Tales of Turnus

S. J. Harrison

The Classical Review, New Ser., Vol. 36, No. 1. (1986), pp. 40-44.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-840X%281986%292%3A36%3A1%3C40%3ATOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W

The Classical Review is currently published by The Classical Association.

---

misprints and slips: 'nor any pity at all' (p. 73) should read 'piety', 'pay to heaven' (p. 80) 'pray', 'Evander tells Latinus' (p. 93) 'Evander tells Aeneas', 'Aeneas of Book VIII' (p. 125) 'of Book VII', 'spe suscitat iras' (p. 139) 'spes'; p. 46 n. 13 is a wrong reference to a non-existent book (Eden on Book VII?) and should be identical with that given in G.'s Book 8 commentary p. 23 n. 3, while the page-reference at p. 144 n. 28 should read '103–4', not '103–43'.

In sum, this is both a stimulating and a mildly exasperating book. G. is reasonably successful in relating *Aeneid* and *Iliad* given his limitations of format, and the book's draw-back (for the reviewer) of over-concentration on modern literary theory, consequent skimping on the scholarly side and some careless error are counterbalanced by some illuminating remarks on the neglected (cf. p. 1) second half of the *Aeneid*.

Balliol College, Oxford S. J. HARRISON

TALES OF TURNUS

PETER SCHENK: *Die Gestalt des Turnus in Vergils Aeneis*. (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 164.) Pp. 420. Königstein/Ts.: Anton Hain, 1984. DM. 74.

CORNELIA RENGER: *Aeneas und Turnus. Analyse einer Feindschaft*. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 11.) Pp. 109. Frankfurt am Main/Berne: Peter Lang, 1985. Paper, Sw. Fr. 27.

Schenk's Cologne dissertation takes its place in a recent German tradition of 'Figure of' studies of characters in the *Aeneid*, following C. Balk on Latinus (Diss. Heidelberg, 1978), A. Brill on Camilla (Diss. Heidelberg, 1972) and G. Thome on Mezentius (Diss. Berne, 1979). Turnus is something of a Leviathan compared with these small fry, and the size of S.'s book reflects the importance of its subject. Any study of Turnus must confront fundamental issues of the *Aeneid*, and S. is not afraid to do so, though many readers will disagree with his evaluations.

In his introduction (1–24) S. sketches a useful brief history of the criticism of Turnus. In the literature he is seen either as a tragic victim of higher powers and their violence, or as an aggressive opponent of human and divine justice, even a public enemy (*Staatsfeind*). S. himself inclines to the latter view, though he thinks that Buchheit's political term 'public enemy' is out of place in an epic poem (35 n. 21). 21–4 contain a useful summary of the book's intentions (dippers should also note those at 25–7, 77–9, 116–18, 185–9, 287, 335–6 and 395): the remainder of the book discusses in detail all Turnus' appearances in the poem, and is capped by an epilogue reinforcing its general conclusions. Key ideas and opinions are helpfully (perhaps even excessively) reiterated throughout, and the style is pleasantly lucid for foreign readers.

S.'s fundamental purpose is to prove that Turnus is not a tragic hero. His basic argument is as follows: Turnus acts with full knowledge and responsibility in opposing the divinely-sanctioned match between Lavinia and Aeneas. He shows himself a hero of the 'old' destructive Homeric type, a quality inherent in his nature and not imposed by divine influence, in contrast to the 'new' proto-Roman heroism embodied by Aeneas, which destroys only for moral ends. His general arrogance and defiance of destiny, shown in his conduct towards both god and man, condemns him as an offender: he is no plaything of higher powers. As such he does not fit the Aristotelian

criteria for a tragic figure: he does not act in ignorance and does not make any ἁμαρτία or error of judgement which leads to his downfall, a downfall which follows deservedly and inevitably from his criminal activities, in particular the killing of Pallas. This clear-cut view seems to the reviewer to be somewhat hard on Turnus, who, though he clearly 'deserves' his end in some ways, is in other ways a sympathetic character whose downfall is partly engineered by the gods. It is also hard on the poet, since it discounts his clear interest in moral ambiguity and paradox. S. admits that Turnus is presented positively in the final duel of Bk. 12, but argues that this is merely the 'better' side of the Homeric hero, emerging to give the reader a required sympathy for Turnus at the end. It can be argued that Turnus is presented positively on a number of occasions and is even given Roman qualities; it is certainly not clear that he is a wholly 'black' character until the last book.

The Allecto–scene is twice discussed by S. (27–48, 306–13). He believes that Allecto does not inspire war–madness in Turnus but simply reveals his true nature: there is no diminution of responsibility. Thus 'audacis Rutuli' (7.409) indicates Turnus' violent character: 'audax' and its cognates are taken by S. to refer to impiety, a meaning which the world can certainly bear (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.3.25), but in a Homericising epic there is also a relation to typical heroic epithets such as θρασύς, and S.'s view is clearly seen to be too strong when 'audeo' is used of the actions of sympathetic characters such as Pallas (10.458) and Lausus, of the latter when engaged in an action of explicit 'pietas' (10.811). This is symptomatic of S.'s attempt to present Turnus in a bad light: thus 'nigra...nocte' (7.414) is said to connect Turnus with the powers of the Underworld (37 n. 27), whereas it simply describes night, the time for epic visions: any chthonic reference anticipates the appearance of Allecto rather than characterising Turnus. S. sees Turnus' first words as arrogant and impious, laying much stress on the supposed *hybris* of 7.435 'inridens vatem'; while a certain over-confidence may be seen here, 444 matches Turnus with the sympathetic Iliadic Hector, while 'nec regia Juno / immemor est nostri' seems sadly ironic: Juno is working on Turnus through Allecto in a way which will lead to his death, instead of protecting him as he expects. S. rightly presents the action of Allecto as bringing out previous tendencies to oppose fate in both Turnus and Amata: however, the top-simile of 7.378ff. together with the Bacchic aspect of 385ff. (the two are closely connected *via* Dionysus the child–god – cf. G. Hirst, *CQ* 31 [1937], 65–6) clearly demonstrates that Amata is also divinely possessed. A similar compound of possession and existing character is seen in the Turnus of the Allecto–scene: this does not lead to S.'s clear ascription of deliberate offence but rather to an obscuring of moral responsibility characteristic of the poet.

In his discussion of Turnus' 'furor' (189–288), S. argues that he inherits the destructive qualities of the Greeks at Troy, especially Pyrrhus, *via* his Argive origins: in the *Aeneid* he shares 'furor impius' with Mezentius, Camilla, Lausus and the pair Nisus and Euryalus. Of these the last three names are surprising, since Lausus and Nisus both perish for a laudable 'pietas' – for a more positive evaluation of Nisus and Euryalus, not mentioned by S., see P. G. Lennox, *Hermes* 105 (1977), 331ff. Crucial to the comparison are the clear instances of Aeneas' 'furor' (2.314ff., 10.510ff., 12.494ff.): Aeneas differs from Turnus, claims S., in observing the law of action and reaction (260), answering 'impietas' with justified 'furor'. This is unsatisfactory: Aeneas' clear negligence of fate (as revealed by Hector) in favour of a heroic death in Troy and his butchering of suppliants after the death of Pallas belong wholly to the 'old' Homeric tradition, and S.'s attempts to ascribe them to the higher motive of 'fides' to Troy and to Pallas and Evander are sophistic: Aeneas in Troy is mad

for war like Turnus in the Allecto–scene (2.314 'arma amens capio', 7.460 'arma amens fremit') while quasi-familial loyalty to Pallas does not demand the slaughtering of suppliants, some of whom invoke Roman family values (10.524–5, 597). The poet's injection of moral disturbance into the latter scene is surely indicated by the comparison of Aeneas to the theomachic Aegaeon (10.565ff.), lamely discounted as 'untypical' by S. (269 n. 156). Both Turnus and Aeneas are capable of 'vis consili expers', an essential moral ambiguity which S. does not recognise.

S. views Turnus as 'impius' in the battle–scenes of 9 and 10. In 9 the burning of the Trojan ships, sacred to Cybele, is seen as an act of sacrilege, and Turnus' reaction to their miraculous metamorphosis (9.128ff.) as impious. Again this is unlikely: Turnus like the Iliadic Hector attacks the ships after a divine vision, while his encouragement of his men after a bad omen, there as at 10.276ff. (also criticised by S.) indicates not impiety but good generalship in telling the troops what they want to hear, just like Aeneas at 1.209 'spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem'. Similarly, too, S. ignores the typological link of Turnus' leap into the Tiber with the famous deed of Horatius Cocles (9.815ff. – cf. Livy 2.10.11). It is true that Turnus' taunts and the tactical error of not opening the camp gates show his irrational 'furor', but Hector is capable of much the same sort of actions without being seen as impious. Decapitation is characterised as a method of killing used by brutal 'impii' (90 n. 125), but it is also employed by Pallas (10.394ff.) and Aeneas himself (10.554ff.) and belongs to the Homeric heroic tradition. In 10 S. rightly observes the *Schadenfreude* of Turnus' killing of Pallas, clearly contrasted with Aeneas' killing of Lausus. Juno's abstraction of Turnus at 10.606ff. is seen as a punishment for his 'furor', offending his honour, and as a foreshadowing of his death. The last of these is an interesting notion, but primary here are the elements of sympathy and dramatic necessity: Juno keeps Turnus away from Aeneas to protect him and to prevent the poem from ending too quickly, just as Hector is several times preserved from Achilles by divinities in *Iliad* 19–21. In the notion of punishment S. again inserts a strict moral judgement not present in the poet.

S.'s last chapter (337–95), inverting von Albrecht, employs the canons of Aristotle's *Poetics* to argue that Turnus is not a tragic hero. Aristotle's rules are indeed a useful guide, but (notoriously) cannot even be taken for normative for the body of Greek tragedy from which they are extracted. Even so, it is not clear that Turnus fails to meet them. S. agrees that Turnus fulfils the Aristotelian criteria of prosperity (340), of undergoing a *περιπέτεια* (341), and of having an *ἀναγνώρισις* (12.894ff. – cf. 362 n. 52). However, he views Turnus' death as wholly merited, excluding the tragic emotions of pity and fear for the audience. This exclusion relies on the lack of diminished responsibility in 7 (questioned above) and ignores the emotional effects of the poet's sympathetic presentation of Turnus throughout 12. S.'s further assertion that there is no *ἁμαρτία* or consequent *ἁμάρτημα* seems technically true, since no relevant action of Turnus is done *μετ' ἀγνοίας* and *ἄνευ κακίας* (for these criteria cf. 339 n. 10). Yet even this aspect seems at least to be hinted at: 10.501 'nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae' suggests not only a lack of Stoic 'praemeditatio' (so S. 351–3) but also that Turnus' despoiling of Pallas evinces a tragic ignorance (cf. the Homeric use of *νήπιος*). S.'s contrast between the untragic end of Turnus and the tragic end of Dido thus seems a false one: both err fatally in opposing Aeneas' destiny of which both are aware, both are led by their own characters but are also victims of divine manipulation, both see their deaths as deserved (4.547, 12.931) yet receive the reader's pity at the end (though Dido unlike Turnus has it throughout). This ambiguity for Turnus is brought out in the last scene where the baldric of Pallas, sign of Turnus'

excesses, and the complaint of his parting soul ('indignata') are juxtaposed: S. (393) sees 'indignata' as continuing to the bitter end of Turnus' 'furor' against Aeneas and fate, but there is surely a sympathetic comment about deserts here as well as in an allusion to the formula for the deaths of Patroclus and Hector in the *Iliad*. Here as elsewhere S.'s search for a firm evaluative decision is ill-founded: Vergil's iridescent moral canvas does not admit of monochrome reproduction.

The main arguments of the book are thus open to doubt. Bibliographically, though very full on recent German literature on Vergil, there are gaps, especially in matters not strictly Vergilian. Thus (e.g.) 57 n. 70 (on prayer–gestures) might contain a reference to Sittl's *Gebärde* 174ff., 73 n. 103 (on the 'aura') to Servius Tullius and further anthropological material (approached *via* Austin on 2.683 and Ogilvie on Livy 1.39.1), 83 n. 113 (on 'superbus') to the full treatment by R. B. Lloyd in *AJPh* 93 (1972), 125ff., 105–6 (on the 'balteus') to G. B. Conte's article in *RFIC* 98 (1970), 292ff. – see now also R. R. Schlunk in *Classical Texts and their Traditions*, ed. D. F. Bright and E. S. Ramage, Chico, Calif., 1984, 223ff., 190 (on the repetition of 'arma') to Fordyce on 7.460 or Austin on 2.668, and 223 n. 78 to Kenney on Lucretius 3.1032. On the positive side, there is interesting lexical material on 'audax' (28–35), 'ardens' (239 n. 106), 'furere' (230 n. 90), 'insultare' (223 n. 78, 236 n. 100) and a discussion of Stoic μανία (329ff.), as well as treatments of Homeric war–madness (231ff.) and boars in epic (243 n. 114). However, the book's main use will be as a provocative commentary on the scenes S. discusses, and those working on the 'Iliadic' books of the *Aeneid* will need to consider its interpretations in detail.

Renger's book, also a dissertation, this time from Heidelberg and supervised by von Albrecht (*vir saepe in libro laudatus*), is less ambitious in scope. Her object is to analyse the enmity between Turnus and Aeneas with a view to establishing 'objective' right and wrong, a legalistic enquiry as befits an ex-law-student. Her general view is that Aeneas acts rightly both in fighting for Lavinia and in avenging Pallas, being justified both by the archaic duty of blood-retribution and by the more civilised values of Augustan law and society; she eschews the more 'subjective' criteria of modern Vergilian critics such as the 'two voice' theorists and the 'Harvard School' (cf. Schenk). This dichotomy of standards seems false: Vergil's epic is only superficially archaizing, and its anachronism clearly extends to the evaluative domain (6.851–3 fits the *Aeneid* but not the *Iliad*). However, her attempt to construct a Roman reader's response is a worthwhile exercise.

The section on Lavinia (21–47) defends Aeneas' claim, supported by fate, oracles and the express promise of Latinus: though Amata claims that Turnus has a similar promise (7.365ff.), this is not mentioned in Allecto's rousing of Turnus as one would expect if true. R. is clearly right here: claims of Turnus' engagement are only made by highly interested parties and never confirmed by the poet (note especially the careful language of 7.54–8). Like Schenk, she views Turnus as a personification of anti-'fata' 'furor', bringing out his close connection with Juno (25–6); unlike him, she does recognise that the Allecto–scene constitutes some diminution of Turnus' responsibility, but fails to pursue the moral consequences of this. She sees Turnus as a foreign 'hostis' through his Greek origins, contrasting Aeneas' Italian origins through Dardanus and comparing with Vergil's language Cicero's descriptions of the public enemies Catiline and Antony (following Buchheit but with new material: 26–8): the claim that Turnus is 'objectively' a foreign 'hostis' is surely too strong and ignores the main dramatic function of his Greek descent in providing a replay of the Trojan War in Latium (cf. 6.89, 9.742, 10.26ff.). There is some analysis of Turnus' denigration of the Trojans and

of his other speeches (31–6). Her final argument is that of necessity: Aeneas has no choice but to fight for his destined bride and lands, the creation of a great nation, while Turnus is merely pursuing personal ambitions in defiance of national interests. This seems over-partisan, totally ignoring Turnus' understandable view of himself as defending his country and prospects, given some airing in the *Aeneid* (7.359ff., 10.74–8): Vergil's motivations are more complex than this.

In considering Aeneas' conduct after the death of Pallas (49–104), R. identifies three points of possible criticism: the attack on the Latin capital in 12, the massacre after Pallas' death and the final killing of Turnus. The first is dismissed as strategic necessity, perhaps rightly; in the second R. argues that Aeneas acts from a laudable 'fides' to Pallas and as the 'priest of fate', but the reader is surely meant to be worried by what he does (suppliant killings, human sacrifice?). She is led by this to odd judgements: the priest Haemonides is killed for rejecting Apollo and Diana for Mars (63), while the view that the sacrifice of prisoners is an allusion to Octavian's Perusine massacre is approved (64). Of these the first is simply the old irony of the sacrificer sacrificed (cf. Laocoon at 2.223–4), while the second is surely an event which, if historical (presented even by Suetonius (*Div. Aug.* 15) with the *caveat* 'scribunt quidam'), Octavian as Augustus wished to forget. There is detailed comparison of the deaths of Pallas and Lausus (without reference to any of the previous discussions), rightly seen as detrimental to Turnus (69–72). In the discussion of the final duel Aeneas is seen as linked to Pallas by a triple tie of consanguinity, 'hospitium' and 'clientela': the first of these, though undoubtedly true (75 n. 5) is never emphasised in the poem, while the third is incorrect and should be replaced by 'contubernium' (cf. R. G. M. Nisbet, *PVS* 18 [1978–80], 57). Three further principles are alleged to justify Turnus' killing: the Roman duty of 'talio' or retribution, especially applicable to blood-relations, the possibility of Pallas' returning ghost, and the archaic judgement of actions by their results, necessitating Turnus' death after that of Pallas. The second of these is too crude for Vergil who only plays at primitivism, and all ignore the power of the literary model of the death of Hector, which plays a considerable part in the reader's judgement and expectations.

The last twenty pages of the book consider how Vergil's poetical technique aids the justification of Aeneas. R. argues that the religious significance of Turnus' failure to dedicate his spoils (here she might cite R. Hornsby, *PhQ* 45 [1966], 347ff.), his 'devotio' (87–90) and the rhetoric of his final speech (over-schematised) all point to a quasi-religious justification of the killing. She raises the possibility that Aeneas is possessed by the Erinys of Pallas at the end of the poem (97–8), thus overcoming his natural 'clementia': this is again too crude for Vergil and seems to derive from too literal a reading of 12.948–9. The killing, she rightly claims, is detached from the Lavinia issue, yielded by Turnus at 937; it is 'pietas' towards Pallas and not personal or political considerations which determine Turnus' death. In sum, this is a book more interesting for its ideas and arguments than for contributions to formal scholarship. Bibliography is too often inadequate and/or limited to lengthy citation of secondary literature, and there are occasional errors of detail: thus at 74 Pallas is said to be Hercules' son, a version found at Dion. Hal. 1.43.1 but not in Vergil, while 'miseri...parentis' at 12.931 cannot be ambiguous between subjective and objective genitive (92). Its main thesis is flawed by a failure to consider any moral ambiguities – in the Allecto–scene where Turnus is arguably partly a victim, in Aeneas' massacre of suppliants and in the final killing, neither of which square with the Roman 'parcere subjectis'.

Balliol College, Oxford S. J. HARRISON