

THE DEATH OF TURNUS

The difficulties presented by the final episode of the *Aeneid* have been so often discussed that it might seem doubtful if anything new of value remained to be said. Nevertheless much about this important topic remains unclear and some modest progress may perhaps still be possible. After a brief look at one well-known feature of Turnus' death I will consider Virgil's account of the treaty violation and the wounding and subsequent cure of Aeneas earlier in Book 12. I will argue that characteristic features in the narrative of the development and reversal of that near-disaster are also to be found in the account of the development and reversal of other near-disasters—particularly the ship-burning in Book 5 (as Aeneas' sea-voyage approached its end), but also the storm in Book 1. I believe that Virgil by means of these links reveals that Turnus' death, so far from being a disquieting triumph of *impius Furor*¹ at the conclusion of the poem, is in fact essential to secure the destiny of Aeneas—the apotheosis to which Jupiter refers at the opening of his final speech to Juno at 12.793–4.

TURNUS AS A SACRIFICE

It is clearly signalled by Virgil that Turnus must in some sense be seen as a sacrificial victim. Aeneas himself declares that it is the dead Pallas who carries out the sacrifice:²

Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat . . . (12.948–9)

There is also, however, a clear hint at the idea that Turnus is responsible for his own death in an act of self-sacrifice on behalf of his people. Both Turnus and his sister use significant language of his willingness to die (*animam hanc . . . deuoui*, 11.440–2; *se deuouet aris*, 12.234) and Juturna rebukes the Rutuli for allowing Turnus to give up his life on their behalf:

non pudet, o Rutuli, pro cunctis talibus unam
obiectare animam? (12.229–30)

The idea of one life being offered on behalf of many and, indeed, of the glory to be won by the dead man (12.234–5) would surely have strongly suggested to Virgil's readers something akin to an anticipation of the ritual of *deuotio*³—even though it is probable that Turnus had no intention of dooming himself in such a formal self-sacrifice. Aeneas' own words at 12.317, *Turnum debent haec iam mihi sacra*, reinforce this atmosphere, suggesting the utterance of a god to whom Turnus is due as a sacrificial victim.

If Virgil intends us to see something of the atmosphere of a *deuotio* in Turnus' death

¹ M. C. J. Putnam (*The Poetry of the Aeneid* [Harvard, 1966], 193) sees Aeneas himself becoming *impius Furor*.

² The familiar point was recognized already by Servius ad loc. (*tamquam hostiam immolat Pallas*).

³ The possibility and nature of links with the concept of *deuotio* have been much discussed. See now Matthew Leigh, 'Hopelessly devoted', *PVS* 21 (1993), 89–105.

it might be thought that by his death Turnus should achieve some form of victory for the Latins. Virgil, however, by ending the poem abruptly with the killing of Turnus, appears to suggest (as we might expect) that Aeneas is the winner. Indeed Turnus himself admits defeat (12.934). It has been suggested⁴ that Turnus' 'victory' lies in the destruction of Troy and the name of Troy which Jupiter has promised to Juno (12.828–37). This was Turnus' aim in life, and it is now to be achieved—doubtless not in the way in which he intended—by his death. Yet, even if Virgil is hinting at this (as he may well be) it seems hardly credible that this in itself can be the only point he wished to make by presenting Turnus' death as a sacrifice. It would mean that Virgil was treating his death as if it were the consequence of a full and formal *deuotio* like the deaths of the Decii. Virgil's method is surely more subtle and allusive and he is unlikely to rely solely on the well-known ritual features of the *deuotio* to convey his meaning at the end of his poem. While hinting at the relevance of certain aspects of a formal *deuotio* he does not intend a strictly accurate correspondence to the formal rite. In any case it can hardly be ignored that the truce and the religious ceremony at which Juturna uses the words *se deuouet* with reference to Turnus have been violated before the final conflict.

THE TREATY VIOLATION AND ITS SEQUEL

The final single combat between Aeneas and Turnus should have taken place earlier under a treaty which Turnus himself had proposed and which had been agreed by Latinus and Aeneas. This treaty was, however, broken because of the scheming of Juno acting through her agent Juturna who tricked the Rutuli. The augur Tolumnius is the first to violate the truce and soon afterwards Aeneas, attempting to restrain the fighters, is wounded by an arrow and forced to retire from the field. General chaos then follows. The doctor Iapyx labours in vain to cure Aeneas' wound and in the meantime the situation on the battlefield grows ever more menacing:

... saeuus campis magis ac magis horror
crebrescit propiusque malum est. iam puluere caelum
stare uident: subeunt equites et spicula castris
densa cadunt mediis. it tristis ad aethera clamor
bellantum iuuenum et duro sub Marte cadentum. (12.406–10)

At this crisis, however, Venus intervenes, secretly adding curative herbs to the medicaments applied by Iapyx. The effect is dramatic. Aeneas is cured and his recovery is followed by his immediate return to battle after a short but significant exhortation to his son (12.435–40).

This episode shows a near-disaster being narrowly averted by divine intervention. It is interesting to compare the details of this sequence of events in the final book of the poem with Virgil's account of another narrow escape from disaster in Book 5 which shows certain similarities⁵—the episode of the ship-burning which immediately precedes the final journey to Italy.

⁴ James J. O'Hara, *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton, 1990), 83–4.

⁵ Agathe Thornton (*The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid* [Leiden, 1976], 206, n. 3) mentions the exact correspondence between the sequence of events in Book 5 when Juno's agent Iris rouses the Trojan women and that in Book 12 when her agent Juturna acts upon the Rutulians. She does not, however, explore this point in depth or look at correspondences in the events that follow the initial actions of Iris and Juturna.

In both passages Juno attempts to thwart Aeneas at a crucial stage in his mission—before the final duel and before the final leg of the journey to Italy. In both she uses minor deities as agents—Iris and Juturna—who mingle with the group which they intend to influence (*inter medias sese . . . conicit . . .*, 5.618–19; *in medias dat sese acies . . .*, 12.227) disguised as typical members of that group. Iris appears as Beroe, one of the Trojan women, and Juturna as Camers, a Rutulian warrior. The distinguished status of the real Beroe and the real Camers (which will add conviction to the words of the impersonating goddesses) is noted in very similar terms (*cui genus . . . et nomen*, 5.620, 12.225–6). So too Virgil remarks in similar phraseology on the aptitude for the task of each of Juno's agents. Iris is *haud ignara nocendi* (5.618) and Juturna is *haud nescia rerum* (12.227). In each case a partially successful first attempt on the victims in the form of a speech designed to foment discontent is followed by a more dramatic and wholly successful action. Iris reveals her true form as the rainbow goddess which causes the women to lose their senses completely:

*tum uero attonitae monstribus
conclamant . . .* (5.659–60)

Juturna sends a portent—the omen of the eagle and the swan—which has an immediate effect on the minds of her audience:

*turbauit mentes Italas monstroque fefellit,
. . .
tum uero augurium Rutuli clamore salutant* (12.246, 257)

In each case—ship-burning and treaty violation—it appears initially that Juno's scheme has been successful. Certainly early attempts to remedy both situations fail. In Book 5 Ascanius brings the frenzied women to their senses by appealing to them after having removed his helmet so that he can be recognized. This does not, however, extinguish the fire. In Book 12 Aeneas pleads with the fighting men *nudato capite* (*scilicet deposita galea ut possit agnosci*, as Servius comments).⁶ His effort fails and he is wounded. At this point the two sequences momentarily diverge somewhat, although in each case the strength of the obstacles in Aeneas' way is made clear. In Book 5 the fire rages out of control until it is extinguished by Jupiter in response to Aeneas' desperate prayer. Not even that, however, prevents Aeneas from plunging into doubt as to whether to continue with his voyage or to remain in Sicily *oblitus fatorum* (5.703). In Book 12 Aeneas' withdrawal is followed by an *aristeia* of Turnus who carries all before him.

Perhaps the most significant convergence of the two narratives occurs at this point with the appearance of two very similar figures—Nautes in Book 5 and Iapyx in Book 12. Each appears only once in the poem. Both are old men (*senior*, 5.704; *longaeuus*, 12.420). Each was the favourite pupil of a deity—Nautes of Pallas (5.704–5) and Iapyx of Apollo (12.391–7). Both fail in their attempts to assist Aeneas in time of crisis. Nautes' advice is ineffectual in providing spiritual uplift for Aeneas' mind. Iapyx is equally ineffectual in his efforts to cure Aeneas' body. In each case it is left to more powerful forces—Aeneas' father and mother—to provide the appropriate help which

⁶ Servius ad 12.312. Tib. Claud. Donatus ad loc. also comments *ut cognosceretur a suis* though he lays more stress on the absence of weapons as a sign of Aeneas' desire to avoid sharing in the guilt of the combatants.

their son needs to set him back on the right course. It is worth considering in more detail the reasons behind the failures of Nautes and Iapyx.

I have argued elsewhere⁷ that Nautes, for all the practical excellence of his advice, fails for two main reasons. First, his speech focuses solely on the problems posed by the weak, the old, the timid, and the weary—all who are ‘tired of your enterprise and your cause’ (5.714). Virgil (5.751) describes them as ‘spirits with no desire for great glory’. Nautes gives good advice (as might be expected from a pupil of Pallas)—identical in substance to that offered by Anchises which is readily followed by Aeneas. Anchises, however, succeeds in reviving Aeneas’ morale where Nautes fails, because he reminds his son of his main task—that facing the *fortissima corda* (5.729) and inspires him with the thought of the Italian future—he says nothing of the faint-hearts who are to stay in Sicily. Second, Nautes fails because he shows himself a follower of Fortuna under any circumstances. He lacks a fixed ideal—oddly, given that Pallas could have taught him *quae fatorum posceret ordo* (5.707). Anchises, however, promises to provide Aeneas with a knowledge of the future:

tum genus omne tuum et quae dentur moenia disces (5.737)

Iapyx fails to cure Aeneas in spite of the fact that he, like Nautes, is a favourite of a powerful deity who had the power to provide him with the skill necessary to deal with the crisis. Iapyx had asked Apollo for knowledge of *potestates herbarum usumque medendi* (12.396). His failure, therefore, appears strange since it is precisely ‘the power of herbs’ administered by Venus which cures Aeneas. Why is Venus, hardly a patron deity of medicine, able to succeed where the expert Iapyx, Apollo’s favourite, fails? The answer surely lies in the fact that Iapyx appears to have the same character defects as Nautes.⁸ As Nautes had no vision of the glorious challenge awaiting Aeneas, so Iapyx is completely lacking in high aspirations. Apollo had offered him glory as an augur, a musician or an archer, but he preferred instead *mutas agitare inglorius artes* (12.397). Virgil’s disapproval is plain (whatever we may think of Iapyx’s motives for his choice). The word *inglorius* has unpleasant connotations. Before shooting Camilla, the cowardly Arruns prays to Apollo for help and, disclaiming all desire to win spoils of any kind from his action (*mihi cetera laudem / facta ferent*, 11.791–2), asks only to be able to return home *inglorius* (11.793). Apollo allows him to kill Camilla but rejects the second part of his prayer. Arruns and Iapyx both have close links with Apollo. In their requests to the god they both disclaim any desire for glory. Apollo rejected part of Arruns’ prayer—can we assume that he granted the prayer of Iapyx? Virgil does not say that he was prepared to offer medical skill as an alternative to the three options of augury, music, and archery that he *did* offer. Whatever the case may be, any similarities

⁷ W. S. M. Nicoll, ‘The sacrifice of Palinurus’, *CQ* 38 (1988), 462–4.

⁸ E. L. Harrison (‘Vergil and the Homeric tradition’, *PLLS* [1981], 209–25) asks the reasons for the bizarre failure of Iapyx (especially given his Apolline connections) and Venus’ unexpected success in an area with which she has no real concern. His answer is that Virgil is offering a ‘corrective’ to the Homeric account in *Iliad* 5 of Aphrodite’s unsuccessful attempt to rescue Aeneas after his wounding by Diomedes—a situation that is only retrieved by the intervention of Apollo. This view is attractive, and does not conflict with my own argument which focuses on the character of Iapyx. Both views can co-exist. J. D. Noonan (‘The Iapyx episode of *Aeneid* 12’ (*Phoenix* 51 [1991], 374–92) notes that the nature of Aeneas’ cure is ‘mysterious even to the doctor Iapyx himself’ but does not seem troubled by the incompetence of a doctor who has ‘accepted Apollo’s gift of the medical art’ or by the god’s failure to intervene. Although he notes that Venus ‘had no very strong links to medicine’, he offers no convincing explanation for her unexpected medical skill on this occasion.

with Arruns hardly cast a favourable light on Iapyx. Other Virgilian appearances of the term *inglorius* are equally unflattering to the character so described. At 10.52–4 Venus, pretending with bitter sarcasm to abandon all hope of future Roman glory, says to Jupiter (of Ascanius):

positis *inglorius* armis
exigat hic aeuum. magna dicione iubeto
Karthago premat Ausoniam.

As Arruns contrasted the life of the *inglorius* with the true heroism of the warrior, so Venus makes the same distinction.⁹

Iapyx, then, fails perhaps not so much because of technical incompetence (if we can assume that Apollo *did* grant his wish) but because he, like Nautes, is an unheroic character. It is also possible that there is a further reason for his failure. Virgil comments (12.405) *nulla uiam Fortuna regit*. Success in medicine is seen as a matter of luck. This provides another link with Nautes and, more importantly, with the steersman Palinurus. In the storm following the Trojans' departure from Africa Palinurus observes *quoque uocat* [sc. *Fortuna*] *uertamus iter* (5.23) and as Fortuna can be said *uiam regere* in the case of the doctor's activities, so Palinurus, a creature of Fortuna, says of himself *cursus regebam* (6.350). The art of medicine, like that of the helmsman, is seen by Virgil as dependent upon the wind of Fortune. As Nautes' name may have some significance, so may that of Iapyx.¹⁰ If Iapyx's reliance on Fortuna were an important reason for his failure it would, of course, give real point to Aeneas' famous and controversial speech to his son immediately after his wound is cured by his mother. Aeneas would then be asserting to Ascanius that it was not *fortuna* which secured the divine aid responsible for his cure, but *uirtus* and *uerus labor*. It may further be noted that at 10.48–9, when Venus ironically abandons Ascanius to the life of an *inglorius*, she equally sarcastically expresses her readiness to leave Aeneas himself to the mercies of Fortuna

Aeneas sane ignotis iactetur in undis
et quacumque uiam dederit Fortuna sequatur.

Thus the speech of Nautes, the character of Iapyx, and the ironic speech of Venus all bring together the lack of desire for glory and the following of Fortuna as the two character traits that might form obstacles to the successful achievement of Aeneas' mission.

⁹ The same contrast is apparent at 9.548 (Helenor sent to Troy *uetitis armis* and described as *inglorius*). In the *Georgics* the inferior of the two *reges* in the bee community is described as *horridus*, slothful, and *inglorius* in strong contrast to his more brilliant rival (4.93–4) and, significantly, Virgil declares himself content to lead the life of the *inglorius* countryman (sc. country poet) should he prove unable to master the higher calling of natural philosophy (2.483–6)—a contrast which resembles that made at *Geo.* 4.559–66. where Augustus and his military achievements are set beside Virgil *studiis florentem ignobilis oti*.

¹⁰ Servius auct. links the name with *ἰαθαι* commenting *aptum nomen medico*. J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 234–5 comments that both the name and the patronymic of the doctor suggest this link. This connection is doubtless valid. Iapyx is, however, the name of the Apulian wind (cf. *Aen.* 8.710, Gellius 2.22). Nautes, Palinurus, and Iapyx seem, therefore, to have names suggestive of the random powers of wind and/or waves and the patronymic is a further link between the doctor and the steersman. Cf. Nicoll (n.7), 464 and n. 16. On the possible etymologies for the name Palinurus, see O'Hara (n. 4), 110 and n. 44 and (n. 10), 170.

A final observation may be made on the character of Iapyx. Venus' intervention is remarkable in that it not only cures Aeneas but also has a dramatic effect on Iapyx himself. He recognizes a divine hand at work and calls on the Trojans to bring arms for Aeneas so that he can at once return to the battle. This transformation from the aged and *inglorius* doctor to the man who takes the lead (*primus*, 12.426) in arousing the battle ardour of Aeneas' comrades is extraordinary.¹¹ It is also remarkable that the words of Iapyx's exhortation (*arma citi properate uiro*) seem to echo the words used by Vulcan (8.441–2) in a similar scene. Vulcan calls on the Cyclopes to make arms for Aeneas (*arma acri facienda uiro*). As Vulcan saw the need for all the craftsmanship of the divine workshop (*usus . . . omni nunc arte magistra*) so Iapyx, in contrast, recognizes that what has happened owes nothing to human aid (*non haec humanis opibus, non arte magistra / proueniunt*). As Venus used Vulcan as her instrument in procuring arms for Aeneas, so too she uses Iapyx as her instrument in curing her son's wound and enabling him to take up again these same arms.

The structure of the sequence from Juturna's intervention (at Juno's prompting) to Aeneas' return to battle is noteworthy. The treaty violation by Tolumnius which is inspired by Juno and her agent initiates a series of events in which the Trojans' situation steadily deteriorates. This deterioration culminates in the *aristeia* of Turnus, the failure of Iapyx, and the growing menace suggested in 12.406–10. Venus' intervention, however, leading to the cure of Aeneas (through the apparent agency of Iapyx) and his exhortation to his son, initiates a reverse sequence. The Trojans' fortunes, then, improve as Aeneas returns to battle, causing fear among the Rutulians (12.447–8). Tolumnius, the violator of the treaty, is killed and Juturna herself is terror-stricken and attempts to rescue her brother. The sequence reaches its culminating point when Aeneas, enraged by the treachery of his opponents, eventually gives full rein to his anger against the enemy and begins a terrible slaughter (12.499).

This type of pattern where a deteriorating sequence of events is reversed and followed by an improving sequence is seen elsewhere in the poem. It occurs in the ship-burning episode in Book 5 where Anchises' intervention marks the turning-point in the crisis of morale. It is also paralleled in the strongly programmatic storm in Book 1 where Neptune's appearance marks a dramatic change for the better both in the Trojans' fortunes and in the morale of Aeneas himself. It is worth noticing the way in which these patterns are marked by counterbalancing positive and negative elements. Thus in Book 5 the negative speech of Nautes is balanced by the positive speech of Anchises—both on a practical level giving the same advice, though the tone and effect on Aeneas is very different. In the storm in Book 1 the most notable of several counterbalancing elements are the two contrasting speeches of Aeneas (94–101 and 198–207), which differ in tone in precisely the same way as the speeches of Nautes and Anchises. In Book 12 the ineffectual and random efforts of the *inglorius* Iapyx are set against his success (as the instrument of Venus) and his new-found military ardour for the task ahead. Again the same contrast between heroic and unheroic is to be seen.

¹¹ It is worth noting that Iapyx's sudden transformation from inglorious and unsuccessful doctor to a man fired by new heroic enthusiasm provides another link with the ship-burning episode in Book 5. At 5.616–17 Virgil sums up the demoralized state of the Trojan women—*uox omnibus una; / urbem orant, taedet pelagi perferre laborem*. When, however, Trojan morale begins to recover following the inspiring message of Anchises the very women who had been unable to face the prospect of further voyaging now *ire uolunt omnemque fugae perferre laborem* (769) and have to be consoled by Aeneas for being left in Sicily. Here the obvious echo of 617 throws strong emphasis on the dramatic change of heart in the women in response to the improving situation—just as remarkable as the change in Iapyx after Aeneas' miraculous cure.

In view of these links between the initial episode in Book 1, the ship-burning in Book 5, and the crisis of the treaty violation and the wounding of Aeneas in Book 12 it seems worth examining whether the role of the ship-burning can throw light on the significance of the crisis in Book 12 and its sequel—the death of Turnus.

TURNUS AND PALINURUS

I have argued elsewhere¹² that in Book 5 the old counsellor Nautes is closely associated with the figure of Palinurus—the archetypal seafarer. This can be seen from an examination of the attitudes of both men to Fortuna which they see as the force that rules their world. This view leads Palinurus to declare in the storm at the opening of Book 5 that even if Jupiter himself were to guarantee a successful voyage to Italy he would not expect to get there. He advises making for Sicily—the refuge which Nautes will later propose as the home for those who have no stomach for Aeneas' mission. These characteristics of Palinurus in my view lie behind his selection as the victim to be sacrificed *unum pro multis . . . caput* (5.815). This sacrifice is duly made before the final stage of the passage to Italy and directly after the crisis of the ship-burning (Juno's final attempt to prevent their safe arrival) and its resolution. It is inevitable that one should raise the question whether the final event of Book 5—the sacrifice of Palinurus, coming after a sequence which closely resembles that of the treaty violation and its consequences in Book 12, is not to be seen as parallel to the final event of Aeneas' labours on land—the death of Turnus.

At first sight it might appear unreasonable to argue for a parallelism between Aeneas' faithful steersman and his chief opponent in the war in Italy. Yet there are grounds for seeing similarities between the two. Palinurus died because his guiding principles in life would be inappropriate for a leader in the Augustan world, the foundations of which Aeneas himself was laying. The Augustan leader cannot drift where the wind of Fortuna takes him. If Jupiter were to promise success, such a leader would have confidence that the Italian landfall was assured and would not take refuge in Sicily. Turnus too makes very plain his belief in Fortuna as a goddess to be followed. In a wild address to Juturna (12.637) he asks *quae iam spondet Fortuna salutem?* Fortuna is hardly a goddess who can guarantee safety—or indeed anything else. As Palinurus would not trust the hypothetical guarantee of Jupiter himself, so Turnus—even though his cry is one of despair—seeks guarantees from the ficklest of goddesses. Again at 12.676 he cries out

iam iam fata, soror, superant, absiste morari
quo deus et quo dura uocat Fortuna sequamur.

Palinurus had urged (5.22)

superat quoniam Fortuna, sequamur,
quoque uocat uertamus iter.

Although Turnus may in a confused way associate *fata* and *deus* with *dura Fortuna*,¹³ his attitude is essentially the same as that of Aeneas' steersman, or indeed that of the amoral opportunist Coroebus (2.387). Turnus is, of course, a complex character. Yet

¹² Nicoll (n. 7).

¹³ Nautes too (5.709) seems to see *fata* as a capricious force dragging a man hither and thither and in the next line he talks of overcoming *fortuna* by endurance (*ferendo*). Nicoll (n. 7), 463.

it seems as if Virgil at the conclusion of the poem may be drawing particular attention to his tendency to 'follow Fortuna'. Especially interesting in this connection is Virgil's own comment at 12.714 when Aeneas and Turnus finally meet—*fors et uirtus miscetur in unum*. Editors here tend to discount the explanation offered by Servius—*casus in Turno, uirtus in Aenea*. It is, however, worth considering whether Servius may not be right. If this is what Virgil means, it would sum up the essential difference between the two men. Indeed, it would underline the point that Aeneas himself made to his son (12.435–6) when he advised Ascanius to learn from him *uirtus* and *uerus labor*, but to turn to others in order to 'learn' *fortuna*. Aeneas is surely indicating here that success is to be founded on *uirtus* and *labor* rather than luck. When he advises Ascanius further (440) to be inspired as a grown man *repetentem exempla tuorum* by both his father and his uncle Hector, he echoes Andromache's words at 3.343. Andromache had asked Aeneas whether Ascanius was inspired specifically in *antiquam uirtutem animosque uirilis* by his father and his uncle. This echo strengthens the point. The stress on *uirtus* as a characteristic quality to be found in both Hector and Aeneas is very plain. It would be appropriate if Turnus were to be seen as embodying a less satisfactory way of life—that dominated by reliance on Fortuna.

THE PURPOSE OF TURNUS' SACRIFICE

If Turnus had simply embodied a way of life that was inadequate for the new age, the necessity for his death would have been obvious. It would not have been clear, however, why he is represented as a sacrificial victim. Although the symbolic destruction of Trojan identities through some form of *deuotio* may be part of the answer, I would argue that the links between the figures of Turnus and Palinurus also suggest a purpose behind the sacrifice which is more directly related to Aeneas' own destiny and that Turnus, the final sacrificial victim in the poem, dies to secure the promised deification of Aeneas. Turnus' death is the final instance of a link between sacrifice and deification which is present not only in the sacrifice of Palinurus but also in the poem's first sacrifice—that of the Lycian ship and its crew (1.113–19)

Before the final stage of the Trojans' journey to Italy, Neptune makes clear that a sacrifice is necessary to ensure a safe sea-voyage. His language (5.814–15) clearly echoes the passage in Ennius' *Annales* in which Jupiter promises Mars that his son Romulus will be deified,¹⁴ and I have argued¹⁵ that Virgil in his account of the sacrifice of Palinurus is subtly reworking the story of Remus' death with Palinurus representing the figure of Remus and Aeneas that of Romulus. Palinurus/Remus does not die through a brutal fratricidal act. Instead he is sacrificed *pro multis*. While Ennius probably presented Romulus' deification as a recompense to Mars for Remus' death (just as Ovid's Mars, immediately before echoing the Ennian Jupiter's promise, declares [*Fasti* 2.486] that Romulus' deification will be *pro . . . Remo*), Virgil develops this idea further. Aeneas' safe arrival in Italy is something more than merely a recompense for the death of Palinurus/Remus. It is, in fact, a direct result of that death. In addition Virgil uses the Ennian echo to hint delicately at a greater event to come long after the end of the Trojans' voyage—Aeneas' future deification. This is done indirectly since Neptune's words, of course, refer not to Aeneas' deification, but to Palinurus' death. Yet Virgil clearly stresses the importance of the idea of deification in this episode. It is

¹⁴ Enn. *Ann.* 1 fr. 33 Sk.

¹⁵ Nicoll (n. 7), 466–70.

central to the context of the Ennian passage which he is echoing and is given additional emphasis in that Virgil not only presents Palinurus' mysterious death as having similarities to a typical apotheosis but crucially also echoes the same Ennian passage twice elsewhere in the poem in references to Aeneas' future deification—in Jupiter's initial prophetic speech to Venus (1.259) and in his last speech to Juno (12.795). The same link between sacrifice and deification is found in the episode of the Lycian sailors in Book 1.113–19. Their role as sacrificial victims is clear from the fact that they die near the *Arae* rocks (109). The immediate purpose of their sacrifice, although this is never openly stated, is clearly to induce Neptune to save Aeneas and the rest of his men. Yet there is also a hint at the idea that such a sacrifice may lead to greater consequences, for when Achates subsequently (1.581–5) alludes to this incident the appearance of Aeneas immediately changes and he now appears *deo similis*—a mimic deification that is described in a passage of clear Augustan significance.

I would argue that the death of Turnus should be seen as the final instance where *unum caput* is sacrificed *pro multis*. Juturna's indignant question to the Rutuli (12.229–30) represents Turnus as willing to die *pro cunctis talibus*. By this she clearly means—as the Rutulians understand—the Rutulians themselves. Yet since in the future the Trojans and their opponents will be one people it seems possible that Virgil intends the reader to see both Trojans and Rutulians as benefiting from Turnus' sacrifice. In particular it should be noted that the third clear echo of the key Ennian passage on the apotheosis of Romulus occurs in the speech of Jupiter to Juno (12.794–5) immediately before the final duel:

indigitem Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris
deberi caelo fatisque ad sidera tolli.

At the beginning of the poem the deaths of the Lycian sailors led to the Trojans' landfall and Aeneas' mimic deification. At the end of the Trojans' sea-voyage Palinurus' sacrifice leads to their safe arrival in Italy and also hints at Aeneas' future deification. At the end of the poem Turnus too is sacrificed. He is a man who shares certain failings of Palinurus, and the duel in which he meets his death follows a narrative sequence closely similar to that which precedes Palinurus' death. It also comes shortly after the final echo of the key passage from the *Annales* has reminded the reader again of the Ennian context and its relevance to Aeneas' future deification. I would argue, therefore, that it is probable that Turnus' death should be seen as not only concluding the war in Italy but leading to the actual apotheosis of Aeneas. In the *Annales* Remus was not sacrificed. He was killed in anger. Nevertheless Mars may have been promised Romulus' deification as a kind of compensation. Virgil, however, by introducing the idea of sacrifice, sees Aeneas' deification, not as a compensation for the death of Turnus, but rather as obtained at the price of his death.

It may seem more unlikely that the sacrifice of Turnus—Aeneas' opponent—should secure Aeneas' deification than that Aeneas' own followers—the Lycians and Palinurus—should die to forward his destiny. Yet the political context of the poem must be remembered. The theme of peace and reconciliation is crucial to the *Aeneid* and the stress on it will have reflected Augustus' own concerns in the aftermath of the Civil War. Virgil's use of the story of Romulus and Remus plays an important part in establishing this theme. The Jupiter prophecy in Book 1 concludes with the binding of *Furor impius*, and immediately before this comes the picture of the brothers Romulus and Remus administering justice together in harmony. The same message is conveyed in the scene of the wolf and twins at 8.630–4 where the echoes of Lucretius' prayer to

Venus for peace (*De Rerum Natura* 1.35–7) reinforce the point. The repeated echoing of the Ennian passage on the apotheosis of Romulus and the additional suggestion that Remus is a sacrifice whose death brings this about is highly significant in this context. Civil War is in itself impious. If, however, the deaths of Antony and his followers could be represented as sacrifices necessary to ensure the firm foundations of Augustus' rule then perhaps the charge of impiety might appear less damaging.

Recently Wiseman, discussing the Romulus and Remus story, argued that the earliest version of the story of Remus' death presented him as a 'foundation sacrifice'.¹⁶ It is significant that one of the passages cited to support the view of Remus as such a sacrifice is Prop. 3.9.45–50—a passage in which Propertius undertakes (under the guidance of Maecenas) to sing of lofty themes charged with Augustan symbolism such as the Gigantomachy and the rustic simplicity of cattle grazing on the Palatine. The appearance of the theme of Remus' death in Propertius' list suggests that that story too had Augustan political overtones, and Propertius' expression *caeso moenia firma Remo* also suggests that in the version to which he alludes the walls of Rome were strengthened by Remus' death. Propertius' reference seems to indicate the existence of a version of the death of Remus which, so far from taking a defensive or evasive position with regard to the awkward matter of fratricide, instead boldly exonerated Romulus by making his brother's death not murder, but an act of sacrifice which ensured the future greatness of the new city. This version, whether it is the earliest one or not, must have offered promising material for Augustan poets seeking, for political reasons, to provide an acceptable alternative to fratricide. Antony is the new Remus. The version of Remus' death which lies behind Virgil's account of the deaths of Palinurus and, I believe, Turnus exonerates Romulus. So too does Propertius' version. Both poets replace murder with sacrifice for the future good of the community. Propertius seems to see Remus' death as a foundation sacrifice leading to *moenia firma* for Romulus' new city. For Virgil the sacrifice of Turnus—though not a foundation sacrifice as such—will ensure the deification of Aeneas, just as, Virgil suggests, Remus' sacrifice led to Romulus' deification.

Attention has been drawn to the ambiguities in the *Aeneid* as to what lay ahead for Aeneas after the end of the poem.¹⁷ Thus Cairns¹⁸ observes 'It looks as though Virgil had not made up his mind whether to make the "founder" of Rome a man of brief and doom-laden life, or whether to exploit the longevity of Odysseus and make Aeneas too live long.' To my mind the important point is that Turnus' sacrifice indicates that Aeneas' destiny as a god is assured. Whether Aeneas' death comes sooner or later is less significant. O'Hara argues¹⁹ that the experience of Juturna casts doubt on the value of immortality as a reward and concludes that the *Aeneid* 'perhaps allows the reader to think that the reward of deification makes up for all of Aeneas' pain . . . but the poem does not insist upon that view'. Yet Juturna's personal unhappiness is bound up with her close links with the flawed Turnus and her inability both to save him and to face the future after his death. Her experience has only limited relevance to Aeneas himself. As the certainty of the founding of Aeneas' city and his subsequent apotheosis are the first things on which Jupiter reassured the anxious Venus in his prophecy in Book

¹⁶ T. P. Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth* (Cambridge, 1995), 125.

¹⁷ O'Hara (n. 4), ch. 3 discusses the contradictory versions of Aeneas' future that are presented in the course of the poem.

¹⁸ Francis Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989), 187.

¹⁹ O'Hara (n. 4), 114–16.

1.257–9, so his final speech to Juno opens by stressing the fruitlessness of further opposition in view of Aeneas' certain deification. Aeneas' apotheosis is a central issue at the end of the poem. I do not believe its value is questioned.²⁰

University of Edinburgh

W. S. M. NICOLL

²⁰ Versions of this paper were presented at the University of Bologna and at a meeting of the Classical Association of Scotland in St Andrews. I am grateful to Professor D. A. West for assistance and suggestions and for sending me some of his unpublished material on the Iapyx episode. I am also grateful to my colleague Dr Y. Nadeau for allowing me to see a draft of his unpublished material covering aspects of *Aeneid* 12 and to the *CQ* referee for his helpful suggestions on improving the structure of the argument.