for Syria with the sixth legion—his cavalry is not referred to (33). In describing the battle of Domitius against Pharnaces, the author neglects to mention the disposition of the Roman cavalry (38–9). There is no report of the cavalry action in the battle of Zela (75 ff.). The cavalry is neglected in the important evaluation of the troops by Caesar in Pontus (69).

The pattern, sometimes subtle, is unmistakable. Caesar and the subsequent authors of the civil wars, displaying traditional Roman neglect of the cavalry, at times overlook this arm in their reports of military actions. The cavalry was regarded as an unfortunate necessity generally posing more problems than the more disciplined, polished, and effectively trained legionary soldiers. The author of the de bello Hispaniensi reverses this pattern and provides detailed information about the cavalry and, more than this, is proud of its effectiveness in Spain. For this reason it seems logical to suggest that the author of the Spanish War was connected with the cavalry in a leadership capacity such as praefectus equitum.
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8. It is well-known (Holmes, Rom. Rep., p. 298) that the author of the Spanish War had an abysmal lack of knowledge about important aspects of the campaign (e.g. the purpose of certain operations). As praefectus equitum he would not have been an important member of Caesar's staff.

THE FUROR AND VIOLENTIA OF AENEAS

In this article I will discuss three episodes in lines 517 to 560 of book 10 of the Aeneid in order to support the view that the Aeneid is not an unqualified glorification of Aeneas and Rome, but is rather a painfully ambiguous epic in which, to quote R. A. Brooks, 'Aeneas never fully possessed either the light or the kingdom that is ordained for him.'

Furor and violentia are often said to be characteristic of Aeneas' opponents, especially Dido and Turnus, but no character in the Aeneid displays as much furor and violentia as Aeneas himself when he avenges Pallas' death in Aeneid 10, 513–604. His three most brutal acts are modelled on

3. Indeed, when Vergil sums up this passage in X. 604, he states that Aeneas was 'furens'.
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actions committed by Achilles in the twenty-first book of the *Iliad* when he is avenging Patroclus’ death. They are the taking of enemies alive to be a human sacrifice at Pallas’ pyre in lines 517–520 (modelled on *Iliad* 21, 27–32), the killing of Magus after he begs for his life in lines 524–534 (modelled on *Iliad* 21, 74–113), and the gloating over what will happen to the unburied corpse of Tarquitus in lines 557–560 (modelled on *Iliad* 21, 122–135). In all three, Vergil introduces changes which make the episode even more horrible and brutal than the Homeric model.

When Homer describes Achilles’ taking of captives to sacrifice at Patroclus’ funeral, he simply states (*Iliad* 21, 27–33) that Achilles took them out of the river in a dazed condition, tied their hands behind their backs and gave them to his companions to lead back to the ships. When he describes the actual human sacrifice (*Iliad* 23, 175–176), Homer, who usually provides vivid descriptions of all sorts of actions, certainly not excluding gory ones, states in a simple participial phrase, ‘killing with bronze twelve brave sons of the great-hearted Trojans.’ Vergil describes the actual capture of the men in 10, 517–518, and in 519 states Aeneas’ purpose: ‘that he might offer them as sacrifices to the dead.’ Then in 520 he adds the gruesome amplification not found in Homer, ‘that he (Aeneas) might soak the flames of the funeral pile with the blood of captives.’ As for Homer’s detail of tying the captives’ hands behind their backs, Vergil transfers it to the actual sacrifice where it helps to provide a much more vividly brutal effect than Homer’s simple, colourless participial phrase: (*Aeneid* 11, 81–82) ‘he (Aeneas) had tied their hands behind their backs, being about to sprinkle the flames with the blood of slaughtered men.’

The next incident in both *Aeneid* 10 and *Iliad* 21 is the killing of an enemy after he begs for mercy. But the enemy’s supplicating speech in Vergil is in no way modelled on Homer’s. Lycaon in *Iliad* 21, 74–96 delivers a rambling speech which advances two reasons why Achilles should not kill him. The first (*Iliad* 21, 75–76) is that he is ‘as good as a suppliant’ since he once dined with Achilles. The second (*Iliad* 21, 85–96) is that he is not a full brother of Hector. On the other hand, Magus’ speech in *Aeneid* 10, 524–529 centres on the fact that he has a great deal of wealth at home which can be paid as a ransom. This was the basis of the two speeches of this nature in the *Iliad* (6, 46–50 and 10, 378–381). But Magus also introduces his plea with an appeal that is not found in any of these passages in the *Iliad*, but which is the strongest imaginable appeal for a character in the *Aeneid*: (*Aeneid* 10, 524–525) ‘by the spirit of your father and the hope of rising Iulus, I beg that you save this life for my son and father.’ He ends his plea with another statement which is not found in any of the similar Homeric passages: (*Aeneid* 10, 528–529) ‘the victory of the Trojans does not depend on me nor will one life make such a big difference.’ This argument underscores how irrational and gratuitous the killing of Magus is.

---

4. All translations in this article are my own.
Aeneas’ answer to Magus resembles Achilles’ answer to Lycaon in that they both revolve around the assertion that mercy has been made impossible by the death of the man they are avenging. But except for that, they are completely different. Achilles’ rejection of Lycaon’s plea (Iliad 21, 99–113) is based partly on a desire for revenge, but mostly on his new outlook. Now that Patroclus is dead and he sees the certainty of his own death, he cannot understand why anyone, especially a lesser man like Lycaon, should cling to life with such intensity. But Aeneas in his fury simply throws Magus’ plea back at him: (Aeneid 10, 531–532) ‘As for the many talents of silver and gold of which you talk, save them for your sons’. Here we see the main effect of Vergil’s having made wealth the basis of Magus’ plea. It enables him to have Aeneas combine it with Magus’ mention of his son and throw both back at Magus at the same time. By doing this he demonstrates Aeneas’ callousness not only to monetary consideration but also to the bond between father and son, a relationship which is so important through most of the Aeneid.

The third episode in Aeneas’ revenge which is modelled on an incident in Achilles’ revenge is his gloating over a dead enemy that he will not receive a proper burial (Aeneid 10, 557–560). Conington and Nettleship\(^5\) state (ad. loc.) that this passage is a compound of two passages in Homer: Iliad 11, 452–455 (Odysseus to Socus) and 21, 122–135 (Achilles to Lycaon). But that is a very misleading assertion. The only element of Aeneas’ speech which comes from Odysseus’ speech in Iliad 11 is the mention of the corpse left for birds to eat. This comprises only three words in Vergil’s passage. Furthermore, the ancient Greeks considered being eaten by birds to be the stereotyped embodiment of the horrible things that happen to an unburied corpse (e.g. Iliad 1, 4–5; Sophocles’ Ajax 1065 and Antigone 29–30). The two main parts of Aeneas’ speech are modelled clearly on parts of Achilles’ speech in Iliad 21, 122–135. They are the fact that the dead man’s mother will not be able to give the corpse a proper burial and the prediction that fish will lick the corpse’s wounds. The second part shows how indebted Vergil was to Achilles’ speech. The mention of fish licking the corpse’s wounds is very natural for this episode in the Iliad since it takes place in the Xanthus river and the presence of the river is extremely important through the whole passage. But the mention of fish in Aeneas’ speech is incongruous in its setting since the nearness of a body of water is neither mentioned nor taken into consideration in Aeneid 10, 513–604.\(^6\)

Even though Vergil modelled this episode closely on the corresponding Homeric episode, he still changed it to make Aeneas’ speech more brutal than Achilles’. With a minor addition he made the already horrible picture of fish

---

6. Also, the mention of only the bereft mother and not both parents (as in Iliad 11, 452–455) is another unusual aspect shared by this speech of Aeneas and Achilles’ speech in Iliad 21.
licking the corpse’s woulds more gruesome by describing the fish as ‘impasti’. But the major change is in the order of the parts of the speech. Homer had Achilles mention the fish first, but Vergil has Aeneas mention the bereft mother first. This is very significant. Although parental and filial emotional ties are important in the *Iliad* and are described with interest and sympathy, they are not nearly as important in the *Iliad* as they are in the *Aeneid*. Vergil had just described in the previous book (*Aeneid* 9, 485–489) the agony of Euryalus’ mother because her son is lying unburied in a strange land and she cannot bury the corpse properly. Furthermore, many scholars have pointed out that in the *Aeneid* the presence of a loved one makes death less terrible. The importance of having one’s loved ones near one at death is brought out in Aeneas’ first speech (1, 94–101) when he changes the Homeric model (*Odyssey* 5, 306–312) by making the most enviable thing about those who died at Troy that they died ‘ante ora patrum’. Thus, in the context of the overall tone of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas’ speech over the dead Tarquitus is more brutal than Achilles’ over the dead Lycaon.

An apologist for Aeneas might offer two explanations for the fact that Aeneas’ actions are more brutal than those of Achilles. First, Vergil’s style generally tends to be more rhetorical and emphatic than Homer’s. Second, Aeneas’ *violentia* in this passage is the obverse of his *pietas* with respect to his feeling of responsibility for Pallas. I will oppose these possible defenses of Aeneas with three observations.

As for the argument from style, it must be noted that Vergil, if any poet, was a master of his style not its slave. Moreover, the style that Vergil employed was a very consciously created poetic invention which differed not only from normal conversational Latin but also from contemporary literary prose. So when Vergil took three brutal passages from Homer, who was not in the least bit squeamish about gruesome descriptions, and made them even more brutal, we may assume that he was aware of the effect he was producing.

As for the argument that Aeneas’ *violentia* is explicable because of its provocation, it must be observed that Turnus also has extremely justifiable causes for all of his behaviour. The crucial difference between Aeneas and Turnus is supposed to be that since the revelations of book 6 Aeneas is functioning on a higher plane. He is a man who has been made aware of his world-historical mission which includes ‘parcere subiectis’. He is supposed to be the archetypal and ideal Roman. In book 8 he is linked with Hercules and

8. Some of these differences are outlined by Kenneth Quinn in *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature* (London: 1963) pp. 198–202 as part of his illuminating study of Vergil’s style.
Augustus, and, according to Brooks Otis,10 'All three symbolize the eternally Roman struggle of pietas and humanitas against savage and barbaric violence.'

My third observation is, I think, the strongest argument against both defenses of Aeneas. It is that the brutalities which Aeneas perpetrates in book 10 of the Aeneid are unique in the Aeneid, but Achilles' actions upon which they are modelled are all, except for human sacrifice, done by other characters in the Iliad. In the Aeneid, the style of which supposedly lends itself to more gruesome descriptions than the Iliad's, no character except Aeneas murders a man who is begging for mercy.11 This includes Turnus who is supposed to be Aeneas' foil since he is often a veritable personification of furor and who has a great deal of provocation. But Aeneas kills three men who are begging for mercy.12

Furthermore, Aeneas is the only character in the Aeneid to gloat over a dead enemy because he will never be properly buried by his parents and his corpse will be mangled terribly by animals. Finally, he is the only character in the Aeneid to perform a human sacrifice, a deed which was regarded with great horror by his contemporaries.13 Furthermore, although Aeneas performs only one human sacrifice explicitly, Vergil implies by the use of the verb immolo that on two other occasions Aeneas kills a human being as if he were an animal slaughtered for the dead. This verb is first used in the Aeneid in 10, 519 of the eight captives who Vergil explicitly states will be a sacrifice. Then it is used in 10, 541 of another enemy Aeneas slays.14 Finally it is used of Aeneas' killing of Turnus in Aeneid 12, 949. It is used of no-one's actions besides those of 'pius Aeneas', who is supposedly distinguished from the other characters by his dedication to a higher mission, a mission which includes as one of its most important aspects 'parcere subjectis'.
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11. In 11, 697 Vergil states that Camilla killed Orsilochus 'oranti et multa precanti' and in 12, 294 that Messapus killed Aulestes 'orantem multa'. But only Aeneas, in the three passages cited in the footnote below, murders someone whose begging is brought strongly to the reader's attention by its being quoted. (There is one passage where Vergil describes Aeneas killing a man who is begging but does not quote his words. That is in 10, 554 where he strikes off the head of Tarquitus 'orantis').
12. 10, 524–534; 10, 597–600; and of course the horrible last 22 lines of book 12.
13. Conington and Nettleship (ad 10, 519–520) cite Livy 7, 15 as an example of the horror with which Vergil's contemporaries regarded human sacrifice.
14. Here Servius comments 'quasi victiman'.
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