Transactions of the American Philological Association 127 (1997) 257–286

The Lament of Juturna: Pathos and Interpretation in the *Aeneid**

Christine Perkell
Emory University

Introduction

Recent interesting and important critical studies of the *Aeneid* have put into question the function of pathos in the poem. Pathos is of crucial significance to a reading of the *Aeneid*, since for many readers those features of the poem that seem to problematize the moral quality of the Roman imperial project fall under this heading. While "pessimistic" readers of the *Aeneid* have consistently understood the poem's pathos to be genuinely subversive of its imperial claims, William Empson (lately followed in different ways by, e.g., Charles Martindale and Susanne Wofford) read the poem's pathos as functioning, in fact, to support Augustan values. Empson considered that "the dreamy, impersonal, universal melancholy [of the *Aeneid*] was a calculated support for Augustus."[1] He went on to develop the point that pathos, as in Gray's "Elegy," can have "latent political" content, since it puts the reader "into a mood in which one would not try to alter [social/political conditions]." More recently Charles Martindale has described what he calls "Vergil's reconciling pathos" (49). A further quotation clarifies this concept: "Does the eloquent pathos of the *Aeneid* (if it is that) reconcile us to human pain...and in a rather sinister, aestheticized way?"[2] In

*Previous versions of this essay were presented at the 1994 annual meetings of the American Philological Association and the Classical Association of the Midwest and South, at a 1994 conference on "Epics and the Contemporary World" at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and in the Seminar on Ancient Greece and Rome in the Center for Literary and Cultural Studies at Harvard University in 1996. I am indebted to Professor Richard Thomas, my host for this last occasion, and to the other audience members for illuminating discussion. I am, in addition, most grateful for rigorous criticism and generous advice to the editor, Marilyn Skinner, and the anonymous readers of *TAPA*, and to Professors Lowell Edmunds, Joseph Farrell, and James O'Hara.

[1]Empson 3–4.

[2]Martindale 42 (posed as a rhetorical question). In her chapter "Grieving Mothers and the Costs of Attachment" (38–55), Wiltshire reads pathos as validating the Augustan project by

short, while many readers currently agree on the presence of pathos in the *Aeneid*, they disagree about its relationship to the Roman/Augustan project: is it supportive or subversive?

How might one develop a persuasive reading of pathos? In pursuit of this goal, I initially turned my attention to a quintessential vehicle of the *Aeneid*'s pathetic quality, namely the laments. In particular, the so-called "lament of Juturna" that precedes the close of the *Aeneid* drew my notice because of its climactic placement. This passage, as many know, is the subject of a greatly respected and much-cited semiotic[3] analysis by Alessandro Barchiesi that in its

---

clarifying its cost: "In the *Aeneid* the world's good is death to mothers and others who cherish community. But the detail Vergil lavishes on the mourning of those deaths attaches both meaning and questions to the grief. The suffering of mothers measures the achievements of heroes by the losses they cost" (55). Taking its start from the poem's plangent tone, Adam Parry's famous essay on the *Aeneid* offers another interpretation of the function of pathos: "The brightness of the image and the power of the pleasurable vision it confers, consoles for the pain of what it represents. The pleasure of art in fact gives value to the pain itself" (122).

[3]I categorize this study as "semiotic" in the sense that the term has been used by scholars to describe the work of Gian Biagio Conte in *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (1986) and *Genres and Readers* (1994). As Charles Segal points out, Conte's method combines elements of structuralism, formalism, and reception theory, along with the strategies associated with traditional philological and literary-historical analysis (Conte 1994: viii). The same may be said, I believe, of Barchiesi, who has, however, described his work as "intertextual" (1984: 120). The differences between Barchiesi's comparative studies of Homer and Vergil and those of Knauer, for example, seem to be twofold. In the first instance, Barchiesi takes interpretive steps beyond the cataloguing of parallel passages in order to study the functions of the Homeric models in Vergil's text. Secondly—and this is where it becomes useful perhaps to call his work semiotic—he views parallel passages not from a traditional literary-historical perspective but rather from the perspective of the epic genre, conceived as a product of codes, conventions, and functions that the competent reader can decipher correctly (1984: 119–21). Usually, but not always, he restricts investigation of codes, conventions, and functions to those constitutive of genre and not to areas outside of the epic tradition. This restriction of the field of inquiry to the literary genre does characterize the semiotic approach, in which textual features assume meaning in relation to each other within the closed system of the genre and not in relation to wider systems of meaning in literature or society as a whole. "Semiotics is the systematic study of...the production of meanings from sign-systems" while structuralism "analyzes cultural phenomena...emphasizing the systematic interrelationships among elements of any human activity, and thus the abstract codes and conventions governing the social production of meaning." (Definitions are taken from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* [1991] s.v.) For my purposes here, the terms "structuralist" and "semiotic" appear more or less interchangeable, since semiotics, as a sub-category of structuralism, deals with *sign* systems (like poems), while structuralism studies the whole range of cultural systems. To the extent that Barchiesi's interest in genre is expressed in terms of the structures, conventions, and functions that define and create the epic genre, his work is broadly structuralist or semiotic in its conception, even when it assumes in practice a more humanistic

wide learning, precision, imagination, and sensitivity to stylistic nuance represents a major achievement.[4] It is not possible, therefore, to work on Juturna's lament without reflecting carefully on Barchiesi's conclusions. In his treatment of pathos, Barchiesi rhetorically examines the tonality of the lament as a "stylistic register," one that performs a necessary function in the epic genre, the retarding of closure. On this reading Juturna's lament would constitute a formal function of the text.

Barchiesi does not explicitly address the question of whether pathos is supportive or subversive of the imperial project; his reading, rather, is wholly apolitical. However, other scholars such as Duncan Kennedy have argued, or indeed shown, that the so-called "apolitical" actually effects support of the status quo in that it encourages a quietistic acceptance of powerlessness.[5] From this perspective, therefore, Barchiesi's apolitical reading of pathos could be regarded as, in fact, a conservative and pro-Augustan reading. What Empson, Martindale, and Barchiesi have in common, then, if perhaps inadvertently, is a questioning of the moral authenticity of the *Aeneid*'s pathos, a shared assumption that its pathos serves some purpose other than challenging the Augustan imperial project. In its implicit denial to the *Aeneid* of genuine moral and political questioning, Barchiesi's article resembles other current readings of the epic that understand its meanings to be shaped significantly by factors even independent of the poet's volition, such as generic restrictions, the rhetorical operations of figure and action, or the political implications of epic teleology.[6] Both because Barchiesi's essay converges to a certain degree with these newly articulated methodologies, and also because the function of pathos in the *Aeneid* may be viewed as its central interpretive problem, I believe it may be useful to interrogate his procedures and assumptions in the following essay.

To anticipate my provisional conclusion, Barchiesi's reading is ultimately unpersuasive as an *overall* reading, despite its great brilliance of detail, insofar

---

focus than others' semiotic readings. Scholes argues for an expanded conception of semiotic readings that does engage the world outside the text: see his chapters "Toward a Semiotics of Literature" (17–36) and "Semiotics of the Poetic Text" (37–56).

[4]Barchiesi 1978. Discussion of Juturna is continued in Barchiesi 1994. Here I do want to state clearly, of course, that this essay of mine is conceived only in the sincerest respect and admiration for the importance and interest of Barchiesi's work, qualities that should be manifest to all readers.

[5]Kennedy *passim*.

[6]To some degree, the respective studies of Conte 1986, Wofford, and Quint could be said to illustrate those categories, although the authors would rightly find my brief descriptions reductive.

as it puts into question the poem's moral urgency. Semiotic readings, however subtly executed, do limit the range of questions deemed appropriate to ask of a text and also require, as Conte and Barchiesi make clear, certain assumptions about the possible meanings of epic as a genre. Many structuralists omit questions of contemporary political meaning altogether: whether the text affirms or negates the status quo, or how, if at all, it relates ideologically to a contemporary target audience is not of interest for them. Rather, there is only the literary tradition or genre. Knowledge of a text's codes enables a competent reader to decipher its meaning, which is regarded as a product of the interrelation and deployment of various functions and structural or formal features. The valuable goal of this procedure, of course, is to establish a stable, objective basis for interpretation. However, a focus upon formal features and upon a restricted range of intertexts in which to find models results, quite deliberately, in largely ahistorical, apolitical readings—as is the case concerning the articles that are my subject here.[7] While I am not yet ready firmly to pronounce my own comprehensive verdict upon the authenticity of pathos (i.e., does it genuinely propose moral and political values alternative to the status quo, or, rather, does it reinforce the status quo?), I myself do respond to the *Aeneid* as a text with genuine moral power and political relevance for its time and ours. Consequently, as a preliminary and limited step, I wish to consider why this particular semiotic/intertextual approach that essentially regards pathos as a generic feature without contemporary moral or political significance is not compelling. In the course of the discussion, I will necessarily introduce some reasons for believing that the theory of pathos as a "reconciling" element is inadequate as well.

All readings of texts are partial, determined by an interpreter's prior assumptions and contingent upon historical surroundings. Stanley Fish and Terry Eagleton, among others, have drawn attention to the culturally determined nature of all reading practices, no matter how much they aspire to "objectivity." While I understand, then, that my own questions can lead to only a partial reading, I find this semiotic-intertextual approach ultimately unpersuasive as a

[7]See Eagleton 91–150 for a general introduction to structuralism; cf. Culler 47–134 and Genette. Eagleton 109 explains that structuralism is ahistorical, since most structuralists perceive structures themselves as universal products of the human mind, independent of specific circumstances.

"heuristic fiction" because of its exclusion of moral and political questions that most readers of the *Aeneid*, from Servius on, have seen as central to the poem.[8]

In this essay, then, I propose to give a critique of the above-cited readings of Juturna's lament. I will summarize the arguments, trying to make explicit, where the author does not, the critical assumptions underlying them. I will then point to possible objections one could lodge against these readings, through which it will become apparent that, even within the framework of a formal approach focused on discovery of codes and intertextual models, the manner of applying them involves an *interpretive* decision. It is always possible to read particular rhetorical features as more significant, or to define or conceive such features in a different way and therefore to "map" them differently and upon a different "grid." (Indeed, Stanley Fish has argued for the contingent nature of even so-called "formal" features.[9]) I will then propose my own reading of Juturna's lament through consideration of what fundamentally amounts to a different set of intertexts for deciphering the meaning of the lament—among them, Vergil's innovations in the tradition surrounding Juturna, the influence of contemporary history, and lament both elsewhere in the *Aeneid* and in the lament tradition as a whole. My purpose in considering other intertexts of my choice will be to suggest how the pathos created by Juturna's lament might be read as authentically subversive of the status quo, i.e., as opening a genuinely

[8]Serv. ad *A.* 1.1: *Intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus; namque est filius Atiae, quae nata est de Iulia, sorore Caesaris, Iulius autem Caesar ab Iulo Aeneae originem ducit, ut confirmat ipsa Vergilius a magno demissum nomen Iulo.* Readers should note that Barchiesi, a scholar of immense talent, has his own criticisms of those who criticize the limitations of his method and his own strong points to make against other methodologies. See Barchiesi 1984: 120–21. It should also be observed that, in response to charges that such "intertextual" approaches as his are "reductive" and "mechanistic," Barchiesi does discuss with admirable finesse the contemporary political and human significance of Aeneas' killing of Turnus, precisely insofar as it can be inferred from his intertextual reading (1984: 120–22). Furthermore, I perceive greater openness to the power of Juturna's lament in Barchiesi 1994 than in Barchiesi 1978. Conte, too, has in subsequent studies formulated the workings of genre in a less prescriptive way than some passages in Conte 1986 would allow. See "Genre between Empiricism and Theory" in Conte 1994: 105–28.

[9]Fish 12–13: "...formal features...are the *product* of the interpretive principles for which they are supposedly evidence...[they are] a function of the interpretive model one brings to bear (they are not "in the text")." Fish develops this insight in "Interpreting the *Variorum*" (147–73). "How to Recognize a Poem When You See One" (322–37) recounts how students/readers, once told an assembly of words was a "poem," deployed various learned critical strategies (involving, e.g., verse-endings, sequence, and the assumption of meaning) to interpret as poetry what was, in fact, a vertical list of names written on the blackboard by a previous lecturer. The critical strategies themselves created the "poem" and its "meanings."

alternative moral space.[10] Ideally, my reading will produce a twofold result: it will reveal some of the limitations of a semiotic reading that uses (its idea of) genre as the only stable ground for interpretation, and it will also give the reader some reason to reconsider the value of pathos in the poem's overall moral economy.

The Lament of Juturna

> At procul ut Dirae stridorem agnouit et alas,
> infelix crinis scindit Iuturna solutos
> unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis:
> 'quid nunc te tua, Turne, potest germana iuuare?
> aut quid iam durae superat mihi? qua tibi lucem
> arte morer? talin possim me opponere monstro?
> iam iam linquo acies. ne me terrete timentem,
> obscenae uolucres: alarum uerbera nosco
> letalemque sonum, nec fallunt iussa superba
> magnanimi Iouis. haec pro uirginitate reponit?
> quo uitam dedit aeternam? cur mortis adempta est
> condicio? possem tantos finire dolores
> nunc certe, et misero fratri comes ire per umbras!
> immortalis ego? aut quicquam mihi dulce meorum
> te sine, frater, erit? o quae satis ima dehiscat
> terra mihi, Manisque deam demittat ad imos?'
> tantum effata caput glauco contexit amictu
> multa gemens et se fluuio dea condidit alto. (12.869–86)

> But when, far off, Juturna recognized
> the shrill wings of the fury, luckless she
> tears at her flowing hair, defiles her face
> with nails, her breast with fists. "Turnus, how can
> your sister help you now? And what is left
> for all my struggle? By what art can I
> draw out your daylight? Can I stand against
> such prodigies? Now I must leave the field.
> You, filthy birds, do not excite my fears;
> I know the beating of your wings, your fatal
> shrieking: I know these are the harsh commands
> of that great-hearted Jove. Is this how he
> requites me now for my virginity?
> Did he give me eternal life for this?
> For this have I have been made exempt from death?
> I surely would be done with such a sorrow

[10]Cf. R. Williams 114: "We are better able to see the "limits of the hegemonic, if we develop modes of analysis which, instead of reducing works to finished products and activities to fixed positions, are capable of discerning, in good faith, the finite but significant openness of many works of art."

and go as my sad brother's comrade through
the Shadows. I immortal? But can any
thing that is mine be sweet to me without
you, brother? For what lands are deep enough
to gape before me, to send me, a goddess,
into the lowest Shades?" And saying this,
Juturna placed a gray veil on her head;
moaning, she plunged into the river's depths. (Tr. Mandelbaum)

Semiotic/Intertextual Readings of Juturna's Lament

Here I offer unusually lengthy summaries of Barchiesi's two readings of Juturna's lament, both in the interests of comprehensiveness and because I want to engage with a number of specific arguments with which readers may be unfamiliar. Numbers in parentheses refer to page numbers in each article.

Reading #1. "Il lamento di Giuturna," *MD* 1 (1978): 99–121

Summary of the argument:

> The speech of Juturna is difficult to categorize generically. Neither martial epic in style nor aligned with the "positive ideological axis" of the *Aeneid*, i.e., the plot of founding Rome (100), it deviates from the norm, which is to be sought in the association of Homeric narrative with the Roman ideological orientation (the victory of the new order wished by the fates through the divine will). Neither precisely a lament nor a conventional tragic monologue, its function in the epic is above all as epic retardation (100) of the conclusion; the isolation of its form reflects its meaning, which is the isolation of the impotent individual in a brutal world (121).
>
> While the initial apostrophe marks the speech as a lament, rhetorical analysis establishes pathos as its stylistic register (102, 113). Recurrent questions, fragmentary utterances, interrogative bursts, brief clauses, lack of continuous linear thought or rhetorical ornamentation or periodic style—all fit the rhetorical prescriptions for pathetic discourse (102: Nicol. *Progymn.* 66.12ff.). From a synchronic perspective, these features orient the speech towards the grand monologues of *Aeneid* 4, also pathetic outbursts of isolated, impotent individuals (104), e.g., the lament of Anna, another grieving sister "at war with destiny," and verses in speeches by Dido (4.317, 387, 424). Diachronically, the formal similarity to pathetic monody, a marked discourse of isolation in tragedy (114), confirms the marginality and impotence of Juturna.
>
> Certain motifs in the speech have precedents: the theme of unhappy marriage with a god is seen in Euripides' *Ion*; the accusation against Jove is paralleled in the figure of Thetis, who conceived a mortal son and accused Apollo of his death in a fragment of Aeschylus and in the

muse who appears to lament her son in Euripides' *Rhesus* 948ff. (115). The wish to accompany the deceased into death is a *topos*. Juturna's collocation of unhappiness and immortality recalls Epicurean critiques of Homeric theology, as in Philodemus' *De pietate* (119),[11] and may be attributed to the "ambience of crisis in the ancient world."

In epic, dialectic and dialogue are not possible, as fate is superimposed on any human (120–21). Juturna's protest is cut off from the positive ideological axis of the poem. The lack of exchange (neither Turnus nor Jove hears or responds) prevents her protest from being absorbed into a new theodicy or accommodated within the value system of the epic. Therefore it cannot put in doubt the "system of values" of the poem and necessitate a different "theodicy" (120–21). Thus the ending of the *Aeneid* is merely mournful ("si riduce al luttuoso"), not tragic, because it shows the isolation of the individual, not a tragic conflict between characters (121).

In sum, retardation in function; isolation and marginalization in form and meaning.

Possible Objections to This Reading

This reading makes assumptions that are contestable and move to foreclose important interpretive possibilities. For example, potential political implications of the lament are contained by the interpreter's assumption, based on a hypothetical understanding of the parameters of epic and tragedy and the functions of pathos within those genres, that Juturna's lament is to be construed as marginalized and impotent. As a consequence, formal intertexts (i.e., tragic monodies and Anna's speech) are read as protests "against fate" and therefore as impotent utterances. A corollary of this understanding of epic—that fate is superimposed upon the epic action as a generic requirement—disallows, *a priori*, the reader's further engagement with the character of Juturna. This reading of fate is not, however, universally accepted. For example, fate *may* be understood as a trope for what has happened in history, not as a constraining force externally imposed by genre or some other function. Within the very economy of the poem, Lyne notes, Jupiter and Fate are not represented as all-powerful.[12]

[11]Philodemus, the Epicurean philosopher and poet, lived approximately 110–40 B.C.E. Among the fragments of his writings found at the Villa dei Papiri in Herculaneum are segments of the treatise *On Piety*, which contains a lengthy attack on mythographic poetry (for recent discussion see Obbink 1995a), and a concluding remnant of *On Flattery* (*PHerc. Paris.* 2), in which Vergil is addressed (for this and other possible links between the two men, see Sider 43–44).

[12]Lyne 79; see too G. Williams 3–16 ("The Concept of Fate") and also 35–39. Juno is a major determinant of the poem's action. Cf. Konstan 25: "Juno too is fate" (I owe this

The author's assumption that there is a necessary subordination of the individual to fate (or Jove, in this case) accords with the Roman imperial reading of the poem but is not defended on the grounds that the *Aeneid* must serve Augustan purposes. That issue is not touched upon here at all. Rather, fate triumphs, on this reading, because epic ultimately allows no persuasive expression of individual subjectivity.[13] As opposed to the genre of tragedy, which the author understands to require dialogue between individuals and some ultimate edification and/or reconciliation, epic is said to make no room for authentic exchange of opinion or resistance, but instead necessarily to isolate the protesting individual into insignificance. These assumptions about the nature of tragedy and epic are presented as truisms; arguments on their behalf are not adduced.

In seeking a precedent, an intertext, for form, motif, and theme, this reading would tend to disallow any novel or subversive content in Vergil's text. Indeed, the structuralist method, by its very nature, tends to find only the already familiar. In this regard the method is inherently conservative. As Culler observes rather ferociously, "the semiotician courts banality because he is committed to studying meanings already known or attested within a culture in the hope of formulating the conventions that members of that culture are following."[14]

The hypothesized reference to Philodemus constitutes a methodological anomaly: in seeking an intertext for the motif of the unhappy goddess, this reading goes outside the epic genre, to the philosopher Philodemus and the general "ambience of crisis in the ancient world." But once we proceed outside the genre, what directs us to Philodemus rather than to, e.g., contemporary politics? Despite the striving for objectivity, reading Juturna's unhappiness as

---

reference to James J. O'Hara). Spence 23 remarks: "It is with [Juno's] exile as much as with Aeneas' journey that the text concerns itself."

[13]Conte 1986 proposes that Vergil expanded the genre by allowing other voices to speak. However, these voices have no ongoing power to challenge the conventions of the epic genre or of readers. "These voices [Dido, Turnus, Andromache, Helenus, Deiphobus, Anna, Palinurus, Evander, Amata, and Juturna] are not allowed to disturb the text by instituting a truly dramatic dialectic; they can [only] in the textual present claim a hearing from the poet. At most, each can express its own mourning—the suffering attached to inevitable defeat" (171). Cf. his prior comment: "Copresence, then, is the basic category in Virgil's poetic technique. In him contradiction does not entail an outcome, and it does not display (even if it desires) a tendency toward gradual resolution. No 'becoming' appears; conflict and contrast thrive without entering upon a real dialectic and without being set in motion along a temporal path" (158).

[14]Culler 99.

an allusion to Philodemus' critique of Homer rather than as a contemporary political comment is an individual interpretive move. As read by many other critics, the oppositional content of Juturna's speech centers on her attack on Jove as the epitome, or the representative, of Augustan moral values, not as, more narrowly, an objection to Homeric theology.[15] For one alternative line of interpretation, consider the following comment of W. R. Johnson:

> Juturna no more needed to be in Book 12 than the swallow needed to flutter into the poem just before the wrath of Aeneas and the cry of Vergil; she is in Book 12 because, beyond her usefulness as an engine of suspense, beyond even her ability to elicit some reflected sympathy for Turnus, she creates, in conjunction with the images and themes that surround her, a powerful undersong for the last book of the poem, one that fuses with earlier similar themes and figures to countervail the poem's promise of imperial grandeur and of the theological rationalizations that nourish it.[16]

[15]Other examples of contrasting readings are Boyle 105 n. 37: "Jupiter's rape of Juturna's virginity, emphasized at *Aen.* 12.141 and 878, seems to function as a symbol of Aeneas' conquest of virgin Italy..." (cf. 105–6: "The sympathy aroused for Juturna...alienates the reader from Aeneas") and Lyne 87: "Not just Jupiter's absence of generous feeling, but also his morality is again commented upon." This is of consequence, Lyne believes, because it is "Jupiter who oversees the grand Roman future" (86). The lament makes Turnus more complex, less wholly evil, thereby complicating our moral judgment of Aeneas' killing him (221). See further O'Hara 115: "Juturna criticizes both the justice of Jupiter—so that, indeed, 'the god-given destiny of Rome is called powerfully into question as it is uttered' [Griffin 1986.130]—and the desirability of the immortality of the gods for 'the gods are more unhappy than mortals because they suffer like them but cannot die' [Conte 1986.158]." O'Hara relates the latter motif to a central issue in the poem, namely the promised apotheosis of Aeneas and the purpose of Aeneas' mortal suffering. Like Barchiesi, he considers other passages in which immortals lament the deaths of mortals whom they cannot save (e.g., *Il.* 16.459–61, where Zeus sheds tears of blood when he cannot save Sarpedon, imitated at *A.* 10.467–72), relating the *topos* to an issue of moral and political consequence for the poem: "Both the Homeric and Vergilian scenes stress the sorrow of immortality, in a way that is especially appropriate for making suggestions about the fate of Aeneas, much of whose suffering comes from seeing the suffering and often the death of others. The *Aeneid* perhaps allows the reader to think that the reward of deification makes up for all of Aeneas' pain, and for the deception of him by the gods that contributes to that pain, but the poem does not insist upon that view." See also n. 35 below on the question of the justice of imperial rule. Earlier, Heinze read Juturna's lament as inappropriate in its context: isolated, interrupting literally and tonally the epic story line of decision and action (100, 106, 111); a virtual lapse of taste (100).

[16]Johnson 1992: 438. His essay is a sympathetic study of the power of the Juturna episode to alienate sympathy from Jupiter and put into question the morality of the Roman mission. See also di Cesare 213–32 for a compassionate reading of Juturna.

In Johnson's reading, that is to say, the complexity of the textual reference pertains to the moral aspects of Jove's actions, not to the Epicurean repudiation of divine unhappiness.

In reading #1 above, the lament of Juturna is paralleled with the lament of Anna and the plaint of Dido because of the "pathetic register" that they share. When all these speeches are characterized as laments "against fate," however, this is a judgment of content and not an uncontestable one. "At war with destiny" is an *interpretive* description, which obscures what I, for example, have argued elsewhere is the ideological comment implied in Anna's reproach to Dido for abandoning the city (*exstinxti te meque, soror, populumque patresque / Sidonios urbemque tuam*, 4.682–83) as opposed to Dido's pursuit of an individual heroic death while displaying indifference to the fate of her city: *et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago*, 4.654.[17] Speaking on behalf of the survival of the city, Anna expresses a Roman, communal ethic, as opposed to Dido, who pursues an archaic kind of heroism—hence the implicit allusion to Ajax in her implacable silence before Aeneas in the underworld (6.469–71). As I read this passage, Dido's speeches as well as her actual death operate thematically to put into question the value of the traditional heroic code—as opposed to the position of Anna, who articulates a larger, more Roman sense of political responsibility. The reader need not accept this particular interpretation; my point is simply that other readings of Anna's speech and its textual role are possible.

Certain verses of Dido's earlier speeches to Aeneas in Book 4 are correlated stylistically with Juturna's lament. These speeches are construed as the monologues of a helpless, marginalized female; but one could argue, on the contrary, that they make powerful ethical accusations of lack of pity and faith against Aeneas and promise a future hostile pursuit from beyond the grave that does indeed materialize in the Punic wars.[18] What I am suggesting is that all the referenced speeches of Dido have a content, comprehended by the value system of the poem, that extends beyond mere impotence in the face of fate.

It is perhaps significant that the author criticizes Michael Putnam's method of analysis, described as construing any type of verbal repetition to

[17]Perkell 1994.

[18]The curse also has its effect in the second half of the poem. See Austin *ad* 615ff. and O'Hara 94–103, who trace the ways in which the curse is subsequently implemented. O'Hara also demonstrates how it contradicts more "optimistic" prophecies about Aeneas' future. Quint 106–13 treats the prophetic curse launched by the losers as a rival narrative of resistance.

imply symbolic recall of its appearance in preceding contexts and thereby establishing correspondences over distance (105), since it generates meanings beyond those produced by his own intertextual method. To be precise, Putnam's approach is useful for constructing what Cahoon calls a counter-coherence of victims and mourners,[19] which strict semiotic readings might well overlook unless all victims and mourners were heard to speak in the same stylistic register or were perceived to serve the retarding function. While Juturna's lament is said not to interact with any one of the other modes in which the action of the text is apprehended (109), it does, I would say, place her in a coherent category of victims of imperial politics.[20]

In sum, "retardation" dismisses and depoliticizes the function of the Juturna episode. It would, I believe, be less limiting and more accurate to say that the lament does not simply retard the closure of the *Aeneid*, but rather complicates and destabilizes closure.

Reading #2. "Rappresentazioni del dolore e interpretazione nell'*Eneide*," *Antike und Abendland* 40 (1994): 109–24.

Barchiesi discusses Juturna a second time in this later, equally interesting article. Again, to summarize.

> How to read epic pathos, of which Juturna's speech is one example, is the question. Pathos comes from representation of pain or grief, but what does it actually mean for interpretation? Epic necessarily deals with suffering or pain since it features the co-presence of men and gods, friend and enemy, in a community of inequality. Gods and humans interpret suffering differently, but readers must maintain a dual perspective. The

[19]See Cahoon 63 on the "counter-coherence of victims and mourners" in Ovid. On the rape motif in the Juturna episode, cf. n. 15 above and n. 20 below.

[20]Hardie 1997: 149 also thinks of Juturna as integrated into the systems of meaning in the *Aeneid*; for him this occurs through the vocabulary she shares with both divine and human figures. He comments: "Barchiesi's excellent discussion of this passage is vitiated by the insistence on the total isolation of Juturna and her point of view from the normative ideologies of the poem; he fails to see the extent to which the scene functions as a middle term between the divine and the human...." (149 n. 42).

For Boyle the element of rape is the major manifestation of Juturna's integration into the poem: he sees a counter-coherence in the parallel between Aeneas' conquest of Italy and virgin-rape, a parallel reinforced by stress upon the virginity of three important figures in Books 7–12, Lavinia, Camilla, and Juturna (167). Similarly, the hesitating bough suggests an opposition of the natural world of pastoral Italy to the "civilising" forces of empire and history. Thus Boyle both sees Juturna as integrated thematically into the *Aeneid* and also attributes to the Juturna episode a symbolic function different from that proposed by Barchiesi in readings #1 and #2 above.

reader must determine his degree of distance from the suffering represented with respect to that of the author implied in the artistic representation (114).

Aeneas' famous verse in Book 1, *sunt lacrimae rerum*, a compelling instance of pathos, reads like a universal declaration, destined from its origin to a loss of context. Aeneas sees respect and compassion for Trojans' suffering; readers consequently see the *Aeneid* as a poem "of the vanquished, of the sad victors, of humanity, of the tears of things, of universality" (114–15).

Aeneas, however, is not the only Roman leader to shed tears over Troy at the site of Carthage. Scipio, after weeping over its imminent fall and the general mutability of cities, empires, and all human things, and citing *Il.* 6.449, gave the order to annihilate Carthage (App. *Pun.* 2.19–20). "This so Vergilian model of the sad victor must not make us forget that Scipio annihilated Carthage methodically" (123). "Weeping for the enemy" could, then, be read as a virtual *topos*.[21] "Suffering is a point of crisis in epic, which must continuously and by tradition divide its actors among the human and the divine, the vanquished and the victors." (In a footnote it is pointed out that we do not have enough of earlier Roman epic to know how the genre reacted to the expansionism of the second century, although many critics assume a virtual zero grade of epic which celebrated Roman imperialism without compromise[22] and against which the humanity of the *Aeneid* emerges.) [This suggestive note raises the possibility that "humanity" is a *topos*.]

[21]While Appian's period is the second century C.E., we understand that his sources, of course, are earlier. App. 8.19–20: "Scipio, beholding this city, which had flourished 700 years from its foundation and had ruled over so many lands, islands, and seas....now come to its end in total destruction, is said to have shed tears and publicly lamented on behalf of the enemy. After meditating by himself a long time and reflecting on the inevitable fall of cities, nations, and empires, as well as of individuals, upon the fate of Troy, that once proud city, upon the fate of the Assyrian, the Median, and afterwards of the great Persian empire, and most recently of all, of the splendid empire of Macedon, either voluntarily or otherwise he let the verses escape his lips:

There will come a day when sacred Ilion shall perish,
and Priam, and the people of Priam of the strong ash spear. (6.448–49, tr. Lattimore)

Being asked by Polybius...what this meant, Scipio did not avoid naming his own country clearly, on behalf of which he was fearful when he considered human things." [Loeb translation by H. White, slightly modified.]

[22]Conte 1986: 144: "...the Latin epic *norm* establishes that the substance of its contents should, in particular, be identified with the supremacy of the state as an embodiment of the public good, with the acceptance of the divine will as providential guidance, and with the historical ratification of heroic action."

Possible Objections to Reading #2

This treatment of pathos ignores any political causes or ramifications. It argues that pathos is a necessary, traditional feature of the genre of epic and may well have been present in Roman epics unavailable to us; the conventional nature of pathos may be suggested by the extractability from context of the famous *sunt lacrimae rerum* verse, which probably reflects not a broad but a limited humanity, as exemplified by Scipio's tears before annihilating Carthage. In sum, the irrelevance and impotence of Juturna's protest, along with the retarding function of her lament, both correspond to the categorization of pathos as a *topos*. As in reading #1, above, localization of suffering in the unchangeable human condition of mortality acts to depoliticize the poem. Pain or suffering is perceived primarily as a result of the inequality between mortals and immortals (112), not as a political or military conflict between opposing groups of mortals who might be motivated by different ideologies.

Illustrative of the author's intertextual approach is the reading of pathos as exemplified both in *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt* and in its perceived Scipionic parallel. This is a brilliant and provocative collocation of texts,[23] but I propose a different, and I think plausible, interpretation of the Appian passage and its relation to the *Aeneid*. Let us remember that the tears of Aeneas, when he is contemplating the frieze in Dido's temple to Juno, are shed *not for the enemy* but for himself and other Trojans. It seems accurate to say that Aeneas is the sad vanquished, rather than the "sad victor." He is reflective and tearful at the beginning of the poem when he is the conquered, but not at the end when he is the conqueror. *Aeneas* tells the sad story of his *defeat*; *Vergil* tells the (sad?) story of his victory. Vergil makes Aeneas an angry conqueror at the fall of the city, whereas Scipio is a reflective conqueror. Aeneas is, then, not like Scipio precisely because he lacks reflectiveness at the end of the poem. The felt sadness is in the poet, not in the victor. Interestingly, Scipio is reflective in such a way as to occlude his own role in events: he sees the fall of Carthage as an illustration of the impermanence of human things, not as a consequence of his own action or responsibility.[24] In his reflections, there is no individual

[23]That Appian's anecdote is not an epic intertext might again make us ask why it is a legitimate text for comparison, as opposed to any other extra-epic text.

[24]Scipio blames the mutability of all human things for the fall of Carthage; Aeneas blames Turnus' death on Turnus and Pallas (*A.* 12.947–49). Perhaps there is fine perception here in the portrait of Aeneas as a successful commander who does not feel personal responsibility for enemy deaths. It is not Aeneas but Juturna who laments over the killing of Turnus.

actant; instances of doom are impersonal, functionally and ethically equivalent. This is a reading of events that would no doubt have been palatable to Scipio and, in its generalizing and depoliticizing of historical processes, makes of him rather a proto-structuralist: from his perspective, pathos *would*, as Martindale argues, serve the status quo. This reading may miss the irony in Vergil's handling of pathos as an epic *topos*, if in fact it was one.[25]

Towards a (Political in Meaning, Eclectic in Method) Reading of Juturna's Lament

In the readings outlined above, we have seen that opportunities to read a text as politically relevant are consistently avoided, even when content is discussed. Omission of the political where others have seen and still do see it as central means that this approach overlooks important interpretive possibilities. I believe, therefore, that questions outside the generic frame of reference demand to be considered. Even within the parameters imposed by these readings—which do in practice make interpretive assumptions and which do occasionally admit extra-generic texts as intertexts—a different selection of intertexts could, of course, lead to a more political reading. What follows is an attempt to justify such a reading. I will start by questioning some of the precise claims and assumptions of these previous readings.[26]

First, the effect of Juturna's isolation on the reader may be viewed in two ways. Certainly the style and tone of the lament do interrupt the epic action, as was argued above, but that prompts a further question: how are we to read such an interruption? I propose that the interruption intensifies rather than negates the impact of the lament, at least for some readers. Since it stands alone, unassimilated, can we not say that it is strong? Indeed, Juturna's lament made its impression upon Heinze exactly because of its apparently unassimilable quality. Her lament temporarily halts the martial, forward-driving, male action of the poem and focuses the reader's attention on what I would claim is the immoral quality of Jupiter, even as he exemplifies Roman victory.

Second, assertions that the absence of response to Juturna's lament in the text, and its lack of integration into the other modes of the epic, signify its

[25]In any case, Vergil's pathos is not restricted to epic, since he wrote pastoral and georgic poetry as well, both of which are also characterized by pathos. Famous passages of those texts could be assigned to the "pathetic register."

[26]I am not undertaking a stylistic study of the lament, which has in fact been done with admirable skill and sensitivity in Barchiesi 1978.

impotence and irrelevance can also be reversed. If there is no response to the lament, there is no denial of Juturna's protest, which remains always unrebutted.[27] Absence of counter-arguments spoken by either Jupiter or the epic narrator leaves open the possibility that Juturna's accusations are not contradictable. Indeed, Juturna's final action in the poem is descent into the stream that bears her name. Therefore her lament continues forever, unsilenced in the sounding of this stream (*fluminibus sonoris* 12.139) and in the imagination of readers who recall the myth Vergil created for her and the consequent aetiology for the babbling of her stream. The effect would be similar for any readers of the *Aeneid* who visited the cult of Juturna in the Forum and were thereby reminded of Vergil's version of her story.

Finally, while no character in the poem hears the lament, *the reader does*. In the first reading above the impotence of Juturna *within the epic action* is conflated with the impotence of her lament. But that conclusion does not necessarily follow, since the power of lament lies in its impact upon the audience.[28] The primary audience for effecting any social change would be an external audience moved to pity by lament or other expressions of pathos. To speak in more general terms, reception theory contends that meaning is made at the point of reader reception. Manuals of classical rhetoric indicate that this precept holds good for an ancient audience, since those manuals specifically teach how to manipulate audience response through direct emotional appeals—among which the eliciting of pity was paramount. For this purpose there were numerous effective procedures. Cic. *Inv.* 1.55–56 is devoted to *conquestio*, the *oratio auditorum misericordiam captans*. The *conquestio* is the final part of the *conclusio*, following the *enumeratio* (summary review of issues) and the *indignatio* (exciting of hostility against the opponent). Hence the appeal to compassion is the powerful emotional climax and is to be placed last—as it is at the close of the *Aeneid*. Cicero proposes sixteen different *loci* for moving the audience to pity and therefore to compassion. At least two of these approaches are applicable to Juturna. She is shown to fulfill the conditions for the sixth argument by being in misery beyond expectation, for, having had the

[27]Note that non-response is frequent in the *Aeneid*. Highet finds that 127 speeches receive no response; in twenty-five cases this happens to Aeneas, in two to Juturna (Appendix 3). Another way to read this pattern of non-response is as a meaningful comment on the fictional world of the poem: Johnson 1976: 107 observes that the *Aeneid* shows an incapacity for shared suffering, thus a comparative scarcity of dialogue. Feeney 1983 sees Aeneas' own taciturnity as a sign of his honesty, his lack of deceptive rhetorical artifice.

[28]See Foley and Seremetakis *passim* for the relationship of political unrest or vendetta to lament.

expectation of a good, she not only did not receive it but fell into the greatest misery (*sextus, per quem praeter spem in miseriis demonstratur esse, et, cum aliquid exspectaret, non modo id non adeptus esse, sed in summas miserias incidisse*, 1.55.108). As a figure whose resourcelessness, weakness, and solitude are demonstrated, she meets the provisions of the tenth *locus* (*decimus, per quem inopia, infirmitas, solitudo demonstratur*, 1.55.109).[29]

We have good reason to believe, therefore, that the significance of any event in the text for readers may not be the same as for characters in the poem. Indeed the actors in the poem are largely unaware of the poem's figurative language, which is the source of most of the contested meaning of the *Aeneid.* All the metaphorical language, the figures and tropes, and most of the pathos exist for the benefit of readers, not characters; and, as Wofford points out (1–26), this is what complicates the poem morally and ideologically. Therefore meaning in the poem does not inhere in what the characters know. Like figurative language, the lament partakes of the *reader*'s construction of meaning.

Vergil's Construction of Juturna in the *Aeneid*

Vergil has invented a coherent, detailed legend for Juturna, with the result that the circumstances of her lament are established over several books. According to Servius (*ad* 12.139), the poet created the stories of Juturna's being the sister of Turnus and also of her being raped by Jupiter and promised immortality as recompense for the rape. Servius' information has been accepted by later scholars such as Heinze (245). These Vergilian accounts are noteworthy because they deviate from traditions extrinsic to the *Aeneid.*

Originally, as far as can be determined, Juturna was a native Italian goddess of springs, whose name was given to a spring in the Forum, the *lacus Iuturnae*, some time in the second century B.C.E., that is, well before Vergil's time (*RE* s.v. "Iuturna"). Turnus addresses her as "goddess who presides over pools and sounding streams"—perhaps an older and wider view of the spirit who in historical times was associated with the *lacus Iuturnae* in the Forum.[30] Servius tells us that water was brought from this spring for all state sacrifices. Varro (*L.* 5.71) adds that the waters of this spring were considered to have

[29]A shorter account of strategies for arousing pity is found in [Cic.] *ad Her.* 2.50. The power of Vergil's text to elicit tears is suggested by Servius' and Donatus' accounts of tears shed by Augustus and Octavia on hearing the passage on the death of Marcellus at the *end* of *Aeneid* 6.

[30]Bailey 36.

healing powers and that the spring was venerated in particular by artisans who worked with water. Other references to Juturna are Arnobius 3.29, who identifies her as the mother of Faunus, and Ovid.[31] In *Fasti* 1.463 and 707–8, Juturna is "sister of Turnus," with a shrine at the spot of Aqua Virgo, at an aqueduct built by Agrippa in 19 B.C.E. (Note that in this passage there is no mention of any association with Jupiter or rape.) At *Fasti* 2.583ff. an ancient story is said to tell of Jupiter's apparently unsuccessful pursuit of Juturna, a theme that occurs in conjunction with the violent story of Jupiter's and Mercury's treatment of the mute(d) goddess Lara/Tacita. Jupiter tore out Lara's tongue when she betrayed his rapacious intentions to Juturna. While escorting her to Hades in execution of Jupiter's further punishments, Mercury rapes and impregnates her. Her offspring become the twin Lares. This dreadful story has perhaps some suggestive parallels with Vergil's story of Juturna, but in fact omits both Turnus and the actual rape of Juturna. That Ovid has not wholly adopted Vergil's version of the story tends to corroborate its novelty. In sum, Juturna had a cult and ongoing worship in Ovid's time. Therefore, long before Vergil's time and afterwards as well, the cult of Juturna played a part in the civic religion of Rome. But the story that Vergil tells of Juturna is not traditional. His apparent innovations in Juturna's story, that is, her relationship to Turnus and her rape and deceitful treatment by Jupiter, are emphatic through their deviation from tradition and therefore lend power to her lament.

In a probable further innovation, Jupiter sends one of the Dirae, hell-born creatures said to wait on his commands, to bring about Juturna's abandonment of Turnus and then Turnus' death. This terrifying and deadly entity, although her identity is familiar to Juturna, is problematic to Servius and therefore most likely Vergil's invention.[32] For Servius it is the relationship of the Dirae to the Furies and their placement in the heavens that require comment. Contemporary scholars wonder in addition whether, if the Dirae *are* the Furies, the Dira in this

[31]Other references to Juturna in D.H. 6.13, Cic. *Clu.* 101; Flor. 1.28.15; for scholarly discussion see Wissowa 222–23, Witte, Simon 36.

[32]Mackie finds parallels to Vergil's representation of the Dirae in the iconographical evidence of Etruria and South Italy. While Vergil is our oldest Latin source for the three named Fury-figures (Allecto, Megaera, Tisiphone), he observes that the names are attested on fourth-century B.C.E. vases from Paestum—an Italian tradition Vergil could certainly have known (354). Mackie thinks the Dirae and the Furies are the same beings, having dual functions, i.e., operating for and against Jupiter. (Contrast with Feeney below, who believes it is instead Jupiter who possesses the twofold function, both celestial *and* infernal, as is revealed to readers in the scene under discussion.)

episode is specifically Allecto.[33] Whatever the provenance of the Dirae, this is the first time that they are attested in epic.[34] This Dira functions both as a sign to Juturna and as an agent in Turnus' death. The association of Jove with powers from hell is provocative and may be seen to complicate his moral position,[35] thus lending credence to Juturna's negative portrayal of him. In sum, Vergil has contrived to bring together a number of innovations in order to construct this particular, unprecedented context for Juturna's lament. Common sense would require that readers reflect on the novelty and coherence of the

[33]These are unresolvable questions. For Servius the Dirae are "similar" to the Furies and exist, as he assumes the Furies must exist, in infernal, terrestrial, and celestial forms. (That is why Vergil specifies *Tartarean* Megaera.) Page *ad* 12.845 also thinks the Dirae are different from the Furies, pointing out that *dicuntur* suggests the novelty of the account. While Tisiphone, Allecto, and Megaera live in Tartarus (6.280, 571), he notes, the "twin plagues whose name is Dreadful" attend at the gate of Jove, appearing by his throne when he is angry (Serv. *ad* 12.849: he is not angry all the time) and summons them. On the other hand, R. D. Williams ad loc. assumes the Dirae are precisely Allecto and Tisiphone. Hübner, in an extensive study, argues that the Dirae represent a fusion of Greek demon birds and Roman birds of prodigy. Furies, he says, bring about disorder, while the Dirae restore order. Edgeworth argues for a difference between the Dirae and the Furies.

Contemporary political relevance for the episode is implicit in the verb *apparent*, since Page *ad* 12.850 notes that the term *apparent*, "attend," suggests the *adparitores* or "public officers" of magistrates. By implication Jupiter functions as a Roman magistrate. Cf. Hübner 13: "Jupiter bekommt dadurch römisch-konkrete Züge"; he argues further that the literal sense of "appearing" manifestly to human beings (as to Turnus in Book 12) is essential to their functioning.

Mackie observes factually: "the actual identity of the Dirae is never made clear. Instead, there is a rather oblique description of them..." (352). Surely this is the essential point: Vergil declines to identify the creatures precisely, thereby allowing for a certain mystery. We may wonder but cannot know if the Dira is (a celestial?) Allecto. Because we do not know, there is a kind of sense we are prevented from making. If the same demon that initially maddens Turnus also appears to bring on his death (as Putnam 198 assumes), there is a closed structure to Turnus' experience, which implies meaning, perhaps, and causality. It would reveal a divine plan that conflates heaven and hell. If the Dira is another demon altogether, a hitherto unimagined celestial demon assistant of Jove, Turnus' death remains frightful, but the structure of his experience is less clear.

[34]Hübner 75.

[35]Feeney 1991: 152 on the Dira "as a creature of evil; Jupiter's force is Junoesque, not of a different essence from hers, as his acknowledgment of their kinship marks." Hardie 1993: 73: "Our faith in the geography of the universe that had been built up during the poem, with a serene and reasonable Jupiter enthroned in the *aether*, poles apart from the depths of Tartarus whence Juno summons the embodiment of evil, Allecto, for her purposes, is shattered." Further on Jupiter as a problematic moral figure: Putnam 151–201; Johnson 1976: 114–34. Cf. Barchiesi 1978: 110.

pattern of these several innovations, which align Juturna with other victims of the Roman mission and put into question its moral authority.

Further Innovations: Juturna's Lament and the Lament Tradition

As noted above, the initial apostrophe identifies Juturna's speech as a lament, as does its return to direct address to Turnus at the close.[36] Referred to accordingly as "the lament of Juturna" by critics, the passage is nevertheless unlike other laments in the *Aeneid*[37] or in the lament tradition as a whole. When we study it in the context of the lament genre, we discover the degree to which it is anomalous. From that perspective, the features of the speech that are not conventional in laments have the status of deviations from tradition.

Ordinarily, laments praise, at least in part, some characteristic features or actions of the deceased. They express as well the pain experienced by the lamenter, who is bereft. Frequently they attribute blame for the death to someone or something—usually the opponent, fate, the gods, the war policy of the male state. Juturna's lament is remarkable in that it recalls no feature, characteristic, or action of Turnus. It does not praise, for example, his courage, beauty, or patriotism. Turnus himself aspires to show his courage, to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of the Rutulians, and to be acceptable to his *Manes* in the Underworld. These aspirations receive no acknowledgment. Neither does the lament blame Turnus' recklessness or miscalculation, as he himself is made to do (e.g., 12.931), or his opponent of the moment, Aeneas. In other words, it leaves out the conventional formulae and focuses instead, as I read it, on another issue: the moral quality of Jove as manifest in both his rape and his betrayal of Juturna (12.877–84).[38] Juturna might feel helpless and marginalized, but for the reader she constitutes protest against the god who

[36]See Alexiou 132–34 on the characteristic ABA form, as she calls it, of lament: direct address to the deceased, some narrative midsection, return to direct address. On the lament tradition see Alexiou; Foley; Holst-Wahrhaft; Seremetakis. Among sixteen different types of speeches in the *Aeneid*, which do not include lament as a separate category, Highet lists this one under "apostrophe." Of the fourteen speeches in this group, the large majority are addressed to a person dead or about to die. Therefore apostrophe seems to be largely a trope for deathly circumstances. It appears in increasing frequency towards the end of the poem.

[37]Other laments in the *Aeneid*: 4.675–85; 6.868–86; 9.481–97; 10.846–56; 11.42–58; 11.152–81. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 608a ff.

[38]This betrayal is multidimensional: Jupiter both raped Juturna and then paid for the rape with immortality, a kind of counterfeit currency, since he knew of Turnus' coming death and therefore was aware that immortality would bring not happiness but pain. Note that Juno (*A.* 12.142–53) exploits Juturna as well, engaging her with cynical flattery and false hopes in futile efforts to save Turnus.

sustains the Roman mission. Thus Juturna's lament, the last divine utterance in the *Aeneid*, voices the final (but not the only) questioning of Jove in the poem and, if one accepts the more general implications, of the moral foundation of Roman victory.[39] As a goddess she is visionary and sees beyond circumstances visible to mortals. Her lament therefore fuses public and private and mortal and immortal: it is mortal in grief and female in its private pain; it is immortal in its vision of highest causality. Juturna is weak in the poem's action, that is, weak in the world of power, because she must yield. She lacks "dominance"; but she is strong in "moral authority," because she is a pitiable victim of injustice.[40] Vergil has made a living, vital, and enduring entity into a voice of opposition, both in nature, insofar as she is associated with an extant spring, and in public space, because she is worshipped in cult.[41]

In sum, Juturna's lament is not merely pathetic and retarding but also has a certain *moral direction.* Vergil has departed significantly from the prior mythic record in order to motivate this lament, to which he has given a distinctive content. Now a strict structuralist critic could ignore content on the

[39]Zetzel reminds us that Romans were well aware that their imperial rule was morally questionable, as the debate in Cic. *Rep.* 3 makes clear. There the speakers debate the morality of imperialism in general and of Roman imperialism in particular. To the speaker Philus is given the argument that no commonwealth can be run without injustice, while Laelius then argues, on the contrary, that no state could survive without justice. The text is fragmentary and reconstructions vary, but the essential point here is that Vergil would have been familiar with the proposition that empire in itself is unjust. Zetzel summarizes Philus' argument as follows: "If justice were the basis of society, the Romans would have to give up all the territory and subjects that they had conquered, and return to living in huts on the Palatine. Empire is based on the desire for power and on self-interest; it involves the enslavement of others, and is essentially unjust" (303). Laelius' counterarguments include the justice of the rule of superior over inferior. In concluding, Zetzel finds in both Cicero and Vergil an ambivalence about the justice of empire and the divinely ordained destiny of Rome.

[40]Terms from Gramsci 55f., cited in Rose 1993: 222.

[41]Wofford, on the other hand, says we forget the rape and are calmed; it is aestheticized and compensated for by the haunting of the landscape which gives a voice to streams and pools: "Juturna's actions in the poem, and the mythology that stands behind them, again expose the sacrifice necessary for the attainment of the poem's political goals. Her story summarizes also the situation of all those characters who give their names to the landscape: they all reveal the destructiveness of Aeneas's political project and of the epic narrator's imaginative one" (187). (One should bear in mind that the "epic narrator" is not, for Wofford, the equivalent of the poet Vergil.) "Juturna's story is linked, through myth, idyllic figuration, and imagery, with a hidden violence. Such imagery causes a calm forgetting of the rape that transformed the woman into a trope in the first place....Here a rape is aestheticized and compensated for by the haunting of the landscape...."

grounds that the retarding function is what signifies, independent of meaning; but that position would leave some readers unconvinced.

The Oppositional Power of Lament: Tragedy, Classical and Modern Greece

Hoc fletu concussi animi, maestusque per omnis / it gemitus; torpent infractae ad proelia vires (*A.* 9.498–99). Thus Euryalus' mother's lament is said to undermine the military fervor of the Trojans. That they become disheartened by the lament and lose their zeal for war shows that laments can be understood, at least in the *Aeneid,* as having authentic oppositional power. In Livy's history too we find that women's lament is feared as genuinely demoralizing of military fervor. After the battle of Cannae, Livy reports, the Roman *patres* decided to confine grieving women to their homes in order to quell the confusion and fear generated by lamentation: *ut tumultum ac trepidationem in urbe tollant, matronas publico arceant continerique intra suum quamque limen cogant; comploratus familiarum coerceant* (22.54.11).[42] This strategy of control recounted by Livy is the one implemented in the *Aeneid* in the case of Euryalus' mother. The power of lament is controlled for the poem's *internal* audience when Iulus orders Euryalus' mother to be carried out of the men's hearing. Is the power of lament controlled for the external audience as well? This episode could be seen to embody contradictory lessons: first, lament has emotional power and subversive potential; second, lamenters can be removed from the scene by those in authority. The potential power of lament remains manifest, though, however one reads the dominant meaning of this episode.[43]

The oppositional power of lament has a long history. Plutarch reports that Solon established laws to restrain the wilder qualities of lament and funeral ritual (*Sol.* 21.5). Because of its potential to subvert the political or military interests of the city, Athenians of the classical period passed laws to restrict lament and to limit public displays of grief by women.[44] Helene Foley, Gail Holst-Wahrhaft, and Nadia Seremetakis have all observed the recurrent opposition between women's laments for the dead and the political or military ideology of the ruling class. As a general rule, the content of female lament, in its emphasis on personal loss and in its indifference to the state *per se*, functions

[42]Cited by Heinze 268 n. 1. Note how this vocabulary describes precisely what R. Williams 113 describes as incumbent on a hegemonic power.

[43]See Wiltshire 52–55 for a resonant discussion of the meaning of Euryalus' mother's lament.

[44]See, e.g., Foley 103–7, 128 for discussion and references. For a psychological rather than a political reading of male and female expressions of grief and their place in Greek culture, see Segal 1992: 142–58.

in opposition to the male ideology of war and dedication to the city or state and has, therefore, a radicalizing potential.[45]

Pathetic monodies are cited in reading #1, above, as examples of impotent and marginalized female speech, thereby corroborating the argument for the impotence and marginalization of Juturna's lament in the *Aeneid*. Plato, however, did not consider such lamentations powerless. Socrates argues in the *Republic* that female lament as represented in drama has a potentially dangerous and corrupting impact on rationality, nobility, self-control. Imitation of such behavior will habituate the young, if they see it, to this inferior model of comportment; others might also be poorly affected by it (*R.* 395d–e). Mourning and long speeches of lamentation in drama or epic are emotionally engaging and elicit sympathy from the audience. Such behavior, however, would not characterize the good man; rather, this kind of behavior is womanly (10.605d–e). There is a lamenting part in all of us that needs to be restrained, for pity for others' suffering leads to weakness in enduring one's own suffering; pleasure and pain, instead of reason, are kings wherever poetry is allowed. In the *Laws*, it is argued that the ideal city would ban female lamentation both inside and outside the house (12.960a).[46] None of these strictures would be necessary if laments were culturally without power.

Nadia Seremetakis' study of contemporary lament in rural Greece attests to the continuity of the power of lament as a voice of resistance from antiquity to the present. She finds a structural opposition between the *yerondiki* (the all-male council) and the *klama* (the women's mourning ceremony), where women resist the perceived male-dominated ideologies of modernization, urbanization, rationality, and the idea of progress. Even the Christian church, with its male priest, is ranged in opposition to the ritual practices of women (127, 167, 236). Like Antigone in Sophocles' play of that name, these women may be read as defenders of family and tradition, as figures of resistance, against the new male "rational" order. Thus, as Seremetakis proposes, laments are "strategies of resistance that emerge and subsist in the margins" (1). To render these traditional rituals systematic and coherent, she argues, is virtually a form of social protest (236).

[45]Contrast the *epitaphios logos*, spoken by men, praising the deeds of those who died on behalf of the city. See Holst-Wahrhaft 119–26 on the *epitaphios logos* and other forms of male mourning.

[46]For discussion of Plato on female lament see Segal 1993: 64.

We find an interesting example of the political power of lament in the history of modern Greece. The poet Yiannis Ritsos composed a lament, "Epitaphios," on the death of a young man killed by police during a strike of factory workers in Salonika on 10 May 1936. The slain youth was pictured in the newspaper, his mother bent over his body as he lay bleeding in the street. Ritsos' poem voiced the lament of the mother, combining traditional lament imagery and motifs with explicit revolutionary purpose. The poem was banned by the Metaxas regime. Some parts subsequently set to music by Mikis Theodorakis were also banned and Theodorakis himself imprisoned.[47] The history of this poem suggests the powerful emotive character of lament and its compatibility with authentic social protest, even if appropriated for an essentially male political struggle. Lament may subvert the dominant male ideology (as in Greek tragedy or, as I argue, in the *Aeneid*) or reinforce it, as in Inner Mani, where lament is the prelude to murderous vengeance (Seremetakis *passim*); but in either case, its emotive power and potential to effect action are clear. For the lamenters it is authentic opposition, neither a means of reconciliation with the status quo nor an empty trope.[48]

Pathos and Interpretation in Epic

It has been argued, as we have seen above, that pathos is an inherent characteristic of epic, insofar as suffering is inevitable in a genre that encompasses gods and men, friends and enemies in unequal relationships. Moreover, an instance of real-life pathos—the case of Scipio Africanus weeping before annihilating Carthage—suggests its lack of political or military consequence. For these reasons pathos in the *Aeneid* is, supposedly, adequately accounted for by the epic tradition (and could, therefore, be thought to require no further interpretation). While I cannot prove that the argument thus summarized is false, I have pointed out that it involves some arbitrary and contestable acts of interpretation and have also suggested that the real-world power of lament in ancient and modern cultures shows that, for at least some audiences and in some contexts, it does have authentic oppositional power.

[47]Holst-Wahrhaft 172–84.

[48]Contemporary examples, as in South Africa, of the power of laments or funerals to mobilize opposition to political authority are familiar to us from newspapers and cited by Foley 101–2. In South Africa's recent history funerals were banned and public displays of grief limited. Foley provides contemporary examples of the power of lament or funeral to mobilize opposition to political authority. Female lament, therefore, has a demonstrated potential to result in social unrest.

In this final section of the paper, I briefly remind readers of the power of pathos to effect compassionate action within the epic tradition. Characters in epic are ennobled by pity, Achilles most of all. The power of pathos, of which lament is one expressive means, and the pity it elicits from the human characters in epic texts suggest that Scipio's is not the only recognized response to a pitiable situation, and thus not the only intertext we might consider.

The *Aeneid* itself offers multiple examples of pity that moves characters to action. The first, in paradigmatic position, involves Aeneas, who, as we have seen above, reads the representations of the Trojan War in Dido's temple in Carthage as expressive of pity and asserts that the pity embodied in the frieze reflects the values of the people who commissioned it and *therefore* ensures his and Achates' safety. Aeneas expects other people to act in accordance with their pity:

> constitit et lacrimans 'quis iam locus' inquit 'Achate,
> quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?
> en Priamus. sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi,
> sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
> solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem.' (1.459–63)
>
> He halted. As he wept, he cried: "Achates,
> where on this earth is there a land, a place
> that does not know our sorrows? Look! There is Priam!
> Here, too, the honorable finds its due
> and there are tears for passing things; here, too,
> things mortal touch the mind. Forget your fears;
> this fame will bring you some deliverance." (Tr. Mandelbaum)

Dido, in fact, does pity the Trojans in Book 1 and does help them, as she says, because of her own suffering (*non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco*, *A.* 1.630). The Trojans in Book 2 fatally pity Sinon, and he exploits their natural inclination to pity—an inclination upon which, precisely, his rhetorical strategy relies—in order to persuade them to open their walls to the Trojan horse. Later in narrative time the Trojans, for pity, take aboard their ship the abandoned Achaemenides. Thus there is represented in the *Aeneid* a natural human impulse to pity, and I would propose further that this impulse is authorized by the poet through the sympathy he elicits on behalf of the pitying characters. This implied

authorial endorsement of pity plays a part in the reader's construction of meaning in the last scene of the poem.[49]

Pity is the endorsed moral value of the *Iliad* and central to the *Odyssey* as well. In the *Iliad* Achilles' magnanimity towards Priam, the action that constitutes his climactic and greatest heroism (as its placement in final position suggests), is triggered first by his perception of the suffering and loss that joins all people, both enemies and friends (24.507–12), and then by his *pity* for Priam (24.516), whose suffering he sees to mirror his own father's (534–51). Achilles' pity is rendered climactic through both action and form. In action, Achilles, once provoked, is shown to be pitiless and is so characterized earlier in the poem by his allies (as in 9.497), by Patroclus (as at 16.33), and by Apollo (24.44). His refusal to make a compact with Hector before their combat (22.261ff.: "There are no trustworthy oaths between lions and men," etc.) confirms his sense of separateness from the human community. When, therefore, at the culmination of this theme, he finally acts with pity in Book 24, that pity has the force of moral revelation.[50] Among the formal features that signal closure—and thereby emphasize the climactic position of Achilles' pity—are the close parallels between Books 1 and 24 (a child returned alive, a child returned dead; a supplication denied, a supplication granted).[51] The theme of pity and humanity is carried through in the laments of Andromache, Hecuba, and Helen for Hector that conclude the poem with a passage of sustained pathos—almost the very closing verses of the poem (24.725–75).[52] The dramatic effect of pity on epic action in the *Iliad* is mirrored in the *Odyssey*, if perhaps less obviously. James Redfield offers numerous examples, from both the Homeric poems, of appeals to *aidos* (shame) and *eleos* (pity) produced as arguments for accepting the

[49]This is well studied by Barchiesi 1984: 120–22. I have explored the implied authorial endorsement of pity in the *Georgics* in Perkell 1989: 46–59 and the persuasive power of pathos in *E.* 1 in Perkell 1990: 176–80.

[50]Many have written on the importance of Achilles' pity for the meaning of the *Iliad.* Crotty is a recent study of pity as the central ethical value and final insight of the poem: "For Aristotle, *eleos* required "purification" (*katharsis*) through the medium of tragedy. In the *Iliad*, on the other hand, pity—as Achilles ultimately feels it for Priam—does not stand in need of such purification, for as presented in Book 24, pity *is* the purification of the mourner's passions" (102–3). See also Nussbaum 267: "...The consequences of pity for social life in the *Iliad* are enormous: the return of the corpse, the truce, the dignity of the public funeral."

[51]Redfield 213, 219 lists others.

[52]Rose 1997: 189 proposes that the *Iliad* undermines the ideological bias of epic toward "the naive celebration of the glorious deeds of heroes" through irony; I believe that, like the *Aeneid*, it does so through pathos as well. This is a line of investigation I am currently pursuing.

suppliant instead of killing him: *Il.* 21.74–75, 22.123–24; *Od.* 5.447–50, 9.266–71, 22.312–24.[53] In both the *Aeneid* and in the Homeric poems, then, heroic characters can hope that a plea for pity will elicit compassionate action. Martha Nussbaum argues that such paradigms would teach the audience the value of compassionate acts.[54]

Conclusion

When we consider 1) the emphatic presentation of Juturna's lament in the *Aeneid*, 2) the inscription of the power of lament to subvert military fervor within the *Aeneid* itself, 3) the vitality of Juturna's cult in the Forum, 4) the particular aetiology that Vergil has given her lament, 5) the centrality of Jupiter, whom Juturna assails, to the ideology of the *Aeneid*, and 6) the real-world capacity of lament to effect resistance to authority, we may feel that Juturna's lament signifies more than retardation of closure and that the content of her lament is of consequence. Closure is not only retarded but also complicated by the passage,[55] which embodies a moral perspective at odds with the "ideological axis" of the poem and therefore extends the poem's moral contradictions into the closing scene. The degree to which the lament of Juturna and the complications it entails have been overlooked shows the power of conventional expectations to shape many readers' responses.[56] But the competent reader

[53]Redfield 118.

[54]Adducing Arist. *Po.* 9.51b5–6 and 51b8, Nussbaum argues that the generalizing power of pity and fear is the same in epic as in tragedy (277). "Spectators, sharing in the hero's suffering, become aware of the importance of these elements [the value of things misfortune has spoiled] in their own lives, and of their vulnerability. According to the [Homeric/tragic] tradition, this should have a tendency to increase generosity and concern for the sufferings of others....Tragic action gives rise to pity and fear. Through their pity and fear, indeed *in* those responses, spectators attain a deeper understanding of the world in which they must live, the obstacles their goodness faces, and the needs each has for the help of others" (286–87). Socrates reads the effect of pity similarly, as noted above, but without the same approbation.

[55]Illuminating studies of difficulties of closure are provided by Roberts and by Smith 210–34. Recent considerations of the complications of closure in the *Aeneid* include Mitchell-Boyask; Hardie 1997: 142–51; Fowler 1989: 100. According to Quint, the "image of civil war" at the end of the *Aeneid* "calls its own closure into question" (50).

[56]See Culler 66 on the force of conventional narrative expectations to produce misreadings, especially those associated with a genre that has become prominent. However, as Genette 16ff. argues, evolution, transgression, and subtle interplay between expectation and surprise must also be seen as part of genre. Similarly Eagleton 125 observes that literary texts are "code-productive" and "code-transgressive" as well as "code-confirming." Contrast Conte 1986: 147: "Genre is the organizing system that links, in stability, particular ideological and thematic contents with specific expressive structures...genre enables us to correlate stably the

would also see that the counter-coherence of victims and the consistent allocation of sympathy to the vanquished suggest the inadequacy of mere power either to undo or to compensate for the moral problems that conquest entails. This inadequacy is suggested primarily through pathos, as expressed in part by laments. There is much to suggest that the *Aeneid* inscribes readers who authentically lament loss. While Juturna's disappearance from the poem *could* be seen to affirm the power of Jove, Augustus, and Roman imperialism, her lament, with its living presence in readers' memory and experience, could also be seen as an invitation to various members of the vanquished to hope for better and for readers with power in the world to act with humanity: *vis consili expers mole ruit sua...* (Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.65).

In conclusion, then, I propose that neither a generic necessity for retardation of closure nor a generic necessity for non-specific pathos can adequately account for the significant features of the lament of Juturna. Rather, I argue, the origin of these elements is to be sought in Vergil's own large humane purposes,[57] which we overlook, I believe, only at the cost of our own impoverishment.

content of a literary work with a system of expressive forms, in a historically evolving rhetorical relationship."

[57]Cf. Johnson 1992: 441: "No, though [Juturna] serves the closure in several ways, compressing and stylizing the narrative line beautifully, the reason for and the meaning of her final scene and its superb tirade transcend the conventions of type scene and epic narrative pattern or even the more general rules of pace and rhythm in good storytelling. Vergil's choice of her to introduce this final scene...finds no explanation in epic *langue*, in the structure of literature; Juturna is rooted in Vergil's *parole*."

Works Cited

Alexiou, M.. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge.

Austin, R. G., ed. 1966 [1955]. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Oxford.

Bailey, C. 1969 [1935]. *Religion in Vergil*. New York.

Barchiesi, A. 1978. "Il lamento di Giuturna." *MD* 1: 99–121.

———. 1984. *La Traccia del modello: Effeti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa.

———. 1994. "Rappresentazioni del dolore e interpretazione nell'*Eneide*." *A&A* 40: 109–24.

Boyle, A. J. 1986. *The Chaonian Dove: Studies in the* Eclogues, Georgics, *and* Aeneid *of Vergil*. Leiden.

Cahoon, L. 1996. "Calliope's Song: Shifting Narrators in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5." *Helios* 23: 43–66.

Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Vergil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca and London.

———. 1994. *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's* Encyclopedia. Trans. G. W. Most. Baltimore and London.

Crotty, K. 1994. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's* Iliad *and* Odyssey. Ithaca and London.

Culler, J. 1981. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, and Deconstruction*. Ithaca.

di Cesare, M. A. 1974. *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's* Aeneid. New York.

Eagleton, T. 1983. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis.

Edgeworth, R. J. 1986. "The *Dirae* of *Aeneid* XII." *Eranos* 84: 133–43.

Empson, W. 1974 [1935]. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. New York.

Feeney, D. C. 1983. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *CQ* 33: 204–19.

———. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.

———. 1992. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate." In Powell 1992: 1–25.

Fish, S. 1980. *Is there a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge.

Foley, H. P. 1993. "The Politics of Tragic Lamentation." In A. Sommerstein *et al.*, eds., *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis*. Bari. 101–44.

Fowler, D. 1989. "First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects." *MD* 22: 75–122.

Genette, G. 1982. "Structuralism and Literary Criticism." In *Figures of Literary Discourse*. Trans. A. Sheridan. New York.

Gramsci, A. 1971. *The Prison Notebooks*. New York.

Hardie, P. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.

———. 1997. "Closure in Latin Epic." In D. H. Roberts *et al.*, eds., *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton. 139–62.

Heinze, R. 1972 [1915]. *Virgils epische Technik*. Darmstadt.

Highet, G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton.

Holst-Wahrhaft, G. 1992. *Dangerous Voices*. London and New York.

Hübner, W. 1970. *Dirae im römischen Epos. Spoudasmata* 21. Hildesheim and New York.

Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's* Aeneid. Berkeley.

———. 1992. "Dismal Decorations: Dryden's Machines in *Aeneid* 12." In R. Wilhelm and H. Jones, eds., *The Two Worlds of the Poet: New Perspectives on Vergil*. Detroit. 433–47.

Kennedy, D. F. 1992. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In Powell 1992: 26–57.

Konstan, D. 1986. "Venus' Enigmatic Smile." *Vergilius* 32: 18–25.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mackie, C. J. 1992. "Vergil's *Dirae*, South Italy, and Etruria." *Phoenix* 46: 352–61.

Martindale, C. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge.
Mitchell-Boyask, R. 1966. "*Sine Fine*: Vergil's Masterplot." *AJP* 117: 289–308.
Nussbaum, M. C. 1992. "Tragedy and Self-Sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity." In A. O. Rorty, ed., *Essays on Aristotle's* Poetics. Princeton. 261–90.
Obbink, D. 1995a. "How to Read Poetry about Gods." In Obbink 1995b: 189–209.
———, ed. 1995b. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace*. New York and Oxford.
O'Hara, J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton.
Page, T. E. 1909. *The* Aeneid *of Vergil. Books VII–XII*. London.
Perkell, C. G. 1989. *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Vergil's* Georgics. Berkeley.
———. 1990. "On *Eclogue* 1.79–83." *TAPA* 120: 171–81.
———. 1994. "Ambiguity and Irony: The Last Resort?" *Helios* 21: 63–74.
Powell, A., ed. 1992. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the* Aeneid*: Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design*. Cambridge.
Quint, D. 1993. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton.
Redfield, J. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago.
Roberts, D. H. 1993. "The Frustrated Mourner: Strategies of Closure in Greek Tragedy." In R. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds., *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor. 573–87.
Rose, P. W. 1993. "The Case for Not Ignoring Marx in the Study of Women in Antiquity." In N. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, eds., *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. London. 211–37.
———. 1997. "Ideology in the *Iliad*: Polis, Basileus, Theoi." *Arethusa* 30: 151–200.
Scholes, R. 1982. *Semiotics and Interpretation*. New Haven and London.
Segal, C. 1992. "Euripides' *Alcestis*: Female Death and Male Tears." *CA* 11: 142–58.
———. 1993. "The Female Voice and its Contradictions: From Homer to Tragedy." *GB* 5: 57–75.
Seremetakis, C. N. 1991. *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani*. Chicago and London.
Sider, D. 1995. "The Epicurean Philosopher as Hellenistic Poet." In Obbink 1995b: 42–57.
Simon, E. 1990. *Die Götter der Römer*. Munich.
Smith, B. H. 1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago.
Spence, S. 1988. *Rhetorics of Reason and Desire: Vergil, Augustine, and the Troubadours*. Ithaca and London.
Williams, G. 1983. *Technique and Ideas in the* Aeneid. New Haven.
Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford.
Williams, R. D., ed. 1977 [1973]. *The* Aeneid *of Virgil: Books 7–12*. New York.
Wiltshire, S. F. 1989. *Public and Private in Vergil's* Aeneid. Amherst, MA.
Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. Munich.
Witte, K. 1919. "Iuturna." *RE* 20.1348–49.
Wofford, S. 1992. *The Choice of Achilles: Ideology and Figure in the Epic*. Stanford.
Zetzel, J. E. G. 1996. "Natural Law and Poetic Justice: A Carneadean Debate in Cicero and Virgil." *CP* 91: 297–319.