his first appearance in the chariot are characterized as haughty and tyrannical, qualities that his avidity and lack of restraint after Pallas' death further affirm. Yet, far more rapidly than in Aeschylus' play the distinction between charioteer and helmsman in the *Aeneid* begins to blur in two ways which recur at the epic's end with greater intensity: Aeneas begins to take on both the characteristic qualities and images of the charioteer, while Turnus is presented as a

victim of the assaulting sea, recalling Aeneas' first appearance in the epic and foreshadowing his own final presentation (see Ch. 8).[527]

To a certain extent the instability of the separation between helmsman and charioteer is a natural derivative of its use in the context of civil war. The confronting political figures of charioteer and helmsman appear in the milieu of internecine war precisely because they have a long tradition in literature of being presented as analogous, which suggests the original unity of the state, but they also manifest significant differences, an analogue of the war, with political potential. The civil war recovers unity, but its accomplishment is tragic, paradigmatically expressed in the mutual slaying of Eteocles and Polynices. In Vergil's foundational epic the tragic recovery of a proleptic unity ("peoples destined to live in peace eternally," 12. 504) occurs through an extended, but intermittent and never total, reversal of roles. In book 10 a movement toward unity is seen as Aeneas manifests qualities associated with the charioteer Turnus––fiery and savage action evoking Achilles and Pyrrhus—in his rage-driven *aristeia* that the news of Pallas' death prompts and in his being likened to a storm, imagery belonging to the rising tide of war in Latium and Juno. Although the charioteers Aeneas encounters at the end of the *aristeia* share Turnus' pride, and their ejection from the chariot appears to bring about the long-desired strategic goal of the Trojans' release from the camp, the comparison of Aeneas to Aegaeon, foe of Jupiter, and implicitly to Mars, and the savage rejection of suppliant pleas are aspects expected from a charioteer that, in fact, do occur in Turnus as well. On the other hand, Turnus actually takes the final sea voyage in the epic, but not at the helm. Rather, Juno tricks him into leaping onboard a ship at dock, which the goddess whisks out to sea in a whirlwind. The very image of helplessness, a victim of Juno like Io on his shield, Turnus' exit from battle contrasts completely with Aeneas' approach to battle, even as it is tightly linked to his entry into the epic, battered at sea in a storm sent by Juno. Turnus will of course become Aeneas' victim in the epic's conclusion, which this scene among others foreshadows, but the ramifications of Aeneas' instability as

[527] In keeping with the primary focus of *Septem* on Eteocles, change is evident exclusively in his character, which happens immediately upon his decision to face his brother at the seventh gate. He goes from being the city's representative of piety to believing "We are already past the care of Gods" (702). The chorus characterizes his decision to fight his brother as "frantic lust for battle" (θυμοπληθὴς δορίμαργοςμαργος, 686-7) and "passion" (ἵμερος, 692).

moral helmsman, have disturbing implications for the people each will rule, given that in this role he is equated to Augustus.

This chapter, then, will first analyze the very different presentations and implications of Aeneas as helmsman and Turnus as charioteer brought together in book 10, but will then demonstrate the ways in which each figure begins to resemble the other.

Cybele and the *Aeneid*'s Ship of State

Even though Aeneas' return to the Trojan camp at the head of the Etruscan allies passes before the reader somewhat like a triumphal procession in a series of scenes of varying intensity, all of which contribute to the prestige of the general at its head and honor his leadership, some scenes have greater symbolic and cultural significance. So, for example, the catalogue of ships has no particularly distinguished leader, lacking even Tarchon, king and head of the Etruscan allies, first place is instead given to "the nonentity Massicus." Harrison (1991), 163-214, posits two reasons for Tarchon's absence both of which seem relevant; "first, his inclusion as king might endanger the heroic primacy of Aeneas," and his name also would recall his eponymous city of Tarquinii, home of Rome's hated last king and tyrant, Tarquinius Superbus. This provides a supportive and non-competing setting for Aeneas. The scenes which command attention through their imagery or miraculous implications are the description of Aeneas and Pallas together onboard ship, the return after the catalogue to Cymodocea's speech to Aeneas at the helm and the climactic presentation of Aeneas and his shield to the Trojans and Latins with the related shipwreck of Tarchon. Since these episodes, taken together, express the nature and interconnected ramifications of Aeneas' helmsmanship, they will constitute the focus of this section.

<u>The Phrygian Lion Ship</u>

Even though Aeneas' ship is the first among the group of allied ships returning to camp and would, therefore, be an expected part of the catalogue (166-214), its initial description (156-62) is separated from the catalogue by the invocation to the Muses (163-65). Therefore, Aeneas' ship becomes a logical extension of the narrative of his meeting with the Etruscan leader Tarchon and the agreement they strike of joining forces under Aeneas' leadership (148-56). The diction of this passage (147-56) emphasizes

political negotiation (*regem adit et regi memorat…*, 149; *foedusque ferit,* 154) and concludes with a divine endorsement of Aeneas' role as leader: "The Lydian tribe [was] entrusted to a foreign leader by divine command," (155-56). This eccentric procedure of a king yielding the leadership of an expedition to resolve a local grievance (against the misrule of Mezentius) to a foreign newcomer is justified by the divine selection of Aeneas, the first in a series of such signs and an appropriate segue to the enigmatic scene of Aeneas and Pallas onboard ship.

In at least two ways, the first and second halves of this scene do not cohere (10. 156-62), a situation which foregrounds the central conceptual presentation of Aeneas' ship:

> Aeneia puppis
> prima tenet rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones,
> imminet Ida super, profugis gratissima Teucris.
> hic magnus sedet Aeneas secumque volutat
> eventus belli uarios, Pallasque sinistro
> adfixus lateri iam quaerit sidera, opacae
> noctis iter, iam quae passus terraque marique.
>
> Aeneas' ship takes the lead with Phrygian lions
> yoked at the beak and Mt. Ida towering above,
> a very welcomed sight to the exiled Trojans.
> Here great Aeneas sits and ponders to himself
> the various issues of war, and Pallas, keeping
> close to his left side, enquired about the stars,
> the pathway of the dark night, and about the things
> he had endured both on land and sea.

The first inconsistency evident is spatial: in the first half (up to *varios,* 160), *hic* (159) would seem to indicate, as Wilhelm suggests (1988, 88), that Aeneas is seated directly above Mt. Ida on the prow and the Phrygian lions are beneath yoked at the rostrum; i.e., he is in the front of the ship. In the second half, Pallas' question about the stars, which are always the concern of the helmsman at the back of the ship, implies a location in the back near the helm. Also the slightly later description of Aeneas seated and guiding the steering oar (*ipse sedens clavumque regit*, 218) suggests, as Harrison maintains (1991, 159-60), that "Aeneas is clearly seated at the helm," i.e., the rear of the ship. Related, perhaps, to this disconnect in location, is the apparent unresponsiveness of Aeneas to Pallas' questions. Although Aeneas

is famously aloof and uncommunicative,[528] his separation here seems pronounced. For the duration of line 159 Aeneas is as static as the icons to which *hic* joins him and the heavily spondaic meter and formality of the word order reinforce this impression. We are thereby encouraged to consider the first four-and-a-half lines as a signifying unit. Pallas is just as strongly associated with Aeneas, grammatically by *-que* but also by *adfixus* (which, in addition to the root meaning "to fasten to," also carries the connotation of "not leaving the side of"), a particularly tight kind of spatial closeness. Pallas' youthful eagerness is suggested by his curiosity and also through anaphora (*iam...iam, -que...-que*), but the comfortable closeness suggested by his spatial nearness and inquisitiveness is made far less immediate by its indirect recounting, so that Pallas, no less than Aeneas, likewise is depicted as an individual cameo vignette (the pensive leader, the promising youth), but one made more vivid by the stars, the dark night, the allusion to Aeneas' past tribulations (*iam quae passus terraque marique,* 162) and their former recounting to Dido.[529] Both these incongruities—the conflicting indications of place, front or back of the boat, and distancing of the supposedly interactive moment between youth and leader—facilitate the conceptual interaction of the images on the prow associated with Phrygian Cybele's lion-drawn chariot (already seen in the parade of heroes in the Underworld)[530] with the connotations of the ship and Aeneas' years of voyaging and guiding the Trojans. Aeneas' suggested location (*hic*) with the lions "yoked at the beak (of the ship)," in combination with his implicit (by means of Pallas' reported questions) presence at the helm in the rear, means, in effect, that Aeneas can be two places at once, figuratively driving a chariot,

---

[528] Lyne, 1987, 159: "Note: Pallas 'asks,' Aeneas 'ponders.' Pallas makes the overture...And Aeneas? He ponders." And Feeney, 1983, 183: "If Aeneas' only words to his son are in the guise of a final farewell, his only words to Pallas, his 'Patroclus,' are such in fact." Lyne (160), also points out, characterization in Vergil is selectively developed ("Aeneas may not be greatly characterized in relation to Pallas, but Evander is.") and often the characterization of one person is sufficient to illuminate the actions of another.

[529] Cf. 1. 750-52. Harrison (1991), 161-2: "Pallas, like Dido, asks for Aeneas' story from his own lips and is no doubt like her (cf. 4. 13-14) a sympathetic and impressed listener." Particularly because Aeneas is not described as even taking notice of Pallas, the allusions to Dido in behavior and vocabulary of love (*adfixus lateri,* 10. 161, cf. *haeret lateri,* 4. 73; Putnam, 1995, 36), emphasize especially Pallas' admiration of Aeneas which is, perhaps, "a repetition of "his father's youthful crush on Aeneas' father (8. 155-68)," but may also be a reminder that Aeneas' feelings for Dido are only clearly revealed after her death.

[530] See Ch. 4, pp. 181-82, for the association of her chariot in the parade with Rome's expanding empire and Augustus. In Aeneas' later prayer to Magna Mater (10. 252-55), he gives particular emphasis to the control the goddess possesses *biiugique ad frenas leones* (253), more apparent than in Lucretius simple expression (*biiugos...leones*, 2. 601), since it includes both the yoking and the reining of the pair.

but actually steering the ship, he is, as the concluding line implies, "both on land and sea." The conflation of chariot and ship is not, of course, without precedent in the *Aeneid* in the seafaring chariot of Neptune, although there the chariot rather than the ship is the dominant part. The political implications of Aeneas' lion-drawn ship will become a further elaboration of the rule of restraint and order that Neptune's chariot suggests in book 1.

Initially, the decoration on the beak of Aeneas' ship recalls Troy as represented by Mt. Ida, the most famous site of Cybele's worship. But the Trojans now are exiles and it is as such that they view Cybele's lions and Mt. Ida (*profugis*, 158). The peoples Aeneas leads are incorporated onto his ship indirectly, through narratorial comment on the prow decoration of Mt. Ida, which is "a most welcome [sight] to the exiled Trojans" (158). The comment allows for the possibility of the Trojans' literal presence, but in their specific connection only to the emblematic images of the ship, their reaction to what they see becomes primary. It would also have encouraged a Roman's gaze and similar reaction, since the journey of Cybele from Troy to Rome during the Punic wars brought victory against Hannibal. But, the distinctive addition in Cybele's Phrygian imagery in this passage is that of the lions yoked to Aeneas' ship. The goddess' chariot with yoked lions, (Lucretius 2. 604-5; Ovid, *Fast*, 4. 217-18, "People believe their ferocity is gentled by her, as her chariot attests"), suggests Magna Mater's civilizing capacity. Like Neptune's ocean-faring chariot, which brought calm to the waves, equated to an unruly Roman crowd, Aeneas' ship, likewise—although less overtly—suggests that it too may be an agent of civilization, as it works to calm the figurative savage beasts, which we have seen were prevalent among the Latins in book 7.[531] Thus, the Phrygian lions on Aeneas' ship would unavoidably bring to mind for a Roman audience,

[531] The yoked lions on Aeneas' ship participate in a nearly consistent division of lions and lion imagery in the *Aeneid* in which subdued lions (yoked, reduced to hides or killed) are associated with the Trojans and their gods and savage living lions, with one very significant exception, are Circe' transformed men (7. 15) or the subject of similes for Aeneas' adversaries. But this division increases in importance because Aeneas and Cybele are heavily represented among the 11 subdued lions (each with three) and Turnus among the fierce lion simile's (9. 792-96, 10. 454-56, 12. 4-8; 3 of 4, the other tenor being Mezentius, 10. 723-28). All of the yoked lions are Cybele's (3. 113, 10. 157, 10. 253), while the hides are associated with Aeneas (usually as seat coverings, 2. 722, 8. 177, 8. 552) or Hercules (Aventinus, 7. 666), who is also described as the slayer of the Nemean lion (8. 295), or they are gifts/prizes (5. 351, 9. 306). The lions in the similes are savage, although sometimes compromised (Turnus is compared to a wounded lion, 12. 5 and Mezentius to a lion mad with hunger, 10. 724). The linking of Turnus with lions reinforces the portrait of him developed in book 7 as an extreme warrior, since one lion (which roars with a bloody mouth,

Cybele's soteric victory-assuring journey from Mt. Ida to Rome in 204 (Hardie, 1987, 170-71) and her civilizing powers, an important addition to the implications of Aeneas' role as helmsman of the Trojan/proto-Roman ship of state.

The Ships of the Magna Mater

After the catalogue of Etruscan ships the narrative returns to Aeneas who now guides the steering oar (*ipse sedens clavumque regit velisque ministrat*, 218), overtly evoking the role of the ship of state's helmsman. In this last scene of the leader at sea, Aeneas discovers that his ships were made of Phrygian pine sacred to Cybele and that the rest of his fleet are now goddesses, as recounted by one of the ships-turned-goddess herself, Cymodocea. The nymph describes a spectacular series of events that occurred while he was in Pallanteum, adding a nearly numinous quality to Aeneas' ship of state.

In one of the first actions of the war, Turnus' attempts to engage the Trojans who are under orders from Aeneas to remain behind the walls in his absence, have been rebuffed and in frustration he decides to burn the Trojan fleet docked nearby (9. 69-76). In a flashback of a conversation between Cybele and her son Jupiter, which the narrator indicates occurred while Aeneas was building his fleet on Mt. Ida (3. 5-6), Vergil reveals that Aeneas' ships are constructed of wood from Cybele's sacred pine forest, which she "happily (*laeta*) gave to the Dardanian youth when he needed a fleet" (9. 85-89), but she is anxious for the trees' well-being and asks Jupiter to protect them. Reluctant to bestow a favor on Aeneas not even granted to immortals, Jupiter instead promises that whatever ships make it to the Laurentian shores he will transform into Nereids, goddesses of the sea, (94-103).[532] The privilege that Cybele grants Aeneas

---

fremit ore cruento, 12. 8) connects him directly with the personification of *Furor* in Jupiter's prophecy in book 1 (*fremet ...ore cruento*, 296). Vergil, however, undercuts this apparent dichotomy of opposites (subduer/civilizer: savage beast), by comparing Euryalus in the midst of his savage slaughter at night to a lion, in words that anticipates the first line and a half of Mezentius's simile (9. 339-40, 10. 723-24) and Turnus/Furor's *fremit ore curento* (9. 341). The broad lines of the dichotomy, however, I would argue, are as significant as the very important and familiar Vergilian sabotaging of its, only apparent, validity.

[532] As Hardie (1994), 101, notes, "This transformation is not so bizarre when one recalls the belief that trees are the habitations of nymphs: Cybele's Dryads become Nereids." Likewise, the peculiar status of ships in Hellenistic literature, often anthropomorphized (the first ship, the Argo, speaks, the *phaselus* narrates its own story, Cat. 4, and the blurring of distinction between trees, ships and humans at the beginning of Cat. 64, 1-15), provides important precedence (Hardie, 1987; Fantham, 1990, 106), as does the prominence of metamorphosis elsewhere in the poem (Hardie, 1994, 77-122). Nevertheless, criticism of the episode's plausibility and incongruity has been prevalent since antiquity (*ibid*).

(unbeknownst to him) of the use of her sacred trees indicates an extraordinary favor, since the violation of sacred trees was a serious offense even in Vergil's day.[533] The subsequent metamorphosis is one of the most spectacular divine intercessions in the *Aeneid* and can be seen as the fulfillment of Jupiter's portent of thunder and the brilliant shimmering cloud in response to Aeneas' prayer at 7. 141-43 (so Fantham, 1990, 112), which Cybele's breaking forth into the human world resembles in its initial manifestation. Although Turnus attempts to calm the fear of his own men when the ships are transformed before their eyes by interpreting the omen as evidence that the Trojans' accustomed help has been taken away (9. 128-31 and see Ch. 7, p. 375), Aeneas' former fleet comes to his aid in a manner which alludes to the Magna Mater's great political importance at Rome, which may justify the extraordinary nature of the events Cymodocea recounts and her miraculous speech to Aeneas.

Through the comparison of Cybele to the city of Rome in the parade of heroes in book 6, her long-standing role as guarantor of the safety of the state, the purpose for her original importation from Phrygia in 204 (Ch. 4, pp. 185-87; Livy 29. 10. 4), is honored. Roller has shown that the Great Mother's public worship as a god of the state is a distinctively Roman aspect of her cult.[534] The goddess's first home in Rome was the temple of Victory on the Palatine, in hopeful expectation of the victory she would bring to Scipio in Africa, and numismatic evidence indicates that she continued to be worshipped as a goddess of Victory (see Ch. 4, pp. 185), an apt association for general Aeneas about to begin his war. Her lengthy yearly festival established in 194 was the type of celebration that was generally limited to the major

---

[533] See Hardie, 1994, 89, who comments on the seriousness of the offense involved in cutting down trees in a sacred grove and refers to the execution in 30 by Octavian of Antony's friend D. Turullius, which "was seen as also making just amends to Asclepius for Turullius' felling of wood in the god's grove on Cos to build a fleet" (Dio 51. 8. 3).

[534] Roller's study of Cybele encompasses the goddess's cult in Anatolia, Greece and Rome and therefore she says with some authority that the public nature of Rome's cult was distinctive (317): "In the Greek world, the Mother was essentially a deity of private cult. Despite her position as keeper of laws in several Ionian cities, including Athens, she was not a deity who defined and guarded the polis." Whereas at Rome the ecstatic rites of her eunuch priests were part of the public processional of the goddess in which the Romans participated only as observers (her priests could only be non-Romans and there is no indication that ordinary people turned to her for consolation), in the Greek world the ecstatic state was experienced in active participation, but privately.

gods.[535] Lucretius suggests that the Magna Mater was associated both with patriotism and *pietas*.[536] The escort in her yearly festival is armed (recalling the Dictaean Curetes) because (2. 641-43),

> ... significant divam praedicere ut armis
> ac virtute velint patriam defendere terram
> praesidioque parent decorique parentibus esse.
>
> ... they indicate the command of the goddess that
> with arms and courage they be ready to defend their
> native land and to be both protection and
> a source of pride to their parents.

Clearly, as Roller (316) has argued, at Rome Magna Mater "was a deity of patriotism. She was the mother of the state, and literally the mother of the state's most important deity, Jupiter." These distinctive aspects of the goddess' worship at Rome complement Aeneas' history and the values associated with his helmsmanship, as Cymodocea's speech shows in which the goddess and Aeneas are more closely joined.

Cymodocea, one of ship-nymphs, who "recognize their king (*rex*) from a distance" (10. 224), hails him and proceeds to report on their transformation and the current situation in his camp, and in conclusion she recommends specific action and predicts victory. Although epic intertexts, primarily Argonautic,[537] provide ample precedents for marine divinities acting as messengers or benefactors for heroes at sea, the political connotations interwoven in the message (and already suggested in the nymphs' approach, i.e., *rex*) are new.[538] Even the description of the nymph's position as she speaks with Aeneas draws attention to the helmsman's position: following from behind, she holds the ship's stern with her right hand (*dextra puppim tenet*, 226), below where Aeneas sits at the helm, and paddles in the water with her left,

---

[535] Roller (1999), 288-89, notes that eventually the festival lasted more than a week with plays, a formal parade, chariot races and festive banquets. The "five official festivals with games during the Republic" honored Jupiter Apollo, Hercules, and Liber and Ceres.

[536] On Lucretius' Cybele with bibliography see Wilhelm (1988), 86.

[537] See in particular Fantham (1990), 114-16; *Argon.* 1. 1310-25, 2. 598-600, 4. 931-32, 1310-25 and Harrison (1991), 219-50, Cat. 64. 14-18; Moschus, *Europa* 118; *Od*. 4. 364, 5. 333.

[538] According to Servius (on 10. 228), Cymodocea's address and initial command (*vigilasne, deum gens, Aenea? vigila et velis immitte rudentis*, 10. 228-29) echo a formula with which the Vestal Virgins greeted the *rex sacrorum,* the priest of Janus who took over the sacerdotal function of the early kings: *vigilasne, rex? vigilia* (Harrison, 1991, 228-9). Nothing is known about the context or history of the formula, but the likelihood of its relevance to Cymodocea's words is increased by the recent description of Aeneas as king (224) and his frequent performance of the priestly role in the *Aeneid*. Note especially Aeneas' division of labor at the signing of the agreement in book 12. 192-93, should he win the contest with Turnus: *sacra et deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,/ imperium sollemne socer.*

temporarily taking over the helmsman's job. In Cymodocea's description of the nymphs' transformation she reiterates the affiliation of the Magna Mater with the pine and Mt. Ida, ancient and distinctive aspects of her cult at the Palatine temple (230-35):

> nos sumus, Idaeae sacro de vertice pinus, 230
> nunc pelagi nymphae, classis tua. perfidus ut nos
> praecipitis ferro Rutulus flammaque premebat,
> rupimus invitae tua uincula teque per aequor
> quaerimus. hanc genetrix faciem miserata refecit
> et dedit esse deas aevumque agitare sub undis.
>
> We are pines from the sacred summit of Ida,
> now nymphs of the sea, your fleet. When the
> treacherous Rutulian was pressing us headlong
> with sword and flame, we unwillingly broke your moorings
> and sought you by sea. Our Mother, having pitied us,
> remade us with this appearance and granted that, as goddesses,
> we spent our life under the waves.

Aeneas' ships constructed of pine, he discovers, were part of Magna Mater's sanctuary, essentially votaries of the goddess and now, with the exception of his ship,[539] are goddesses themselves. The pine seems to have been a distinctive aspect of Magna Mater's cult only at Rome. The terra cotta pine cones found at Magna Mater's temple site (dating between 191-111) "suggest[s] Rome's connection with Mount Ida and the intertwining of the Magna Mater with the legend of Aeneas,"[540] since the pine is "nowhere attested as a Phrygian cult symbol, nor are pine cones found among the images connected with the goddess or Attis in the Greek world."[541] In Ovid's account of Magna Mater's journey to Rome (*Fast.* 4. 273-74), her ship is constructed of "pine which dutiful Aeneas had used for his escape" and this ship,

---

[539] Vergil leaves unexplained how Aeneas at this point in the narrative has what appears to be his original ship, for it seems to appear as if by magic. It either was dismissed with the other Trojan ship (*pars cetera*) to return to the Trojans' camp with news of Aeneas (8. 548-50), before the leader left Pallanteum on horseback, or was left at Pallanteum (Harrison, 1991, 156-7). In either case its appearance approaching the Trojan camp in book 10 at the head of the Etruscan ships becomes difficult (if left at Pallanteum, it could not have joined the Etruscans, presumably embarking from Pyrgi, the port of Caere, without passing the Trojan camp again; if from the Trojan camp, how did it arrive to Pyrgi where Aeneas is?).

[540] Roller (1999), 279. Gruen (1990), 12-15, also has argued for a much earlier adoption of the Aeneas legend into Rome's mythology (the idea was familiar to Romans through much of the third century), congruent with its association with Magna Mater. Both he (18-20) and Roller (269-71) provide evidence for Mt. Ida as the place of origin for the Magna Mater in her journey to Rome, despite the citing of Pessinus by Livy, for whom, like other Romans of the late Republic, it was the principle functioning shrine of the goddess in Asia Minor (Gruen, 19).

[541] Roller, 279. Although the later mythological tradition associated the pine with Attis, because he had castrated himself under it, Roller argues that this "seems an artificial aetiology, designed to explain the presence of this symbol in Roman cult."

which became know as the *Navisalvia* (ship of salvation), seems to have become a focus of the Magna Mater cult.[542] Thus, both chariot and ship, combined in Aeneas' ship, became important symbols in Cybele's cult.

Regarding the immediate situation, Cymodocea shows her partisan support of Aeneas in the description she gives of Turnus, *perfidus...Rutulus,* and then provides him with foreknowledge of the strategic situation at his camp (236-240), the urgent nature of which leads to a rousing conclusion with a series of commands to action (*surge age... iube...cape*). She specifically recommends the use of his shield decorated with Augustus in its center and scenes of Roman history ("take up the unconquerable shield, which Vulcan himself made and surrounded its layers in gold," 242-43), and predicts future victory for the hero, as befits a votary of the Magna Mater, a traditional bringer of victory. When she concludes her speech Cymodocea thrusts Aeneas' ship forward (246-48), recalling both Portunus' help to Cloanthus in the ship race (5. 241-43) and Athena's help to the Argo at the Symplegades (*Arg.* 2. 598-600).

Thus, Cymodocea's revelation of the sanctity of Aeneas' pine-wood ships—their city walls while at sea, but, in fact, only on loan from Cybele—together with the attention she draws to Aeneas' god-given shield, bearing the history of Rome and Augustus' victory and her prediction of victory all indicate Cybele's traditional presentation in Roman myth and cult, which from the time of her introduction to Rome in the third century was associated with victory and the well-ordered prosperous state. In the only scene in which Aeneas steers the oar as helmsman, his ship of state is cloaked with this mantle of divine guidance and selection. Certainly, Vergil's innovation of bringing Aeneas to the shores of the Tiber for his first settlement, as opposed to the traditional Lavinian shore along the sea's coast, facilitates the interconnection of Cybele's similar voyage with Aeneas' and thereby expands the symbolic connotations of his ship of state in keeping with contemporary Augustan motifs.

We have already seen evidence of Augustus' veneration of Magna Mater in the *Aeneid*: the proximity of his home on the Palatine to her temple, which had been dedicated in 191 (Roller, 274), is

---

[542] Roller, 313-14, n. 95, fig. 74. Inscriptions dedicated to the goddess and the ship, including one from a certain Telephus, *magister* (in this context "helmsman") of the college of the cult (*CIL VI*, 494) should probably be associated with a shrine "localized at a site along the Tiber where the Mother's ship first docked in Rome."

suggested by the juxtaposition of Cybele and Augustus in the parade of heroes (6. 784-87; 788-805; Ch. 4, pp. 185-86). Her importance to Augustus is also apparent in material art. The wife of Augustus, who himself was proclaimed *pater patriae* (Suet. *Aug.* 58. 2), is represented as the Magna Mater,[543] complete with mural crown, lion, tympanum (representing the world), as well as a cornucopia (fecundity) and a rudder,[544] which may suggest "the wise governing of the world" (Wilhelm, 1988, 95).[545] Certainly, the Augustan capricorn issues,[546] with rudder, globe and cornucopia, speaks to Augustus' successful rule.[547] Consequently, even before Aeneas raises his shield with Augustus and the battle of Actium at its center, the symbolic importance of Cybele in Aeneas' approach probably would have seemed Augustan as well.

Fiery Helmsmen, a Roman Ship of State and a Shipwreck

Although the day now rushes upon Aeneas and his allies and a series of rapid indirect commands show that Aeneas followed Cymodocea's advice expeditiously (*sequantur, aptent, parent*, 258-59), the narrative pace undergoes a pronounced rallentando for the presentation of Aeneas with his shield and the description of the effect it has upon, first, the Trojans besieged in their camp and then upon the besieging Latins. As if to draw attention to the importance of the visual in the following lines, the first noun in the opening line is sight itself (*conspectu,* 260-64):

> Iamque in conspectu Teucros habet et sua castra
> stans celsa in puppi, clipeum cum deinde sinistra

---

[543] I refer to the life size seated sculpture in the J. Paul Getty Museum, dated to either the Claudian or Antonine periods (Roller, 313, n. 91).

[544] Fertility was also a distinctively Roman aspect of the Magna Mater's cult; see above Ch. 4, p 184.

[545] The rudder may also imply the good fortune and (with the cornucopia) prosperity brought to Rome with Augustan rule, since both the rudder and cornucopia are frequent attributes of Tyche/Fortuna. Bieber (1968), 5, who also illustrates a coin with the head of Septimius Severus and Fortuna Redux with rudder (pl. III, fig. 14).

[546] Augustus' birth sign, even though his birthdate, September 22, was in the sign of Libra ("… he later minted a silver coin with the Zodiac sign Capricorn, under which he was born," Suet. *Aug.* 94). See Galinsky's (2012), 3-4, fig. 1, essay, ("Augustus' Birth Sign: Why Capricorn?"), on the possible reasons why he used the sign of Capricorn among his images. He concludes that for ancient astrologers accurate birth dates were not essential and that the polyvalence of capricorn undoubtedly made it attractive. The possible connotations he discusses are its association with luck and good fortune, as well as rule over the west. Zanker (1990), 48, fig. 36 a, also suggests Capricorn's connection with fortune: "Capricorn…(was)… a reminder that Augustus' role as savior of the state was 'in the stars.'"

[547] As Wilhem (1988), 95 has suggested. For illustrations see Mattingly, nos. 305-08, 344-50, 664, 696. Roller, 289-92, takes pains to document the eagerness of aristocratic Roman families to be engaged on the goddess' behalf and to acknowledge her help in their victories, noting in particular an Octavian aureus of 43, that depicts the Magna Mater in her lion chariot, as a possible allusion to expected victory.

> extulit ardentem. clamorem ad sidera tollunt
> Dardanidae e muris, spes addita suscitat iras,
> tela manu iaciunt...
>
> And now standing high on the stern, he already had
> the Trojans and his own camp in view, when he raised
> his blazing shield with his left arm. From the walls
> the Trojans lifted their shouts to the stars, added hope
> fanned their anger, they throw their weapons...

Following the last of Cymodocea's orders (*clipeum cape*, 242) Aeneas lifts up his shield, the sight of which produces a tremendous response from the waiting Trojans. But this is the last action Aeneas takes for 26 lines (until *socios...exponit,* 287-88) and the Trojans for almost 100 lines (until *Troianae acies...concurrunt*, 360-61), while these actions, with a further description of fire around Aeneas (270-71), reverberate in a series of similes that retard the narrative, drawing attention to the hero's epiphany. Because Vergil already has provided a detailed ecphrasis of the images on Aeneas' shield and invited the reader to view his action at this time in terms of vision, an allusion to the similarly-stationed Augustus represented on his Actium battleship/ship of state in the center of that shield is inescapable. Not unexpectedly, there is a similar reference to sight shortly before Augustus is described in the ecphrasis (8. 675-81):

> in medio classis aeratas, Actia bella,
> cernere erat, totumque instructo Marte videres
> feruere Leucaten auroque effulgere fluctus.
> hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
> cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis,
> stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammas
> laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.
>
> In the middle the brazen fleets, the battle of Actium,
> was visible. You would see, with the battle drawn up,
> all Leucate seething and the waves shining with gold.
> Here Augustus Caesar, leading the Italians into battle
> with the fathers and people, the penates and the great gods,
> standing high on the stern, twin flames stream from his
> radiant brow and his father's star appears above his head.

Although the viewer is invited to see the foces amassed and Augustus leading the Italians into battle, the reality of the battle situation fades as the senators, Roman people, penates and gods, are added in. Put another way, the strain on narrative credibility—to conceive of one ship accommodating the whole city of

Rome is impossible—suggests a figurative or symbolic level of meaning for these additions. The suggested presence of the fathers and Roman people and Augustus positioned at the stern connotes a metaphorical meaning for his ship as a ship of state. The actual commanding of the fleet may have been in the hands of Agrippa,[548] whose description follows immediately afterward (although he is *parte alia*, 8. 682), wearing decorations for achieved naval victories (*tempora navali fulgent rostrata corona*, 684). Although all four commanders are described before the naval battle, only Augustus is specifically located on the ship, and he like Aeneas, stands in the helmsman's position.[549] The twin flames associate Augustus with divine selection (cf. Iulus, 2. 682; Lavinia, 7. 73) and the star with the comet that appeared when Augustus was celebrating funeral games in honor of Julius Caesar, which was taken to symbolize Caesar's deification (Gransden, 1976, 680-1; Fordyce, 1977, 8. 680, 681; Williams, 1972-73, 8. 680-1). Aeneas too, as he stands on the stern, is similarly marked by flames (270-71):

> ardet apex capiti tristisque [550] a vertice flamma
> funditur et vastos umbo vomit aureus ignis:
>
> A point of fire burns on his head and a grim flame
> streams from the top and the golden boss spews forth
> tremendous fire.

The use of identical, or comparable, words (*a vertice* [10. 271], *vertice* [8. 681]; *flamma, flammas*; *vomit*, *vomunt*; *apex* [10. 270], *sidus* [8. 681]; *capiti*, *tempora*) is enough to suggest that both Aeneas and Augustus enjoy similar divine favor, but the darker connotations of *tristis* and the abundant flames pouring from Aeneas' war shield, foreshadow the deaths Aeneas will cause in bloody combat, implications subsequent similes amplify (concerning which, see below). In the initial reaction of Turnus and the Ausonian leaders there is yet another allusion to the scene represented on Aeneas' shield. In this passage *ea mira* refers to the shouting of the Trojans besieged within the camp, whom the Rutulians most recently (10. 118) had been pressing hard around all the gates (267-269):

---

[548] Syme (1939/1960), 297: "But Octavianus, though 'dux', was even less adequate in maritime warfare than on land. Agrippa, victor of Naulochus, was in command." Much about the battle is uncertain; see below, n. 550.
[549] After the battle Cleopatra gives sail letting lose the cables (707-8).
[550] I am following Harrison's (1991), arguments in support of Gabriello Faerno's (1568) emendation of *cristisque* to *tristisque*, especially attractive for the correspondence with *contristat* in the simile (275).

> at Rutulo regi ducibusque ea mira videri
> Ausoniis, donec uersas ad litora puppis
> respiciunt totumque adlabi classibus aequor.
>
> But these things seemed strange to the Rutulian
> king and the Ausonian leaders until they caught sight of
> the sterns turned toward the shore and the whole sea
> gliding toward them with fleets.

Ships were normally beached stern first (cf. 3. 277, 6. 3), but the hyperbole in the last line indicates that nothing else about what the Latins see is within reasonable expectations. The image of the invading sea is indeed "bold" (Harrison, 1991, 268), but the plurality of the fleets likewise involves a degree of hyperbole, since Aeneas was only leading a partial contingent of Etruscans. More aptly, the expression *totum...aequor* occurs in the shield ecphrasis when the combined forces of Antony and Cleopatra finally go into action against those of Augustus and Agrippa framing a line and a half (8. 689-90), which also described the beginning of the ship race:

> una omnes ruere ac *totum* spumare reductis
> conuulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus *aequor*.
>
> They all rushed together and the whole sea was foaming
> torn up by the pulling of the oars and the triple beaks.[551]

Regardless of how little action there may have actually been at Actium,[552] at least the number and size of the ships were such that the whole sea in a fairly large area could have been in motion because of their engagement.[553]

By these careful allusions to the scene on Aeneas' shield—Augustus at the stern, his flaming effulgence and the churning of the whole sea in the midst of the naval battle—Vergil simultaneously aggrandizes the significance of both leaders and both battles, but to different ends. By making Aeneas'

---

[551] The first line of the ship race differs (5. 142-43):
> infindunt pariter sulcos, totumque dehiscit
> convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor.

[552] Syme (1939/1960), 297, on Actium: "There may have been little fighting and comparatively few casualties." According to Gurval (1995), 2, the particulars of the naval battle "remain neither clear nor certain," with bibliography provided on the naval battle, preliminary operations, opposing strategies, and varied maneuvers.

[553] Casson (1971), 99, and n. 13, follows the ancient sources which say (Plutarch, *Ant.* 64. 1), that Antony had a variety of ships up to as large as "tens," (usually interpreted as 10 banks of oars) and Augustus had the fleet with which he had crushed Sextus (Dio Cassius 50. 19. 3) and this included "sixes" (Florus 4. 11. 6). Plutarch (*Ibid*), says that Antony had 500 ships and Octavian 250.

approach to what will be an exclusively land-based war into a prototype of the contemporary Augustan naval battle with vast numbers of forces coming together from across the broad extent of the Roman empire, Aeneas' fugitive maritime wanderings across a great part of that empire become prophetic of the extent of Roman rule—an idea implicit from the beginning of the epic (1.1, 1. 7, *Troiae…Romae*) and more recently highlighted by the shadow of Cybele's parallel soteric journey. At the same time, the battle of Actium and its leader are imbued with a semi-divine Trojan ancestor as a prototype, and that battle itself assumes foundational significance. The placement of Anchises in the identical position on the ship when the Trojans first sight Italy (3. 527), where he foretells future wars, further supports an interpretation of Augustus' war as foundational, just as the fulfillment of Aeneas' mission can only be achieved through war (3. 458, 5. 730-31; 6. 86-94, 890), which he is now about to enter upon. That Aeneas' helmsmanship has carried Ciceronian connotations of an overarching concern for the well-being of the *populus Romanus* strengthens similar implications for Augustus' leadership. At the same time, even without understanding the two leaders as equivalent in any way,[554] Aeneas' role as leader in the rest of the epic must have some relevance to Augustus, because of the ideological similarity suggested at this important point in the epic. Thus, Aeneas' shield facilitates the opening of contemporary political relevance for this moment in the narrative of his journey, but intertextual links to Achilles' fiery light shortly before he kills Hector and previous use of fire imagery in the *Aeneid* highlight the destructive aspect of the fire surrounding Aeneas on his ship and Augustus on the shield.

Although the flames around the heads of Aeneas and Augustus undoubtedly bear connotations of divine selection,[555] as in the case of Iulus flaming hair before departing Troy (2. 682-84), fire is strongly linked to war and its destruction both in book 2 and book 7 in which fire, flames, burning, and blazing are

---

[554] Harrison (1991), 261-2, notes that "Such analogies between Aeneas and Augustus surface at intervals in the *Aeneid* (especially in book 8, cf. Binder, *passim*), but there is no constant identity (cf. esp. 517-20); for laudable caution cf. Syme, *RR* 463, Griffin, *Latin Poets*, 197." Also see Galinsky (1996), 4, 23, 123.

[555] Williams (1972-73), 680-1, for example, contends that the flames around Augustus give "an element of the supernatural" to the leader, referring to both Iulus' flames (2. 682) and Lavinia's (7. 73), but although her flames are interpreted to portend a bright future (*illustrem fama fatisque*, 79), they also imply *magnum… bellum* (80). The star at the top of Augustus' helmet refers to the comet, which appeared shortly after Julius Caesar's death and was taken as a sign of his deification (Galinsky, 1996, 17, 395, n. 29, lists sources in addition to Vergil, *Ecl.* 9. 47-49 with Servius' commentary).

the tools of Allecto and characterize Circe and Turnus.[556] Virbius' horses rushing to war are *ardentes* (781), the Circean-bred horses Latinus gives Aeneas breath fire (281), as does the volcanic Chimaera on Turnus' helmet (786). Although Aeneas' weapons, including his shield, are divine gifts, which accompanying fire often signifies, clearly, his blazing (*ardentem*, 262) shield also signifies destruction, as the anger it instills in the Trojans suggests. Likewise, the use of the verb *vomo*, to describe the pouring forth of fire from the boss on Aeneas' shield (10. 271) and from Augustus' brow (8. 681), is inherited from Lucretius, where it describes the volcano Aetna throwing out fire (1. 724; Harrison, 1991, 270-1), whose close relationship to the Chimaera we have noted in discussing Turnus' helmet decoration. Equally complicating is the use of that verb to describe the fire-breathing monster Cacus (8. 199, 259), from which Hercules rescues Evander's people. Thus, even before Vergil compares Aeneas' brightness (*ardet apex, flamma, aureus ignis,* 270-71) to the dog star Sirius, intratextual allusions to Circe, Allecto, Turnus and his Chimaera, as well as to Cacus, have already imputed to him suggestions of the extremes of war frenzy.

The comparison of Aeneas' fire to Sirius is particularly ominous because it is Achilles as seen by Priam who is compared to Sirius in the *Iliad* at the beginning of the book in which he will kill Hector (22. 26-31). As in Homer, at the center of Vergil's simile is the destruction for humanity associated with the coming of Sirius (10. 273-75):

> non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
> sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor
> ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris
> nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.
>
> Just as when blood-red comets redden dolefully
> in the clear night or the heat of Sirius, bringing thirst
> and diseases on weary mortals, rises and saddens the
> sky with sinister light.

In this context the double reddening of the comets, particularly with blood, could hardly be a clearer indication of coming "bloody destruction for the Italians" (Harrison, 1991, 273) and with the addition of *lugubre*, Vergil distances his simile from the general brightness of Homer's first four lines (22. 26-29):

---

[556] *Ardens* occurs most often in the story of the fall of Troy in book 2 (9), but also 8 times in book 7.

"like that star which comes on in the autumn and whose conspicuous brightness far outshines the stars that are numbered in the nights darkening…Orion's dog." Homer's conclusion is, however, similarly ominous (30-31): [It] "is brightest among the stars, and yet [it] is wrought as a sign of evil and brings on the great fever for unfortunate mortals." At the climax of Aeneas' prolonged return to camp in which his divine affiliations have been stressed the Sirius simile relates the Trojan leader to Achilles, the warrior aligned in his savagery with Juno in the ecphrasis on her temple in Carthage in book 1 (see Ch. 4, pp. 170-76) and whom the Sibyl represents as Turnus' analogue (6. 89-90), thus far, justly. These significant intra- and intertextual allusions which Aeneas' attendant flames summon are ominous. In a return to the concrete problems of leadership, instead of moving quickly into warfare, the scene of disembarkation (287-301) is prolonged to focus on the differing manner of Aeneas' and the Etruscan leader Tarchon's disembarkation, which provide contrasting models of helmsmanship.

The initial impression at the beginning of this scene is that Aeneas will finally becoming a participant in the narrative of the war. He lands his troops (*exponit*, 287) and their choice of one of two methods—leaping into the shallows or sliding down the oars—is expressed with historic infinitives (*multi servare...*,288) or elliptically (*per remos alii*, 290), quickening the narrative pace. But instead the narrative focuses on Tarchon's contrasting unsuccessful method of disembarkation. Yet, even though this episode ends climactically in the shipwreck of his vessel, leaving his soldiers floating in the waves with absolutely no foothold, it has no consequences in the narrative, despite their obvious vulnerability and Turnus' readiness to capitalize on this expected circumstance (*trepidi...labant vestigia*, 283).[557] Tarchon, who is surprisingly absent from the catalogue of ships, despite being the leader with whom Aeneas negotiated their joint alliance, reappears in book 10 only for this scene (with a later scene in book 11, 725-59, preceded by an earlier brief mention, 184). That these two leaders, Aeneas and Tarchon, are meant to be compared seems obvious from the identity of the task and the difference of their methods, as well as the repetition of the verb *exponit* (288, 305, to "land" or "disembark"). As Muse (587) succinctly

[557] This scene and Tarchon's role in the *Aeneid*, as well as in Vergilian scholarship, have been studied by Muse, 2007, who notes, 590, that after the wreck "Virgil abruptly shifts his gaze to Turnus and Aeneas as the battle is joined on shore" and that his shipwreck has "no practical consequences for the rest of the narrative" (599).

summarizes: "Aeneas shows us how to lead, Tarchon how not to" (also Williams, 1972-73, 287f). But why is Tarchon used for this purpose?

Muse argues that Tarchon's shipwreck foreshadows the Tarquins failure as rulers of Rome. Harrison has already suggested that Tarchon may have been excluded from the catalogue of ally ships because his name would recall his eponymous city of Tarquinii (Strabo, *Geogr.* 5. 2. 2; Muse, 587, n. 7), home of the hated last king of Rome (see above, p. 305). Muse develops the relevance of Tarquinius to Tarchon's presence here in the narrative based on analogy with the shipwreck of Sergestus in the ship race in book 5 (201-9), which has been recognized since the mid-nineteenth century as foreshadowing Catiline's political failure (593).[558] He notes that they are the only two men in the epic that cause a shipwreck, both of which are precipitated by the leader's sudden dangerous maneuver and have no practical consequence for the narrative (599). The language of Tarchon's command to his men recalls the ultimate outrage of the Tarquins, the rape of Lucretia, which led to their expulsion from Rome (10. 294-98; Muse, 599):

> nunc, o lecta manus, validis incumbite remis;
> tollite, ferte rates, inimicam findite rostris 295
> hanc terram, sulcumque sibi premat ipsa carina.
> frangere nec tali puppim statione recuso
> arrepta tellure semel.
>
> Now, chosen band, fall upon your strong oars;
> lift and carry your boats, cleave with your prows
> this enemy land and let the very hull plow a furrow.
> I do not refuse to break a ship in such an anchorage
> once the land has been seized.

Muse also draws attention to the sexual metaphor in the expression of plowing a furrow, a "commonplace" metaphor for sexual intercourse in Greek tragedy, while *premo* can also be used of the embrace of copulation and *sulcus* (296) can likewise be sexually suggestive (in the *Georgics*, 3. 136, eg., it refers to the genitalia of mares). Certainly lust, as a ruling passion (to use Plato's terminology), is a common

[558] This connection is facilitated by Vergil's association of three of the captains with Roman *gentes,* in Sergestus' case with the *gens Sergia,*(5. 121), the best known member of which was Catiline. See above, Ch. 4, pp. 194-95.

feature of the stereotypical tyrant as represented in Greek tragedy, Plato, and Cicero.[559] Muse maintains that Vergil has chosen the shipwrecks of Sergestus and Tarchon to make allusions to Catiline and Tarquinius because their descendants "will wreck the ship of state," finding it "particularly apt" that Vergil's apostrophe to Tarchon (*sed non puppis tua, Tarchon*, 302) refers to the stern (*puppis*), the place from where the ancient ship was steered and where both Aeneas and Augustus stand (604-5).

The same use of *puppis* in ship-of-state metaphors occurs in Cicero's letters (*Fam.* 9. 15. 3; 12. 25. 5; Muse, 604-5, n. 79), but since the polarity between the good and bad helmsman, as we have seen, frequently forms the center of Cicero's ship-of-state metaphor and the primary energy of his image typically resides in the corrupt usurpers (Ch. 2, pp. 23-32), the broader development of Cicero's use of the ship of state image also supports Muse's thesis. This is the concluding section of the most extended and obviously political evocation of Aeneas' ship of state and we are at this point invited to compare the two men as leaders. In Cicero's earliest use of the metaphor in *De inventione* (1.4) rash (*temerarii*) and audacious (*audaces*) men who take the helm of the ship of state bring great and disastrous shipwrecks, while the men of the greatest talent leave public life, as sailors seek refuge in port from a raging storm.[560] And in *De re publica* (2. 51), it is precisely Tarquinius Superbus with whom Cicero juxtaposes the ideal helmsman (*rector et gubernator civitatis*), a digression from his historical narrative (Ch. 2, pp. 37-39), and who in his insolence, pride and arrogance recalls aspects of Cicero's bad helmsmen and pirates. After the most overt presentation of Aeneas as helmsman of the ship of state, Tarchon's more realistically described counter-example ends with the very physical details that put his crew in the least stable position to start the war opening immediately before them.[561] Vergil has presented Aeneas as the ideal helmsman in image and through miracle. Now in the parallel examples of disembarkation, the real and metaphorical shipwreck of Tarchon dramatizes the advantages of Aeneas' leadership.

---

[559] See Ch. 2, p. 63, on Agamemnon's entry as charioteer with his prize, Cassandra (Aeschylus, *Ag.* 950-55); pp. 63-64, on the tyrant in Plato's *Republic*; and p. 65, on tyrants in Cicero.

[560] The traits of the bad helmsmen here, rash (*temerarii*) and audacious (*audaces*) men, are similar to those Muse, 604, identifies as common "in Virgil's thinking" about the Tarquins and Catiline: "arrogance, intemperance and overreaching."

[561] "Fragments of oars and floating cross-beams obstructed their way and at the same time the ebbing wave dragged on their feet," 306-7.

The three scenes focusing on Aeneas approaching the battle in his ship—with Pallas, the nymph Cymodocea's address and the presentation of his shield—increase progressively in dramatic intensity and complexity, beginning with the quiet, suggestively intimate scene of Aeneas and Pallas, their only scene together after leaving Pallanteum and before Pallas dies. Yet Aeneas' position as mentor to Pallas is presented in such a way that his roles as knowledgeable helmsman and broadly experienced leader are implied, but in a scene that both suggests and denies intimacy, every aspect is in varying degrees abstract, in order to allow the ship's decorations and their implications to have equal weight in the presentation. The spatial ambiguity of Aeneas' position, front or stern, I have argued, is intentional, allowing Aeneas to guide the implied chariot the lions draw as he actually steers the ship. Cybele's yoked lions suggest the goddess's civilizing power and recall Neptune's order establishing sea chariot in book 1, with which Aeneas was also, through his *pietas*, associated.

In a return to Aeneas now specifically at the helm, the miraculous in the form of Cymodocea provides weighty evidence of the chosen nature of Aeneas' expedition and intertwines his affiliation with the Magna Mater with that of Augustus on his shield. Far from the disadvantage Turnus predicted for the Trojans to lose their ships (9. 128-31), Cymodocea reveals the amazing fact that Aeneas' ships have always been to some degree numinous and now are divine. The ships' construction from the sacred pine trees on Cybele's mountain draws attention to the particular Palatine cult connection with Mt. Ida and its pines. In the nymph's close association with Aeneas' ship—she both takes over the steering and, like the Argonautic Athena, sends the ship on its way with a thrust of her hand—and the revelation of the Magna Mater's transformation of her Idean pines, together with her prediction of coming victory, the historically disparate journeys of Aeneas and goddess seem to become intertwined. Since from the earliest time of Cybele's presence in Rome her cult was centered on the Palatine near Augustus' home, the nymph's order to take up his shield with the central scenes devoted to Augustus' principal battle and triumph, (especially if its finale was read as occurring on the Palatine), would accentuate the importance of this goddess for Augustus as well.

Following the nymph's advice Aeneas raises his shield as he, like Augustus on the shield, stands in the lofty stern of his ship (*stans celsa in puppi*). His location in the helmsman's space activates with these words all previous symbolic connotations of his helmsmanship, but especially recalls his father at the first sight of Italy in book 3 and Augustus on the shield, in the most overt symbolic ship of state in the epic at the battle of Actium. Through the use of this phrase Aeneas as helmsman assumes a temporally pivotal place in the transition from Troy to Rome. Anchises, representing Troy and the past, is in the helmsman's position at the first site of Italy, but Palinurus still holds the rudder. In Aeneas' assumption of the helm from Palinurus at the end of book 5, I have suggested that one level of meaning in Palinurus' sacrificial death is an allusion to that of Cicero whose conception of the ideal helmsman grants essential qualities to the Vergilian metaphor, as manifested in Mnestheus, Palinurus and Aeneas. In the continuation of this kind of helmsman concerned with the well-being of his people in the figure of Aeneas the hero becomes a proto-Augustus on the stern of his ship, identical in position to the *princeps* on his shield, who steers the Roman state toward the victory, as he rises to power and founds a new Golden Age (*aurea condet saecula*, 6. 792-3). In embarking upon this war Aeneas initiates a series of foundations—of his town Lavinia, of Alba Longa, of Rome, of the Republic—which will culminate in Augustus' principate. Via his development of Aeneas as a responsible helmsman Vergil suggests that this sort of leader was present from Rome's earliest beginnings and thus is in some way archetypal. Within the context of Cybele's civilizing power, manifested in the lions on Aeneas' ship, a victory is also foreshadowed for Aeneas, which would enable the establishment of a responsibly governed proto-Roman community and, to the extent that Cybele functioned similarly for Augustus, another level of comparison between Aeneas and Augustus and their leadership is suggested.

With both leaders, however, the connotations of fire imagery are more ambivalent. Although a divine aura attends the flames around Augustus and Aeneas, they are, nevertheless, problematized through shared diction with Cacus, Circe, Allecto and Turnus' Chimaera in the *Aeneid* and via shared fire/star imagery Aeneas clearly alludes to the death-dealing Achilles. Death and destruction are expected in war, but all the gods except Hera censor Achilles' extreme savagery in the *Iliad* (see Ch. 4, pp.167-68).

While the theme of Aeneas' divine selection predominates all three scenes of the leader's approach, this simile comparing the brightness of his surrounding flames to Sirius at the conclusion of his voyage is ominous. Latinus' gift to Aeneas of chariot and Circean fire-breathing horses, we have seen, are not without relevance for Aeneas who drove horses in the *Iliad* gained with similar Circean subterfuge (see Ch. 5, pp. 241-42). Vergil suggests that there may be aspects appropriate to the charioteer in Aeneas even in the culminating scene of his helmsmanship.

When Aeneas finally does descend into the fray of battle, the implications of his metaphorical ship of state have a presence in the shipwreck that Tarchon's reckless leadership causes. In fact, the placement of this incident immediately following the concentrated development of Aeneas' role as helmsman into the more obviously symbolic realm represents one argument in favor of a similar emblematic interpretation of Tarchon's role, with whom Aeneas in this passage serves as a positive counter-example of leadership. The language of violent assault on the land in Tarchon's command to his crew, may be suggestive of Sextus Tarquinius' rape of Lucretia, but could also be suggestive of the violence of tyrannical rule on a country more broadly. This passage concerning a realistic challenge for a general—how to transfer soldiers from a ship onto land occupied by enemy soldiers ready to attack—compares the leadership of Aeneas and Tarchon in such a way that very concrete elements fill the narrative—splinters or oars, floating cross-beams, the water dragging on the men's feet—yet the sequence of actions still imply another symbolic level of meaning; an optimal means of transition from the almost iconic presentation of Aeneas on a ship, which has been carefully developed as a ship of state with divine guardianship, to the physical world of hand to hand combat about to commence.

The War Chariot and the Tyrant

Although Turnus hustles his troops to the shore to meet the oncoming Trojans (308-10), his actions are not followed further immediately. Instead, the victories of the Trojan leaders predominate the action, first those of Aeneas (310-52) and then Pallas proves his valor (362-425). But Turnus' debut in the epic as charioteer follows soon thereafter in his famous confrontation with the less-experienced warrior (440-509). In the standard comparisons of this encounter with that of Aeneas against the younger Lausus,

Turnus' greater brutality is generally acknowledged.[562] While Aeneas has the engagement with younger Lausus thrust upon him by the valiant onslaught of the youth attempting to defend his father (796-99), Turnus seeks out Pallas, insisting that he is "owed" to him (443), but Pallas' youth and inexperience (*viribus imparibus*, 459; cf. also *maiore sub hoste*, 438) suggest Turnus may be seeking "the easy glory of killing a young and inexperienced hero" (Harrison, 1991, 442-3). While Aeneas remarks upon Lausus' *pietas* both before and after their duel and subsequently honors him for it (812, 824), Turnus, evoking the horrifying slaughter of Polites by Pyrrhus before the eyes of his father Priam described in book 2 (529-32; and of Hector by Achilles *Il.* 22. 408), wishes Pallas' father were present to watch, as if a spectator at the games, as he kills the youth (*cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset*, 443).[563] After he has killed Pallas Turnus again recalls the Vergilian Pyrrhus in his words, *Arcades, haec...memores mea dicta referte Evandro*, (491-92; cf. *referes ergo haec et nuntius ibis/ Pelidae genitori. illi mea tristia facta/ degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento,* 2. 547-49). The contrasting treatment of their victims by Turnus and Aeneas are represented in the image of Aeneas compassionately lifting the body of Lausus to give to his comrades (821-32) and Turnus' stepping on Pallas as he rips his baldric from him (*et laevo pressit pede talia fatus/ exanimem rapiens immania pondera baltei,* 495-96; Thornton, 1976, 131). The excess implied in Turnus' actions is strongly expressed in words of plunder and exaltation (500):

> quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus.
>
> [the baldric] which now Turnus glories in and
> having gotten possession of the spoil, rejoices.

The verb *ovare*, as we have seen in the hubristic charioteer Salmoneus punished in Tartarus, can be associated both with excessive display (see Ch. 2, pp. 66-67), as here, and also can mean "to triumph" and will describe Turnus in his final moments in the chariot. The Iliadic intertexts, especially that of Hector, who exalts (ἀγάλλεται, 18. 132-33) in Achilles weapons taken from Patroclus' body, suggest a

---

[562] See in particular Harrison (1991), 491-500, and Thornton (1976), 128-30.

[563] Harrison (1991), 442-3, "Turnus gratuitously evokes an image of particular horror for the ancients. The death of a child before its parents (die)...was considered a cruel perversion of nature" and "its death *ante ora parentum*, desired by Turnus, was even more horrifying," in part because this witnessing was a religious pollution. Harrison notes that *spectator* is the normal word for "an onlooker at the games."

foolhardiness that will bring death, but, as we have seen (Ch. 1, p. 54), Himmelhoch has also identified a small group of charioteers in the *Iliad* (Asios and Patroclus), whose exulting in their horses and chariot or in war, connote a character lacking in restraint and wisdom. Turnus' taking of the gold-wrought baldric (*multo caelaverat auro,* 499) also implies an appetite for gold comparable to Camilla's (*femineo praedae et spoliorum ardebat amore,* 11.782; Thornton, 1976, 131), which in both cases will lead to their death.[564] In sum, Turnus in this scene evokes the negative qualities of Achilles and his son, in his brutality, and of Hector, in his foolhardiness and lack of restraint in the context of a distinctive Vergilian emphasis on *pietas*. But while Turnus' encounter with Pallas obviously manifests aspects of the Homeric warrior, political connotations are likewise present. The two references to Turnus' chariot early in the scene surround characterizations of his opening words to Pallas as arrogant and tyrannical. Both these words and the chariot, I will argue, imply a tyrannical potential in Turnus, which his behavior in the scene supports.

Turnus reenters the narrative following the revelation that although Lausus and Pallas seem to be a perfect match for each other, Jupiter will not allow them to meet, since each is fated to fight a more formidable foe (*mox illos sua fata manent maiore sub hoste*). Despite the fact that in the *Iliad* a charioteer typically drives the warrior to his encounters on the battlefield (both of whom nevertheless are referred to as a ἡνίοχος, "the holder of the reins"; Himmelhoch, 1997, 30), no charioteer is mentioned with Turnus here or in any scene in the *Aeneid* until the last sequence in book 12 which gives the impression that Turnus is his own charioteer,[565] the chariot his particular emblem of power. Turnus is advised by his sister to come to Lausus' support (439-56):[566]

---

[564] As Harrison (1991), 501-5, notes, it is not the taking of the arms per se that is offensive, but the wearing (not specifically noted here by Vergil, but obvious in the final scene). Both Hector (in Zeus' speech *Il*. 17. 201-6) and Turnus (501-5) are blamed for "ostentatiously putting on the spoils, a token of fatal over-confidence," not for the act of taking alone. On spoils in general see Heinze, 165-66.

[565] The warrior/charioteer also has precedent in the *Iliad*, (Himmelhoch, 1997, 33). Note that there is no doubt that Turnus is his own charioteer in book 12 when he joins the reignited war (*emicat in currum et manibus molitur habenas*, 12. 327).

[566] Since Juturna is formally introduced in book 12 (138-41), the reference to her here (without name or introduction) is unexpected. I agree with Harrison (1991), 439, who finds "much to be said" for the view that her appearance here is "a revision added after the passage in book 12."

Interea soror alma monet succedere Lauso
Turnum, qui volucri curru medium secat agmen.
ut vidit socios: 'tempus desistere pugnae;
solus ego in Pallanta feror, soli mihi Pallas
debetur; cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset.'
haec ait, et socii cesserunt aequore iusso.
at Rutulum abscessu iuvenis tum iussa superba
miratus stupet in Turno corpusque per ingens
lumina voluit obitque truci procul omnia visu,
talibus et dictis it contra dicta tyranni:
'aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis
aut leto insigni: sorti pater aequus utrique est.
olle minas.' fatus medium procedit in aequor;
frigidus Arcadibus coit in praecordia sanguis.
desiluit Turnus biiugis, pedes apparat ire
comminus; utque leo, specula cum vidit ab alta
stare procul campis meditantem in proelia taurum,
advolat, haud alia est Turni venientis imago.

Meanwhile his kindly sister advised Turnus to advance on
Lausus and he cut through the midst of the battle line
in his swift chariot. When he saw his allies, he said:
"It's time to cease the fight; I alone go against Pallas;
Pallas is owed to me alone; I wish his father were
present to see the sight." He spoke and his forces
left the field at his command. But at the withdrawal
of the Rutulians, the youth, wondering at his arrogant
orders, was amazed by Turnus and he his gaze over his
huge frame and encompassed everything from a distance
with a fierce gaze and with such words countered those
of the tyrant: "Either I will be praised now for capturing
supreme spoils or for a distinguished death; my father is
prepared for either outcome. Take away your threats."
After he spoke he proceeded into the middle of the field.
The Arcadians' blood froze cold in their hearts. Turnus
leapt down from his two-horse chariot, preparing to go
on foot to meet him; and as a lion, when it has seen from a high lookout
a bull in the distance standing in the fields planning to fight,
flies down upon it, this was just the look of Turnus coming on.

What opens this presentation of Turnus to a political reading is his description as a tyrant (448), although his other qualities in this scene are far from inconsistent with the tyrannical behavior, as characterized in Cicero and Plato. But before discussing the word's meaning in this particular context, the generally accepted view of its meaning in the *Aeneid* deserves review and, in my opinion, revision.

Several complicating factors attend any discussion of the term *tyrannus*: variation in meaning attends most of the history of its ancient use;[567] there is no accepted canon of the characteristics for what constitutes a negative tyrant;[568] and, finally, many of the physical identifying characteristics of the negative tyrant are also used to describe highly effective warriors.[569] Nevertheless, there are a cluster of recurring characteristics of the tyrant in the writings of Cicero and Livy that can serve as a basis of comparison in studying Vergil's use of the term, namely *superbia, saevitia, vis* and *libido*. Although impiety, one of the three characteristics Seaford identifies in the Greek tragic tyrant, does not figure prominently in Livy or Cicero, it is of central importance for Vergil.

The meaning of the word *tyrannus* in its seven occurrences in the *Aeneid* has generally been characterized as varied, from the full-blown negative oppressive ruler to an essential equivalent to the word *rex*. Pygmalion, (Dido's brother 1. 361), and Mezentius (8. 483) clearly qualify as tyrants (cruel,

---

[567] Evidence of both negative and neutral connotations in the term τύραννος, the origin of which is debated, can be found from the beginning of its use in Greek. The term was narrowly applied to any sole ruler who came to power outside of the accepted means, but a stereotype of an absolute, cruel and violent eastern potentate also occurred in literature. Dewald (2003) discusses both the uncertainty of the term's origins, its early uses in Greek and especially the varied implications with which Herodotus uses τύραννος. Helegouarc'h's (1972), 561-62, opinion that because the use of the term in Cicero is not specifically linked to a desire for power it is merely a term of invective, seems to ignore the close association of a cluster of moral defects of character with the term through much of its history and that the typical problem has been seen to be an uncontrollable lust, the objects of which do not seem to vary with particular significance. That being said, the use of *tyrannus* by others against Cicero (Helegouarc'h's, 1972, 565, n. 19) does argue that it served as invective.

[568] Seaford (2003), 96, identifies the chief characteristics of the "stage tyrant" in the fifth-century tragedians as impiety, distrust of close associates and greed. Dunkle (1971), 12-14, has argued that the theme of the tyrant in first century Latin rhetoric arrived in Rome via Latin tragedy, influenced by Greek, and in its early manifestations in rhetorical literature the tyrant was characterized by *superbia, crudelitas*, *vis*, and *libido* (Cicero, *Inv. Rhet*. 1. 22, 102, 2. 144; *Rhet. Her.* 1. 8, 2. 49; Dunkle, 1967, 151-71). In the last few years of Cicero's life *crudelitas* is replaced by *saevitia* and while both can be translated as cruelty "*saevitia* includes connotations of hysteria and maniacal sadism" and refers properly to wild animals and only metaphorically to men. But Cicero expands this list of characteristics considerably (see Stevenson, below n. 589). Dunkle also catalogues the same traits of the tyrant (*superbia, saevitia, vis,* and *libido*) in Livy's descriptions of Tarquinius Superbus, Sextus Tarquinius, Appius Claudius, L. Papirius Cursor, Q. Pleminius and Hannibal (see Dunkle, 1971, 16-17 for Livy citations). Dunkle, 1971, 19, points out that "in reference to the despot *libido* can mean either lust for unchecked sexual fulfillment and political power or political caprice, i. e. government by whim of one man."

[569] A most striking comparison is that of the description of the tyrant's face in *Rhet. Her.* 4.68 (labelled by Dunkle, 19, "the standard rhetorical picture of the tyrant's face:" [Scipio Nasica] *sudans, oculis ardentibus...spumans ex ore scelus*) and in *Ver.* 2. 5. 161 (*Ipse inflammatus scelere et furore in forum venit; ardebant oculi, toto ex ore crudelitas eminebat*) with the description of what made the Samnites finally turn to flight after resisting the Roman army under Valerius Corvus all day: *oculos sibi Romanorum ardere visos aiebant vesanosque voltus et furentia ora; inde plus quam ex alia ulla re terroris ortum,* (Liv. 7. 33).

arrogant, lustful [or avaricious], irreligious [*impius*]).[570] However, when the Nomad chieftains assailing Dido for her hand (4. 320), Latinus (7. 266) or Aeneas (7. 342, 12. 75) are called *tyrannus,* the meaning is thought to be interchangeable with *rex*.[571] While there are undoubtedly times in literature when *tyrannus* seems not to be negative (eg., Archilochus, fr. 22. 3; Neptune in *Met.* 1. 276),[572] far more often it is, despite the extreme characters at times categorized simply as monarchs.[573] The African chieftains Dido characterizes as *tyranni* may be assumed to be the equivalent of kings simply because they are not otherwise characterized (Harrison, 1991, 448="king"), but they were earlier described by Dido's sister as *infreni*, "unbridled" (4. 41) and *furentes,* "raving" (43), the former a concept we have seen associated with Ciceronian scoundrels, suggesting they are comparable to bad charioteers (Ch. 2, pp. 53, 60-61) and among these, Marc Antony, in the orator's opinion, aspiring to tyrannical rule (Stevenson, 2008, 98-102). *Furere,* associated with many in the *Aeneid,* but notably the tyrant Pygmalion (*furor*, 348) and Mezentius (8. 489), clearly does not preclude a negative connotation in Dido's words, who had personally suffered at the hands of Pygmalion. The occurrences of *tyrannus* which have made it difficult to interpret the term with its more negative Ciceronian sense would seem to be especially those in book 7 referring to Latinus,

---

[570] M. Paterlini, *EV* 5: 341-42, *tyrannus*, sees in Mezentius the *topos* of the tyrant, since he incarnates the Platonic concept of the bestial nature of the tyrant. Evander's description of his behavior (8. 482-89)—he ruled with arrogant power and savage arms, used a form of torture (tying dead and living bodies together) attributed to Etruscan pirates (Aristotle, fr.106 Walzer; Cicero, *Hort*. fr.112, Grilli), and performed *facta...effera*—accords well with Cicero's characterization of the tyrant as a fierce and savage beast (*in figura hominis feritas et immanitas beluae*, *Off*. 3. 32; *...tyrannus, quo neque taetrius neque foedius nec dis hominibusque invisius animal ullum cogitari potest; qui quamquam figura est hominis, morum tamen immanitate vastissimmas vincit beluas, Rep*. 2. 48). For Pomathios (1987), 31, Mezentius is a Tarquin before his time. Pygmalion's cruelty, impiety, deception and lust for gold make him an easily recognizable Eastern tyrant (Pomathios,1987, 29), as represented in Aeschylus' *Persae* (see Ch. 2, pp. 54-55) and Herodotus (3. 80-82; 5. 92; see Dewald, 2003, 26-35). In discussing Cicero's characterization of Antony as a tyrant, Stevenson (2008), 100, nts. 16-18, lists (with references) the qualities Cicero uses to characterize Antony as a tyrant, *adrogans, barbarus, crudelis, impurus, avidus, impius, libidinosus, vitiosus;* he is also a man of*, ira, audacia, dementia, stultitia, furor, insania, amentia, immanitas, stupor* and *violentia.*

[571] Cairns (1989), 4, n. 6, also includes the references to Turnus (here, 10. 448) and to Aeneas by Turnus (*nuntius haec, Idmon, Phrygio mea dicta tyranno...refer,*12. 75-6) as examples with "hostile overtones;" Paterlini, *ibid*, agrees that *Phrygio* confirms a negative connotation since, it is suggestive of softness which motivates Turnus' contempt. Tarrant (2012), 75, characterizes *Phrygio* with *tyranno* as "a double-barrelled insult," and points out that for contemporary Romans "Phrygian" still connoted "effete decadence." Conington and Nettleship both at book 10. 447-8 and 12. 75, as at 7. 266, 342 see *tyrannus* as the equivalent of *rex*. Cairns, *ibid,* interprets the examples at 4. 320, 7. 266 and 342, as "more neutral."

[572] Dewald (2003), 40-47, discusses aspects of Herodotus' characterization of individual tyrants in which "tyranny seems to be used neutrally to signify *archē* (rule)," despite their more general negative depiction.

[573] *OLD* 1 a monarch, sovereign: Lamus, a cannibal (Hor. *C.* 3. 17. 9), Tereus, passionate, brutal rape artist (Ov. *Am.* 2. 6. 7), Juba, notorious for cruelty and arrogance (Lucan, 4. 691) and Hannibal (Sil. 4. 707).

largely deemed a "good" king (Cairns, Nelis), and to Aeneas, so called by Latinus, but in the next line referred to as *rex* (266-67):

> pars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tyranni.
> uos contra regi mea nunc mandata referte
>
> A part of the peace for me will be to have touched the tyrant's right hand.
> You, for your part, take my mandates to your king.

This juxtaposition of titles leads Horsfall (2000, 266) to conclude that *tyranni* is "without negative connotations," and so it would appear initially. But one of the most important aspects of Latinus' character in book 7 is the two-fold nature of his background, peaceful king and descendant of the bestializing Circe, whose actual destructive power he seems not to comprehend, as we saw in the fire-breathing horses and chariot he bestowed on Aeneas. Intertextually linked with Aeetes (Ch. 5, pp. 242-46), who is called "most imperious of kings" (*Arg.* 4. 1102) and a tyrant with similarities to the Great King of Persia (Mori, 2008, 174), Latinus takes up impious arms against Aeneas (12. 31). His own internal conflict as ruler, I argued, was expressed precisely in terms of successive helmsman and charioteer images at the climax of the storm sequence (Ch. 5, pp. 257-59). Rather, than expressing the equivalence of tyrant and king these two lines may express the instability of the nature of Latinus' rule and, perhaps, the uncertainty of the quality of Aeneas' future rule. This seems to be a reasonable possibility both because the nature of one-man rule is a central contemporary concern in the period between Julius Caesar's assassination and the emergence of the Augustan principate, and because in Cicero's political writing the tyrant develops from the king, not, as Plato argued, from the man of the people. Cicero finds monarchy the least stable form of government precisely because the corruption of one person can destroy the entire government,[574] a point he makes repeatedly in the account of his example of the tyrant, Tarquinius Superbus in book 2 of *De republica*, (*Rep.* 2. 47, 48). The exploration of a similar kind of instability seems of interest to Vergil. While Cicero expresses overtly the

[574] E*a autem forma civitatis (regnum) mutabilis maxime est hanc ob causam, quod unius vitio praecipitata in perniciosissimam partem facillime decidit* (*Rep.* 2. 43); cf. also 2. 47, 50, 51. At this point Cicero considers monarchy the best of the simple forms of government, but he later acknowledges that "the fortune of any people is...a fragile thing...when it depends on the will or the character of one man," since he can change.

vulnerability of monarchy to the rapid fall into tyranny because of the vices of one man, Vergil suggests this via the application of *tyrannus* to a broad selection of kings (although few in number) who are at various stages along the continuum toward tyranny or are, being human, capable of changing for the worse. *Tyrannus* in the *Aeneid* is not the equivalent of *rex*; it labels the despotic tyrant, but it also is a shadow that threatens any king.

Two aspects of Turnus' behavior in the scene of his duel with Pallas argue that the Rutulian is presented with the negative connotations of a tyrant.[575] The first is the impiety he shows in both his speech before and after having killed Pallas, in desiring Evander to be present (443) or implicitly enjoying his suffering (491-92). The second aspect is the particular cluster of qualities he exhibits after the death of Pallas, qualities which were also attributed to the tyrannical Tarquinius Superbus. As we have seen, impiety is a prime characteristic of Greek tragic tyrants and characterizes prominently both Pygmalion (*impius ante aras*, 1. 349) and Mezentius (*contemptor divum* (7. 648). Pygmalion is part of a small group in the *Aeneid* who kill before an altar: Orestes (3. 332) and Pyrrhus (2. 550), all three of whom are identified as committers of impious actions (*scelere*, 1. 247, 356; *scelerum*, 3. 331; *scelere,* 2. 535), a very strong term of moral criticism otherwise reserved in Vergil for the Greeks at Troy, and the damned in Tartarus (6. 560, 626), including Catiline (8. 668), and Cacus (8. 206).[576] Pyrrhus' allusive presence, as noted above, is especially strong in both of Turnus' speeches, which intensifies the ruthlessness and impiety of Turnus' words and actions in this scene. There is, of course, Homeric precedent within the confines of war for the most extreme abuse of a son before the parents' eyes (Achilles' killing of Hector and dragging his corpse behind his chariot), but in Vergil's epic in which the nature of leadership has

---

[575] Although Cairns (1989), 67, has argued that Turnus' name was derived from the Etruscan version of the Greek τύραννος, for which there is ancient etymological support, this is only one possible etymology and Cairns' argument has failed to convince O'Hara (1996), 185.

[576] The implications of *scelus* in the mouth of some characters must be qualified by their ethos and intentions Sinon, (2. 125, 164), the Trojans (2. 229), Juno (7. 307) and Turnus of Drances (11. 407). It seems significant that no living character in the present of the storyline, with the exception of Drances, is accused of committing *scelera* and that the occurrences of the word in the second half of the epic are far fewer (5 versus 14 in the first half) and none refer to any warrior, as though Vergil is protecting the moral ambiguity of his story. Cicero characterizes Tarquinius Superbus act of killing his father-in-law (cf. Pygmalion's killing of his brother-in-law), Tullus Servius, as *sceleris sui* (*Rep.* 2. 45). Also see above, n. 569, for the use of *scelus* in reference to Scipio and Verres.

been weighted with greater political significance from the beginning and is specifically activated in this passage with the use of *tyrannus,* Turnus' impiety, likewise, could have political ramifications, especially since in this scene he shares important qualities with Cicero's portrait of Tarquinius Superbus, namely his arrogance, exaltation in riches and inability to control himself, all aspects associated with tyrants.

In fact, the combination of both *iussa superba* (445) and *dicta tyranni* (448) to characterize Turnus' initial words ("It's time to cease the fight…I wish his father were present to see the sight" 441-43) could reasonably be assumed to have suggested the most infamous tyrant in Rome's history, Tarquinius Superbus.[577] That *superbia* is the overarching flaw in Turnus' actions in this scene is strongly suggested by the narrator's apostrophe of Turnus soon after, which links his arrogance with the slaughter. When Aeneas hears of Pallas death he goes after Turnus: *te, Turne, superbum caede nova quaerens* ("seeking you, Turnus, proud in your recent slaughter," 514-15).[578] The combination of arrogance, exultation in war conquests or riches and a lack of ability to control emotions are clustered in close proximity both in Turnus' behavior after killing Pallas and in part of Cicero's encapsulated description of Tarquinius Superbus (*Rep*. 2. 45):

> deinde victoriis divitiisque subnixus exultabat insolentia, neque suos mores regere poterat neque suorum libidines.
>
> Then relying on his victories and wealth he was running wild in arrogance and was unable to control either his own conduct or the lustful desires of his family.

Turnus exhibits the same character flaws—exultation in conquest and riches, arrogance and lack of moderation—after killing Pallas (496...502):

---

[577] Although Christenson (2002), 54, has made the argument that Vergil "offers no stable vantage point from which to determine who the true *superbi* of the epic are," I believe he undervalues the importance of the focalizer in the adjective's use by foes of Aeneas (Dido) and the Romans (Juno). However, his discussion of the inversion of *superbus* from Tarquinius to Brutus, the facilitator of Roman liberation, but the executioner of his sons (in the Underworld parade of heroes, 6. 817), suggesting that "patriotism and boundless competition for public acclaim...under some circumstances may become a monstrous thing," is cogent. This difficult juxtaposition of the conflicting demands of *pietas* is comparable to the moral dilemma presented at the end of the epic for Aeneas, immediately preceding which, Jupiter's orders to abandon Turnus to his fate, Juturna calls *iussa superba,* 12. 877. Lloyd (1972), 127, notes the very frequent association in the *Aeneid* of *superbus* with kings ("*rex* or a related word is to be found in immediate juxtaposition with it in at least 10 of 37 appearances"), and "with apparent strong reminiscence of the last of the Tarquins."

[578] Lloyd (1972), 131, notes the bracketing of this scene by the two occurrences of *superbus* and describes these as "such bold uses of the adjective as virtually epithetical of Turnus," arguing that because Anchises advises Aeneas to *debellare superbos* (6. 853), Aeneas is, therefore, only "fulfilling his mission," when he kills Turnus.

> ...rapiens immania pondera baltei
> ...
> quae Clonus Eurytides multo caelaverat auro;
> quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus.
> nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae
> et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!
>
> ...seizing the huge weight of the balteus
> ...which Clonus son of Eurytus had engraved in much gold;
> Now Turnus glories in this spoil and rejoices
> to have gotten possession of it. Mind of men ignorant of fate
> and of the future and of how to maintain a limit when
> raised up in favorable circumstances.

Vergil's scene does not lack important Iliadic precedent in Hector's donning of Achilles' armor stripped from the dead Patroclus, which "elicits a similar soliloquy from Zeus" (17. 201-6; Harrison, 1991, 505-5). But even according to epic decorum the simple taking of the armor, according to Zeus, was done "improperly" (οὐ κατὰ κόσμος, 17. 205), so that Turnus shows greater excess in glorying and rejoicing in his possession and receives greater censure in the narratorial caution against excess (*servare modum*, 502); Zeus primarily pities Hector: "Ah, poor wretch, not in your thoughts is death...,"17. 201). In addition, however, the inclusion of *tyrannus* to characterize Turnus earlier in this passage may have activated an awareness of similar tyrannical behavior patterns. An inability to maintain control of one's passions is a summarizing quality of the tyrant in Plato (*Rep.* 9. 572e), who is finally purged of all restraint (σωφροσύνης) by his frenzy (οἰστρᾷ) and madness (μανίας; see Ch. 2, pp. 57-58). Cicero sees loss of control (*intemperantiam*; *temperantia*, the Latin equivalent of σωφροσύνη) as the source of all emotions (*perturbationum*),[579] "which is a rebellion (*defectio*) in the mind as a whole against right reason" (*Tus*. 4. 22), and in the *Republic* he implicitly contrasts the ideal statesman who guides the state (*rector*, 2. 51) with Tarquinius Superbus, who is unable to control (*regere*, 2. 45) his own conduct. The perception of these political connotations, I believe, would have been further encouraged by the prominent references to Turnus' chariot, which bracket both his initial arrogant speech and its characterization as tyrannical, although this is not to deny the chariot's primary function as a vehicle of war.

---

[579] *Temperantia*=self-control, moderation, restraint (*OLD* 1) is the noun form of the adjective *temperans*, which according to Cicero, *Tusc*. 3. 16, *Graeci σώφρονα appellant*; *σώφρονα* is the adjective form (temperate) of σωφροσύνη=self-control, temperance, moderation, Lat. temperantia (*LSJ*).

The first and most overt association of Turnus' chariot (*volucri curru*, 440) is with that of Mars,[580] the only other chariot described with this adjective in the epic (although here it properly modifies *rotas*), referred to in the description of the various Cyclopes in Vulcan's workshop (8. 433-34):

> parte alia Marti currumque rotasque volucris
> instabant, quibus ille viros, quibus excitat urbes;
>
> In another part they were devoting themselves to (the production of)
> the chariot and swift wheels of Mars, with which he rouses men and cities.

Secondarily, the chariot, after Turnus' heartless words recalling the actions of Pyrrhus, could bring to mind Achilles' chariot, ubiquitous in the ecphrasis on Juno's temple (*curru*, 1. 468, 476, *currum*, 86) and evoked again in the description of the Hector's dream appearance to Aeneas (*uisus adesse mihi... raptatus bigis ut quondam*, 2. 271-72; cf. *desiluit Turnus biiugis,* 453). Both of these references (Mars and Achilles) accord well with Turnus' fierceness in this scene. Moreover, a Roman audience for whom high public office and army leadership were actively joined throughout the city's history would also be sensitive to the political implications of the chariot in this scene with its suggestive political diction.

The achievement of proconsular rank for a Roman politician regularly included the privilege of leading an army, governing a province and often extorting wealth from that province.[581] Having the opportunity to win the coveted achievement of a triumph in war was a privilege of high office, as was driving a chariot, and a triumph was always accompanied by the potential for abuse due to the ceremony's royal and divine connotations (see Ch. 2). The use of military accomplishments and its rewards as a means of gaining individual political power to rule in the first century culminated in the sole rule of Julius Caesar, whose royal and even divine aspirations may have been reflected in the lavishness of his triumphs. Perhaps the most relevant example of the chariot as an instrument of war in combination with autocratic office are the chariots of king Tullus Hostilis on the shield of Aeneas, which are brutally executing a betrayer of Rome during the course of its war with Fidenae and Veii (See above, Ch. 5, pp. 297-301).

---

[580] Turnus' chariot is also compared to that of Mars in a simile (12. 331-36), as he joins the renewed battle after Aeneas is wounded. See Ch. 8, pp. 409-11.

[581] Verres, the most infamous example of that practice, Cicero also accused of being a tyrant. *Ver.* 2. 1. 82; 2. 3. 71, 77; 2. 5. 103 and see Dunkle (1967), 160-62, on Cicero's portrait of Verres as a tyrant. On the use of the term *tyrannus* in Roman rhetorical invective, see Dunkle (1967) and (1971), as well as Stevenson (2008).

Intratextual allusions to both Achilles and Turnus as brutal warring charioteers suggest that Tullus' use of the chariot could be characterized as brutally uncivilized, even under the circumstances of war, but the chariot also served as the literal seat of a king's office, as is reflected in the later name of the magistrates' chair, *sella curulis* (see Ch. 5, pp. 299-300), and the association of Tullus' political power would also be inherent in his executing chariot. Given Turnus' words and behavior in this episode of Pallas' death, the double reference to his location in the chariot, (his first but by no means his last appearance there), contribute to the impression that the young prince, if he became king would in all likelihood become a tyrant.

Thus, in the first scene to present Turnus in a chariot (10. 439-509) Vergil has also interwoven political connotations of the stereotypical tyrant from various traditions with those of the Achillean warrior in a major characterization of Turnus as leader, although the vehicle functions as the classic war chariot, carrying the warrior to the scene of engagement where he dismounts. The predominant inter- and intratextual references are definitely those of the warrior—Pyrrhus earlier in book 2 and Achilles in both the *Aeneid* and *Iliad*, but the use of the combination of *iussa superba* and *dicta tyranni*, referring to the same words of Turnus, which are surrounded by references to his chariot, strongly suggest a tyrannical potential in Turnus. I have argued that the term *tyrannus* always has negative connotations in the *Aeneid,* since it is used to describe the epic's overt despotic tyrants, Pygmalion, Mezentius and the barbarian chieftans, or to describe Latinus, whose instability as a good king and lack of awareness of his Circean heritage, suggest the primary failing that Cicero identified in monarchy, its vulnerability to the weakness of the individual ruler. Latinus has no understanding of the negativity inherent in his Circean affiliations and so imputes none to Aeneas in calling him *tyrannus*, whereas, Turnus' use of this label for Aeneas clearly does.

Aeneas *Victor* and the Latin Charioteers

If the chariot contributes to Turnus' tyrannical portrait in the scene of Pallas' death, the rage inspired by the news of Pallas' death in the subsequent series of victorious encounters of Aeneas with Latin charioteers produces such frenzied cruelty in Aeneas (510-605) that the distinction between the

natures of the two leaders developed thus far around the political symbols of helmsman and charioteer is seriously undermined. Words of fire and frenzy, previously associated with Juno, Allecto, Circe and Turnus, in this section describe Aeneas (*ardens,* 514; *ardenti*, 552; *arsisse*, 567; *furit,* 545; *furens,* 604; *desaevit*, 569; *frementem*, 572).[582] How closely aligned he is at this point with negative forces is expressed clearly in the simile which likens him to the hundred-handed giant Aegaeon (Biraeus), in this version the fire-breathing adversary of Jupiter (565-68).[583] Agamemnon's series of encounters with ephebic charioteer pairs in the *Iliad*, in which his brutality is a salient feature, is the basis of Vergil's intertextual dialogue with Homer in Aeneas' successive encounters with the *quadrigae*-driving Niphaeus and the chariot pair of the brothers Lucagus and Liger. Vergil utilizes the Homeric intertext to associate Aeneas with the ferocity of Agamemnon and Achilles and the charioteers with the youthful inexperienced warriors who, like Troilus, are no match for the mature warrior. But in this section Vergil also presents the same conflicting demands of *pietas*, the sparing of the suppliant versus the justice demanded by an alliance of trust, which are at the heart of the epic's final scene, in which Aeneas again faces a similarly weakened charioteer in Turnus. The many parallels between the presentation of Aeneas in this passage and in the last lines of the epic—the theme of sacrifice for atonement expressed in forms of the verb *immolare,*[584] the entreaty for mercy requested on the basis of *pietas,*[585] Aeneas' association with a black

---

[582] Rage and fire also characterize Aeneas at the epic's end: *furiis acccensus et ira terribilis,* 12. 946-7; *fervidus*, 951) and, as discussed above (pp. 316-18), are anticipated in the Achillean fire around Aeneas as he approaches the war. On the similarity between Aeneas' rage here and at the end of the epic see Putnam (1995), 173-4, 193; and Tarrant (2012), 21, 23, and on his anger in general also see Galinsky (1988), Wright (1997), Fowler (1997a), 30-34, and Gill (2004), 118-21. Almost all commentary on the end of the *Aeneid* makes or implies a judgment on the morality of Aeneas' rage driven killing of Turnus.

[583] Harrison (1991), 565-70, notes that Aegaeon is "twice mentioned in early epic as the helper of the gods (*Il.* 1. 401-6, Hes. *Th*. 617ff)," but that Vergil here seems to follow the version of the Cyclic *Titanomachy.*

[584] Aeneas takes 8 young men to sacrifice (*immolet*) as funeral offerings to shades of Pallas (519-20) and a few lines later (541) his killing of Haemonides is also characterized as a sacrifice (*immolat*), which foreshadows Aeneas words to Turnus before he kills him, that Pallas sacrifices him (*Pallas te...Pallas/ immolat* , 12. 948-49) and exacts the penalty from his wicked blood. Williams (1972-3), 510f, compares the two passages more generally: "We are prepared for his later outburst in 12. 441f. and for his final refusal to show mercy to his defeated adversary (12. 930f)." Harrison (1991), 510-605: "This anger is necessary for Aeneas' victory and crucial to the last scene of the poem; like his other failings, it makes Aeneas a credible character."

[585] Harrison (1991), 521-36, notes that while "the killing of suppliants is regular in the *Iliad*...[it] has not yet appeared in the fighting of the *Aeneid*: in his rage of 510-605 Aeneas dispatches no fewer than three (Magus, 535-36; Tarquitus, 554-55; Liger, 597-98), anticipating his killing of the suppliant Turnus at the end of the poem, and disturbing the reader in departing from the Roman ideal of *parcere subiectis*" (6. 853). Both Magus (*per patrios*

whirlwind (*turbinis atri*, 10. 603; *atri turbinis,* 12. 923) and his wrathful exacting of vengeance—suggest that these encounters with charioteers at the passage's climax, in their foreshadowing of the end and in the strategic outcome of the passage, may have relevance for the reading of the epic's conclusion.

While the broad similarities between Agamemnon in *Il.* 11. 91-279 (the overarching intertext) and Aeneas in book 10. 510-605 provide yet another means of enhancing Aeneas' degree of heroic prowess and brutality,[586] the incorporation of vivid allusions to Achilles and Patroclus helps to emphasize the more personal motivation of Aeneas' wrath and to facilitate the distancing of Aeneas from the bestiality of Agamemnon's encounters with charioteers. Agamemnon, like Aeneas on foot (11. 12; 10. 572), is merely the first among the Achaeans to break through the battle line on the second day of fighting (11. 92),[587] nevertheless, his brutality equals that of Aeneas, whose emotional anguish at the news of Pallas' death is clearly displayed before he begins his vengeful *aristeia* (515-17). An examination of aspects of Agamemnon's confrontations with three pairs of young fighters in chariots in the *Iliad* will help to clarify the distinctive use Vergil makes of this Homeric intertext especially evident in his divergent similes.

Because the first three pairs of fighters Agamemnon encounters on the second day of battle are charioteers, they serve as an important unifying element to his day of fighting that facilitates a greater awareness of a thematic unity of the series, that of the loss of Troy's youth. Numerous techniques intensify the pathos: the crescendo in length and savagery of the separate encounters,[588] that two pairs are brothers (Hainsworth, 1985, 91-147), the intermittent focus on exposed vulnerable areas of flesh and

---

manis et spes surgentis Iuli/ te precor, 524-5) and Liger (*per te, per qui te talem genuere parentes,* 597) make appeal to Aeneas based on his sense of duty toward family, as will Turnus (*oro* [*fuit et tibi talis/ Anchises genitor*] *Dauni miserere senectae...*, 12. 933-34). Shortly before he dispatches Liger in book 10 the narrator describes Aeneas as *pius* (591), which is true in the sense of his obligation to Evander, but, as Harrison, 590-1, notes, "in a context where he rejects appeals to the *pietas* of family feeling (524 ff., 597 ff.) suggests that one form of *pietas* may conflict with another."

[586] Just as Aeneas' *aristeia* after Pallas' death includes an initial phase of encounters with non-charioteer adversaries (515-570), Agamemnon's concludes without charioteers (218-279), and in both cases these sections are at times relevant to the charioteer discussion (91-147 in the *Iliad* and 570-601 in the *Aeneid*).

[587] Hainsworth (1985), 146, points out that "Agamemnon's present cause of anger is rather remote."

[588] Hainsworth (1985), 91-147: "the three episodes form a crescendo marked by increasing length (9½, 21, and 27 verses respectively) and savagery."

youths' general powerlessness before the brutal onslaught of Agamemnon,[589] who distinguishes himself as one among few warriors by killing while on foot both Isos and Antiphos ensconced in a chariot (11. 101-21).[590] Undoubtedly, the intertextual suitability of Agamemnon's *aristeia* for those of Aeneas lies in the combination of a raging mature warrior as brutal slayer of youthful inexperienced charioteers, but the means by which each poet characterizes the mature warrior's brutality differ importantly. While the description of the actual killing completed by the two warriors is comparable,[591] the savagery of Agamemnon is conveyed largely through similes of great immediacy, whereas that of Aeneas is most evident in fiery descriptors, in his more numerous, though brief, speeches,[592] and in similes with subjects of awesome size and power. Agamemnon in his killing of Isus and Antiphus, sons of Priam, is likened to a lion in a simile that conveys the tragic theme of Agamemnon's actions with considerable pathos (11. 113-21):

> And as a lion easily crushes the little ones of a swift hind, when he has seized them with his mighty teeth, and has come to their lair, and takes from them their tender life; and the mother, though she happens to be very near, cannot protect them, for on herself too comes dread trembling, and swiftly she darts through the thick brush and the wood; sweating in her haste before the mighty beast's attack; so was no one of the Trojans able to protect these two from destruction.

---

589 "These [Bienor and Oileus] then did Agamemnon, king of men, leave there, gleaming with their naked breasts, when he had stripped off their tunics…," 11. 99-100; "[he] struck Isus on the breast above the nipple with a cast of his spear…," (108). Himmelhoch (1997), 88, characterizes the boys in this series as "not only young but... eroticized, blooming adolescents, and their sexuality is made more explicit at the moment of their deaths."

590 Hainsworth (1985), 101-21, characterizes this feat as "unusual" and achieved otherwise only by Achilles (20. 484) and Diomedes (5. 159-60).

591 The most violent of Agamemnon's acts, a warrior who has been called "the most wantonly violent in battle of all the Achaeans," is his treatment of Hippolochus, in the third pair, whose arms and head he cuts off before he sending him rolling, like a round stone, amid the throng (11. 146-47). Hainsworth (1985), 146, points out that "here Hippolokhos receives the sort of treatment reserved for treacherous slaves in the *Odyssey* (22. 475-7). Heads are cut off in the *Iliad*...[again by Agamemnon at 11. 261, one of the fourth pair], but not arms." Aeneas' extreme acts precede his encounters with charioteers: suggestive of Pyrrhus' murder of Priam (2. 552-3), Aeneas bends back Magus' neck and plunges his sword in up to the hilt (10. 535-36) and, analogous to Agamemnon's treatment of Hippolochus (Harrison, 1991, 555-6), Aeneas violently decapitates Tarquitus and sends his warm trunk rolling (554-55). Neither of Aeneas' killing of charioteers are as savage.

592 In the course of the whole *aristeia* Aeneas addresses four warriors prior to dispatching them: Magus (531-34), Tarquitus (557-60), Lucagus (592-4) and Liger (599-600). The final two are addressed to charioteers and are discussed below (pp. 347-48). That to Tarquitus, Putnam (1995), 193, characterizes as "the epic's most jarring curse," and is Aeneas at his most Achillean (*Il.* 21. 122-5; 22. 352-4; Harrison, 557-60): "Lie there now, awesome one. Your lady mother will not bury you in the ground and load your body with a paternal grave. You will be left to the wild birds or the waves will carry you off, submerged in a whirlpool and the hungry fish will lick your wounds."

The vulnerability of the little deer is emphasized by the ease with which the lion kills them (ῥηϊδίως, 114), his mightiness (κρατεροῖσιν, 114; κραταιοῦ, 119), the redundancy of their small size (νήπια τέκνα, 113), and their tenderness (ἁπαλόν, 115), but the simile directs more attention to the hind, the analogue of the Trojans, in the elaboration of her inability to save her young and fear for her own life. That Isus and Antiphus are sons of Priam encourages the perception of them as representative of Troy's youth,[593] as does the repetition of the chariot ensemble among Agamemnon's victims and his repeated likening to a lion in an alternating pattern of brief and elaborately developed similes; the third relates to his effect on all the Trojan and is the most graphically grisly (11. 113-21, 129, 172-76, 239).[594] Agamemnon's killings of young Trojan charioteers foreshadow the tragedy of Troy's fate by juxtaposing the extreme violence of the accomplished warrior-predator with their vulnerable youth, presented in the weakness of their analogues in the simile, the occasional focus on their bare flesh and their powerlessness which is closely associated with the chariot.

By contrast, in the *Aeneid* the two similes which frame Aeneas' encounters with charioteers avoid the bloody details of animal attack for imagery on a grander universal scale that facilitates both a political reading of the chariot as well as one that prepares for the productive strategic effect of Aeneas' *aristeia*.[595] The similes that surround the chariot encounters of Aeneas do not initially seem to be particularly related

---

[593] Himmelhoch (1997), 81: "There may be a textual strategy devoted to attributing most of the wanton destruction of Trojan youngsters *qua* future generations to Agamemnon in particular and, in many incidents, the chariot ensemble is employed to emphasize the weakness and youth of his opponents."

[594] The third simile in the series (172-76), like that of the hind and her offspring, is more elaborate, but broader in its sweep initially ("But some were still being driven in rout over the middle of the plain like cattle that a lion has driven in rout …"), but as the lion picks out a single victim ("all he has routed, but to one appears sheer destruction"), the scope of the simile narrows to focus on the lion's feasting upon its prey ("her neck he seizes first in his mighty teeth and breaks it, and then devours the blood and all the inward parts"). The actual description of Agamemnon's killing in the narrative is generalized (so did lord Agamemnon, son of Atreus, follow hard on the Trojans, ever slaying the hindmost, and they were driven in rout," 177-78); here only the simile suggests the violent brutality of his actions.

[595] It is not only in this sequence of encounters that Vergil refrains from comparing Aeneas to a lion, but throughout the *Aeneid*, in contrast to Homer's use of the lion in similes for warriors on both sides (See the chart of lion and boar similes in the *Iliad* in Scott, 2009, 193-96). Of the five instances in which a warrior is likened to a lion three are applied to Turnus (9. 792-6, 10. 454-6, 12. 4-8), concerning which both Gale (1997, 182 and 194), and Hardie (1994, 792-6) comment on the aptness of this symbol for Turnus because of the lion's traditionally violent anger as expressed in Lucretius (also see above, Ch. 5, n. 447). Mezentius (10. 723-28) and Euryalus (9. 339-41) are also compared to lions. It should be acknowledged, however, that in characterizing Aeneas as "raging" (*desaevit*, 569), Vergil employs a compound of the word (*saevire*) especially associated with Circe and her beasts in book 7, as well as with Juno, Allecto and Turnus (See Ch. 5, pp. 227, 251).

to the chariot ensembles. In the first, Aeneas, after he has killed a series of warriors (561-64), is likened to the gigantic hundred-handed monster, Aegaeon (also known as Briareus), here the foe of Jupiter (565-68), and in the concluding brief pair of similes he is likened to a torrential river and a black whirlwind (603). On a basic level the three charioteers are thematically joined via their common ejection from the chariot by Aeneas (*effununtque ducem,* 574; *excussus curru,* 590; *curru delapsus eodem,* 596). But the near embedding of the episode of the charioteer Niphaeus (570-74) within the Aegaeon simile (565-70) facilitates the recognition of an allusion to the *Georgics* (1. 505-14) that will illuminate the connections between the Aegaeon simile and the charioteer encounters and lead to the conclusion that the implications of the charioteers' ejection from the chariot are also political and related to the release of the Trojans in the camp, both places of security analogous to an enclosed town. The charioteers are represented as worthy of defeat in ways that recall Turnus—Niphaeus via his presentation as Hippolytus and Liger and Lucagus because of their arrogant boasts—at the same time, the allusion to the *Georgics* intensifies the significance of Aeneas' comparison to Aegaeon into an indirect likening to Mars. His final comparison to a black whirlwind places him within the charioteers' imagery in the *Aeneid* (and in *Septem*)—the Latin side in book 7 was persistently associated with the storm of war. Just as Aeneas in this *aristea* has transgressed into the diction associated with Turnus, the storm represents an intrusion into imagery associated with Turnus and the charioteer side in the war. But the broader allusion in the combined Aegaeon simile and Niphaeus episode to the end of *Georgics* 1, first establishes a political background to the epic events of war.

After Aeneas has killed Antaeus, Luca Numa and Camers he is likened to Aegaeon, but then immediately he advances against the charioteer Niphaeus, whose horses he terrifies into throwing their charioteer out, providing Aeneas an effortless victory (10. 565-74):

> Aegaeon qualis, centum cui bracchia dicunt
> centenasque manus, quinquaginta oribus ignem
> pectoribusque arsisse, Iouis cum fulmina contra
> tot paribus streperet clipeis, tot stringeret ensis:
> *sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor*
> ut semel intepuit mucro. quin ecce Niphaei
> quadriiugis in equos adversaque pectora tendit.

> atque illi longe gradientem et dira frementem
> ut videre, metu versi retroque ruentes
> effunduntque ducem rapiuntque ad litora currus.
>
> Such was Aegaeon, who they say had one hundred arms and
> one hundred hands, and blazed forth fire from his fifty mouths
> and breasts, when he clashed so many similar shields and
> drew so many swords against the thunderbolts of Jupiter,
> *so Aeneas raged victoriously on the whole field*, once his
> sword became warm. Look, he makes his way toward
> Nipheus's four-horse team and their breasts confronting him.
> And when they saw him, taking great strides and roaring frightfully,
> they turned away in fear and rushing back they threw out their
> charioteer and dragged the chariot toward the shore.

The three-part division of this passage—description of Aegaeon (565-68), Aeneas raging (569-70) and his immediate intimidating encounter with the charioteer Niphaeus (570-74)—recalls the similar progression of events at the end of book 1 of the *Georgics*. The similarity of the final two parts is readily apparent: as in the *Aeneid* a figure (here Mars) rages across an extent of space, but in a single line in the center of the passage. The scene of a charioteer unable to control his *quadrigae* follows immediately. The difference in presentation, image versus narrative, of the first part, the simile of Aegaeon and the circumstances of war in the *Georgics*, makes the comparability here less apparent initially, but a defense follows immediately (505-514; also see above Ch. 2, pp. 69-72):

> quippe ubi fas uersum atque nefas: tot bella per orbem,
> tam multae scelerum facies, non ullus aratro
> dignus honos, squalent abductis arva colonis,
> et curvae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.
> hinc movet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum;
> vicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes
> arma ferunt; saevit toto Mars impius orbe,
> ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae,
> addunt in spatia, et frustra retinacula tendens
> fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas.
>
> For right and wrong change places; everywhere
> So many wars, so many shapes of crime
> Confront us; no due honor attends the plough,
> The fields, bereft of tillers, are all unkempt,
> And in the forge the curving pruning-hook
> Is made a straight hard sword. Euphrates here,
> There Germany is in arms, and neighbour cities
> Break covenant and fight; through the world
> Impious War is raging. As on a racecourse,

> The barriers down, out pour the chariots,
> Gathering speed from lap to lap, and a driver
> Tugging in vain at the reins is swept along
> By his horses and heedless uncontrollable car.

Aegaeon (565-70) in his many shields and swords, fire-breathing mouths and the impiety of his cause reflects figuratively the circumstances of war and its effect that concern Vergil at the end of *Georgics* 1, 505-11, which are expressed in the language of extent and number.[596] The vast quantity of shields and swords the monster wields and his fifty fire-breathing orifices give the impression that Aegaeon, like the Chimaera on Turnus' helmet, is an image of war itself.[597] Thus, Aeneas via this allusion is indirectly compared to Mars in three ways: he is like Mars in his comparison to Aegaeon, an alternative figure of war, he rages like Mars (*sic toto Aeneas desaeuit in aequore uictor* 10. 569; cf. *saeuit toto Mars impius orbe,* 1. 511) and he overturns a *quadrigae* driver, as Mars is threatening to do.[598] In this *aristeia* in which Aeneas' fury is expressed in terms usually associated with Turnus, the closeness of the allusion to the *Georgics*' Mars is appropriate for Aeneas and in yet another way lessens the distinction between Aeneas and Turnus, who is the only hero in the *Aeneid* directly compared to Mars (see Ch. 8, pp. 409-11). But the overtly political context of the end of *Georgics* 1, I believe, is also relevant to the *Aeneid*'s charioteer, Niphaeus.

In the *Georgics*, immediately before Vergil describes the circumstances of war in the world he asks that the gods not prevent this youthful prince (Octavian) from saving a world in ruin (*hunc saltem everso*

---

[596] In the *Georgics* (505-11) Vergil describes the circumstances which prompt him to ask the gods to allow the youth (Ocatvian) to help his disturbed age (500-01), which, in addition to the countryside bereft of farmers, concern the ubiquity of war (*tot bella per orbem*, *hinc movet Euphrates...bellum, toto orbe*) and evil (*nefas, scelerum, ruptis...legibus, impius*). Weapons are likewise a concern, as the plowshares are forged into swords and neighboring cities bear arms against each other (508, 510-11), but the anaphora of number and extent (*tot, tam , toto*), the repetition of *orbis* at lines' end (*orbem,* 505; *orbe*, 511) and the many words related to wickedness show the dominance of these factors in Vergil's characterization of his age (*everso...saeclo*, 500). The monster Aegaeon, likewise connives with evil, since he fights against the thunderbolts of Jupiter, but in this image it is the extent of weaponry, the tools of war, that dominates in the repetition of *centum, centenas* and *tot...tot*, echoed in the next line by *toto.*

[597] Like Aegaeon who "blazes forth fire from his fifty mouths" (*quinquaginta oribus ignem/...arsisse*, 566-67), the Chimaera, blows out fire from her jaws (*efflantem faucibus ignis,* 7. 786) and each description of fire is closely followed by an anaphoric expression of the extent of their power (*tot paribus streperet clipeis, tot stringeret ensis*, 568; *tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera flammis/ quam magis effuso crudescunt sanguine pugnae,* 7.787-88).

[598] Putnam (2011), 40-41, also has linked Aeneas in this passage to Mars, but via the ancient etymology (Paulus Festus) of *Gravidus* (an epithet of Mars, cf. 10. 542) from *gradientem* (Aeneas as he approaches Niphaeus' horses, 572): *Gravidus Mars appellatus a grandiendo in bella ultro citroque.*

iuvenem succurrere saeclo/ ne prohibete, 1. 500-01), bringing contemporary politics into the foreground of the conclusion. The circumstances of the charioteer, or rather, the apparently imminent circumstances of a wreck, reflect the description of the age as "overturned" (*everso*, 500) and help to imply Octavian as, at least, the hoped for replacement of the powerless charioteer of the simile or the poet's pupil ("Octavian is as much the poet's pupil as his topic, and the political didactic of the poem is in full force" Nappa, 2005, 64). Even in the charioteer's Aeschylian intertext,[599] in which the dominating force is within Orestes' mind, his madness is expressed in terms of his mind's ungovernability (δύσαρκτοι, 1024), an apparent coinage of Aeschylus' (Garvie, 1986, 1023-24).[600] The figurative runaway horses, like an invading arming, carry him off "conquered" (φέρουσι γὰρ νικώμενον/ φρένες δύσαρκτοι, 1023-24), also a politically suggestive word. The *Georgic*'s charioteer, implicitly a powerless leader, is similarly carried off by horses, here representing war, and is racing toward disaster (*fertur equis auriga*, 514), a chariot wreck, the destruction of the state. *Currus*, the penultimate word in the simile and in book 1, clearly synecdoche for the horses (Mynors, 1990, 512-14), also suggests the chariot of state,[601] an association which at Rome goes back to the regal period and is preserved in the name of the magistrates' chair (*sella curulis*; see above, p. 300). Thus, the simile concluding the first book of the *Georgics,* in which the raging of Mars is figured as a runaway team of horses,[602] continues the political theme of the preceding lines, suggesting through the tragic intertext of Orestes' madness attendant guilt, perhaps, even in the

---

[599] See Ch. 2, pp. 72-73.

[600] Orestes is speaking to the chorus after killing Aegisthus and Clytemnestra (*Cho.* 1021-24):

> For I have no ida how this will end; I am already, as a horse-driver might say,
> charioteering somewhat off the track; my mind is almost out of control
> (φρένες δύσαρκτοι, 1024), carrying me along half-overpowered.

Thomas (1988), 512-14, also notes similarities of expression with Horace's *Sat.* 1. 1. 114-16, but here the team is completely within the charioteer's control.

[601] Lyne (1974), 64-65, "The chariot begins to seem the state helpless in the grip of war—for there is no effective *auriga.* This there must be and of course it must be Caesar. He must—somehow—control the state, govern its warlike propensities: he must make sure that the *retinacula* are not unheeded."

[602] The god is clearly represented in the horses (variously expressed: *quadrigae, equis, currus*), which rush forth (*effudere*), a word with connotations of excess, crowding and boundlessness, which are well suited to the omnipresence of war as described in the initial section and its passion suggested in *ruptis...legibus* and *saevit.* Mars' association with horses was long-standing, from his reputed origins in Thessaly, a region famous for its horses, to the sacrificing of horses to Ares (See above, Ch. 5, p. 278, n. 484) and the horse's strong associations with war. Hidden in the spare expression *addunt in spatia* is the idea of increasing speed with each successive lap, the presage of the runaway team evident in the last line, but it is also the analogue of the countless wars and crimes (*tot bella per orbem*; *tam multae scelerum facies*) of the narrative description.

would-be charioteer,[603] but also drawing attention to the chariot as a locus of power or its lack. This obvious political context strongly suggests that the similarly configured series of Aegaeon, Aeneas and Niphaeus may have further political implications in its charioteer episode, even though no contemporary political leader is overtly invoked.

Within this allusive political context Aeneas makes his way toward the *quadrigae* of Niphaeus (10. 570-71), still maintaining something of the monstrous expressed in the effect he has on the frightened horses; like a beast he takes giant steps and roars so horribly that he defeats the charioteer with no other effort. In the epic Iliadic intertext for the *Aeneid*'s Niphaeus (570-574), the horses of the two sons of Antimachus, Peier and Hippolochus (11. 126-47), are running wild,[604] but otherwise the scenes differ. Aeneas' distance from his victim, never speaking or touching him, contrasts completely with Agamemnon who speaks and graphically kills his victims. Instead, Aeneas emerges as a bull from the sea echoing not so much the *Iliad* but Euripides' *Hippolytus*.

What identifies the scene initially as Hippolytan is the fear of the horses in a chariot ensemble that results in the throwing out of the charioteer along the coast of the sea.[605] Although the charioteer Niphaeus is thrown out without any apparent attempt on his part to resist, adding to the impression of Aeneas as terrifying, inter- and intratextual allusions cast him as a Hippolytus figure. Details of Euripides' description of the closer encounter of the bull with the team on land are appropriately incorporated for the striding Aeneas: the bull also approaches Hippolytus' team from the front in order to cause them to turn back (προυφαίνετ' ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν, ὥστ' ἀναστρέφειν, 1228) in response to Hippolytus' directing of the team toward the soft sand, an exchange that happens several times (κεἰ μὲν, 1226). Particulars of content and diction also recall the emblematic description in the catalogue of Hippolytus' crash (*metu/ pavidi*; *effundunt/ effudere*; *litora/ litore*; *currus/ currum*). Niphaeus' horses, like Virbius,'

---

[603] Hölscher, 1991, 164, as quoted in Green, 2007, 44: "Orestes finally had shed the blood of relatives and had to be absolved; in the same sense the victory of Octavian over fellow-citizens was a pollution which needed purification."
[604] "Together they were seeking to contain the swift horses, for the shining reins had slipped from their hands, and the two horses were running wild," *Il*. 11. 127-29.
[605] Technically the shore is more likely that of the Tiber, but in the traditional stories Aeneas landed on the coast of Italy and the Hippolytan aspects of the scene encourage that impression.

are rushing head-long, but instead of charging forward into war (*curru in bella ruebat*, 7. 782), they are retreating in panic (*retroque ruentes*, 10. 573). The presence of the *quadrigae* (*quadriiugis*, 575) and the teams' rejection of the charioteer recall the *Georgics'* racing charioteer where the chariots pour out from the barriers (*effudere quadrigae,* 1. 512) and the horses have taken control from the charioteer (*fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas*, 514). The reference to the *Georgics* gives racing, Hippolytus' avocation, a stronger presence in the scene, but it also recalls the situation of a world in dire need of a leader. The connotations of failed leadership this allusion contributes are enhanced by the broader Hippolytan connotations for the chariot.

Hippolytus' chariot was the emblem of his allegiance to Artemis and his resistance to Aphrodite and to full adult participation in the polis. Banished from the polis, he fled in his chariot, but was also thrown from this last place of refuge when betrayed by his horses.[606] Euripides' presentation of Hippolytus' attempt to control the team and the wreck focuses on the construction of the chariot and its parts, which I argued (Ch. 3, pp. 95-97) represent Athena and the polis. Hippolytus had an ambivalent relation to these, eschewing marriage and politics, but training his horses in proximity to the city and possessing skills associated with Athena's μῆτις. Euripides presents chariot racing, in contrast to any political aspirations, as the public side of Hippolytus' elitist life style, which, in a sense, like his commitment to chastity, attempts to artificially prolong youth, avoiding adult and (according to Vidal-Naquet, see above, Ch. 5, pp. 283-84) collective responsibilities. By his insertion into the Hippolytan frame of this scene, Nipaheus, who is little more than a name, carries aspects of failed leadership, which may be alluded to in his novel characterization as leader (*effunduntque ducem*, 574), a term first found in Vergil with the meaning of "charioteer." If Harrison (1991, 574) is correct in maintaining that Vergil is "probably following ἡγεμών at Soph. *OT* 804," where the Greek analogue for *dux* refers to Oedipus' father Laertes, king of Thebes, there is good reason to suspect that some idea of political leadership adheres to the use of *ducem* and, within a Hippolytan context, it would be that of failed leadership. But

[606] Hippolytus, in the messenger's account cries out to his horses (1240-41): "Stand, horses, stand! You were fed in my stables. Do not kill me!" and later before his father and Artemis, he curses the horses (1355-57): "Curse on my team! How often have I fed you from my own hand, you who have murdered me!"

Hippolytus' chariot bears still further connotations, particularly as an alternative space to that of the city, a place of exile and, ultimately, of betrayal and death, an expansion to the precarious chariot of state suggested by the concluding simile in the *Georgics.* The prolonged attention given to Hippolytus' chariot in Euripides' play is paradigmatic for all three of the charioteers Aeneas defeats, as their chariots represent a potential locus of power, leadership and victory, but become, in fact, a position they cannot and implicitly should not maintain.[607]

What is gained by the combination of these intertexts—from the *Iliad, Georgics* and *Hippolytus*—in the Niphaeus episode is an extraordinary balance of image and narrative, that produces a considerably rich array of meanings. Thanks to the Hippolytan frame of the scene, Aeneas reenters the narrative war still in the fantastic world of the monster Aegaeon, an alternative Mars, striding like a man, but roaring and frightening like the monster from the sea he also represents. This allusion to one of the most extraordinary manifestations of passion in literature also presses the characterization of Aeneas' wrath further toward extreme limits. Aeneas' justification for his rampage is far more compelling than that of Agamemnon and he is distanced from his more bestial brutality, while his behavior, nevertheless, moves him close to the circle of fighters Zeus condemns for actually loving war, including Ares (*Il.* 891). But an additional consequence of the intertextual web of this episode surrounds Niphaeus, a character who never speaks or even acts: via the allusions to the *Georgics* and *Hippolytus* his defeat suggests political and moral failings it would otherwise have lacked. Octavian's possible rejection of the charioteer/leadership role in the *Georgics* would be the wreck of society and, similarly, the cultural consequences of Hippolytus' rejection of Aphrodite, marriage and political engagement for the polis

---

[607] In the epic's final rapid narrative buildup toward the climactic encounter of Aeneas and Turnus, Aeneas engages with and defeats once again the Hippolytan charioteer, this time in the shape of Murranus (12. 529-34). As with the Niphaeus tableau in which Vergil incorporates a new detail of the Euripidean text (in addition to those in the catalogue of book 7)—the close range encounter with the terrifying bull, here the actual entanglement of Hippolytus in the reins and the damaging pounding and smashing of his body are alluded to, as well as the sad irony that the horses which he has reared and doted on in their care, when terrified, are incapable of any awareness of him (532-34). This is a further stage in the narrative of the Hippolytus myth beyond that of Niphaeus, in which the horses bolt in fright at the bull-like Aeneas. The correspondence with Euripides text is general, not exact. Hippolytus is "tangled in the reins and dragged along in an inextricable knot" (1236-37), rather than rolled under the wheels and the reins and yoke, and in *Hipp.* 1238, his head is smashed on the rocks, not by the horses' hooves (533-34).

would have been extinction. Hippolytus' death was expiation for a version of impiety that amounts to a rejection of civilized society. Thus, this passage projects a theme of failed leadership associated with the forceful, and merited, ejection from the chariot's place of power, which the episode of the charioteers Lucagus and Liger further elaborates.

Aeneas' *aristeia* concludes with his defeat of this fraternal pair (575-601), whose chariot becomes the focus of Liger's boasting, and Aeneas' subsequent mockery of him, which in turn activates spatial connotations of the chariot that emphasize its precariousness and suggest defeat. Although this pair is generally modeled on the brothers Isos and Antiphos, killed by Agamemnon (*Il.* 11. 101-21; Harrison, 1991, 575-76), neither the brothers nor Agamemnon speak, nor are any of the young men Agamemnon defeats in this section as arrogant as Liger is, who suggests that he is a better charioteer/ warrior than either Diomedes or Achilles (*non Diomedis equos nec currum cernis Achilli*, 581), because he will end Aeneas' life (*nunc belli finis et aevi/ his dabitur terris,* 582-3). Aeneas finds Lucagus and Liger arrogant even before hearing the words of Liger (*haud tulit Aeneas tanto fervore furentis,* 578) and the narrator characterizes Liger as "mad" (*vesano*, 583), implicitly, because of what he has said. The clustering of words for chariot in this encounter is extraordinary (7 within 22 lines, 9, when synecdochic words are included; see Appendix A) and is without precedent in the comparable passage of the *Iliad.*[608] The brothers arrive in their chariot (575), Lucagus urges on the team (587),[609] and is then struck from the chariot (*excussus curru,* 590), while Liger falls out (*curru delapsus eodem*, 596) after Aeneas seizes it (*arripuit biiugos*, 595). In this passage the words of Liger and, to an even greater extent, those of Aeneas go beyond any narrative necessity to bring attention to the chariot.

---

[608] *Biiugi* 575, 587, 595; *currus* 581, 590, 592, 596; *rotis, iuga,* 594. To a certain extent the formula used to describe both pairs of brothers in one chariot ("the two being in one chariot," εἰν ἑνὶ δίφρῳ ἐόντας, 11. 103, 127) and the similar expressions of ejection (ἐκ δ' ἔβαλ' ἵππων, 109; ἀφ' ἵππων ὦσε χαμᾶζε, 143) emphasize the movement of the charioteers from within the chariot to outside, but relentless frequency of the words in the *Aeneid* is far greater.

[609] It may be noteworthy that both Lucagus and Liger have a turn at driving the chariot, first Liger (*sed frater habenis/ flectit equos, strictum rotat acer Lucagus ensem,* 576-77), but later Lucagus (*Lucagus ut pronus pendens in verbera telo/ admonuit biiugos*, 586-87, cf. the description of the *aurigae* in the opening simile in the ship race: *pronique in verbera pendent*, 5. 147). Himmelhoch, 1997, 30, notes that the switching of roles by charioteer and the warrior in the *Iliad* "without exception" is "disastrous."

A thrust of Aeneas' spear pierces Lucagus' groin and knocks him out of the chariot (10. 590-96):

> excussus curru moribundus voluitur arvis.
> quem pius Aeneas dictis adfatur amaris:
> 'Lucage, nulla tuos currus fuga segnis equorum
> prodidit aut vanae vertere ex hostibus umbrae:
> ipse rotis saliens iuga deseris.' haec ita fatus
> arripuit biiugos; frater tendebat inertis 595
> infelix palmas curru delapsus eodem:
>
> Struck from the chariot, he rolled dying on the ground.
> Dutiful Aeneas spoke to him with bitter words:
> "Lucagus, no cowardly flight of your horses betrayed
> your chariot nor did empty shadows turn them from the enemy:
> Leaping from the chariot you deserted the chariot."
> Having spoken, he seized hold of the team. His unlucky brother,
> having slipped from the same chariot, held out his empty hands...

That Aeneas is pointedly identified with his characteristic attribute here (*pius*, 591) within the context of his cruel mockery of—and subsequent pitiless rejection of—Liger's plea for mercy (*morere et fratrem ne desere frater*, 600) draws attention to the sometimes conflicting demands of *pietas* (Harrison*,* 1991, 590-1, responsibility to his host Evander and sparing the humbled), but Aeneas' words recall those of cruel Pyrrhus as he kills Priam.[610] Likewise similar to Achilles in his cruelty toward young charioteers, Aeneas uses the chariot, not as a weapon, but as a *locus* upon which to center his mockery of Liger and as he does so he elaborates upon his dethroning of all three charioteers from their lofty position. Alluding to Patroclus in his mocking of Cebriones (*Il.* 16. 745-50; Harrison, 1991, 594), Hector's charioteer, Aeneas sarcastically interprets Liger's exit as an act of will, making fun of his plummet from on high, caused in reality by the deadly blow Aeneas sends. The sudden change from a high place to the ground is emphasized both in Lucagus' rolling on the ground (590) and by Aeneas' describing him as "leaping from the chariot" (594). But the change in height is particularly vivid in Patroclus' characterization of Cebriones' removal, the Iliadic intertext: "How easily he dives! I think if he were in the teeming deep, this man would satisfy many by seeking for oysters, leaping from his ship..." (16.745-48). The utter

[610] Pyrrhus' words to Priam (2. 548-50): "*illi mea tristia facta/ degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento./ nunc morere*."

disempowerment of Cebriones lying in the dust after his fall, concludes the narrative of the fight over his body (16. 775-76):

> But in the whirl of dust he lay mighty in his might,
> forgetful of his horsemanship.

We have seen Plato use this passage by inverting the placement of Cebriones on the ground (*Rep.* 8, 566c-d), putting the popular leader-turned-tyrant standing in the chariot, now associated with the city over which the tyrant has full control (See above, Ch. 2, pp. 57-58).[611] Clearly, Plato's allusion to Homer, at least in part, serves to emphasize the sudden shift in the extent of the tyrant's power, which in its full expression, he localizes figuratively in the chariot. In Plato, Homer and Vergil, the chariot is a locus of power. He, who can maintain his position in the chariot is powerful, but in the context of war, still more powerful is the warrior who, standing on the ground, can thrust the charioteer out to his death (see above, p. 339 and n. 590).

The focus on the chariot as symbolic space associated with power is further developed in the particular formulation of Aeneas' taunts, which figure the chariot as capable of betrayal (*tuos currus...prodidit,* 592-93) and abandonment (*iuga deseris,* 594). These taunts facilitate a unifying of the charioteer encounters, which both prepares for and contrasts with the concluding result of Aeneas' *aristeia.* Each of the possible causes of Lucagus' ejection that Aeneas denies refers to the actions of Niphaeus' horses (Harrison, 1991, 592, 593): Liger's horses did not take flight (cf. Niphaeus' horses, which run off with the chariot, 574), nor did they veer off course frightened by an apparition (cf. *metu versi retroque ruentes,* 573). By means of this implicit comparison Aeneas draws attention to his complete dominance of Latin charioteers, following which he takes possession of the brothers' chariot (*arripuit biiugos*),[612] causing yet another charioteer to be dislodged (*curru delapsus eodem*). The result of the forceful "dethroning" of the Latin charioteers is that "the boy Ascanius and the youth, besieged in

---

[611] "As for this popular leader of ours, he clearly does not lie mighty in his might but...he stands in the chariot of the city" (*Rep.* 8, 566c-d).

[612] Although the *OLD* cites this use of *arripio* with its first definition ("to grasp with the hand"), connotations of the the third clearly adhere as well: "to take possession of seize, grab, take control of," also frequently used in a military context.

vain, at last broke out of and left the camp" (604-05). As Harrison (1991, 605) notes, Aeneas' *aristeia* after the death of Pallas concludes "with its military result of the relief of the Trojan camp, an important objective." But, I believe, greater significance lies in this fact than has been noted.

Even though the release of the Trojans is stated with little obvious emphasis before the narrative switches to the reaction in heaven, its importance has been prepared for in the repeated eviction of the charioteers from a place which like the *castra* can be both relatively safe (the chariot because of its higher position), but also is threatened by enemy attack. Both chariot and camp have political resonance—the chariot via its association with the Roman monarchy (and hence the city of Rome) and power in general, the camp by its frequent and also initial representation as a city (See above, Ch. 5, p. 231). That Aeneas figures Lucagus' and Liger's chariot as something which can be both betrayed and deserted encourages an interpretation of the chariot as deserving of loyalty, the way an ally or one's city would be. The repeated removal of the charioteers (*effununtque ducem, excussus curru, curru delapsus eodem*) prepares for the similar breaking out of Ascanius and the young men (*erumpunt*), who afford the primary cause of concern to Venus in the council of the gods at the beginning of book 10 (46-7) and are what gives urgency to Cymodocea's instructions to Aeneas as he returns.[613] The continuing importance this issue has had is emphasized by *tandem* (604), which could in some sense justify Aeneas' rage.[614] Preventing the intrusion of assaults on a charioteer in his chariot or citizens within a city is a fundamental objective in war. However, the primary strategic goal in this passage has been the release of the Trojans from their camp to be able to fight, which is achieved ironically by (among other victories) the forced "release" of the charioteers from their chariot. The suggestive associations of both the chariot and the camp with a city highten awareness of a cause and effect relationship between Aeneas removal of the charioteers and

---

[613] *at puer Ascanius muro fossisque tenetur/ tela inter media atque horrentis Marte Latinos*, 236-37.

[614] In his development of the concept of Aeneas' *pietas* as a particularly civic virtue concerned primarily with the safety of the leader's citizens, Noonan (2007), 80, has argued that the appeals made to Aeneas in war based on familial piety like those of Lucagos, Liger and Magos (10. 524-49), are limited compared to Aeneas' *pietas* "which embraces an entire society in its scope; that community is what he must protect." Against those who threaten the leaders's followers or do actual harm the leader like Aeneas will "seem merciless" (81).

the release of the Trojans from their camp. This successful outcome to Aeneas' rage driven *aristeia* may be relevant to a discussion of Aeneas similar act in killing Turnus at the epic's end.

A clear foreshadowing of the later Aeneas is present in the concluding couple of very brief similes which summarize, immediately before the Trojan youth are released, the actions of his *aristeia* (602-4):

> talia per campos edebat funera ductor
> Dardanius torrentis aquae vel turbinis atri
> more furens.
>
> The Dardanian leader was giving out such
> deaths across the fields, raging like rushing water
> or a black whirlwind.

As brief as these similes are they indicate, like his comparison to Aegaeon, a dark, destructive potential within Aeneas. Storms,[615] the adversary of the helmsman, have been repeatedly associated with the Juno/Allecto inspired war frenzy of Turnus and his charioteering Latin forces in book 7. Although little of the specific diction of the book 7 similes occurs here, the dependence of these similes on *furens*, already used of Aeneas twice in the *aristea* (545, 604), suggests that Aeneas' actions make him the very essence of war (personified as, *Furor*, 1. 294), as had his comparison to the multi-weaponed Aegaeon, and very like Turnus (*furor, furo* of Turnus, 7. 464, 9. 691, 760, 11. 486, 12. 680). While the Aegaeon simile relates Aeneas to a foe of Jupiter, the black whirlwind will be used to describe Aeneas' javelin blow that strikes Turnus (*volat atri turbinis instar*, 12. 923), which is an echo of the Dira Jupiter sends as a sign of Turnus' approaching death (12. 855, *illa volat celerique...turbine fertur*), one of several complicating associations of Aeneas with Jupiter at the epic's end. While these two brief similes compare Aeneas to superhuman forces and not, as Agamemnon had been, to a bestial predator, they too begin to blur the distinction between qualities of the helmsman and charioteer.

Thus, in developing the conclusion of Aeneas' *aristeia* in which he defeats three charioteers Vergil employs as the framing intertext the similar series of Agamemnon's encounters with young charioteers in *Iliad* book 11. These actions suggest Aeneas' power and ruthlessness, but also throw into higher relief

---

[615] The first three definitions of *turbo* in *OLD* are an object that spins, a whirlwind or tornado and a whirlpool. Of the 17 uses of *turbo* in the *Aeneid*, 5 are in marine contexts, all 4 in book 1 (45, 83, 442, 511), in which together with book 12 the word occurs most often (320, 531, 855, 923).

how Vergil diverges from Homer. The similes for each warrior are of a completely different nature: Agamemnon is systematically compared to lions, whose realistic gory predation of young animals mirrors the warrior's violent slaughter of Troy's youth, while Aeneas is likened first to the giant Aegaeon fighting Jupiter, a larger-than-life conflict between the ruler of the universe and a monster with a hundred arms and fifty fire-breathing mouths, more a conceptualization and universalization of war than an analogous natural particularization like the lion similes. This impression of Aeneas as the essence of war in his *aristeia* becomes more pronounced in the three-part allusion to the end of *Georgics* 1, in which all three sections concern war, as in the *Aeneid,* but, in addition, the question of Octavian's leadership pervades the whole. While this allusion intensifies the belligerent fierceness of Aeneas, the failure of the *Georgics*' charioteer to maintain control of his chariot in its clear political context introduces similar connotations of failed leadership in Niphaeus' chariot. The additional allusion to Euripides' *Hippolytus* confirms and broadens the chariot's political significance and subtly transforms the monstrous in Aeneas into a metaphorical bull that terrifies the charioteer Niphaeus' horses, which cast him out and run away with the chariot. Although in Euripides' tragedy the charioteer and his chariot have connections to the polis, the chariot is primarily associated with Hippolytus' alternative life of disengagement from the polis, his enforced separation and death, for which he is responsible. Some of these connotations of failed leadership potential and merited death, which I have argued is the unifying theme of all three of Aeneas' charioteer encounters, adhere to Nipheus and his chariot.

Within Aeneas' encounter with Lucagus and Liger, a continuing part of the Iliadic frame, the interjection of an allusion to Patroclus' mocking of Hector's charioteer, Cebriones, reminds the reader that, unlike the relatively unmotivated anger of Agamemnon and his more general and temporary strategic achievement, Aeneas' anger derives from the strong feelings of affection and loyalty he has for his allies, Pallas and Evander, which are analogous to the intensity of Achilles' feelings for Patroclus. The parody of a charioteer's fatal fall from the height of the chariot to the ground, on a basic level a fall from power, is more obviously relevant to the immediate moment. Vergil's allusion to Cebriones' fall and the mocking references to Nipheus' Hippolytan-like demise draw attention to the fall of all three charioteers

from their chariot, their forced ejection from a place of dominance, which, I have argued, helps to relate the feats of Aeneas' *aristeia* to what they accomplish, the long-awaited release of Ascanius and the Trojan youth from their camp. Aeneas' defeat of the Latin charioteers, incapable of maintaining their higher and more advantageous position, indicates not only their lack of strength and agility in battle, but via intertextual contributions and the brothers' excessive boasting, the appropriateness of their defeat.

Aeneas' strategic success issuing from the defeat of these charioteers, however, can also be seen as an achievement that was accomplished at a concomitant cost to his moral stature. Aegaeon, as foe of Jupiter or personification of war, is a terrifying monster, a type usually associated with Turnus. Likewise, the black whirlwind of the concluding simile, suggests that Aeneas in his raging (*furens*) resembles his adversaries, who have also been figured as storms besieging the ship of state. These images accompany a group of acts by Aeneas that are without precedent in their brutality and are particularly disturbing in close proximity to his near divine presentation as helmsman and immediate association with Augustus.

The Voyage of Turnus

In the face of Aeneas' rage-driven search for Turnus following Pallas' death (*te, Turne, superbum caede nova quaerens*, 514-15), Juno asks Jupiter to be allowed to rescue Turnus from certain death (*Dauno possem incolumem servare parenti*, 616), which he grants with the stipulation that it could only be a temporary reprieve (622-24). She rescues him by subterfuge, creating a phantom Aeneas who leads Turnus out of battle and onto an Etruscan ship docked at shore. Juno then drives the ship in a whirlwind over the ocean and, ultimately, down the coast to Ardea (10: 687-88):

> labitur alta secans fluctuque aestuque secundo
> et patris antiquam Dauni defertur ad urbem.
>
> He glides along, cutting through the deep and is carried away
> by favoring wave and tide to the ancient city of his father Daunus.

Almost every aspect of the sequence—the forming of a phantom, the rescue of a hero from imminent death by a god and his conveyance to a place of safety—has Homeric precedent, except the use of the

ship to transport the warrior.[616] What does this innovation of the wind-driven ship add to the story of Turnus' rescue? I think that it urges a comparison of Turnus with Aeneas at two important points of his sea journey: first, his recent long, politically-charged approach to the battlefield and then his initial appearance in the epic as the helpless victim of Juno's storm in book 1. The contrast implied by the first comparison augments Turnus' powerlessness and the hopelessness of his fate, but the second, due to the similarity of the heroes' victimization by Juno, raises sympathy for Turnus, even as it foreshadows his ultimate death.

Vergil has already placed Turnus in a position that invites comparison with Aeneas in book 10 in a number of ways. His is the reaction noted first among the Latins to the visual manifestation of the epiphanous Aeneas and he immediately leads the troops to the shore to face Aeneas' disembarking forces (308-9). After Juno breaks the cable of the ship carrying Turnus, the narrative switches to the real Aeneas, who is demanding to fight the absent Turnus (661), so that when Turnus leaves battle onboard ship, a comparison with Aeneas' approach by ship is invited. In fact, Harrison (1991, 660) has noted "an elegant contrast" between Juno's push of Turnus away from battle (*avulsamque rapit...navem*, 660) and the divine push of Cymodocea that sends "Aeneas' ship *towards* the battle" (246-48). Vergil activates a contrast between the power of the two warriors on ship; having developed the presentation of Aeneas in the position of helmsman for many lines and implied his divine selection variously and also particularly his similarity to the victorious Augustus, the contrast evident in the powerlessness of Turnus' position on the ship carrying him off is obvious (Pöschl, 108), especially in his words, his lack of defined position on the ship and by the fact that he has no power over the winds (677-79):

> 'vos o potius miserescite, venti;
> in rupes, in saxa (volens vos Turnus adoro)
> ferte ratem saevisque vadis immittite syrtis,
> quo nec me Rutuli nec conscia fama sequatur.'

[616] In the *Iliad* (5. 445-52) after Apollo spirits Aeneas out of battle, he fashions a wraith (ὅ εἴδωλον) of him to take his place and sets Aeneas down at his holy shrine at Pergamus where Leto and Artemis heal him and give him glory. Apollo likewise protects Hector (20. 441-46) and Agenor (21. 595-601) from Achilles, but in both cases the warrior is shrouded in a thick mist, not taken from the field of battle.

> Rather, you winds, have pity (I, Turnus, gladly beseech you),
> carry the ship and send it into the savage shoals of a sandbar,
> where neither Rutulians nor knowing rumor may follow.

While Aeneas is dealing death on the battlefield (663), Turnus is carried away in the midst of the sea by a whirlwind (*Turnum medio interea fert aequore turbo*, 665), the winds which he now entreats to carry him to his ruin. In his desperate appeal to the winds Turnus recalls Eteocles' wish, after he has learned that he will face his brother Polynices (*Septem* 689-91):

> Since the god is plainly hastening things to their
> conclusion, let it run before the wind, the whole
> house of Laius, hated by Phoebus and consigned
> to the waves of Cocytus.

At this point in the narrative Eteocles sees his death as inevitable and so now represents himself as totally deprived of agency, in contrast to his and his fellow citizens' previous characterization of him as the watchful helmsman of their ship of state. Like Turnus, who has no illusions about his lack of power at this moment, Eteocles casts his fate to the winds (κατ᾽ οὖρον, 690)—in his case, the figurative winds—assuming them to be the means by which he will achieve (at this point, figurative) death. Given that *Septem* appears to have had significant influence on the *Aeneid*'s ship and chariot imagery, Polynices' words could contribute a sense of the hopelessness of preventing Turnus' ultimate fate. Thus, one compelling reason for Turnus to be described en route to his place of refuge onboard a ship, over which he has no control, is to draw attention to his complete powerlessness on the vehicle with which Aeneas' political power has been persistently associated, most recently in a magnificent visual and intratextual display. It is almost as if Jupiter has allowed Turnus' temporary respite from war in part to facilitate his further humiliation on Aeneas' symbolic vehicle.

But Turnus' circumstances also recall Aeneas' at the epic's beginning, where he too is tossed by a Junonian storm, although more violent and malevolent, extending his hands toward heaven in desperation (*et duplicis tendens ad sidera palmas talia voce refert,* 1. 93-94; cf. *et duplicis cum voce manus ad sidera tendit* 10. 667) and longing to have died a hero's death at Troy. Although the distraught speeches of both

are centrally concerned with the wish to die (1. 94-101; 10. 668-79), Turnus' slightly longer speech expresses greater desperation and concern for the condition of his own men (671-76):

> Laurentisne iterum muros aut castra videbo?
> quid manus illa virum, qui me meaque arma secuti?
> quosque (nefas) omnis infanda in morte reliqui
> et nunc palantis video, gemitumque cadentum
> accipio? quid ago? aut quae iam satis ima dehiscat
> terra mihi?
>
> Will I see the Latin walls or my camp again?
> What of that band of men, who followed me and my arms,
> all of whom I have abandoned (how dreaful!) to an unspeakable death
> and now I see them scattered and hear their groans as they fall?
> What am I to do or what land will gape open deep enough for me?

The long series of questions, with which this passage concludes, and Turnus' longing for and attempts to commit suicide (680-82),[617] add to the resemblance of his speech to those of desperate heroines like Medea and, especially, Ariadne,[618] whose stories also involve ocean voyaging, desperation and abandonment. The extremity of Turnus' desperation may heighten sympathy for his manipulation by Juno.[619] But any Roman would have respected Turnus' loyalty and care for his men, which contrasts with Aeneas' opening speech, in which no thought for his men is evident. To be sure this is partly to strengthen the allusion to Odysseus,[620] but a major and thematic difference between Odysseus and Aeneas resides in the strong sense of responsibility for his men the Latin leader will exhibit (see Ch. 4, p. 208). In similar straits Turnus thinks of his men, which may contribute to some rebuilding of sympathy for Turnus after his killing of Pallas.[621] But in alluding to the storm-tossed Odyssean Aeneas of the epic's beginning, this scene initiates and prepares for similar intratextual allusions at the epic's end, most famously in the reaction of Turnus' body to death (*ast illi solvuntur frigore membra*, 12. 951, cf. *extemplo*

---

[617] Similarities with Juturna and Dido in the *Aeneid* have been noted (*Ibid* and 675-6), as well as, in his attempted suicide, with Sophoclean Ajax (Pöschl, 108).

[618] See, for example, Ariadne's speech in Catullus, 64. 132-38,177-83.

[619] Highly excited questions constitute most of Turnus' speech (9, beginning with *quo feror? unde abii? quae me fuga quemve reducit?* 670). Harrison, 1991, 668-79, notes that the resemblance of Turnus' speech to those of Medea or Ariadne contributes "a literary colour which tends to present T. as vulnerable and sympathetic."

[620] On Aeneas' opening speech and its allusion to Odysseus' (5. 299-312) see Ch. 4, p. 150.

[621] So Harrison (1991), 606-88, "Turnus is shown as humiliated and deceived as well as being ultimately doomed, regaining some of the sympathy he forfeited in the killing of Pallas."

Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra, 1. 91). And so both of the implicit comparisons with Aeneas in Turnus' sole ship voyage suggest Turnus' doom; Aeneas' approach to camp, sanctioned by the forces of heaven and history, increases the impression of Turnus' utter lack of power and agency, while the allusion to Aeneas at the epic's beginning in a position of utter powerlessness will finally attend Turnus' death.

Although in book 5 Mnestheus expresses the first and fullest version of the values associated with the helmsman as a political leader in the *Aeneid*—the centrality of the collective versus the individual, reflected in a treasured collective past and shared future goals, the selflessness of the leader who is willing to forego his own desires for the benefit of the community and the unity of leader and community in devotion to the gods—the relation of this episode both to Aeneas and the contemporary political scene is strongly implied, but not insisted upon. Such is not the case for Aeneas' final journey as helmsman in book 10. As he follows the advice of Cybele's nymph approaching the Trojan camp, Aeneas assumes the identical position standing at the rear of his ship as Augustus depicted on the shield he raises, an equally dramatic moment, but here, of the breaking in to the epic of the contemporary. Augustus stands on his ship *cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis* (8. 679), as he leads his forces into battle and thus recalls in this symbolic collocation the values of the helmsman Mnestheus articulated. Partly to facilitate the most productive conceptual interaction between Aeneas and the images on his shield, his presentation forgoes naturalism in favor of visual description and supernatural events, which either concern Cybele or echo superhuman aspects of Augustus on the shield. The representation of Cybele's lions yoked to the masthead of Aeneas' ship above a depiction of mount Ida, her site of worship and Aeneas' place of birth, suggests that Aeneas' journey up the Tiber will like Cybele's result in victory or rescue, both ultimately in the war and immediately for those besieged in the camp/city, a suggestion the triumph of Augustus on the shield also supports. But the yoking of Aeneas' ship to Cybele's lions also suggests that her capacity for civilizing will adhere to Aeneas' leadership and as a result his conflated ship/chariot recalls the order restoring action of Neptune's in book 1, a passage likewise redolent with contemporary political connotations. Nevertheless, despite the divine selection and protection of Aeneas the transformed sea nymph Cymodocea testifies to and the similarity of Aeneas' fiery emissions to those of Augustus on the

shield, fire also joins Aeneas' entry into the war with the reentry of Achilles in the *Iliad*, a brutal destroyer of Trojans, and suggests a similar capacity within Aeneas.

Turnus' first appearance in the chariot riding to the duel with Pallas shows immediately that the precedents for his charioteering in the first half of the *Aeneid* lie in the Junonian world of Achilles, as seen on the goddess's temple in Carthage, warring in the chariot, having defeated the young Troilus and abused Hector's body before his parents. In Turnus' wish for Pallas' father to view his son's death he recalls the impiety of Achilles' son Pyrrhus, who kills Polites before Priam, a connection reinforced at several points in Turnus' words in this scene. But the narratorial characterization of his words as *dicti tyranni* and *iussa superba* extend the connotations of Turnus' charioteering into the political realm of oppressive domination, one traditional area of engagement for the chariot. Turnus' pride and acquisitive lack of restraint in this scene are signal characteristics of tyrants in both Cicero and Plato and may allude in particular to Cicero's portrait of Tarquinius Superbus in *De Republica*. Some of Turnus' pride and self-centeredness reappears in the charioteers Aeneas faces in his *aristeia*, but they lack his strength and power.

All three charioteers participate in the overarching Iliadic intertext of Agamemnon's defeat of a series of young Trojan charioteers and their vulnerability to Aeneas' attack would be evident with the perception of this allusion. But for Nipheus the didactic and tragic allusions have a stronger influence, and they suggest an image of failed or rejected leadership, exile and death. The chariot is a place of power that none of these charioteers can retain and through their removal Aeneas is finally able to release the Trojans besieged in their camp. Yet in spite of this victory, within his *aristeia* the destructive fire imagery associated with Aeneas in his approach to the shore returns in the descriptions of Aeneas laying waste (*ardens, ardenti*, *arsisse*), accompanied by other vocabulary commonly used to describe passionate Juno and Turnus (*furit, furens, desaevit*, *frementem*). Aeneas is likened to a foe of Jupiter, in his comparison to the fire-blazing Aegaeon, a comparison that is intensified through allusions to the *Georgics*' Mars and Aegaeon's similarity to the Chimaera. It seems as if in the process of his domination of the chariots Aeneas is contaminated with their Junonian or more particularly, Circean associations, for now

Latinus' gift to Aeneas of a chariot with fire-breathing horses begins to seem entirely appropriate. And while Aeneas is insulated from the savage bestiality associated with Agamemnon's *aristeia,* Aeneas' concludes with another intrusion into the charioteers' imagery, that of storms which threatened the ship of state in book 7.

Turnus' enforced departure from the battlefield on board a ship countermanded by Juno contrasts utterly with Aeneas approach at the helm of his ship. He is lured onto the ship, which is driven off by a whirlwind, leaving him powerless and desperate. His speech expressing shame and hopelessness has affinity with those of the abandoned heroines Medea and Ariadne, further emphasizing his loss of agency, but also recalls Aeneas' words in the opening storm of the epic. This allusion underscores the victimization of Turnus and encourages sympathy for him as he expresses concern for the men he has left behind in battle. Presented as brutal tyrant in his first appearance in the chariot, Turnus leaves the battlefield as the vulnerable victim of Juno, who knows the respite she provides is temporary.

In the same book in which the climactic manifestation of Aeneas' helmsmanship appears in all its symbolic glory, is soon shown to be abandoning the important values of restraint, rationality and devotion associated from the beginning of the epic via Neptune with the helmsman/statesman. Likewise disturbing perhaps is that Turnus in his first scene as charioteer has been accused of tyrannical behavior. Because of the apparent instability of the helmsman's values and the extremity of what is imputed to the charioteer, I will pursue an investigation of their public speeches in the second half of the *Aeneid* as a means of evaluating and perhaps amplifying or refining these conclusions.

CHAPTER 7

The Ethos of the Leaders in Public Speech

The climactic presentation of Aeneas as helmsman in book 10 is highly visual, symbolic and allusive and, accordingly, Aeneas' speech is restricted: during his extended approach his only words are a brief prayer. Augustus' representation on Aeneas' shield on a ship of state accompanied by Roman senators and people implies that the quality of his helmsmanship or leadership is one of a sense of responsibility to his community, but this has only been directly expressed in the speech of Mnestheus (5. 189-97) which alludes to Aeneas' to his men on the shore of North Africa (1. 198-207). His selection is clear, but whether he manifests the good helmsman's qualities is not. This chapter will present direct evidence in Aeneas' later public speech of his concern for community and dutifulness to the gods, the qualities of the Ciceronian (and Eteoclean) good helmsman. In a different way the first expression of Turnus as charioteer in book 10 encourages a study of his public speech since in the scene of Pallas' death the context of war competes with indications of the tyrannical political potential in Turnus and his other public speech reveals a greater complexity in his character, his affinity with Roman Republican values, but also his selfish motivation for fighting the war. This chapter, then, will consider what the words of Aeneas and Turnus in books 8-12 reveal about their essential qualities as leaders and about their values which will provide fuller and more detailed pictures of them as helmsman and charioteer. This will provide an essential foundation for analysis of the speech and behavior of both leaders as they undergo significant changes near the end of the epic, which will be discussed in the last chapter. Because the most basic contrast in the values of helmsman and charioteer resides in their relation to the state or civic entity this aspect will be the focus of the investigation of the leaders' speech.

A study of the two leaders' speech as diplomats and leaders will strongly confirm that Aeneas and Turnus have very different core values and conceptions of community. Aeneas' primacy in initiating the idea of resolving the war in a duel develops directly from his concern for the well-being of both

communities, Trojan and Latin, and he is neither eager for power in his vision of the future, choosing the role of priest for himself, nor associates Lavinia with its acquisition. Turnus, on the other hand, although young, has already won a reputation for prowess in war about which he publicly glories and boasts. I will argue that his public speech reveals that only in war among his leaders and soldiers does he find meaningful community and that he is as avid to gain Lavinia and the power she represents as he is to seize the golden baldric of Pallas. But, while Aeneas' public speeches outside of war reflect well the concern for the welfare of the community of the ethical helmsman, his brutal speech in war casts doubt uon the capacity of Aeneas to sustain the helmsman's virtue. Turnus, by contrast, more consistently represents, as his chariot suggests, a highly capable warrior, but one who largely fights to gain his personal objectives and maintain his reputation: Iliadic values, but also arguably the motivations of many late Republican "war lords."

Although the choice of considering only public speech represents a considerable restriction of the speech of these two heroes, their public speeches are the most relevant to assessing the nature of their leadership. To a large degree this selection avoids the much-discussed inability of Aeneas to communicate in private speech,[622] which is clearly not irrelevant to the question, but is far too extensive a topic within the current study. The majority of commentators agree that both Aeneas and Turnus are effective public speakers,[623] although Turnus is more prone to exaggeration of the truth.[624] The content of

---

[622] Highet, 1972, 40, "Aeneas lacks the sort of characterization that can only be conveyed through speech"; "He made his hero as taciturn as a Spartan warrior...as thoughtful and silent as a Stoic sage." Feeney (1983), 187-88, broadens the implications of Aeneas' speech: "In the private realm, he is the poem's most consistent and prominent paradigm of the weak and insubstantial nature of human speech." Connally (2010), 413-15, interprets what she identifies as Aeneas' characteristic figure of speech, apostrophe, as a cross-circuiting of "the conditions of communication [that] speaks past the situation of communicative rationality," but see below, n. 705.

[623] Kennedy (1972), 395: "Aeneas, like Augustus, makes rather little use of rhetoric, though he can effectively encourage his men (1. 198-207) or successfully appeal to Evander for an alliance (8. 127-51). Feeney (1983), 184, "Much of his speech is effective… in the public realm he is increasingly successful through the course of the poem as the leader of the Trojan enterprise" (188). Johnson (1986), 92, "Aeneas can speak with clarity and force; but when he must talk with father or mother, wife or mistress… his words are forced, cramped, groped after." Even Connolly (2010), 416, who maintains that "aphasia is Aeneas' lot," acknowledges that "Aeneas is capable at times of engaging in effective public speech."

[624] Reflecting the contrastive types of personalities Aeneas and Turnus are often taken to represent, for example, Jungian introvert and extrovert, (Johnson, 1986, 90). Turnus' weaknesses, in otherwise effective speech ("Turnus speaks easily and with effect to his men and his family," Connolly, 2010, 413), typically concern his emotional inclination: "The character of Turnus is like his speeches: impetuous and strongly emotional, ranging widely

the speeches will be primary in the search for the expression of the leaders' values, which will determine the aspects of style discussed.

Aeneas

The qualities of the Aenean helmsman as represented in the speeches of Aeneas and Mnestheus form the basis of comparison for this investigation of Aeneas' speech in the second half of the epic. In general, the primary emphasis on the leader's shared past heroic struggles with his men (1. 199-202; 5. 190-93), an immediate grounds for encouragement en route, will find less dominant expression, whereas the voicing of trust in the gods and belief in the working out of what is fated to be in their lives (1. 199, 205; 5. 195) intensify in expression and frequency. The focus on the future goal of the reestablishment of citizenship (1. 205-6; 5. 196) is more typically expressed unobtrusively, but the high value Aeneas places on citizenry is complemented by the largely pacific inclination Aeneas exhibits together with his respect for citizens of other cities.[625] Perhaps of greatest importance, Aeneas will exchange the recollection of past, shared sufferings with his men for his own willingness to endure more and even a greater ordeal in the settling of the war through the duel with Turnus, placing his life on the line for the community, the core Ciceronian characteristic of the ideal helmsman. Although Vergil will give clear indications of Aeneas' failure to maintain this ideal near the epic's conclusion, the consistency of its reflection in his speech up to this point, (with the temporary exclusion of his wrath-driven speech in his *aristea*), I will argue, is clear. Three speeches of Aeneas in particular reveal his political values: his address to Evander requesting alliance in the war (8. 127-51), his words to the Latin *oratores* requesting a truce to bury their dead (11. 108-19) and his prayer and oath at the ceremony before the proposed duel (12. 176-94). These

---

between extremes of excitement and depression" (Highet, 1972, 44). Johnson (1986), 90-91, notes both his casual use of facts and passion: "the awkward, somewhat disingenuous, yet passionate efforts at expression of Turnus."

[625] The consistency of Mnestheus' character has been noted by Dunkle (2005), 162, who draws attention to the similarities between his speech in book 5 and that in book 9 (782-89), when Turnus has been closed within the Trojan camp and wreaking havoc. Beyond the similarities he discusses of the addressing of his men as *cives* (783) and that "Mnestheus' moral strength lies in his fortitude and determination to expend every effort on behalf of victory," Mnestheus expands the implicit city associations by referring to the camp as a city (*urbem,* 784) and by the strong emphasis on the camp's wall (*muros, moenia*, 782) and retains the appeal based on country and gods (*non infelicis patriae veterumque deorum*, 786).

will form the basis of my discussion, although reference will be made to relevant aspects in other speeches.

While Cicero's use of the ship of state image seldom articulates the helmsman's religious obligations, perhaps assuming them to be obvious as the *Pro Sestio* seems to indicate,[626] Aeneas' dutifulness to the gods, including the belief in the truth of their oracles and conviction that in attempting to found a city in Latium he is accomplishing what has been fated, is his defining character trait and is amply reflected in these addresses. In the opening of his speech to Evander Aeneas identifies *Fortuna* as the motivating force behind his supplication (8. 127),[627] but he becomes more specific in identifying the *sacra oracula divum* (131) along with his courage, Evander's reputation and their surprising shared genealogy all as indication of the workings of fate in their meeting (*coniunxere tibi et fatis egere volentem*, 133). To the Latin envoys Aeneas attributes his coming to Italy solely to the fates and the dwelling they assured him (*nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent*, 11. 112). In book 12, unaware of the outcome of his duel with Turnus, Aeneas, like Mnestheus in the ship race (5. 195), prays parenthetically to the gods as he admits to thinking he probably will win (*ut potius reor et potius di numine firment*, 12. 188). As part of the ceremony Aeneas begins his speech with prayer (12. 176-82), and prayer forms a significant part of Aeneas speech in the second half of the *Aeneid.*[628] But in this agreement Aeneas shows his deep commitment to the gods' service by choosing for himself, if he wins the duel, only the religious aspect, not the power per se of leadership (*sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,/ imperium*

---

[626] First among the elements the leaders of the republic ought to protect and defend are religious observances and the auspices (*Pro Sestio* 98).

[627] See Ch. 4, p. 210, for a discussion of Quint's idea that *fortuna* is equivalent to chance and associated with individualists in the *Aeneid*, while the *fata* represent destiny related to the leader of the collective. Although in these speeches Aeneas does seem to use *fortuna* as chance or luck (cf. the beginning of his speech to the Latin envoys *quaenam ... fortuna indigna, Latini*, 11. 108), in this instance *fortuna* draws closer to fate since it refers to the oracle of the Sibyl (6. 96-97) and, more recently, the Tiber river, who tells Aeneas of the help available at Pallanteum and promises to take him there (8. 51-58).

[628] Aeneas prays 5 times (7. 120-1, [reported 134-40]; 8. 71-78; 10. 252-55, 875-76, 12. 174-82), a total of 30 lines, which is 15% of the lines he speaks in the second half (199). Aeneas is alone when he prays after his private interview with the Tiber river (8. 71-78) and his two-line prayer in battle concerns his immediate desire, but the other three prayers are significant public prayers and concern his Trojan community. Turnus prays twice (9. 18-22; 10. 668-69; 12. 777-79), a total of 10 lines, 4% of his total of 237 lines of speech. Neither of Turnus' prayers are on behalf of anyone but himself.

sollemene socer, 12. 192-93). Thus, the belief in divine guidance expressed by the helmsmen of the first half of the epic, remains a part of Aeneas' speech in his public addresses and otherwise.

Aeneas' respect for the collective community is evident both in his words to the men and also in his generally pacific inclinations.[629] When in book 11 (100-105), the Latin envoys ask for the return of their dead and time to bury them Aeneas willingly grants their request and expresses a readiness to grant peace even to the living (*pacem… equidem et vivis concedere vellem*, 110-111). He claims not to be waging war with the people (*nec bellum cum gente gero*, 113), but, unaware of Allecto's agency and Latinus' attempts to resist, he blames Latinus for supporting Turnus against the Trojans (113-14; Horsfall, 2003, 113). The disassociation of the Latins as a people from Aeneas' hostility prepares for the second half of his speech in which the duel as a preferable means of resolution for the war is first mentioned.[630] By repeating Turnus' name in the same metrical position in two successive lines Aeneas suggests his primary responsibility for the war, thus, a rationale for the duel, saving the lives of their armies (113-117):

> rex nostra reliquit
> hospitia et Turni potius se credidit armis.
> aequius huic Turnum fuerat se opponere morti.
> si bellum finire manu, si pellere Teucros
> apparat, his mecum decuit concurrere telis:
>
> The king abandoned our friendship and rather
> entrusted himself to the arms of Turnus. It would have
> been fairer that Turnus meet this death.
> If he is prepared to finish the war with his right hand,
> to drive the Teucrians out, it would have been right
> for him to fight me with these weapons.

The context of Aeneas' proposal, the benevolent granting of a truce to bury the dead, places an emphasis on the duel's humanity in the sparing of many lives, a compassionate inclination in Aeneas that is evident in the concluding line of the speech (*nunc ite et miseris supponite civibus ignem,* 119). That Aeneas refers to the Latin dead as "wretched citizens" may suggest a projection into the future unity of Latins and

---

[629] Noonan (2007), has argued that the concern for the safety of his men and future citizens is a distinctive feature of Aeneas' public *pietas* and leadership, and that it contributed (with other factors, see above Ch. 4, p. 216, n. 383) to the development of the concept of the emperor as *conservator.*

[630] The grieving Latin mothers and daughters-in-laws later call upon Turnus to meet Aeneas ("since he [Turnus] demands the kingdom of Italy and first honors for himself," 219), a sentiment Drances is said to encourage (220-21) and with which he goads Turnus in the assembly (374-75).

Trojans (Horsfall, 2003, 119), but it certainly indicates an appreciation for the fundamental importance of the political collective and its support and nurturance. Vergil uses the term *civis* sparingly, but in book 11, where there is the greatest concentration of its uses, it finds expression in the words of leaders and leading citizens (Ventulus, 243; Latinus, 305; Drances, 360; Turnus, 459), who each in their use of the word manifest a different attitude toward the Latin citizens.[631] Only Aeneas and Latinus seem genuinely concerned about promoting the welfare of the Latin community and only the helmsmen Aeneas and Mnestheus use *cives* two times each as they exhort their men to action of great importance for their future city.[632]

Likewise, in the terms Aeneas proposes at the ceremony in book 12, win or lose, he sees the future for the Trojans only in terms of a city.[633] If the Trojans lose, they will withdraw to the city of Evander (184, ironically, the future cite of Rome); if they win, Lavinia will give her name to the city the Trojans build (*urbique dabit Lavinia nomen*, 194), the climactic end to what is a long speech for Aeneas (19 lines).[634] As Tarrant notes (20012, 194), "Aeneas tactfully leaves unstated the fact that Lavinia will become his bride, in contrast to T[urnu]s' concluding references to *coniunx Lavinia* in 17 and 80 … also 937," but whether this omission should be attributed primarily to tact or to some other motivation is mute.

---

631 Ventulus is fulfilling the role of trusted civil servant as he reports on his unsuccessful embassy to enlist Diomedes' support: *Vidimus, o cives, Diomedem Argivaque castra,* 243; Latinus expresses his very negative assessment of their war effort: *bellum importunum, cives, cum gente deorum / invictisque viris gerimus,* 305-6, while Drances, whether out of honest concern or his hatred of Turnus, bewails the effect of Turnus' war on the citizens: *quid miseros totiens in aperta pericula civis / proicis,* 360-61. On Turnus, see below. *Civis* is used 15 times in the *Aeneid.* Other uses of *civis* emphasize wrong-headed behavior with significant ramifications for the city either by the citizens (Laocoon, 2. 42; Beroe, 5. 631; Ascanius, 5. 671) or by the king (Mezentius, 8. 489, 571) or by attack from outside (Turnus approaching the Latin camp, 9. 36; Aeneas attacking Latinus' city, 12. 583). For the irony of Aeneas' use of *civis* in his new role as charioteer, see below, Ch. 8, p. 451.

632 On Mnestheus, see above, n. 625.

633 Zeitlin (1965), 338, rightly stresses the significance of this scene: "The conclusion of this *foedus* is one of the vital scenes in the poem … (it) represents the legendary-historical bond contracted between Latins and Trojans, divinely sanctioned by Jupiter (X, 15) and reaffirmed by Juno (XII, 822) … In respect to the simple narrative of the poem, the *foedus* represents the achievement towards which the active energy of the last six books has been directed. On the symbolic level, the *foedus* is meant to portray the final triumph of pietas over *violentia* and furor…" Also see Tarrant (2012), 113-133: "The heavily Roman colouring of the scene underscores the fact that the Roman people is actually being brought into existence by this chain of events."

634 Of Aeneas' 69 speeches the only speeches which are longer than this one (in descending order of lines, based on Highet's, 1972, statistics, 327-29, but with all fractions rounded off) are Aeneas' address to Dido (4. 333-61, 29 lines), Aeneas' address to the assembled Trojans in Sicily (5. 45-71, 27 lines), his speech to Evander (8. 127-51, 25 lines), and his two addresses to the Sibyl, which are each 21 lines long (6. 56-76, 103-123).

On one level, Turnus has shown the hallmarks of passion. When near Lavinia (after her pink and white beauty is described, 65-69), Turnus' passion is suggested: *illum turbat amor figitque in virgine vultus/ ardet in arma magis,* 12. 70). And he has implied a similar avidity on the part of Aeneas toward Lavinia (*coniuge praerepta*, 9. 138). His relentless juxtaposition of *coniunx* with Lavinia's name, with the exception of one instance by Juno, is done by no one else in the second half of the epic including the narrator.[635] Thus Aeneas' use of Lavinia's name in association with the goal of the entire epic, the founding of a city, could be called tactful in that it forgoes domestic or sexual suggestion. But when her association with Aeneas' city is seen as integral to the divine programmatic employment of her name, used otherwise only in the first half of the epic (*cernes urbem et promissa Lavini moenia*, Jupiter, 1. 257-58; *regnum ab sede Lavini transferet,* Jupiter, 270-71; *in regna Lavini Dardanidae venient*, the Sibyl, 6. 84-85),[636] Aeneas' use of her name can be seen as returning her to the role of political signifier, a quasi-personification of Aeneas' city Lavinia. It is possible that Vergil is breaking with a tradition that associated her name with Latinus' city,[637] which, given the Trojan longing for their own new city after the loss of theirs, implies tremendous importance in the giving of this Latin princess' name to the achievement of the epic's goal. As Anchises describes her in book 6 to Aeneas among the parade of future Romans, she is the source of the Trojan line leading to Augustus (*Silvius…quem tibi longaevo serum Lavinia coniunx educet,* 764-65, the only use of *coniunx* with Lavinia's name in the first half), but Aeneas' speech represents her in her divinely-ordained symbolic political role as Rome's city of origin.

The terms Aeneas proposes to abide by as a consequence of the outcome of the duel, should he win, are especially generous towards the Latin community and show a lack of avidity for power (12. 189-91):

---

[635] Lavinia's name otherwise in the second half is used in close association with either of her parents; standing next to her father she is *Lavinia virgo* (7.72), as she is when she accompanies her mother (11. 479); she hears the words of her mother with tears (12. 64) and she is *filia* when she hears the news of her death (12. 605). Amata also begs Latinus not to give Lavinia to the Teucrians to be led in marriage (*ducenda*, 7. 359).

[636] Lavinia's name is also used twice adjectivally to describe the land to which Aeneas sails: *Laviniaque...litora* (1. 2) and *nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia respicit arva* (4. 236; Jupiter speaking to Mercury).

[637] Both Tarrant (2012), 194, and Horsfall (2000), 162, speculate that if Latinus' city was traditionally known as Lavinia, Vergil's bestowing of her name on Aeneas' city may account for his vagueness about the name of Latinus' city.

> non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo
> nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae
> invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.
>
> I shall not order the Italians to obey the Teucrians
> nor seek rule for myself: with equal terms let both
> unconquered peoples commit themselves to an
> eternal agreement.

In the case of his own people Aeneas describes them as conquered (*victos*, 184),[638] if Turnus wins; but here he characterizes the people of both the winner and the loser as "unconquered" (191) and, as we have seen, he allots the chief political and military role of the united people to Latinus and a purely religious role for himself (192-94). What Aeneas proposes contrasts pointedly with his picture of Rutulian rule in his speech to Evander; there instead of the equality of two peoples joining in an eternal covenant (*aeterna in foedera mittant,* 12. 191), the Rutulians would send all Hesperia under the yoke (*sua sub iuga mittant*, 8. 148), as charioteers in the Argive Aeschylan mode would do.[639] Latinus, in his corresponding speech, simply affirms that the Latins will uphold the terms Aeneas has proposed (*nulla dies pacem hanc Italis nec foedera rumpet*, 202), which is reasonable, since by these terms he retains his position regardless of which warrior wins. Although he recently expressed a self-condemnation for the support he has given Turnus against Aeneas (*promissam eripui genero*, *arma impia sumpsi*, 12. 31), his original intention was to marry his daughter to Aeneas and he has always spoken against the war. Thus, Aeneas' care and concern for community, the helmsman's chief identifying quality, reaches beyond his own men even to his current adversary, both in his first voicing of a desire to resolve the conflict by the duel and in the equitable consequent terms he proposes. In as much as a helmsman always hopes for an absence of storms ("the most frequent image of battle in the *Aeneid,*" Hardie, 1994, 668-71),[640] Aeneas' desire for peace could be expressed figuratively as the helmsman's hope for smooth sailing. That aspect of the Ciceronian helmsman, the willingness to sacrifice oneself for the good of those on board the ship of state,

---

[638] Aeneas also promises that, if he loses, his people will not continue the war (*cedet Iulus agris*, 185), nor initiate any future wars (*nec post arma ulla rebelles/ Aeneadae referent ferrove haec regna lacessent*, 185-86).

[639] See Ch. 8, p. 448, further on Aeneas' assumptions regarding the Rutulian rule in this passage and the similar motif in the Argive charioteers in Aeschylus' *Septem.*

[640] Hardie (1994), 668-71, commenting on this book 9 example, also cites 2. 416-19; 7. 528-30; 10. 356-9, 603-4, 693-6, 803-8; 12. 365-7, 451-5.

a rhetorical *topos* that Cicero incorporated into his self-presentation in the *Pro Sestio* (see above, Ch. 2, pp. 27-28), also finds expression in Aeneas' diplomatic speeches, although not as part of the ship of state imagery *per se*.

Aeneas voices the personal risk he has taken in approaching Evander as a suppliant emphatically (8. 143-45):

> his fretus non legatos neque prima per artem
> temptamenta tui pepigi; me, me ipse meumque
> obieci caput et supplex ad limina veni.
>
> Relying upon these (their shared ancestry, etc., 131-42), I have neither sent
> ahead envoys nor craftily made a preliminary test of you; I myself
> have exposed myself and my very life and have come as a suppliant
> to your door.

Under Aeneas' instructions, Ilioneus led a envoy to Latinus in book 7, perhaps a more typical procedure, but what seems to be implied here is that Aeneas has assumed the task himself because of the increased risk of approaching a king from Greece, one related to the Atridae (130), leaders of the fatal expedition against Troy. Aeneas' expression *obieci caput* (145) recalls his description of his return to the burning city of Troy to look for Creusa (*caput obiectare periculis*, 2. 751; Fordyce, 145), but the sacrificial nature of the risk Aeneas suggests he has taken in coming to Evander is more akin to Cicero's description of his exile in *De domo sua* (145; Fordyce, 145), the style of which is also emotionally charged. Cicero claims that by going into exile he exposed his life (*obieci meum caput*) to the frenzy and swords of the most profligate citizens on behalf of the city's gods and, further, that he essentially offered his life as a sacrifice (*meque atque meum caput ... devovi,* cf. *me, me ipse meumque obieci caput*, 8. 144-45) for the safety of his citizens (*de salute meorum civium*). Cicero also represented his exile figuratively in the *Pro Sestio* as throwing himself into the sea from a ship, while pirates threaten, in order to save those onboard. In both speeches he suggests that his *devotio* is analogous to that of the general Decius Mus (295), a voluntary

sacrifice of himself to enable the Roman army's victory. Both Ciceronian inter- and intratextual allusions (2. 751), then, suggest that Aeneas' expression here implies risk and sacrifice.[641]

The duel for settling the war, as we have seen, is first mentioned by Aeneas to the Latins requesting a truce for burial, implicitly, in order to save lives—it would be "fairer" (*aequius,* 11. 115) for Turnus to meet Aeneas in a duel—and Aeneas' humane attitude toward the Latins manifests a concern for the lives of both people. Juturna suggests that the death of either warrior could be seen as a sacrifice when she attempts to persuade the Latins to restart the war by arguing that it is shameful for one to be sacrificed for so many (*non pudet, o Rutuli, pro cunctis talibus unam / obiectare animam*? 12. 229-30). When the war reignites, *pius* Aeneas, unarmed (*dextram … inermem / nudato capite*, 311-12), insists on the legality of the treaty (which was sealed before the leaders, 12. 212-13) and attempts to convince his warriors to desist from fighting, emphasizing his exclusive right to the risk of battle (314-17):

> quo ruitis? quaeve ista repens discordia surgit?
> o cohibete iras! ictum iam foedus et omnes
> compositae leges. mihi ius concurrere soli;
> me sinite atque auferte metus. ego foedera faxo
> firma manu; Turnum debent haec iam mihi sacra.
>
> Where are you rushing or what sudden discord is rising?
> Check your anger! The treaty already has been struck
> and all its terms settled. It is right only for me to fight;
> allow me and let go of your fears. I shall fulfill the
> treaty's terms with my strong arm; By these rites
> Turnus is now owed to me.

But even in the act of speaking Aeneas is wounded and forced to withdraw, which Turnus sees and now capitalizes on (324-27):

> Turnus ut Aenean cedentem ex agmine vidit
> turbatosque duces, subita spe fervidus ardet;

---

[641] Vergil uses the frequentative form of this verb *obiectare* in the mouth of Juturna/Camers as she attempts to stir the Rutulians to break the treaty and return to warfare: *non pudet, o Rutuli, pro cunctis talibus unam/ obiectare animam*? (12. 229-30). The phrase *pro cunctis talibus* "implies that T. is performing a *devotio* on behalf of the Latins" (Tarrant, 2012, 229), a term (in the verbal form) that Juturna uses in the conclusion of her speech: Turnus' fame will rise to the gods, on whose altar he now dedicates himself (*quorum se devovet aris*, 234). The conditions under which Turnus proposes he is willing to undertake a *devotio*, and whether or not his death constitutes one are discussed below. At this point, the similarity in verbs (*obiectare*, *obicere*) and expression suggest Aeneas believes that he is taking significant risk in coming personally to Evander.

> poscit equos atque arma simul, saltuque superbus
> emicat in currum et manibus molitur habenas.
>
> When Turnus sees Aeneas withdrawing from battle
> and the leaders distressed, he burns passionately
> with sudden hope; at once he demands his horses and
> arms and arrogantly leaps with a flash into his chariot
> and he takes up the reins in his hands.

The contrast between the two leaders in these passages is complete. Aeneas unarmed attempts to check the material evidence of anger around him (an emotion associated with flames and heat) amid flying weapons, one of which wounds him, even as he speaks (318-23).[642] Turnus, on the other hand, taking advantageous of Aeneas' enforced withdrawal, embraces the fire of war as he, ignited, blazes into action (*fervidus ardet, emicat*), demanding the weapons of war (*equos, arma, currum*), as he had done upon leaving the assembly in book 11 (7. 486-91).[643] Although later he will be driven by charioteers—Metiscus, Juturna—at this point Turnus pointedly charioteers his own car (*manibus molitur habenas*). Once again Turnus' pride is associated with his chariot (*saltuque superbus emicat in currum*, 326-270), as it had been before he killed Pallas (see above, Ch. 6, p. 333), and also his eagerness for warfare as his flashing leap shows. Aeneas, like the statesman in the epic's first simile, attempts to stop violence with words, a parallel made more noticeable by the echo of Horace's *Epode* (7.1 *quo, quo scelesti ruitis*?) in the first line of his speech.[644] Aeneas' attempts, amid flying weapons, fail to stop the rising discord with his actual words (*discordia surgit*), while in the simile where strife also arises (*coorta est/ seditio* (1. 148-49), rocks and flames fly, weapons appear, but the statesman is able to guide their spirits with his words (*ille regit dictis animos,* 153) and restore calm. In both passages Vergil clearly alludes to contemporary civil strife (Tarrant, 2012, 313; above, Ch. 4, pp. 152-54), but whereas Neptune's authoritative and becalming

---

[642] Once spurred into war by Calybe, Turnus' anger is represented figuratively as a boiling caldron (see above, Ch. 5, pp. 251-52, on 7. 462, *ira super*), but anger also will characterize Aeneas at the epic's end (*ira terribilis*, 12. 96-47).

[643] Here Turnus is *fervidus* and he flashes, expressed by *fulgebat* and *exsultat.* Also note his reaction to the face of Lavinia earlier in book 12 (*ardet in armis magis*, 71).

[644] Horace's *Epode* 7, "almost certainly" anticipates Octavian's war with Antony, its dramatic date may be early 32 (Mankin, 1995, 143). The poet expresses outrage at the Roman citizens for rushing into civil war, an act even without precedent among the beasts (11-12), which the Romans seem driven to by the fates and the history of the founding act of Romulus (17-20).

chariot concludes the scene in book 1, Aeneas' hopeless attempt is followed immediately by the savage war chariot of Turnus, who, in the following lines, "is described as a killing machine operating at peak capacity" (Tarrant, 2012, 311-382; see below, Ch. 8, pp. 409-11)

Thus, in Aeneas' diplomatic speeches—to Evander, to the Latin embassy and at the treaty—he looks out for the well-being of his community, the chief attribute of the helmsman in the first half of the epic. He praises his men's bravery, spirit and proven performance in war to Evander (8. 150-51), but what is more surprising is that he also treats the Latin embassy with compassion and makes clear at the treaty that if the Trojans win the war, he has no intention of treating the Latins as conquered people, but rather they will be allies (*aeterna in foedera*).[645] Aeneas' initiation of the idea of a duel in the context of peaceful, conciliatory and even sympathetic words to the Latins indicates his desire to reduce casualties on both sides and his willingness to accept the possibility of dying in the attempt indicates the depth of his commitment to procure a home for the Trojans. Aeneas' devotion to the gods and belief in and acceptance of their oracles is evident in all three speeches, but especially in his allotment to himself of only a religious role, if he wins the duel, entrusting the political and military aspects of power, what constitutes Roman *imperium*, to Latinus. As the helmsmen in the first half of the epic encouraged their men with hopes of their future city, Aeneas concludes the terms of the treaty with the specific plans for the Trojan's new city, bestowing on Lavinia not the title of wife, which she will become and upon which Turnus is fixated, but an eternal association with this new city, which with her name begins the Trojans' transformation into Romans. Aeneas expresses his desire for peace and the avoidance of war's mayhem both to the Latin embassy, but most vociferously in his speech to his troops asking them to respect the treaty and allow him alone to risk his life. As the joining of Lavinia's name with the future Trojan city renews Jupiter's linking of her name with the origins of Roman *imperium* early in book 1, so Aeneas' attempt to calm the storm of the reignited war in book 12 not only alludes to Horace's *Epode* 7 bemoaning the contemporary continuation of civil war, but also recalls the first simile in the epic that

[645] An arrangement that king Latinus had previously proposed at the council in book 11 (321-22): *foederis aequas dicamus leges sociosque in regna vocemus.*

compares Neptune's calming of Juno's storm at sea with his chariot to a statesman's restraining of a seditious mob with only his presence and words. In place of this overt comparison of god and politician, the narrative following Aeneas' spoken attempt to regain adherence to the words of the treaty describes Turnus arming and rejoining the passion-driven fray in his war chariot, still acting as Juno's agent, with whose arms and chariot in Carthage the epic also began. Thus, Aeneas' diplomatic speech links him with the forces of order, rationality, dutifulness, especially to community and gods, and peace.[646] At times his speech in war, as we have seen and will again, departs from these high ideals which is signaled by uncharacteristically pejorative descriptions.[647]

Turnus

By contrast, Vergil shapes the reader's response to a much greater degree through the descriptions of Turnus that precede his speeches, which, with very few exceptions, represent him as akin to Aristotle's rash man.[648] Three categories of description predominate: those with words that describe Turnus as mocking (*inridens,* 7. 435; *subridens,* 9. 740), which are associated with arrogant behavior, those that indicate his boldness (*audaci*), which accompany his misguided interpretations of signs, and those that describe him as blazing (*exarsit, accenso*) and violent (*violentia*).[649] The speeches themselves are

---

[646] Aeneas' diplomatic speech exhibits what Spence (1988), 11-21, has identified as the characteristics of the rhetoric of reason, reflecting the rhetorical tradition of Isocrates and Cicero, established in the first simile of the *Aeneid* in which "order and calm are associated, through reason, with the good."

[647] Aeneas' speeches typically lack distinctive descriptions of his demeanor, but when present are positive. In the second half of the epic Aeneas speaks usually with no preceding words that qualify his character (11 times: 7. 121, 8. 70, 116, 531; 10. 251, 332, 530, 897, 11. 13, 107, 12. 564); his piety is implied 5 times (10. 591, *pius*; 824, *patriae subiit pietatis imago*; 874, *laetusque precatur*; 12. 175, *pius*; 311, *pius*), his compassion 3 times (11. 29, *lacrimans*; 41, *lacrimis...abortis*; 95, *gemitu...alto*), and his friendliness once (8. 126, *dictis...amicis*) or affection (12. 434, *summaque per galeam delibans oscula*). Twice within his anger-driven *aristeia* after Palla's death he or his words to his victim are described as hostile (10. 591, *inimico pectore*; 591, *dictis...amaris*, note used in conjuction with *pius*) and he rebukes (*increpat*) and threatens (*minatur*) Lausus (10. 810), but all of these descriptions are quite mild compared with those before his final two speeches: *saevo sic pectore* (12. 888) and *furiis accensus et ira terribilis* (946-47), which are typically adjectives describing Turnus.

[648] Tarrant (2012), 13, in comparing the arming scenes of Turnus and Aeneas in book 12, summarizes the implications: "T. is a character swept along by passion, whereas A. represents a model of self-control" and he notes that this contrast "parallels Aristotle's distinction between the rash man and the courageous man (ὁ ἀνδρεῖος), who "is passionate (ὀξύς) in the midst of danger but calm (ἡσύχιος) beforehand." See also Heinze, 211, "Aeneas has *vis temperata* (controlled strength) while Turnus has *vis consili expers* (strength unaccompanied by judgement)."

[649] Turnus is described as bold (*audaci*) before the speeches at 9. 126 and 10. 276, fiery (*exarsit*, 11. 376; *accenso*, 12. 9; 12. 71), violent (*violentia*, 11. 376, 12. 9, 45). Other terms indicate a more general emotional distress (*turbidus*, 10. 648; *turbat,* 12. 70; *amens*, 12. 621, 776). Turnus also is commonly associated with instruments of

impassioned, generally well-organized, but prone to emotional digressions, deficient in military strategy and largely myopically focused on himself and his personal agenda of gaining power through the war he leads.

It is fortunate that Turnus' first speech in the epic precedes Allecto's flaming propulsion of him into war, for certain important aspects of Turnus' character, which resonate with his later actions, can therefore be considered inherent, namely, his boldness (*audacis Rutuli*, 7. 409), mocking arrogance (*vatem inridens*, 7. 436) and lack of respect for a priestess (*sed te victa situ verique senectus, o mater,...exercet*, 7. 440-41), a lack of *pietas*, as we have seen (Ch. 5, pp. 252-53). Although Turnus expresses a confidence in his own (and masculinity's) domination of the pursuit of war and peace (*bella viri pacemque gerent quis bella gerenda*, 7. 444), Calybe/Allecto, reacting to his comments with blazing anger (*exarsit in iras*, 445),[650] catapults him into war. But Turnus maintains his confidence in himself as a warrior and in the value of war as a means to achieve his goal of expanded power with the marriage to Lavinia.

Turnus' boldness characterizes his demeanor as he gives speeches of encouragement to his troops in the face of divine epiphanies, one as the fire-emitting Aeneas approaches the shore (10. 270-71; *haud tamen audaci Turno fiducia cessit*, 276), in which he fearlessly encourages his troops and recommends effective actions to take against the landing forces (279-84).[651] But an earlier instance, to which this line alludes (*at non audaci Turno fiducia cessit*, 9. 126), a speech given to his troops as the Trojan ships, which the Rutulians had been in the act of igniting, are changed before their eyes into nymphs (128-58),

---

war, especially his spear (9.746, 10. 480, 12. 93-94), to which he addresses a speech in book 12 (95-100), but also his helmet (9. 50) and his chariot (10. 440, 12. 681). His speeches without an introductory description are few: 12. 631, 894.

[650] On the association of fire with anger and in Turnus see above, Ch. 5, pp. 253-4.

[651] Turnus in his response acts quickly, speaks in short rousing clauses to his men and strategizes rapidly; the narrative pace quickens (276-86). He fearlessly models qualities of an effective general. His movements, speech and thoughts are dynamic, which is evident on a stylistic level by the high number of verbs (16) and participles (5) in the passage, as well as by the brief clauses and imperative and hortatory verbs. The verbs are powerful (*praecipere, pellere, occurramus*), the actions he recommends are strategically sound (Harrison, 1991, 277, 285-6), he demonstrates the forethought of a careful planner (285-86), and the motivational imperatives are *topoi* of generals' speeches before battle (Harrison, 1991, 280-1, 281-2). Compared to the presentation of Aeneas that has been largely driven by iconic visual descriptions onboard his ship and interaction with the divine (his only speech since book 8 is the four-line prayer to Cybele, 252-55), Turnus' words present the living vitality of an energetic human engaged in a concrete world.

presents a far greater challenge to the young leader as his speech testifies. The transformation is preceded by the *vox horrenda* of Cybele, accompanied by a cloud of heavenly votaries (*Idaeique chori,* 112), which is said to fill the battle lines of both the Trojans and the Rutulians (9. 113) and specifically names Turnus, who, Cybele says, will be able to burn the sea before he can burn her sacred pines (*maria ante exurere Turno quam sacras dabitur pinus*, 115-16). The reaction of the Rutulians (with the exception of Turnus) and the natural world is commensurate with the grand and fantastic nature of the event,[652] but Turnus, named disparagingly by the thundering divine voice, is undaunted, "forcing his own blinded interpretation on events" (Hardie, 1994, 128). He assures his men that the transformation of the ships is meant to show the Trojans that Jupiter has taken away their accustomed support (*auxilium solitum,* 129) and thereby precluded any hope of escape (128-31), initiating a theme of Trojan denigration in his speech.[653] Hardie (1994, 128) suggests that it is "the mark of a good general to capitalize on inauspicious moments" such as these,[654] but the incontrovertible evidence that his interpretation is wrong also suggests the power of Turnus' presence and speech to persuade, even if it is a manipulative and arrogant form of persuasion, the excesses of which suggest the desperation of the moment for the leader of the forces opposing a powerful god.

The core of Turnus' argument rests on a fabrication of his role in the war as the wronged husband, based on the abduction of Helen by Paris. Building from this false analogy he argues that he, like the Atrideae, has fate on his side, a fate that opposes that of the Venus and the gods and gives him the right to destroy an entire race (133-142):

> nil me fatalia terrent,
> si qua Phryges prae se iactant, responsa deorum;
> sat fatis Venerique datum, tetigere quod arva
> fertilis Ausoniae Troes. sunt et mea contra

---

[652] The Rutulians are simply astonished, but Messapus, the *equum domitor* (7. 691, 9. 523, 12. 128, 550) is terrified and cannot control his horses and the Tiber flows backward (123-25), a *tricolon crescens,* a 'spotlight' technique that "isolates by contrast the *audacia* of T" (Hardie, 1994, 123-05).

[653] Hardie (1994), 129, maintains that by using the adjective *solitum,* Turnus "scornfully (and unfairly) implies that the Trojans habitually save their skins by flight overseas."

[654] Hardie (*ibid*), cites the example of Julius Caesar's changing the interpretation of his fall, as he disembarked from his ship in African, into a positive omen, simply by saying *teneo te, Africa* (Suet. *Iul*. 59), but he is interpreting a simple human act, open to a clever reinterpretation, not a miracle accompanied by a booming divine voice.

> fata mihi, ferro sceleratam exscindere gentem
> coniuge praerepta; nec solos tangit Atridas
> iste dolor, solisque licet capere arma Mycenis.
> "sed periisse semel satis est": peccare fuisset
> ante satis, penitus modo non genus omne perosos
> femineum.
>
> The decrees of the fates do not terrify me, if the Trojans
> are boasting that these are responses of the gods.
> Enough has been given to the fates and Venus
> when the Trojans touched the fertile fields of Ausonia.
> I also have my own opposing fate, to exterminate a wicked race
> with the sword, since they have taken my wife;
> this grief touches not only the Atridae and not only at
> Mycenae are they allowed to take up arms. "But to have
> perished once is enough:" It would have been enough
> to have sinned before, without deeply despising
> the whole feminine gender.[655]

In this passage Turnus comes close to defining fate as "that which lies in the strength of my weapons," an implicit "rejection of a supernatural sanction (that) brings him close to Mezentius, the *contemptor divum*,"[656] and he further justifies his interpretation of his fate on a complete misrepresentation of his relation to Lavinia, to whom he was never engaged, let alone married.[657] The winning of Lavinia has been inextricably bound to the succession to Latinus' kingdom since her introduction into the epic (and Turnus'),[658] but war as a means of determining Lavinia's future husband was wrathful Juno's vindictive addition. In her speech at the beginning of book 7, enraged that fate is thwarting her destructive plans

---

[655] Hardie (1994), 140-2, translates *peccare… feminum*: "Their previous sinning might have been enough for them, with a heartfelt hatred for all but the whole race of women," adding "the limiting phrase *modo non* is awkward, and the text may be corrupt" and Williams (1972-73), 140-2, translates the last clause "if only they didn't deeply despise the whole female sex."

[656] Hardie (1994), 136-7, who notes that Mezentius "prays blasphemously at 10. 773-4 *extra mihi deus et telum… nunc adsint!*" Perhaps in his tendency to turn his desires into his fate Turnus resembles more Julius Caesar, who as Nicoll (1988), 470-71, characterizes him, was "a follower of *Fortuna*—his own personal good fortune seen as a power which ensured his success and safety." Nicoll also discusses ancient criticism of Caesar's trust in his *Fortuna.*

[657] Hardie (1994), 138, and Horsfall (1995), 156 and n.16.

[658] Lavinia is introduced as both the sole preserver of Latinus house and as marriageable (7. 52-53): *sola domum et tantas servabat filia sedes/ iam matura viro, iam plenis nubilis.* Turnus is first mentioned as the leading contender for Lavinia's hand (*petit ante alios pulcherrimus omnis/ Turnus*, 7. 55-56), having been introduced by the Sibyl as *alius… Achilles* (6. 89) in the war, the cause of which is again a woman (i.e., Lavinia, *causa mali tanti coniunx iterum*, 6. 93). Allecto overtly links Lavinia with marriage, war and kingdom in her speech to Turnus (7. 423-24): *rex coniugium et quaesitas sanguine dotes/ abnegat, externusque in regnum quaeritur heres.*

against the Trojans she promises to replay the Trojan War,[659] but it will be twisted and distorted version, the essentials of which recur here in Turnus' speech: Aeneas, who never even sees Lavinia and has no opportunity to become enamored, will be a second Paris (*Paris alter*, 7. 7.321; cf. *coniuge praerepta*, 138) and Juno will exterminate the people of two kings (*populos exscindere*, 7. 316; cf. *exscindere gentem*, 137) before a marriage will occur. However, on the battlefield where many lives are threatened the discrepancy between Turnus' narrow selfish cause for fighting and his goal of annihilating a race suggests that he is thoughtlessly risking others' lives to fulfill his own desire.[660] In terms of Turnus' character, his insistently personal expression of incentive (*sunt et mea contra fata mihi…coniuge praerepta*),[661] indicates an eagerness for warfare and its rewards (Lavinia and power) with little awareness of the consequences for others.

Almost as though Turnus suddenly realizes a need to address his men and the immediate situation he switches abruptly to the frustrating circumstances that caused him to resort to attacking the ships, the Trojans' inaccessibility within their camp. In his mockery of the Trojan reliance on their fortifications

---

[659] The war in Latium as a second Trojan war is accurately predicted by the Sibyl in her revelation to Aeneas (6. 88-94): *non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra defuerint… causi mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris externique iterum thalami.*

[660] Horsfall (1995), 209, argues that Turnus' motives for fighting are "palpably confused," that although he fights for Lavinia (9. 136 [also included as an example of Turnus as "champion of Italy," which can only be true in the sense that he is addressing his troops], 600, 10. 78, 12. 17, 80), "he claims repeatedly to be fighting 'for Italy' (or for the kingdom he hopes to inherit as Latinus' future son-in-law)." However, in only two of the passages sited in support of Turnus' repeated claims, is he the (here, indirect) speaker (*primis iuvenum et iubet arma parari,/ tutari Italiam, detrudere finibus hostem,* 7. 468-69; *Turnus… terrorem ingeminat: Teucros in regna vocari,/ stirpem admisceri Phrygiam, se limine pelli,* 7. 578-9). The remaining are spoken by other characters or from their perspective (7. 423, 436, Allecto; 7. 98, Faunus; 7. 268-9, Latinus [to Ilioneus! *est mihi nata, virgo gentis quam iungere nostrae non patrio ex adyto sortes*]; 7. 343, 359, Amata; 7. 433, Allecto; 12. 27, Latinus). References to the Trojans as a group, in my opinion, do not necessarily imply a nationalistic war, since the Trojans as a group also become linked to Turnus' wife-stealing paradigm (Numanus to the Trojans: *en qui nostra sibi bello conubia poscunt!* 9. 600) and the destruction of the group is predicated upon the "stealing" of Lavinia, as in the passage under discussion (138).

[661] Heinze (1903/1993), 211, stresses this point: "Above all, he (Turnus) is not fighting on behalf of his people and their future, as Aeneas is, but is justifiably reproached for fighting to defend his own personal claims" and as further support he supplies a strong statement from Cicero (211, n. 46): "but as for the elation of spirits, which can be seen to drive a man through toils and perils, if there is no just cause involved, and a man fights, not for the preservation of his people, but for his own advantage (*non pro salute communi sed pro suis commodis*), then that is wrong; for not only is that nothing to do with valour (*id virtutis non est*), but rather it is characteristic of outrageous behaviour that denies every kind of human feeling," *Off.* 1. 19. 62). So also Bowra (1990), 375, "Turnus… fights not for his country's wrongs nor even for her safety, but for his own glory. His is a case of that elation of mind described by Cicero (*Off.* 1. 19) which fights for its own advantage and is therefore a vice."

Turnus continues to use the Trojan war as fuel for his complaints against his foes, as he belittles their valor and lessens the threat they pose, setting the stage for a renewed call to attack the Trojan camp in which he demonstrates a willingness to fight alongside his men, his version of community (9. 142-47):

> quibus haec medii fiducia valli
> fossarumque morae, leti discrimina parva,
> dant animos; at non viderunt moenia Troiae
> Neptuni fabricata manu considere in ignis?
> sed vos, o lecti, ferro qui scindere vallum
> apparat et mecum invadit trepidantia castra?
>
> For these (the Trojans) confidence in the intervening palisade
> and the delay of trenches, scanty protection from death, gives them
> courage. Didn't they see the walls of Troy, built by Neptune,
> settle into flames? But, O you chosen men, who among you is prepared
> to cut through the palisade with a sword and with me attack
> the terrified camp?

This is the core of Turnus' speech to his men; having minimized the impact on them of the terrifying occurrence as best he can, he attempts to refocus their attention on the Trojan camp by ridiculing the flimsiness of its fortification in contrast to the mighty walls of Troy which were built by a god. He thereby suggests that the Trojans are losers who in their present less protected circumstance will be an easy mark. The call to his men to accompany him in attacking the camp (146-47), follows logically from the comments on walls and fortifications and shows an admirable willingness to fight alongside his men.

This evidence of Turnus' closeness to his troops in conjunction with his more frequent arrogance finds parallels in the development of Julius Caesar's self-presentation. In the first century a general's fighting with his men was a characteristic especially associated with Marius, the soldiers' soldier, whose speech in Sallust (*Iug.* 85) upon his first election to the consulship, defends his knowledge of war and willingness to fight with his men, in contrast to the noble generals' love of luxury and insolation from their soldiers.[662] Julius Caesar, in an apparent desire to be associated with this Marian approach to leadership, at first represented himself fighting on foot with his men, not leading them on horseback (*B.*

---

[662] *Non possum fidei causa imagines neque triumphos aut consulatus maiorum meorum ostentare, at, si res postulet, hastas, vexillum, phaleras, alia militaria dona, praeterea cicatrices adverso corpore. Hae sunt meae imagines, haec nobilitas… Hoc est utile, hoc civile imperium. Namque cum tute per mollitiem agas, exercitum supplicio cogere, id est dominum, non imperatorem esse… Egomet in agmine* [*a*]*ut in proelio consultor idem et socius periculi vobiscum adero, meque vosque in omnibus rebus iuxta geram.*

Gall. 1. 25. 1; 2. 25. 2; McDonnell, 309-10), even though he did in fact command from horseback. However, later as sole ruler he remodeled his public *virtus* on that of the aristocrat M. Claudius Marcellus and was represented prominently in equestrian statues (on the rostra and in front of the Temple of Venus Genetrix; McDonnell, 317-18), a presentation which may have been largely avoided until the late Republic due to its implied arrogance.[663] Turnus, seems to combine both aspects of Julius Caesar's self-presentation; in this speech he shows a Marian closeness in his desire to attack the camp with his men and at the end of the speech he seems sympathetic to their needs (156-58).[664]

Yet Turnus also shows at least aristocratic arrogance both in the chariot in book 10, as we have seen (Ch. 5, p. 333)[665] and will again in book 12, and on horseback. Earlier in this book (47-53), Turnus rides a Thracian piebald up to the Trojan camp in a passage that alludes to Rome's most feared enemy, Hannibal, who was thought to have ridden up to Rome and hurled a spear over the walls.[666] As we will see in Turnus' speech in the assembly, the most meaningful value to Turnus, *virtus*, clearly understood as marital courage in confrontations at relatively close range, would be most often expressed on the ground amid the general fighting.[667]

---

[663] McDonnell (2006), 154-61, 257, discusses the apparent anomaly that despite the strong link between aristocratic *virtus* and the mounted warrior starting with the Samnite War (343), archaeological evidence indicates that representations of equestrian warriors seem to have been very limited due, he argues, to the arrogance they imply, based on the numerous equestrian coins and statues of the dictator Sulla and passages in Cicero indicating the implied arrogance of equestrian statues. Cicero comments on the inappropriateness of an equestrian statue for Sulpicius Rufus because he opposed the arrogance of the present age (*huius saeculi insolentiam*, *Phil.* 9. 13) and on the "unbelievable shamelessness" (*impudentiam incredibilem*) of the equestrian statue Lucius Antonius erected of himself in the Roman Forum (*Phil*. 6. 13). McDonnell, (258), also notes that equestrian statues became "almost commonplace in the 50s, when republican government and republican constraints on political competition and self-aggrandizement were breaking down."

[664] Turnus' closeness with his men may also be reflected in the greater frequency of his speeches to them (5 times with a total of 47 lines: 9. 51-52, 128-58, 10. 279-84, 11. 463-67, 12. 693-95) than Aeneas makes to his men (3 times with a total of 29 lines: 11. 14-28, 12. 313-17, 565-73).

[665] See above, Ch. 2, pp. 79-80, and Ch. 5, pp. 296-97, on Julius Caesar's numerous triumphs and their possible tyrannical associations.

[666] Horsfall (1974), 80-86, who speculates on Vergil's possible sources (80, n. 5); Hardie (1994), 48 and 52-3.

[667] Even in the previous scene of Pallas' death in which Turnus arrives prominently in his chariot, he jumps from his chariot following Iliadic practice: *desiluit Turnus biiugis, pedes apparat ire/ comminus,* 10. 453-54.

The last third of Turnus' speech (148-58), largely consisting of a series of boasts enumerating the many ways in which he and his men will far outperform the Greeks' effort in the Trojan war,[668] seems to be an extended digression from the apparent rallying of his men to attack the Trojan camp. Hardie (1994, 146-47) considers the rally (*sed vos, o lecti…qui…invadit trepidantia castra?*) "a necessary prelude to the boasting," which would be a reasonable interpretation if the boasting led to some action, but instead, Turnus abruptly decides, that since the better part of the day has passed and things have gone well, they should rest up for the following day's fighting.[669] In fact the Rutulians have accomplished nothing other than moving up to the camp and turning in frustration to torching the ships, which was immediately aborted (Hardie, 1994, 157). Further, as Highet maintains (88-89), in the Iliadic passage (8. 502-7) in which Hector tells the Trojans to rest after a day of hard fighting, the decision to cease action is absolutely necessary since it is almost dark, whereas at this point in the *Aeneid* this incontrovertible necessity is lacking. It seems, therefore, far more likely that despite his boldness Turnus is also distressed by the extraordinary occurrence of the ships' metamorphosis, as suggested by his emotional and exaggerated digression on his stolen wife and the final lengthy boasting of his prowess.[670] As a consequence, he may be losing an opportunity to gain an advantage,[671] as he will at the end of book 9 when an overt narratorial comment forces the reader to notice that Turnus' passion prohibits him from being a good strategic commander.

---

[668] Turnus commences with the assertion that he does not need the arms of Vulcan (although Servius points out that he does have a sword made by Vulcan [12. 90-91; Hardie, 148]), nor a thousand ships to defeat the Trojans (148-50), nor will he resort to the trick of hiding in dark places as the Greeks did in the belly of the horse, but he will fight in the open with fire (150-53). He will make sure the Trojans don't think that they are fighting the Greeks who took ten years to win their war (154-55). Turnus goes from identifying with the Greeks in "the stealing of his wife" to belittling their efforts in comparison with his own prowess.

[669] 9. 156-58:

> *nunc adeo, melior quoniam pars acta diei,*
> *quod superest, laeti bene gestis corpora rebus*
> *procurate, viri, et pugnam sperate parari.*

[670] Hardie (1994), 158, characterizes the end of Turnus' speech as "feeble.

[671] Hardie (1994), 146-7, objects to Highet's view that Turnus' failure to follow up on his rally constitutes "a serious blunder" (88), because "the following days events do not show up a blunder in T.'s siege-tactics." But the anticlimactic ending of his speech, with the cessation of action after nearly none has occurred, seems to indicate a lack of decisiveness and resourcefulness, not necessarily "over-caution" (which Hardie rightly finds inconsistent with Turnus' "rashness").

Turnus has managed to gain entrance into the camp, thanks to the foolhardy disobedience of Pandarus and Bitias (675-76), and after he is accidentally closed within he becomes another Achilles, as he himself asserts (742). The Trojans are fleeing in fear when the narrator comments (757-61):

> et si continuo victorem ea cura subisset,
> rumpere claustra manu sociosque immittere portis,
> ultimus ille dies bello gentique fuisset.
> sed furor ardentem caedisque insana cupido
> egit in adversos.
>
> And if this concern had immediately occurred to him in victory,
> to break open the bolt with his hand and send in his men by the gate,
> that would have been the last day of the war and of a race.
> But frenzy and an insane lust for slaughter drove him blazing
> against his foes.

Whatever allies Aeneas brings with him, including his divine mother, those within the camp are so significant a force (in particular Ascanius for whom Venus cares especially)[672] that the rest of the Trojans would dwindle away without ever contributing to Rome's heritage, if Turnus had released the bolt. Thus, the possibility of obtaining Turnus' insane hope of destroying a whole people, one day after he expressed it, is within his grasp (*sunt et mean contra fata...sceleratam exscindere gentem*, 136-37), but another kind of insanity, blood lust, precludes it. His lack of awareness of his soldiers (*socios immittere portis*) at this point essentially loses him the war, which suggests that his previous failure to act on a rally after a lengthy digressive series of boasts in his speech at the water's edge constitutes a similarly significant and needless loss of opportunity, a weakness in a leader, especially in one who glorifies the political effectiveness of war, as his speech in the council demonstrates.

Thus, in Turnus' first long speech in the epic, a *cohortatio* to his troops, his boldness before a terrifying divine manifestation directed against him clearly shows a lack of fear, but also a lack of perception and arrogance in misinterpreting the sign according to his will and asserting his own narrow reading of fate buttressed by a false analogy of his situation to that of the wronged husband Menelaus. His elevation of this perceived wrong to the justification for his personal agenda of Trojan annihilation

---

[672] Venus makes it clear to Jupiter shortly after this episode concludes, that how Aeneas fares is not as important to her (10. 48-49) as Ascanius' survival (*liceat dimittere ab armis/ incolumem Ascanium, liceat superesse nepotem,* 46-47).

suggests that he views the war from a very restricted perspective, that of Quint's individualist leader in pursuit of his own selfish goals (see above, Ch. 4, pp. 210-11). While Turnus' arrogant pride is evident in his elaboration of his (implicit) superiority to the Greeks (in contrast to his initial assimilation of himself with the Atridae), his encouraging of his warriors to attack the camp with him shows a willingness to share their danger analogous to Sallust's descriptions of Marius and Julius Caesar's self-presentation at times in the *Bellum Gallicum.* At the same time, Turnus' valor would seem to be analogous to that of Caesar's own soldiers at the siege of Gergovia (*B. Gall.* 7. 52. 1), who, due to their recklessness and passion (*temeritas cupiditasque*), thought "they could capture the town with *virtus* alone," and failed implicitly because they ignored Caesar's more rational strategic savvy (McDonnell, 304). In this area, the more rational side of warfare, Turnus struggles due to his passionate nature, which is evident in this speech's digressions, boasting and the sudden anticlimactic ending that seems to refute his earlier boldness due to his apparent indecisiveness and lack of resourcefulness. There is no question that at the end of book 9 Turnus loses an opportunity to end the war because he is blinded by blood lust from taking a simple act that would have brought him victory in the war.

Turnus' longest speech and the one which reveals the most about his character is that given in response to both Latinus' and Drances' speeches in the council called in the wake of Diomedes' rejection of the Latin appeal for help (11. 378-444). The scene is a paradigm of disfunctional public discourse;[673] king Latinus, who wants to sue for peace, describes two alternative options he would like to offer the Trojans (land of their own, if they want to stay, 315-23; ships and supplies, if they want to go, 324-29), but he avoids mentioning the root cause of the war (the offer of his daughter to Aeneas) and unwisely asks for discussion (*consulite in medium*, 11. 335), having said nothing to attract Turnus to this course of action. Drances, powerful in sedition (340) and an old enemy of Turnus (336-37), poses a reasonable alternative that does include Turnus—that he meet Aeneas in single combat,[674] but he presents this in such

[673] The darker implications of this are suggested by Hardie (1998), especially 261-62.

[674] Horsfall (2003), 343-75: "the reader's reaction of instinctive dislike … stands in subtle counter point with an inescapable sense that he [Drances] expresses sane and reasonable views, as a proponent of peace and of a solution of the struggle by means of singe combat." Also see Hardie (1998), 261, and Fantham (1999), 266.

a way— demeaning Turnus and adding Lavinia to the deal with the Trojans—that he enflames Turnus, who mocking Drances' voluminous loquacity is himself so distracted by Drances' slights that he launches into a lengthy tirade against him and in defense of his courage (378-409), before ever discussing the proposed options.[675] Drances successfully goads Turnus into an impassioned response, which is expressed strongly: his violence (aggressiveness, passionateness), a word used only of Turnus in the *Aeneid*,[676] is said to blaze forth (*talibus exarsit dictis violentia Turni*, 376). Turnus' violence is most apparent in the first half of his speech—his *ad hominem* attack of Drances and his defense against Drances' belittling of his *virtus,* (378-409)[677]—but even in the more orderly part of his speech, that directed to Latinus (410-44), which considers the three options under discussion—peace, continued war, and a duel—his *virtus* is a unifying theme of the whole and is also used to support the continued violence of the war.

Turnus begins his fiery response to Drances' speech with a personal attack against Drances that belittles his eagerness to speak in the assemblies and mocks his fear of fighting (378-91). In choosing essentially a warrior's perspective of the value of acting versus speaking,[678] he is able to insinuate even into this attack his own desire to continue the war (*sed non replenda est curis verbis…dum distinet hostem agger murorum nec inundant sanguine fossae*, 380-82; *nec longe scilicet hostes quaerendi nobis;*

---

[675] Kennedy (1972), 394, seems tentative when he notes that "[c]ommentators have sometimes thought Drances was Virgil's picture of Cicero," but he also points to several parallels—poor reputations as fighters, their backgrounds are not aristocratic, Drances' speech has "something like" the oratorical parts and he employs irony—which suggests that he concurs. In Horsfall's opinion (2003), 122-32, this identification has been refuted with great weight and, while he finds no fault with his identification as a *popularis* (occasionally noting [360, for example], that the tone is "exactly right for his developed *popularis* character,") he considers "the language and themes of late Republican politics" in Drances' speech of greater importance.

[676] Cicero also associated *violentus* (2. 68) and *violentia* (12. 26) with Antony in the *Philippics*, as Camps (1969), 40 and n. 30, notes. Kennedy (1972), 394, "Turnus might possibly be thought of as influenced by Antony."

[677] Drances has interlaced his supportive response to Latinus' plans for peace with comments that imply Turnus' tyrannical intimidation of the Latins who, Drances maintains, are all apposed to the war (345-46, 348) and the use of his *violentia* to bend Latinus to his will (354, 357). He accuses Turnus of being the source of all the evils the Latins are enduring in the war (361), but he also describes him as an inept general (*fugae fidens et caelum territat armis*, 351), who is defeated and should remove himself from the city (*pulsus abi*, 366).

[678] See, for example, Marius' comments after being elected consul in Sallust (*Iug.* 85): *Comparate nunc, Quirites, cum illorum superbia me hominem novum. Quae illi audire aut legere solent, eorum partem vidi, alia egomet gessi; quae illi litteris, ea ego militando didici. Nunc vos existimate, facta an dicta pluris sint.*

circumstant undique muros, 387-88).[679] In the negative characterization of Drances' words and in the description of their locus as the equivalent of the senate (*patribusque vocatis*, 379; *curia,* 380),[680] Turnus devalues political action in favor of military acts, the arena of *vivida virtus* (vital courage, 386), in which he will argue he excels. While the themes of *virtus, gloria* and *Fortuna*, are recognizably Sallustian,[681] the style of Turnus' attack, ironically, has affinities with Cicero's many *ad hominem* speeches,[682] a statesman with next to no military experience, whose life was devoted to speaking in assemblies. But Turnus, military man that he is, in this speech shares with Cicero the tendency to differentiate himself from his opponents by stark and extreme antitheses and to bolster his importance by frequent exaggerated boasting,[683] a tendency evident in his specific defense of his valor in the longest section of the speech (392-409).

An increase in emotional intensity as Turnus tries to refute Drances' charges against his courage and the war is evident in the piling up of questions, violent name calling (*foedissime, demens, artificis*

---

679 "The curia shouldn't be filled with words...while the ramparts and walls hold off the enemy and the ditches are not yet filled with blood;" "… nor do we have to look far for the enemy; they surround the walls on all sides."

680 Drance's words are excessive (*larga… copia fandi,* 378; *non replenda est curia verbis, quae… magna volant*, 380-81), loud (*magna,* 381; *tona* 383) and windy (*volant,* 381; *ventosa in lingua*, 390).

681 *virtus*: 385, 415, 441, 444; *gloria*: 336 (what stirs Drances' envy of Turnus), 421, 431, 444; *Fortuna*: 414, 427; Horsfall (2003), 336, considers "the concern with glory itself in general peculiarly and recognisably Sallustian" and labels Turnus' intention *virium opibus gloriam quaere* Sallustian." On *virtus* in Sallust, see Earl (1961), 28-40; *gloria*: 7-11, 72, 79, 95, 100.

682 Ciceronian aspects are apparent in all of the speech directed against Drances, but especially in the first 13½ lines in which antithesis is pervasive, the tone is bitterly ironic, personal pronouns (and possessive adjectives) referring to the antagonist are prolific (*tibi:* 378, 381, 383, 389; *tu* 384; *tua;* 385) and opposing (*tibi me*, 384), there is an imagined episode (*imus in adversos—quid cessas?* 389) ending with questions—what Horsfall (2003), 389, calls an *interrogatiunculae,* (cf. Cic. *Cat*. 1.20), the use of the pejorative *iste,* here both times at the end of lines and sections (*pedibusque fugacibus istis*, 390; *pectore in isto*, 409) and some distinctive vocabulary (*foedissime*, 392, cf. Cic. *Pis*. 31; *Phil*. 13. 35). Although it is true that evidence of invective survives almost exclusively in Cicero's speeches, Powell's opinion (2007), 5, that invective may not have been "a fundamental feature of ancient culture, but… something that belonged particularly to the atmosphere of Late Republican politics" is intriguing. Certainly, a very much more detailed comparison between Turnus' speech and examples of Ciceronian invective would be required to demonstrate an intended allusion.

683 From many possible examples of Cicero's excessive boasts, one we have looked at in some detail, is the belief that his departure into exile, saved the Republic in a way analogous to a general's *devotio* (See above, Ch. 2, pp. 27-29).

scelus) and the exaggeration of his martial accomplishments, although the quoting of Drances' words in the form of questions followed by a response imparts a degree of organization (392-402):[684]

> pulsus ego? aut quisquam merito, foedissime, pulsum
> arguet, Iliaco tumidum qui crescere Thybrim
> sanguine et Evandri totam cum stirpe videbit
> procubuisse domum atque exutos Arcadas armis?
> haud ita me experti Bitias et Pandarus ingens
> et quos mille die victor sub Tartara misi,
> inclusus muris hostilique aggere saeptus.
> nulla salus bello? capiti cane talia, demens,
> Dardanio rebusque tuis. proinde omnia magno
> ne cessa turbare metu atque extollere viris
> gentis bis victae, contra premere arma Latini.
>
> I defeated? Whoever would argue rightly that I am beaten
> who will see the Tiber swelling with Trojan blood and the
> entire house of Evander fallen with its descendants and the
> Arcadians disarmed? Not so did the giants Bitias and Pandarus
> find me and those thousands whom in one day I victoriously sent
> into Tartarus, shut in by the walls and hedged round by the enemy
> rampart. No salvation in war? Your insane! Tell that kind of thing to the
> Trojan and your affairs. Then keep disturbing everything with
> your loud fears and extolling the strength of a twice beaten race
> and denigrating the arms of Latinus.

While Turnus has killed Evander's only possible heir, he has not seen the Arcadians disarmed, but seems to be still thinking of his defeat of Pallas and glorying "hyperbolically in his victory, rich in spoils… over a single, young adversary" (Horsfall, 2003, 395). Likewise the deaths of the giant twins Bitias and Pandarus were recounted at the end of book 9 (672-755), but the killing of a thousand men by one, even in the course of a war is unlikely, let alone within one day.[685] Drances had indeed claimed that there is no salvation in war as a preamble to asking Turnus for peace (*nulla salus bello, pacem te poscimus omnes*, 362) and in the context of the suffering of their citizens (*quid miseros totiens in aperta pericula civis proicis,* 360-61). Turnus here implies that this is a treasonous and disloyal thought (*capiti cane talia,*

---

[684] *pulsus ego?… pulsum,* 392, cf. *pulsus abi,* 366; *nulla salus bello?*, 399, cf. *nulla salus bello*, 362. The last item Turnus discusses from Drances' speech is his suggestion of intimidation against free speech by Turnus (346-48), which is most apparent at the beginning of that orator's speech, with the result that Turnus takes up Drances' topics in reverse order, another indication of organization.

[685] Horsfall (2003), 396, "Accelerated hyperbole, in that 'a thousand slain' is an unusually ample bag for a single warrior, while 'a thousand in a day' is extending the known limits of the battle-vaunt." Horsfall (2003), 420 and (1995), 196, also notes Turnus' recurrent tendency to stray from the truth.

demens, Dardanio, 399-400), despite the fact that Latinus had advocated this course as well. Tragically, Turnus will only become aware of the truth of what Drances claims when Saces comes to tell him of the Trojan destruction of Latinus' city, hails him as the towns last hope of salvation and begs for his compassion (*Turne, in te suprema salus, miserere tuorum*, 12. 653).[686] But at this point it facilitates Turnus' clear inclination to continue the war to represent Drances' desire for peace as disloyal to *arma Latini*, the war of the kingdom.

As Turnus moves to the proposal for peace that Latinus has put forth, he assumes a more respectful tone (*nunc ad te et tua magna, pater, consulta revertor*, 410) and the orderly progression of his remarks—evident in the marking off of the three possible options (*si,* 411; *sin,* 419; *quod si,* 434)—suggests that Turnus' *violentia* has abated. Regardless of which option Turnus discusses he reveals the paramount importance and high value he places on martial *virtus*. Even as he agrees to the idea of peace, only if Latinus is convinced that the Latins truly are defeated, he shudders at the thought and interrupts himself with a paeon of praise for the soldier who choses death over surrender (415-18):

> quamquam o si solitae quicquam virtutis adesset!
> ille mihi ante alios fortunatusque laborum
> egregiusque animi, qui, ne quid tale videret,
> procubuit moriens et humum semel ore momordit.
>
> But, O, if only something of our usual valor were present!
> That man is fortunate in his labors and outstanding in spirit
> before all others, who, so that he not behold any such a thing,
> falls down dying and once and for all bites the ground.

Individual shame at defeat can be transformed into a kind of good fortune in a chosen heroic death. The theme of Fortune and its changeability, already mentioned as a possible source for improved circumstances, (*neque habet Fortuna regressum*, 413), becomes a pivotal point for Turnus' advocacy of continuing the war. The Trojan's victories (*gloria*) have come at great cost to them as well, the Latins have no cause to hold back from war since Fortune changes (425-27):

---

[686] *Salus,* Horsfall (2003), 362, is "dear" to Vergil, and rich with emotional connotations (*hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem ausus,* 1. 451; *feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem*, 1. 463). It is associated exclusively with the Trojans and their allies through book 9, but from 10-12 it always is used by or refers to the Latins (11. 336, 12. 241) or Turnus (10. 653, 11. 397, 12. 637, 653).

> multa dies variique labor mutabilis aevi
> rettulit in melius, multos alterna revisens
> lusit et in solido rursus Fortuna locavit.
>
> Time and the mutable toil of different days change much for the better.
> Fortune at one time mocks many and again sets them on solid ground.

The ideas expressed here are "very old and altogether conventional" (Horsfall, 2003, 425), but the similarity of Turnus' circumstances in the war to those of Paris—both being largely responsible for a war fought to keep or obtain their desired woman, a war in which many of their countrymen are dying—suggest that Vergil may be alluding to Paris' blithe defense of his recent lack of success, to Hector (νίκη δ' ἐπαμείβεται ἄνδρας; "Victory goes to one now to another." *Il.* 6. 339) and to Helen, with the near gnomic assurance that victory in war regularly shifts from one man to another (3. 438-40):

> Reproach not my heart, lady, with hard reviling words. For
> now has Menelaus vanquished me with Athene's aid, but
> another time will I vanquish him; on our side too there are gods.
>
> μή με γύναι χαλεποῖσιν ὀνείδεσι θυμὸν ἔνιπτε:
> νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
> κεῖνον δ' αὖτις ἐγώ: πάρα γὰρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν.

The likelihood of the relevance of these passages is increased by the proximity of the simile comparing Turnus, as he returns to war after this council is interrupted, to a horse, a more obvious allusion to Paris returning to war at the end of book 6 (506-11), after Hector had reminded Paris that he was the cause of the war in which his people were perishing around the city (6. 327). Recourse to the vagaries of fortune from the mouth of a man who has precipitated a war from which he would be the primary beneficiary are tainted, regardless of that man's valor (Paris is ἄλκιμος, 6. 522, according to Hector; Turnus in his own words is *haud ulli vetrum virtute secundus,* 11. 441). So strongly does Turnus desire to continue the war that he overlooks (or perhaps consciously suppresses) that they still lack the now necessary additional forces.[687] Instead, he praises the forces he already has from which no small amount of *gloria* should be

[687] When the narrator first summarizes the report of the negative results of the embassy to Diomedes, he provides the essence of the Greek hero's advice: Either look for support from other Latins or seek peace with the Trojan king (11. 229-30). Diomedes himself (as reported by Ventulus) advises against fighting and for a treaty (292-93). Horsfall (2003), 420, 429, notes that neither Messapus nor Camilla are fresh reinforcements, as Diomedes would have been.

expected (430-31), singling out Messapus, Tolumnius and Camilla (429, 432-33). While *gloria* on the part of his forces does indeed follow in the war, so too do many deaths and defeat, which suggests Turnus' advocacy for renewing the war, given the knowledge he had, was not strategically sound. Once again, as when caught within the Trojan camp (above, pp. 378-79), Turnus acts the part of Aristotle's courageous but rash man (Tarrant, 2012, 11).

Turnus concludes his speech with the third option under discussion—his meeting Aeneas in a duel, only recommended by Drances as an alternative to peace. In the ongoing debate over whether Turnus' expression of willingness to meet Aeneas constitutes a general's *devotio,* (*vobis animam hanc soceroque Latino Turnus ego… devovi*, 440-42), which it technically does not (see below), the implications of the close relationship of Turnus' presentation to that of Drances have been largely overlooked.[688] This correspondence suggests, I will argue, that far from being an expression of willingness to sacrifice himself for the safety of his fellow citizens, in this section Turnus expresses what he hopes will be an effective and climactic refutation of his adversary's impugning of his *virtus*, as the recurrence of Drances' name at the end of the speech suggests, which is not a digression,[689] but an appropriate conclusion to this section and the speech as a whole.

Drances, who has developed an entirely negative portrait of Turnus as oppressively selfish, does not abate as he begins this section by suggesting three possible reasons why Turnus may want to engage with Aeneas (368-75):

> aut, si fama movet, si tantum pectore robur
> concipis et si adeo dotalis regia cordi est,
> aude atque adversum fidens fer pectus in hostem.
> scilicet ut Turno contingat regia coniunx,

---

[688] I am referring here to Drances' comments relative to *devotio*. Fantham (1999), 268, treats extensively the effect of Drances' speech on Turnus', concluding that the vituperative nature of his accusations causes a heightened emotional response from Turnus which leads "to a growing sympathy for the passionate young fighter" in the reader that "balance (s) the negative picture of Turnus which was created during book 10." Her conclusion (272): that Drances' "provocation has contaminated Turnus' largely persuasive deliberative proposal with side issues of personal enmity and pride that detract from the heroic ethos of his response," I question because many aspects of Turnus' speech have or will recur in other contexts.

[689] Horsfall (2003), 443, "Tu. cannot bring himself to end with the duel, but must return once more to Dr(ances)." Fantham (1999), 271, sees the effect of Drances' attack causing Turnus to extend his speech beyond the obvious climax of the *devotio* with which he should have ended.

> nos animae viles, inhumata infletaque turba,
> sternamur campis. etiam tu, si qua tibi vis,
> si patrii quid Martis habes, illum aspice contra
> qui vocat.
>
> If your fame moves you, if you conceive such great
> strength in your breast, if having the palace as dowry is
> so dear to you, dare and confidently go against the
> opposing enemy. Of course, so that Turnus may have
> a royal wife, we worthless souls, an unburied
> an unwept throng, are scattered across the fields. Do
> you also, if you have any strength, if you have anything
> of your ancestors' courage, face that one who calls you.

Drances clearly implies that only Turnus' concern for his reputation as a valiant warrior and desire for Lavinia and the kingdom she would bring him, expressed in terms of his material gain (*dotalis regia*), would motivate him to fight Aeneas. His martial prowess, presented as questionable in its expression both at the beginning (368-69) and end of the passage (373-74) in conditional clauses, receives greater emphasis by the importance of its placement and length, but the identical position of *regia* in two close lines (369, 371; which is also followed by a two-syllable word with the same initial sound) and the biting sarcasm that *scilicet* adds to the second reference to the marriage also give considerable weight to this as a likely motivation. Drances has already accused Turnus of being a negligent commander (350-51) and the cause of the war (361). Here he returns to that theme by juxtaposing the deaths of the implicitly disdained and ignored citizens (*animae viles, in humata infletaque turba*, 372) with his view of the cause of the war: a royal wife for Turnus. In Turnus' response to Drances' challenge to meet Aeneas, he will reveal the accuracy of Drances' assessment of his motivations.

Turnus shows his reluctance to accept the duel by essentially backing into saying he would meet Aeneas, throwing up three conditions that would need to be met, before he would go (434-44):

> quod si me solum Teucri in certamina poscunt
> idque placet tantumque bonis communibus obsto,
> non adeo has exosa manus Victoria fugit
> ut tanta quicquam pro spe temptare recusem.
> ibo animis contra, vel magnum praestet Achillem
> factaque Volcani manibus paria induat arma
> ille licet. vobis animam hanc soceroque Latino
> Turnus ego, haud ulli veterum virtute secundus,

> devovi. solum Aeneas vocat? et vocet oro;
> nec Drances potius, siue est haec ira deorum,
> morte luat, sive est virtus et gloria, tollat.'
>
> But if the Trojans are challenging only me to a contest
> and this is supported by consensus and I am obstructing the common good
> to such an extent, Victory has not fled so much in hatred these hands
> that I would refuse to try anything for so great a hope.
> I will go with courage against him, whether he surpasses
> great Achilles or puts on arms the equal of those made by
> Vulcan. I, Turnus, second to none of my ancestors in courage,
> dedicate this life to you and to my father-in-law Latinus.
> Does Aeneas call me alone? I pray let him call.
> But don't let Drances, if it reflects the anger of the gods,
> atone with his death or, if it is a matter of courage and glory,
> let him prevail.

As Drances had, Turnus begins with three conditions (although without the repetition of *si*) and in addition his acceptance of the challenge is less than enthusiastic (he would not not go, 437), at least initially. Clearly Turnus' expression of the possibility that he may have been acting against the common good reflects Drances' numerous charges (347-50, 360-61, 363-65, 372-73). Drances' suggestions that concern for his reputation as a fighter would be an important goad to Turnus' willingness to meet Aeneas, finds validation in Turnus' words. The offer of his life is both preceded and interlaced by words of confidence and braggadocio about his ability to fight. Although Drances uses words of overt physical strength (*tantum…robur, vis*), while Turnus' words are suggestive of both physical and mental strength (*animis, virtute*), he employs them to support his *fama* as a warrior, which Drances' speech attempts to destroy. Turnus' boasts about his capacity to overcome divine arms and to be a warrior the equal of Achilles (438-440) are familiar,[690] but they also answer the accusations Drances made of his flight and ineffectiveness on the battlefield (350-51). Turnus' assertion within his dedication that his *virtus* is better than that of his ancestors (441), directly answers Drances' last condition (*si patrii quid Martis habes,* 374; "If you have anything of your ancestors' courage"). He is confident in his ability to go against even the

[690] We have seen in his *cohortio* in book 9 (148; see above, pp. 377-78), that he fears no divine weapons and will fight without any of the subterfuge of the Greeks. In a vaunt before killing Pandarus also in book 9, Turnus equates himself to Achilles in words that recall the *Aeneid*'s Pyrrhus to Pandarus: *incipe, si qua animo virtus, et consere dextram, / hic etiam inventum Priamo narrabis Achillem* (9. 741-42). Cf. Pyrrhus to Priam: *referes ergo haec et nutnius ibis / Pelidae genitori. illi mea tristia facta / degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento* (2. 547-50).

greatest warriors, as his words echoing Drances' argue: Does Aeneas call me alone, let him call (443; cf. *illum aspice contra qui vocat*, 374-75). Thus, almost every line of Turnus' acceptance of the challenge to fight Aeneas answers Drances' proposal and attempts to reestablish the Rutulian's reputation as a courageous warrior, which his conclusion seems to indicate he thinks he has successfully accomplished (443-44). Turnus refutes Drances' attack directly in the beginning of the speech by a violent personal assault on Drances' lack of courage, but in the acceptance at the end of his speech of Drances' challenge to meet Aeneas Turnus less obviously, but more effectively, silences the orator's attack. But what of Drances' other insinuation, that a desire for marriage to Lavinia and its rewards, for which the Latins are being sacrificed, would bring Turnus out to face Aeneas? It too is present in Turnus' acceptance of the challenge and interferes with the implications of self-sacrifice, of a *devotio ducis,* which the pronouncement of the dedication of his life suggests.

As we have seen,[691] the *devotio* is a solemn ceremony of self-sacrifice which occurred on the battlefield whereby a Roman general (the most famous example being P. Decius Mus in 340) vows his life as a sacrifice to the gods of the underworld in order to procure victory for the Romans and their forces.[692] The vow is immediately followed by the sacrificial death, the general riding directly into the enemy forces. Clearly none of these circumstances prevail in the Latin assembly, but the words *vobis animam hanc… devovi* coming from the general of the Latin side of the war undoubtedly evoke the *devotio ducis*. Any number of the various divergences from the classic model have been used legitimately to disallow Turnus a *devotio*,[693] but adherence to the spirit of the ceremony ("the substantial

---

[691] See Ch. 2, pp. 25-27, for discussion of the ceremony of the *devotio* as figuratively represented in Cicero's going into exile; for Palinurus' fall from Aeneas' ship as *devotio*-influenced (via Cicero), see Ch. 4, p. 214; and above, pp. 370-71, on the connotations of self-sacrifice in Aeneas' speeches suggesting a willingness to die for the benefit of his people comparable to a *devotio ducis*.

[692] Oakley (1997), 8. 19-11. 1, discusses the likely historicity of this and other *devotiones*; while all are doubted by the most skeptical, who "cannot formally be refuted," those of the two Decii, father (340) and son (295) are most secure. These uncertainties were not relevant to the Romans of the late Republic and early Principate (including Cicero, Vergil and Lucan), who were interested in the *devotio* and "the resonances which it might have in public life."

[693] See Horsfall (2003), 442, for bibliography and summarizing comment which is apt: "To be able to clothe Tu. visibly in the selfless devotion of the early Republican hero…would be a notable step, but the volatile, excitable tone… and the polemical moment are not appropriate to solemn self-sacrifice." Fantham (1999), 268, and Tarrant

sense," Leigh, 105) is far more important here. Does Turnus' offer express the essential ingredient of the *devotio*, the general's desire to die in order to rescue his forces and people. It would appear that he does, vowing his life to the assembled (*vobis*) and their king (*Latino*). But in the formula prayer,[694] the general dedicates his life to gods, Earth and the gods of the underworld, not humans (Horsfall, 2003, 439). In the prayer the beneficiaries are expressed, not in the dative but, with *pro* "on behalf of" and its object (*pro re publica* [*populi Romani*] *Quritium…*), as they are in Cicero's figuration of his exile as a *devotio.*[695] In fact, in Turnus' speech the beneficiary of his ordeal is expressed in a *pro* phrase, but earlier in his first reluctant acceptance of the challenge: he would not refuse to try anything for the sake of so great a hope (*tanta… pro spe,* 437), which clearly refers to what he hopes to gain, Lavinia and the kingdom; in essence he would be the beneficiary. That this is the primary goal he has in mind may also be revealed in his description of Latinus as his father-in-law.[696] Although *vobis* (440) may indicate his concern for his community; if so, he quickly loses this attitude when he leaves abruptly to return to battle (459-61):

> 'immo,' ait 'o cives,' arrepto tempore Turnus,
> 'cogite concilium et pacem laudate sedentes;
> illi armis in regna ruunt.'
>
> "Indeed, citizens," Turnus says, seizing the moment,
> "Gather in assembly and sit there praising peace;
> They are rushing against the kingdom with arms."

(2012), 11, point out that Turnus' request for his life at the epic's end is a negation of the spirit of sacrifice and a failure to carry out his own intentions.

[694] In Livy 8. 9. 6-8 (but here as analyzed in Dyck, 2004, 306) the prayer has four parts; an invocation to many gods (*Iane, Iuppiter, Mars pater, Quinine, Bellona, Lares,* etc.), a request that victory be achieved for the Roman people and defeat for the enemy, the naming of a beneficiary (the Roman people, senators, army, legions, and allies) and the dedication of the enemy army with the Roman general to Earth and the shades of the Underworld.

[695] For example, in *Red. pop.* 1: *me fortunasque meas pro vestra incolumitate… devovi*. Although Cicero varies his construction, sometimes using *propter* (*propter salutem meorum civium, Ses.* 45) or *gratia* (*vestrae salutis gratia*, *Red. pop.* 1) instead of *pro*, the beneficiaries of his act of *devotio* are not given in the dative.

[696] Although Aeneas too refers to Latinus emphatically as *socer* in his prayer at the treaty (12. 192-93), it is within the well-circumscribed condition of his winning the duel, after acknowledging the possibility of his defeat and its consequences. In Turnus' mind Latinus' status as father-in-law is an accomplished fact, which ironically will never actually occur, if Turnus "succeeds" in his *devotio.*

Now, as though no other option is available but war, Turnus expresses scorn for his fellow citizens and their advocacy of peace,[697] in the last use of *cives* in book 11, which contrasts with its first sympathetic use in the book by Aeneas (See above, pp. 365-66). Ironically, at this point in the narrative Aeneas shows more compassion for the Latin people (*nunc ite et miseris supponite civibus ignem,* 119; cf. Drances' appeal to Turnus: *miserere tuorum,* 365), than does Turnus.

After Turnus rushes forth from the confinement of the assembly (*corripuit sese et tectis citus extulit altis*, 462), he is soon compared to a horse breaking free from its bonds, which activates its primary intertext: Paris' return to battle after a dalliance with Helen in the *Iliad* (6. 506-11).[698] The engagement with this moment in the *Iliad* (a replay of the cause of the war) alone tends to confirm the irresponsible self-centeredness of Turnus' approach to the war,[699] even if the Rutulian is far more avid for battle (11. 486-97):

> cingitur ipse furens certatim in proelia Turnus.
> iamque adeo rutilum thoraca indutus aenis
> horrebat squamis surasque incluserat auro,
> tempora nudus adhuc, laterique accinxerat ensem,
> fulgebatque alta decurrens aureus arce
> exsultatque animis et spe iam praecipit hostem:
> qualis ubi abruptis fugit praesepia vinclis
> tandem liber equus, campoque potitus aperto
> aut ille in pastus armentaque tendit equarum
> aut adsuetus aquae perfundi flumine noto
> emicat, arrectisque fremit cervicibus alte
> luxurians luduntque iubae per colla, per armos.

[697] A scorn, which is still evident in the beginning of book 12, when Turnus again talks of the duel with Latinus: (*sedeant spectentque Latini*, 12. 15). Tarrant (2012), 15, notes that Turnus' "sneering tone makes it [these words] a reproach, implying that T. alone has the courage to fight on behalf of his people; cf. his words here, 11. 460 *pacem laudate sedentes.*"

[698] The simile is exactly repeated at *Iliad* 15. 263-68, but here concerning Hector. While Aristarchus judged the simile in book 15 to be an interpolation, Kirk (1990), 506-11, considers it to be "equally effective, in a different way, in that context, and the probability is that the monumental composer liked it well enough to use it twice." But there are considerably more details in the description of the horse which are relevant to Paris both in the immediate context (for example, that the horse glories in this splendor ὃ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθὼς, 6. 510) and in the larger narrative of book 6. I concur completely with Horsfall's (2003), 492-7, opinion that "(the Vergilian) simile's Homeric associations with Paris weigh more heavily than do those with Hector."

[699] So many of the basic elements in both the *Iliad*'s narrative and simile have been retained—the return to war of the warrior after a hiatus from fighting, the careful wedding of the simile to the larger narrative (see below), the equating of the flashing arms with the horse's expressions of pleasure in the same two physical actions, going to join other horses or bathing in the river—that Vergil's significant divergences from Homer may be too easily minimized.

> Raving Turnus eagerly girds for war and so
> having put on his breastplate auburn with bronze
> he was bristling with its scales and he had enclosed
> his calves in gold, bare-headed still, he had girded his
> sword to his side. He was shining in gold as he ran
> down from the high citadel and he exults in his courage
> and already anticipates the enemy with hope.
> Just as when a horse having broken his tether flees his stall,
> and finally free, gains the open field. He either makes for
> the pastures and herds of mares or, accustomed to bathe in
> the familiar river, he flashes forth. And with head held high
> he snorts, gambling and his mane plays along his neck and shoulder.

The circumstances from which each warrior departs are nearly the opposite: Paris has been taking his joy with Helen, "bedded together in love," in the privacy of their own room (3. 441), while Turnus has been at a public council defending himself against Drances' accusations of selfishly prolonging the war and suffering of his people. Their attitudes toward returning to war also contrast: while Turnus leaps up and rushes from the hall (*corripuere sese et tectis citus extulit altis*, 11. 462) and arms himself in a frenzied state (*furens*, 486), eagerly anticipating meeting the enemy (*certatim,* 486; *spe iam praecipit hostem*, 491), Paris' speed seems to be motivated only by anticipation of a scolding from Hector: nowhere does he express any desire to be returning to war (6. 363, 503-7, 511, 514). In fact, the horse to which Paris is likened lacks any obvious motivation for breaking his bonds, since he has already eaten his fill (satiated, like Paris, 3. 441) and,[700] while translators frequently assume the horses he runs to join are mares,[701] there is no grammatical justification for the assumption (ἵππων, 6. 511), as there is in Vergil's simile (*equarum*, 494). Rather, this horse's motivation derives from the pleasure of the actions in which he engages: he exults in bathing in the river (508-9) and glories in his splendor, his free-flowing mane (509-10) and Paris

[700] As Schlunk (1974), 26-27, shows, there was considerable debate among the scholiast as to the meaning of ἀκοστήσας, ("full-fed," 6. 506), one interpretation being "unable to endure the confinement of the stable" (interpreting φάτνῃ, "manger," metonymically), which would provide some motivation for the horse's breaking of his ties. However, Schlunk also notes that Ennius in his version of the Homeric simile includes the well-fed concept: *Et tum sicut equus qui de praeseptibus fartus / vincla suis magnis animis abrupit et* (*Ann.* 535-6).

[701] Lombardo (1997) and Murray/Wyatt (1999) both translate ἵππων, 6. 511, as "mares." Lattimore (1961), translates ἵππων, 6. 511, as "horses," while Fagels (1990), translates νομὸν ἵππων as "stallion-haunts."

likewise lacks the ability to focus on war; he is a valiant fighter, but his will flags and he slacks off.[702] By shifting the emphasis in his simile away from satiation toward the opportunity that freedom provides the horse (*tandem liber equus*, 11. 493), Vergil can bring into the simile suggestions of future fulfillment that relate to that for which Turnus fights—Lavinia, mentioned only seven lines prior to Turnus' arming as the cause of the war (*Lavinia virgo, causa mali tanti*, 479-80). The concluding description of the horse's behavior ("And with head held high he snorts, gambling..." 496-97) may also suggest a behavior of display before mares, for as Xenophon notes (*Eq.* 10. 4), whenever a horse "chooses to show off before horses, especially mares, he raises his neck arches his head most, looking fierce."[703]

Vergil's horse not only raises his head but he also snorts (*fremit*), a word often translated here simply as "whinnying," but which is associated in the *Aeneid* with winds (4), horses (5), and war (8), programmatically at the end of Jupiter's speech in book 1 (295) as *Furor*: *fremet horridus ore cruento*.[704] *Fremit* is clearly analogous to the fierceness of Xenophon's horse, expressed in the language of the gorgon's eye (γοργούμενος), and also to the fierceness of the warrior Parthenopaeus in Aeschylus' *Septem* (γοργόν τ᾽ὄμμ᾽ἔχων, 537; See Ch. 5, p. 269). Likewise, *fremit* recalls the description of Turnus at the beginning of his arming as *furens*, expressing his crazed desire for war.[705] Thus, this simile effectively combines in the behavior of the horse implications of avidity for war and sexual dominance, vividly encapsulating what was revealed in Turnus' speech in the assembly.

Turnus uses the advance of Aeneas and his forces as an opportunity—he "seizes the moment" (*arrepto tempore*, 459), to gain his desire to continue fighting the war, despite the vigorous disapproval of

---

[702] "Strange man, no one who is right-minded would make light of your work in battle, since you are valiant (ἄλκιμός, 6. 522), but you choose to slack off (ἀλλὰ ἑκὼν μεθιεῖς) and are unwilling (οὐκ ἐθέλεις, 523)." Hector thereby emphasizes Paris' lack of commitment to fighting a war that he is responsible for creating.

[703] Horsfall (2003), 492-7, "V. writes *equarum* and the stallion's excitement may thus be thought to derive principally not so much from freedom, pastures new or the chance of a swim as from sexual excitement and the sense of approaching satisfaction."

[704] Winds: 1. 56, 5. 19, 10.98, 11. 299; horses: 1. 56, 11. 496, 599, 607, 12. 82; war: 1. 296, 2. 338, 4. 229, 668; 7. 460, 590, 787, 12. 787.

[705] *Fremo* is frequently associated with Turnus and animals to which he is compared or owns, where it also implies the extremity of fierceness in relation to war, first in book 7 (460) when he roars for arms and prominently in the catalogue where the fire-breathing chimaera on his helmet rages more as the war grows fiercer (787-88). Other uses associated with Turnus: 9. 60, 12. 8, 82, 371, 535

that plan expressed in a communal meeting by the most senior king and the proposal of possible alternative plans, for which he expresses support. When Aeneas' forces are approaching, he instead, like the horse to which he is compared, breaks out of the confines of the city walls and releases himself into war frenzy, which in the simile is subtly interwoven with lust for sexual conquest. While Vergil's manner is tactful (Horsfall, 2003, 492-7), through his intertextual dialogue with Homer he emphasizes the *Aeneid*'s political context and suggests Turnus' unsuitability for wise leadership, were he to win the war. The political context suggests the relevance of Cicero's adjective *effrenatus* "unbridled," his abbreviated version of the Phaedran dark horse, used, as we have seen (see above, Ch. 1, pp. 53-4, 60-61), to describe destructive politicians like Catiline (*Quem ad finem sese effrenata jactabit audacia*, *Cat*. 1.1). Here the simile comparing Turnus to a horse breaking free from restraint suggests that in his dash from the assembly Turnus enacts unbridleness.[706] It also confirms that his offer of dedicating himself in a duel with Aeneas were convenient words for the moment without sincere commitment. At this point in the narrative Turnus is not as concerned with his fellow citizens as he is with achieving his own great hope. He will later become concerned, but far more of his citizens will die before he does.[707]

Thus, in the assembly called to reconsider the continuation of the war, Turnus' *virtus* thematically unites his longest speech in its defense, in his plea for the war's continuation and in his somewhat reluctant agreement to a duel with Aeneas. Turnus' vitriolic attack on Drances and refutation of the impugning of his courage provide the clearest evidence of the violence the narrator attributes to Turnus. In his *ad hominem* attack on Drances, in which he mocks the orator's lack of *virtus,* Turnus associates

---

[706] Hunter (2012), 88, n. 164, indicates that rhetorician Maximus of Tyre (20. 5; 2nd century A. D.) has seen a similar connection when he "combines an echo of the horse-simile for Paris at *Iliad* 6. 506-11 with the unruly horse of the *Phaedrus.*"

[707] I disagree with Connolly's (2010), 413, argument that "the figure of community in the *Aeneid* is not Aeneas but his rival Turnus, a man utterly defined by his connections and obligations…." The disassociation from community that Connolly attributes to Aeneas seems to be based on a truncated definition of apostrophe (turning aside), what she considers "Aeneas' characteristic figure of speech," and an exaggeration of his identification with the dead. Her demonstration of Turnus' concern for the collective is based on the family as collective ("Turnus is figured here as a vital supplement fulfilling the needs of Latinus' family," 413) and the rather casual acceptance of his dedication here at face value ("Turnus is also the one who vows himself up to his men," *ibid*). Johnson's (1986), 92, interpretation of Aeneas' apostrophes as revealing "at his core something of the lyric poet in the modern, Romantic sense of the word," seems more apt.

him with the fake battles of words in assemblies in contrast to his own acts of *vivida virtus*. The impatience with discussion and assemblies this suggests in Turnus is confirmed when the assembly is interrupted by news of Aeneas' approach, after which Turnus mocks the *cives* in the assembly for sitting and praising peace and, as he runs exultantly to war, is compared to a horse fleeing its stall, finally free (*tandem liber*), a distinctive Vergilian addition to the Homeric intertext. Turnus' attitude toward peace, treated as treasonous in the mouth of Drances and endorsed unenthusiastically and only conditionally in reply to Latinus, was clearly never positive, as his praise of the man who would rather die than look on surrender shows. But this is also positive evidence of the high value Turnus places on martial *virtus*, as is his enthusiastic praise of his leaders—Messapus, Tolumnius and Camilla—and warriors from Latium. Turnus gives some evidence of his own acts of *virtus* in numerous exaggerated boasts: all the Arcadians have fallen to his hand, a thousand Trojans were sent to the underworld in one day, he could beat Achilles and any warrior clad in divine arms since he is second to none of his ancestors in valor. The intimations of the *devotio ducis* in his acceptance of the challenge of facing Aeneas allude to arguably the most courageous act of a general in war, riding against the enemy to a voluntary death for the victory of his forces, and the verb *devoveo* is used only of him (twice, 11. 442, 12. 234, Juturna about Turnus: *se devovet aris*), with the exception of Dido (*pesti devota futurae,* 1. 712). But Turnus is neither able to accomplish the sacrifice in the end, asking for his life (*me...redde meis*, 12. 934-35), nor does he seem sincere in the offer. Rather he is willing to try for what he will personally gain should he survive, which is, nevertheless, also the primary reason the Latins are at war.

Turnus' passionate emotional nature is a hindrance to him in this speech and helps to reveal his basic self-centeredness. He waxes overlong in the defenses of his *virtus*, which in the beginning of the speech are peppered with words of invective,[708] an indication of strong emotions, and in general are

[708] Powell (2007), 1-2, notes that the word is only known in Classical Latin as an adjective (*invectiva*), which is derived from *inveho*, its root meaning is "to ride into the attack" and it still "often seems to have a military air about it when applied to political or forensic attacks." Turnus, as he accuses Drances (*an tibi Mavors ventosa in lingua ... semper erit?* 389-91), also figuratively brings war into the assembly, and threatens to literally (408-9). According to Powell (2), "an invective is, taken at face value, a cavalry charge," a natural mode for Turnus, who on a Thracian piebald *campo sese arduus infert* (9. 54; see above, p. 379).

excessively present (392-409, 415-18, 436, 438-441). The praises bestowed on his generals and troops are not germane to the need for auxiliaries, which he ignores, perhaps, because of his eagerness to fight. His trust in the changeability of fortune, likewise, may reflect how great his hopes are of winning, but also apparent in it is a blithe insensitivity to the unnecessary loss of life his unrealistic optimism will cause. Turnus' ultimate concerns are primarily selfish, which is evident in the number and extent of his boasts, his giving of only lip service to the alternative of peace, his general distain for the process of deliberation, the extent to which passion rules him and his central focus on gaining the objects of his personal desire. The juxtaposition of his impatience with the assembly, his insensitivity to the suffering of his fellow citizens and his determined self-interest clearly imply that were Turnus to win the war his rule could easily become tyrannical.

The salient aspects of the assembly speech have also been seen in the earlier speeches considered—to Calybe/Allecto, and the two *cohortationes* to his troops before the Trojan camp. Turnus' confidence in his fighting ability remains a constant, at times expressed in similar boasts that extend into digression, (the mass of ships, length of time, quality of arms, subterfuge and stealth required by the Greeks to defeat the Trojans, which Turnus will not need, 9. 148-55) and in similar distortions of truth (Lavinia is his wife whom the Trojans have carried off, 9. 138). By falsely extending the act of Paris to Aeneas Turnus universalizes one instance of wife theft into a characteristic of a race, which threatens the whole feminine gender (*sceleratam…gentem,* 9. 137; *genus omne…femineum*, 140-41). He thus seeks to broaden the justification of the war, but does not hide that it is his personal experience that motivates his action (*coniuge praerepta*). The ill effect of his emotions upon his strategic judgment is more strongly suggested in his not clearly motivated cessation of the attack on the Trojan camp (9. 156-58) and in the later direct attribution of his loss of the war to frenzied blood lust (9. 757-61). But in some other ways the earlier speeches expand the portrait of Turnus as leader.

His bold confidence (*audacia*) is marked before all three of his previous speeches and, since there is evidence of this quality before the actions of Allecto in book 7, it can be considered innate to his character. In these speeches Turnus also manifests either a certain blindness to divine manifestation or an

outright impiety, which suggests a significant degree of negativity in his boldness. In his first speech he mocks an older woman whom he thinks is a priestess; before the transformed Trojan ships, an act Cybele's voice associates with his attempt to burn them, he refutes the obvious implications of the sign and before Aeneas' ship-born approach to the same location, which is also attended by unnatural fiery brilliance, Turnus presses blindly ahead with the war. In claiming to have his own fates that oppose those of Venus and the fates Turnus arrogantly and unwisely elevates himself to divine status (9. 135-36). Turnus does pray—to Iris, Jupiter and Faunus—but always for his own concern and in the first two instances he has no idea who the divinity is behind the action he observes—in both instances Juno—despite his claim of a close relationship to precisely this goddess (*nec regia Iuno / immemor est nostri*, 7. 438-39).[709] Turnus' boldness accompanies an impulsivity, which precludes reflection, and a selfish willfulness both of which seem to obscure his perception of the divine. Nevertheless, simultaneously evident in his *cohortationes*, especially the first, is a sympathy for and closeness with his troops. He looks out for their physical well-being and is willing to fight alongside them, a characteristic somewhat at odds with his otherwise proud aristocratic portrait. But a similar dichotomy also occurs in Julius Caesar's self-presentation, although sequential rather than simultaneous as in Turnus' case. In *Bellum Gallicum* Caesar represents himself fighting alongside his men, while later the equestrian presentation became his preferred mode, one which he previously avoided and Cicero identified as arrogant. Caesar also, along with two other dictators, celebrated a large number of triumphs, an excess Augustus seems to have consciously avoided (See Ch. 2, pp. 78-79). Turnus, whose career in the *Aeneid* is confined to a few days of war, can only suggest by his actions what kind of king he would have been had he been given the chance. However, his association with the chariot and horses and the evidence of his speeches suggest that he would be inclined toward the tyrannical.

---

[709] When Iris advises Turnus to attack the Trojan camp at the beginning of book 9, Turnus asks her what divinity has sent her (*quis te mihi nubibus actam / detulit in terras?* 18-19), but agrees to follow her advice. When Juno has led Turnus unto the ship with a phantom Aeneas, in utter despair he cries out to Jupiter (10. 668-79). But, there was a cult to Juno at Ardea (Williams, 1972/73, 7. 419; Pliny, *HN*. 35. 115), of some note, as the scene with Calybe seems to attest.

In summary, Aeneas' diplomatic speeches conform to the helmsman's salient characteristics, particularly in his concern for the well-being of the community and devotion to the gods. He is sympathetic to the Latin embassy, expressing no animosity toward them, but rather a desire to settle the war by single combat with Turnus, implicitly to save lives on both sides. This same respect for the Latin people is present in the terms established for the duel in which Aeneas projects, if he wins, a jointly shared community. In his attempt to check his own forces as the war breaks out anew Aeneas expresses vociferously his respect for this consecrated treaty as a binding law that reduces the risk in deciding the war to himself and Turnus. Although Aeneas is wounded in the process of this vain attempt, as a single man attempting to bring order to chaotic upheaval he recalls the politician of the first simile in the *Aeneid* and also the divine tenor of the simile, Neptune. Aeneas' devotion to the gods is also evident in his respect for the treaty, but his frequent prayers and the designation of himself in the treaty as the chief religious official, without any secular power, confirms his basic pacific inclination and lack of desire for power. Likewise Lavinia, the cause of the war as a second Trojan war, is not an object of desire in Aeneas' speech, but the namesake of the city the Trojans have been seeking since the beginning of the epic.

The lens of the world Vergil accords Turnus, however, is almost exclusively marital. Of his past the reader knows that he fought long, hard and successfully enough that Allecto felt Latinus owed him Lavinia and the kingdom (7. 423) and many Latins were attracted to his cause in the war (7. 474). This perspective is evident in his speech in the Latin council: *Virtus* is the organizing principle of the speech, as a respected value and the quality upon which Turnus' reputation rests and which he cares deeply about maintaining, as is evident in his speech which is prolonged excessively by his violent defense against Drances' belittling of his leadership of the war. Drances, an unattractive spokesman for the well-being of the Latin community, argues that there is no *salus*, salvation or safety, in war, which Turnus mocks, but he leaves unexplained what that salvation is in the war he is eager to continue. In his first *cohortatio* his motivation is extremely personal and falsely grounded: Aeneas has stolen his wife. Nor does this prevent him from extending this proclivity to all Trojans, which instead of making his justification for war more

reasonable, makes it seem irrational. Even when Turnus reluctantly agrees to meet Aeneas in a duel and suggests that he would do so for those at the assembly, this same motivation, the hope of gaining the *dotalis regia*, actually motivates his willingness, as Drances has implied. His disdain for deliberation and assemblies can be explained as natural to a vital, emotive man of action, but it seems also to derive from his evident impatience with the impediment this discourse threatens to be to gaining his personal desires. The Romans had seen similar reactions to the constraints of the political process at various times in their history, but especially in the first-century generals, who fomented civil wars as they vied to increase their personal power.

Turnus' willingness to fight along with his soldiers, a more natural community for him, also reflects the practice of some of Rome's first century generals, famously Marius, but especially Julius Caesar, who like Turnus was from an ancient aristocratic family. In several speeches Turnus encourages his men to follow him into the fighting and he also shows concern for their health and morale. But Turnus, clearly, stands apart from Caesar in his reactive emotionalism, which in the midst of battle leads him to become blinded to important strategic concerns by his lust for killing.

And so the selected speeches of Aeneas and Turnus seem to accord well with the antithetical values that have been associated with helmsman and charioteer thus far. Aeneas values peace and the *salus* it brings for the community and is not eager for war, while Turnus scoffs at the idea of peace and its *salus* and strains to engage in war. Aeneas seems disinterested in power, opting for a religious role for his future at the treaty, while Turnus feels unfairly deprived of power he is willing to die to gain. Aeneas honors Lavinia as a near personification of Trojans' future community; she is a possession to be regained for Turnus as is the power she would bestow. Finally, Aeneas more obviously esteems the political community, but Turnus is anxious to disassociate himself from the assembly and its words in favor of the community of his leaders and soldiers.

The basic differences between chariot and ship and how they function facilitate an awareness of this dichotomy. The chariot drawn by swift horses, symbols of war in the *Aeneid* and beasts who must be mastered by the charioteer for the ensemble to function, fits Turnus' passionate, youthful predilection for

war, but in its dependence on control by the individual charioteer it can easily express that individual's willfulness, egotistic goals and capacity for inhumane, harsh rule, qualities which are evident in Turnus' speech and behavior. Although the important role of steering the ship is also accomplished by an individual, this vehicle requires a crew of men whose various tasks the helmsman coordinates, which makes the ship a very appropriate emblem of Aeneas' role as leader of what has been a community since the end of book 2, when a miserable throng of fellow Trojans gathered, prepared to go with Aeneas into what ever land he would lead them. His sense of responsibility for the well-being of this group as they seek a home, is aptly represented in his role as helmsman and expressed in his speech.

But the connection of Aeneas' behavior and speech with the values of the helmsman has already been weakened once in Aeneas' enraged *aristeia* after the death of Pallas, in which he becomes like Turnus in his heartlessness and is likened to a storm, the helmsman's foe, but the charioteer's analogue. Given the close connection of this passage in book 10 to the end, further developments in this role reversal should be expected. The chariot in Turnus' numerous appearances in book 12 will relate the story of his final acceptance of responsibility for the Latin and Rutulian community, but chariot imagery will also reveal the potential charioteer, i.e., the tyrant, in Aeneas, who is also specifically figured as a sea storm assailing Turnus.

CHAPTER 8

The Helmsman and the Charioteer in Book 12: Reversal

In slaying Turnus at the epic's end Aeneas has sometimes been said to be killing himself,[710] in effect, performing a mutual slaughter akin to that of Polynices and Eteocles at the end of Aeschylus' *Septem.* There is indeed some justification for such an interpretation based either on the prominent pairing of the two warriors in similes in the twelfth book and shared characteristics (eg., *pulcherrimus*),[711] or based on pointed parallel differences (eg., extroversion and introversion).[712] But they also both undergo a significant transformation, each becoming in some way what the other was;[713] of particular interest here is the exchange of leadership emblems that occurs. Although both changes have been foreshadowed, their actuations are distinctively developed for each man, a fact that will determine the organization of this chapter around the evolution of the individual hero—tracing first Turnus' more direct and time specific change, and then the more gradual, indirectly signaled and frightening change in Aeneas. Turnus' long-awaited awakening to the consequences of the war on the Latin side follows the most numerous and varied appearances of any character in the chariot, all of which are associated with his changing attitude toward the duel, the ultimate climax of the epic. His arrival at the ceremony for the duel driving a *bigae* next to Latinus' *quadrigae* is but a cameo predicting his minor and subordinate role at the ceremony, but his reentry into the war in his chariot as Aeneas' withdraws initiates a concentrated

---

[710] Most overtly stated in Gross (2003-04), 150: "Visual and verbal references (eg. *solvuntur frigore membra,* 1. 92, 12. 951) conspire to suggest that Aeneas is symbolically engaged in an act of self-destruction," or he is killing his "alter ego" (149), or he "spiritually annihilates himself" (154). Thomas (1998), 277, describes Aeneas and Turnus as "doublets of each other," while Rossi (2004), 165, discerns in the fact that they kill "their own mirror images" a suggestion of a *bellum internum.*

[711] The type of criteria scholars referred to in note 1 employ. In addition, Tarrant (2012), 14-15, notes "several characteristics that make them potential doubles," including that they both have a divine mother and mortal father, who survives alone into old age and both have weapons made by Vulcan.

[712] So Johnson (1986), 103, describes Turnus as a "foil" to Aeneas. Tarrant (2012), 15, notes that Aeneas and Turnus have actually been developed as "antitypes of each other," which describes perfectly the opposing aspect of the qualities studied in the last chapter, which I characterized as "antithetical."

[713] See Tarrant, 15, "they are not simultaneous doubles, but successive ones," which as he notes, has the corollary effect, that each departure from their typical behavior is registered "with added force."

elaboration of Turnus' and his chariot's association with Thrace, Mars and the most brutal kind of fighting. When Aeneas returns to the battlefield hell-bent on finding Turnus, his sister Juturna takes command of his chariot in the guise of his charioteer Metiscus, and in an attempt to protect him from Aeneas she adopts a strategy of evasion through which she is liken to Athena giving aid to Odysseus in his fight for his wife, home and kingdom. Turnus' similar self-serving goal, Vergil suggests, will not be accomplished. However, when Turnus perceives signs of the destruction of Latinus' city, he takes back control of the chariot, and then, finally understanding the extent of the harm he has caused, he exits the chariot and willingly embraces death on behalf of his people, the highest level of commitment of the Ciceronian helmsman. This implication is further supported through the storm imagery associated with Aeneas in the second half of the book, since figurative storms typically describe the charioteer and his assault on the helmsman's ship of state. A further allusion to Odysseus' journey suggests that the Aenean storm will be specifically directed at Turnus, who in the last lines of the epic succumbs to its force.

Aeneas provides a clear expression of the helmsman's value in his early speeches in book 12, as we have seen, both in the terms for the treaty and in his attempt to stop the reigniting war, which harken back respectively to Jupiter's prophecy for the foundation of the initiating community and the order-establishing water chariot of Neptune. In his return to the battlefield after his injury, Aeneas is again likened to a storm, as he had been at the end of his enraged *aristeia* in book 10, but now in an extended simile. As if to confirm that storm imagery is indeed the correlative to the charioteer, Aeneas becomes a figurative charioteer, replete with anger and savage slaughter. In his subsequent speech to his troops urging an attack on Latinus' city, Aeneas contradicts the enlightened political terms of the treaty for the duel and in the language of the charioteer promises to enforce oppressive rule upon the Latins. While the transformation of Aeneas from helmsman to charioteer is expressed solely in imagery, its language is overt, reiterated and has been carefully prepared for by earlier suggestions of his potential as a wrathful tyrant. In the last few scenes of the epic, Aeneas, retaining the charioteer's alternative expression as assailing storm, threatens Turnus as he prays to an unexpected god of the sea and endures in dying the chilly slackening of his limbs Aeneas had experienced in the initial Junonian storm. Thus in the final

book of the *Aeneid* the hero embodies both forces of the original and paradigmatic storm, first order-restoring Neptune in his attempt to arrest the rising tide of war, then figuratively the storm itself, recalling Juno's initial storm which also was prompted by a remembering anger. The apparent alignment of Aeneas' brutal behavior with the will of Jupiter complicates the implications of his change toward the dictatorial. The ending of the epic with Aeneas as an avenging charioteer, exhibiting the lack of restraint, blurring of the distinction between personal and political concerns and the anger consistently associated with his adversary implies a bleak future for the Latins, the Trojans and Aeneas.

Thracian Turnus

Although when Turnus makes the decision to leap into his chariot and join the fighting that erupts at the ceremony he firmly rejects the duel as a means of settling the war, essentially replaying his abrupt departure from the Latin assembly in book 11, this is not his attitude at the beginning of book 12. With the rout of the Latin forces following the death of Camilla at the end of book 11, Turnus realizes that the time for honoring his expressed willingness to meet Aeneas in a duel is upon him and he embraces the opportunity as enthusiastically as he had previously argued for war. This eagerness is apparent in his repeated requests that the duel should not be delayed (12. 11, 76) and in his volatile fierceness evident in his *violentia* (9, 45) and especially by his fiery hotness (*ardet,* 3, 71; *accenso gliscit,* 9; *ardentem,* 55). Although in his speeches Turnus indicates some awareness (to Latinus, 11-17, 48-53; to Amata, 72-80) of the consequences for the Latins and Rutulians of the outcome of the duel (*habeat victos*, 17), the resulting acquisition of Lavinia as wife (*cedat Lavinia coniunx,* 17; *illo quaeratur coniunx Lavinia campo,* 80) seems to be of far greater importance to him. In fact, after Amata reveals her suicidal intentions should Turnus be killed, his eagerness to fight is directly fired by his passion for the distressed Lavinia (*illum turbat amor figitque in virgine vultus./ ardet in arma magis…*, 70-71). And while both Turnus and Amata imply that the rule of Aeneas would be tyrannical (*Phrigio mea dicta tyranno/ haud placitura refer*, 75-76; *nec generum Aenean captiva videbo,* 63), the parallel arming scenes of the two heroes again suggest that Turnus has the greater despotic potential.

Rushing into the house after his conversation with Amata, Turnus immediately demands his horses, frequent images of war, soon to bloody their hooves in Turnus' slaughter (*spargit ungula rores / sanguineos*, 339-40), and he takes pleasure in their sight (*poscit equos gaudetque tuens ante ora frementis*, 82). This prominent and close association of Turnus with horses in the context of arming for battle brings to mind Turnus' earlier likening to a horse in book 11, which suggested his unrestrained eagerness for war and its rewards. The horses here in their "snorting" (*frementis*, 82) recall the horse of the book 11 simile (*arrectisque fremit cervicibus alte*, 496), but also allude to wilder creatures, the war-stimulating Chimaera on Turnus' helmet (*tam magis illa fremens...quam magis…crudescunt…pugnae*, 7. 787-88) and the wounded lion, to which Turnus is likened in the opening lines of book 12 (*fremit ore curento,* 8; cf. Furor, *fremet horridus ore curento*, 1. 296),[714] and therefore suggest an unrestrained wildness in Turnus' battle lust. In the climax of the arming scene Turnus' address to his spear links him with Achilles, but also with tyrants (95-100):

> 'nunc, o numquam frustrata uocatus
> hasta meos, nunc tempus adest: te maximus Actor,
> te Turni nunc dextra gerit; da sternere corpus
> loricamque manu valida lacerare revulsam
> semiviri Phrygis et foedare in pulvere crinis
> vibratos calido ferro murraque madentis.'
>
> O spear, never having disappointed my calls,
> now the time is here: greatest Actor carried
> you and now the right hand of Turnus will.
> Grant it to me to lay low the body of that half-male
> Phrygian, to tear off his cuirass and rip it to pieces
> with my strong arm and befoul in the dust his locks,
> crimped with a hot iron and dripping with myrrh.

In construction, Turnus' address to his spear is a prayer (cf. 6. 66-67, 10. 62, 11.789; Tarrant, 97), which imputes a degree of divinity to his weapon and associates Turnus with overtly impious warriors and tyrants—Mezentius, who addresses his right hand as a god (*dextra mihi deus*, 10. 773), Parthenopaeus,

---

[714] Tarrant (2012), 82, notes other recollections of the opening lion simile in this section (*gaudet*, 82; cf. *gaudet*, 6, of the lion, which shakes its mane, *comantis*, 6, that part of the horses which the charioteers comb (*colla comantia pectunt*, 86). Tarrant also notes the parallel of the Chimaera and, while he acknowledges that *fremere* of horses "need only denote excited neighing," here he thinks that the word indicates a similar eagerness on the part of Turnus' horses for the fight.

who is more confident in his spear than a god (Aesch. *Sept.,* 529-30) and the fourth-century tyrant, Alexander of Pherae, who sacrificed, as if to a god, to the spear with which he had killed his uncle (Plut. *Pel.* 29. 4; Tarrant, 92-100).[715] Achilles also is alluded to in the sparks and fire that fly from his face and eyes (*totoque ardentis ab ore/ scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis*, 101-2) immediately after his speech.[716] As Tarrant (13) notes, that Turnus is driven (especially by madness, *his agitur furiis,* 101), while Aeneas rouses himself (*se suscitat*, 108) to battle wrath, especially in conjunction with his concerns for his men,[717] suggests that Turnus, as he has been up to this point, "is a character swept along by passion", whereas Aeneas "represents a model of self-control."

But a very different, perhaps even fearful, Turnus appears the next day at the oath-taking ceremony. The simple war chariot, in which he arrives (*bigis it Turnus in albis,* 164), is greatly superseded by the *quadrigae* of Latinus and his radiant Sun crown, which may reflect Turnus' lesser role in the ceremony in which he has a subordinate position relative to Latinus (Tarrant, 2012, 164). But the pale, youthful submissiveness of Turnus at the altar as perceived by his fellow Rutulians is still unexpected, since it contrasts with his presentation thus far and foreshadows rather his final submission to Aeneas (216-21):

> At vero Rutulis impar ea pugna videri
> iamdudum et vario misceri pectora motu,
> tum magis ut propius cernunt [non viribus aequos].[718]
> adiuvat incessu tacito progressus et aram
> suppliciter venerans demisso lumine Turnus
> pubentesque genae et iuvenali in corpore pallor.

---

[715] The character of Parthenopaeus may be of particular relevance to Turnus for his adversary was also named Actor (*Sept.* 555), as was the former owner of Turnus' spear (96), an apparent adversary, but who is otherwise unknown. As we have seen Parthenopaeus like Turnus has a horse like fierceness (537; see above, Ch. 5, p. 269), but likewise relevant is his half-maidenly appearance, "something between man and boy," with newly sprouted bear and youthful bloom, for Turnus will appear at the next day's ceremony, unexpectedly, with downcast gaze, pubescent cheeks and a youthful pallor (220-21; see below).

[716] Although other Iliadic heroes' eyes flash fire (see Tarrant, 102), none are as frequently associated with fire as Achilles (*Il*. 206, 225; 19. 16-17, 365-6). On the association of the fire of Aeneas with that of Achilles, see above, Ch. 6, pp. 319-20.

[717] Aeneas is glad that the war will be decided by an agreement (*oblato gaudens componi foedere bellum,* 109), a topic that is again linked with his sympathy for his men, whose concerns and fears he attempts to assuage (*tum socios maestique metum solatus Iuli / fata docens,* 110-11.

[718] The MS reading is *non virbus aequis*, which is difficult grammatically and has been considered an interpolation by some (Tarrant, 218).

> But for a long time it had seemed to the Rutulians that
> the fight was uneven and their hearts were upset in a variety of ways
> even more when they perceived from up close that the men [were not
> equal in strength]. That Turnus stepped forward quietly and supplicating
> worshipped at the altar with downcast gaze and had downy cheeks and
> a paleness about his youthful body increased (their anxiety).

The Rutulians' focalization of and their reactions to this scene provide Turnus' sister Juturna, whom Juno had advised of her brother's sad fate and encouraged to stir up war (138-53), the perfect opportunity to rouse sentiment for a return to war (222-37), but this utterly new presentation of Turnus associates him with the prominent youths of the narrative who have unsuccessfully faced older more experienced fighters, namely Pallas (*viribus imparibus*, 10. 459), Lausus (*maioraque virbus audes?* 10. 811) and, perhaps especially, Troilus, the unlucky charioteer whose defeat by Achilles Aeneas viewed represented on the Juno's temple (*impar congressus Achilli* 1. 475).[719] All four are youthful, but Troilus and Turnus alone are prominent charioteers, a role that Vergil may have created for Troilus, and the only two uses of *impar* in the nominative in the *Aeneid* refer to Troilus and Turnus (see above, Ch. 4, pp. 174-75). Troilus has more radically been "brought low" by Achilles (*curruque haeret resupinus inani*, 1. 476), but the lowly submissiveness of Turnus (*suppliciter venerans demisso lumine Turnus*, 12. 220) foreshadows his futile supplication of Aeneas before he is killed (*ille humilis supplex*, 12. 930; Tarrant, 220). Troilus' death bore a special significance for Troy, portending its fall (see above, Ch. 4, p. 172), as, more obviously, Turnus' death will be consequential for the Rutulians and Latins. Turnus' pervasive paleness (*iuvenali in corpore pallor*, 221), the hue of death inappropriate to his youth, becomes a more certain sign of his impending fate in the light of the noun's only other use to describe Dido as she contemplates her death (*pallor simul occupat ora*, 4. 499; Tarrant, 221). Dido and Turnus also share the only three uses of the verb *devoveo* (see Ch. 7, p. 397), soon to be used by Juturna/Camers to characterize Turnus' act at the altar ("Certainly his fame will rise to the gods, at whose altars he dedicates himself," *se devovet*, 234-35), but as used of Dido in book 1 (*infelix, pesti devota futurae,* 712), the verb conveys not the sense of

[719] Reed (2007), 47, "The situation here (12. 216-21) echoes 1. 474-78… It is Troilus… who prefigures the Rutulian prince here: a lesser, tenderer Hector, an 'unlucky boy'."

dedication, but of inevitable doom, which is surely the gist of Turnus' appearance here at the altar.[720] But with the renewal of war that Juturna foments and with Aeneas' withdrawal after being wounded in his attempt to stop the war's outbreak, Turnus is filled with resurgent hope and returns to his former fiery passion for war in the fiercest of his charioteering exploits, as if the scene at the altar only represented the fearful fabrications of his men.

Like the youthful charioteer in the *Iliad* Euphorbus, who wounds Patroclus with an unheroic spear throw from behind (16. 806-7),[721] Turnus only joins the reignited war when he sees the wounded Aeneas carried off the field. The quick assent into his chariot announces his rejection of the duel and welcoming of the renewed war in a passage in which he is compared to Mars and associated with Thrace, winds and primitive bestiality (324-82). Here, he specifically takes the reins of the chariot (*manibus molitur habenas*, 326), as Metiscus and Juturna will later. Pride again attends Turnus in the chariot (*saltuque superbus/ emicat in currum,* 326-27), as it had in the scene before Pallas' death (*iussa superba,* 10. 445), and the chariot here is, even more than Achilles' chariot in the ecphrasis (*instaret curru cristatus Achilles,* 1. 468) overtly a weapon of war, rolling over and crushing dying men (*seminecis volvit multos aut agmina curru/ proterit*, 329-30). A number of warriors from both sides in the *Iliad* are compared to Ares (Agamemnon, 2. 49; Ajax 7. 208-20; Idomeneus and Meriones [to Ares and Phobos], 13. 298-303; Hector 15. 605-6; Achilles, 20. 46, 22. 132), but in the *Aeneid* Turnus alone is compared to Mars,[722] giving this simile a distinctive importance for him (12. 329-40):

> multa virum volitans dat fortia corpora leto.
> seminecis voluit multos: aut agmina curru
> proterit aut raptas fugientibus ingerit hastas. 330
> qualis apud gelidi cum flumina concitus Hebri

[720] As Reed (2007), 49, notes in his analysis of Turnus' participation (at 12. 219-21) in what he characterizes as the "Adonis moment," the eroticized deaths of Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, and Camilla, it is "as if Turnus' Adonis-moment were displaced from his actual death to a premonition thereof...this description is a foreshadowing: Turnus is going to die."

[721] Euphorbus' brief portrait shows parallels with Turnus: "...Panthus' son, Euphorbus, who excelled all men of his years in casting the spear and in horsemanship and in speed of foot; for already twenty warriors had he cast from their horses at his first coming with his chariot as he learned of war" (16. 808-11).

[722] Although Aeneas' comparison to Aegaeon in book 10. 565-68 relates him allusively to the *Georgics*' Mars (See above, Ch. 6, p. 340) and when he later plunges into general war he does so with Mars favoring (*Marte secundo*, 12. 497).

sanguineus Mavors clipeo increpat atque furentis
bella movens immittit equos, illi aequore aperto
ante Notos Zephyrumque volant, gemit ultima pulsu
Thraca pedum circumque atrae Formidinis ora 335
Iraeque Insidiaeque, dei comitatus, aguntur:
talis equos alacer media inter proelia Turnus
fumantis sudore quatit, miserabile caesis
hostibus insultans; spargit rapida ungula rores
sanguineos mixtaque cruor calcatur harena.

Flying along he sent the brave bodies of men to destruction.
He rolled over many dying men: either he trampled the lines
with his chariot, or threw spears he had seized into those fleeing.
Such as when bloody Mars aroused along the streams of the chilly Hebrus,
crashes on his shield (with his sword), and stirring wars, lets lose his
raging horses. On the open plain they fly before the south and west winds,
Thrace resounds to its limits with the drumming of their hooves, and all around
the dark faces of Fear, Rage and Treachery, companions of the god, speed on.
So did swift Turnus lash his horses foaming with sweat, trampling upon
his foes miserably slaughtered. The rapid hooves sprinkle bloody dew and
and kick and mix gore with the sand.

Speed, twice associated with Turnus (*volitans, alacer*), but most extensively with the horses, which are faster than the winds,[723] throughout the passage contrasts with the physical destruction of bodies and the ground they lie upon. In the first line Turnus' flying is surrounded by the many brave bodies of men (328), while the windy speed of Mars' horses is immediately countered by the resounding of the land, which groans far and wide (*ultima,* 334) with the pounding of the hooves. After the simile, quick Turnus and his foaming horses produce slaughter (*caesis*, 338), a contrast more specifically expressed in the bloody dew that their rapid hooves sprinkle (339-40). While the unconventional epithet of Mars (so Tarrant, 332), *sanguineus,* begins a theme of blood, since Mars is only initiating war, Turnus seems "to surpass the war god himself in bloodthirstiness," as he is already in the midst of the fight (Tarrant, 331-40). "Dew-dripping blood" does appear in the *Iliad* (ἐέρσας αἵματι μυδαέας, 11. 53-54), sent by Zeus, "since he was minded to hurl down a multitude of strong heads to the house of Hades" (54-55) and "bloody dew" (φοινίας δρόσου, 1390) is the expression used by Clytemnestra to describe Agamemnon's blood falling on her, human blood derived from slaughter, perhaps a closer parallel in expression and

[723] See above, Ch. 5, pp. 278-79, on the traditional association of horses and winds and recall the horselike winds of Aeolus (1. 52-63).

thought to the blood Turnus produces.[724] In any case, it is a metaphor Vergil seems to associate especially with chariots in reference to Turnus and, as we have seen, to the effect of Tullus Hostilius' killing by chariot-dismemberment of Mettus Fufetius on Aeneas' shield, where the sprinkled briars drip blood *sparsi rorabant sanguine uepres,* (8. 645, the verb *roro,* "to bedew" derived from *ros*, "dew"), an inhumanly barbaric punishment meted out by a Roman king (see Ch. 5, pp. 297-301).

But an equally disturbing use of the word occurs in conjunction with the heads of two brothers Turnus kills, which he affixes to his chariot later in battle (509-12):

> Turnus equo deiectum Amycum fratremque Diorem,
> congressus pedes, hunc venientem cuspide longa,
> hunc mucrone ferit, curruque abscisa duorum
> suspendit capita et rorantia sanguine portat.
>
> Turnus on foot goes to meet Amycus, who had been unhorsed,
> and his brother Diores. He struck the one coming at him with a long spear
> and the other with his sword and the severed heads of the two, he hung
> from his chariot and carried them along dripping a dew of blood.

Among the numerous participles in the passage the finite verbs of striking, hanging and carrying attract the greatest attention (Tarrant, 509-11), but the macabre image of the heads, which the narrative tarries from the otherwise rapid surrounding narrative to describe Turnus both cutting and affixing to his chariot, is by itself shockingly barbaric, to which the knowledge that they are brothers adds even greater pathos. Significantly, the similar examples in Livy that Tarrant (512) cites are non-Roman, Gallic and Thracian,[725] which suggests that Turnus' acts may have been seen as a continuation of his association with Thrace and its wild primitive culture, initiated in his comparison to Thracian Mars (335) and continued thirty lines later in a simile comparing Turnus to the force of Thracian winds (365-67). Thrace is the traditional home of Mars,[726] Amazons and fine horses (see above, Ch. 5, p. 278), but at least from the time

---

[724] Horsfall (2003), 8, discussing Mezentius helmet on Aeneas' trophy which drips blood (*rorantis sanguine cristas*, 11. 8), associates bloody dew with tragedy, citing this Asechylan passage and Sophocles, *Ant.* 1238, and with Apollonius (1. 751), where a field in the ecphrasis of Jason's mantle given to him by Athena, is dew-wet from the blood of men fighting over cattle.

[725] Livy 42. 60. 2 (Thracians) *superfixa* [*hastis*] *capita hostium portantes redierunt;* Livy 10. 26. 11 *Gallorum equites pectoribus equorum suspensa gestantes capita et lanceis infixa.*

[726] In the Iliadic simile comparing Idomeneus and Meriones to Ares and Phobos (13. 298-303), they "are seen coming from Thrace" (Tarrant, 331).

of Herodotus (4. 95) it was seen as an uncivilized place and was home of some of the most barbaric rulers, who were also sons of Ares, Diomedes owner of man-eating mares and Tereus, who raped Philomela.[727] While Thrace in the *Aeneid* has a variety of connotations in addition to its association with Mars, Turnus and Amazons (5. 312, 11. 659),[728] it is the home of the Thracian king who broke faith with Priam and murdered his son Polydorus in order to steal his gold (3. 55-57).[729] The connotations adhering to Turnus of Amazonian Camilla's deviant otherness in the Latin catalogue, may be fulfilled in his Thracian barbaric actions here. Turnus' comparison to Thracian Mars, "the embodiment of war… cannot escape sinister connotations" (Tarrant, 331-40) and carries both immediately in the resumption of the narrative and in Turnus' further exploits connotations of uncivilized and barbarian behavior.

The continuation of the topic of winds from the previous simile (*ante Notos Zephyrumque volant*, 334; cf. 367) and their location in Thrace (*Thraca*, 335; cf. 365) in the comparison of Turnus' chariot after he kills Eumedes to the wind, keeps active the overarching association of Turnus in the larger passage with Thracian Mars, even during the momentary rallentando in the tempo to catch sight of Turnus' crest tossing in the wind (365-370):

> ac velut Edoni Boreae cum spiritus alto
> insonat Aegaeo sequiturque ad litora fluctus,
> qua venti incubuere, fugam dant nubila caelo:
> sic Turno, quacumque viam secat, agmina cedunt
> conversaeque ruunt acies; fert impetus ipsum
> et cristam adverso curru quatit aura volantem.

---

[727] Ares is also somewhat of a primitive. Zeus considers Ares the most hateful god because strife, wars and fighting are always dear to him (*Il.* 5. 890-91) and Gantz (1993), 80, notes that the continued linking of Athena and Ares, the two battle gods, suggests that "Athena was regularly thought of as representing a more rational counterweight to Ares' battle fury." Diomedes as son of Ares is found in Pindar (fr. 169 SM) and Apollodorus 11. 5. 8. Tereus, as son of Mars in Apollodorus 3. 14. 6 and Ovid, *Meta.* 6. 412-674. Anderson (1982), 458-60, maintains that "the Greeks entertained a prejudice that the Thracians, almost barbarian in behavior, were excessively lustful," and similarly, W. K. C. Guthrie, 1966, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, New York, 114, "This opposition [to the orgiastic worship of the Thracians] was largely fed by feelings of contempt for the Thracians themselves, who to Greek eyes were barbarians and beyond the pale."

[728] Orpheus is twice identified as Thracian (6. 120, 6. 645), one of the gifts at the games is a crater of Cisseus (5. 536-7), a Thracian king who was in some accounts father of Hecuba (Williams, 1960, 537), and Thracian horses are ridden both by Turnus (9. 49) and by little Priam in the Trojan games (5. 565).

[729] The recounting of the act prompts narratorial comment (3. 55-57): *fas omen abrumpit: Polydorum obtruncat, et auro / vi potitur. quid non mortalia pectora cogis, / auri sacra fames!*

> As when a blast of the Thracian North wind resounds upon
> the Aegean out to sea and pursues the waves to the shore. Where
> the winds have swooped down the clouds in the sky take flight.
> Thus for Turnus, wherever he cuts his way, the army yields and
> the battle lines turn and flee. Violent motion carries him along
> and the wind shakes his flowing crest as his chariot turns.

Turnus' rout of what appears to be the whole Trojan army (Tarrant, 368-9) is lifted into the realm of the heavenly winds. Airy words predominate (*Boreae, spiritus, venti, nubila, impetus, aura, volantem*) and the previous tight focus on the grizzly details of slaughter is broadened to a generalizing sweep of the field. Even the reference to Thrace (*Edoni*), is soften by indirectness (Mt. Edon is in Thrace), perhaps in part to made the simile more analogous to one accompanying Aeneas' return to battle (See below, pp. 440-43).

Thus, when Turnus takes advantage of Aeneas' withdrawal from the battlefield to return to chariot warfare, he dominates his adversaries as completely as had Aeneas in his fury-inspired defeat of Latin charioteers in book 10. Turnus' chariot ensemble participates centrally in almost every aspect of the passage—the full description of him mounting and taking the reins, the crushing destruction the chariot itself wreaks, its horses' speed, faster than the wind, and the important simile comparing Turnus, alone of the warriors in the *Aeneid*, to Mars. In the *Aeneid* Turnus shares only with Achilles and Tullus Hostilius the use of the chariot as weapon of death, chariots which drip or spray blood or abuse the corpses of the fallen. In this passage the association of both Mars and Turnus with Thrace, a traditional locus of the uncivilized and barbaric, deepens the impression of Turnus' wildness and savagery. We have seen in Aeneas' rage-filled *aristeia* in book 10 that he manifested many characteristics associated with Turnus, yet not the bestiality evident in Agamemnon's more grizzly killings in the major contributing intertext. Beastiality is a distinctive aspect of Turnus in this passage, where it is particularly associated with his chariot when he hangs the heads of two victims from his chariot.

The introduction to book 12 and the arming scene that follows would lead an audience to expect just this sort of wild Turnus. In his first speeches, those to Latinus and Amata, his violent eagerness to fight the duel is evident in his fiery passion in general and toward Lavinia in particular, whom he

consistently represents as the prize for the winner of the duel and who makes him eager for his arms. He rejoices in his horses, images of the fierceness of war, and prays to his spear, putting him in the company of other godless warriors and a famous tyrant. The pale appearance and submissive demeanor of Turnus at the ceremony formalizing the agreement for the duel, to which he drives in his chariot for the first time in book 12, is therefore all the more surprising. In his perceived weakness and inequality to Aeneas Turnus at the altar resembles the defeated charioteer Troilus, while his paleness and suggestively sacrificial presentation link him with the doomed Dido. Like nothing seen before or immediately after in Turnus this dark cloud foreboding his defeat and death facilitates Juturna's first and most significant intervention in her attempt to delay Turnus' inevitable end, but in her assumption of the reins of Turnus' chariot she expedites a major transformation in the actions of Aeneas that causes devastation to the city of Latinus.

The Chariot and the Palace

While Turnus has been dominating the battlefield in his chariot, Venus' ministrations have finally healed Aeneas' wound and he returns to war with a power that intimidates all (*gelidusque per ima cucurrit ossa tremor*, 447-48), but he wishes only to engage with Turnus, emphasized in the elaboration of those he will not fight (*nec… neque… nec* , 464-65) and the repetition of *solum* describing Turnus (466-67); in essence he still tries to maintain the terms of the treaty. Turnus' sister, Juturna, has succeeded at stirring up war in the disguise of Camers, a bold fighter from a distinguished family (224-26), but now at the sight of the returning Aeneas, she first flees trembling (449) and then, when she perceives his single-minded pursuit of her brother, even more evidently wracked with fear (*hoc concussa metu mentem Iuturna*, 468), she throws Turnus' chairoteer Metiscus out of the chariot and takes over the job herself. Juturna remains there until Turnus abandons the chariot for good, a climactic moment in the epic, which the symbolic connotations of the chariot enrich. While as charioteer Juturna succeeds at her primary goal of keeping Turnus away from facing Aeneas, that is, until Turnus makes the choice to accept that challenge, there are indications that her presence in the chariot adds further meaning to Turnus' abandoning of the chariot that go beyond her stratagem of protective avoidance. Allusions to both the

Iliad and *Odyssey* compare Juturna's actions to those of Athena in helping Diomedes and Odysseus, the latter of which is especially helpful for interpreting the various and apparently contradictory implications of Juturna's charioteering.

What seems perplexing about Juturna's intervention is that she clearly carries Turnus far from Aeneas, implicitly to the fringes of fighting (*nec conferre manum patitur*, *volat avia longe*, 480) to avoid engagement, prompting Aeneas' frustration and angry plunging back into the fray (497), yet at the same time Turnus also resumes fighting in his usual brutal manner which, as we have seen in his hanging of the severed heads of his victims from the chariot (511-12), maintains the violence that has been associated with his chariot. While he could simply be fighting far afield on the fringes, it is precisely in this section that Turnus and Aeneas are first prominently presented simultaneously as equal and analogous adversaries: they wreck havoc alternately (*inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros*, 502), their nations were destined to live eternally at peace (504), their acts are described in correlation (*ille, hic,* 51, 516, 529, 535) and most significantly, they are joined together in two successive similes (521-25), which lead to a joint description of their battle rage and strength (525-28). These devices strongly suggest at least the relative proximity of the fighters and perhaps the failure of Juturna's trick of removing Turnus to the fringes.[730] The juxtaposition of Juturna's frightened maternal protectiveness, vividly expressed in the simile comparing the flight of her chariot on the battlefield to that of a swallow gathering food for her nestlings (473-77), with the severed heads dangling from Turnus' chariot, fits awkwardly. But the swallow simile, which initiates this section, refers to Athena's actions on behalf of Odysseus in the midst of his full-fledged and bloody battle within his home to regain his wife. This is the very paradigm that Turnus sees himself following in his war with Aeneas, the recovery of his wife (*coniuge praerepta*, 9. 37, and, indirectly, *nunc coniugis esto quisque suae tectique memor*, 10. 280-81). As long as Juturna serves as Turnus' charioteer she facilitates his war to regain his "wife", but when Turnus rejects the confines of the chariot he abandons both war and his personal and selfish motivation for fighting, that is, "re-gaining"

[730] The clearest indication that the two fight in separate places (other than Aeneas' previous inability to catch up to Turnus) is that the fire in the first simile starts in *diversis partibus* (521).

Lavinia and her royal house.[731] At this point he will finally understand the suffering that he has brought to the community, as he perceives it in the destruction Aeneas has brought to the city and willingly accepts the challenge of the duel, which he truly fights on their behalf (*pro vobis*, 695). As in Vergil's earlier allusions to Odysseus in the narrative of Aeneas and Palinurus' voyaging (see Ch. 4), comparison between Turnus and Odysseus highlights what is distinctive in his analogous situation, which is the lack of justification and hopelessness of his cause. But the addition of the sympathetic figure of his sister to his chariot with her Odyssean allusions softens the brutish tyrannical connotations of Turnus' chariot in preparation for his heroic abandonning of the chariot, fully aware he is doomed in his duel with Aeneas. What then in Juturna's assumption of Turnus' chariot and comparison to a swallow signals an allusion to Athena and Odysseus?

Juturna's take over as charioteer from Metiscus, who here makes his first and last appearance in the epic, is described in some detail (468-72):

> Hoc concussa metu mentem Iuturna virago
> aurigam Turni media inter lora Metiscum
> excutit et longe lapsum temone reliquit;
> ipsa subit manibusque undantis flectit habenas
> cuncta gerens, vocemque et corpus et arma Metisci.
>
> Shaken by this fear, Juturna, a heroic woman,
> thrust Metiscus, Turnus' charioteer, from the reins
> and, after he slipped from the chariot, left him far behind.
> She took over and shook the waving reins in her hands,
> bearing every aspect of Metiscus, his voice, body and weapons.

[731] Although my analysis of the swallow simile, as well as Faunus' wild olive tree, does argue that significant traces of the *Odyssey* are present in these two episodes, my conclusions about these passages are at odds with those of Cairns (1989), who argues that the *Odyssey* is the major intertext of the *Aeneid* (177-214, especially 179-80). He interprets Aeneas as like Odysseus in recovering his "wife" at the end (179) and sees allusions to the killing of the suitors in Aeneas' slaying of Turnus (212-13). However, in contrast to Aeneas, who only mentions Lavinia at the ceremony and without reference to marriage, Turnus has referred to Lavinia as his wife (see above) and her "recovery" is a central motivating factor in his fighting. Nor do I think Vergil has presented Turnus as analogous to the suitors' vermin-like eating away at Odysseus' estate and lusting for his wife (211). I will argue for the presence of Odysseus "in erasure" (See Introduction, p. 5) in the circumstances of Turnus. Although this implicit comparison highlights the inaccuracy of the analogy Turnus has made between himself and Menelaus and forcasts his demise, in so doing Turnus like Aeneas is compared to the hero of the epic, but in his case, as in that of Palinurus, the implications are bleak.

Just such a scene occurs in the *Iliad* when Athena throws Diomedes' charioteer Sthenelus to the ground and drives Diomedes against Ares, whom (5. 835-41),[732] with the goddess' assistance, he strikes with his spear (855-57). That Juturna, a goddess of lakes and sounding rivers (12.139-40), is characterized as a *virago*, literally, a woman with the qualities of a man, strengthens this Iliadic allusion to Athena, a war-like woman,[733] and is also appropriate for Juturna's assumption of the appearance of Metiscus, an aspect that is, however, *not* part of the *Iliad*'s episode, in which Athena's actual divine presence draws comment regarding her weight which strains the chariot and the necessity of hiding her identity from Ares with the cap of Hades (5. 838-40; 844-45). On the other hand, in the *Aeneid* Juturna's assumption of the disguise of Metiscus is stressed at length—a generalizing statement and the enumeration of three different aspects of likeness, voice, body and arms (472)—and not only in this passage, but in everyone in which Juturna subsequently first reappears, whether in the chariot (*in faciem soror ut conversa Metisci aurigae*, 623) or not, as when she runs (*procurrit,* 785) to give Turnus his own sword, after Metiscus' shatters (*rursus in aurigae faciem mutata Metisci*, 784), especially unnecessary information at this point.[734] These brief quasi-formulaic[735] reminders that Juturna is disguised as Metiscus are unlike other gods' assumption of disguise in the *Aeneid* in which the actual appropriation of the disguise and often its dramatic rejection is elaborated upon and interwoven into the narrative plot in one unified episode without any subsequent brief reminders.[736] But this is, in fact, especially characteristic of Athena's disguise in the *Odyssey,* when

---

[732] Tarrant (2012), 468-72. "So saying, with her hand she drew back Sthenelus, and thrust him from the chariot to earth, and he speedily leapt down; and she stepped into the chariot beside noble Diomedes, a goddess eager for battle. Loudly did the oaken axle creak beneath its burden, for it was bearing a terrible goddess and an excellent man. Then Pallas Athene grasped the whip and the reins, and against Ares first she speedily drove the single-hoofed horses."

[733] Ovid characterizes Minerva in two different stories as *virago* (*Met.* 2. 765, 6. 130).

[734] An exception to this is when the Dira flies at Turnus and Juturna laments (869-86). Although Tarrant (2012), 784, reluctantly follows Servius' assumption that *rursus* (784) indicates "that Juturna had put off her disguise at some point after being recognized by T. in 632-4 and now reassumes the appearance of Metiscus," he points out that "there is no obvious reason for V. to have introduced that complication." However, if the *rursus* does not go closely with the participle *mutata*, but with the whole phrase, the sense is more one of emphasis: "Again (as she was before), changed into the appearance of the charioteer Metiscus, she runs forth."

[735] By quasi I mean repeating the same basic information (she had the appearance of the charioteer Metiscus) with some of the same words (*Metiscus, auriga, facies*).

[736] For example, Venus disguised as Diana to Aeneas (1. 315-20, revelation of true goddess: 402-5), Cupid as Ascanius to Dido (1. 683-4, 689-90), Iris as Beroe to the Trojan Women (5. 619-20, revelation 657-58), Allecto as

she appears as Mentor,[737] who like Metiscus only has one appearance in the epic as himself (2. 229-34), but reappears as Athena's disguise five times, always with a formulaic reminder of her disguise ("likening herself in appearance and voice to Mentor," 2. 268, 401; 22. 206; 24. 504, 549),[738] one of which is the last line of the epic (24. 549). This disguise of Athena in the *Odyssey* is closely linked to the restoration of Odysseus both to his proper place in his house and to his role as king, for the only speech that Mentor, an old friend of Odysseus, gives in person recommends that all gentle kind and just kings should be harsh because of the way Odysseus, kind like a father, has been treated (2. 230-34), a speech repeated by Athena to the gods (5. 8-12), in her argument to start the wheels turning for his return home. Athena in the guise of Mentor aids Odysseus in his defeat of the suitors in book 22 and brings Zeus' plan for peace to accomplishment at the epic's end.[739] The repetition of this formula as the last line of the epic implies that the full restoration of Odysseus to his home and as king has been accomplished.[740] Metiscus, who utters not a word and is the disguise of a minor divinity, is not of comparable weight to Mentor,[741] but in this particular moment of the *Aeneid*, Athena and Juturna's roles are allusively likened, as suggested by the swallow simile they share, which fashions Turnus' war as a fight to regain his wife and proper place in home and kingdom.

Calybe to Turnus (7. 415-19, revelation 447-48). The only description of a disguise that is similar in expression to Juturna's here is that of Venus who *virginis os habitumque gerens et virgins arma* (1. 315). None of these disguises mention the voice of the disguise they assume, which, as Clay (1974), has shown is a important aspect of the formula describing Mentor, as it is here for Metiscus (472).

[737] Athena also assumes other disguises in the *Odyssey*: Mentes (1. 105), a vulture (3. 372), the daughter of Dimas (6. 22, 24) and a herald (8. 8; Fernández-Galiano, 1992, 22. 206), but these are not repeated. Juturna also appeared earlier to disrupt the duel as Camers, distinguished in his family and courage (225-26).

[738] Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἠμὲν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ αὐδήν.

[739] Mentor's speech is given at the meeting that Athena (disguised as Mentes) had advised Telemachus to call in order to tell the suitors publicly to leave. Telemachus' future help in the restoration of Odysseus is shortly suggested, as he sits next to Athena, who is now for the first time in the guise of Mentor and steers their boat as they set out to find word of Odysseus (2. 416-21).

[740] Heubeck (1992), 548, omits reference to kingship and Athena's disguise, but also considers the last line appropriate as a reflection of Athena's decisive role in the return of Odysseus: "The renaming of the goddess in the last lines is also an appropriate end to the whole work, for she had set events in motion, ensured that they followed the intended course with numerous interventions, and now brought abut the conclusion towards which the entire poem has been directed: the return of the hero, reunion with his wife, and the restoration and renewal of the old order on Ithaca."

[741] In discussing the "comparative paucity of divine intervention on the human level" in the *Aeneid*, Feeney (1991), 182-3, describes Juturna's lesser divine state: "She is a minor goddess, an ex-mortal, who, in her eternal mourning for her brother, remains exempt from the divine prerogative of ultimate invulnerability (12. 872-86)."

Vergil contrives to make the relationship of the simile describing a swallow's search for food in a large villa for her nestlings to the narrative tenor of Juturna and Turnus in his chariot difficult to understand immediately by postponing the narrative description of the dominate point of similarity—movement—until *after* the simile. Juturna has no sooner picked up the reins in the guise of Metiscus than vistas of the villa of a rich man appear (12. 473-80):

> nigra velut magnas domini cum divitis aedes
> pervolat et pennis alta atria lustrat hirundo
> pabula parva legens nidisque loquacibus escas,
> et nunc porticibus vacuis, nunc umida circum
> stagna sonat: similis medios Iuturna per hostis
> fertur equis rapidoque volans obit omnia curru,
> iamque hic germanum iamque hic ostentat ovantem
> nec conferre manum patitur, volat avia longe.
>
> As when a black swallow flies through the great dwelling of
> a rich man and traverses on wing the high halls,
> gathering small bits and edibles for her chirping nestlings
> and she sounds now in the empty porticoes and now around the ponds.
> In the same way Juturna drives her horses through the midst
> of the enemy and flying traverses everywhere in her swift chariot.
> And now she shows her brother exulting her and now there,
> nor does she allow him to engage in combat, but
> she flies far out of the way.

Thus, it is not only due to the remoteness of the simile's setting that it has been seen as a contrasting interlude (Tarrant, 2012, 473-80), for the house and its vastness predominate the first two lines, even overwhelming the presence of the swallow, which is gradually revealed.[742] The great size (*magnas*), height (*alta*) and spaciousness (*vacuis*) of the villa by comparison to the swallow, encourages seeing Juturna's chariot movement as encompassing a similar huge area of the battlefield (*obit omnia*, Tarrant, 2012, 473-4). Clearly the motion of the bird (*pervolat, lustrat, nunc…nunc*) is analogous to that of

[742] Tarrant (2012), 473-4, suggests that the hyperbaton of *nigra*…and *hirundo* could express "the large spaces traversed by the bird, an impression heightened by the magnifying phrases *magnas…aedes, domini…divitis, alta atria.*" By comparison, the extended simile that likens the effect of huge Bitias' fall on the ground, to that of rock pillars sent as foundations on the sea near Baiae (also an apparently contemporary context), makes the relationship of the comparison almost immediately clear (Bitias falls in 708 before the simile, the rock pillar at 711).

Juturna in the chariot (*fertur, volans obit, hic… hic…, volat*),[743] but perhaps the most significant point is the similarity of what compels the movement: a concern for their loved ones (offspring or brother; Tarrant, 2012, 473-80).[744] This shared "motherly concern" has led Lyne (1987, 139-40) to see in the swallow's sounds an allusion to Procne's lament for her son Itys, a foreshadowing of Turnus' death,[745] although the swallow's "cries" (Lyne's translation of *sonat*, 477) seem to be a slim justification for this mythological allusion, which is, however, surely appropriate to the context.[746] But there is also an aspect of Juturna's movement that is distinct from the swallow's, which is that it is carried out as a deceptive strategy to protect Turnus from Aeneas without her brother's awareness of that fact.[747] This aspect may be alluded to in Metiscus' name and in the flight of the swallow within the hall in book 22 of the *Odyssey* when the battlefield is brought within a hero's home, a plan formed and aided by Athena, goddess of strategy, who takes the disguise of a swallow in the midst of that battle. Μῆτις, the quality of cunning that Athena and Odysseus share, participates centrally in the joint formation and execution of the scheme for Odysseus' restoration.

Upon Odysseus' return to Ithaca in book 13 Athena meets the hero face-to-face for the first time in the epic to plot with him the defeat of the suitors.[748] In expressing her affection for Odysseus and confidence in their collective ability to succeed against the suitors she refers to their shared reputation for cunning (κέρδος, 297, 299) and shrewdness (μῆτις, 299, 303) and promises to be at his side at that time

---

[743] The simile which likens Mnestheus' ship's movement under the renewed force of his crew to a dove breaking free of a cave and flying in the open air also focuses on movement (and shares some vocabulary: *celeri, fertur, volans, pennis, celeris, volantem,* (5. 210-19).

[744] Although several meanings have been suggested for Juturna's name, that derived from *iuvare* "to help" fits her role in the *Aeneid* and has support (Harrison, 1991, 439; Tarrant, 2012, 138).

[745] Although in the main Greek version Philomela, the sister of Procne, becomes a swallow, another "firm version emerges (which seems characteristically Roman)" in which Procne is the swallow (Lyne, 1987, 142).

[746] The fear aroused in Juturna at the onslaught of Aeneas is strongly expressed (448-49, 468) and is the motivation behind her assumption of Metiscus' place in the chariot. Further, her role as charioteer is recalled shortly before Turnus' death (918).

[747] Turnus indirectly identifies it as a stratagem when he perceives it (632-34): "O sister, I recognized you long ago when first you disturbed the treaty by scheming (*per artem*) and devoted yourself to this war and you do not deceive (*fallis*) me now, pretending not to be a goddess."

[748] Clay (1983), 188-211, discusses this important meeting and argues that Athena's help is indispensable for Odysseus' reestablishment on Ithaca, since only a god has the power to change appearances and that Odysseus' disguise is "the ultimate purpose for Athena's coming" (192).

when she expects the ground to be spattered with the blood and brains of the suitors (καί τιν᾽ ὀΐω αἵματί τ᾽ ἐγκεφάλῳ τε παλαξέμεν ἄσπετον οὖδας ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων, 394-96). And indeed their plan results in just such a grisly scene at the end of the "Iliadic spear battle" within Odysseus' home (Fernández-Galiano, 1992, 207), when he stands "spattered over with gore and battle filth like a lion" (αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον ὥστε λέοντα, 22. 402). But before this, after Odysseus runs out of arrows for his bow and he and the three fighting with him have been armed with spears from the storeroom, Athena makes an appearance "likening herself in voice and appearance to Mentor" (206), yet recognizable to Odysseus as Athena, leader of armies (λαοσσόον, 210; also so identified at *Il*. 13. 128), perhaps a signal for the spear battle to begin.[749] But because she is still testing Odysseus and Telemachus, Athena (22. 239-40):

> αὐτὴ δ᾽ αἰθαλόεντος ἀνὰ μεγάροιο μέλαθρον
> ἕζετ᾽ ἀναΐξασα, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη ἄντην.
>
> likening herself to a swallow shot up high aloft,
> and perched on a beam of the smokey hall.

From this high position and apparently undiscerned by any,[750] Athena aids Odysseus' cause by turning aside the suitor's spear throws twice (256, 273) and at the end shaking the aegis, now from the roof (297-98), terrifying the suitors and bringing about their total defeat. Thus, from the devising of the plot for winning back his wife and home to its accomplishment Athena, as Odysseus requests (13. 387, 389), does stand by him.

The battle context in the *Aeneid,* the related Iliadic intertext (Athena's take over of Diomedes' chariot) and Turnus' ever closer defeat and death (fear about which motivates Juturna's stratagem) mitigate against an immediate awareness of this Odyssean intertext,[751] but Vergil has provided further

---

[749] The spear battle is considered a later addition to the primitive version of the myth that ended with the shooting down by arrows of the defenseless suitors (Fernández-Galiano, 207), which brought with it numerous contradictions in the plot.

[750] Whether Athena does change into the swallow or whether this is a simile is still an open question (Fernández-Galiano, 1992, 239-40). εἰκέλη (like, 240), introduces similes (10. 304, 11. 207, 21. 411), but also can introduce a transformation (20. 88).

[751] This Odyssean swallow allusion is suggested among several "external connections" listed in an extremely useful Appendix of similes in the *Aeneid* (208-24) in Schell (2009), 223, but it is not well-known (Tarrant, 2012, 473-80, "No Homeric model has been cited for this simile," except that of Achilles comparing himself to a mother bird

clues to its relevance beyond the central similarity of the likening of a hero's divine patron in the midst of a battle to a swallow flying high in the central room of a house (ἀνὰ μεγάροιο…ἀναΐξασα, cf. *alta atria lustrat*). While both Athena's and Odysseus' renown for cleverness, μῆτις, is central to their portrait in the *Odyssey* (see above), μῆτις has also been suggested as a major component in the meaning of Metiscus' name (a combination of μῆτις ['cunning'] and *metus* ['fear']; Paschalis, 390),[752] a name that both relates Juturna's disguise to that of Athena as Mentor in her intercessions, and also expresses the major difference in the situations, Athena's confidence as opposed to Juturna's fear. Vergil presents his passage in the same sequence as events occur in the *Odyssey*—the goddess appears (205, cf. 468; Juturna further takes over the chariot), she takes on the appearance of Mentor, in voice and appearance (206, cf. Metiscus, 472), and she is likened to or turns into a swallow who flies up high in the megaron (238-40, cf. *alta atria,* 473-74). The abrupt change from Juturna as Metiscus in the chariot (472) to the description of the rooms of the villa and the swallow (473-4), given the numerous preceding allusions to Athena, would encourage awareness of the situation in Odysseus' home, the threatened wealth of which is a central issue in the epic's plot (cf. *domini…divitis aedes*, 473). The enumeration of the areas of the villa the swallow traverses (*aedes, atria, porticibus*), in addition to giving the villa a distinctly Roman aspect, are similar to parts of Odysseus' house referred to throughout the battle of book 22; most frequent are house (δόμος) and hall (μέγαρον), but courtyard (αὐλή, 7 times) is also common and these three words, generally equivalent to *aedes, atria, porticibus,* occur in one line near the end of the account as the rooms Odysseus treated with fire and brimstone in a final cleansing (494).[753]

---

looking for food for its young [*Il.* 9. 323-7], but he notes that the emphasis in this simile is on the bird's selflessness, not, as in Vergil, on its motion.)

[752] The meaning of Mentor's name, whose formulaic appearances I have suggested are the basis of Metiscus', is "probably to be understood as 'adviser' (from **men-* 'think', as in μέμονα)", as is that of Mentes, the disguise Athena assumes when she first intercedes in book 1, encouraging Telemachus to call a meeting of the suitors. Mentes, however, is probably modeled on Mentor (West, 1988, 105). Mentor's initial advising to Telemachus and later to Odysseus both work toward the restoration of Odysseus, which included facilitating the maturation of Telemachus. On Juturna's name, see above, n. 744.

[753] A similar listing of three—hall (μέγαρον), round house (θόλος) and courtyard (αὐλή)—occurs twice (441-2, 458-59) in designating the place for the execution of the servant women who befriended the suitors.

A relevant point of comparison, which concerns the savagery of both Odysseus and Turnus, elaborates upon the heroes' different fates. While Turnus' bestiality is a frequent part of his characterization, most recently seen in the decapitation and fastening of the heads to his chariot (509-12, see above), Odysseus also manifests this same quality during the battle with the suitors, which is not always acknowledged (Magrath, 1982, 211). He decapitates one of the suitors (328-29), the supplicating priest Leodes, despite his having "always kept himself disapprovingly apart from the suitors" (cf. 21. 146-47; Fernández-Galiano, 308-9). And after the fighting comes to an end in his home, Odysseus spattered over with gore is likened to a lion, bloody from feeding on an ox (402-406), which Magrath (1982, 210-11) has argued is the climactic end of a progression of lion similes in the epic and in its savagery displays "a shocking affinity" with the comparison of Polyphemus to a lion as he cannibalizes Odysseus' men (9. 292-93), commenting that to destroy the suitors in his home Odysseus becomes like the foul beasts who nearly destroyed him on his journey. In contrast to this completely satiated lion, in the last of three lion similes Turnus is compared to a wounded lion at the beginning of book 12 (4-8),[754] which nevertheless rejoices in the coming battle with his pursuers and roars with a bloody mouth.[755] This simile, however, is also permeated with references to Dido and her figurative wound which was ultimately fatal and indirectly caused by Aeneas, one of many harbingers of Turnus' future death. Like the lion, to which he is compared, Odysseus is sated by his victorious kills; Turnus, the wounded lion simile suggests, will never be.

Juturna's strategy is clever enough to postpone the inevitable, but she can do no more. As her tactic of evasion begins Juturna is likened to a swallow and its success depends upon her continuing presence with Turnus. In contrast, Athena is likened to a swallow as she "abandons" Odysseus and Telemachus to test their strength and courage (237), which, of course, they prove (even if it is with plenty of unseen help from Athena). Turnus' chariot is part of this terrain of difference, but not only because of its obvious domestic inappropriateness. In Vergil's swallow simile the chariot becomes associated with

[754] 9. 792-96, 10. 54-56 and see Ch. 6, p. 308, n. 531 on lions in the *Aeneid.*

[755] The Odyssean simile also ends with the face of the lion which is "terrible to look at face to face" (405), at least in part due to blood covering his chest and flanks (404).

Turnus' vulnerability to loss and death and in this sense he is more analogous to the suitors.[756] The vulnerability of Turnus' chariot is revealed in the simile, but not obviously.

The chariot has a material analogue in the simile in the stationary nest of the swallow's baby birds, whose vulnerability to predators in the absence of the mother is great. Although both chariot and nest are a place of relative safety, they are frail. The construction of both nest and chariot place a premium on lightness of material and can both involve weaving.[757] The vulnerability of nestlings to the plough is a recurrent theme in the *Georgics* (2. 211, 4. 512) and Juturna's anxious fear makes it a latent concern in the simile. Even though Turnus' chariot will soon be a platform for war again, now it is the instrument of Juturna's scheme of evasion as she takes advantage of its lightness and speed to keep Turnus away from Aeneas. Especially in the context of Juturna's anxious fear Turnus' glorying (*ovantem*, 479) as she drives him in the chariot around the battlefield is arresting and, given other occurrences of the word in the *Aeneid,* foreboding and, finally, in his boasting Turnus differs significantly from Odysseus in book 22.

As we have seen in the discussion of the charioteering Salmoneus (6. 589; see Ch. 2, p. 68 and n. 126), *ovans* does not necessarily carry negative connotations, although in his case, the only mortal sinner in Tartarus for the crime of attempting to impersonate Jupiter, it certainly does. The lack of any specific cause for Turnus to be glorying, suggests a sort of the mindless self-absorption evident in the first charioteer in the Latin catalogue, Aventinus, who shows off his winning horses and chariot in the grass, as if he were taking a victory lap instead of going to war (7. 655-57; see above, Ch. 5, pp. 268-69), an action that may be recalled later in Saces' criticism of Turnus for circling his chariot in the deserted grass while Latinus' city burns (664). But obviously ominous for Turnus is that his glorying in the the baldric taken from the corpse of Pallas (10. 500, *quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus*), prompted

---

[756] But he is like the suitors in no other significant way (*contra* Cairns, 1989, 211, who sees the suitors as Turnus' appropriate analogue, see above, n. 731).

[757] See Nestor's reference to Antilochus' "well-plaited chariot" (*Il*. 23. 335 and also 5. 727). The manufacture of chariots placed a priority on lightness and chariots roughly contemporary with the supposed date of the Trojan War were made of light hardwoods with an interwoven leather platform and weighed less than 30 kilograms (Cotterell, 2004, 40) and see now Crouwel's (2012), 11, description of the Type I chariot as exemplified in the 7th-century chariot from Vulci: "The floor frame was held together by a mesh of rawhide or leather thongs…which…provided a strong and resilient floor in an otherwise springless vehicle (and)…was widely used on ancient chariots in different parts of the ancient world." Also see Crouwel, figs. 1a and 2a.

narratorial censor for his lack of restraint with overtly foreboding words ("There will be a time when Turnus will wish he had bought Pallas' safety at a great price and will hate these spoils and the day" 10. 504-05; Tarrant, 2012, 479), which are fulfilled at the epic's end. Further, in the context of what I have argued are a series of allusions to Odysseus' battle with the suitors in book 22 of the *Odyssey*, the hero's caution to his old nurse Eurycleia, when she sees the dead and raises a cry of triumph (ἴθυσέν ῥ᾽ ὀλολύξαι, 408), that it is not pious to glory so over slain men (οὐχ ὁσίη κταμένοισιν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάασθαι, 412) may add yet another note of criticism to Turnus' actions. While Odysseus seems to have learned his hard-earned lesson from the consequences of his boasting to Polyphemus, Turnus' boldness will cost him his life.

In summary, Juturna's assumption of the role of Turnus' charioteer in her actions first signals an allusion to the Iliadic Athena's take over of Diomedes' chariot, but in her disguise and singular concern for the hero she also resembles the Odyssean Athena, who as Mentor helps Odysseus achieve his restoration to the roles of husband in his home and king of Ithaca. These same roles of husband and king Turnus believes Aeneas has stolen from him. The name of Metiscus, with its suggestion of the Greek word μῆτις, the chief quality of Athena and Odysseus, its emphatic repetition at the end of proximal lines (469, 472) and lengthy specification of areas of likeness, which in condensed form is twice restated later in the text (623, 784), would probably have suggested Athena's disguise as Mentor, expressed formulaically five times in the *Odyssey,* even before the *Aeneid*'s swallow simile. The thrusting forward of the architectural spaces of the villa to the beginning of Vergil's simile and of the entire simile before the narrative tenor on which it depends forces attention to rest on the house, through which the swallow flies, and the question of its meaning in the comparison. This fact together with the several different ways in which Juturna's presentation evokes Athena, I believe, suggests an allusion to the Odyssean swallow simile. This allusion implies that the relationship between the battlefield and the simile's house in the *Aeneid* is meaningful: the battlefield is the means by which Turnus hopes to achieve his goal of a wife, a palace and kingship, the same very personal goals Odysseus has for which he fights an Iliadic battle within his house. There are also important ways in which Odysseus' brutality—the decapitation of

Leodes and the bloody lion simile—relates to that of Turnus, but just as Palinurus' future differs tragically from Odysseus', to whom he too is likened, (see Ch. 4, pp. 209-10), so too death awaits Turnus, not a royal wife. But this allusion to the *Odyssey*'s famous and climactic battle does far more than point to Turnus' distinctive tragedy, for it allusively draws attention to the personal self-centered nature of Turnus' war in preparation for the young hero's rejection of that premise for one that considers the well-being of city and community as properly deserving of his help. Thus, like Aeneas whose arrival on the Italian shore recalls the return of Odysseus to Ithaca, yet differs in the fellow travelers he still has with him (Ch. 4, p. 208), we will see that Turnus voluntarily accepts the fatal challenge to meet Aeneas on behalf of his community, while Odysseus requires not only the voice of Athena, but also Zeus' thunderbolt to halt his attack on the Ithacans at the end of the *Odyssey* (24. 531-32, 539-40). The association of Turnus rather than Aeneas with sea-faring Odysseus, contributes to the series of role reversals of Aeneas and Turnus prevalent in the epic's final lines.

The Chariot and the City

Juturna's strategy of avoidance has its intended success in keeping Turnus away from Aeneas, but it also foments Aeneas' anger and frustration in his vain attempts to engage the Rutulian, a major factor in Aeneas' decision to attack Latinus' city (560, see below, p. 445). The repercussions of the attack on Turnus, first via the sights and sounds issuing from the city and then from an eyewitness account, cause him to take control of the chariot and halt Juturna's evasive tactics, as he realizes the damage being done to his honor and embraces his dire fate. However, after Sace's report from the city, clearly stunned when he perceives the toll his war for Lavinia has exacted from the city, Turnus leaps from his chariot and runs toward the city in a voluntary sacrificial act that is now truly undertaken for the sake of his community. At every stage of this process Turnus stands in his chariot, which is repeatedly placed in tension with the demands of the city. Consequently, the abandoning of his chariot to come to the relief of the city tends to confirm the association of the chariot with his personal, selfish will.

Following Aeneas' attack on Latinus' city Turnus is now very clearly located on the outer fringes of the battlefield (*extremo...in aequore*, 614) and, since he is pursuing only a scattered few soldiers (615),

his description as a warrior (*bellator*, 614) takes on an ironic tone, to which his slower speed and lack of pleasure in his horses also contribute (*iam minus atque minus successu laetus equorum*, 616). Yet, both pleasure in his horses (*poscit equos gaudetque*, 12. 82) and rejoicing like a horse (*exsultatque animis...qualis...liber equus*, 11. 491-93) have been part of Turnus' eager arming for war, which suggests that the lessening enjoyment in his horses here may signal an approaching momentous change. Straight away Turnus hears sounds of distress from the city, whereupon he stops the chariot, apparently reaching in to grab hold of the reins which Juturna guides (618-24):

> …arrectasque impulit auris
> confusae sonus urbis et inlaetabile murmur.
> 'ei mihi! quid tanto turbantur moenia luctu?
> quisve ruit tantus diversa clamor ab urbe?'
> sic ait, adductisque amens subsistit habenis.
> atque huic, in faciem soror ut conversa Metisci
> aurigae currumque et equos et lora regebat,
>
> ...and the noise of the disturbed city
> and gloomy rumblings struck his alert ears.
> "What is this! Why are the walls disturbed by such great grief?
> What is this great noise pouring from the distant city?"
> So he spoke and frantic he drew up the reins and stopped.
> And his sister, changed into the appearance of his charioteer
> Metiscus, was guiding both the chariot and horses and reins…

Turnus' distress is indicated by the extremity of his emotional response (*amens*, 622; "a surprisingly strong reaction," Tarrant, 2012, 622) and by his stopping the chariot, even while Juturna is still holding the reins (624). Although the repetition of the nature of her disguise occurs, it is abbreviated and the line that previously enumerated the aspects of Metiscus that Juturna manifested (*cunta gerens vocemque et corpus et arma Metisci*, 472), now is recalled in an elaboration in one line of the parts of the chariot ensemble she is in control of or represents (*aurigae,* 625), which draws particular attention to Turnus' chariot. In contrast, the city appears repeatedly at the beginning of the passage in three successive lines, either the word *urbs* (619, 621) or *moenia* (620), a frequent metonymy for city. This clustering of city and chariot words expresses the awakening of Turnus' conscience to the consequences his continued pursuit of war have had on the people of the city. Juturna immediately attempts to persuade Turnus to continue where they are in the chariot by appealing to his desire for individual honor and achievement in

war (*viam victoria pandit*, 626; *nec numero inferior pugnae neque honore recedes*, 630),[758] representing Turnus as if he were in a competition with Aeneas for highest honor. She privileges this vying for honor over the defense of the city, which she says others can see to (*sunt alii qui tecta manu defendere possint*, 627). But clearly the signs of impending disaster for the city have profoundly shaken Turnus, which seems to generate his recognition of Juturna behind her disguise and the realization that he is doomed.[759]

Even before Saces arrives to describe the full extent of the disaster in the city Turnus indirectly acknowledges in his reply to Juturna that at least in his recent immediate actions (his time in the chariot on the edges of the battlefield) he has failed the city. And because it is especially in this regard, in his concern for the suffering of the city due to the war, that Drances publicly faulted Turnus (11.349-50, 365, 372-73), expressions and topics from Drances speech in the assembly recur now, in Turnus' speech and also in Saces' subsequent speech. Turnus realizes that if he does not leave the chariot and come to the city's aid, he will be, and implicitly has recently been, the self-concerned coward that Drances accused him of being (643-45; cf. *fugae fidens*, 11. 351):

> exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum)
> perpetiar, dextra nec Drancis dicta refellam?
> terga dabo et Turnum fugientem haec terra videbit?
>
> Shall I allow our homes to be destroyed (only this has failed to happen to us),
> and not refute the words of Drances by my right hand?
> Shall I turn my back and will this land see Turnus fleeing?

Although the use of *domos* instead of *urbs, moenia,* or *muri* is a more general term connoting individual habitation, the word, like *haec terra,* shows that Turnus is aware of the impact of his actions on the broader community, even if he may be primarily concerned with the perception of his valor, as he musters courage to face bravely what he now sees as his inevitable death. Two echoes of topics from Drances'

---

[758] "When you are done your score of killings and your glory will match his" (630; Mandelbaum).

[759] Although Turnus' acknowledgement that he knew Juturna caused the renewed fighting in her first disguise as Camers (632-33) does indicate, as Tarrant (2012, 632) maintains, that Turnus "is taking responsibility for his actions," his addition of *et nunc nequiquam fallis dea* (634), suggests that he is only now recognizing her in the disguise of Metiscus. Tarrant (632-49) identifies Turnus' recognition of Juturna as the Aristotelean tragic moment of recognition (ἀναγνώρισις, based on *agnovi*, 632), but because Turnus' relationship to the city is the theme of the larger passage (614-696) and the sounds from the city first prompt him to stop the chariot, I believe its disaster more importantly stimulates Turnus' change of direction (περιπέτεια).

and Turnus' speeches in the assembly clearly indicate Turnus' self-concern. When Turnus asks "What fortune can promise me safety now" (*quae iam spondet fortuna salutem*, 637), he unwittingly and ironically recalls Drances' assertion *nulla salus bello* (11. 362), which Turnus in his reply then dismissed as at least an irrelevant point, if not seditious (11. 399-400; see Ch. 7, pp. 385-86). Although Drances is referring to the *salus communis*, Turnus realizes now the truth of his statement, at least regarding himself.[760] In Turnus' concluding prayer to the gods of the Underworld he recalls Drances' questioning of his valor relative to his ancestors in the assembly (*si patrii quid Martis habes*, 11. 374), which Turnus had strongly asserted in his climactic dedication of himself to Latinus and the assembly (*haud ulli veterum virtute secundus, devovi,* 11. 441-42), but had not yet fulfilled. In full expectation of death, Turnus maintains he will die worthy of his ancestors (12.648-49):

> sancta ad vos anima atque istius inscia culpae
> descendam magnorum haud umquam indignus avorum.
>
> I shall descend to you an undefiled spirit and innocent
> of that fault,[761] ever worthy of my great ancestors.

But the shock caused by the more specific picture of disaster in the city that Saces brings will intercede before Turnus takes the action that these echoes of the assembly in book 11 imply is imminent.

Saces brings the horrific circumstances in the besieged city into stark contrast with Turnus' useless turning of his chariot, but not before entreating him desperately for his help in yet another pointed recollection of Drances' words (653-657):

> Turne, in te suprema salus, miserere tuorum.
> fulminat Aeneas armis summasque minatur
> deiecturum arces Italum excidioque daturum,
> iamque faces ad tecta volant. in te ora Latini,
> in te oculos referunt;
>
> Turnus, our final safety rests on you, pity your own people.
> Aeneas is thundering with his arms and threatens to throw down
> the high citadels of Italy and give them to destruction. Torches

---

[760] Because Turnus has been speaking about himself (*nam quid ago?* 637), he seems to be referring to his personal fortune. Tarrant (2012), 637, considers the possibility that *quae fortuna* is a hypallage for *quam salutem iam Fortuna spondet,* although he concedes that it may refer to Turnus "personal Fortuna." The latter seems more likely because it would then contrast appropriately with Saces' later use of *salus* to refer to the collective (653).

[761] As Tarrant (2012), 648, notes, the *culpa* refers to the actions of 643-45.

> already fly to the roofs. To you the Latins turn their faces and eyes,
> to you.

Salus now clearly has the collective sense it had in Drances' original use of the word (362), the sense in which Cicero describes the salutary effect on the state that his going into exile had.[762] Saces also quotes Drances (*miserere tuorum*, 11. 365) in asking Turnus to pity his people (653). The urgency of Saces' appeal to Turnus for help is brought out by the triple repetition and emphatic placement of *in te* and by the further description of Latinus' confusion (657-58), the queen's death (659-60) and the few men left to defend the city against many (*soli...Messapus et acer Atinas...circum hos utrimque phalanges stant densae*, 661-63). Saces quickly and abruptly concludes his speech: "And you are turning your chariot in the deserted grassland" (*tu currum deserto in gramine versas*, 664), which clearly implies that not only is Turnus unaware of the attack on the city, he isn't even engaged in fighting, perhaps he is merely turning his chariot in circles (Tarrant, 2012, 664).

Saces' accusation is the culmination of a theme linking Turnus and other Latin charioteers with self-centered youthful pride that blocks their awareness of the immediate requirements of war,[763] a variation of the Iliadic theme of charioteers who lack restraint and glory in their wealth or accomplishments.[764] In the *Aeneid* pride in chariot racing becomes a possible addition to this theme as in the announcing figure of this type, the handsome charioteer Aventinus, who follows directly after the opening leaders in the catalogue, Mezentius and his son Lausus. He shows off his victorious horses and

---

[762] "It was for the sake of your abodes and temples, for the salvation of my fellow-citizens (*salutem meorum civium*), which has ever been dearer to me than life, that I avoided fighting and bloodshed" (*Sest.* 45). Hellegouarc'h (1972), 412, notes that Cicero uses *salus* to refer both to the state and its people (*Cat.* 4. 1; *Man.* 14, 57, 71) and, like Turnus, to his own situation (*Pis.* 33; *Quir*. 15; *Sen.* 7 et *passim*; *Sest.* 128; *Prou*. 1, 43; *Planc*. 2; *Mil*. 68). Those who contributed to Cicero's recall from exile were thanked with the title of *defensor* (*Sen.* 3) or *restitutor salutis meae* (*Mil.* 39). Since the earliest example of the figure of rescuing fellow travelers on the ship of state in the *Ad Herennium,*(4. 57) the leader's choices have been expressed in terms of the *communis salus* or his own. See Ch. 2, pp. 25-27.

[763] The excessive boasting of the charioteer Liger, that he is a better warrior than either Diomedes or Achilles and that he will now end both the war and Aeneas' life (10. 581-83), as we have seen (Ch. 6, p. 348), angered Aeneas and qualified him as mad (*vesano*, 583) and facilitates his defeat, as is the case with Murranus (12. 529-30), expansively recounting the names of his ancestors.

[764] See above, Ch. 2, p. 54, and Himmelhoch (1997), 111-14, where the group of "bad" charioteers are described as either heedless of wise advice because they are exalting in success, impious in resisting a god's guidance or glorying in their wealth. Examples are the Trojan charioteer Asios who exalts in his chariot and horses (12. 113) and the Greek Patroclus who exalts in war (16. 91).

chariot, like Turnus in the grass (*per gramina...victoresque ostentat equos*, 7. 655-56), leads no soldiers unlike most of the others in the catalogue (see above, Ch. 5, pp. 274-75), and is headed toward the palace (*sic regia tecta suibat*, 668),[765] certainly not directly into war. Not surprisingly, Aventinus does not reappear in the war narrative.[766] But Juturna has just exhorted Turnus to fight with an eye toward competitive victory, even while the city is burning (625-30). And Turnus recently in his chariot has shown similar self-absorption, exalting (*ovantem,* 479), taking pleasure in his horses' success (*successu laetus equorum*, 616) and now he is accused of pointless wandering. While these behaviors on the battlefield are reprehensible in any soldier, in the commanding general they are far more so and in connection with the calamity in the city that Saces has described, every aspect of Drances' taunting criticism receives affirmation. Turnus is stunned into motionless silence by Saces' report (*Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit*, 666), but another sight of the city in flames motivates his final abandoning of the chariot and acceptance of responsibility for his fellow citizens by facing Aeneas alone.

Even though this scene, with Saces' report and Turnus' response, constitutes a major development in the character of Turnus from a youthful, willful and self-concerned charioteer to a general whose most important concerns are the soldiers and the community they defend, this is only clearly evident, first, in Turnus' movement from the chariot to the city and, finally, in his words at the gates of the city, for much in Turnus' motivation of his action as revealed in his thoughts and speech remains obscure and his character traits remain essentially the same. The thoughts that teem through his mind after Saces' speech are familiar (665-71):

> obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum 665
> Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; aestuat ingens
> uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu
> et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.
> ut primum discussae umbrae et lux reddita menti,

---

[765] That Aventinus approaches the palace *ipse pedes* (666), as opposed to in the chariot, may reflect the unfinished state of lines 664-69, but Horsfall (2000), 664-69, considers this not at all certain.

[766] See Ch. 5, p. 273, on the frequency of characters in epic catalogues with no part in the narrative and on Sammon's (2010), 137-38, argument that epic catalogues interact and comment on the narrative, as is the case here, in which the figure of Aventinus announces an extreme form of the boastful, self-concerned charioteer, the full consequences of which are demonstrated in the behavior of a major character.

ardentis oculorum orbis ad moenia torsit 670
turbidus eque rotis magnam respexit ad urbem.

Turnus was astounded, disturbed by the different impressions,
and he stood, silently gazing; in one heart tremendous shame,
and madness mixed with grief seethed and love driven by frenzy
and guiltily aware courage.[767] As soon as the shadows dispersed
and light returned to his mind, he turned his blazing eyes
toward the walls and from his chariot frantically looked back
at the great city.

Since Turnus has shown considerable pride and concern regarding the perception of his valor on several occasions (on the ship, 10. 679; in his assembly speech, 11. 392-98, 441; recently, 12. 645-49), that this dominates his emotions after the harsh juxtaposition Saces has made between the disaster in the city and Turnus' uselessness is not surprising, but little else in his feelings attends to the suffering in the city either. His madness (*insania*) may be fueled by his grief (*luctu*), but *insania* remains the more dominant word and the passionate nature and importance of his love for Lavinia has been a constant since his entry into the narrative (*petit ante alios pulcherrimus omnis Turnus*, 7. 55-56; *coniuge praerepta*, 9. 138; *ut Turno contingat regia coniunx*, 11. 371; *illum turbat amor figitque in virgine vultus*, 12. 70). Although these feelings could be viewed as a momentary mental tumult, in spite of the light that subsequently returns to his thinking, he remains frantic (*turbidus,* 671). Even in his heroically Stoic speech to Juturna before he leaves the chariot,[768] the perception of his honor appears foremost as a possible motivation for his action (676-80):

iam iam fata, soror, superant, absiste morari;
quo deus et quo dura vocat Fortuna sequamur.
stat conferre manum Aeneae, stat, quidquid acerbi est,
morte pati, neque me indecorem, germana, videbis
amplius. hunc, oro, sine me furere ante furorem.

Now the fates, sister, have the upper hand; stop your delaying.

---

[767] Although *conscia virtus* is generally understood as "a courage aware of its own worth," Tarrant's (2012), 668, suggestion that "another possible meaning, which would cohere with T.'s other emotions, is 'guiltily aware,' i. e. T.'s valour is aware of his failure to act in accord with it," seems preferable to me after Saces' comments.

[768] Tarrant, 2012, 677: "The near equation of a generalized *deus* and *fortuna*, together with the previous mention of *fata*, has a definite Stoic colouring: the Stoics saw *fatum* and *fortuna* as the manifestations of divine providence. T.'s *sequamur* alludes to the Stoic view that right living consists in 'following nature' (or fate, or god) in the sense of aligning one's actions with what nature requires." Tarrant also notes here that elsewhere in the *Aeneid* this language is primarily associated with Aeneas.

> Where the god and where harsh Fortune call let us follow.
> I am determined to meet Aeneas, determined to endure
> whatever bitterness there is in death. You will no longer
> see me acting dishonorably. I beg you let me rage this
> madness first.

In his determined insistence to meet Aeneas Turnus resolutely refutes Juturna's strategy of avoidance with its accompanying dishonorable connotations (*sat conferre manum Aeneae*, 678; cf. *nec conferre manum patitur*, 12. 480). But the Stoicism apparent in the first two lines of his speech yields to Turnus' more typical emotionally frenzied inclination in the conclusion (Williams, 1973, 680: "The repetition of the idea of *furere* by its cognate accusative *furorem* puts enormous emphasis...on the characteristic quality of Turnus." *furor, furo* of Turnus, 7. 464, 9. 691, 760, 11. 486, 12. 680). And even in the simile, in which Turnus' rushing from his chariot to the city is likened to a boulder hurtling down a mountain side, the multiple nature of Turnus' motivation and his former destructiveness are prominently expressed (684-91):

> dixit, et e curru saltum dedit ocius arvis
> perque hostis, per tela ruit maestamque sororem
> deserit ac rapido cursu media agmina rumpit.
> ac veluti montis saxum de vertice praeceps
> cum ruit avulsum vento, seu turbidus imber
> proluit aut annis soluit sublapsa vetustas;
> fertur in abruptum magno mons improbus actu
> exsultatque solo, silvas armenta virosque
> involuens secum: disiecta per agmina Turnus
> sic urbis ruit ad muros, ubi plurima fuso
> sanguine terra madet striduntque hastilibus aurae.
>
> He spoke and quickly gave a leap from the chariot to the ground,
> and he rushed through the enemy and through the weapons and
> deserted his gloomy sister and in a rapid dash he broke through
> the midst of the battle lines. As when a rock rushes headlong from
> the peak of a mountain, torn off by the wind or a wildly pelting rain
> has washed away or age slipping away in years has loosened it.
> The reckless mass is carried heedlessly with great drive and it leaps
> upon the ground rolling with it woods, hears and men. So Turnus rushed
> through the scattered ranks to the walls of the city, where the earth
> is steeped with shed blood and spears whiz through the air.

Alternative ways the rock's dislocation from the mountain could have occurred suggest the multiple possible reasons for Turnus' leap from the chariot that crowded his mind recently—shame, madness, love, courage—some of which are more violent and while others reflect a more persistent presence in the

circumstances of the mountain. The possible cause of age in the rock's loosening suggests a new and very plausible contributing factor in Turnus' change of direction, that of the maturation accruing to the young leader in the course of the war. While the heedless destructiveness expressed in *mons improbus* (the adjective implying "reckless indifference to damage caused," Tarrant, 2012, 687) corresponds to the Ilidadic intertext's ἀναιδέος...πέτρης ("ruthless stone,"13. 139), this idea is much more developed in Vergil's simile. The rock's leaping (*exsultat solo*) recalls the joy with which Turnus' arms for war after the assembly (*exsultatque animis*, 11. 468, as well as anticipating Aeneas' exalting at Turnus' approach to the duel, *laetitia exsultans*, 700),[769] especially in conjunction with the rock's devastation to the land, herds and people. In the assembly Drances begged Turnus to avert further suffering from the citizens by engaging in a duel with Aeneas, but Turnus' exit to fight the precluded this option (*miserere tuorum...illum aspice contra qui vocat*, 11. 365, 374-75).[770] In sum, in what is revealed of Turnus' thoughts, a significant part of his speech before leaving the chariot and the following simile suggest a lack of clarity in his motivation for moving from the chariot to the town beyond the persistent importance of his *virtus* and its perception by others and that an essentially unchanged young man leaps from the chariot. Where then are the indications that Turnus acts now for the well-being of the citizens?

The indication that Turnus is broadening his perspective beyond self-concerns to include concern for his larger community is conveyed primarily by means of the dynamic tension that is established between Turnus' chariot and the city and the decisive role his gaze on the city has in motivating the exit from the chariot and run toward the city. The narration of Turnus' gaze back upon the city once his mind has cleared is essentially duplicated: he twists his eyes to the walls (*orbis ad moenia torsit*,[771] 670) and

---

[769] With the exception of the leaping Salii (8. 663) and the phantom Aeneas created by Juno (10. 643) the Latin side is associated with forms of *exsulto* (Turnus, 7. 464, 11. 468, 12. 688; Tarquitus, 10. 550; Lausus, 10. 813; Camilla, 11. 648; the Amazons, 11. 663), which makes its association with Aeneas (12. 700) another noteworthy adoption of a characteristic of Turnus.

[770] Although Tarrant (2012), 684-91, proposes that aspects of the simile appear to qualify the positive impression of Turnus in this context (*improbus* "may suggest the continuing presence of *furor* in T.'s actions"), greater importance would seem to be attached to the results of Turnus' previous behavior because his dash ends where the ground is steeped in the blood already shed (690-91) and because his future acts do no further damage to the citizens.

[771] Pachalis (1997), 394, notes the ambiguity in *orbis*: "...*orbis ad moenia* evokes the ancient etymology of 'urbs' from 'orbis.'"

looks back at the great city (*magnam respexit ad urbem,* 671). The synecdochic chariot (*eque rotis*, 671) at first seems to be a pale expression for what I am arguing is a very significant place, but the chariot's wheels facilitate a connection between the chariot and the wheels of the tower which Turnus himself built and which is now in flames (672-75):

> Ecce autem flammis inter tabulata volutus
> ad caelum undabat vertex turrimque tenebat,
> turrim compactis trabibus quam eduxerat ipse
> subdideratque rotas pontisque instraverat altos.
>
> But look, flames were rolling through the floors and
> were holding the tower with the peak of the flames
> waving up into the sky, the tower which he himself
> had built with firm beams and drawn up on wheels,
> and laid on long bridges.

Turnus' gaze fixes first on the tower, "a basic component of City, and its burning marks the most critical stage of the siege" (Paschalis, 1997, 394), and because Turnus' role in its creation is stressed in a triple elaboration, its destruction has suggested to some Turnus' imminent destruction (Williams, 1973, 674). But, in addition, since this sight seems to be the direct cause of Turnus' decision to leave the chariot for the city (only the final speech to Juturna intercedes between the gaze and his exit), the impression is created of a merger of Turnus' personal affairs with those of the city (Paschalis, 1997, 395):

> Its [the tower's] relation to Turnus' wheeled chariot ['rotis'], from which the hero looks at the city, is crucial: the mobile tower is a positive stratagem inviting Turnus to become again a "defensor Urbis",[772] an alternative to Juturna's stratagem that has led the city to the verge of destruction.

And the connection between the chariot and city is conveyed by means of the repetition of *ruit* from Turnus' departure from the chariot (*e curru saltum dedit ocius arvis/ perque hostis, per tela ruit*, 681-82) through the simile (*cum ruit avulsum vento*, 685) to his final arrival at the city's walls (*Turnus/ sic urbis ruit ad muros*, 690; see passage on p.31), before which much of the action of the duel will occur (696-97, 705-6, 745, 762, 915). While warriors in the *Iliad* normally dismount from their chariot to face an

[772] Although the evidence of the tower does suggest that at some previous point Turnus took concern for the city's defense, it is only now indicated.

encounter on foot,[773] as has Turnus previously as well (10. 453, 12. 355), his final dismount has been endowed with significance in the immediate context by the chariot's numerous juxtapositions with the city and Turnus' developing intention to come to its rescue and in the elaborating simile, but also in the heavy preponderance of Turnus' appearances in and the association of his behavior with the chariot in roughly five-hundred lines of book 12 (164-681). In book 10 Aeneas forced Latin charioteers with selfish or boastful characters from their chariots to liberate the Trojan camp/city from siege (Ch. 6, pp. 351-52); Turnus, whose character flaws have been fully developed in relation to his chariot—would be tyrant, boastful and savage warrior, avaricious lover of gold and Lavinia—in a voluntary leap from his chariot moves beyond his selfishness to liberate the Latin community from siege in the duel with Aeneas.

Before the city walls Turnus announces his intention to atone for the treaty on behalf of the Latins and Rutulians (6 92-95):

> significatque manu et magno simul incipit ore:
> 'parcite iam, Rutuli, et vos tela inhibete, Latini.
> quaecumque est fortuna, mea est; me verius unum
> pro vobis foedus luere et decernere ferro.'
>
> And he gave a sign with his hand and at the same time
> he began in a loud voice: "Enough now, Rutulians, and Latins,
> check your weapons. Whatever outcome there is, is mine.
> It is more fitting that I alone pay for the treaty and contend
> with the sword on your behalf.

Turnus' announcement that it is more fitting for him alone to pay for the treaty (694-95) recalls Juturna's question, as she attempted to stir up war, whether the Rutulians were not ashamed to submit one soul on behalf of all (*non pudet, O Rutuli, pro cunctis talibus unam/ obiectare animam?* 229-30), which prepares for the reinstatement of the treaty (Tarrant, 2012, 695). However, it also alludes to Turnus' similar offer in the conclusion of his speech in the assembly (11. 440-42): *vobis animam hanc soceroque Latino/ Turnus ego…/ devovi*. But very significant changes have occurred in how he expresses his commitment. As we have seen (see Ch. 7, pp. 391-92), although Turnus appears to dedicate himself for the benefit of the assembled citizens and Latinus, according to the formula of the *devotio* which signals the beneficiary

[773] Himmelhoch (1997), 67, 72.

with *pro* (on behalf of), Turnus clearly indicates a selfish motivation, when he says a few lines earlier that he would not refuse to try anything (i.e., accept the challenge of a duel) for so great a hope (*tanta...pro spe*, 437), that is, to win Lavinia and the kingdom. Turnus here has made no mention of Lavinia and has designated both the Rutulians and Latins as beneficiary with the *devotio* formula *pro*. Furthermore, Turnus' pride in his prowess, interlaced within his dedication in the assembly (*haud ulli veterum virtute secundus* 11. 441) and still present before Saces' speech (*magnorum haud umquam indignus avorum*, (12. 649), is no longer evident. While Turnus has not been transformed into a completely different person by the knowledge of the disaster occurring in the city or the sight of its flames, he now sees the consequences his personal ambitions have had for the city, ambitions that have been symbolically associated with his chariot, and takes action, by leaving the chariot and running to the city, which will stop its suffering and, with the death he expects to follow, atone for it as well.

Turnus' acceptance of the duel with Aeneas, expecting his subsequent death, and the dire circumstances of the burning city that the duel would alleviate presents a situation fit for a *devotio*, a voluntary sacrifice of oneself for the benefit of the army and the state, such as that of Palinurus. Juturna roused these expectations for his role in the duel when she described Turnus as dedicating himself (*se devovit*, 235) at the altar of the gods at the ceremony. Although *foedus luere,* (695) is generally understood, following Servius, as "to pay the penalty for the violation of the treaty," Tarrant (2012, 695) points out that Turnus' elliptical formulation "allows a second meaning to be felt, 'to pay the price demanded by the treaty', i.e., his death." Leigh (1993, 92-98) has analyzed Turnus' rush from the chariot to the city as the climactic example in the epic of a "death-rush" motif, which occurs throughout the epic "at moments of personal sacrifice for state, son or friend,"[774] and which he argues is an essential component of the *devotio* in that it "embodies the voluntary and ardent aspect of the sacrifice."[775]

---

[774] Leigh's (1993), 92-93: Coroebus, 2. 408-9; Priam, 2. 509-11; Aeneas, 2. 353-54; Nisus, 9. 399-401, 438; Helenor, 9. 554-55; Lausus, 10. 10. 811; Mezentius, 10. 870, 882-83; and Tarchon, 11. 741.

[775] Leigh (1993), 94, here quotes H. S.Versnel (1981) "Self-Sacrifice, Compensation, Anonymous Gods," *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 27: 145-48. Other aspects that support the connotations of a *devotio* according to Leigh, 95-98, are that this is a moment of supreme crisis for the existence of the state, Turnus as the commanding general is a qualified actor, he is aware of the inevitability of his death and he is giving way to a state of ecstasy

Although Palinurus' death clearly was not voluntary, the similarity of its sacrificial nature to that of Turnus', as expressed in Neptune's statement *unum pro multis dabitur caput* (5. 815, cf. *me verius unum pro vobis foedus luere*, 696-95), is of particular interest at this point in the epic because of Palinurus' close relationship to Aeneas, who follows him as helmsman.[776] The final exit of Turnus from his chariot toward a sacrificial death similarly represented as on behalf of his community, as we will see, responds to Aeneas' assumption of the role of charioteer.

And so in Turnus' final moments in the chariot the demeaning effects of Juturna's charioteering, with which he was to some degree complicit, are expressed in the qualities of vain-glorious boasting and obliviousness to the requirements of war that recall earlier now-defeated Latin charioteers. Initially, heavy irony emphasizes his ridiculousness as he sluggishly pursues a few scattered soldiers on the edge of the battlefield, no longer as pleased with his horses as he had been earlier. This attitude in which war is treated as a competitive contest for personal victory, first announced in the opening charioteer in the Latin catalogue, Aventinus, whose chariot sported a victory palm and was drawn by victorious horses, in this passage is juxtaposed with its consequences, the destruction and suffering Aeneas' attack brings to the Latin city. Saces' description of Turnus' wheeling his chariot in the deserted grass at the conclusion of his report on the devastation in the city conveys the most damning implications in the immediate context. However, the relative frequency of this motif among the Latin charioteers beyond Turnus and the announcing figure of Aventinus—Nisus' racing *quadrigae*, the boasting of Licurgus and Murranus—suggests this weakness has a significant presence in the Latin charioteers and, because all but Aventinus (who only appears in the catalogue) have been eliminated by Aeneas by this stage of the epic, has dire consequences for the charioteers themselves as well. It is perhaps due to the great shame (*ingens...pudor*)

(*sine me furere ante furorem*, 680). Leigh rightly points out (98-99), that the traces of the *devotio* ceremony "regularly appear in episodes where there is no apparent religious content," citing the example of Catiline in Sallust (*Cat.*60. 7), Hasrubal in Livy (27. 49. 4) and Tacfarinas in Tacitus (*Ann*. 4. 25).

[776] The similarity between the two men's deaths have been noted by Paschalis (1997), 395, and Hardie (1993), 33-34, and beyond the similar sacrificial formulation, they both fall or run "head-long" from a high place, have been closely linked textually with Aeneas—Palinurus by Aeneas taking his position as helmsman and through shared allusions to Odysseus, while Turnus will be joined in future double similes and the exchanging of characteristics. On Aeneas and Turnus as doubles see above, p. 403.

that Turnus feels even before hearing Saces' report, that Drances' humiliating public accusations of his heedless self-concern in the face of the city's suffering are evoked both in Turnus' first speech to Juturna and in Saces' and in such a way that his chariot comes to represent Turnus' selfishness.

Even when Turnus abruptly draws his chariot to a halt with the perceptions of disaster from the city and asks "Why are the walls disturbed by such great grief?" (*quid tanto turbatur moenia luctu*? 620) he may allude to Drances' remark "We see the whole city settle in grief" (*totamque videmus/ consedisse urbem luctu*, 11. 349-50), but the reactions this sight prompts in Turnus—the recognition of Juturna, and the perception that she has been leading him into dishonorable behavior, the realization that his death is inevitable and his acceptance—all occur while he stands in his chariot with Juturna. He specifically associates his time in the chariot with Drances' accusation of flight and and neglect of the city's defense. Drances' assertion that there is no safety in war, Turnus alludes to regarding his own collapsing fortune and Saces' does as well to describe the city's great need for Turnus' help. The reiteration of Drances' plea for Turnus to pity his own people, now within the context of the fiery destruction of their city, heightens an awareness of Turnus' responsibility for the city's continued suffering since the time of the assembly and especially during his recent time in the chariot, as Saces' concluding remark strongly implies. But the clearest indication of the association of Turnus' neglect of the city as presented by Drances with his chariot is that his offer of a sacrificial death on behalf of the citizens, proposed once before in the assembly in response to Drances' criticisms, is immediately preceded by the carefully developed and elaborately described final exit from his chariot.

The symbolic significance of Turnus' simple leap down from the chariot is prepared for by the persistent antithetical pairing of the chariot with the city and by its use to characterize Turnus' actions, again in contrast to what he could have been doing for the city. The first sounds of disaster from the city cause Turnus to stop the progress of his Juturna-driven chariot. He describes his time in the chariot as cowardly, when the city needs defending, a perspective which Saces confirms at the end of his report. It is the view of the burning city that Turnus has from his chariot that prompts him to abandon it for the city, a process that is elaborated with a simile. The simile appears to confirm both that Turnus' emotions and

motivations are in a state of flux and that he bears responsibility for the city's suffering, but his subsequent expression of willingness to meet Aeneas on behalf of his citizens is devoid of his familiar vaunts and gives no indication of self-interest.

Especially because Turnus expects to die in the duel with Aeneas and that his death will be of benefit to his fellow citizens and the state in general, his offer fulfills the most important aspects of a *devotio*, even more so than the death of Palinurus, with which Turnus' expression of intention and subsequent death have been compared, due to the voluntary nature of his commitment. Beyond the similarity of their deaths as a substitution (*unum pro multis*), they both fall/run headlong (*praeceps*) from a height and occur at similar points in the narrative, shortly before the conclusion of a major division of the epic, the sea journey from Troy and the end of the war. In his willingness to die on behalf of his people Turnus assumes the most significant aspect of the helmsman, responsibility for the safety of the state, an aspect of Aeneas' defining characteristic of *pietas* and thus his action constitutes a major role reversal. Both the presentation of Turnus' intentions to die on behalf of his people as a reproduction of Palinurus' death and the inversion of Turnus' values this constitutes suggest some momentous transformations have occurred in Aeneas.

Another Storm and a New Charioteer

Up until Aeneas' wounding in his vain attempt to stop the renewed outbreak of war, his demeanor in book 12 has been representative of the best aspects of the figurative helmsman. In the arming scene he is grateful that the war will be resolved in a duel and consoles his men (107-12), while at the ceremony the sympathy he has previously shown to the Latins persists in his promise to treat all future citizens equally and in his relegation of *imperium* to Latinus (187-94). His valiant refusal to yield to the passion for war overtaking all around him is apparent even after his subsequent return to battle—as we have seen, he only wants to engage with Turnus (466-67), but his movement in tandem with his forces undermines that impression as does the violence of the storm sweeping across the ocean to which he is compared (450-58):

ille volat campoque atrum rapit agmen aperto.
qualis ubi ad terras abrupto sidere nimbus
it mare per medium (miseris, heu, praescia longe
horrescunt corda agricolis: dabit ille ruinas
arboribus stragemque satis, ruet omnia late),
ante volant sonitumque ferunt ad litora venti:
talis in adversos ductor Rhoeteius hostis
agmen agit, densi cuneis se quisque coactis
adglomerant.

Aeneas flies and he hurries along his dark army in the
open field. Such as when a storm cloud moves through
the midst of the ocean, with the sun's light cut off.
(Alas, for the miserable farmers, whose hearts, aware early on
of what was coming, tremble. It will mean devastation
for the trees and slaughter of the plantings, it will destroy everything
far and wide); the winds fly before and carry the sound to the shore.
Just so the Trojan leader leads his army against the opposed enemy,
they, each of them, mass together, gathered in formation.

The wide-scale destruction the storm will bring dominates its presentation (*ruinas, stragemque, ruet omnia late*), which is amplified by a sympathetic depiction of the human perspective (*miseris...agricolis*). The destructive emphasis becomes more evident in comparison to its primary Iliadic intertext (4. 275-79), in which a shepherd watches a dark storm bearing a mighty whirlwind approach, but he merely shudders at it and drives his flock to safe refuge in a cave.[777] Furthermore, the violence and devastating power in the *Aeneid*'s simile is intensified greatly by its allusion to the storm described in *Georgics* 1 (316-34; cf. Briggs, 1980, 91), which dwells extensively on its destructive power that cuts down the work of farmers. As Lyne (1987, 7) notes, Vergil associates the *agricola* with a peaceful moral life in the *Georgics*, which would increase sympathy for them in this simile. The *Aeneid*'s other sea storm similes generally lack a victim's perspective,[778] but in the narrative Aeneas himself was the victim of the epic's first storm. In this

[777] *Il*. 4. 275-79:

As from his watching place a goatherd watches a cloud move
on its way over the sea before the drive of the west wind
far away though he be he watches it, blacker than pitch is,
moving across the sea and piling the storm before it,
and as he sees it he shivers and drives his flock to a cavern.

[778] However, the simile at 10. 97-99, in which the gods' murmuring as Juno talks in the assembly is compared to the first breezes in the trees, which warn sailors that (storm) winds are on the way, is similar, but neither the storm or its effects are described. Latinus' characterization of the war frenzy overtaking Latium as a storm carrying off an implied ship of state is decidedly from the victims' perspective (*ferimurque procella,*7. 594). Other sea storm

simile Aeneas is aligned with the divinities that control the forces of nature, instead of being their victim (Hardie, 1986, 176).[779] As Thomas (1998, 296) would have it, based on the large part Jupiter has in the *Georgic*'s storm (1. 328-34), "Aeneas not only becomes the storm, he becomes Jupiter."[780] This inversion of Aeneas' role, from storm-battered at the beginning of the epic to the ruinous storm itself at the end, has a wider presence than has been acknowledged in the remaining lines of the *Aeneid* and important ramifications for the resolution of its helmsman/charioteer imagery.[781]

Early in Aechylus' *Septem*, the informing intertext for the *Aeneid*s' interactive leadership images, storms are linked with the Argive attacking charioteers. The scout informs Eteocles that, like a good helmsman he should make the city tight before the squalls of war assail it, because the Argive army is like a roaring land wave (βοᾷ γὰρ κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ, 64; see Ch. 3, p. 114). The chorus of young Theban maidens, through whose emotional response the brutal threat of the charioteers is amplified, repeats this image (111). Similarly, in the climactic confrontation between Latinus and his citizens, the charioteers in the *Aeneid*, who are clamoring for war, are likened to a storm (7. 586-90) and he speaks of the state as "swept off in a storm" (594; see Ch. 5, p. 259). The helmsman Aeneas has already

---

similes with tenor: 2. 416-19, (Greeks); 7. 528-30, (Latin and Trojan forces), 586-90, (Latins); 10. 356-59, (Latin and Trojan forces), 693-96, (Mezentius, assailed by his own people); 11. 624-28 (Latins and Rutulians); 12. 365-67 (Turnus). Aeneas is compared to a *turbo*, a whirlwind or whirlpool, 10. 603-4, and his spear is, 12. 923, which can be understood as a storm (see above, Ch. 6, p. 352, n. 615). The joining of the Trojan side in the *Aeneid* with the Latins twice in ocean similes seems to be part of the Iliadic more general depiction of war as a storm.

[779] Hornsby (1970), 125, and Briggs (1980), 90, previously commented on Aeneas' movement from passive victim in book 1 to active storm here. Putnam, 1999, 217, notes that in the *Georgics* "it is the role of man, in the guise of the farmer, to bring order to his world and tame the wildness of nature…," but Aeneas "adopts an ungeorgic stance," since he "appears to represent malevolent nature itself instead of the prospects of civilization for which the farmers' efforts stand."

[780] A probable additional intertext for this simile and the inversion it constitutes within a series is the movement in the *Argonautica* of Jason from victim, facing the bulls' fire as a rock endures the waves whipped up by endless gales at the beginning of his ordeal (3. 1293-95), to, first, a spring storm as he cuts down the Earthborn at the end and (1391-92), finally, to Zeus who sends heavy rains which batter nurslings in the vineyard (1399-1403), in a clear expression of his victory over Aeetes. The importance of this section of the *Argonautica* for the imagery of the developing war in book 7, especially for Latinus' comparison to a storm battered rock and in his resemblance to Aeetes has been noted (see above, Ch. 5, pp. 256-58 and 246-48). The allusive reappearance of Aeetes in Latinus' crown at the ceremony (12. 1662-64) may have prepared for the relevance of Jason's contest here. Beyond reinforcing the significance of Aeneas' changed position at the end of a series of storm similes (cf. Hardie, 1986, 176, "the structural intent is clear: by a process of inversion, whose stages are marked in the repeated use of storm-imagery throughout the poem…"), the emphasis on agricultural destruction and its effect on workers (and here, on the owner as well) at the end would suggest Aeneas' victory also will be costly.

[781] Hornsby (1970), 125, acknowledges the possibility that more allusions to the book 1 storm are present: "All such language and all such descriptions are meant to recall the opening storm of book 1."

"trespassed" briefly into the charioteer's imagery of storms at the end of his rage driven *aristeia* after the death of Pallas in book 10, when he is likened to a dark whirlwind (*turbinis atri*; see Ch. 6, pp. 51-52). But Aeneas' likening to a storm in this simile in its richer content emphasizes the novelty and importance of this imagery for him. Due to the punishing nature of this storm simile, Aeneas' changed position in the broader epic-wide symbolism presented in the first storm sequence is apparent (from victim to agent). As presented here the storm of Aeneas and his men bears a greater likeness to the threatening Argive storm than the Latin storms in book 7, for these storms, although symbolic of war, were directed internally against their own state;[782] Aeneas' storm carries external destruction as the impending situation of the farmers makes clear, an analogue to the fears the chorus in *Septem* constantly express about their future at the approach of the "roaring land-wave" of charioteers, a description that may be alluded to in the last line of the *Aeneid*'s simile in which the winds carry sound to the shore (455). But if the signaling of a migration of Aeneas into the charioteer's realm of imagery is not made obvious in this simile, he will soon figuratively assume the reins of the charioteer as further confirmation.

The onslaught of Aeneas and his forces motivates Juturna to take over Turnus' chariot as charioteer and, although she is able to frustrate Aeneas' search for Turnus (483-85), the near miss of Messapus' spear prompts an angry response from Aeneas, as he appears to give up hope for regaining the duel with Turnus (494-99):

> tum vero adsurgunt irae, insidiisque subactus,
> diversos ubi sensit equos currumque referri,
> multa Iouem et laesi testatus foederis aras
> iam tandem invadit medios et Marte secundo
> terribilis saevam nullo discrimine caedem
> suscitat, irarumque omnis effundit habenas.
>
> Then indeed his anger burst forth and driven by their treachery,
> when he perceived that the horses and chariot were going
> off in the opposite direction, often calling upon Jupiter and
> the altars of the betrayed treaty, now at last he plunged
> into their midst and with Mars favoring he fiercely
> stirred up savage slaughter indiscriminately and he threw
> off all restraints of his anger.

[782] The war at Thebes is also an internal war, since the two brothers are contending for rule, but the Argives appear foreign, even barbarian, and are assaulting the city from without, as Aeneas will do.

The extremity of Aeneas' response here seems evident in the framing of the passage with anger (*irae, irarumque*), the quintessential Junonian emotion. In fact, the last two lines are permeated with Junonian diction from the beginning and end of the epic (*saevae…iram*, 1. 4; *saevi...ira terribilis*, 12. 945-47). As in book 10 where Aeneas is virtually compared to Mars via the allusion to the conclusion of *Georgics* 1 (511; see above, Ch. 6, pp. 343-44), the support of Mars, the "bloody" charioteer to whom Turnus was recently compared (332-36), suggests the extreme warrior so frequently represented in Turnus' behavior. But the suggestion of Aeneas' lack of restraint, "unbridledness" (499),[783] may carry the most extreme connotations. Recall Cicero's predilection for figuring his adversaries as unbridled (typically with the adjective *effrenatus*), essentially associating the Phaedran dark horse (frequently described as ἀκολάλαστον, "unbridled" [256a, c]) with a whole character's *ethos*, who for Cicero are men with a frightening lack of restrain suggestive of gross excess; Antony in particular was so characterized (See above, Ch. 2, pp. 60-62). The figurative use of reins (*habenae, frena*) in the *Aeneid* always connotes at least potential power (as do real reins, "controlling or guiding power"), paradigmatically expressed in Aeolus' control over the winds (*et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas*, 1. 63),[784] but there is only one other use which implies a similar sense of lack of control, that describing the fire that the Trojan women start on the ships in book 5 which rages out of control (*furit immissis Volcanus habenis*, 662).

---

[783] When the same words, *omnis effundit habenas*, are used of Neptune at the end of book 5 as he leaves Venus with his retinue, a more positive translation seems appropriate ("he gives them full rein", 5. 818; this "also illustrates the use of *omnis* in a quasi-adverbial sense, 'entirely,' Tarrant [2012], 499), but in the context of extreme anger, in which the reins are figurative, a more negative translation can be justified, even though the translation of *effundo* as "to throw off" normally only applies to the ejection of a rider or charioteer (cf. *iuvenem monstris effudere marinis,* 7. 780; *effuduntque ducem*, 10. 574; *effunditque solo Murranus*, 12. 532). Similarly, when Aeneas *classique immittit habenas*, as he sails to the coast of Italy ("loosens the reins of the fleet" 6. 1), the translation should not indicate overt lack of restraint, but when *furit immissis Volcanus habenis* ("Fire rages with unbridled fury;" 5. 662; cf. Williams [1972], 662: "i.e., in full career, with unbridled frenzy"), it should. Tarrant (2012), 499, draws attention to the fact that Aeneas "chooses to unleash his anger", but in the context of his indiscriminate action (*nullo discrimine*, 498), which, while it may distinguish between Turnus and all others or other leaders, recalls Aeneas' rampage in book 10, which begins *proxima quaeque metit gladio* ("everything near him he harvests with his sword", 513) and "which expresses the lack of discrimination in Aeneas' passion for revenge" (Harrison, 1991, 513-14), the rationality choice implies seems lacking.

[784] In addition to the examples cited above, Aeneas looses the reins of his fleet (*classique immittit habenas,* 6. 1), Latinus lets go of the reins of state (*rerumque reliquit habenas,*7. 600) and Apollo shakes the Sibyl's reins (*ea frena furenti concutit*, 6. 100). Power is also implicit in the frequent description of divinities with reins, although considerably less so of Juturna: Neptune (1. 156, 5. 818, both *frena* and *habenis*), Aeolus (1. 63), Vulcan (5. 662), Bacchus (6. 804), Apollo (6. 100), Cybele (10. 253), and Juturna (12. 469).

The dominance of anger, presence of Mars, Junonian diction and evidence of a lack of restraint in this passage, which are all characteristically associated with Turnus, clearly indicate that Aeneas has become a figurative charioteer.

This passage which describes Aeneas giving into his anger confirms and completes the above analysis of the storm simile as an announcement of Aeneas as a figurative charioteer, for it too recalls the epic's first storm, but does so through an elaboration of the change occurring within the individual leader. Where as the storm brings total destruction (*ruet omnia late*), Aeneas completely gives into his anger (*irarumque omnis effundit habenas*) and, if Aeneas moves from being the victim of the storm to the storm itself, he now moves from being a victim due to his restraint (*o cohibite iras!* 314), when he attempts to stop the war and is wounded by a whirlwind driven against him (*turbine adacta*, 320), to perpetrating savage slaughter (*saevam...caedem*). The potential violence of the storm in the simile recalls the violence of the storm Juno sent against the Trojans, but here Junonian diction recalls the emotional nature of Juno that gave rise to the storm. The figurative use of reins recalls not only Aeolus' control over the winds, but that the winds which caused the storm, were represented as horses at numerous points in the opening storm sequence (1. 54, 63, 141), joining equine and ocean imagery in the paradigmatic storm of the epic. These two passages announce the opening storm as a determining intratext for what is to follow and signal a disturbing transformation within Aeneas, which will have consequences in his speech and action as leader.

The Theban Maidens' Worst Fears

Although Aeneas does plunge into war, as is described in a double *aristeia* with Turnus (500-554) in which the presentation emphasizes their parity (*inque vicem*, double similes, correlatives), he does not abandon the desire to engage with Turnus alone, which, at least in part, motivates his decision to change strategy from open warfare to an attack on Latinus' city.[785] Venus is represented as moving Aeneas to this action (*hic mentem Aeneae genetrix pulcherrima misit*, 554), but "in a clear example of double

[785] In his subsequent speech to his troops after describing his designs on the city, Aeneas implicitly contrasts the attack with the alternative—the fruitlessness of waiting for Turnus to decide to engage with him (570-71).

motivation," Aeneas also conceives the idea "as if spontaneously" (Tarrant, 2012, 554-60) and somewhat serendipitously (557-60):

> ille ut vestigans diversa per agmina Turnum
> huc atque huc acies circumtulit, aspicit urbem
> immunem tanti belli atque impune quietam.
> continuo pugnae accendit maioris imago:
>
> As he looks here and there, tracking Turnus
> in all directions among the ranks, he catches
> sight of the city, untouched by this great war
> and at peace and unharmed. Immediately,
> the thought of a greater battle inflamed him.

The "greater battle" may be an allusion to the fall of Troy because a number of other references to Troy occur in the description of the attack (Tarrant, 2012, 554-613, 560; Putnam, 2011, 67-79), which is grimly ironic both because, having suffered through this misery in Troy, Aeneas could be expected to refrain from perpetrating the same and because a ktistic epic by definition concerns foundation rather than destruction of cities (Hardie, 1994, 11). Also disconcerting is the *volte-face* in Aeneas' attitude toward Latinus and his people. In his oath at the ceremony he promised not to make the Latins obey the Trojans (*non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo*, 12. 189), but to treat them as equal and unconquered (*paribus se legibus ambae invictae gentes*, 190-91), a considerable concession (Horsfall, 1989, 24). Nor would Aeneas rule, except in religious matters, but Latinus would hold *imperium* and the army (192-3). Now in his speech to his troops Aeneas reveals in the harsh repression he is ready to impose on the Latins the ramifications of his recently adopted role of figurative charioteer.

Although Aeneas addresses his gathered troops in their midst (*concurrit legio*, *medius,* 563-64), which suggests their cohesiveness as a force, he also assumes a high position (*tumulumque capit*, 562; *celso...aggere*, 564), reinforcing his dominant power and preparing for the central idea in his speech of bringing the height of the city low. In addition, *celso medius stans aggere* recalls the position of both Aeneas and Augustus as helmsmen on their ships of state (*stans celsa in puppi*, 8. 680, 10. 261), a reminder of Aeneas' former emblem of leadership and its connotations, which are completely undercut in this speech (565-73):

celso medius stans aggere fatur:
'ne qua meis esto dictis mora, Iuppiter hac stat,
neu quis ob inceptum subitum mihi segnior ito.
urbem hodie, causam belli, regna ipsa Latini,
ni frenum accipere et victi parere fatentur,
eruam et aequa solo fumantia culmina ponam.
scilicet exspectem libeat dum proelia Turno
nostra pati rursusque velit concurrere victus?
hoc caput, o cives, haec belli summa nefandi.
ferte faces propere foedusque reposcite flammis.'

He addressed them standing on a high mound in their midst:
Let there be no delay for my orders, for Jupiter stands with us,
nor let anyone be sluggish because this is a sudden undertaking.
Unless this city, the cause of the war, the very kingdom of Latinus,
agrees in defeat to obey and submit to the yoke, I shall demolish it
and make their smoking roofs level with the ground. Of course,
I should wait until it pleases Turnus to put up with fighting me
and again becomes convinced to engage. Citizens, this is the head,
this the crux of the wicked war. Bring torches quickly and demand
back the agreement with flames.

Because the city could not be held responsible for the hesitation of Turnus to meet Aeneas, there isn't any logical reason for Aeneas to attack the city now that didn't exist before (Conington-Nettleship, 1883-4, 12. 567; Tarrant, 2012, 567). This lack of logic in Aeneas' strategy seems at least partially responsible for his beginning with the negative commands and the assertion of Jupiter's support. Even though the god's actions in the concluding scenes of the epic do "bear out" Aeneas' claim (Tarrant, 2012, 565), since the phrase is Ennian (*Iuppiter hac stat, Ann.* 232 Sk.), where it probably was spoken by Hannibal, Rome's most hated enemy, strongly negative implications may adhere to the expression. Indeed, Turnus, whose affiliation with Hannibal was established in book 9,[786] begins a speech to his troops with a similar confident assertion about Jupiter's support that was patently false (that Jupiter had taken the Trojans' ships away, not waiting for Rutulian weapons, 9. 128-30; see Ch. 7, p. 375). A lack of strategic logic and other allusions to Turnus and, possibly, Hannibal would be a reasonable environment for the expression of a tyrannical attitude toward an enemy city such as Aeneas proceeds to make. But it is also possible that Vergil is suggesting that Jupiter could countenance such a domineering move on Aeneas' part.

[786] See Hardie (1994), 52-3, on the allusion to Hannibal's riding a horse up to the walls of Rome and hurling a spear within the walls and Turnus' similar action toward the Trojan camp (9. 49-53) and further, Horsfall (1974).

At both points in the text where Vergil presents Aeneas as a figurative charioteer the hero associates himself with Jupiter as an implicit justification for his actions. When he lets loose the reins of his anger, his actions are preceded by his "often calling upon Jupiter and the altars of the betrayed treaty" (496) and here, as he announces the attack on the city he promises to subjugate, Aeneas claims Jupiter's support as a means of preventing any reluctance (implying that this could be expected) on the part of his men (565-66). Further, the association of Aeneas with Jupiter via the common use of the word *turbo* (whirlwind) near the end of the epic is far from a trivial coincidence. As we have seen (Ch. 6, p. 352), after his enraged *aristeia* in book 10 Aeneas is compared to an *atri turbinis* (603) and so too is the spear with which he brings Turnus down (*atri turbinis*, 12. 923). However, what gives this word its terrifying connotation at the end is the allusion to Jupiter's *Dira* sent from its place near the savage god's throne (*hae Iovis ad solium saevique in limine regis* 849) to confront Juturna as an omen of Turnus' approaching death.[787] Jupiter, who previously said he would maintain impartiality,[788] now takes very partisan action since the *Dira* in enacting Jupiter's instructions flies in Turnus' face screeching and beating his shield with its wings, immediately weakening him (865-68). Twenty-four lines (843-66) are devoted to the description of the *Dirae*, including their lineage, the horrible intentions that give rise to their use (death, disease and merited wars), its comparisons to the whirlwind, to a Parthian poison arrow (casting Jupiter's intention "in the darkest possible light," Tarrant, 2012, 856-59) and transformation into the little bird (probably an owl) that flies at Turnus. The diction throughout is gloomy and menacing as befits the use of such a hellish creature (snake-haired and winged, 847-48) by the king of the gods.[789] In this elaborate

---

[787] Although the *dira*'s birth from Night and sister Megaera argues that the *Dirae* are the same as the Furies, Tarrant (2012), 842-52, maintains that they are different in function (Furies avenge, *Dirae* are harbingers of disaster) and abode (Hell and Jupiter's throne) and should therefore be considered distinct.

[788] After Venus and Juno's confrontation in the assembly of the gods in book 10 Jupiter says that he will not take sides (*ullo discrimine habebo*, 108) and will be the same to all (*rex Iuppiter omnibus idem.* 112). However, as Harrison (1991), 111-12, notes "His claim of impartiality in this war…must be to some degree insincere temporizing in front of a divided divine assembly… he gives the appearance of magisterial fairness and ignorance as to the outcome of the war at a point when he is fully aware that the Trojans will win…with his own help as arbiter and enforcer of fate." Hejduk (2009), 320, notes that Jupiter intercedes twice in book 10 and twice in book 11 even before this final intervention. Also see Feeney (1991), 145.

[789] Williams (1973), 843-86: "This is a daemonic scene, terrifying in its weird and supernatural aspect." These aspects are reinforced in Juturna's lament (*tali… monstro*, 874; *obscenae volucres*, 876; *letalemque sonum*, 877).

development of the *Dira* Jupiter's intercession on Aeneas' behalf cannot go unnoticed. And the fact that only Aeneas is more often associated with a destroying *turbo* (10. 603, 11. 284, 12. 531, 923) than Jupiter (1. 45, 6. 594, 12. 855) in the *Aeneid*,[790] suggests that they are similar in ruthlessness. When the nature of Jupiter in the *Aeneid*, who is solely concerned with the extent of his and Rome's power, being honored by mortals and avenging threats to his power (Hejduk, 2009), is taken into consideration, Aeneas' affiliation in his angry charioteering with Jupiter will seem quite appropriate.

From a leader with considerable compassion for the sufferings of his adversaries (*miseris supponite civibus* ignem*,* 11. 119), whose people he maintains he is not waging war against (*nec bellum cum gente gero*, 11.113) and, he previously vowed, would live as equals with his (12. 190-91), Aeneas has become a despot. The people who were going to live as unconquered in the oath Aeneas swore, (*invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant*, 12. 191), now must acknowledge that they have been conquered (*victi*). The helmsman had promised that he would not make the Italian people obey the Trojans (12. 189), but now that is precisely what they must do (*parere*) and, finally, they must submit to the yoke (*frenum accipere*; *frenum OLD* 3b: control, mastery),[791] the Theban chorus of maidens' greatest fear, as we have seen (Ch. 3, p. 133). The Argives like the Latins throughout *Septem* are associated with the chariot and horses and, just as consistently, they are feared for the nature of their rule, should they prevail in their attack, for it is

---

[790] Pallas actually uses Jupiter's thunderbolt in a particularly brutal example of divine retribution taken against only one man's offense, as Juno complains. Its placement at the very beginning of the narrative (39-45), is a harsh and memorable introduction to the *Aeneid*'s gods. In the context of the recurrence of the ocean storm from the epic's beginning the clustering of the highest number of occurrences of *turbo* in book 1 and 12 (see above, Ch. 6, p. 352, n. 615), supports the interpretation of its deployment as thematically expressive of vengeance.

[791] That references to accepting the yoke (*iugum accipere*) are "common in accounts of Roman conquest" (Lavan, 2013, 84, who cites examples in Livy, Velleius Paterculus, and Valerius Maximus and also discusses the archaic Italian practice of sending captives beneath the yoke, n. 37), as was the selling of captives into slavery (for example, in Palermo, Sicily during the first Punic War [254] after the Romans took possession of the town thirteen thousand "were sold by the Romans as booty along with their loot," Diod. 23. 18. 5), should not lessen the startling nature of Aeneas' expression of his intention to subject the Latins to repressive rule. The evidence in the *Aeneid* indicates that this constitutes a radical and harsh shift in policy from what Aeneas proposed at the treaty and the literary precedent of the Theban's fear of the same type of expected rule (expressed in the same image) from the Argive charioteers, are more apt comparanda. Also in these terms Cicero describes the action of Brutus in freeing Rome from Tarquinius Superbus' rule: *…depulit a civibus suis iniustum illud durae servitutis iugum* (*Rep.* 2. 46; see Ch. 2, p. 39).

Although the use of *frenum* (a horse's bridle or bit, including reins) instead of *iugum* may indicate a degree less of repression (cf. Livy 37. 36. 5, a Roman general to an ambassador from Antiochus II "you have taken not just the bit, but the yoke," *non solum frenis, sed etiam iugo accepto*), both are images of mastering animals (Lavan (2012, 5), which imply suppression.

assumed by all speakers in the play (Eteocles, the chorus, the scout, and the messenger) that it would be brutal and include the imposition of the yoke of slavery (470-71, 793, δούλιον ζυγόν; 74-75, ζεύγλησι δουλίοισι; see Ch. 3, p. 133), making the Thebans themselves figurative horses. Aeneas has himself used this figure to describe the Rutulians' future rule in his speech to Evander (8. 147-49):

> nos si pellant nihil afore credunt
> quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant,
> et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra.
>
> They believe that if they defeat us,
> nothing would prevent them from sending all Hesperia
> under their yoke and from taking over both the Hadriatic
> and the Tyrrhenian seas.

As in Aeschylus' play, the side associated with the helmsman in the coming war deduces that the chariot riding side, here specifically the Rutulians, will be harsh in their rule. It is possible that when Aeneas expresses this concern about the Rutulian intentions to Evander with only the hearsay he might have gained from a scout to go on as evidence,[792] he is simply deducing this from the nature of the Argive-like warriors in the Latin catalogue (Mezentius, charioteers and Turnus, see Ch. 5, pp. 263-71). On the other hand, Turnus, the most ruthless charioteer, has never overtly expressed this repressive intention nor has any other human character in the epic,[793] so that both Aeneas' expressions of his own and of Turnus' tyrannical proclivities may be "a glimpse into a side of him normally hidden" (Tarrant, 2012, 568), i.e., a proclivity in his nature. As we have seen, Turnus, a charioteer with tyrannical potential, assumes it also in Aeneas (75-76, see above, p. 403). Within this context in which Aeneas has revealed himself as a figurative despotic charioteer and in which he calls for torches and flames (*faces, flammis*, 573) that immediately appear (*subitus apparuit ignis*, 576) and do their work (596, 656, 672), Latinus' gift to

---

[792] For which he has been roundly criticized: Fordyce, 146: "In these lines Aeneas' diplomacy rests its case on total misrepresentation: for the Italians have done no more than repel the Trojan incomers and there has been no suggestion that they even have designs on anything that is not their own." Thomas (2004-5), 136, also accuses Aeneas of subterfuge: "...realities belie the claim of Aeneas that he is not acting with craft (*neque ... per artem)*; that is precisely what he does here."

[793] Juno imputes a metaphorical yoke of oppression (*arva aliena iugo premere,* 78; Harrison, 1991, 78: "*iugo premere* is invidious, suggesting not so much the literal yoke of ploughing as the metaphorical one of oppression") to the Trojans in her defense of her favorites in the meeting of the gods in book 10. Her obvious partisanship renders her assessment suspect.

Aeneas, the former helmsman, of the chariot and fire-breathing horses are now most particularly appropriate to him (see above, Ch. 5, pp. 239-44). Instead of representing the Jason-like ordeal Aeneas must face to achieve his golden fleece, the founding of a city, they now seem a most appropriate symbol of the leader Aeneas has become, ruthless and repressive. The bitter irony of Aeneas' use of the word *cives* to address his troops as they attack the city, gains another level from its previous uses by the helmsmen Mnestheus to suggest their collective goal of the future foundation of their own city (5. 196, 10. 783) and by Aeneas (11. 119), in an expression of compassion for the very people he now assaults.

And so, in these three scenes—Aeneas flying across the field with his forces likened to a storm moving across the ocean, returning to general warfare after he has loosened all constraint of his anger, and urging his forces to attack Latinus' city—the epic's hero surprisingly appears as a figurative charioteer, the polar opposite of his initial and nearly continuous presentation as a helmsman, whose defining characteristic is protecting the well-being of his community and, in the war half of the *Aeneid*, even the communities of his adversary. Although his comparison to a destructive storm, which focuses on the farmers who can foresee the terrible destruction that will accrue to their crops from the storm and forcefully announces the changed position of Aeneas—formerly victim, now the destructive storm itself–– may not initially appear related to a charioteer, allusive texts confirm the affiliation. The recollection of Aeschylus' association of storms with the Argive charioteers, memorably described by the scout and echoed fearfully by the town's maidens, and of Vergil's presentation of the Latin future charioteers' frenzy for war as a storm, which Latinus described as sweeping away the Latin ship of state, make the implications for Aeneas in the storm simile clear. His rage-driven *aristeia* in book 10 concludes with a brief likening of his progress across the field to a dark whirlwind (603) in preparation for this developed simile and it is again in the context of anger that Aeneas becomes a charioteer. Here, the numerous echoes of Junonian diction, also prevalent with Turnus, and the presence of Mars, all three of whom are well-attested charioteers, deepen the significance of Aeneas' lack of restraint expressed in the figurative language of charioteering (*irarumque omnis effundit habenas*, 12. 499). But in addressing his troops Aeneas figures himself as a charioteer with the most dire political implications, which are diametrically

opposed to those of the helmsman as they have been developed in the *Aeneid*, when he threatens to destroy Latinus' city, unless they agree to submit to the yoke (*frenum accipere*), i.e., be subject to the oppressive rule of Aeneas. This is an expression used elsewhere in the epic only by Aeneas (*omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant*, 8. 148) or about his rule (*arva aliena iugo premere,*10. 78). In this manifestation of the despotic charioteer, again familiar from Aeschylus' *Septem*, and in the fire that Aeneas causes to rain down upon Latinus' city, he symbolically mounts Circe's chariot drawn by fire-breathing horses. Circe, whose presentation in book 7 emphasized her dehumanizing transformations—of the men whose animal sounds the Trojans hear as they sailed by and of Picus, changed by Circe to a woodpecker as represented in Latinus' palace—would appear to have had a similar dehumanizing transformative effect on the epic's hero. Although Aeneas as city destroyer is recalled at several points before the epic's end, particularly in the image of the javelin Aeneas sends at Turnus as a rock thrown from a siege machine (921-22),[794] this speech and the subsequent assault on Latinus' city which he leads form the final impression of Aeneas' attitude toward the collective and it is one of an oppressive dictatorial ruler. However, Aeneas as figurative storm has a continuing and significant presence to the very end and in one last ocean scene, via yet another complex of allusions, Vergil presents Turnus as a sailor at the mercy of the Aenean storm and destined not to make it home.

The Wild Olive and the Sea

It has long been recognized that in the instant before Turnus' life flees in the epic's last line the preceding loosening of his body in a chill (*illi solvuntur frigore membra*, 12. 951) echoes the words describing Aeneas in his first appearance in the epic onboard his ship battered by Juno's violent storm (*Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra*, 1. 92).[795] This is the climactic expression of the role reversal of the two heroes characteristic of the epic's last book and most significantly expresses Aeneas' changed role relative to Juno: "The repetition is a marker of (Aeneas') transformation (from) the terrified victim of

[794] Aeneas also threatens to destroy the city (*excisurum urbem minitans*, 762), if anyone attempts to bring Turnus a replacement for his shattered sword.

[795] Reed (2007), 54, n. 31, also notes the parallel in the position of Turnus' hands as he extends them to Aeneas (*tendere palmas*, 12. 936; cf. *dextramque precantem protendens*, 930), to Aeneas' in the same scene in book 1. 93: *tendens ad sidera palmas.*

Juno's anger to the angered (i.e., Juno-like) avenger…" (Tarrant, 2012, 951).[796] We have, in fact, seen this same reversal in the simile comparing Aeneas' return to battle to a storm approaching across the sea (450-58; see above, pp. 441-43), which clearly prepares for this more prominent restatement of Aeneas' reversal from victim to agent, from object of wrath to wrathful perpetrator, from storm-tossed to the storm itself. Significantly, it is only by virtue of the continuing image of the storm, which typically attends the charioteer in the dueling leadership images of helmsman and charioteer that either leadership image appears in the epic's conclusion. The idea of Aeneas as figurative storm reappears in a small suggestion––Turnus' sword shatters on the golden sand (*fulva...harena*, 741)[797]—but also in a very prominent scene that is made difficult, and therefore more noticeable, by the novel transformation of Faunus, Latinus' father and a rustic god of the forest, to a god who protects sailors, rescuing them from the sea.

In the process of fighting each other both Turnus and Aeneas experience a failure of their weapons––Turnus' sword shatters upon impact with the divine shield of Aeneas (731-32) and Aeneas' javelin becomes irretrievably (it appears) lodged in the root of a wild olive tree, sacred to Faunus (772-73). Both warriors are eventually rearmed, but the description of the olive tree is intriguingly developed (766-71):

> Forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris
> hic steterat, nautis olim venerabile lignum,
> servati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant
> Laurenti divo et votas suspendere vestis;
> sed stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum
> sustulerant, puro ut possent concurrere campo.
>
> By chance a bitter-leaved wild olive tree,
> sacred to Faunus had stood here, long-revered
> by sailors, where, rescued from the waves,
> they were accustomed to affix gifts to the

---

[796] Similarly, Putnam, most recently, (2011), 91: "It is now the turn of the victim of a goddess's anger and resentment to become himself furious and to kill someone who is in a position parallel to that which had once been his."

[797] See above, p. 442, n. 781, for Hornsby's suggestion that all storm language in the last episodes of the epic are meant to recall the opening storm. Tarrant (2012), 340, notes that *harena* is a favorite line-ending word in Vergil (40 instances), is often the last word in a section and once ends a book (5. 871). Hardie (1994), 589, argues that *harena* perhaps hints at a gladiatorial image, because "even in later books when the fighting is well inland V. uses *harena* of the dust of the battlefield." He also points out (1986, 152, n. 80) that "the gladiatorial image is frequently applied to the chief opponents in a *bellum civile* by writers of the first century AD," discussing in particular Livy's description of the fight between Manlius Torquatus and a Gaul (7. 10). Nevertheless, in the context of a series of allusions to the image of the destructive ocean, this example may participate within this progression as well.

> Laurentian god and to hang their clothes as an offering.
> But the Trojans had indiscriminately destroyed the sacred tree
> so that they would be able to engage on a clear field.

Turnus subsequently prays to Faunus and Terra to hold onto Aeneas' spear (777-79), which Faunus is able to do (*opemque dei non cassa in vota vocavit*, 780), until Venus releases it (787), indignant at Juturna's return of Turnus' sword. Undoubtedly, this tree sacred to Faunus, grandfather of Latinus, on one level represents the treasured center of ancient Latin culture, which the Trojans are indiscriminately destroying,[798] "the end of Latinus' world."[799] But Faunus, a god of flocks and fields even when assimilated to the Greek Pan, does not appear anywhere else associated with the sea or sailors (Tarrant, 2012, 766, 767-9; Ferenczi, 2000, 99). Why is he here? An allusion to Horace's *Ode* 1. 5, which most commentators draw upon as confirmation of the tradition of sailors rescued from shipwreck hanging their wet clothes as a dedication to the god of the sea,[800] represents more than a compliment to a fellow-poet since it explains a likely motivation for Faunus' sea-god identity.

Ode 1. 5 is a prediction of the future of a love affair from the current moment of embrace and high expectations of fidelity to the projected end in the inevitable rejection of the boy by the golden-haired Pyrrha. Horace fashions her volatile changeability as the stormy sea—the boy will marvel at the sea rough with black winds (*aspera nigris aequora ventis emirabitur*, 6-8) and is unaware of treacherous breezes (*nescius aurae fallacis,*11-12)—and the ultimate destruction of the affair as a shipwreck caused

---

[798] While Thomas (1988c), 269-70, and Dyson (2001), 20, 147, n. 24, find the Trojans guilty of tree violation in this passage, Tarrant (2012), 766-83, notes that the sacred sites of Rome's foes were fair game for fire and sword, although he also comments that *nullo discrimine* (770), "may be an echo of 498-9 above," where Aeneas "fiercely stirred up savage slaughter indiscriminately and threw off all restraints of his anger." I think this allusion is more certain and carries with it considerable negativity here (770).

[799] Ferenczi, 2000. I disagree, however, with her characterization of Latinus' reign as "a continuation of the peace of the golden age." See above, Ch. 5, pp. 227-48, on the conflicting signs in book 7 of a peaceful and bellicose people in Latium. A variation of this interpretation focuses on the choice of the wild olive as a characterization of Latin civilization, since in the *Georgics*, 2. 302-314, the wild olive is grafted unto the cultivated olive and is the sole but barren surviver of a fiery conflagration, *infelix superat foliis oleaster amaris* (314). See Mynors (1990), 303, and Thomas (1988a), 2. 314.

[800] Williams (1973), 12. 768-9; Ferenczi (2000), 99; Tarrant (2012), 769, who suggests that Vergil alludes to Horace. Also see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 78-79, on evidence attesting to the actual practice.

by the storm Pyrrha has become.[801] In the final quatrain the poet reveals that he has had his own experience with Pyrrha:

> Me tabula sacer
> votiva paries indicat uvida
> suspendisse potenti
> vestimenta maris deo.
>
> The temple wall shows on a votive tablet
> that I have hung up my wet clothes
> to the god powerful over the sea.

The poet has endured the ocean storm of Pyrrha, survived the shipwreck of their affair and shown his gratitude to the sea god.[802] Sufficient similarity exists between *suspendisse potenti vestimenta maris deo* (1.5. 15-16) and *Laurenti divo et votas suspendere vestis* (12. 769) to suggest an allusion to the Horace's ode,[803] especially when the similarity between Turnus' and the Horatian persona's situation are taken into consideration: they have both faced or are facing the threat of a metaphorical storm, the poet in Pyrrha, Turnus in Aeneas. The destructiveness of the Aenean storm is forcefully expressed in the earlier simile (*ruinas, stragemque, ruet omnia late*, 453-54), fully attested here in the destruction of the tree (*stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum sustulerant*, 770-71; associated closely with Aeneas at 779), and fatally for Turnus at the epic's conclusion (*solvuntur frigore membra*, 951). Sea travel in the epic is the proper sphere of the Trojans and Aeneas has referred to himself as *servatum ex undis* (3. 209) and *ereptus ab undis* (1. 596; Ferenczi, 99-100), but all references to the storm of book 1 have included this reversal of roles—now Turnus specifically is the victim of the storm of Aeneas. Faunus' striking novel identity as a

---

[801] This interpretation is standard; see, for example Nisbet-Hubbard (1970)72-80; Commager (1962/1995), 67, and Thomson Vessey (1984/1999), 25. The association of women with the sea goes back at least to Simonides of Amorgos (7. 37).

[802] Debate has arisen over which god is referred to in the last line, Neptune or Venus. Sufficient precedence exists to attest to Venus as sea god in love poetry that an emendation of *deo* to *deae* has been suggested (Zielinski, 1901; cited in Waterhouse, 1987, 369) and defended by Nisbet-Hubbard (1970, 79-80: "Neptune has nothing to do with the metaphorical sea of love"). Waterhouse, however, argues that Horace's intention was purposeful lack of specification so as not to preclude the responsible deity by an inaccurate assumption. General description of divinities was a practice with plenty of evidence to support it, including in the *Aeneid* Cloanthus' prayer in the ship race (*di, quibus imperium est pelagi,* 5. 235), the wisdom of which is revealed in the outcome, since Neptune does not figure in his victory. I wonder if Vergil isn't taking notice of the precedent in Horace's lack of specificity when he fashions his novel sea god.

[803] While the first three books of Horace's odes were probably published in 23, the first book is generally considered earlier and his work on the odes began at least as early as 30 (Nisbet-Hubbard, 1970, xxvii-xxxvii).

sea divinity facilitates the continuation of the image of Aeneas as storm and also, by virtue of his more reasonable association with the wild olive,[804] draws attention to the juxtaposition of the wild olive with the idea of rescue from the sea.

The numerous associations of the olive tree with the sea in the *Odyssey* begin early with the olive-handled axe Odysseus uses to build his raft (5. 236), when Calypso finally allows him to restart his sea journey home, and reach a climax in Odysseus' recounting of how he constructed the olive-wood bed at the enter of his house, finally proving his identity to Penelope (23. 190, 195, 204).[805] His joy in embracing her is likened to that of shipwrecked men at the sight of land and her gladness looking upon him is likened to that of the shipwrecked men setting foot on land (23. 233-39). The beam of olive with which Odysseus blinds Polyphemus is likened to a ship's mast (9. 320-22) and the Phaeacians sailors return Odysseus to Ithaca, sailing into the harbor of Phorkys at the head of which is an olive tree with spreading leaves (13. 102, 122, 346), under which, as we have seen (See above, pp. 420-21), Athena plots with Odysseus the defeat of the suitors (13. 372). In the *Odyssey* the olive is associated with τέχνη—construction of the raft, fashioning of the beam, hewing of the bed—a principle domain of Athena (see Ch. 3, p. 89); it is a "cultural artifact" (Cook, 1995, 154), but also can manifests a "saving aspect" (Segal, 1994, 47), which is clearly represented in a well-know scene of rescue, which I believe amplifies the significance of Vergil's olive tree for Turnus' fate.

As Odysseus, finally released from Calypso's island, is sailing his raft homeward he is battered by Poseidon's punishing storm (5. 291-381), a fundamental intertext for the *Aeneid*'s opening storm, while Athena performs Neptune's task of calming the winds and smoothing the way for Odysseus (5. 383-87), who with difficulty makes his way onto the island of Scheria. Odysseus expresses concern about where, in his exhausted state, he might rest safe from the elements and wild beasts, finally choosing to rest underneath "two bushes that grew from the same place, one of cultivated olive, one of wild olive"

---

[804] See Thomas (1988c), 268-70, who identifies the wild olive (*oleaster*), based on its use in the *Georgics* (see above, n. 799) as representative of "the stage before man's propagation arrives...which stands in opposition to the civilizing ventures of man."

[805] The juxtaposition of the olive and the sea in general evokes Odysseus' protector and his adversary Poseidon, who punishes him with the sea. See below, n. 808.

ἐξ ὁμόθεν πεφυῶτας: ὁ μὲν φυλίης, ὁ δ' ἐλαίης,[806] 5. 477), where Athena sheds sleep on his eyes "so as most quickly to quit him...from the exhaustion of his hard labors" (492-93). The island of Scheria, where Odysseus recounts his journey through the fantastic lands of giants, cyclopses, Circe and other monsters, is a place in between this world of strange encounters and Ithaca. Odysseus arrives at the island from the wilderness of his journey as a lion that descends from the hills and kills livestock (6. 130-33), but when he departs after finally encountering cultivation, cooked food and proper sacrifice,[807] hallmarks of Greek culture, he leaves like a tired plowman returning home (13. 31-35; Vidal-Naquet, 1996, 49). The double olive bush under which Odysseus sleeps represents the wild places of his travels from which he arrives and the cultivated civilized world to which he returns (Vidal-Naquet, 1996, 48).[808] The Phaeacians will bring Odysseus to Ithaca, he will plot his return under an olive tree, and regain his conjugal bed and wife with the joy of a rescued sailor. The cultivated olive tree, then, in the *Odyssey*, is associated with the hero's rescue from the sea and return to civilization, his home and wife, while the wild olive with the strange, uncivilized and mythological world of his journey.

Faunus in the *Aeneid* receives the identity of a sea god capable of rescuing sailors from the sea, because Turnus is in desperate need of rescue from the ocean storm that is Aeneas pressing down upon him, but Faunus's association with the wild olive tree opens a dialogue with the *Odyssey*'s hero, who is rescued from the sea by Athena and returns home to his estate and wife. However, like Juturna, Faunus is not the equal of Athena and can only grant Turnus a brief respite, nor, as Thomas (1988c, 268-70) has noted, is he on the side of the civilizers as Odyssean Athena is.[809] He rather represents the pre-cultivation days of Saturn, Latinus' impression of Latium created for Ilioneus of a land with no need for laws. The

---

[806] All citations to olive trees in the previous paragraph use forms of ἐλαίης, the cultivated olive.

[807] Vidal-Naquet (1996), 40, concedes that Odysseus has plenty to eat with Aeolus, Circe and Calypso, but he emphasizes that "we are never told where the food comes from or who produced it."

[808] Vidal-Naquet (1996), 48, n. 72, maintains with textual support that the ancient world "unanimously" understood φυλίης (5. 477) as "wild olive" and that it is only a few modern critics who "have thought that a myrtle was intended." On a broader level, the frequent pairing of Poseidon and Athena in literary and archaeological records, reifies "the Greek polarization of nature and culture" (Cook, 1995, 128). Also see Cook (1995), 131-34, on the domestic olive as a frequently exploited symbol of culture.

[809] Spence (1999), 155, notes that according to Pausanias (8.5) Minerva was born in Arcadia, which is an indication that she relates both to the pastoral and urban (in her role as patron goddess of cities). Athena's role in the *Odyssey* is more one-sided.

location of Faunus' oracle in the depths of the woods (*sub alta...Albunea, nemorum maxima*, 7. 82-83) therefore seems appropriate, as does the wild olive without the cultivated tree. However, by the allusion to the *Odyssey* and the wild olive's association with the wilderness and monsters of Odysseus' voyage, Faunus' more fantastic affiliations in the *Aeneid* are also reactivated. His mother Circe, who changes men into beasts, including his father Picus to a bird, and breeds fire-breathing horses in the *Aeneid* lacks the positive human side apparent in Homer and is representative of a general proclivity on the Italian side to confuse man and beast (see above, Ch. 5, p. 229). For Turnus, who is very much a part of this world, as his prayer to Faunus suggest (*colui vestros si semper honores*, 778), this allusion to Odysseus, whose personal quest will be fulfilled at his home (as would Turnus'), again points to the likely failure of his aspirations, his inability to reach port safe and sound.

The presentation of Aeneas as a figurative destructive sea storm, imagery typically attendant to that of the charioteer, is established at the midpoint of book 12 shortly before Aeneas' loosens the reins on his anger and persists to the very end of the epic. In fact, the Aenean storm suffuses the scene of the wild olive and allusively suggests Turnus' defeat. The anomalous presentation of Faunus, normally a god associated with flocks and fields, as a rescuer of sailors is not "easily explained away" (Tarrant, 2012, 767-9) and its primary expression—*servati ex undis*—confuses because of its literal aptness for Aeneas and the Trojans. Faunus' sea god identity is comprehensible only on the figurative level within the continuing series of clues to Aeneas' storm identity and the frequent appearance of role reversals of Turnus and Aeneas in book 12. Allusion to Horace's Pyrrha ode reinforces the likelihood that the sea in this context is figurative and associated with an individual, but the juxtaposition of rescue from the sea and the olive tree leads the way to the more prominent examples of the pairing in the *Odyssey*, which Vergil causes to speak to Turnus' situation. And it is the uncultivated wildness of the olive tree that points to Turnus' dark future. In the *Odyssey* the wild olive represents the fantastic world of monsters, giants and goddesses from which Odysseus has just escaped on Scheria. Faunus' association with the wild olive in the *Aeneid* carries much wider associations, since he is Latinus' father and the oracle of Lavinia's foreign marriage, but as the son of Circe, who threatens and transforms men into beast and

fashions fire-breathing horses, he is part of Latium's characterization as primitive, slightly fantastic and only recently, and not completely, civilized. These associations combined with the tree's destruction suggest that Turnus will not be rescued from the sea nor achieve the embrace of a grateful wife. The relevance of these Odyssean allusions can only be understood within the framework of the continuing image of Aeneas as a destructive storm.

Thus, the concluding book of the *Aeneid* presents a clear expression of the antithetical emblematic images of helmsman and charioteer as they have been developed in the epic around the leaders Aeneas and Turnus. In the second half of the book, however, those affiliations are reversed triggered by the actions of their adversary within the tumult of war. Although Aeneas has long since left his position of authority at the helm of the ship of state as developed in his approach to the battlefield in book 10, his speech and actions at the ceremony before the duel and his attempt to stop the warfare that subsequently breaks out express the fundamental quality of the helmsman as developed in the *Aeneid*, which is a selfless concern for the well-being of the community. He proposes generous terms and when war breaks out Aeneas is wounded in his attempt to check the violence flowing from the collective anger in a scene recalling the order-establishing statesman in the epic's first simile. On the other hand, when Turnus sees Aeneas leaving the field, he proudly jumps into his chariot and, taking up the reins himself, rolls over bodies with his chariot as his horses' hooves spray the blood of the fallen, recalling Achilles' presentation on the temple in Carthage and Tullus Hostilius' savage dismemberment of Mettus Fufetius. These allusions and his own quasi-deification of his spear in prayer while arming maintain previous suggestions of the despotic in Turnus. But these antithetical emblems of leadership, which are a particularized expression of the epic's paradigmatic polarities announced in the opening storm—the confrontation of *pietas* and the qualities associated with it (quiet restraint, firm control, order and rationality) and *furor* and its attendants (explosive anger and passion), near the epic's conclusion are either consciously rejected in the case of Turnus or are progressively inverted in Aeneas with disturbing and unresolved implications for his future rule. Since Turnus' is unable to persist in his heroic intention to die for his people (12.

935-36), no helmsman survives the epic. In fact, the inversion of leadership emblems is conveyed solely by means of the charioteer and imagery associated with him, including the ocean storm.

Aeneas appears as charioteer in imagery alone, but the political implications are the most negative of the charioteer in the *Aeneid*, that of tyrant, and are expressed in the hero's own speech as he urges his forces to attack the city (568). In the scene of Pallas' death Turnus presents classic despotic characteristics of arrogance, pride and acquisitiveness, but Aeneas here expresses the intention to oppress a whole people as a figurative charioteer and, thus, further confirms the affiliation of the charioteer with political oppression in the *Aeneid*. Aeneas had previously migrated into the figurative world of the charioteer when he threw off all control of his anger (*irarumque omis effundit habenas*, 499), in a passage which recalls the impassioned vocabulary of un-forgetting, Juno, who is motivated by an individual internal resentment (*memorem...iram,* 1. 4; *tantaene animis calestibus irae,* 11; *memor Saturnia,* 23; *animo, manet alta mente repostum,* 26), which suggests that here Aeneas' mind may be losing track of a leader's responsibility to his followers.[810] Anger is also implicitly operative in Aeneas' subsequent decision to assault Latinus' city (*pugnae accendit maioris imago*, 560), which is without any obvious strategic justification. In his speech urging his forces to attack Aeneas formulates his last words indicating the nature of his future rule and they predict he will be, at least for his adversaries, a despotic charioteer: the Latins must acknowledge that they are conquered, obey and submit to the yoke. In this context of the figurative charioteer, when Aeneas orders flames to be thrown onto the city, Latinus' gift to Aeneas of a chariot and fantastic fire-breathing horses, beasts that are only a precarious part of the narrative, become comprehensible as proper to Aeneas. Due to the passion driven, violent and self-centered connotations of the charioteer that have been developed throughout the *Aeneid* as the negative alternative to the civic-centered helmsman, Aeneas' public proclamation in the language of a charioteer of his intention to subjugate a city become more than disconcerting. When seen in the context of the

[810] Just such awareness coexists with anger as Aeneas arms (*saevus in armis...se suscitat ira,* 12. 107-8; *oblato gaudens componis foedere bellum/ tum socios maestique metum solatus Iuli*, 109-10), but here his anger is clearly more restrained and necessary (see Tarrant, 2012, 108, "on the widely held ancient view, [that] anger was necessary for an effective warrior), as compared to the words of excess and totality in the later passage" (*terribilis, nullo discrimine...irarumque omnes...habenas,* 498-99).

political emblem Vergil has carefully developed for Aeneas of the helmsman as caretaker and protector of the community, as a paradigm of the political aspect of *pietas,* Aeneas' words seem shocking.

The impact on Turnus of the destruction Aeneas and his forces wreak on Latinus' city initiates a developing awareness within him of his fated death and of his fault in the suffering of his fellow citizens, which leads to his rejection of the chariot and acceptance of responsibility for his fellow citizens. The whole of this process is interlaced with echoes of Drances' criticisms of him in the assembly of Latins in book 11, all of which are relevant to the moment, since they have all by now been associated with the chariot; these are tyrannical behavior (implied by the citizen's fear of speaking, 11. 346, and his threatening Drances with death, 348), lack of *virtus* and selfishness in his callous indifference to his fellow citizen's death and suffering for a reward that would only benefit Turnus, the winning of Lavinia and the kingdom. Although suggestions of the tyrant in Turnus have appeared occasionally earlier in book 12, with Aeneas' manifestation of the despotic and Turnus' awakening conscience and awareness of his fate this aspect fades. The question of his impugned *virtus* and civic dutifulness now occur to him in a different light. With the evidence of Aeneas' attack Turnus sees through Juturna's stratagem and understands his time in the chariot with her as flight from a general's responsibilities (645) and considers it shameful (*ingens…pudor, conscia virtus*). In leaving the chariot Turnus abandons boasting and display as well as further avoidance of his responsibility to the city and its soldiers

Vergil employs several strategies in fashioning Turnus' move from his chariot as a rejection of consuming selfish acquisitiveness, as represented in his desire for Lavinia, in exchange for an acceptance of responsibility to the public collective. The first step in this direction is the intertextual imbuing of Turnus' chariot while driven by Juturna with Odysseus' Athena-assisted fight within his home to regain Penelope, even though Turnus' flawed premise (that Lavinia is his wife, who has been stolen) upon which the comparison rests implies he will not be successful. The allusions to Drances' speech and in particular to his criticisms of Turnus' indifference to the suffering of the city also suggest he is abandoning his selfish focus on Lavinia, because Drances directly linked his callousness to the citizens situation to his desire for marriage (*scilicet ut Turno contingat regia coniunx, / nos animae viles…/ sternamur campis?*

11. 371-73). Finally, the playing out of Turnus awakening of conscience to his responsibility to the city occurs while he is in the chariot with Juturna and is stimulated by his gaze on the city and Saces' report from the city. In addition, Turnus' realization that he will die (*usque adeone mori miserum est?* 646) and the allusions to Palinurus' sacrificial death (*me verius unum/ pro vobis foedus luere*, 694-95) suggest that Turnus is primarily accepting that his responsibility to the city will be fatal. That much of Turnus fiery, volatile character remains through this process (*insania, furiis agitatus amor, ardentis, turbidus, sine me furere ante furorem*), makes his acceptance of death more heroic. The aspects of his character associated with the chariot that he rejects or at least puts aside—savage brutality, the arrogant, selfish passion of tyrant, love of display and acquisitiveness—increase this impression. Nevertheless Vergil seems to have taken care that the reader is not left with the impression that Turnus has become a helmsman, despite his selfless act.

But it is the comparison of Aeneas' return to battle, after being healed by his mother, to a storm moving across the sea bringing destruction to the shore (451-55) which precipitates the series of events that result in the leadership images' disassociation from their "proper" hero and infuses the concluding narrative with the figurative presence of Aeneas as destructive sea storm, inverting his role as victim at the beginning of the epic. Aeneas' likening to a storm bringing destruction also should be seen as a complementary image with that of the charioteer, well established at the beginning of Aeschylus' *Septem,* as well as in the rising storm of war in book 7, and is, therefore, preparation for the figurative presentation of Aeneas as charioteer. It is this first manifestation (in book 12) of Aeneas as storm that motivates Juturna, responding to the sight of him twice with fright, to take over Turnus' chariot in an attempt to rescue him from the sea, as Athena had Odysseus. We have seen that Aeneas' subsequent outburst of anger is expressed in terms of a charioteer (*irarumque omnis effundit habenas*, 499), but this expression in the context of Junonian diction recalling the epic's beginning further develops the allusive background of the opening storm with the recollection of the reins of the winds as horses, that Aeolus lets lose to cause the storm (*et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas*, 1. 63). This background provides a means of understanding why Turnus prays to Faunus as a sea god, when he asks him to hold on to Aeneas'

spear, stuck in his sacred olive tree. Vergil's allusion to Horace's Pyrrha ode elucidates the relevance of the sea for Turnus' request: he is being besieged by Aeneas as a figure of the stormy sea. Faunus' wild olive tree suggests, again through an allusion to the Athena-rescued Odysseus (as on the island of Scheria), that Turnus will not obtain his longed-for goal. When Aeneas becomes the embodiment of Junonian wrath at the epic's end he again is present as a destructive storm in the configuration of Turnus' dying body in that of his own onboard ship in the epic's original storm.

Within the system of interactive helmsman and charioteer in the *Aeneid* the ramifications of the allusions which compare Turnus to Odysseus under the olive tree on Scheria and fighting the suitors in his home are significant, especially due to the even stronger link they establish between Palinurus, Aeneas' helmsman, and Turnus, whose deaths are similarly sacrificial. We have seen in Chapter 4 that Palinurus is textually linked both with Aeneas and with Odysseus at sea and now that Turnus interacts textually with Odysseus on land. Furthermore, allusions to Odysseus on Scheria for both Palinurus and Turnus draw attention to the hopelessness of their situations compared to Odysseus: Palinurus also clings to rocky crags before he becomes the prey of bestial robbers, the lot Odysseus only feared; Turnus prays at Faunus' wild olive tree, but ultimately receives no rescue from a god whose tree has been swept away in the Aenean storm, while Odysseus sleeps peacefully under the joined cultivated and wild olive and Athena plans his vindication. Especially significant in the ties linking Palinurus and Turnus is that both are presented as doubles of Aeneas and that the substitution that takes place of Aeneas for Palinurus is of a helmsman with *similar* values to his predecessor. For some scholars Palinurus' death symbolizes the death of the individual, the distinctive personality of the leader, who in the person of Aeneas becomes the selfless servant of the community. And, while Augustan propaganda espoused this image for Augustus, those who want to see significance in this for Aeneas seem to have been forced to associate Palinurus with the warlords of the previous century who pursue their own selfish goals. But this proves difficult to argue for Palinurus, who matches Aeneas in his dutifulness and clearly performs the task of helmsman well. However, it is most apt for Turnus, Palinurus' analogue at the end of the epic, as his character is developed in the war in Latium. In Aeneas' assumption of the charioteer's place these same selfish

concerns adhere to him and are exhibited in his final act. As Lowrie (2010, 395) most recently has noted, Aeneas kills Turnus not because he has broken the publicly agreed upon treaty binding all, but because Turnus is dressed in the spoils of Aeneas' own, "It is a personal act of vengeance done in anger," as Vergil emphasizes (*tune hinc spoliis indute meorum/ eripiare mihi?*). There is nothing of the helmsman in it.

CHAPTER 9

Conclusion

The narrative of Vergil's epic sweeps across continents and oceans to the shores of Latium where the greater story (*maius opus moveo*) of the battle between the Trojans and Latins unfolds, but this broad expanse narrows to a very tight focus on the concluding act of the epic, Aeneas burying his sword in Turnus, enraged and exacting revenge at the sight of Pallas' sword belt. The close up-view of Turnus' death, however, does nothing to obviate the challenge Vergil presents to the reader of assessing the implications of Aeneas' act, long an issue of debate and one considered from numerous perspectives.[811] This study of the political images of helmsman and charioteer indicates that in as much as Aeneas has assumed imagery and vocabulary pointedly and programmatically associated with Juno at the beginning of the epic—the chaotic destructive sea storm, *saevi monimenta doloris, furiis accensus, ira*—his remembering anger is presented as motivating an act which is at least as destructive as Juno's unleashing of the storm. Aeneas is no longer an exemplar "of a 'collective' responsibility to an ethic of forbearance," but "Virgil leaves him prey to 'individualitstic' emotionality, which ignites an Achillean anger insistent on the need for retribution" (Putnam, 2011, 206). As a figurative charioteer Aeneas also belongs to Juno's imagery, whose chariot is in Carthage and whose charioteers (Aeolus and Achilles) execute her will. In asking Aeneas not to continue further in his hatred (*ulterius ne tend odiis*, 12. 938), Turnus imputes to Aeneas the same Junonian abiding hatred (Tarrant, 2012, 938).[812] But the description of Aeneas' anger as he kills Turnus (*furiis accensus*, 946) also "combines elements of Turnus' characterization at the start of the book" (*accenso*, 9; *his agitur furiis,* Tarrant, 2012, 15) and because Vergil has developed the two heroes as antitypes—Aeneas as restrained, Turnus as reckless—the

---

[811] Horsfall's (1999), 192-216, summary of views is useful. Also see Tarrant's (2012), 16-24, perceptive assessment of the last scene.

[812] As does the narrator (*saevi monimenta doloris*, 945). Tarrant (2012), 945: "The juxtaposition of *saevi* and the memory term *monimenta*, with *ira* in the following line, forms another counterpart to the poem's opening, 1.4 *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram*."

departure from their norms is especially pointed (Tarrant, 2012, 15). As the figurative helmsman of the Trojans Aeneas has been committed to a collective goal, but in his final act his motivation is clearly personal, passion-filled and a continuation of his new identity as charioteer,[813] the nature of which is most clearly expressed in his speech to his troops before they attack Latinus' city.

While in attacking the city Aeneas indicates that he is motivated by political concerns—the breaking of the treaty which he accuses Latinus and his people of having done twice, his speech and actions are equally, if not more, alarming than the killing of Turnus, because he indicates his intention to subjugate the Latins as a people (*ni frenum accipere et victim parere fatentur,/ eruam…*, 568-69) and precipitates *discordia* within the city, which neither the Argive charioteers in *Septem* nor the Latin charioteers have done. Juno has implied in the council of the gods opening book 10 (78) that the Trojans are already oppressing the Latin land, but the god in the *Aeneid* with a similar attitude toward both his own and Roman power is Jupiter, as Aeneas seems to realize at the beginning of this speech (*Iuppiter hac stat*, 12. 565). In killing Turnus Vergil suggests that Aeneas is the agent of Jupiter in the language that links his spear throw with the death announcing Dira Jupiter sends (*atri turbinis instar*, 923; cf. *ad terram turbine fertur*, 855), although following the accord reached by Jupiter and Juno (791-842) there are indications of their like-mindedness (i.e., the Dirae are on the threshold of the savage king; *saevi limine regis*, 849; cf. *saevi…veneni*, 857; *et saeva Iovis sic numina poscunt*, 11. 901). In the final scene Aeneas becomes "the angered (i.e., Juno-like) avenger who acts with the support of Jupiter" (Tarrant, 2012, 951). And the implications of being an agent of Jupiter in the *Aeneid*, particularly after Hejduk's study of Jupiter in the epic, are bleak and largely coincide with the attitude of the charioteer developed in the *Aeneid*.

---

[813] Noonan's (2007), 66, analysis of Aeneas' *pietas* as one of "public protectiveness" as a *conservator* supports my analysis of Aeneas as helmsman (even down to particulars: "military victories should de-emphasize triumphalism," 86), but I think he misses an important distinction between public and private when he treats Pallas as if he were a group in his paraphrase of 947-48: "Are you to be saved from me clothed in the spoils of my followers?" Aeneas' hesitation and subsequent rage mitigate against interpreting Aeneas' killing as simply retaliatory in the context of battle. Tarrant's (2012), 22, observation that Aeneas seems to have forgotten about Pallas until the moment when he sees the baldric and that his anger, therefore, may be partially self-directed, likewise compromises Aeneas' motivation.

Hejduk's (2009, 280) thesis can be simply stated, which alone makes it startling: "Beyond power and adulation… Jupiter has no other concerns (in the *Aeneid*)." Her thorough and articulate defense of this assertion also seems completely convincing. In her opinion, readers have been mislead by descriptions of Jupiter's pleasant expression (i.e., 1. 254-56) and stately rhetoric into overlooking the god's single-minded concern with power and his reputation. Despite the fact that many consider Jupiter's first speech to Venus optimistic,[814] his vision for Rome's future, with the exception of its extent of rule, is grim, Hejduk argues (283-86), lacking any of the typical promises of prosperity or abundance and only assuring an absence of war. Nothing indicates he feels sorrow or pity (302) and he only punishes violations relative to his own rank, such as Salmoneus' attempt to impersonate and usurp his honors (310-11). Jupiter, more overtly than Aeneas, expresses rule in terms of enslavement (1. 283-85):

> Veniet lustris labentibus aetas,
> cum domus Assaraci Phthiam clarasque Mycenas
> servitio premet, ac victis dominabitur Argis.
>
> An age will come, as the years slip by, when the
> house of Assaracus will curb Phthia and famous Mycenae
> in servitude and will rule over conquered Argos.

In the context of enslavement *dominabitur* should have the connotation of rule by a despot (*OLD* 1), as Cicero speaks of Pompey and Caesar in a letter to Atticus (8. 11; see Ch. 1, p. 42): "Both of the pair have aimed at personal domination (*domination*), not the happiness and fair fame of the community...both want to reign (*regnare*)." This passage strongly suggests that Jupiter sanctions Aeneas' attack on Latinus' city with his intention of subjugating its people (*frenum accipere*) after he has conquere them (*victi parere*, 12. 568). Nevertheless, even though Jupiter expresses the characteristics associated with the charioteer and as such was among the most familiar images in the Roman world, he never appears as a charioteer in the *Aeneid*, I believe, because in this role he would interfere, both with his carefully crafted presentation of surface serenity and evident obsession with power, but also with the progressively developing and varied meaning of the chariot in the *Aeneid*, of which the full implications only become comprehensible in the last book.

---

[814] On Jupiter's (and Aeneas') manipulative rhetoric see Thomas (2004/05).

Neptune's sea-chariot in particular requires an unimpeded presentation because it is the great symbol of hope in the *Aeneid* for the possibility of constructive, restorative power on earth, which a chariot of the version of Jupiter represented in this epic could never express. The overwhelming difficulty of achieving the ideal Neptune's chariot represents is quintessentially expressed in Aeneas' vain attempt to stop the reignited war in book 12, but much of the epic tells that story. Nevertheless, the beauty and prominence of the opening storm sequence with its contemporary political relevance resolves the fear of a vacuum of power expressed in the *Georgic*'s charioteer with the runaway team and presents the ideal as possible, so the intaglio with Octavian as Neptune would also suggest (see Ch. 4, pp. 154-55). Neptune's chariot also is the announcing image of the comparability of the charioteer and helmsman, which, even moe prominently than in Aeschylus' *Septem*, figures the god as the fundamental symbol of the state's unity. This connotation of unity is recalled in Aeneas' ship as he approaches the war, its prow decorated with Cybele's yoked, civilizing lions. The relevance of Neptune's sea-chariot to contemporary politics also prepares for the ship race in book 5 with its strong shadow presence of the *Iliad*'s chariot race and allusions to contemporary Rome.

The absence of Jupiter's power-dominating chariot also provides space for the variety of charioteers developed in the Latin war, all with the common denominator of a fixation on the charioteer's personal agenda. The *Iliad*'s theme of the youthful charioteer's failed transition to adulthood sometimes due to boastful glorying is strongly represented in the Latin catalogue and later charioteers, especially Turnus. The suggestion of deviance in the Hippolytan figure of the charioteer Virbius, who together with the Amazonian Camilla frame Turnus at the end of the Latin catalogue, adheres to Turnus and to the Latin cause in the war. Turnus' later pointed association with Thrace, a traditional home of Amazons, may continue this theme. While the extremely violent warrior charioteers represented in Achilles and Turnus could co-exist with Jupiter's chariot via their association with the charioteers Juno and Mars, both equally condemned for extremes of hatred or violence by the Iliadic Zeus, the suggestive interplay between the charioteer Turnus and the ethos of the Roman statesman/warrior also benefits from the absence of Jupiter's chariot which could seem to justify and legitimize the extremes of a Julius Caesar. Thomas'

(1998, 283-84) conclusion that the similarity between Turnus' characterization at 7. 473-74 (*hunc decus egregium formae movet atque iuventae*, */ hunc atavi reges, hunc claris dextera factis*) and sepulchral epigrams of the Scipios indicates, "We are in the world of Roman republican military heroism,"[815] is clearly legitimate. Turnus not only has earned a reputation for valor, which he cares deeply about protecting, but he is willing to fight along side his men and praises his captains. However, as in the case of Pompey and especially Caesar, a proclivity for war both as a political solution and as a means of achieving personal ambitions is a policy that was costly both for Turnus and Latium in the *Aeneid* and Rome in fact. Turnus also manifests an inability to control his emotions, an unbridledness which, together with his arrogance and boastful exultation in the scene of Pallas' death, recalls Cicero's description of Tarquinius Superbus, although Cicero frequently perceived unbridledness among contemporary politicians, notably in Marc Antony. Nevertheless, Turnus is a distinctive Vergilian creation, representing none of these historical figures but at times evoking each.[816] His novel youthful presentation in Vergil, emphasized by his occasional resemblance to less capable Latin charioteers, mitigates against an excessively harsh assessment of his character; Caesar, Pompey and Antony all died in their 50's, long-established in their hunger for power. Turnus' genuine pain with the awareness of the suffering in Latinus' city and his responsibility in causing it can be understood as hard-earned growth of character, but his request for his life (12. 934-36) constitutes a failure of his heroic intentions that can less reasonably be attributable to youth. However, the absence of Jupiter's chariot has the most significant impact on the presentation of Aeneas as a figurative charioteer, because nothing obstructs the impression of total negativity in his emergence in this role, which the observant reader can see as proper to Jupiter as well.

---

[815] The virtues Thomas, 283, notes Turnus shares with, for example, L. Corneoius Scipio Barbatus (consul in 298), of good looks, fine ancestry and brave deeds, also do not differ from those Dido admires in Aeneas—*vultus*, *honos gentis*, *virtus* (4. 3-4).

[816] Tarrant (2012), 13: Turnus' "acute sense of his position and of how others see him, his charismatic leadership skills and his propensity to violence would have made him fully at home in the turbulent final decades of the Roman Republic."

In assessing the broader implications of Aeneas' act of killing Turnus the reader has the knowledge of both the previous sequence of similarly merciless killings by Aeneas in his *aristeia* after the news of Pallas' death, which exhibit numerous significant connections with the end of the epic, and his speech and behavior between these two major rage-driven events. We have seen that the outcome of Aeneas' *aristeia* was the crucial strategic success of the liberation of the Trojan camp, a decided military benefit and at least a limited affirmation of his actions, but just as important is the nature of Aeneas' speeches to the Latin embassy in book 11 and at the oath-taking ceremony before the duel. In these speeches he exhibits consideration toward his enemy, respect for Lavinia, fairness, concern for his own forces, a disinclination toward wielding power and a desire to serve the gods, all qualities appropriate to his helmsmanship and indicative of a recovery of his better nature. How large a part of Aeneas do the chariot and fire-breathing horses represent? Once he manifests their presence is his morality completely compromised, is he forever disqualified from the role of helmsman? The character of Eteocles in *Septem* presents a similar challenge: although he models (and encourages the Thebans toward) an ethic of *pietas* throughout most of the play, he also threatens the Theban maidens of the chorus with death by stoning. While Stehle's interpretation that this speech represents a temporary invasion of the curse of his father seems to account for this anomaly in the leader's behavior (see Ch. 3), Vergil presents no such "easy" solutions to the similar unevenness of Aeneas' behavior and speech, such as, for example, his surprising assertion to Evander that the Rutulians intend to submit all Italy to the yoke (8. 148). Two compelling solutions to the problem of Aeneas' inconsistency are yet in some ways antithetical: either Aeneas' final act is sanctioned or not.

For Putnam clearly it is not. He identifies city-destroying as foreshadowed in Aeneas' behavior in book 2 and apparent in 4, 7 and 12, an essential aspect of his nature, and sees Turnus' authority at the end validated by an allusion to Jupiter's words (2011).[817] The characteristics of Aeneas' rage-driven killing

[817] Putnam's (2011), extending of the city-destroyer capacity in Aeneas and the irrational episodes of book 10 and 12 further back into the epic are not as successful, in my opinion, not because they are dissimilar in his rage, but because the circumstances are considerably different and fault is not so clearly Aeneas'. The circumstances the night of Troy's fiery destruction (60-65) could justify much irrational behavior and I am not as convinced as Putnam

both in book 10 and at the end are encoded with the diction of Juno and Turnus that have been developed as clear antonyms to Aeneas' virtues and goals, which adds weight to Putnam's view of the unsanctioned nature of Aeneas' act. Vergil has established, I believe, the appropriate limit of anger in Aeneas' arming scene in book 12 in which the hero rouses himself to anger at the coming confrontation with Turnus (*se suscitat ira*, 12. 108), but rejoices only that the war will be settle by the treaty (*gaudens componi foedere bellum*, 109) and still maintains concern for his followers (*socios . . . solatus*, 110).[818] From Vergil's perspective Aeneas' final act is untoward, even if all but the Stoic philosophers would condone it.[819] However, I do not agree, as Putnam implies, that this suggests Aeneas' final act is the definitive statement of his character. Vergil does not seem to espouse what May has attributed to Cicero, a conviction of the unchanging nature of character.[820] On the other hand, Tarrant (2012, 16) suggests that Aeneas' act is sanctioned: "It would seem that in Virgil's world madness and disorder can only be treated homeopathically; this is, they are not overcome by their opposites, but by like forces."[821] The *Aeneid*'s

---

of the authenticity of the Helen episode. Aeneas certainly shares fault for Dido's suicide (51-60), but her warm nature and sense of shame and divine interventions contribute. Both Putnam (68-71) and Thomas (2004/05) are not concerned to note the evident ambivalent signals in Vergil's characterization of Latinus and Latium, which, I believe, makes their image of the destructive Trojan invasion of the peaceful Latin realm appear overstated. While there is clear importance in the exclusive use of *ulterius* (further) by Jupiter to Juno (*ulterius temptare veto*, 12. 806) and by Turnus to Aeneas (*ulterius ne tende odiis*, 12. 938; 97-99), which seems to add the "voice of ethical authority" to Turnus (Putnam, 2011, 97), the more important interaction is between Juno and Aeneas both of whom will proceed with their actions, Aeneas sooner, Juno later (in the Punic Wars, see Feeney, 1984).

[818] As Wright (1997), 179, notes with regard to the first appearances of Turnus (7. 460-2) and Aeneas (2. 314-17), "praiseworthy anger which characterizes heroic temper can be taken to excess. Then it subverts rather than supports reason."

[819] Galinsky (1988), 327, and Tarrant (2012), 19, point out that most of the ancient ethical tradition, except the Stoics, would condone Aeneas' anger and the killing of Turnus as a justifiable avenging of wrong, although Tarrant does not go as far as Galinsky (339), who thinks the ethical tradition would find Aeneas' act "praiseworthy." Tarrant (20), points out that "in the *Aeneid* as a whole *ira* is ascribed to Aeneas [8 times] more often than to Juno [6]," and that the consequences of his wrath are "frightening" and in the attack on Latinus' city "barbaric." Putnam (1995), 183, asserts that Vergil's use of *dolor, ira* and *furiae* in the description of Aeneas as he kills Turnus (945-46), words which are only positive in one context in the *Aeneid*, that describing the citizens of the tyrant Mezentius, are the "best guide" in assessing the connotations of Aeneas' act. Fowler (1997a), 33-34, whose outlook I share, similarly stresses that "the imagery of emotion in the *Aeneid* is overwhelmingly negative and Stoic." He reads the *Aeneid* "as simultaneously asserting the absolute necessity of emotional control and its complete impossibility."

[820] May (1988), 6: "The Romans believed that character remains essentially constant in man and therefore demands or determines his actions. Since character does not evolve or develop, but rather is bestowed or inherited by nature [Cic. *De Off.* 1. 107-14], an individual cannot suddenly, or at will, change or disguise for any lengthy period his ethos or his way of life."

[821] Similarly, Spence (1999), 160, who argues that, "The killing of Turnus… asserts that *furor* has a necessary place in the system of *pietas*—it is not foreign to it," thinks that the ending "encapsulates and demonstrates precisely what

Jupiter, whose full support Aeneas has in the end, clearly advocates this view. The character of king Latinus, whose ineffective leadership seems to be presented as a cautionary example, may corroborate Tarrant's point. In the inherited tradition Latinus is a forceful figure, often fighting successfully along with Aeneas and evidence of this more bellicose Latinus is alluded to in the training of the youthful charioteers before the palace, in war spoils and in the wars Allecto/Calybe mentions to Turnus that he fought with Latinus. But nothing of this forceful vigor is evident in Latinus' behavior, even though he has many positive attributes including a strong devotion to the gods, which lead him to welcome Aeneas and offer his daughter to him, sight unseen. However, his stability is almost immediately rendered suspect when he sends the fire-breathing horses to Aeneas, which suggests he has been infiltrated in some way by Circe, a decidedly negative feminine presence both in the area and in his family, visibly in the avian representation of his grandfather Picus. Although the forces for war aligned against him may justify his abandoning of his governing authority before the palace as, first, an overwhelmed helmsman and, then, a helpless charioteer, his proclivity for fleeing a crisis is persistent.[822] His lack of effectiveness as a leader may be most pronounced in his handling of the public meeting that he called for the citizens to hear the report from the emissaries to Diomedes and to consider his proposal.[823] The moment required more forceful action either by shaping and restricting the areas of discussion, applying some restraints to Drances and Turnus, or by simply demanding his proposal be enacted. He had, after all, tried the war option, which resulted in the deaths of many. Whether we attribute his vacillations (He asks himself, *quo referor totiens? quae mentem insania mutat?* 12. 37) and passivity, as he does, to a soft heart (he tells

---

the poem has been trying to show all along: those things that seem so opposed, so incompatible, are completely intertwined" (159).

[822] At this point "he shuts himself in the palace" (*saepsit se tectis*, 7. 600), an act he repeats to avoid having to open the Gates of War, "turning away he flees the wicked ministry and hides himself in the dark shadows" (*refugit…et caecis se condidit umbris*, 7. 618-19); he deserts the assembly and his great undertaking in book 11 (*concilium ipse pater et magna incepta Latinus/ deserit*, 469-70), after all had rush off to war and, of course, when war reignites at the oath taking ceremony in book 12, he flees carrying his defeated gods with him (*fugit ipse Latinus/ pulsatos referens… divos.* 285-86), belying the powerful impression he makes approaching the ceremony in his *quadrigae* and radiant crown.

[823] He knew before hand that Diomedes had rejected their offer to join them against Aeneas and he takes this as an indication that the Trojans are fated by the gods to be there. In the assembly he therefore proposes coming to terms with the Trojans, but when he opens the meeting up to general discussion his directive is unspecific: "Consider among yourselves and rescue our weary affairs," (*consulate in medium et rebus succurrite fessis*, 11. 335), even though he knows the enemy are at the city's walls (304).

Turnus he didn't follow what was right, *fas*, because he was defeated by love for him, (*victus amore tui*, 12. 29) and feelings for his wife (*cognate sanguine victus / coniugis et maestae*, 29-30) or the more mysterious continuing influence of Circe, he is an ineffective leader, whose lack of forceful action causes harm to his people. In his self-condemnation he represents his passive acquiescing to the demands of family and affection in place of doing what is right (following the gods directives and marrying Lavinia to Aeneas) very actively as a breaking of all restraints (*vincla omnia rupi*, 12. 30). These words are suggestive of the unbridledness of Turnus rushing off to war as a figurative horse (*abruptis…vinclis / tandem liber equus*, 11. 492-93), a striking image that energizes his will even in its passivity and suggests its ultimate destructiveness. Nevertheless, the harshness of Jupiter, just as in the *Georgics*,[824] seems to be in the *Aeneid* more a fact of life, than a model of leadership. Rather, I believe, Vergil problematizes the stability of good leadership, presenting it as determined by the ethical disposition of the leader, which circumstances can alter. For Vergil the Phaedran charioteer of the soul, is an apt political image.[825]

The *Aeneid*'s model of state is monarchical, from Cicero's perspective a good form of government, but one that, "even if there is a senate," "even if the people possess some power," is most liable to change because the vice of one man can overthrow it, can turn it toward destruction (*Rep*. 2. 43), his chief example being Tarquinius Superbus.[826] I have argued (Ch. 6, pp. 329-32) that the term *tyrannus* in the *Aeneid* always conveys negative connotations because it either accurately describes a heinous, unrestrained king such as Mezentius or sends an alert that the tyrannical potential lurks even in the best of

---

[824] *Geo*. 1. 121-35 establishes the theme of the harshness of life under the age of Jupiter (*pater ipse colendi/ haud facilem esse viam voluit*, 121-22). Thomas (2004/05), 123, argues that the premise of the *Georgics* is the transition from the age of Saturn to that of Jupiter, the age of the farmers' struggles. In his opinion the second half of the *Aeneid* actually demonstrates the supplanting of the age of Saturn, still in place when the Trojans arrive, by the age of Jupiter whose agents are Aeneas and the Trojans.

[825] Fowler (1997a), 34, remarks on the tendency in the *Aeneid* for the passions to be jointly opposed to reason, "which attempts constantly to control them. This binary opposition within the soul between reason and emotional disturbance is consonsnt with the wider ideology of the *Aeneid*, with its stress on the imposition of order in the state and world through forceful action." This is a generally similar representation of the struggle within the soul that the charioteer and horses of the *Phaedrus* portrays and both conceptions show the effort to contain the emotional part of the soul as an ongoing process. Note too the connection Fowler implies between the individual soul and the state.

[826] "Do you not see, therefore, how a king was transformed into a despot, and how a good form of government was change into the worst possible form through the fault of one man? For here we have a master of the people, whom the Greeks call a tyrant" (*hic est enim dominus populi, quem Graeci tyrannum vocant*, 2. 47).

kings. The terms *rex* and *tyrannus* are not interchangeable (nor are the poltical image of charioteer and helmsman), but their joint use for the same individual (Latinus, Aeneas) expresses the tyrannical potential that threatens the soul of any king and is finally fully manifested in Aeneas in several scenes at the end. The ending of the *Aeneid* leaves the future of Aeneas' rule absolutely unresolved, but threatens the worst (the complete impossibility of emotional control, Fowler, 1997a, 34), both for Aeneas and for Augustus, the most important helmsman in the epic.

The privileged emblem of leadership in the *Aeneid* is that of the good helmsman as developed in the ship race in book 5, especially in the speech of Mnestheus, which engages with one of Aeneas' most famous speeches to his crew on the coast of North Africa. Both speeches build a sense of community on the basis of past challenges overcome together and a shared vision for the future of a renewed community. The speakers use these as grounds for encouragement in the present challenging situation as well as the knowledge that the gods and fate hold out a bright future. This model of leadership that demonstrates a concern for followers as a community and their well-being suggests a symbolic level of meaning analogous to Cicero's development of the ship of state image. When Aeneas assumes the helm at the end of book 5 these positive political connotations adhere to his ship and further divine and state-sanctioned affiliations accrue to his final helmsmanship as he approaches the battle in Latium in book 10, but the darkening of even its climactic moment with Achillean flames adds some level of doubt as to the stability of these lofty associations that Aeneas' ensuing rage-inspired *aristeia* intensifies.

The subsequent crowding of the epic's concluding scenes with overt negative charioteer imagery combines with the abrupt ending to overwhelm thoughts of the previous helmsman in a way that seems to foreshadow the state of affairs in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, which presents the death of the Roman Republic and the rise of the Empire through a distinctive recounting of the historical civil war fought by the leaders Caesar and Pompey. Continuing in the tradition of Aeschylus' *Septem* and the *Aeneid*'s use of the interacting helmsman and charioteer in an internecine war, Lucan associates Pompey, the leader of the Republican forces with the helmsman and the future tyrant Caesar with the charioteer in scenes which overtly allude to quintessential scenes of Aeneas' helmsmanship and Turnus' charioteering so as to

suggest the unhappy next stage in the development of these leadership images. Pompey before his speech at the battle of Pharsalia is described as a helmsman (7. 85), but immediately afterwards he has already become, like the Labdacids, the ignominious burden of the ship (*ignavum…puppis onus*, 7. 126-27),[827] foreshadowing his disasterous end, but also the Republic's. Julius Caesar, "burning with desire for a royal throne," (7. 240), like Turnus in the midst of battle, is compared to Mars rousing the men of Bistonia to war as he lashes his horses with a savage whip (*verbere saevo*, 7. 569). The god's two acts in Caesar's exploits are collapsed into one as he goads (*Caesar…stimulusque furorum*, 557) his (equine) troops into savage war; a leader reduced to the instrument of control he wields over his figurative beasts, the paradigm of tyrantical rule that was realized in some of the Julio-Claudian emperors.[828] Whatever equivocal sense of hope the dueling political images of helmsman and charioteer in the *Aeneid* offer on the threshold of the empire for a resurgence of the ideal Republican leader's protection of the community in Augustus' new regime, Lucan's allusions to Vergil's epic suggest, were ill-founded.[829]

---

[827] Dilke (1960), 126, translates *ignavum* as "useless", noting that it is "properly inactive (*in-gnavus*), however, Duff's translation (used here) would be in keeping with the Aeschylean precedent of the morality of the Labdacids ("prosperity grown too fat") being the cause of their rejection from the ship of state ("leads to the cargo being thrown overboard from the stern" *Septem,* 768-71). Johnson (1987), 77-78, comments, "The *victus navita* is a shameful burden...on his own ship, now hastening to its destruction."

[828] While Caesar perhaps moves farther in savagery in his likening to Mar's whip beyond that expressed in Turnus' comparison to Mars (12. 331-36), Pompey, in an allusion to the scene of Aeneas as helmsman with Pallas sailing toward battle (10. 159-62), in a similar night scene but after his defeat, is disempowered into the role of Pallas asking the (here nameless) helmsman (*rectorem*) about the stars (8. 165-70).

[829] Lucan was numbered among Nero's intimates, but a rupture occurred between them for unclear reasons. It is possible "that Nero did not look with favor upon those ideas expressed in Lucan's poem that were too clearly marked with a nostalgic republicanism" (Conte, 1994, 440). Lucan subsequently joined the conspiracy of Piso and received an order to take his own life after the plot was discovered. He was not yet twenty-six at the time of his death.

References

Primary Sources

Anon. 1954/1981. *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Trans. H. Caplan. Cambridge, MA.

Aeschylus. 2008. *Persians. Seven Against Thebes. Suppliants. Prometheus Bound.* Trans. A. H. Sommerstein. Cambridge, MA.

———. 2009. *Oresteia: Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers. Eumenides.* Trans. A. H. Sommerstein. Cambridge, MA.

Apollonios Rhodios. 1997. *The Argonautika*. Trans. P. Green. Berkeley.

Demosthenes. 1926/1963. *De Corona. De Falsa Legatione.* Trans. G.A. Vince. Cambridge, MA.

Homer. 1999. *Iliad.* Trans. A. T. Murray and W. F. Wyatt. Cambridge, MA.

———. 1965/1991. *The Odyssey of Homer.* Trans. R. Lattimore. New York.

Lucan. 1997. *Lucan, The Civil War* (*Pharsalia*)*.* Trans. J. D. Duff. Cambridge, MA.

———. 1993. *Lucan, Pharsalia.* Trans. J. W. Joyce. Ithaca, NY.

Pindar. 1976. *The Odes of Pindar.* Trans. R. A. Lattimore. Chicago.

Plato. 1925/1962. *The Statesman. Philebus.* Trans. H. N. Fowler. Cambridge, MA.

———. 1966. *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Eptistles.* Trans. R. G. Bury. Cambridge, MA.

———. 1914/1999. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. Trans. H. N. Fowler. Cambridge, MA.

———. 2003. *Phaedrus.* Trans. and ed. S. Scully. Newburyport, MA.

———. 2004. *Republic*. Trans. C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis, ID.

Plutarch. 1959. *Plutarch's Lives.* Trans. B. Perrin. Cambridge, MA.

Other Works

Adams, J., and D. A. Rees, eds. 1902/1963. *The Republic of Plato. Books I-V.* Vol. 1, 2nd ed. New York.

Alföldi, A. 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins.* Ann Arbor, MI.

Amis, E. 1986. *Psychagogia* in Plato's *Phaedrus*. *ICS* 11: 153-72.

Anderson, W. S. 1966. Horace *Carm.* 1. 14: What Kind of Ship? *CPh* 61:84-98.

———, ed. 1999. *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations*. Wauconda, IL

Austin, R. G., ed. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos, liber primus.* Oxford.

———. ed. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos, liber sextus.* Oxford.

Bacon, H. H. 1964. The Shield of Eteocles. *Arion* 3:27-38.

Balot, R. K. 1998. Pindar, Virgil, and the Proem to *Georgic* 3. *Phoenix* 52:83-94.

Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets.* Trans. and ed. M. Fox and S. Marchesi. London.

Bayet, J. 1941. L'*Omen* du cheval à Carthage: Timée, Virgile et le monnayage Punique. *REL* 19:166-90.

Beard, M. 2007. *The Roman Triumph.* Cambridge, MA.

Beard, M., J. A. North, and S. R. F. Price, eds. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge.

Belfiore, E. 2006. The Myth of the Chariot in Plato's *Phaedrus. AJPh* 127:185-217.

Benario, H. W. 1978. Vergil and the River Tiber. *Vergilius* 24:4-14.

Bernard, J. D., ed. 1986. *Vergil at 2000:Commemorative Essays on the Poet and his Influence.* New York.

Bieber, M. 1968. *The Statue of Cybele in the J. Paul Getty Museum.* Malibu, CA.

Bleisch, P. 2003. *The* Regia *of Picus*: Ekphrasis, Italian Identity, and Artistic Definition in *Aeneid* 7. In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 88-109. Afton, MN.

Blok, J. 1995. *The Early Amazons: Modern and Ancient Perceptions on a Persistent Myth.* Leiden.

Booth, J., ed. 2007. *Cicero on the Attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond*. Swansea.

Bowra, C. M. 1990. Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal. In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid, ed. S. Harrison, 362-77. Oxford.

Boyd, B. W. 1992. Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7. 803-17). *AJPh* 113:213-34.

Bramble, J. C., M. Whitby, P. R. Hardie, and M. Whitby, eds. 1987. *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble.* Oak Park, IL.

Braund, S. M. and C. Gill, eds. 1997. *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*. Cambridge.

Breen, C. C. 1986. The Shield of Turnus, the Swordbelt of Pallas, and the Wolf. *Aeneid* 7. 798-92, 9. 59-66, 10. 497-99. *Vergilius* 36:63-71.

Brenk, F. E. 1984. *Unum pro multis caput.* Myth, History and Symbolic Imagery in Vergil's Palinurus Incident. *Latomus* 43:776-801.

Briggs, W. W. 1975. Augustan Athletics and the Games of *Aeneid* V. *Stadion* 1:267-83.

———. 1980. *Narrative and Simile from the* Georgics in the *Aeneid.* Leiden.

Brock, R. 2013. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London.

Burian, P., ed. 1985. *Directions in Euripidean Criticism: A Collection of Essays*. Durham, NC.

Cairns, D., ed. 2013. *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought.* Swansea.

Cairns, F. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. New York.

Cameron, H. D. 1971. *On the* Seven Against Thebes *by Aeschylus.* The Hague.

Campbell, D. A., ed. 1967. *A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry.* New York.

Camps, W. A. 1969. *An Introduction to Virgil's* Aeneid. London.

Casson, L. 1994. *Ships and Seafaring in Ancient Times.* Austin, TX.

Chaplin, J. D., and C. S. Kraus. 2009. *Livy.* Oxford

Christenson, D. 2002. *Superbia* in Vergil's *Aeneid*: Who is haughty and who is not? *Scholia* 11:44-54.

Clay, D. 1988. The Archaeology of the Temple of Juno in Carthage (*Aen.* 1. 446-93). *CPh* 83:195-205.

Clay, J. S. 1974, *Demas* and *Aude*: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer. *Hermes* 102:129-36.

———. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey. Princeton.

Commager, S. 1962/1995. *The Odes of Horace; A Critical Study*. Norman, OK.

Cook, E. F. 1995. *The* Odyssey *in Athens.* Ithaca, NY.

Cooley, A. ed. 2009. Res Gestae Divi Augusti: *Text, Translation, and Commentary.* New York.

Conington, J., and H. Nettleship, eds. 1883-84. *P. Vergili Maronis opera.* 4th ed. 3 vols. London.

Connolly, J. 2007. *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome.* Princeton.

———. 2010. Figuring the Founder: Vergil and the Challenge of Autocracy. In *A Companion to Vergil's* Aeneid *and its Tradition*, ed. J. Farrell and M. C. J. Putnam, 404-18. Walden, MA.

Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and other Latin Poets.* Ed. C. Segal. Ithaca, NY.

———. 1994. *Latin Literature*: *A History*. Trans. J. B. Solodow. Baltimore, MD.

Copeland, R. and P. T. Struck, eds. 2010. *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory.* Cambridge.

Corbeill, A. 2008. *O singulari Prodigium:* Ciceronian Invective as Religious Expiation. In *Cicero's* Philippics: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology.* ed. T. Stevenson and M. Wilson. 240-54. Auckland, NZ.

Cotterell, A. 2004. *Chariot: From Chariot to Tank*, *the Astounding Rise and Fall of the World's First War Machine.* Woodstock, NY.

Courtney, E. 1988. Vergil's Military Catalogues and their Antecedents. *Vergilius* 34:3-8.

Crouwel, J. H. 2012. *Chariots and Other Wheeled Vehicles in Italy before the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Dawson, C. M. 1970. *The Seven Against Thebes by Aeschylus.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

DeGraff, T. B. 1940. Plato in Cicero. *CPh* 35:143-53.

Degrassi, A. 1954. *Fasti Capitolini.* Turin.

Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* Trans. J. Lloyd. Atlantic Highlands, NJ.

Dewald, C. 2003. Form and Content: The Question of Tyranny in Herodotus. In *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece*, ed. K. A. Morgan, 25-58. Austin, TX.

Dewar, M. 1988. Octavian and Orestes in the Finale of the First *Georgic*. *CQ* 38:563-65.

———. 1990. Octavian and Orestes Again. *CQ* 40:580-82.

Dilke, O. A. W., ed. 1965. *De bello civili: liber VII.* Cambridge.

Dinter, M. 2005. Epic and Epigram: Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid. CQ* 55:153-69.

Dougherty, C., and L. Kurke, eds. 1993. *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics.* New York.

Dowden, K. 1997. The Amazons: Development and Functions. *RhM* 140:97-128.

Dunkle, J. R. 1967. The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic. *TAPhA* 98:151-71.

———. 1971. The Rhetorical Tyrant in Roman Historiography. Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. *CW* 65:12-20.

———. 2005. Games and Transition: *Aeneid* 3 and 5. *CW* 98:153-78.

Dyer, R. R. 1995. Cicero at Caieta in Vergil's *Aeneid. Latomus* 54: 290-97.

Dyson, J. 2001. *King of the Wood*: *The Sacrificial Victim in Virgil's* Aeneid. Norman, OK.

Dyson, M. 1990. Palinurus and his Rudder: Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.858-9. *Antichthon* 24:70-78.

Dyck, A. R. 2004. Cicero's *devotio:* The Rôles of *dux* and Scape-goat in his *Post Reditum* Rhetoric. *HSPh* 102:299-314.

Earl, D. C. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge.

Egon, R. 2012. *Insignes Pietate et Armis*: The Two Camilli of the *Aeneid*. *Vergilius* 58:21-52.

Euben, J. P., ed. 1986. *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory.* Berkeley.

Fantham, E. 1972. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery.* Toronto.

———. 1990. *Nymphas…e navibus esse*: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in *Aeneid* 9.77-122 and 10. 215-59. *CPh* 85:102-19.

———. 1999. Fighting Words: Turnus at Bay in the Latin Council (*Aeneid* 11. 234-446). *AJPh* 120:259-80.

———. 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero's* De oratore. New York.

Farrell, J. 1991. *Vergil's* Georgics *and the Tradition of Ancient Epic*: *The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York.

———.1997. The Virgilian Intertext. In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale, 222-38. Cambridge.

Feldherr, A. 1995. *Aeneid* 5 and Augustan Circus Spectacle. *ClAnt* 14:245-65.

Feeney, D. 1983. The Taciturnity of Aeneas. *CQ* 33:204-19.

———. 1984. The Reconciliations of Juno. *CQ* 34:179-94.

———. 1986. History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld. *PCPhS* 32:1-24.

———. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition.* New York.

Ferenczi, A. 2000. The End of Latinus' World: The Wild Olive Episode of the *Aeneid* (12. 766-790). *AAntHung* 40:93-100.

Fernández-Galiano, M., J. Russo, and A. Heubeck, eds. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Books XVII-XXIV*. Oxford.

Ferrari, G. R. F. 1987. *Listening to the Cicadas: A Study of Plato's* Phaedrus. New York.

Fisher, N. R. E. 1993. *Slavery in Classical Greece.* London.

Fordyce, C. J., ed. 1977. *Virgil, Aeneid VII-VIII.* London.

Fowler, B. H. 1970. The Imagery of the *Seven Against Thebes. SO* 45:24-37.

Fowler, D. 1990. Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*. *PCPhS* 36:42-63.

———. 1997a. Epicurean Anger. In *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. S. M. Braund and C. Gill, 16-35. Cambridge.

———. 1997b. On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies. *MD* 39:13-34.

———. 1997c. Virgilian Narrative: Story-telling. In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale, 259-70. Cambridge.

Gale, M. 1997. The Shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7. 783-92). *G&R* 44:176-96.

———. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics*, Lucretius, and the Didactic Tradition.* Cambridge and New York.

———. ed. 2009. *De rerum natura. V*. Oxford.

Galinsky, K. 1988. The Anger of Aeneas. *AJPh* 109:321-48.

———. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction.* Princeton, NJ

———. 2008. Review of *Aeneas Dux in Vergil's* Aeneis. *Eine literarische Fiktion in augusteischer Zeit*, by Markus Schauer. *BMRC* 06.29. http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2008/2008-06-29.html.

———. 2012. *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor.* Cambridge.

Ganiban, R. T. 2007. *Statius and Virgil: The* Thebaid *and the Reinterpretation of the* Aeneid. Cambridge.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources.* Baltimore, MD.

Garvie, A. F., ed. 1986. *Aeschylus, Choephori*. Oxford.

Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the* Forum Augustum*.* Leiden.

Gill, C. 2004. Character and Passion in Virgil's *Aeneid*. *PVS* 25:111-24.

Gjerstad, E. 1960. *Early Rome 3, Fortifications, Domestic Architecture, Sanctuaries, Stratigraphic Excavations*. Lund.

Goff, B. E. 1990. *The Noose of Words: Readings of Desire, Violence, and Language in Euripides'* Hippolytus. New York.

Gowing, A. M. 1992. *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio.* Ann Arbor.

Gransden, K. W. ed. 1976. *Aeneid, Book VIII*. Cambridge.

Graver, M., ed. 2002. *Cicero on the Emotions:* Tusculan Disputations *3 and 4.* Chicago.

Green, C. M. C. 2007. *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia.* New York.

Gross, N. 2003-04. Mantles Woven of Gold: Pallas' Shroud and the End of the *Aeneid. CJ* 99:135-56.

Habinek, T. N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome.* Princeton, NJ.

Hainsworth, B., ed. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 9-12*. Cambridge.

Halleran, M. R., ed. 1995. *Euripides, Hippolytus.* Warminster.

Hardie, P. R. 1986. *Virgil's* Aeneid: *Cosmos and Imperium.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1987. Ships and Ship-names in the *Aeneid.* In *Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. J. C. Bramble, M. Whitby, P. R. Hardie, and M. Whitby, 163-71. Oak Park, IL.

———. 1991. The *Aeneid* and the *Oresteia. PVS* 20:29-45.

———. 1992. Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome. In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus.* ed. A. Powell, 59-82. Bristol.

———. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition.* Cambridge.

———, ed. 1994. *Virgil, Aeneid. Book IX.* Cambridge.

———. 1998. Fame and Defamation in the *Aeneid.* In *Vergil's* Aeneid: *Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.-P. Stahl and E. Fantham, 243-70. London.

Harrison, S. 1985. Vergilian Similes: Some Connections. *PLLS* 5:99-107.

———, ed. 1990. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

———, ed. 1991. *Virgil, Aeneid 10*. Oxford.

Heinze, R. 1903/1993. *Vergil's Epic Technique.* Trans. H. Harvey, D. Harvey and F. Robertson. 2nd ed. London.

Hejduk=Dyson, J. 2009. Jupiter's *Aeneid*: *Fama* and *Imperium*. *ClAnt* 28:279-327.

Helbig, W. 1903. Le currus du roi romain. In *Mélanges Perrot*; *recueil de mémoires concernant l'archéologie classique, la littérature et l'histoire anciennes, dedié à Georges Perrot.* ed. G. Perrot. 167-71. Paris.

Hellegouarc'h, J. 1972. *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*. 2nd ed. Paris.

Herrmann, F.-G. 2013. Eteocles' Decision in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes.* In *Tragey and Archaic Greek Thought*, ed. D. Cairns, 39-80. Swansea.

Hickson, V. F. 1991. Augustus *Triumphator*: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus. *Latomus* 50:124-38.

Highet, G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton.

Himmelhoch, L. R. 1997. The Charioteer: Representations of Power in Greek Literature. PhD diss., Univ. of Texas, Austin.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry.* Cambridge.

Hornsby, R. A. 1970. *Patterns of Action in the* Aeneid: *An Interpretation of Vergil's Epic Similes*. Iowa City, IA.

Horsfall, N. 1974. *Turnus ad portas. Latomus* 33:80-86.

———. 1988. Camilla, o i limiti dell'invenzione. *Athenaeum* 66:31-51.

———. 1989. Aeneas the Colonist. *Vergilius* 35:8-27.

———, ed. 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* Leiden.

———, ed. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary.* Leiden.

———, ed. 2003. *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary.* Leiden.

———, ed. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary.* Leiden.

Hunter, R. L., ed. *Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica Book 3.* Cambridge.

———. 2012. *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*. Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G. O., 1985. *Aeschylus, Septem Contra Thebas.* Oxford.

Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible. A Study of Vergil's* Aeneid. Berkeley.

———. 1986. The Figure of Laertes: Reflections on the Character of Aeneas. In *Vergil at 2000: Commemorative Essays on the Poet and his Influence,* ed. J. D. Bernard, 85-105. New York.

———. 1987. *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and his Heroes.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

Johnston, P. A. 1981. The Storm in *Aeneid* VII. *Vergilius* 27:23-30.

———. 2006. Turnus, Horses, and *Libertas. Vergilius* 52:20-31.

Johnston, S. I. 1992. Xanthus, Hera and the Erinyes: *Iliad* 19. 400-418. *TAPhA* 122:85-98.

Jones, J. W. 1970. The Trojan Horse. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes. CJ* 65:241-47.

Kaster, R. A., ed. 2006. *Marcus Tullius Cicero, Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius.* Oxford.

Keith, A. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic.* Cambridge.

Kennedy, G. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton, NJ.

Keyt, D. 2006. Plato and the Ship of State. In *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's* Republic. ed. G. X. Santas. 189-213. Malden, MA.

Kraut, R., ed. 1992. *The Cambridge Companion to Plato.* Cambridge.

Kurke, L. 1993. The Economy of *Kudos.* In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke. 131-63. New York.

Lavan, M. 2013. *Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.

Lawrence, A. W. 1983. *Greek Architecture.* 4th ed. New York.

Lawrence, S. E. 2006-2007. Eteocles' Moral Awareness in Aeschylus' *Seven. CW* 100:335-53.

Leigh, M. 1993. Hopelessly Devoted to You: Traces of the Decii in Virgil's *Aeneid. PVS* 27:89-110.

Levitan, W. 1993. Give up the Beginning? Juno's Mindful Wrath (*Aeneid* 1. 37). *LCM* 18:14.

Lloyd, M., ed. 2007. *Aeschylus.* New York.

Lloyd, R. B. 1972. *Superbus* in the *Aeneid. AJPh* 93:125-32.

Long, A. A. 1995. Cicero's Plato and Aristotle. In *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. J. G. F. Powell, 37-61. Oxford.

Lowenstam, S. 1993. The Pictures on Juno's Temple in the *Aeneid. CW* 87:37-49.

Lowrie, M. 2010. Vergil and Founding Violence. In *A Companion to Vergil's* Aeneid *and its Tradition*, ed. J. Farrell and M. C. J. Putnam, 391-403. Malden, MA.

Luce, T. J. 2009. The Dating of Livy's First Decade. In *Livy*, ed. J. D. Chaplin and C. S. Kraus, 17-48. Oxford.

Lucretius, 1975. *De rerum natura*. Trans. W. H. D. Rouse and M. F. Smith. Cambridge, MA.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1974. *Scilicet et tempus veniet*...Virgil, *Georgics* 1. 463-514. In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, ed. J. Woodman and D. A. West, 47-66. London.

————. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mackie, C. J. 1991. Turnus and his Ancestors. *CQ* 41:261-65.

Magrath, W. T. 1982. Progression of the Lion Simile in the *Odyssey*. *CJ* 77:205-12.

Mankin, D. ed. 1995. *Horace, Epodes*. Cambridge.

Martindale, C. 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil.* Cambridge.

Martino, J. 2008. Single Combat and the *Aeneid*. *Arethusa* 41:411-44.

Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile. New York.

May, J. M. 1980. The Image of the Ship of State in Cicero's *Pro Sestio*: *Maia* 32:259-64.

McDonnell, M. A. 2006. *Roman Manliness:* Virtus *and the Roman Republic.* New York.

McKay, A. G. 1998. *Non enarrabile textum?* The Shield of Aeneas and the Triple Triumph of 29 BC. In *Vergil's* Aeneid: *Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.-P. Stahl and E. Fantham, 199-221. London.

Miller, J. F. 2000. *Triumphus in Palatino. AJPh* 121:409-22.

———. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.

Mitchell-Boyask, R. 1999. Euripides' *Hippolytus* and the Trials of Manhood (the *Ephebia*?). In *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society*, ed. M. W. Padilla. 42-66. Lewisburg, PA.

Morgan, K. A. 2003. *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece*, Austin, TX.

Moorton, R. 1988. The Genealogy of Latinus in Vergil's *Aeneid*. *TAPhA* 118:253-59.

Moskalew, W. 1982. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the* Aeneid. Leiden.

Muse, K. 2007. Sergestus and Tarchon in the *Aeneid. CQ* 57:586-605.

Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1994. *Virgil, Georgics.* Oxford.

Nappa, C. 2005. *Reading after Actium: Vergil's* Georgics, *Octavian, and Rome.* Ann Arbor, MI.

Nauta, R. 2005. Catullus 63 in a Roman Context. In *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, ed. R. Nauta and A. Harder. 87-119. Leiden.

———, ed. and A. Harder. 2005. *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*. Leiden.

Nelis, D. 2001. *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the* Argonautica *of Apollonius of Rhodes.* Leeds.

Nicoll, W. S. M. 1985. Chasing Chimaeras. *CQ* 35:134-39.

———. 1988. The Sacrifice of Palinurus. *CQ* 38:459-72.

Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard, eds. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I.* Oxford.

Noonan, J. D. 2007. *Sum Pius Aeneas*: Aeneas and the Leader as *conservator/σωτήρ.CB* 83:65-91.

Oakley, S. P., ed. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*. Oxford.

Obbink, D. 2010. Early Greek Allegory. In *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory*, ed. R. Copeland and P. T. Struck, 15-25. Cambridge.

O'Brien, J. V. 1993. *The Transformations of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the* Iliad. Lanham, MD.

Oglivie, R. M. 1985. *A Commentary on Livy Bks. 1-5.* Oxford.

O'Hara, J. J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton, NJ.

———. 1994. They Might be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil's War in Italy. *CIQ* 30:206-26.

Ostenfeld, E. N. 1992. Self-Motion, Tripartition and Embodiment. In *Understanding the* Phaedrus: *Proceedings of the II Symposium Platonicum.* ed. L. Rossetti. 324-28. Sankt Augustin.

Otis, B. 1962/1995. *Virgil, a Study in Civilized Poetry.* Normon, OK.

Padel, R. 1995. *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness.* Princeton, NJ.

Padilla, M. W., ed. 1999. *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society.* Lewisburg, PA.

Paschalis, M. 1997. *Virgil's* Aeneid: *Semantic Relations and Proper Names.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Perkell, C., ed. 1999. *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid: *An Interpretive Guide.* Norman, OK.

———. 1999. *Aeneid* 1: An Epic Programme. In *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid: *An Interpretive Guide.* ed. C. Perkell. 29-49. Norman, OK.

Perrot, G., ed. 1903. *Mélanges Perrot; recueil de mémoires concernant l'archéologie classique, la littérature et l'histoire anciennes, dedié à Georges Perrot.* Paris.

Podlecki, A. J. 1986. *Polis* and Monarchy in Early Attic Tragedy. In *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory.* ed. J. P. Euben. 76-100. Berkeley.

Pogorzelski, R. G. 2009. The "Reassurance of Fratricide" in the *Aeneid*. *AJPh* 130: 261-89.

Pomathios, J.-L. 1987. *Le pouvoir politique et sa représentation dans l'Énéide de Virgile.* Brussells.

Pöschl, V. 1962. *The Art of Vergil:Image and Symbol in the* Aeneid. Ann Arbor, MI.

Powell, J. G. F., ed. 1995. *Cicero the Philosopher.* Oxford.

———. 2007. Invective and the Orator: Ciceronian Theory and Practice. In *Cicero on the Attack: Invective and Subversion in the Orations and Beyond,* ed. J. Booth, 1-23. Swansea.

Powell, A. ed. 1992. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus.* Bristol.

———. 2002. "An island amid the Flame": The Strategy of Sextus Pompeius, 43-36 B. C. In *Sextus Pompeius*, ed. A. Powell, K. Welch, and A. M. Gowing, 103-33. London.

Powell, A., K. Welch, and A. M. Gowing, eds. 2002. *Sextus Pompeius.* London.

Putnam, M. C. J. 1962. Unity and Design in *Aeneid* V. *HSCPh* 66:205-39.

———. 1965. *The Poetry of the* Aeneid: *Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design.* Cambridge, MA.

———. 1970. *Aeneid* VII and the *Aeneid. AJPh* 91:408-30.

———. 1992. Umbro, Nireus and Love's Threnody. *Vergilius* 38:12-23.

———. 1995. *Virgil's* Aeneid: *Interpretation and Influence.* Chapel Hill, NC.

———. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the* Aeneid. New Haven, CT.

———. 1999. *Aeneid* 12: Unity in Closure. In *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid: *An Interpretive Guide*, ed. C. Perkell, 210-30. Norman, OK.

———. 2011. *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil's* Aeneid. Amsterdam.

Quint, D. 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton.* Princeton, NJ.

Rader, R. 2011. Aeschylus in the Classroom, on Stage and Beyond: Rethinking a Paradigm. *CJ* 106:465-82.

Ramsey, J. T., ed. 2003. *Cicero, Philippics I-II.* Cambridge.

Reckford, K. J. 1961. Latent Tragedy in *Aeneid* VII, 1-285. *AJPh* 82:252-69.

Reed, J. D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the* Aeneid. Princeton.

Richards, I. A. 136/1965. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York.

Richardson, N. J., ed. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 21-24.* Cambridge.

Roisman, H. 1988. Nestor's Advice and Antilochus' Tactics. *Phoenix* 42:114-20.

Roller, L. E. 1999. *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele.* Berkeley.

Rosivach, V. J. 1980. Latinus' Genealogy and the Palace of Picus (*Aeneid* 7. 45-9, 170-91). *CQ* 30:140-52

Rossetti, L., ed. 1992. *Understanding the* Phaedrus: *Proceedings of the II Symposium Platonicum.* Sankt Augustin.

Rossi, A. 2004. *Contexts of War: Manipulations of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative*. Ann Arbor, MI.

Rowe, C. J., ed. 1986. *Phaedrus.* Wiltshire.

Sammons, B. 2010. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue.* Oxford.

Santas, G. X., ed. 2006. *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic.* Malden, MA.

Schauer, M. 2007. *Aeneas Dux in Vergil's* Aeneis. *Eine literarische Fiktion in augusteischer Zeit.* Munich.

Schein, S., ed. 1996. *Reading the* Odyssey; *Selected Interpretive Essays.* Princeton.

Schell, K. C. 2009. Vergil's Self-Referential Simile: Thematic Construction through Internal Allusion in the *Aeneid*. PhD diss., Brown University.

Schofield, M. 1995. Cicero's Definition of *Res Publica.* In *Cicero the Philosopher.* ed. J. G. F. Powell. 63-83. Oxford.

Scully, S., ed. 2003. *Plato's Phaedrus.* Newburyport, MA.

Seaford, R. 2003. Tragic Tyranny. In *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece,* ed. K. A. Morgan, 95-115. Austin, TX.

Segal, C. 1965. The Tragedy of Hippolytus. The Waters of the Ocean and the Untouched Meadow. *HSCPh* 70:117-69.

———. 1968. Circean Temptations. Homer, Vergil, Ovid. *TAPhA* 99:419-42.

———. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the* Odyssey. Ithaca, NY.

Seneca. 1974. *The elder Seneca: Declamations.* Trans. M. Winterbottom. Cambridge, MA.

Silk, M. S. 1974. *Interaction in Poetic Imagery*. Cambridge.

Skutsch, O., ed. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius.* New York.

Slaveva-Griffin, S. 2003. Of Gods, Philosophers, and Charioteers: Content and Form in Parmenides' Proem and Plato's *Phaedrus. TAPhA* 133:227-53.

Spence, S. 1988. *Rhetorics of Reason and Desire: Vergil, Augustine, and the Troubadours.* Ithaca, NY.

———. 1991. Cinching the Text: The Danaids and the End of the *Aeneid. Vergilius* 37:11-19.

———. 1999. The Polyvalence of Pallas in the *Aeneid. Arethusa* 32:149-63.

———. 2002. Meta-textuality: The Boat-race as Turning Point in *Aeneid* 5. *NECJ* 29:69-81.

Stadter, P. A. 2009. The Structure of Livy's History. In *Livy*, ed. J. D. Chaplin and C. S. Kraus, 91-117. Oxford.

Stahl, H.-P. and E. Fantham, eds. 1998. *Vergil's* Aeneid: *Augustan Epic and Political Context.* London.

Stehle, E. 2005. Prayer and Curse in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes. CPh* 100:101-22.

Stevenson, T. 2008. Tyrants, Kings and Fathers in the *Philippics.* In *Cicero's* Philippics: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, ed. T. Stevenson and M. Wilson, 95-113. Auckland, NZ.

Stevenson, T. and M. Wilson, eds. 2008. *Cicero's* Philippics: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology.* Auckland, NZ.

Sumi, G. S. 2005. *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire.* Ann Arbor, MI.

Syme, R. 1939/1960. *The Roman Revolution.* New York.

Tarrant, R., ed. 2012. *Virgil, Aeneid XII*. Cambridge.

Thalmann, W. G. 1978. *Dramatic Art in Aeschylus'* Seven Against Thebes. New Haven, CT.

Theognis. 1961. *Elegy and Iambus*. Trans. J. M. Edmonds. Cambridge, MA.

Thibodeau, P. and H. Haskell, eds. 2003. *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday.* Afton, MN.

Thomas, R. F. 1983. Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces. *HSCPh* 87:175-84.

———, ed. 1988a. *Virgil, Georgics Books I-II.* Cambridge.

———, ed. 1988b. *Virgil, Georgics Books III-IV*. Cambridge.

———. 1988c. Tree Violation and Ambivalence in Virgil. *TAPhA* 118:261-73.

———. 1998. The Isolation of Turnus: *Aeneid* Book 12. In *Vergil's* Aeneid: *Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.-P. Stahl and E. Fantham, 271-302. London.

———. 2004/05. Torn between Jupiter and Saturn: Ideology, Rhetoric and Culture Wars in the *Aeneid*. *CJ* 100:121-47.

Thomson Vessey, D. W. 1999. *Pyrrha's Grotto and the Farewell to Love: A Study of Horace* Odes 1. 5. In *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations,* ed. W. S. Anderson, 20-30. Wauconda, IL.

Thornton, A. 1976. *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's* Aeneid. Lugduni Batavorum.

Torrance, I. 2007. *Aeschylus: Seven Against Thebes.* London.

Tucker, T. G., ed. 1908. *Aeschylus, The Seven Against Thebes*. Cambridge.

Tueller, M. A. 2010. Palinurus and Polydorus: Two Epigrammatic Passages in Vergil's *Aeneid. Latomus* 69:344-58.

Tyrrell, W. B. 1984. *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking.* Baltimore.

Versnel, H. S. 1970. Triumphus; *An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986. *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World.* Baltimore, MD.

———. 1996. Land and Sacrifice in the *Odyssey*: A Study of Religious and Mythical Meanings. In *Reading the* Odyssey; *Selected Interpretive Essays.* ed. S. Schein. 33-53. Princeton, NJ.

Viparelli, V. 2008. Camilla: A Queen Undefeated, even in Death. *Vergilius* 54:9-23.

Von Fritz, K. 2007. The Character of Eteocles in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes.* In *Aeschylus*, ed. M. Lloyd, 141-73. New York.

Waterhouse, W. C. 1987. The Unnamed God of the Pyrrha Ode. *CW* 80:69-70.

West, S., A. Heubeck, and J. B. Hainsworth, eds. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Books I-VIII*. Oxford.

Wilhelm, R. M. 1982. The Plough-Chariot. Symbol of Order in the *Georgics. CJ* 77:213-30.

———. 1983. The Chariot-Ship. Vehicle of Augustan Ideology. *AugAge* 3:73-94.

———. 1988. Cybele: The Great Mother of Augustan Order. *Vergilius* 34:77-101.

Williams, M. F. 1993. Turnus, the Chimaera, and Aeetes: A Note on *Aeneid* 7. 785-88. *Vergilius* 39:31-36.

Williams, R. D., ed. 1960a. *Aeneidos. Liber Quintus.* Oxford.

———. 1960b. The Pictures on Dido's Temple. *CQ* 10:145-51.

———, ed. 1972-73. *The Aeneid: Virgil.* 2 vols. London.

———. 1979. *Virgil; The Eclogues and Georgics.* New York.

Wirszubski, C. 1954. Cicero's *cum dignitate otium:* A Reconsideration. *JRS* 44:1-13.

———. 1961. *Audaces.* A Study in Political Phraseology. *JRS* 51:12-22.

Wiseman, T. P. 2004. Cybele, Virgil and Augustus. In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus,* ed. T. Woodman and D. West. 117-28. New York.

Woodman, J. and D. A. West, eds. 1974. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. London.

Wright, M. R. 1997. *Ferox virtus*: Anger in Virgil's *Aeneid*. In *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. S. M. Braund and C. Gill, 169-84. Cambridge.

Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus.* Trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor, MI.

Zeitlin, F. 1965. An Analysis of *Aeneid* 12. 176-211. The Differences between the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus. *AJPh* 86:337-62.

———. 1982. *Under the Sign of the Shield: Semiotics and Aeschylus'* Seven Against Thebes. Rome.

———. 1985. The Power of Aphrodite: Eros and the Boundary of the Self in *Hippolytus.* In *Directions in Euripidean Criticism. A Collection of Essays.* ed. P. Burian. 53-208. Durham, NC.

Zetzel, J. E. G., ed. 1995. *Cicero,* De Re Publica: *Selections*. Cambridge.

———. 1996. Natural Law and Poetic Justice: A Carneadean Debate in Cicero and Virgil. *CPh* 91:297-319.

Appendix A

Chariots in the *Aeneid*

The exclusive use of the chariot on the Latin side in the war the Trojans fight in Italy was noted by Heinze (159) in 1903: "Virgil confines the chariot strictly to them (the Latin side)...," but his analysis of the expressive logic behind this fact, what this disparity signifies, ("presumably on the grounds that Aeneas and his followers will not have brought chariots across the sea with them"), is hastily dismissive of what amounts to a radical imbalance in the forces and yet, it has remained unchallenged. This is understandable on one level, since the war chariot plays a much smaller part in the *Aeneid* than in the *Iliad.* Yet, the pronounced concentration of the chariot in strategic books of the war narrative and with the protagonists of the epic (Turnus as charioteer and Aeneas as its adversary), suggests a more than casual significance in Vergil's use of this emblem of power. A consideration of the distribution of words for chariot across the books of the *Aeneid* makes more apparent some areas of radical concentration (See chart below).

The chariots of Neptune and Juno in the first half of the *Aeneid* are the expression of the epic's major polarities and are discussed in Chapter 3.[830] The goddess Cybele's chariot appears three times in the epic (3. 113, 6. 785, 10. 253), and it bears political significance, as is obvious from her comparison to the city of Rome (6. 784-87). In the second half of the epic Cybele's chariot, alone among the divinities, pulls the political weight. Aeneas' ship is decorated with her lions, who typically pull her civilizing chariot. Brought to Rome in the middle of the Second Punic war from Mt. Ida where Aeneas was born, she brought victory to Rome against Hannibal and was ever after a goddess of victory and the well-being of

[830] Aurora's chariot has surprising weight. Like other periods of the day or night and the heavenly bodies of the Sun and Moon, Dawn was a divinity who drives her horse-drawn chariot through the sky. While her chariot is specifically mentioned only three of the nineteen times that Dawn occurs in the *Aeneid* (6. 535, 7. 26, and 12. 76), no divinity's chariot occurs more often and every time Vergil verbally marks her chariot to suggest the future occurrence of war (a topic to be discussed at a later time).

the State. The full extent of the implications of both her chariot and her ships, Aeneas' ships, which she protects from the torches of Turnus, will be explored in Chapter 5.

The tremendous expansion of mortal charioteers in the second half of the *Aeneid,* of course, reflects the war, as does the appearance of Mars' chariot (8. 433, 12. 331). This higher frequency of chariot words in the second half (an average of 8 per book versus 3 in the first half) is highly concentrated in three books: 7 (9), 10, (15), and 12 (21), with books 8, 9, and 11 each having only 2 instances. The examples in each of the three high occurrence books have a predominant theme or association. In book 7, the programmatic book for the Iliadic half of the *Aeneid* and closely associated thematically with the first book, the primary programmatic book of the epic (Pöschl, 1962, 23; Otis, 1963, 229-30), chariots are associated with Latinus and his city and the Latin catalogue of troops (Discussed in Ch. 4). In book 10, 9 of the 15 occurrences involve Aeneas on foot dominating fighters in chariots (Chapter 5). Of the 21 instances of a chariot in book 12, Turnus' chariot is referred to 15 times (Chapter 7). As Heinze (160) notes, "the poet takes care that the picture of the king fighting from his chariot is firmly impressed on our minds: he makes this effect more powerful by restricting the use of chariots by others."

Thus, the chariots in the second half are not only restricted to one side in the war, but Turnus' chariot dominates among those (44% of the Latin chariots; 26% of all the chariots in the *Aeneid*). Given Juno/Hera's close association with Achilles and his chariot in the *Iliad* in the Trojan War as presented in the *Aeneid*, this almost excessive marking of Turnus as charioteer suggests more than logistical motivation behind its use. Likewise, the concentration of 9 chariot words in 25 lines of book 10 as Aeneas overcomes three young Latin warriors, alludes to Agamemnon's similar dominance over ephebic charioteers in the *Iliad*, but because of the concentration of chariot references in these few lines, Aeneas' dominance of the Latin charioteer seems more complete and worthy of investigation of possible greater significance.

Numerical Distribution of chariot words in the *Aeneid*

Book	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	D	*G*	D		S	Tr	*D*	D	L_T	D	L*	D
	D		S		S	**D**	L	**R**	L	*D*	S	**L**
	G				*D*	(**G**)	L			*L*		L^T
	Tr				D	Tr	L			L		L
	G					Tr	L			L^T		L^T
						D	L			L^T		L^T
						R	L			***L***^{A}		(D)
							L			L^A		G
							L			L^A		L^T
										L^A		L^T
										L^A		L^T
										L^A		L^T
										L^A		L^{TJ}
										L^A		L^{TJ}
										L^A		L^T
												L^T
												L
												L^{TJ}
												L^T
												L^T
												L^{TJ}
Total	5	1	2	0	4	7	9	2	2	15	2	21

* The chariot in Pallas' funeral procession is identified as Latin because it is a spoil of war.

All letters indicate a form of *currus* unless italicized (*bigae, biiugi*) or in bold (**quadrigae**)

		Total 1st ½	Total 2nd ½
D	Divinity	7	6
G	Greek	4	1
Tr	Trojan	4	0
R	Romans	1	1
S	Within a simile or omen	3	1
( )	Deduced from context	1	1
L	Latin		41
	L^A Latin charioteers defeated by Aeneas on foot		9
	L^T Turnus' chariot		18
	L^{TJ} Turnus' chariot with Juturna mentioned as driving		(4 of 18)
Total		19	50