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This article is concerned with four passages which represent acts committed by Aeneas to avenge Pallas (10. 523–33, 554–60, 595–601; 12. 930–52). In them Aeneas kills suppliants who have begged for their lives and deprives a dead enemy of burial, boasting that his body will be eaten by animals. No other character in the Aeneid is described as doing these things. In addition, in all these passages Aeneas either ignores or scorns the parent-child relationship. Representations and discussions of these actions by Roman and Greek authors will be used to show that Vergil must have intended that they be regarded as extremely repulsive. Indeed, because they involved vitally important issues in ancient Greek and Roman life and literature the negative reaction of Vergil’s contemporaries must have been much stronger than our own is. So this article will refute the most common defense of Aeneas, that our aversion to these and similar actions results from ‘projecting our values on to an age where they are irrelevant . . . Were these acts of Aeneas inhuman in terms of the values of his time?’ 1

Two characters in the Aeneid are described as ‘suppliants’ when they beg for their lives, Magus (10.523) and Turnus (12.930). 2 That suppliants’ pleas should be accepted was a frequent and important theme in ancient Greek literature. Zeus was their protector, 3 and it was ‘barbarian’ (i.e. un-Greek) not to respect them (Eur. Heracl. 123–31).

The same attitude was held by Vergil’s contemporaries. Cicero suggested as a means whereby ‘in aliquem hominem magnum odium aut in rem gravis offensio concitetur’ (Inv. 1. 100),

demonstramus non vulgare neque facitatum esse ne ab audacissimis quidem hominibus id maleficium de quo agatur, atque id a feris quoque hominibus et a barbaris gentibus et immanibus bestiis esse remotum. Haec erunt quae in parentes, liberos, coniuges, consanguineos, supplices crudeliter facta dicentur. (103)

Conversely, he advised that we can obtain ‘benevolentia’ ‘si prece et obscuratione humili ac supplici utemur’ (Inv. 1. 22). Similarly, the ad Herennium (3.4) says, ‘Justitiae partibus utemur si aut innocentium aut supplicium misereri dicemus oportere’. Indeed, what makes oratory the supreme activity is ‘quid tam porro regium, tam liberale, tam munificentum quam opem ferre supplicibus, excitare afflictos . . . (de Orat. 1. 32, cf. Sen. Med. 222–5). And in his pro Murena (9)
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Cicero says that he cannot cease to help men in danger because ‘repudiatio supplicium superbiam...coarguit’. Cicero frequently used the very strong feeling that the appeal of a ‘supplex’ should be accepted by describing his clients or people pleading on their behalf as ‘supplices’ (e.g. Cael. 79, Clu. 200, Lig. 36, Mur. 86, Planc. 21) and as being in a suppliant position (notes 9 and 10). It was characteristic of a ‘defensor’ that he ‘suppliciter demisseque responderat’ (Flac. 21). Exceptions were noteworthy (e.g. Livy 2. 61. 5; Val. Max. 6.4.4), and one of the distinguishing attributes of an advisory speech was ‘non enim supplex ut ad iudicem venit orator’ (Part. 97). The Greek orators also constantly described themselves and their clients as suppliants (Gould, note 3, notes 24, 135, 136). Cicero also described himself as a ‘supplex’ when asking for favors from friends (e.g. Att. 16.16.10).

Love poets also frequently used the very strong sentiment of their culture that the appeal of a ‘supplex’ should be accepted by describing themselves and other lovers as ‘supplices’. An excellent example is Horace, Carmen 3.10.13–17: ‘quamvis neque te munera nee preces/nec...pallor amantium/nec vir Pieria paelice saucius/curvat, supplicibus tuis/parcas’. They also employed the feeling that one who ignores ‘supplicis vocem in novissimo casu’ must be a vicious, inhuman monster (Catul. 60, cf. Hor. Carm. 3.10.17–18).

For illustrating the attitude of Vergil’s contemporaries to actual ‘supplices’ during and after battles the Caesarian books are especially valuable since it must have been one of their purposes to create a favourable impression of Caesar and his followers. The De Bello Alexandrino (70.3) quotes him as saying ‘se neque libentius facere quicquam quam supplicibus ignoscere’. So he forgave Pharnaces for his ‘magnas et gravis iniurias civium Romanorum’ (70.5). Caesar himself records his ‘legati’ as complying with the requests of defeated ‘supplices’ in his absence (Civ. 2.11–13). In Gal. 2.28.3 he says of the defeated Nervii, ‘Quos Caesar, ut in miseris ac supplices usus misericordia videretur, diligentissime conservavit suisque finibus atque oppidis uti iussit’. That would have been an excellent type of end for the Aeneid, if Vergil had intended it to create a favourable impression of Aeneas.

In the extant parts of Livy all appeals made by ‘supplices’ to humans are accepted except in 2. 39.12. But in the next chapter Coriolanus is won over by ‘precibus lacrimisque’ (3) and ‘fletus’ (9). One example which is closely parallel to Turnus and Aeneas at the end of the Aeneid is when Perseus appeals to Aemilius Paullus as a ‘supplex’ (45. 4). They are the two men who dominate their pentad, one the defeated enemy leader, the other the victorious Roman commander; the defeat of Perseus concludes the pentad, and Aemilius Paullus was one of Livy’s heroes, whose virtues he constantly emphasized. In 45.4 Paullus replies to Perseus that he should ‘se suaque omnia in fidem et clementiam populi Romani permitteret’. In the next two chapters Livy mentions two terrible crimes committed by Perseus. Then Paullus points out to him that he had started an unprovoked war ‘tam infesto animo’. But he treats him with respect and generosity, assures him that the traditional ‘clementia’ of the Romans will save
him, and says to his men, ‘exemplum insigne cernitis mutationis rerum humanarum... ideo in secundis rebus nihil in quemquam superbe ac violenter consulere decet’ (45. 7–8). At Rome, the senators also treat Perseus very generously (45. 42. 4).

Paullus' generous treatment of Perseus was used by Valerius Maximus (5.1.8) as an example of ‘humanitas’ and ‘dementia’. Like Livy (45.7.5), Valerius mentions that on first meeting Perseus, Paullus ‘conantemque ad genua procumbere dextra manu allevavit’. He ends the chapter with the moral, ‘Nam si egregium est hostem abiciere, non minus tamen laudabile infelicis scire misereri.’ That is the same ideal that Anchises enjoins on Aeneas as the archetypal Roman (6.853), but which Aeneas does not put into practice at the end of the poem. Valerius’ next example is Pompey’s generosity to his ‘supplex’ Tigranes.

Roman epic poets also used a character’s treatment of suppliants to illustrate and dramatize his moral nature. So in Silius' Punica 8. 55–60, when Anna was in ‘rebus egenis’, ‘Cyrenen molli tum forte fovebat imperio mitis Battus... supplice visa... dextramque tetendit.’ Conversely, in Statius' Thebaid 10.751–4 Capaneus, who is an absolutely evil character, ‘pugnantibus idem supplicibusque furit’. Then the scene changes to an opposite type of person: ‘At pius... Menoeceus’ (756). Creon is also a very vicious character, as will be pointed out later. When Antigone pleads with him on behalf of Oedipus, praising Oedipus because ‘opem... supplicibus... dabat’ (11.721–2), Creon ‘flectitur adfatu, sed non tamen omnia... supplicis indulget lacrimis’ (748–9), because he is ‘tumidus’ (756). Certainly one of the highpoints of the Thebaid is the description of the altar of ‘mitis Clementia’, who ‘sine supplice numquam... novo, nulla damnavit vota repulsa’ (12.482–4). This alter was mentioned very frequently by ancient writers and seems to have inspired the size, structure, and some of the sculpture of the Ara Pacis Augustae. According to Pausanias (1.17.1), the fact that only the Athenians honoured this god shows their φιλανθρωπία and ευσεβεία.

So Vergil must have intended that Aeneas' killing of Magus and Turnus be regarded as extremely brutal and immoral. He heightened that impression by describing these suppliants as using gestures which should have made their appeals especially morally binding. Magus pleads ‘genua amplectens’ (10. 523). This put an extremely powerful obligation on the person supplicated (Gould, note 3, 76–7, 80–81, 84–5). Therefore, it was constantly mentioned in descriptions of supplications in Greek and Latin literature. People were even said to come to the knees of entities that had no knees (e.g. Odyssey 5. 449), and γονοῦθομα and γονοὶζομαι meant supplicate in general. The thing appealed to by them and other verbs of beseeching was in the genitive, an extension of the genitive of the part of the person touched (e.g. Iliad 22. 345, 338). Indeed, the word 'supplex' originally meant 'one who is bent at the feet of' and ἱερός meant 'one who comes to the knees of'. Similarly, 'supplices' were constantly described as throwing themselves down before the feet of the person supplicated.9

Turnus' position reinforces his status as 'supplex' in two ways. First, he is 'humilis' (12. 930, whether figuratively or literally is irrelevant). As has been
shown, lowering oneself was a vitally important part of supplication (cf. Gould, note 3, 76), and suppliants were often described as ‘humiles’ (ThLL 6,3112, 69–3113, 9; Sittl, note 9, 178). Second, he supplicates ‘dextram ... precantem pretendens’ (930–1), which was also a significant gesture of supplication. It is very important in the Aeneid. Indeed, it is Aeneas’ first action (1. 93). It is the gesture in 6. 313–14, a passage whose pathos has always been admired and on which Donatus commented ‘totum ad obsequium supplicum pertinet’. In 12. 311 ‘pius Aeneas dextram tendebat inermem’. In 1.485–7 it is the sight of ‘tendentemque manus Priamum ... inermis’ that breaks Aeneas’ composure as he looks at the scenes of the Trojan War (cf. 461–3). Priam is a ‘supplex’ there (Aen. 2. 541–2; Sen. Tro. 312–13; Stat. Silv. 2. 7. 56). Similarly, in 10. 595–6 Liger ‘tendebat inermis ... palmas’. It is significant that Liger, who uses this typical supplicant’s gesture, Magus and Turnus are the only characters in the Aeneid who are killed after begging for mercy. Three other characters are killed ‘orantes’ (10. 554, by Aeneas; 11. 697, by Camilla; 12. 294, by Messapus), but their entreaties are not brought to the reader’s attention by being quoted.

The other type of atrocity committed by Aeneas with which this article is concerned occurs in 10. 554–60. That is the only passage in the Aeneid which describes someone depriving an enemy of burial and gloating over that fact. For, although Vergil mentions mutilated bodies elsewhere (e.g. 2. 557–8; 6. 494–7; 9. 465–7; 12. 511–12), he does not represent the act of mutilation, in accordance with his tendency to omit descriptions of brutal occurrences (Farron, note 1, 28). Vergil must have intended that Aeneas’ conduct in this passage be regarded as monstrous. The ancient Greeks and Romans felt a very strong sense of awe towards corpses and of ‘religio ... sepulchrorum’ (Cic. Leg. 2.55). Indeed, the course of Greek history was changed on several occasions by the desire to bury the dead or resentment when they were not buried, and their social outlook was profoundly affected by veneration for the graves of their ancestors. When Herodotus wanted to illustrate the power of νόμος he used the intense emotions that the most distant peoples, spatially and culturally, felt about the proper treatment of corpses (3.38); and it was obedience to the νόμος of one’s society that pleased the gods (Xenophon, Mem. 4. 3. 16).

The intensity of this emotion did not depend on any specific belief about life after death. Anyone who is at all familiar with Greek and Roman literature knows how imprecise and various were their beliefs on this subject. Often contradictory views were expressed in the same work (see, e.g., Farron note 1, 25). But all their beliefs provided reasons why proper burial was imperative, whether because an unburied corpse causes pollution (note 12); or because it takes vengeance on the person who is responsible for its being unburied; or, conversely, because the dead have no awareness of what is happening. Therefore, they can harm no-one (Eur. Suppl. 543–8), nor can they be harmed (Aesch., Eur. Ant., Moschion in note 14). Even if enemies were very evil, burying them honours νόμος (Eur. Suppl. 526–9; Aeschin. in Tim. 13–14), but failure to do so incurs divine νέμεσις (Aesch., note 14; cf. Soph. Ajax 1343–4).
Besides, it requires no valour to attack the dead (Soph. Ant. 1030; Philostratus, Soph. 625). On the contrary, 'it is characteristic of those who distrust themselves to show their courage against the bodies of the dead' (Lysias 2. 8). On the other hand, 'magnanimi' bury, or at least do not outrage, enemy corpses (Ov. Tr. 3. 5. 31–40; Scholia B T on Iliad 13.203). Indeed, the ancients criticized even rejoicing over a dead enemy as not καλόν (Eur. Bacch. 1039–40) and ignoble and incurring divine νέμεσις (Plut. Demosth. 22.3), although they realized that it was a natural tendency (Soph. Ajax 988–9; cf. Aesch. Agam. 884–5). Even more, boasting over or reviling a dead enemy (which Aeneas does in 10. 592–4 as well as in 557–60) was wrong (Odyssey 22. 412; Archil. 65 D, quoted by Stob. 4. 57 to illustrate this principle; Diog. Laert. 1. 70). The basic idea underlying all the above passages is expressed by the Latin ambassadors in Aeneid 11. 104, 'Nullum cum victis certamen et aethere cassis'. There 'bonus Aeneas' grants their request (106 ff.). So 'supremi diei . . . [celebritati] cedere inimici etiam solent' (Cic. Mil. 86).

So monstrous was attacking an enemy’s body felt to be that a way of criticizing someone’s conduct was to say figuratively that that was what he was doing (e.g. Soph. Phil. 945–6; Ov. Tr. 3.11.25–32; Pont. 4.16.48–52; Aeneid 5.787–8; conversely, A. 4.427). In the latter two passages it is the last mentioned, ultimate crime despite the viciousness of the previously mentioned acts. In 5. 787–8 it follows 'exedisse nefandis urbem odis' (785–6). Both these accusations are among the hyperboles Venus uses in this speech to emphasize Juno’s viciousness. Others are ‘classe . . . amissa’ (794–5, cf. 699) and ‘ignota terra’ (795) of Sicily. Donatus says that 787–8 shows that Juno is, among other things, ‘crudelis’ and ‘impius’, and lacking in ‘humanitas’. He makes similar judgements about conduct to dead enemies in his comments on 1. 482–4, 2. 540–3, and 10. 825–30.

Six strongly felt Graeco-Roman beliefs concerning the treatment of enemy bodies are especially relevant to the impression Vergil intended to create in Aeneid 10. 554–60. The first is that ‘to outrage a corpse [of an enemy] . . . is conduct befitting barbarians . . ., and even to them it is hateful’ (Herodotus 9. 79.1; for the significance of this see Farron, note 1, 29–30). The qualification in the last clause refers specifically to the Persians (Herod. 7. 238. 2; Paus. 9. 32. 9). But even they often maltreated dead enemies (e.g. Xenophon, An. 1. 10. 1; which was counterproductive: 3. 1. 17–18). Other ancient non-Graeco-Roman peoples routinely exposed the bodies of defeated military enemies to animals or mutilated them. Examples are the Assyrians; Philistines (1 Samuel 17. 44; 31. 9–10; 1. Chron. 10. 9–10); other enemies of Israel (Deut. 28. 25–6; Ps. 79. 2); the Israelites themselves (1 Sam. 17. 46; 1 Macc. 7. 47; Judith 14. 1); Parthians (Plutarch, Crassus 32–33. 4; Lucan 8. 429–39); and Gauls (Strabo, Geog. 197–8). None of these non-Graeco-Roman sources expresses moral disapproval (but Deut. 21. 22–3). However, Plutarch says (33.5) that as just punishment for Hyrodes’ ἐμφατικαί ονειρείς one of his sons was killed and the other assassinated him; in Lucan the unburied corpses make any agreement between a Roman and the Parthians impossible; and Strabo introduces it as ‘barbarian’ and ‘foreign’, and
says that the Romans stopped it as being ‘opposed to our νόμῳ’ (cf. Curt. 4. 6. 29).

The second relevant belief is that the gods want the dead buried and are angry if they are not. This belief appears in many of the passages that have been and will be cited (and Macleod, note 14). It is most striking when the dead person has committed horrible crimes. Among the many examples of this (cf. Aeschin. in Tim. 13–14) are Sophocles’ Ajax and Antigone, where the crucial issue is the burial of a criminal. Both these plays were very popular in antiquity. The Ajax is recalled in many places in the Aeneid, including the only words spoken by Aeneas to Ascanius (12. 435–6, cf. Ajax 550–1). In it Sophocles gave Odysseus every reason for wanting revenge on Ajax (109–13, 296–300, 388–90). Moreover, Ajax’s death was a punishment for having grievously antagonized the gods, and he does not change during the play. But Odysseus realizes that not burying him would offend the gods’ laws (1343–4, cf. 1129–31) and establish a bad precedent that could redound against anyone (1365–7, cf. 121–6). Unlike Ajax, Polyneices has no redeeming qualities, and no-one tries to deny Creon’s statement (285–7) that he intended to destroy the gods’ temples and offerings and their city and its laws. But Creon’s deduction from that (282–3, 288–9), that the gods do not care about his corpse, is proved to be totally wrong (1070–6, 1015–22, cf. 450–7, 76–7). Indeed, Creon’s assertion that the gods do not care about the corpses of evil men is prompted by the speculation that they made the first burial of Polyneices miraculously effective against animals, and Sophocles strongly suggests that that speculation is correct.

The third relevant belief about burial is that ‘qui ... de pietatis generibus scripserunt primum locum in sepultura esse voluerunt’ (Servius on A. 6. 176), an assertion which is copiously supported by statements in Latin and Greek literary works, many concerning the ‘pietas’ of burying dead enemies or the ‘impietas’ of not doing so. The basic conflict of Sophocles’ Antigone is expressed largely in terms of whether Antigone’s burial of her city’s brutal enemy was genuine εὐσέβεια and whether that εὐσέβεια is more important than patriotic εὐσέβεια, a question also raised in the Ajax. Sophocles left no doubt as to the answer. In the Aeneid, of the twenty occurrences of ‘pius Aeneas’, six involve his burying or mourning a dead person or performing funeral games. Moreover, in 1. 349–53 the last mentioned atrocity committed by ‘impius’ Pygmalion is that Sycaeus was ‘inhumatus’. Vergil wanted that atrocity enough to allow an inconsistency. In 6.473–6 Sycaeus is in the ‘Lugentes Campi’, even though as an ‘inhumatus’ he should not have been able to cross the Styx for a hundred years (6. 325–30, 374–6). Indeed, the terribly pathetic fate of the unburied is brought strongly to Aeneas’ (and the reader’s) attention (6. 313–16, 332–3, 340, 365, 370–1), which makes his denial of burial to Tarquitus all the more cruel.

The fourth relevant belief concerning burial was that it was especially deserving of praise when given to enemies killed in battle and of condemnation when denied to them. It was ‘ancestral custom’ that enemies be allowed a truce to
recover their dead without conditions (Thucydides 4. 98. 8). Indeed, the books written about Heracles stated, obviously to glorify him, that he instituted this practice (Plut. Thes. 29. 4–5). Lysander’s failure to bury dead enemies after Aegospotami was listed by Pausanias (9. 32. 9) among his disgraces. He contrasts that with the Athenians’ burial of the Persian dead after Marathon. That was particularly noteworthy because the Greeks, and especially the Athenians, had such good reasons for hating the Persians. Even before the invasion of mainland Greece, the fate of Miletus distressed the Athenians so deeply that they could not bear to be reminded of it (Herodotus 6. 21.2); and the fate of the Eretrians (and afterwards of the Athenian Acropolis) must have convinced the Greeks that a Persian victory would end their civilization and perhaps their existence. But ‘the Athenians say that they buried the Persians [at Marathon] because in all circumstances it is divine law [πάντως ἀνθρώποι] to cover a corpse with earth’ (Paus. 1. 32. 5). Conversely, Herodotus (9. 78–9) described as ἀνθρώποι a suggestion made to Pausanias after Plataea that he impale Mardonius’ body because Mardonius had cut off and put on a pike the head of Pausanias’ uncle, Leonidas. Pausanias answered that defiling a corpse would bring to nothing himself, his country, and his victory.

Many similar passages could be mentioned, and many are cited elsewhere in this article; but for the sake of brevity only one more example will be used from Greek literature, the treatment of the burial of the Seven against Thebes in Athenian and Theban propaganda. The Athenians adduced their burial of the seven as a reason for being placed in a position of honour at the battle of Plataea (Herod. 9. 27. 3). In Euripides’ Supplices, a play filled with Athenian propaganda (e.g. 403–55), Theseus states that the seven were led by brutal men in an unjust war against the gods’ will (131–60, 219–37), but he washes and buries their corpses himself (758–68; cf. Suet. Cal. 3) after having taken them from the Thebans in order to uphold the ancient law of the gods (19, 563) and the laws of all the Greeks (308–12, 526–7, 670–2), which are necessary for international harmony (312–13). Therefore, ‘it is the common concern of all Greece if anyone denies the dead burial . . . ’ (538–40). The same points were made by Lysias (2. 7–10) and Isocrates (Paneg. 54–8; Panath. 168–74; Plat. 53) to glorify Athens (cf. Demosth. 60. 8; Xen. Hell. 6. 5. 46). In all these passages except Panathenaicus it is stated or implied that the Athenians took the corpses from the Thebans by force. In the Panathenaicus Isocrates asserts that the Thebans were persuaded by the Athenians to give them the corpses and acknowledges that that contradicts his Panegyricus. His later version was probably motivated by a desire to avoid offending the Thebans. So Pausanias (1. 39. 2) says, ‘The Thebans state that they willingly allowed the corpses to be gathered up and they deny that they fought a battle.’ This view was also argued by Plutarch (Thes. 29. 4), whose Boeotian patriotism often caused him to glorify Thebes.

The treatment of the burial of the Seven against Thebes in Statius’ Thebaid is also significant. In 8.65–74 Hades sends Tisiphone to bring about a ‘triste,
insuetum, ingens ... nefas': brothers killing each other, 'qui rabidarum more ferarum mandat ... caput', and the last and climactic horror, 'quique igne supremo arceat exanimes et manibus aethera nudis commaculet'. The perpetrator of that 'nefas', Creon, is constantly described in the most derogatory way because of it (e.g. 11. 661–3; 12. 154–9, 165–6, 174, 180, 477, 590–4). By contrast, Theseus 'non spernit coniugis aequas ... preces' to act in accordance with his past behaviour and recover the corpses (9. 517–20). He is 'iusta ... concitus ira' (12. 589), he and his followers are defending 'terrarum leges et mundi foedera' (12. 642), and he guarantees Creon a proper burial despite Creon's denial of burial to others (12. 779–81). Moreover, the gods protect the bodies from putrefaction (12. 137–40), just as they do Hector's body in the Iliad (note 18).

The Romans also thought that conduct to dead enemies in their history was very significant and noteworthy. In their early history the Gauls were an enemy who had many similarities to the Persians in Greek history. They were invaders with a totally different culture and they plundered and burnt Rome. Later Romans remembered as one of the highpoints of the wars against the Gauls the 'inclita pugna' (Livy 6.42. 5) between Manlius Torquatus and the giant Gaul. When Livy told this story (7. 9. 8–10. 11) he made many changes in his source, Claudius Quadrigarius (apud Gell. 9. 13), to glorify Manlius (Luce, note 6, 224–6). Among these changes:

In Claudius, Manlius cuts off the Gaul's head; Livy refuses to include an act so barbarous and so repugnant to Augustan sensibilities. He therefore writes: “The Gaul's body was not violated in any way . . .”. (Luce, 226)

The Second Punic War also corresponded in many ways to the Persian attack on Greece. It was the most terrifying and traumatic invasion in Roman history. They always afterwards regarded Carthage as their arch-enemy. So Silius Italicus began his Punicca by describing Carthage as vicious and evil (1. 5–18) and Hannibal as virtually evil incarnate (56–60). Then he intruded an episode which is irrelevant to the course of the war and Hannibal's career, but which served to illustrate Carthaginian brutality. He introduced Hasdrubal as having 'furiae iniquiae', 'immedicabilis ira', 'feritas', and an 'immite pectus', and being 'asper amore sanguinis'. These qualities were manifested in the first Carthaginian act against an enemy: Hasdrubal, 'nee nota docilis poena satiare furores . . . superumque hominumque immemor', crucified a man and, the climactic atrocity, displayed his body 'sine funere'. (1. 144–54, 168).

However, Silius gave credit where it was due. He described how after Cannae Hannibal gave Paullus an elaborate funeral at which he spoke a glowing eulogy (10. 518–20, 558–75), although he cast doubt on Hannibal's motive: 'hostilis leti iactabat honorem' (559). 'Iactare' in such a context tends to be pejorative (ThLL 7, 58, 41 ff). But the significant fact is that it was something to boast about. Similarly in 12. 473–8 Silius says that Hannibal buried Gracchus because he wanted 'famam nomenque mitificae mentis', so he 'laudem . . . rapiebat humandi'. In 15. 383–96 Hannibal says of Marcellus, 'Latias, Carthago, timere
desine iam leges. Iacet exiitiable nomen'. But he gives him a very elaborate funeral because 'magnanima invidia virtus caret', so 'numquam hoc tibi, Roma, negabo'.

Other ancient authors also praised these deeds. Valerius Maximus (5. 1. ext. 6) stated, as an example of 'humanitas' and 'clementia',

aliquanto ei [Hannibal] plus gloriae Paullus, Gracchus et Marcellus sepulti quam oppressi attulerunt. Siquidem illos Punico astu decepit, Romana mansuetudine honoravit.

Lucan (7. 797–809) mentioned Hannibal's burial of enemies because it did not induce Caesar 'hominum ritus ut servet in hoste'. But he 'fures . . . invidet igne rogi miseris' because 'nondum satiata caedibus ira'. Diodorus Siculus (26.16) described Hannibal's burial of Gracchus as φιλανθρωπον. Similarly Appian (Pun. 104) records Hasdrubal as burying dead Romans 'thinking it an act ἀνθρωπικ and common in war' (cf. Livy 22. 7. 5; 22. 52. 6; 25. 17. 4–7).

Another villain in Roman history, Sulla, greatly aggravated instead of attenuating his infamy by his treatment of enemy corpses. Some Roman authors, like Lucan (2. 119–25), also recounted with horror the Marians' monstrous conduct to the dead. But even he put more emphasis on Sulla's (2. 160–73). He ended his narration of Sulla's atrocities and devoted the most attention to his piling the corpses of his enemies into the Tiber (2. 209–20). Valerius Maximus (9. 2. 1) mentioned the same incident as an example of 'crudelitas'. He began that chapter with 'L. Sulla, quem neque laudare [for his victories] neque vituperare [for his conduct to the defeated] quisquam satis digne potest', an exact reversal of his judgement on Hannibal. In the same chapter he mentioned that Sulla 'Marii . . . erutos cineres in Anienis alveum sparsit.' Cicero (Leg. 2. 56) said that in doing this Sulla was 'acerbiore odio incitatus quam si tam sapiens fuisset quam vehemens.'

The Greek and Roman attitude to the treatment of dead enemies is also well illustrated by the many descriptions of what happened to Pompey's corpse. Lucan emphasized how evil the murder of Pompey was (8. 482–662), but it was followed by 'scleris maius scelus': his body was decapitated and thrown into the sea (668–711). But Cordus, motivated by 'pietas' (718–20, 785), dragged it to the shore and buried it (712–93), for which he gained everlasting fame (782). Lucan would not grant to Caesar any virtue, so he says that his mourning for Pompey was hypocritical (9. 1037–43, 1062–3) and that his order that Pompey be given a fitting burial (1089–95) was motivated by 'fame cura' (1080). Dio (42.8) likewise attributed Caesar's mourning for Pompey to hypocrisy, but said that he gained praise for burying him. Plutarch (Pomp. 80.5) described Egypt as 'filled with pollution' because of what happened to Pompey, and said that Caesar 'turned away from the man bringing the head as from one defiled by blood'. Appian (B.C. 2. 86) stated that Caesar punished those who decapitated Pompey in a manner 'worthy of their δοθεματια'. He killed them (90). Valerius Maximus (5. 1. 10) mentioned Caesar's burial of Pompey as an example of 'humanitas' and
‘dementia’, along with other instances of Romans who buried dead enemies (1, 2, 11).

The descriptions of the death of Pompey have a parallel at a crucial point in the _Aeneid_. At 2. 557–8 Priam ‘iacet ingens litore truncus avulsumque umeros caput et sine nomine corpus.’ ‘Litore’ is very strange since Vergil just described his death in the palace, and it is to that that Aeneas reacts (559 ff.) Several explanations were offered in antiquity (Servius on 2. 506 and 557), of which ‘Pompei tangit Historiam’ has gained the most modern support because of three parallels. First, in the accounts of Pompey’s death the terrible pathos of his body being beaten by waves on the shore is emphasized (e.g. Lucan 8. 698–711). Second, in this passage from Lucan and elsewhere this condition is contrasted with his previous glory, as Vergil does with Priam (2. 556–7: ‘tot quondam populis terrisque superbum regnatum Asiae’, cf. App. B.C. 2. 71). Third, in all the accounts of Pompey’s death tremendous stress is put on the abomination of his decapitation, and Priam’s ‘avulsum caput’ is also totally unexplained in the preceding narrative.

However, no great poet, and certainly not one as careful as Vergil, simply recalls extraneous events for no purpose. This is especially true of a passage which he singles out for special attention, as is the case in lines 557–8. He introduced ‘Priami fata’ in 2. 506. He recalls that phrase in 554 (‘haec finis Priami fatorum’). Moreover, the present tense in 557–8 brings us back to the instances of the present in 506–11 after the intervening instances of the past. So the ultimate horror of ‘Priami fata’ was to be a headless body on a shore. Furthermore, as Heinze pointed out (note 16, 39–40), Vergil made Priam’s death summarize symbolically the fall of Troy (cf. 1. 459–63), a significance it had nowhere else. For, although it was an important event in other accounts of Troy’s fall (including his unburied state: Eur. _Tro._ 1313), Vergil’s version is the only one of which we know that culminates with it. But Heinze did not explain how it symbolizes Troy’s fall. There are two ways. First, Vergil constantly brings out the pathos that ‘urbs antiqua ruit multos dominata per annos’ (2. 363; cf. 3. 1–3, ‘superbum’), the same pathos as in 2. 556–8. Second, he constantly emphasizes the treacherous ferocity of the Greeks, the dominating image of which is snakes. Pyrrhus is introduced as being like a snake (469–75). He is represented as ‘violence personified’ and his killing of a son and father at an altar recalls the snakes that killed Laocoon and his sons (Knox, note 23, 136–7), which had prefigured the activities of the Greek army (Knox, 126–7). So the manner of Priam’s death symbolizes the vicious brutality of the Greeks. This is where the descriptions of Pompey are valuable. They show the revulsion with which a decapitated body thrown into water was regarded. For the ancient Greeks and Romans thought it ‘terrible to die at sea’ (Hesiod, _Works_ 687) and therefore thought throwing corpses into bodies of water to be a particularly heinous crime. This is clear not only from the descriptions of Pompey’s fate, but also of Sulla’s conduct and many other passages. That is the fifth Graeco-Roman belief that must be kept in mind in evaluating the impression Vergil intended Aeneas to
make when ‘truncumque tepentem provolvens . . . inimico pectore fatur: . . .
gurgite mersum unda feret piscesque impasti vulnera lambent’ (10. 555–60). Of
course, Vergil does not describe even the extremely vicious Pyrrhus, the symbol
of Greek brutality, throwing a headless body into water. Only Aeneas is
described as doing that.

The loathing that was felt for a corpse being thrown into water explains why
Vergil allowed the same type of incongruity in 10. 559–60 as in 2. 557–8. As
Asper observed (apud. Schol. Veron. on 559), ‘non est dictum ratione’ that the
body of a man killed on a plain is in a river. He attributed this to Vergil following
Iliad21. 120 ff. ‘nimio studio’. But here again Vergil had a purpose, the same as in
2. 557–8. He wanted Aeneas to follow Achilles in committing what his
contemporaries regarded as a supremely brutal act (note 24).

The repulsiveness of Aeneas’ boast in 10. 559–60 is intensified by the mention
of fish eating the corpse. In many of the passages cited in note 24 that is an
important part of the horror of a corpse being in a body of water. It is a facet of the
sixth relevant Graeco-Roman belief about the treatment of corpses, that their
being eaten by animals was loathsome; and therefore a literary character could be
shown to be brutal by having him expose or intend to expose a body to animals or
even not preventing it. The passages cited in note 25 show that Aeneas’ boast was
as brutal as any boast that a body would be eaten by animals could be, for two
reasons. First, the idea of fish or other sea animals eating corpses was felt to be
more hideous than other animals eating them. That is obvious from Philodemus’
argument (‘being devoured by fish is no worse than by worms and insects’), and
from Seneca’s misquotation of Aeneid 9. 485 (‘canibus . . . marinis’ for ‘Latinis’).
He changed a simple and obvious phrase to a very obscure one which is
incongruous in its context, clearly because he and his readers regarded it as the
ultimate horror. Second, Aeneas first mentions as an alternative to Tarquitus’
being covered by water, ‘alibus linquere feris’ (559). In many of the passages in
note 25 fish and birds are mentioned together. Conversely, in Lucan 8. 718–20
Cordus ‘pietas’ caused him to drag Pompey’s body from the water, ‘ne ponti
belua quidquam, ne fera, ne volucres . . . audeat’ (764–6).

There is another element in all the passages under discussion in this article
whose purpose must have been to shock the reader’s feelings. Aeneas scorns or
ignores the parent-child relationship. It has been pointed out that only three
characters in the Aeneid are killed after they beg for mercy. Magus begs ‘per
patrios manis et spes surgentis Iuli . . . hanc animam serves gnaotoque patrique’
(10. 524–5); Liger ‘per qui te talem genuere parentes’ (10. 597); Turnus ‘miseri si
qua parentis tangere cura26 potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis Anchises genitor) Dauni
miserere senectae’ (12. 932–4). Such appeals were common in Greek and Latin
literature from Homer on (e.g. Il. 15. 662–6; Od. 11. 66–8; 13. 324) and are
frequent in the Aeneid (e.g. 6. 115–17, 364; Donatus on patri in 2. 674). Their
effect can be seen from the comments by ancient scholars on them. Macrobius
(Sat. 4. 2. 11) cited 10. 597 as an illustration of ‘pathos, quo tenore orationis
exprimitur.’ Donatus said of 10. 524–5

79
Tenuit patris memoriam et spem fili surgentis, alterum quod consecratum esse apud Aenean debut, alterum quod contemplatione fili esse debut pium... etiam fili sui nexuit causam... recte a similibus personis principia petitionis induxit.

Servius commented on 12. 931, 'Secundum artem agit rhetoricam... tu debes ignoscere parentis intuitu'. Servius' mention of oratory and Donatus' use of rhetorical terminology suggest Cicero's advice to gain 'misericordia' (Inv. 1. 106), 'ad ipso qui audiant convertimus et petimus ut de sui liberis aut parentibus... nos cum videant, recordentur' (108, cf. 105). He put that into practice in his Pro Caelio (79),

constituitote ante oculos etiam huius miseri senectutem, qui hoc unico filio nititur... quem vos supplicem... vel recordatione parentum vestrorum vel liberorum iucunditate sustentate, ut... vel pietati vel indulgentiae vestræ serviat.

There are times in the Aeneid when Aeneas does react in the proper manner. The sight of Priam's death reminds him of his obligations to his own father, wife and son (2. 559-63). At the sight of Lausus' dying, 'mentem patriae subiit pietatis imago' (10. 824; cf. 9. 294).27 Aeneas is 'pius' in 10. 826 because of this reaction (cf. Cic. Cael. above). But to Magus, Aeneas replies scornfully, 'argenti atque auri memoras quae multa talenta gnatis parce tuis' (531-2), and he kills Liger and Turmus. So he kills these three men after he and the reader have been impressed with the suffering which their deaths will cause their fathers. (This is done indirectly in the case of Liger.) Moreover, Aeneas says to Tarquitus, 'non te optima mater condet humili patrioque onerabit membra sepulcro' (10. 557-8).

Greek and Latin literature show a keen awareness of the agony of parents whose children died. It was 'the most horrible [Σωτικός] grief' (Eur. Med. 1113), the 'greatest pain of all' (Eur. Suppl. 785, cf. 807). It could be used as an example of a terrible emotional blow (e.g. Plato, Rep. 603E) and in similes (e.g. Sil. 8. 129; and many of the passages in note 28). Indeed, Odysseus' mere absence killed his mother with grief (Od. 11. 197-203). Of course, we in our culture also regard the loss of a child as 'atrox fortuna' (Suet. Tib. 23). Nevertheless, we find amazing Aeschines' argument (in Ctes. 77-8) that a man who rejoiced at Athens' good fortune seven days after his daughter's death could never be a good political leader. Equally amazing to us is the compassion with which Vergil and his contemporaries so frequently described the pain of animal parents who have lost their young.28 But it was especially parental misery for children killed in war that seems to have attracted the attention and sympathy of the Greeks and Romans. In the Iliad the misery of bereaved parents is a central theme, and that of Priam and Hecuba was represented so powerfully that subsequent artists and writers constantly dwelled on it as it was depicted there and in the Epic Cycle.29 In subsequent Greek and Latin literature the agony of parents, especially mothers, like Tarquitus', bereaved by war was also a very frequent subject.30 It is a particularly prominent motif in the Aeneid, where it is often referred to briefly31 and is the subject of some of the most moving episodes.

NOTES

1. M. Scott, A Class 21 (1978) 152. Two other actions performed by Aeneas while avenging Pallas, his human sacrifice (10. 517–20; 11. 81–2) and killing a priest of Apollo (10. 537–41), were analyzed in a similar manner in S. Farron, A Class 28 (1985) 21–33.

2. In a way in 4. 414–15 and 424 Dido is a 'supplex' begging for life. Aeneas also rejects her. Becoming a 'supplex' was very difficult for Dido. She dismissed it as a means of saving her life with anyone but Aeneas (4. 535). It entailed 'animos summittere' (4. 414, where 'animos' and 'supplex' are pointedly juxtaposed).


4. E.g. Tib. 1. 2. 13–14, 1. 4. 71–2; Prop. 1. 9. 3; 1. 16. 14; 2. 14.11; 2. 20. 33; 4. 5. 37; 4. 8. 71, Ov. Am. 1. 7. 61; 2. 5. 49; Ep. 4. 149; 12. 185; Ars. 1. 713; 2. 527.

5. In 30. 23. 4 the Carthaginian ambassadors are said to be 'supplies' only by one person, and they are dismissed because they are believed to be insincere. 37.49 strongly implies that if the Aetolians had 'veniam supplices peterent', the Senate would have granted it (cf. 36. 27. 4–8).


9. An example of how important embracing the knees was in making requests is Iliad 11. 609 (with W. Schadewaldt, Iliasstudien, Darmstadt 1966, 81, and scholia BT ad loc.). C. Sittl, Die Gebirten der Griechen und Römer, 1890, rept. Hildesheim 1970, 163–6 provides many significant references in Greek and Roman authors of appeals by the knees. An illustration of how frequently knees are mentioned in supplication in Greek literature is the first quarter of Euripides’ Suppl. (lines 10. 44, 165, 272, 285). For Latin literature see ThLL 6, 1878, 35–1879, 58; Livy 30. 12.11–14 (and 17, if Gronovius was correct); Sen. Tro. 691–2. For the derivation of 'supplex' and 'κέντης see E. Benveniste, Indo-European Language and Society, transl. by E. Palmer, London 1973, 504–7; Sittl, 163–4; and R. Heinze, 'Supplicium', Arch. für Lat. Lexic. 15 (1906) 90 ff. For throwing oneself at the feet of the person supplicated see ThLL 7, 10, 64–11,14; Sittl, 164–5; and Ov. Am. 1.7.61; Ep. 12. 185–6; Sen. Tro. 691–3, 709; Thy. 517–18; Cic. Catil. 79; cf. Cic. Clu. 200.

10. Sittl, note 9, 147–50; ThLL 8, 343, 75–344, 57 and 10, 142, 35–51; Cic. Catil. 4.18 ('patria . . .', a very bold personification); Font. 48; Ov. Met. 1. 635–6; 3.240–1; 11. 39–41 (where it is rejected by 'sacrilegeae'); Stat. Theb. 7.194 (cf. 154). Turnus' words 'vicisti et victum . . .' (936) often accompanied this gesture (Sittl, 150; and Heinze, note 9).

11. Most editors prefer the reading 'inertis' there. The two words were often confused in the manuscripts (e.g. 11. 672; 12. 311). 'Inermis' is nearly certainly correct for two reasons. First, as with lowering oneself (Gould, note 3, 94–5), the purpose of extending the hands was to show that one was defenceless (Sittl, note 9, 147–8). So 'supplies' or their hands were often described as 'inermes' (e.g. Servius on A. 1. 487 and 2. 67); Caes. Civ. 2. 11. 4; Livy 2. 14. 8; Ov. Met. 5. 175–6. Second, 'inermis' is always pejorative in Vergil, with the possible exception of A. 2. 364. So Turnus used it in 11. 414 ('dextras tandemus ineritis') to vary the normal formula for sacrificial effect; although it is assumed there also that if the plea were actually made it would be accepted.

12. This aved had a disastrous effect on their study of anatomy (P. Frazer, Ptolemaic Alexandria, Vol. 1, Oxford 1972, 350–1). Roman priests were forbidden to touch corpses (Tac. Ann. 1. 62; Dio 56.31.3; ILS 6964.7), look at them [Sen. Dial. 6. 15. 3; Dio 54. 35. 4; Servius on A. 6. 176 (very interesting)], or even enter a room containing them (Gell. 10. 15. 24; Servius on A. 3. 64). These prohibitions were undoubtedly connected with the belief that exposure to a corpse causes pollution (E. Rohde, Psyche, transl. by W. Hillis, London 1925, 318, n. 76; W. Barrett, Euripides, Hippolytus, Oxford 1964, on 1437–9; Aeneid 6.50; cf. Numbers 19.11–22).


15. J. Griffin, Homer on Life and Death, Oxford 1980, 45–6; and the bas-relief in the basement of the British Museum showing the piles of Elamite heads after the battle of the Ulai river.


17. H. Kitto, Form and Meaning in Drama, London 1956, 185–92.

18. Kitto, note 17, 139, 152–6. There is a prominent precedent. In Iliad 23, 185–91; 24, 18–21 the gods protect Hector's corpse from animals, putrefaction, and Achilles (cf. 19.23–33). Cf. 24.612 [on which see M. Wilcock, C.Q. n.s. 14 (1964) 141–2.]

19. E.g. Cic. Leg. 2. 54; Prop. 3.7.9; Ov., Fasti 3.3.84; Lucret. 8.316, 718, 784–6; 9. 1094–5; Stat. Theb. 3. 96–8 (‘impius’ is the first word in line 98); 4. 623; 9. 149–50 and 172; 10. 384 (‘più’ because they tried to recover a corpse: 347 ff.); 12. 294, 776–80; Tac. Ann. 14. 1; 15. 924; Eum. 4. 178–9; Aesch. Sept. 1029; Eur. Hef. 1277–9; Plutarch, De vido 1203, 1213; Suppl. 559; Lysias 2. 7–10; Polyb. 36. 9. 15; Plutarch, Pompey 80. 3. ‘Eos koia is ‘pietas’: L-S-J on εορθήξε, 5; Εορθήξεν; ανασκέψαο; 2; A. Fesse, Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus, Cambridge, Mass. 1935, 333; Aelian, Var. Hist. 3. 22.


21. E.g. Cic. Inv. 1. 108 (‘hostili in terra turpiter ... a feris dies vexatus, communi quoque honore ... currit’), to ‘misericordiam captans’ 1. 106; Mil. 33 (‘[My] inimicissimum multo crudelius etiam poenitus es quam erat humanitatis meae postulare ... cadaver ... canibus ... reliquisti ... nefarie fecisti’. Cf. 86);

22. R. Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, Urbana, Ill. 1962, 199–202 refers to many more passages in Greek and Latin literature, as well as to epitaphs. This is relevant to Aeneid 2. 557–8 because Vergil assumed that a corpse at sea would float to the shore (5. 871, cf. Lucan 8. 698–711).

23. Segal, note 14, passim. Also very significant are scholia to Iliad 13. 831 (εμυκηνών) and BT on 18. 179 (έτοσιν), because the Homeric scholia had a profound effect on Vergil and he often avoided what they censured (R. Schlunk, The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid, Ann Arbor 1974); Aesch. Sept. 1019–20, 1026–7, 1041–2; Soph. Ajax 829–31, 1065; Ant. (in which it is a central motif): Kitto, note 17, 139, 148–9, 152–6, and lines 1015–22, and 1080–3, which are an especially strong condemnation if they are a general statement about such cities, as Pearson in the OCT seems to understand them); Eur. Hec. 1076–9, Phoen. 1634, 1644–51, Suppl. 45–7, 282; Enn. Ann. 138–9, Vahlen; Catull. 64. 152–3 (which was an omnipresent model for the Aeneid: note 8 in Farron, note 1); Cic. Inv. 1. 108 (‘hostili in terra turpiter ... a feris dies vexatus, communi quoque honore ... currit’), to ‘misericordiam captans’ 1. 106; Mil. 33 (‘[My] inimicissimum multo crudelius etiam poenitus es quam erat humanitatis meae postulare ... cadaver ... canibus ... reliquisti ... nefarie fecisti’. Cf. 86);

24. Iliad 21.120–35 (an extreme manifestation of Achilles’ savage rage, which is symbolized by a progression of references to fish eating men: Segal, note 14, 30–32); 21.273–83; Odyssey 5. 306–12; Eur. Helen 1209; Greek Anthology 7. 285, 652; Enn. scen. 362–5, Vahlen; Aeneid 1. 94–101 (with Servius on 93); 5.871; 6.362–5; Ov. Met. 11. 539–40, Fasti 3. 595–8, Tr. 1. 2. 51–6; Sen. Suas. 1. 15 (lines 10–11); Sen. Ag. 512–22, Troy. 634–50, Oct. 516–17; Lucan 8. 437–9 (the Parthians’ ultimate atrocity, which makes negotiations impossible); Val. Flacc. 1. 631–3; Sil. 17. 255–67; Stat. Theb. 9. 491, 506–10. R. Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, Urbana, Ill. 1962, 199–202 refers to many more passages in Greek and Latin literature, as well as to epitaphs. This is relevant to Aeneid 2. 557–8 because Vergil assumed that a corpse at sea would float to the shore (5. 871, cf. Lucan 8. 698–711).

25. Segal, note 14, passim. Also very significant are scholia to Iliad 13. 831 (εμυκηνών) and BT on 18. 179 (έτοσιν), because the Homeric scholia had a profound effect on Vergil and he often avoided what they censured (R. Schlunk, The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid, Ann Arbor 1974); Aesch. Sept. 1019–20, 1026–7, 1041–2; Soph. Ajax 829–31, 1065; Ant. (in which it is a central motif): Kitto, note 17, 139, 148–9, 152–6, and lines 1015–22, and 1080–3, which are an especially strong condemnation if they are a general statement about such cities, as Pearson in the OCT seems to understand them); Eur. Hec. 1076–9, Phoen. 1634, 1644–51, Suppl. 45–7, 282; Enn. Ann. 138–9, Vahlen; Catull. 64. 152–3 (which was an omnipresent model for the Aeneid: note 8 in Farron, note 1); Cic. Inv. 1. 108 (‘hostili in terra turpiter ... a feris dies vexatus, communi quoque honore ... currit’), to ‘misericordiam captans’ 1. 106; Mil. 33 (‘[My] inimicissimum multo crudelius etiam poenitus es quam erat humanitatis meae postulare ... cadaver ... canibus ... reliquisti ... nefarie fecisti’. Cf. 86); Ov. Ep. 10. 123–4, Ars 3. 35–6; Sen. Oct. 515–16; Stat. Theb. 11. 190–1. The strength of this loathing is well illustrated by the many attempts to argue against it: Philodemus, De Morte 32 (quoted by C. Bailey, Titus Lucretii Caro De Rerum Natura ... Vol. 2, Oxford 1947, on 3. 888–93); Lucr. 3. 870–93; Cic. Tusc. 1. 104; Petr. 115; Sen. Ep. 92. 34.

26. 'Parentis cura' means 'concern for a father', as is clear from the context, the parallel in 7. 402 and
the obvious manner in which this episode recalls the interaction between Priam and Achilles at the end of the *Iliad* (Farron, note 1, 25–6).

27. 10. 824 and 9. 294 are especially relevant to the passages under discussion if ‘patriae pietatis imago’ means the thought of a parent’s affection, as is argued by J. Henry, *Aeneidae*. Vol. 3, Dublin 1889, 484–58, and Vol. 4, 127–32; or if it means ‘the thought of his father’s “love” for him’, as C. Bailey, *Religion in Virgil*, Oxford 1935, 82–3; or ‘the picture of his own love for his father’, as R. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 7–12*, London 1973, ad locos. The first two interpretations are supported by ‘Anchises’ in 10. 822 (cf. 8. 520–2, in reaction to 514–19).


29. Griffin, note 15, chapter 4, especially 123–7, 132, 113 (note 20); and, e.g. 4. 477–8; 13. 658–9; 23. 222–3; gods: Aes. (15. 110–18), Zeus (16. 433–8, 459–61), and Thetis (passim). For Priam and Hecuba in art see J. Henle, *Greek Myths, A Vase Painter’s Notebook*, Bloomington, Indiana, 137–8, 147–9, with a very extensive bibliography in its notes and bibliography proper (218–19, 220–2); in subsequent literature see J. Frazer, *Apollodorus*. Vol. 2, Loeb, 1921, 239–41; Aesch. *Ransoming of Hector*, fr. 263–72, TGF; *Eur.* *Tro.* and Hec.[which was highly regarded by the Romans (Gell. 11. 4: Servius on *A.* 7. 320)]; Enn. *Hectoris Lutra, Hecuba* (Scaen. 156–211, Vahlen*); Pac. *Ilion* (fr. 191–216, Ribbeck*); Acc. *Asymanas, Hecuba* (fr. 164–88, 481, Rib.3); *Verg.* A. 1. 484–7; 2. 531–51; *Ot.* 13. 423–575; Tr. 5. 1. 55; 5.4.11; 5.12.7; *Cons. ad Liviam* 429–31; Sen. *Tro.*


**ADDENDA**


Cic., *Inv.* 1. 103 recommends arousing ‘indignatio’ by showing ‘crudeliter facta ... in mortuos’.

Sen. *Dial.* 5. 40, 2–3: cruelty of causing a person to be eaten by fish.

*Aeneid* 8. 574: ‘patrias audiite precores’.


Hor. *S.* 2. 8. 58–9: ‘ut si filius ... obisset, flere’.
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