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ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I examine the Neo-Latin supplements to Virgil’s Aeneid (1400–1700), in particular, Pier Candido Decembrio’s Liber Decimus-Tertius Eneidos (1419), Maffeo Vegio’s Supplementum (1428), Jan van Foreest’s Exequiae Turni (1651), and the Supplementum ad Aeneida (1698) of Simonet de Villeneuve. This thesis is a contribution to the ongoing discussion surrounding the nature of classical supplementation in Neo-Latin texts. While advancing new readings of each of the supplements, I argue that previous definitions of supplementation and previous scholarly approaches to each of the Virgilian supplements are insufficient. In addition, I make available several of the supplements for the first time in English translation. In the Introduction, I argue for new subcategorizations of supplementation (reconstruction, correction, completion, and continuation) and I provide a methodological overview. In Chapter One, I argue that the Supplementum of Vegius attempts to allow the reader to recognize the sanctity of the entire Aeneid as a Christian poem worthy of Paul and Augustine. It is thus a completion of the Aeneid, but one that does not insist on the textual incompleteness of the Aeneid. In Chapter Two, I reinterpret the Exequiae Turni of Forestus as a true continuation of Virgil’s complete masterwork—one that extends Virgil’s plotline, challenges Virgil’s characters, and invents new narrative episodes, but does not offer any substantial resolution to the work it continues. In Chapter Three, I demonstrate how Villanova attempts a correction of Virgil’s Aeneid, organizing the plot-points of his Supplementum ad Aeneida along the lines of the prophecies in the Aeneid and systematically justifying each according to Aristotelian norms of composition. Appendix One reviews the incomplete Liber Decimus-Tertius Eneidos of Decembrius and attempts to resolve the question of its influence on Vegius’ Supplementum. I suggest that Decembrius’ poem may be another completion of the Aeneid, but one that lacks Vegius’ theological motivations. Appendix Two presents a fresh translation of the fragment in Appendix Two. Appendix Three offers the first translation of Forestus’ Exequiae Turni in English. Appendix Four provides the first English translation of Villanova’s Supplementum ad Aeneida.
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### Abbreviations

All abbreviations follow the *L’Année Philologique* Abbreviations Key, with the following additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td><em>Chronicle of Higher Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ</td>
<td><em>Classical Receptions Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td><em>Franciscan Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAR</td>
<td><em>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td><em>Modern Philology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLN</td>
<td><em>Modern Language Notes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLJ</td>
<td><em>Neulateinisches Jahrbuch</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td><em>Patrologia Latina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJ</td>
<td><em>The Sixteenth Century Journal</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION: THE NEO-LATIN SUPPLEMENTS TO VIRGIL’S AENEID

I. WHAT IS A SUPPLEMENT?

In a recent collection of essays treating the practice of supplementing texts from the ancient world, the editors, Korenjak and Zuenelli, provide a definition of a “supplement” that serves as a useful starting point for considering the Neo-Latin supplements to Virgil’s Aeneid. Faced with the dizzying possibility that Xenophon’s Hellenica could be considered a supplement to Thucydides, Lucan’s Bellum civile a supplement to Virgil, and all subsequent philosophy a supplement to Plato—in short, a hopelessly broad and unusable definition—they opt for a “narrower sense”:

Ein Supplement soll verstanden werden als Ergänzung eines Textes, der (weil unvollendet oder schlecht überliefert) nur unvollständig vorliegt oder dessen Unvollständigkeit zumindest ernsthaft in Betracht gezogen werden kann. Die betreffenden, mehr oder weniger offensichtlichen Lücken können dabei ebenso an seinem Anfang und Schluss wie im Inneren auftreten. ... Bei Ergänzungen, die diese relative strengen Kriterien nicht erfüllen, ihnen aber doch deutlich näher kommen als die oben für den weiten Supplementbegriff angeführten Beispiele, könnte man von “supplementartigen Texten” sprechen.¹

According to this strict definition, a supplement should only be so considered if it supplements a text that is (at least arguably) incomplete—either because the original text is unfinished or because it is poorly transmitted. Texts that do not fit this definition are only considered “supplement-like.” Thus, Korenjak and Zuenelli attempt to avoid an unhelpfully broad definition, while including a variety of different supplementary texts within their purview. Yet, as we will see, this definition remains both overly broad and unhelpfully narrow when applied to

¹ Martin Korenjak and Simon Zuenelli (eds.), Supplemente antiker Literatur (Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 2016), 10–11.
the Virgilian supplementers, none of whom argued without qualification for the incompleteness of Virgil’s *Aeneid*.

But initially, Virgil’s *Aeneid* appears to be an ideal candidate for the inspiration of additional supplements, according to the definition of Korenjak and Zuenelli. Many have found the ending of the *Aeneid* jarringly incomplete or “abrupt,” and the sixty-or-so half-lines (*tibicinae*) clearly mark the poem as unfinished. Indeed, it has been often said that Virgil’s *Aeneid* begins with an ending and ends with a beginning. The proem announces that the work will include the journeys and trials of Aeneas’ exile from Troy, his arrival at Italy and the Lavinian shores, and the great conflicts he will endure—up to the establishment of his gods in his new homeland and the founding of a new city. From it will come the Latin race, the Alban fathers, and, eventually, the walls of lofty Rome (1.1–7). From the beginning then, readers may believe that they know exactly how the tale of Aeneas will end—and an apparent plot betrayal of this magnitude may be counted among Virgil’s innovations.

By contrast, while the *Iliad* announces its general subject matter—the μῆνις of Achilles and the suffering it inflicts on the Achaeans—it leaves unsaid any precise outcome such as the deaths of Patroclus and Hector, much less the fall of Troy or the νόστοι of the Greek heroes. Although it is true that the *Odyssey* announces the tribulations and homecoming of its eponymous hero in the first lines, nothing is said of the defeat of the suitors and the reunion with

---

4 Homer, *Iliad*, 1.1–7. See G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: books 1–4* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 52–53: “The truth is that Homer provides his audiences with just so much information as they need at this point; the epic is to be set around the central theme of Akhilleus’ anger, and this anger had disastrous consequences for the Achaean army.”
Penelope. Apollonius of Rhodes is similarly reticent, declaring only that his subject will be the κλέα of the men in pursuit of the golden fleece. Lucretius’ proem is famously deceptive; instead of an introduction to atomic theory or a castigation of religion, the Epicurean begins with an invocation of Aphrodite. None of Virgil’s extant epic predecessors appear to betray their entire plotlines or after-plots so gratuitously in the proems to their works.

Perhaps this partly explains why “the end of the Aeneid has long been a site of controversy.” The poem does not close with the expected marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia, the founding of a city, the happy mingling of the Trojan and Latin peoples, or the establishment of religious rites. It certainly does not include an account of the propagation of the Latin race (except as the animae of souls to be reborn [6.756–892]), the rule of the Alban fathers, or the foundation of the Roman state. And it may seem that we have had at least some reason to expect one of these endings, because throughout the epic what appear to be various happy conclusions are regularly foretold. The marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia is predicted in Creusa’s prophecy (2.783–784) and confirmed by Turnus moments before his death (12.937); the founding of a city

---

6 Apollonius, Argonautica, 1.1–4: Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτόν / μνήσομαι, οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ δία πέτρας / Κυανέαις βασιλῆς ἑρμοσύνη Πελίαο / χρύσειον μετὰ κῶδας ἐύζρογον ἰλάσαν Ἀργό.
7 Lucretius, De rerum natura, 1.1–49.
9 Some readers have expressed their disappointment that these endings were not chosen by Virgil. For example, see W. H. Semple, “The Conclusion of Virgil’s Aeneid: A Study of the War in Latium, with Special Reference to Books XI and XII,” BRL 42 (1959–1960), 187: “In reading the Aeneid I have always felt a certain disappointment that Virgil did not end the epic on a happier note. I wanted Aeneas to win after all he had gone through, and I would have liked to see him come into his kingdom amid a scene of triumphant rejoicing because all the dangers of the voyage and of the war had been faced and at last overcome. This man of sorrows has had so much to endure in the course of the poem that I wished for him and his people a time of tranquil accomplishment in which we could see him at peace ... But it was not to be.” Sed contra the prosaic contentment of Nicholas Horsfall, A Companion to the Study of Virgil (Boston: Brill, 2001), 195 (and n. 22), who finds the ending utterly satisfying: “Nor does Virgil leave the ending quite as abrupt and open as might at first sight appear: we do, after all, know pretty much what happens next, from the Aeneid itself.”
named for Lavinia is promised by Aeneas in his oath to Latinus (12.193–194, and hinted at in 1.5) as is the mingling of Trojans and Latins on equal terms (12.190–191) and the establishment of religious cult (1.6, 12.192). But, instead of an image of Aeneas and Italy at peace like the Trojan Antenor at Patavium—nunc placida compostus pace quiescit (1.249)—Virgil ends his epic with the bloody death of the Italian hero Turnus.

Indeed, the debate regarding the completion of the Aeneid has consumed critics since the death of Virgil. According to Donatus’ vita, Virgil intended to spend three years abroad perfecting his poem, but died upon his return to Brundisium. Following his death, Plotius Tucca and Varius, poets in the artistic group gathered around Maecenas, preserved and edited the Aeneid. Other authors attempted to complete the unfinished half-lines. Rumors swirled that the alterations made by the editorial team had been drastic and architectural: The grammarian Nisus claimed that Varius had even changed the order of the books and had struck out the initial lines. Hyginus pointed out “narrative incongruities” in the Aeneid and blamed them on the

---


12 Donatus, 37: qui eius Aeneida post obitum iussu Caesaris emendarunt.

13 ibid., 42: ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena / carmen et egressus silvis vicina coegi, / ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono, / gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis / arma virumque cano ...

incomplete state of the poem. Following intense disparagement by grammarians and critics such as Carvilius Pictor (the “Aeneomastix”), Marcus Vipsanius, Perellius Fausta, and Quintus Octavius Avitus, the historian Asconius claimed that Virgil intended to heavily edit the entire poem ad satietatem malevolorum.

As Tarrant summarizes, “Virgil’s early death and the unfinished state of the Aeneid opportuneely lent his text some of the indefinite quality appropriate to a more remote classic, and fueled lively discussion ... for centuries to come.” Even today, the notion that Virgil’s poem remains architecturally incomplete has bedeviled criticism and scholarship. Sarah Ruden, a recent translator of the Aeneid, sympathizes with modern readers who are confused or troubled by Virgil’s ending, postulating that Virgil’s poem was only half-finished (!) at the time of the author’s death:

I find [the Aeneid] difficult just to read. In part, I blame the half-finished state of his epic: only twelve out of the projected twenty-four books exist, and many lines are two- or three-word fragments.

Similarly, Jennifer Howard opines on the possible shape of the story intended by Virgil and provides a comfortable plotline that would have allowed readers to see the bloodthirsty slaughterer of Turnus develop into the pious and benevolent ruler that some have always imagined him to be:

---

15 Gellius, Noctes Atticae, 10.16.1, 11.
16 Donatus, 46.
It is likely that Virgil did not intend to end the book with that scene; he probably had in mind a much longer work, which would have followed Aeneas’ evolution from warrior to statesman.  

II. SUPPLEMENTING A PERFECT POEM

At this point, it would be easy to conclude that the Neo-Latin poets supplementing Virgil’s epic—Decembrius, Vegius, Forestus, and Villanova—chose to finish the woefully lacunose masterwork, and so gave the poem an appropriate ending and made Virgil’s unfinished epic easier to read. This view would accord well with Korenjak and Zuenelli’s definition of supplementation reviewed above. But despite the jarring ending and the story passed down in the vita, none of the poets of the extant supplements to the Aeneid claim that Virgil’s epic is simply unfinished or incomplete.

The author of the Supplementum (1428), Vegius (1407–1458), never indicates that the poetry of Virgil— for whom he always displays the greatest reverence—is in any way unsatisfying. Instead, in his view, Virgil is very nearly a Christian poet, whose words could almost be included among the works of Paul the Apostle. Aeneas is a model of the virtue of perseverance until the ending of the Aeneid, an ending which Vegius describes in his De perseverantia religionis:

---

19 Jennifer Howard, “Measuring the ‘Aeneid’ on a Human Scale,” CHE 5/26/2008 (qtd. in O’Hara, “The Unfinished Aeneid?” 104). Of course, contrary views are not hard to find. See the classic H. J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1960), 249: “The revision which the poet would have given his work had he lived to bestow on it the further three years’ attention he had in mind would certainly have been no more than a rearrangement and polishing in detail, for the story is complete and the handling such as no one but Vergil could have given it.”
In this passage, Vegius seems to be reading the end of a different poem. Instead of the bloody death of Turnus, he implies that Virgil’s poem ends as foretold by the many prophecies throughout the epic: a happy reign for Aeneas and then a subsequent deification. Nothing disturbs the tranquil serenity of the Aeneid’s allegorical message. Of course, Vegius himself may have been troubled by the Aeneid for other reasons. Perhaps the criticism of his beloved Augustine, who famously castigates the study of Virgil in his Confessiones,\(^{21}\) caused Vegius to shed as much ink as he does in defense of the embarrassing Dido-episode. But in his view, far from being difficult to read, Virgil’s poetry was constructed \textit{miro artificio}; its ending truly is a happy one, which displays the perseverance of virtue in adversity and can serve as a \textit{norma vivendi} for any Christian reader. He certainly does not argue, or even imply, that anything in the work of his master is broken or incomplete.

Forestus (1586–1651), the author of the \textit{Exequiae Turni} (1648), is even more explicit in his insistence on the absolute completeness of Virgil’s epic. In a 1649 letter to Daniel Heinsius, the old Dutch statesman steadfastly denies that there is anything missing from the heavenly monument (\textit{caelesti monimento}) of the Aeneid, written as it was by a poet possessing inimitable majesty:

\begin{quote}
testor eximium candorem tuum, testor consuetudinem, vitae nostrae paene aequalem, nunquam in mentem mihi venisse, ut inimitabilem Maronis maiestatem vel longissimo
\end{quote}

\(^{20}\) Vegius, \textit{De perseverantia religionis libri septem} (Paris, 1511), 1.5 (fol. 10): “For after many disturbances of the world, after long and sad wars of the devil, the world is trampled, the devil is conquered, the soul is well cared for, a safe and tranquil life is led, and at last immortal and eternal happiness is acquired.”

intervallo assequi sperarem, multo minus, ut existimarem caelesti monimento eius aliquid deesse, vel si quid deesset, id a me posse expleri.\textsuperscript{22}

Forestus goes on to explain that attempting to complete the \textit{Aeneid} would be like a common painter attempting to touch up the Venus of Apelles. It remains to be seen later whether Forestus is somewhat disingenuous in this letter—as well as in the dedication of the \textit{Exequiae Turni} addressed to Queen Christina of Sweden, in which he repeats the above passage and adds the hyperbolic denial: \textit{absit enim a me tantus furor}\textsuperscript{23}.

Similarly, in the beginning of his \textit{praefatio} to the \textit{Supplementum ad Aeneida} (1698), Villanova (late 16\textsuperscript{th} – early 17\textsuperscript{th} c.) announces the manifold perfections of the \textit{Aeneid}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ nihil de ipsius Aeneide detrahendum; nihil ipsi addendum. immo mentis inops diiudicandus quicunque sibi confideret subsequi uirum, de quo sic Eumolpius in Petronio: sententiae in carminibus non eminens extra corpus orationis expressae; intexto uestibus colore nitent, mens illius ingenti litterarum flumine inundata; ab omni uerborum uilitate et a plebe sunt semotae eius elocutiones et de cuius Aeneide Statius suam Thebaidem compellans haec profert: “non tu diuinam Aeneida tenta / sed longe sequere, et uestigia semper adora.”\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Although we will see that the theory of supplementation presented in Villanova’s \textit{praefatio} is more complex than this paragraph alone implies, it is remarkable that the Frenchman begins the

\textsuperscript{22} See Hans-Ludwig Oertel, \textit{Die Aeneissupplemente des Jan van Forest und des C. Simonet de Villeneuve} (Zürich: Olms, 2001), 210: “I call to witness your outstanding radiance, I call to witness our friendship, nearly equal to our life, that it never entered into my mind that I might hope to overtake the inimitable majesty of Virgil, even at a long distance, much less that I might think that there was anything lacking from his heavenly monument, or if there were something lacking, that it is able to be fulfilled by me.”

\textsuperscript{23} Oertel, 224.

\textsuperscript{24} C. S. Villanova, \textit{Supplementum ad Aeneida seu Aeneidos Liber Decimus-Tertius} (Paris: Aubouyn, 1698): \textit{Praef.1}: “Nothing should be taken from [Virgil’s] \textit{Aeneid}; nothing should be added to it. Rather, whoever attempts to rival him should be considered foolish. Eumolpus spoke about this very point in Petronius’ \textit{Satyricon}: ‘The thoughts in poems do not stand out from the body of the speech; they shine with color that is woven into the material; the mind is steeped by the great flood of letters; and his elocutions are divorced from popular usage’ [adapted from Petronius, \textit{Satyricon}, 118]. In comparison with the \textit{Aeneid}, Statius rebukes his own \textit{Thebaid} with the following words: ‘Do not assail the divine \textit{Aeneid}, but follow it at a distance and always worship its footsteps’ [Statius, \textit{Thebaid}, 12.816–817].”
introduction to his supplement with an announcement that nothing should be added to the 
Aeneid. To make this point more clearly, Villanova references the valedictory words of the Thebaid in which Statius warns his poem not to attempt to compete with the divine Aeneid: non tu divinam Aeneida tenta / sed longe sequere, et uestigia semper adora. Any attempt to rival Virgil is laughable.

It seems, then, that the motivations for supplementing Virgil’s epic may be more complex and surprising than first supposed. Why supplement a poem that is already complete—even perfect? Do the supplements to the Aeneid even count as supplements if their authors do not believe themselves to be completing an unfinished poem? Are they only “supplement-like”? It seems that, at the very least, the definition of Korenjak and Zuenelli should be re-examined and refined to find room for the Virgilian supplements, whose titles (Supplementum, Exequiae Turni sive liber XIII Aeneidos, Supplementum ad Aeneida), language (Latin), and subject matters (following the conclusion of the Aeneid) mark them out clearly as self-conscious supplements to Virgil’s masterwork.

III. VIRGILIAN SUPPLEMENTATION AND CLASSICAL RECEPTION

Any work of supplementation, Virgilian or otherwise, could be considered an instance of what is known in recent literary theory as “reception.” Inaugurated by Hans Robert Jauss in a dramatic 1967 lecture in Konstanz, “Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literatur-

25 Indeed, the clearest ancient model for the phrase nihil detrahendum, nihil addendum comes from Ambrose’s discussion of the inviolability of the scriptural canon! See Ambrose, Explanatio symboli ad initiantos, 10: si unius apostoli scripturis nihil est detrahendum, nihil addendum.
26 Statius, Thebaid, 12.816–817.
wissenschaft,” reception theory was notably introduced to classical studies by the work of Charles Martindale, in particular, his *Redeeming the text*, which generated a host of imitations and applications throughout the field. Prominent among these, an online Oxford journal, *Classical Receptions*, was launched in 2009, and a vast number of companions and collections has legitimized and popularized this theoretical approach to classical studies. Considering its popularity and possible applicability, it seems important to consider it briefly in connection with Virgilian supplementation. I have decided not to use the terminology of reception theory in this dissertation, but employ instead a version of Kallendorf’s view of allusivity when discussing the relationship between Virgil and the various continuators. Following the work of John Farrell, I distinguish between the meaning intended by an author and the significance or impact of a work on the mind of a reader.

In *Redeeming the text*, Martindale forcefully argues that “interpretation cannot be separated from the ways texts are, and have been, received by readers.” This view is presented over and against previous “Enlightenment” views of reading, where disinterested and rational readers arrive at a “God’s-eye” and stable view of a received text. Drawing out the implications

---

31 *ibid.*
of reception theory in the process of reading, Martindale provides a magisterial axiom that has since been dubbed “hardly contestable”\(^{32}\) in the field:

\[\text{Meaning, could we say, is always realized at the point of reception; if so, we cannot assume that an “intention” is effectively communicated within any text. And also, it appears a writer can never control the reception of his or her work, with respect either to the character or the readership or to any use which is made of the work.}\(^{33}\)

Thus, Martindale attempts to undo the claims of generations of modern classicists, who naively assumed that they could reach a text untouched by the past and attempted to scrape away “barnacles of later tradition” in order to see the “true shape” of the text.\(^{34}\) Yet, in so doing, Martindale claims that all meaning is entirely subjective and bound to a specific reading, a specific history of reading, and a specific reader. There is no “there” there; only a “here” in the present of reading, where any meaning is constituted. Ultimately, Martindale eviscerates any scholarly attempt to reach an original meaning, the intention of an author, or a correct understanding of any text. To be clear: In his view, the text possesses no meaning or intention imparted by the author that is discoverable by the reader; rather, the meaning is created by the reader, who approaches the text with his own history and understanding, and is “realized” at the point of reading.

Martindale’s claims are further developed as two theses, a strong and a weak:

\[\text{The weak thesis is that numerous unexplored insights into ancient literature are locked up in imitations, translations and so forth … The “strong” thesis is that our current}\]

\(^{32}\) William W. Batstone, “Provocation: The Point of Reception Theory,” in \textit{Classics and the Uses of Reception}, eds. Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas (Malden: Blackwell, 2006), 14: “All meaning is constituted or actualized at the point of reception.” Of course, there does seem to be a great difference between the constitution of something vs. the actualization of something. The first could imply that at reception something comes about that was not there before; the second, that at reception something already there was brought into operation or activity. Martindale’s “realization” is hardly less ambiguous.

\(^{33}\) Martindale, \textit{Redeeming the text}, 4.

\(^{34}\) Such as Richard Jenkyns, “Virgil and Arcadia,” \textit{JRS} 79 (1989), 26, quoted in Martindale, \textit{Redeeming the text}, 4, and then \textit{passim}.
interpretations of ancient texts, whether or not we are aware of it, are, in complex ways, constructed by the chain of receptions through which their continued readability has been effected. As a result we cannot get back to any originary meaning wholly free of subsequent accretions.\textsuperscript{35}

This weak claim, that unexplored insights are locked up in the reception tradition of reading, imitation, and continuation, seems sound—after all, Milton was not just a great poet, but a profound reader of Virgil, and may have had something to say on the matter of Virgil’s poetry well worth investigating. Similarly, the notion that our readings of texts are affected to some—and perhaps a great—extent by subsequent works and reading is sensible enough, and is certainly not an original observation. Nevertheless, the wider conclusion that intention can never be assumed to be effectively communicated in any text is far more than Martindale’s arguments could ever hope to justify in their present form. His initial examples are some ambiguous lines in Shelley’s \textit{Ozymandias}, which are, admittedly, ambiguous.\textsuperscript{36} The remainder of the book presents a series of case studies that attempt to solidify his basic arguments. For example, in his analysis of Lucan’s use of Virgil, he combines his weak and strong theses:

Lucan’s disenchantment can show us a way of reading the \textit{Aeneid} which alerts us to the ideological nexus it encodes. By vaunting its own textuality, the poem’s paradoxical surface reminds us that all texts are only texts, and that none gives us unmediated access to ‘reality’ or ‘the truth’ [version of strong thesis] ... Lucan can prompt us into fresh ways of perceiving the \textit{Aeneid} which might otherwise have remained invisible to us [weak thesis].\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{ibid.}, 7. See also \textit{ibid.}, “Thinking Through Reception,” in \textit{Classics and the Uses of Reception}, eds. Charles Martindale and Richard Thomas (Malden: Blackwell, 2006), 3–4: “There is no Archimedean point from which we can arrive at a final, correct meaning for any text.” To this, it seems that understanding \textit{fully} or \textit{finally} is different from understanding \textit{truly} or \textit{correctly}. It is possible to know truly that the \textit{Aeneid} is not about the American Revolution, that it is set in the Mediterranean, and that it is concerned with the history of the founding of the Roman state. It is, however, unlikely that one will ever fully or finally exhaust the meaning of the \textit{Aeneid}.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{ibid.}, 2–4.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{ibid.}, 48–49.
Although reception theory has greatly increased in popularity in recent years throughout classical studies, some have complained about the lack of theoretical consistency in its application and the intransigence of classical scholars more generally. Martindale himself frets that his theory has not won unanimous approval: “Most Anglophone classicists (whatever they may claim) remain largely committed to fairly positivistic forms of historical inquiry.” He notes that some have even ignored his book. In an envoi to the collected papers presented at a Yale conference entitled Reception and the Classics in 2007, Christopher Wood sagely noted that “None of the classicists, it seems to me, took up Charles Martindale’s challenge in its most radical form, as thrown down in Redeeming the Text: namely, to demonstrate the inextricability of a classical text from a present-tense reading situation.” Often, reception becomes a buzzword placed in a title or opening paragraph, only to be ignored by the author’s traditional approach. And occasionally, reception theory is cited without the slightest comprehension of its meaning.

Furthermore, it is on substantial grounds that some classicists have questioned the broader premise of reception theory, that all meaning is constituted at the point of reception and that authorial intention is unrecoverable. In a 2005 paper at the American Philological Association, Joseph Farrell discussed the “unsolved problem” of authorial intention, pointing out

---

38 Martindale, “Thinking Through Reception,” 2.
41 See Martindale, “Thinking Through Reception,” 12, for an amusing citation of a doctoral awards application using reception studies to justify positivistic readings of precisely the sort that he criticized in Redeeming the Text: “By considering how individual texts, authors, intellectual currents and historical periods have been ‘received’ in diverse later contexts, this approach [i.e. reception studies] enhances the clarity with which texts can be seen when returned to their original producers, now separated, to an extent, from the anachronistic meanings imposed upon them.” Martindale continues to worry about the misunderstanding and misapplication of reception studies in Martindale, “Reception – a new humanism?,” esp. 174–176.
that many prominent critics continue to use “intentionalist language” even as they deny the
possibility of recovering the original intention of an author.\textsuperscript{42} In an appendix to the published
version of his talk, Farrell argues forcefully for the knowability of authorial intention in a famous
passage from Cicero’s \textit{Pro Caelio}, where Cicero makes what we would call a Freudian slip in
jokingly calling Clodia’s brother, P. Clodius Pulcher, her husband instead, thereby referring to a
rumored incestuous relationship.\textsuperscript{43}

More recently, philosophers such as John Farrell have been part of a return to the author,
stressing the indispensability of maintaining authorial intention as a fundamental facet of literary
interpretation.\textsuperscript{44} Farrell points out that a robust understanding of intention should not conflict
“with our sense that the meaning of works of art can indeed change radically over time, that they
have an inexhaustible quality.”\textsuperscript{45} Following the work of E. D. Hirsch, he makes a distinction
between \textit{meaning} and \textit{impact/significance}.\textsuperscript{46} In his view, the meaning of a work is fixed and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42}Joseph Farrell, “Intention and Intertext,” \textit{Phoenix} 59.1 (2005), 99: “So disclaimers of interest in the author’s
intentions have become common, while many critics nevertheless use intentionalist language as a correlative for that
which is valid or invalid in literary interpretation. And with reason: because of course the author \textit{had} intentions,
even if we cannot know them fully, and even if those intentions do not define the universe of legitimate meaning
that may be found in his or her work.”
\item \textsuperscript{43}ibid., 110: “This little episode gives evidence that Cicero’s conception not only of his own intentions, but also of a
pathology of intention that was certainly not named until almost two thousand years after his death [i.e., a “Freudian
slip”] and one that might have been thought peculiar to the modern intending subject, was actually very similar to
our own. In addition, he was sufficiently confident that this suspicion was shared by his contemporaries that he was
able to joke about it in a trial for attempted murder. Under such circumstances, I feel few qualms in supposing that
the intending subject of Cicero’s and of Virgil’s day was sufficiently similar to that of today.”
\item \textsuperscript{44}John Farrell, \textit{The Varieties of Authorial Intention: Literary Theory Beyond the Intentional Fallacy} (Palgrave
Macmillan, 2017), 29–30: “I hope this discussion makes clear how radically the banishing of intentions would
separate literary interpretation from our everyday mental habits and processes, where intentions play an
indispensable role in the constitution of human action itself, including … the use of language. To carry out such a
banishment consistently would amount to a kind of literary behaviorism. It would become impossible in principle to
distinguish between an authentically meaningful text and an accidentally or artificially generated artifact in
ostensibly verbal form.”
\item \textsuperscript{45}ibid., 56.
\item \textsuperscript{46}E. D. Hirsch, \textit{Validity in Interpretation} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967). For a similar distinction
regarding the use of the word “meaning” in Martindale and subsequent reception studies, see Andreas Th. Zanker
of a text is dependent on who reads it, but the author’s meaning exists independently from this. One cannot say that
authorial meaning is realized, constructed, actualized, or constituted at the point of reception.” They suggest that the
intended by its author, something that may be understood with more or less success by literary scholarship, although it may not be fully recoverable. The impact or significance of the work is what that work comes to mean in various ways to various audiences and readers—this is not within the author’s control. Indeed, Farrell appropriately separates and defines the spheres of literary scholarship and reception studies without insisting, as Martindale does, that traditional literary scholarship is a profitless exercise of historicism:

It is worth repeating that to recognize that the author is the original source of meaning for the text is not to ignore the fact that once the work has been issued, or indeed in the very process of its issuing, it is subject to intentional reframing by all kinds of intermediaries … Among these influences we should include the way later works of literature reframe earlier ones and the way the extra-literary activities of the authors themselves contribute to their reception. … But there is no reason to think of reception-history, which studies how works are actually interpreted by historically situated readers, as a competitor to the literary scholarship which studies their production. The task of the latter is to scrape away the overlay of intentional representations to reveal the original work; the task of the former is to give full due to the historical experience of reading.

I take this to be a theoretical starting point: Authorial intention in a work can be truly, if not fully, understood, and understanding the intentions of an author is an important part of the work of literary scholarship. While the significance or impact of a work may be constituted individually by each reader at the point of its reception, the work possesses its own meaning independent of a reader or fresh context in which it is read.

More specifically, I understand allusivity in reception according to a modified version of the schema proposed by Craig Kallendorf, whose work was very influential in aspects of this phrase “all interpretation occurs at the point of reception” might be more helpful, and “not of itself preclude the attempt to understand what [the author] meant.”

47 Farrell, The Varieties of Authorial Intention, 57: “The impact of a work might already have been multiple for its original audience and is not in control of the author or governed by his intention as is the case with the meaning of the work.”

48 ibid., 55. This seems to clarify greatly the relationship that should exist between classical reception studies and more traditional classical scholarship, without compromising either.
dissertation. Kallendorf proposed a fourfold model for understanding literary allusion and influence, a model that departs from Martindalean orthodoxy and “focuses on the relationship between the modern critic and the alluding author as two different but interconnected readers”:

The alluding author begins the process by reading an earlier text, then working out an interpretation of that text. As he or she begins writing, the new text unfolds in dialogue with the old one, in such a way that the potential meaning of one or more words resonates against their original usage in another text, where they meant something that is seen as relevant again. The critic, the second reader, works backwards and recreates this process as he or she is able to understand it, reading the second text and coming to a preliminary idea about what it means, then noticing a relationship to an earlier text that the author could have known, then going back and forth between the two to reconstruct the author’s reading of the first text on the basis of the allusions and what they appear to reveal.

This model is attractive because it respects the scholarly attempts to understand (here: “reconstruct”) the ideas and readings of previous writers and readers. In other words, meaning is not constituted at the point of reception, but rather the critic, or second reader, attempts to understand a meaning of a text composed in the past and the sources that influenced the writer of that text to produce that meaning. Kallendorf provides a schema to help understand the complexities of this theory:

\[ \text{text}^1 (T_1) \rightarrow [\text{reading of author} (R-A)] \rightarrow \text{text}^2 (T_2) \rightarrow \text{reading of critic} (R-C) \]

Thus, in my first chapter, T\(_1\) will be Virgil’s *Aeneid* (or Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*); the R-A will be the moral or allegorical message understood by Vegius in Virgil’s text; this reading appears throughout the *Supplementum* (T\(_2\)) in such a way, for instance, that descriptions of

---

49 The following discussion derives from Craig Kallendorf, “Allusion as Reception,” in *Classics and the uses of reception*, eds. Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas (Malden: Blackwell, 2006), 68–70. I modify Kallendorf’s theory to provide an understanding of my own view of allusivity. Farrell, *The Varieties of Authorial Intention*, 186, is suspicious of the fact that theories are “applied” to texts at all, “for the primary aim of a theory is to explain what we are already doing in general, not to change it or make particular applications.”

50 *ibid.*, 68.

51 *ibid.*

52 *ibid.*
Turnus alluding to Cacus in the *Aeneid* take on new demonic resonances. I try to recreate this process through close readings of the Virgilian continuators and their sources and thus produce this dissertation informed by my own understanding (R-C).

Kallendorf enriches his schema with four basic axioms:

1) “The active agent in recognizing and interpreting allusion produces R-C and, by extension, R-A, and has to work within the hermeneutic possibilities for $T^1$ and $T^2$ as he or she understands them.”

2) “R-A … is a construct that emerges from the recognition of fragments of $T^1$ in $T^2$ and the effort of the reader-critic to interpret their significance in $T^2$ in relation to their original significance in $T^1$.”

3) “Some allusions will remain local, a fragment of one text embedded in another that serves primarily to enrich verbal texture, but the most richly rewarding allusive contact will be systematic, one of a number of references that contribute substantially to meaning.”

4) “In allusion meaning flows both chronologically backwards as well as chronologically forwards.”

The first axiom seems relatively unproblematic and allows for the effect of a critic’s historical place and time without entirely sacrificing the ability to understand the meaning of previous authors. Critics will be limited in their vision by the intellectual tools and knowledge available to them. Kallendorf himself modifies the second axiom in a helpful way. Although R-A is often a scholarly construct, frequently additional material may be brought to bear—an author’s journal, for instance, or an annotated text—that can be used to guide and supplement the critic’s

---

53 ibid., 69.
54 ibid.
55 ibid.
56 ibid.
understanding of R-A.\textsuperscript{57} Again, this allows for clarity to be brought to bear regarding the author’s intention in writing a text.

The third axiom allows for broader systems of meaning to be understood through literary allusion. In his explanation, Kallendorf refers briefly to Joseph Farrell’s understanding of systematic allusivity in Virgil and Homer—such totalizing schemas of reference clearly appear to be intended by the author.\textsuperscript{58} The fourth axiom seems sound provided that its precise meaning is clarified. For Kallendorf, this axiom means that R-C is created when the critic reads T\textsuperscript{2} and then T\textsuperscript{1} through it; then T\textsuperscript{1} is used to enrich the critic’s reading of T\textsuperscript{2} and to create and adjust R-A. This is unproblematic, as long as we remember that T\textsuperscript{2} does not actually change the originally intended meaning of T\textsuperscript{1}.\textsuperscript{59} Although T\textsuperscript{2} can illuminate for us possibilities hitherto unseen in T\textsuperscript{1}, we must be careful to separate R-A from our own reading of T\textsuperscript{1}. In other words, we may not want to begin to believe messianic readings of Virgil’s fourth Eclogue ourselves, although we may appreciate the interpretive moves and possibilities opened up by Christian readers, as well as their impact in the history of the Virgilian tradition.

Consequently, I do not use the terminology of “reception theory,” and I reserve the term “reception” to refer to the immediate context of reading and criticism following publication. I use close readings of each supplement (T\textsuperscript{2}) and of the Aeneid (T\textsuperscript{1}) to establish an understanding

\textsuperscript{57}ibid.: “In cases like this, the reader-author’s actual reading of T\textsuperscript{1} provides a check on the constructed R-A, supplementing and, if necessary, correcting the work of the critic.”

\textsuperscript{58}Farrell, “Allusion and Intertext,” 100, argues that even single allusive lines obviously establish a relationship between authors that we can hope to understand. He gives the example of Alcandrumeq Hauiumq Noenonaeq Prytanimeq (Virgil, Aeneid, 9.767), which obviously alludes to Άλκανδρόν Θάλιόντε Νοήμονά Πρύτανίν (Homer, Iliad, 5.678): “Such a line would seem to me to establish some space for the author as well; for if the textual resemblance did not get there by chance, then it must have got there by someone’s will. Any effort to challenge this conclusion can do no more than prove it.”

\textsuperscript{59}Martindale, “Reception – a new humanism” 171, provides a characteristically vague description of this process that is much improved by Kallendorf: “I have argued persistently in favor of accounts in which reception is figured dialogically, as a two-way process of understanding, backwards and forwards, which illuminates antiquity as much as modernity (which is not to say that such dialogue is necessarily productive in outcome or easy to conduct).”
of each author’s reading of the *Aeneid* (R-A) through networks of systematic allusion. I supplement and guide my reading with available external evidence; luckily, such evidence is extant for each author. In Vegius’ case, I rely heavily on his *De perseverantia religionis* to corroborate my reading of the *Supplementum*; Forestus’ letters to Daniel Heinsius and his dedication to Queen Christina of Sweden survive as interpretive guides; finally, Villanova includes a lengthy *praefatio* to his work that provides detailed reasons for the necessity of his supplement. My interest is in what these various authors thought that they were doing when they undertook something as curious as the supplementation of the greatest poem produced by Latin antiquity. The discovery and clarification of their intentions is a principal aim of this work for which a re-examination of supplementation is essential.

IV. SUPPLEMENTATION RE-EXAMINED: RECONSTRUCTIONS, CORRECTIONS, COMPLETIONS, CONTINUATIONS

In place of the definition of supplementation advocated by Korenjak and Zuenelli (reviewed above), I propose four sub-categories that will better make sense of the varied nature of supplementation—including supplements that are not undertaken due to the supposed incompleteness of the original text. In my view, supplements should be organized into categories that depend on the (arguable) state of incompleteness of both the actual existing text and its intended idea or concept. These four primary categories are reconstruction, correction, completion, and continuation. Supplementation is used as an umbrella term to refer broadly to all four sub-categories, and I use these categories throughout my reevaluation of the various Virgilian supplements.
1) In a reconstruction, a work is supplemented whose text and concept are both considered incomplete by the supplementing author, often radically so. Frequently, reconstructions must guess at an intended plotline, and invent a nearly new text either as a scholarly attempt to reconstruct the original work or as part of a fresh artistic effort. In an example of the latter, Katharine Harris Bradley (1846–1914) and Edith Emma Cooper (1862–1913), writing under the pseudonym Michael Field, famously reconstructed numerous fragments of Sappho from single lines:

Δεῦρο δηντε Μοίσαι, χρύσιον λίποισαι. (Sappho, Fr. 127).

Hither now, Muses! leaving golden seats.
Hither! Forsake the fresh, inspiring wells,
Flee the high mountain lands, the cool retreats
Where in the temperate air your influence dwells,
Leave your sweet haunts of summer sound and rest,
Hither, O maiden choir, and make me blest.  

2) In a correction, a work is supplemented whose text is considered incomplete, although the broader concept behind the work is considered complete. Often, corrections fix or supply single lines, scenes, or damaged verses. An example would be the various attempts to complete the half-lines found in the Aeneid, an endeavor that, according to Donatus, began shortly after Virgil’s death. In this case, the Aeneid is assumed to be architecturally complete, although various unfinished lines remain. For example, a work of supplemental correction appears in Seneca’s Epistles, where a Virgilian half-line is finished by an unknown author:

audentes fortuna iuvat (10.284).  

audentes fortuna iuvat, piger ipse sibi opstat (Seneca, Epistulae, 94.28).  

60 Michael Field, Long Ago (Portland: Thomas B. Mosher, 1897), viii.
61 Donatus, 39–40.
62 “Fortune favors the bold”
63 “Fortune favors the bold, but a coward is a hindrance to himself.”
Corrections can be far more substantial than this—finishing intended plotlines, filling out outlined chapters, and collating notes or chapters into works that were left unfinished by their original authors. Of course, the boundary between correction and reconstruction could be blurry, and a writer attempting a lengthy correction may be required to cross the line into reconstruction. An instance of more substantial correction could include the supplements to Petronius’ Satyricon by François Nodot (1693), which were incorporated into editions and translations of the Satyricon until the twentieth century. Motivations for correction can be wide-ranging, and, as O’Hara points out, may reveal less about the supposedly incomplete poem than about the assumptions and worldviews of correcting authors.

3) In a completion, a work is supplemented whose text is presumed complete, but the broader idea, concept, or story behind the text appears to the supplementing poet to be incomplete or in need of some additional resolution. Quintus Smyrnaeus’ late antique Posthomerica is arguably an example of a completion—a poem that picks up the story of the Iliad “exactly at the point at which the Iliad finishes” and continues it to the end of the Trojan War:

Eὐθ᾽ ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμη θεοείκελος Ἐκτωρ καὶ ἀπρή κατέδαψε καὶ ὅστεα γαῖα κεκεύθει, δὴ τότε Τρόις ἐμμύνων ἀνὰ Πριάμου πόλης δειδιότες μένος ἣν θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο (Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomerica, 1.1–4).

---

65 O’Hara, “The Unfinished Aeneid,” 96, regarding the Aeneid: “…often when readers claim that the poem is unfinished they reveal less about the poem’s flaws than they do about their own assumptions about life and literature, and the ways in which certain inherent qualities of the poem are incompatible with these assumptions.”
66 Maciver, BCPSR, 71–89.
67 “After godlike Hector was conquered by the son of Peleus, and fire had consumed him and the earth covered his bones, then the Trojans remained in the city of Priam, fearing the noble strength of the brave-hearted son of Aeacus.”
The author does not claim that the *Iliad* itself is an incomplete poem; rather, the story of the fall of Troy has been left unfinished by the poet of the *Iliad* and is remedied by Quintus’ additional fourteen books.

4) A continuation supplements a work whose text and broader concept are both considered complete. True continuators often extend a story, or part of a story, that is otherwise finished, by creating new plotlines, improvising with original characters, or inventing new characters. An example of a continuation could be Geoffrey of Monmouth’s 12th century account in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* describing the adventures of Brutus of Troy, the grandson of Aeneas, who discovers Britain and founds New Troy—a city that one day will be known as London. The story quickly moves on from Virgil’s world to new adventures, with both Virgilian and non-Virgilian characters: Ascanius’ son, Silvius, has an illegitimate child with Lavinia’s niece. The child is named Brutus, but he is prophesied to kill his own father, which he does, and is exiled:

> nam dum famuli cervos in occursum eorum ducerent, Brutus telum in ipsos dirigere affectans, genitorem sub pectore percussit. quo mortuo, expulsus est ab Italia, indignantibus parentibus ipsum tantum facinus fecisse. Exulatus ergo adivit partes Graeciae et inventit progeniem Heleni filii Priami, quae sub potestate Pandrasi regis Graecorum in servitutem tenebatur.

---

68 See Michael D. Reeve (ed.) and Neil Wright (trans.), *The History of the Kings of Britain* (Rochester: Boydell, 2007).

69 Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, 1.3: “While the beaters were driving stags towards them, Brutus aimed an arrow at them, but struck his father in the chest. After Silvius’ death, Brutus’ grandparents were angry that he had committed such a misdeed and exiled him from Italy. He therefore went in exile to Greece, where he discovered the descendants of Helenus, Priam’s son, held in slavery under the power of the Greek king Pandrasus” (Trans: Wright).
More recently, Ursula Le Guin’s *Lavinia* provides a contemporary prose development of Virgil’s most important voiceless character, which takes place during the last six books of the *Aeneid* and continues into the aftermath of the war.\(^70\)

We can picture the above schema of supplementation, i.e., reconstruction, correction, completion, and continuation, using the following graph:

**Supplementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incomplete Concept</th>
<th>Complete Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomplete Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Correction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Text</td>
<td><strong>Completion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continuation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Text</td>
<td>Incomplete Text</td>
<td>Incomplete Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete Concept</td>
<td>Complete Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Text</td>
<td>Complete Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete Concept</td>
<td>Complete Concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. THE VIRGILIAN SUPPLEMENTS

I will use this four-fold division to examine the Neo-Latin supplements to the *Aeneid* written by Vegius, Forestus, and Villanova—and provide some speculations on the unfinished *Liber Decimus-Tertius Aeneidos* (1419) of Decembrius (1399–1477). In each chapter, I focus on

---

specific aspects of each work that bring their varied characters into sharper focus, and that enrich the previous scholarship on supplements and continuations.

Instead of an example of “ruthless” classicism, as it has been characterized by recent scholarship, I read Vegius’ *Supplementum* as an allegorical completion of the *Aeneid*. Vegius believes that the *Aeneid* as it stands is a nearly Christian poem worthy of the Apostle Paul, but one whose broader meaning must be lovingly revealed as a Christian allegory worthy of Augustine’s approval. To this end, I show how throughout his prose works, in particular, the *De educatione* and the *De perseverantia religionis*, the priestly humanist compulsively allegorizes both Virgil and Ovid, and how unmistakable signs of allegory and anagogy appear throughout the text of the *Supplementum* itself. In Vegius’ view, the *Aeneid* is hardly unfinished; rather, the undermeanings behind the text still need to be completed through a fully developed plotline, in which good can triumph over evil and the saint can make his way to heaven. A vision of Aeneas’ saintliness is thus fully completed for the Christian reader.

By contrast, I present Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni* as a continuation of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. As Forestus explains, he is not attempting to rival Virgil’s “inimitable majesty”—absit enim a metuantus furor! Rather, he extends Virgil’s plotline, challenges Virgil’s characterizations, and invents new dramatic episodes, without offering substantial resolution to the future foretold in the *Aeneid*. After reviewing recent scholarship that characterizes Forestus as a completer, I review the five main sub-plots of the *Exequiae Turni*, showing how the author creates and resolves new narrative tensions unexplored in Virgil’s epic. Aeneas controls his wrath and prevents future war; Latinus overcomes his suicidal despair; Pilumnus, Turnus’ brother, returns from the north and must be pacified and controlled; Lavinia must fall in love with Aeneas after the death of her lover, Turnus; finally, Daunus must be mollified. Yet, Forestus does not recount
the marriage between Lavinia and Aeneas, the founding of Lavinium, or the deification of Aeneas. The events foretold in the prophecies of the *Aeneid*, so carefully completed by Vegius, are left unexplored. Thus, Forestus continues the *Aeneid* without completing it.

Writing during the literary Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns in Louis XIV’s France, Villanova insists on the manifold perfections of the *Aeneid*, even as he claims that the existing text of the poem is woefully incomplete. Consequently, I present the *Supplementum ad Aeneida* as a correction to the *Aeneid*. Villanova’s plotline systematically fulfills the prophecies and predictions found in the *Aeneid*: Turnus is buried, Aeneas and Lavinia are married, additional wars take place in Latium, laws and moral codes are established, and finally Aeneas is apotheosized after his succession is assured. At certain points, Villanova is compelled to go beyond Virgil’s foretold plotline—but he only does so to tie up the loose ends of the *Aeneid*, as he explains in his copious *annotationes* and *praefatio*. Yet Villanova also challenges and transcends the *Aeneid* at numerous points, both by employing opulent and baroque imagery, and by foretelling the advent of Virgil’s poem and its greatest supplanter, Villanova himself. I suggest that, contrary to recent scholarship that has assigned Villanova to the Modern side of the quarrel, Villanova’s complex relationship to Virgil is not clearly defined by either side. For instance, while his insistence that the *Aeneid* is woefully incomplete is distinctly Modern, his devotion to Aristotelian norms of composition and even his choice to write in Latin betray a poem that refuses to be bound to a Modern position.

Furthermore, in my first appendix, I offer some speculations on Decembrius’ unfinished *Liber Decimus-Tertius Aeneidos*, arguing that the poet, like Vegius, may have attempted a completion of the *Aeneid*, and addressing claims that Vegius plagiarized from Decembrius. Owing to the unsatisfactory nature of the only available English translation, I have also
retranslated Decembrius’ poem in the second appendix. In the third and fourth appendices, I provide translations of Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni* and Villanova’s *Praefatio* and * Supplementum ad Aeneida*. These are the first translations of the two later supplements in English.
CHAPTER ONE: COMPLETING THE AENEID: MAPHAEUS VEGIUS AND THE ANALOGICAL SUPPLEMENTUM

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I argue that Vegius’ Supplementum (1428) is an allegorical completion of Virgil’s Aeneid. Previous scholarship has argued against the importance (or existence) of Christian allegory in Vegius’ work; instead, the Supplementum is interpreted as the product of a “goliardic” youth who, after worldly adventures in classical literature, turned to Christianity later in life. First, I briefly examine Vegius’ life and times, arguing against such a radical dichotomy between Vegius’ younger and older worldviews. After a review of scholarship, I discuss the practice of allegorical reading and writing in Vegius’ time and in his own writings, particularly the De educatione liberorum (1444) and the De perseverantia religionis (1448). In these works, he advances allegorical interpretations of Virgil and Ovid, even allegorizing his own Supplementum at the end of his analysis of the Aeneid. With this framework in place, I return to the Supplementum, showing how the work contains unmistakable indications of allegory: Turnus is the conquered dyabolus, Aeneas the victorious vir sapiens, Lavinia the virtuous anima, the Italians the turbulent world. Aeneas’ happy reign in Italy is the safe and tranquil life of virtue. In the end, eternal happiness is achieved and promised to all Aeneas’ followers. Thus, the Supplementum even takes a step towards typology and anagogy. Unlike Forestus, who continues the plotline and characters of the Aeneid without providing substantial resolution to Virgil’s tale, Vegius completes the moral and allegorical message of the Aeneid, recasting Virgil’s poem into

1 Earlier versions of this chapter were delivered as “Post Longa et Tristia Dyaboli Bella: Allegory and the End of the Aeneid,” at the 147th Annual Meeting of the SCS in Toronto, ON, January 6, 2017, and as “Immutantes Verba Dicamus: Allegory and Allusion in Aeneid XIII,” at the KFLC Languages, Literatures and Cultures Conference, in Lexington, KY, on April 16, 2016.
a work worthy of St. Augustine or St. Paul, a work which points to eternal life and unfolds the Christian story of salvation.

1. The Life and Works of Maphaeus Vegius

Standing at an intellectual crossroads in the history of the Virgilian tradition, between the Middle Ages and the flowering of the Renaissance, Maphaeus Vegius occupies “a delightful and almost fantastic chapter in the romance of Virgil’s influence.”

Born in 1407 in Lodi, the Lombardian town near Milan dedicated to St. Bassianus, he lived at a period of rapid change as Italy “set the intellectual pace for Western Europe.”

The details of Vegius’ early life are unfortunately scanty and lacunose. His parents, Bellortus Vegius and Caterina Lauteria, were of substantial means and both were closely involved in the rearing and education of their children. That he had at least four siblings is known from his works: Lawrence, mentioned in the De educatione liberorum et eorum claris moribus libri sex (1444), Eustace, the addressee of Dialogus veritatis et philalethis (1444?), Elizabeth, and Monica, both addressees of De perseverantia religionis libri septem (1448). These books addressed to them were his greatest gifts, stable works expressing eternal truths, he says, in place of the transient and unimportant

--


3 ibid., 5.

4 Vegius, De perseverantia religionis libri septem (Paris, 1511).
presents given by others.⁵ He suffuses each work with a lively affection and fraternal regard—but most of all, they prove the rigorous religious education shared among the brothers and sisters of the Vegius family. To Vegius’ delight, both of his younger sisters entered the religious life without marrying.

At age seven, Vegius’ first schooling in Milan took place under the rod of a harsh taskmaster, an experience he later recalled with distaste.⁶ Later, when his family moved from Milan, his parents entrusted him to an elderly tutor, a man of little erudition but great piety and kindness. Through amor and gentle humanitas, this kindly teacher inspired Vegius, especially in the study of poetry. It was as if he had escaped from a prison and entered a new world of learning; each day he committed more selections of the poets to memory:

```
ex illius itaque disciplina tanquam e carcere quodam liberatus, atque ad alterum humaniorem dulcioremque praeceptorem translatus, mirum est quam erexi me animo, quam litteris toto me dedi studio, quam laborem ultero omnem discendi causa suscepi adeo, ut et nonnulla iam ipse poetarum volumina evoluerem, et carminis aliquid novi—ad quod mira vi naturae impellebar—cotidie semper excuderem nemine etiam docente.⁷
```

During these early years of study, Franciscan preachers strove to revive the faith of Italy. The traveling friars would light “bonfires of the vanities,”⁸ and through the streets of Italian cities the

---

⁵ ibid., Dialogus veritatis et philalethis (Florence, 1444?), pref.: ornant alii germanos suos auro et gemmis, preciosaque suppellectile; ego te bonis disciplinis claris moribus, rectisque vivendi exemplis semper ornare studi.
⁷ ibid., 2.9.28, p. 69 – 2.9.1, p. 70: “Thus I was liberated from his training, as from a prison, and given over to another teacher, one who was more human and kinder. It was marvelous how I raised my spirits, how I gave myself entirely to my studies, and how I voluntarily took up all my work for the sake of learning, to such an extent that I read considerable numbers of the poets, and every day I would memorize some new selection of poetry without anyone teaching—a task which the wonderful force of nature impelled me to accomplish.”
voice of the “Apostle of Italy,” Bernardine of Siena, rang out in sermons full of eschatological fire. Then, Vegius’ elderly teacher would say to his best students:

\[\text{eamus, filii, audituri bonum illum fraterculum, tam vili ac trita indutum veste, cui tanta linguae gratia, tantus splendor eloquii, tam aptus docendi modus, tanta verborum simul atque sententiarum majestas.}\]

Vegius was only eleven years old—the year was around 1418—but the preaching of the friar seemed to him to pour from the mouth of God, and may have been a formative influence on his later decision to enter the religious life. Among the many sermons, the young Maphaeus would have heard of the journey of the soul to eternal life, the renunciation of the things of the world, and warfare against the father of darkness:

\[\text{considera, dilecta anima mea, quam dulcissime te invito, amantissime te desidero, benignissime te expecto; ulcisci omnino contra scelera tua dissimulo; ut ad me redeas, te affligo, dulcedine te attraho, amaritudine te impello, gaudenter te suscipio, redeuntem admitto, magno desidero te expecto, omnem offensam tibi dimitto, gratiam liberaliter dono, ipsum multiplico et conservo, et finaliter vitam aeternam promitto. quid igitur amplius immoraris? quid aliud quaeris? cur aliud diligis, anima mea dilecta?}\]


10 Vegius, \textit{Vita sancti Bernardini}, in \textit{Acta Sanctorum}, Maii V (Rome: Victor Palmé, 1866), 156: “Let us go, my children, to hear that good little friar, clad in such cheap and threadbare clothing, whose speech is so kindly, yet who has such splendor of eloquence, such a suitable way of teaching, and such a great majesty of words and thoughts.” See Iris Origo, \textit{The World of San Bernardino} (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962), 29.

11 Vegius, \textit{Vita sancti Bernardini}, 156: \textit{videbantur mihi omnia quae cumque diceret divino ore prolata}.

12 This point is colorfully made in Raffaele, \textit{Maffeo Vegio}, 1–2: “A Milano ascoltò, verso il 1418, le prediche di fra Bernardino da Siena, e questo fatto merita di essere ricordato, perché ci spiega meglio la tendenza che il Vegio ebbe al sacerdozio prima di giungere alla maturità. L’animo suo giovane, infatti, disposto come la cera a tutte le impressioni, si accende di fervore religioso e si da a quelle pratiche di pietà che lo innamorano della vita sacerdotale.” Vegius certainly remembered these sermons many years later, when, as a priest, he wrote a biography of the saint for his canonization in 1450. See Brinton, 8; Fanning, \textit{De educatione}, x–xi.

When he was fifteen, Maphaeus began to write classicizing poetry in earnest, composing the *Pompeiana* (1423), a series of bucolic elegies and epigrams. Ever mindful of his education, his father commanded that he study dialectic, a more serious and respectable discipline, but one that the young *alter Maro* found “pestiferous.”¹⁴ At nineteen he entered the University of Pavia, where he happily studied jurisprudence, although one suspects that classical rhetoric was the main attraction.¹⁵ He certainly did not obey the spirit of his father’s command to leave poetry behind, but returned happily to his muses, composing the *Supplementum* (1428), the *Convivium deorum* (1430), *Astyanax* (1430), *Velleris aurei libri IV* (1431), *De verborum significatione* (1433).¹⁶ Following an exile to Lodi due to the plague of 1431, Vegius returned to Pavia, and then to Milan and Florence, where “his literary passports gained him immediate access to the brilliant galaxy of writers attached to the Medicean and papal courts.”¹⁷ His contacts were numerous and illustrious; the list “reads like a ‘Who’s Who’ of Quattrocento humanism”: Cyriaco d’Ancona, Flavio Biondo, Guarino da Verona, Leonardo Bruni, Carlo Marsuppini, Pier Candido Decembrio (the author of another extant supplement of the *Aeneid*), Lorenzo Valla, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (soon to be Pope Pius II), and many others.¹⁸

Some scholars have argued that Vegius’ career can be neatly divided into “Pagan” and “Christian” periods of approximately fifteen years each.¹⁹ While this may be broadly true, Vegius’ shift to overtly Christian poetics during the 1430s has been exaggerated into an anti-humanistic religious conversion.²⁰ As we will see, this theory provides a sharp break in Vegius’

---

¹⁴ Vegius, *De educatione*, 3.2.15, p. 104.
¹⁵ ibid., 3.2.5–31, p. 104.
¹⁷ Brinton, 10.
¹⁹ The idea even appears in Brinton, 11.
character and disposition that would allow the Supplementum to be purged of Christian influence. Yet, the distance between the completion of the classicizing Vellерis aurei libri IV (1431) and De verborum significatione (1433) and the beginning of the composition of the overtly Christian Antonias (~1435) is only two years or less. 21 That Vegius developed more overtly religious themes is beyond doubt—he says as much in De educatione 22—but there is no evidence for the excesses of a “goliardic” youth, nor does it appear that he shifted his allegiance dramatically towards or away from the Church at any point. Rather, it seems that throughout his twenties Vegius grew more interested in the style of Christian Latin, especially that of

21 For example, to accentuate a “conversion” between an earlier pagan phase and a later Christian one, Putnam, 165, dates Vegius’ Antonias (Vegius’ first overtly Christian poem) to 1437 (Bononiae MCCCCXXXVII Idus martii [Vat. lat. 1669, cols. 51r–59r]). Yet, there is a Paris manuscript which dates the poem to a year earlier in Pavia (Paviae MCCCCXXXVI, IV idus martii [Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3341, cols. 315v–327v]). Raffaele, Maffeo Vegio, 108, mistook the Vat. lat. 1669 date: “dopo l’ultimo verso del poema si legge in margine la data Bononie MCCCCXXXIII idus marcii,” but has the correct date on 88. Most later scholarship adopted this error. However, Shalimar Abigail O. Fojas and James Hankins, “A Checklist of Manuscripts and Early Editions Containing Maffeo Vegio’s Astyanax (1430) and Antonias (1436/7) (With a Note on the Date of the Antonias),” Scriptorium 58.2 (2004), 265–273, argue convincingly that the original date of composition should be March 1436, and the date of dedication should be March 1437. In evidence of this, there is an extant letter by Giuseppe Brivio to Eugene IV dated from Milan, July 1436, in which he had seen a one-book copy of the Antonias, qtd. in ibid., 167: opera nundum in lucem prodita, mihi tamen visa et perlecta diligenter ... inter quae unum fecit librum insignem et preclarum vitae beati Antonii tuae Sanctitati inscriptum, cuius historiae maiestati non defuerunt eloquentiae ornamenta depicta quidem et proprio verborum splendore et sententiarum dignitate et versus suavitate et elegantia. quod opusculum cum videbis, censebis dignum tua maiestate, dignum sanctitate beati Antonii, dignum suo nobili auctore dignissimunque etiam posterum celebritate, laude, fama. Thus, with Fojas and Hankins, ibid., “we can only surmise that Vegio rapidly finished the work between an earlier point in time when Brivio saw it and March of 1436, just before Maffeo left for the papal court.” This means that Vegius was planning and composing the poem prior to March of 1436, almost certainly during 1435, and perhaps even earlier.

22 Vegius, De educatione, 1.1.8–21, p. 2: nam ut id aperiamus, cum ab gentilibus ac maxime poeticis studiis, quibus per omnem adolescementiam ardentissime vacaveram, convertissem aliquando animum ad legendos sacros codices, delectatus sum adeo eorum lectione ut, quod minime antea speraveram, offensarem tantum eloquentiae, ne de doctrina aliud dicam, quantum me ad nova studia invitare ac vehementissime inflammare coepit. cumque summopere omnes divinae sapientiae scriptores legerem, legens admirarer, admiransque maxime delectarer, unius tamen ante ceteros Augustinus audi me ardens amor corripuit, ut quem non secus ac miraculum mundo natum fuisse arbitraver, illum iam non solum legerem, sed colorem etiam, sed implorarem, sed invocarem, tanta quippe legenti eum occurrit doctrinam omnium erudito, tanta eloquii ubertas, tanta ingenii vis et altitudo, quanta satis omnium iudicio pervulgata praedicantur. This engrossed fascination with Augustine almost certainly took place well before his composition of the Antonias; his adolescencia probably refers to his time prior to the studies in Pavia. Cf. De perseverantia 1.1 (fol. 1) for a brief account of the change in his literary tastes and interests.
Augustine, and began to admire the lives of the saints as literary models for more edifying epic projects.

Rather than a sudden break, we should understand a gradual orientation towards overtly sacred literature throughout Vegius’ young life. There is never any sign that the classical and the Christian were mutually incompatible in his mind. The Antonias prominently displays classical machinery, and, as I will argue, Christian allegory suffuses the earlier poetry, especially the Supplementum.23 Indeed, testimony for Vegius’ reputation as a particularly pious humanist throughout this period can be adduced from a (neglected) letter sent by Giuseppe Brivio to Eugene IV in 1436, in which Brivio commends to the pope the poetic talents of Vegius, as evidenced by the Supplementum and the Antonias. Brivio also praises Vegius’ unusual—for a poet!—religiosity and constancy in the faith, held continually from his childhood (a teneris annis):

integritatem vero et animi et corporis huius nostri poetae non parvam et forte aliis in vatibus vel raram vel inauditam vel non lectam intelliges. is enim est amantissimus aequi, ita ut non prece, non precio, non amore aut metu aut odio traduci posset ad consensus iniqui aut alicuius iniquitatis faciendae. castimoniam vero corporis, divinum manus admirandamque virtutem apud Deum et homines a teneris annis semper amavit amaque mirifice ceteras virtutes, vicia quaeque edit: tua itaque curia letari admodum debet presentia tanti viri.24

Eugene IV’s pontificate (1431–1447), under which Vegius rose in the ranks of the Church, was marked with turmoil, both ecclesiastical and political.25 Following his election, he

---

23 The Antonias is the first Christian Latin epic of the Renaissance, followed by Jacopo Sannazaro’s De partu Virginis (1526) and Marco Girolamo Vida’s Christiad (1535). See Putnam, xxxvii–xxxviii.

24 Sottilli, “Zur Biographie Giuseppe Brivios und Maffeo Vegio,” 225: “Truly, you will perceive that the integrity of both body and mind in this poet is not small, and as far as other poets go, it is rare, or unheard of, or un-read of. For he is so loving of what is right that he would not be able to be led to agree with injustice, or the doing of any iniquity, neither by prayer nor by bribery, and not by love or fear or hatred. From his childhood, always he has cherished the chastity of his body, that divine gift, and marvelous virtue, before God and men, and he amazingly loves the other virtues; he hates all sin. Thus, your curia ought to exceedingly rejoice by the presence of such a man.” Notice how Brivio remarks that Vegius’ piety is surprising, especially for a poet.

was faced with the Council of Basel (1431–1439), which challenged papal authority and governance. Furthermore, he was confronted with intense political opposition on the Italian peninsula. Duke Filippo Maria Visconti, “the very soul of all the Anti-Papal conspiracies,” encouraged the condottieri Niccolò Fortebraccio and Francesco Sforza to attack Rome. Eugene fled to Trastevere, but finally quit the city when a revolution proclaimed a Roman republic in May of 1434. He arrived in Florence in June, where he remained in Santa Maria Novella. Rome was left to the harsh protection of the warrior-prelate Cardinal Giovanni Vitelleschi. It was in Florence that Vegius joined the papal court in 1436.

Consequently, the pious Vegius became a professional, a member of the papal court during a complex and difficult time for the papacy, obtaining a coveted position as an abbreviator. In Florence some of the most talented humanists of the day gathered together in related offices: Flavio Biondo, in particular, who became Apostolic Secretary in 1434 and dedicated his De Roma instaurata in three volumes (1444–1448) to Eugene, a work devoted to the pagan and Christian monuments of the eternal city. Men such as this, who united secular and religious learning, were Vegius’ co-workers and friends. Vegius, not content to be without his own laurels, dedicated the Antonias—the four-book classicizing poem about the life and death of Anthony the Abbot mentioned above—to Eugene, dactor populi custosque fidelis. To other learned Florentine humanists, such as Carlo Marsupini, Leonardo Bruni, and Ambrogio Traversari, Vegius dedicated numerous smaller poems.
But Eugene had bigger problems than the rapacious condottieri of the Duchy of Milan: As mentioned above, immediately on accession to his office, he had received opposition from the bishops and dignitaries at Basel who were attempting to limit the power of the pope in favor of a conciliar model of church government. Eugene first attempted to dissolve the council in 1431; in response, the council declared that its authority came from Christ himself and required papal submission. In a direct affront to his primacy, Eugene was summoned to appear, his legate was imprisoned, and a new schism was threatened. From Florence, the pope attempted to control the council, but, faced with growing opposition, in September 1437 he formally dissolved it. A rival council was convened by the pope, opened at Ferrara in January 1438, and consequently moved to Florence due to the plague.

Vegius traveled throughout Italy with the papal court, from Florence where he joined the court in 1436, to Bologna, to the Council at Ferrara in 1438, and to Florence again in 1439. During this time Vegius “was largely absorbed by a tedious routine of pontifical correspondence.” But perhaps the routine was less than tedious. After all, Eugene’s concerns were tremendous. The Council of Florence-Ferrara attempted to end the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, uniting all of Christendom under the control of the papacy. Although the council initially seemed successful—Laetentur caeli et exultet terra reads the title of the Decretum unionis issued in July 1439—its decrees never gained full acceptance in the East, and were largely ignored after Constantinople fell to Mohammed II in 1453. The Council of Basel responded to the (in retrospect, limited) successes of Florence-Ferrara by

---

30 Rendina, The Popes, 406; Pastor, History of the Popes, 1, 290–291.
31 Brinton, 11.
excommunicating the pope and electing the Duke Amadeus of Savoy as antipope Felix V in November 1439.

Having been appointed apostolic datary and secretary of papal briefs in 1442, Vegius finally returned to Rome in triumph with Eugene IV on September 28, 1443, after a nearly ten-year exile. The dilapidated state of the city is colorfully described by Pastor: “The ancient monuments were being burned for lime, and the marble and precious stones stolen from the churches. Cows, sheep, and goats wandered about the narrow, unpaved streets.”32 While Eugene began his work of rebuilding and reform, Vegius as a datarius “mostly affixed dates to documents and offered the pope informal advice on petitions,”33 acting as an intermediary canon lawyer between the pope and those seeking favors. He continued his studies in philosophy and theology and at some point received holy orders, most likely the diaconate or subdiaconate.34 Soon after his arrival in Rome, he was appointed Canon of St. Peter’s Basilica in December, 1443, and was granted an annual stipend of forty gold florins.35 Around this time he must also have begun work on his De educatione (1444), a masterpiece of pedagogical theory that unites Christian and classical learning. Eugene showed many of the characteristics of the later Renaissance pontiffs; although austere and simple in his own life, he restored both churches and pagan monuments, and patronized literature and the arts. Vegius seems to have been very fond of him: dulcis herus meus, “my sweet master,” he calls him, “who despised the vain and shifting things of the world.”36

32 Pastor, History of the Popes, 1, 333.
33 See Christine Smith and Joseph F. O’Connor, Eyewitnesses to Old St. Peter’s (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 20, for more details.
34 Brinton, 12.
35 Smith and O’Connor, Eyewitnesses, 19.
36 Vegius, De rebus antiquis memorabilibus, 4.132.
Eugene was succeeded by Nicholas V, who was elected on the 6th of March 1447; in him “the Christian Renaissance ascended the Pontifical Throne.”\(^{37}\) To Vegius, he was the *optimus herus*, “my greatest lord,” “who never will be removed from my memory.”\(^{38}\) An epitaph recorded (and perhaps composed) by Vegius announces him as *aemulus Numae* and *alter Augustus*.\(^{39}\) With the final dissolution of the Council of Basel and the reconciliation of the schism in 1449, a jubilee year was declared in 1450, during which the canonization of St. Bernardine of Siena was announced. Magnificent celebrations were held in St. Peter’s. To commemorate the occasion, Vegius wrote a biography of the *fratriculus*, whose words he remembered from childhood.\(^{40}\) Throughout this time, he also wrote numerous *vitae* of Monica and Augustine.\(^{41}\)

Books were one of the two great loves of Nicholas V, and under his direction Rome became “a vast literary laboratory.”\(^{42}\) While not a great scholar himself, he collected immense quantities of books in his personal library, both Latin and Greek, which became the foundation of the future Vatican Library.\(^{43}\) The greatest literary lights of the day—among them many of Vegius’ friends from Florence—gathered in the eternal city. The classics of Greek antiquity were tirelessly translated with the promise of vast rewards.\(^{44}\) Vegius was an enthusiastic participant in this antiquarian activity of collection and composition. In his *De perseverantia* (1448), for instance, Vegius assembles his own veritable library of references to classical sources, both Greek and Latin, Christian and Pagan:

---


\(^{38}\) Vegius, *De rebus antiquis memorabilibus*, 4.132.


\(^{40}\) Brinton, 8.

\(^{41}\) ibid., 12.


\(^{44}\) Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 2, 199.
In a single chapter on prayer ... he quotes from saints and doctors, Bernard, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome, Climax, Cassian, Porphyry, and Eusebius; from the Old Testament books, Exodus, Psalms, Daniel, and Isaiah; from the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John; from Apollonius of Tyana and Hermes Trismegistus. He finally caps his argument with a passage from the Greek dramatist Menander and with the famous conclusion of the second satire of the Roman poet Persius.  

Nicolas V’s other great love was architecture and construction. Throughout Rome, churches were rebuilt, enlarged, and restored: San Celso, Santa Prassede, Santa Maria in Trastevere, Santo Eusebio, Santa Maria Rotonda (the Pantheon), Santa Maria Maggiore, San Paolo, San Lorenzo fuori le mura.  

The energetic pontiff organized the water supply, cleared and paved the streets, repaired and built bridges, and reconstructed the city walls, all the while plundering marble and travertine from pagan monuments, particularly the Coliseum. Beyond all other ambitions in scale and brilliance, however, were the plans proposed by Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) for a new Basilica of St. Peter—in addition to plans for the Papal Palace and Leonine City—which Nicholas did not live to see completed. As with Vegius, we see in Alberti an entwined allegiance to the classical and the Christian. He hoped to remake the tottering Constantinian basilica of Old St. Peter’s into a Renaissance “temple”:

velim quidem templo tantum adesse pulchritudinis, ut nulla species ne cogitari uspiam possit ornatio; et omni ex parte ita esse paratum opto, ut qui ingrediantur stupefacci exhorrescant rerum dignarum admiratione, vixque se contineant, quin clamore profiteantur, dignum profecto esse locum deo, quod intueantur.  

45 Brinton, 13.  
47 *ibid.*, 2, 180: “It seems strange that a Pope, who so highly appreciated the literature of the ancients, should have shown so little regard for their other creations.” For the response of the humanists to the looting of classical monuments, see Rendina, *The Popes*, 413.  
48 Alberti, *De re aedificatoria*, 7.3: “I would wish the temple so beautiful that nothing more decorous could be devised; I would deck it out in every part so that anyone who entered it would start with awe for his admiration at all the noble things, and could scarcely restrain himself from exclaiming that what he saw was a place undoubtedly worthy of God.” (Trans: Rykwert, Leach, and Tavernor).
As with his poetry, Vegius, however, was as attached to the past as he was to the future, and the impending renovation or reconstruction of Old St. Peter's may have at least in part provoked his last great work, *De rebus antiquis memorabilibus Basilicae Sancti Petri Romae* (1455–1457), for which he has been named the “founder of the study of Christian archaeology.” Vegius’ work sets the holiness of the ancient basilica and the church in contrast to the excesses of the pagan world:

> in quo nec satis summam Dei bonitatem ac sapientiam admirari atque laudare possumus, qui locum ubi omnium libidinem irritamenta, ubi omnia scelera omniaque mala et atrocia facinora exercebantur, mutatis contra longe contrariis conditionibus, omnium virtutum portum omnisque religionis et sanctitatis column esse voluerit.

In his historical and archeological investigations, Vegius even rescued for posterity the epitaphs of Probus and his wife Proba, the Virgilian centoist, found in a mausoleum behind the apse of St. Peter’s, about six months before the marbles were repurposed for other projects:

> solamen tanti coniu x tamen optima luctus
> hoc Proba sortita est, jungat ut urna pares.
> felix heu nimium felix, dum vita maneret:
> digno juncta viro, digna simul tumulo.

---


50 Brinton, 14.

51 Vegius, *De rebus antiquis memorabilibus*, 1.3: “In this place we are not able adequately to praise and admire the great goodness and wisdom of God, who wished that the place where the incitements of all desires and where every crime, evil, and atrocious outrage was practiced, when the circumstances should be greatly changed to the contrary, should be the gate of all virtues and the pillar of all religion and sanctity.”


53 *ibid.*, 4.110: “Proba, his excellent wife, received this consolation for so great a grief: that an urn joins them both as equals. Fortunate, alas too fortunate, while life remained: joined to a worthy husband and worthy also of this tomb.”
Vegius made his own small contributions to the vast architectural works of Nicholas V. In 1446 he built a chapel in Sant’Agostino in Rome and dedicated it to St. Monica. Her relics, which had been brought from Ostia to San Trifone in Rome in 1430, were transferred there—*ad aram a Maffeo Vegio constructam* reads the inscription to this day. Not sparing any expense in the veneration of St. Monica, Vegius “funded the manufacture of a silver reliquary of the saint’s head encrusted with precious stones.” In 1458, Vegius died in Rome, and was also laid to rest in the chapel, like a son of the Aurelii, where his tomb slab engraved by Isaia da Pisa can still be seen.

Of the four supplements, Maphaeus Vegius’ 630-line poem has enjoyed the most attention by far in recent scholarship. Immensely popular throughout the Renaissance and frequently printed with Virgil’s *Aeneid*, a modern edition of the *Supplementum* was first published in 1930, followed by a German critical edition and translation in 1985, an Italian translation and commentary in 1997, an English translation in 2004, and an Italian translation and commentary in 2013. Numerous articles and book chapters examine the *Supplementum*, its metrics, rhetoric, and style, relationship with the *Aeneid*, the author’s conception of Rome

and Roman history, the Renaissance context of the poem, its manuscript and printing history, as well as the woodcuts of Sebastian Brant that accompanied the 1502 edition.

Although he is frequently considered a continuator, I argue here that Vegius should be considered an allegorical completer of Virgil’s epic poem and that he reads the Aeneid as a Christian anagogical allegory for the ascent of the soul through the struggles of the world to eternal happiness. Although much recent scholarship dismisses allegorical readings of his Supplementum outright, I aim to place Vegius within the context of medieval and quattrocento readings of classical texts and demonstrate that his allegorical approach to the Aeneid is typical of his time and milieu. His allegory is meant to be lucid, in that it makes Virgil’s moral and allegorical undermeanings readily accessible to the reader. It is united, in that it completes Virgil’s theological vision in both plot and purpose. It is also harmonious, in that it attempts to maintain Virgilian language and diction. First, I will review scholarship that touches on the presence of allegory in Vegius’ Supplementum, focusing on the introduction to Michael Putnam’s I Tatti edition of Vegius’ Short Epics. Second, I will contrast Putnam’s arguments

against an allegorical intention behind the *Supplementum* with Vegius’ own theory of allegory found in his understudied works *De perseverantia* and *De educatione*. Third, I will examine the *Supplementum* in light of the theory Vegius presents in the *De perseverantia*, suggesting that an allegorical reading can be successfully applied to the *Supplementum*, and can make sense of numerous difficult passages. In brief: I argue, *contra* Putnam and others, that Vegius intended the *Supplementum* as a Christian allegory, and that recent scholarship ignoring this allegorical reading should be reconsidered.

2. Vegius’ *Supplementum*: Plot Overview

Vegius’ 630-line poem begins roughly where the *Aeneid* ends. As Turnus dies he pours forth his fleeting soul, while the shattered Italians give up the fight and drop their weapons. Aeneas addresses Turnus’ body and the defeated Italians (13.1–48). The Trojans return joyfully to their camp, where they sacrifice and celebrate (13.49–72). Aeneas speaks to Ascanius (13.72–82) and his men (13.83–102), pondering the perils they have overcome (13.103–124). The Italians carry the body of Turnus to king Latinus, who in mourning (13.125–141) reflects on the transience of power and Turnus’ hubris and insanity (13.142–184). The funeral procession sets out to Ardea to deliver Turnus’ body to Daunus, Turnus’ father (13.185–203). As the procession arrives, Ardea is aflame and the townsfolk are in confusion. Following an Ovidian metamorphosis, the city rises into the air like a flaming bird (13.204–251). After Daunus laments over Turnus’ body (13.252–301), Latinus selects an embassy to the Trojans and comforts the citizenry of Ardea (13.302–324). The embassy arrives and Drances welcomes Aeneas (13.325–373), who replies with a kindly speech, sealing the concord between Trojans and Italians.

3. Allegory and the Supplementum

Over the course of the past century, several critics, mostly non-classicists, have assumed the presence of Christian allegory in Vegius’ Supplementum. In the introduction to her pioneering 1930 edition of the Supplementum, Anna Cox Brinton briefly discussed other contemporary allegorical writers, such as Landino and Alberti, and cites Vegius’ De educatione and De perseverantia as evidence of his own allegorical approach. Although she rightly defends Vegius from Comparetti’s mockery of allegory (“a species of dialectical hallucination, which owes its origin to those earnest convictions which are natural to a vigorous and impulsive temperament”), she sees the Supplementum as a naive “superimposition” onto the Virgilian original: “[I]t is no wonder that an ardent youth, in an age when, for sheer love of the epic, children learned it by heart, should have superimposed upon the artistic completeness of Virgil’s

---

63 Brinton, 26–29.
poem his own enthusiastic version of the heavenly reward.” The success of such a youthful exercise in allegoresis astonishes her: “The surprising fact is not that a Thirteenth Book of the *Aeneid* was composed, but that it should have had so long a history.” Brinton does not develop her comments on Vegius’ allegoresis. In her view, it scarcely needs to be argued; she merely illustrates.

Brinton’s observations came under assault almost at once in an early review by O. F. Long. While he compliments her style of exposition (“The life and activities of Vegius and the role played by allegory in response to the Christian conscience of the day have never been better told in English.”) and admits the presence of allegorical reading of Virgil in the *De perseverantia*, he ultimately denies that the *Supplementum* is, in the main, an allegorical work: “There is nothing in XIII to lend such color, except the hasty apotheosis at the close.” The arguments provided against Brinton’s allegorical reading are hardly compelling. Long cites a “lustily” composed lyric from Vegius’ youth, to prove, I suppose, that sexuality naturally repels an allegorical frame of mind:

```
bella canant alii; me bella elegia fovebit;
illa mihi amplexus osculaque una dabit.69
```

This seems to be a pristine example of the biographical fallacy. To be honest, I find Long’s position difficult to understand. Rephrased: “Besides the ending, there is no reason to think of

65 Brinton, 28–29.
66 *ibid.*, 29.
68 *ibid*.
69 *ibid*. 
the *Supplementum* as an allegory.” But anagogical allegories are precisely concerned with endings.

A few later scholars have agreed with Brinton. Allen, for instance, reluctantly half-admits that “[Vegius’s] new ending is nearly Christian,” which is hardly better than Long.70 More decisively, Fichter remarks that “[Vegius] writes within a tradition that interprets the *Aeneid* as an allegory of the pilgrimage of the soul through material existence, a journey that cannot be concluded until the soul attains the kingdom of heaven.”71 In finding a Christian purpose behind the *Supplementum*, he convincingly argues that the poem enables allegorical readings of Virgil and he provides one example that I will review later.72 He does not, however, ground his reading in Vegius’ prose writings or contextualize Vegius in the practice of 15th century allegoresis.

Finally, Kallendorf argues for the pervasive presence of moral allegory—framed as epideictic rhetoric—in the *Supplementum*. His central claim is that epideictic rhetoric properly explains the poem’s presence in 15th century Italy. Despite the shortcomings of his approach, he does much to rehabilitate the poem, after the attacks on its style and content made by Blandford and Duckworth.73 It will be fruitful to study the poem from the history of Virgilian allegoresis and

---

72 Fichter makes several interesting observations, to be discussed fully later. First, “The ‘Thirteenth Book’ supplies the action that makes [Christian] interpretations possible. The extent to which Vegius managed to educate such meanings without substantially altering the plot provided by the *Aeneid* is the measure of his skill and testimony to his conviction that Virgil’s poem is adaptable to a Christian universe” (14). Second, he is sensitive to the balance in Vegius between classicism and Christianity: “[Vegius] seems equally divided between a desire to produce a plausibly Virgilian narrative, full of verbal echoes and imitations of the original, and a wish to point that narrative in the direction of Christian truths” (15). Importantly, he remains decidedly above the petty Vegius-bashing typical of classicists such as Thomas.
73 For a castigation of Vegius’ entire project, see Blandford, “Virgil and Vegio,” 30: “Although excellent in itself, as an alternative ending to the *Aeneid* Vegio’s Supplement is an anti-climax, a most undramatic conclusion, in a word a failure. We know these things are going to happen, and to take a whole book describing them is, as Pope observes, to ‘overshoot the mark.’” Similarly, see Duckworth, “Mapheus Vegius and Vergil’s *Aeneid*,” 2: “In a sense, however, the *Supplementum* was a mistake ... Vegius’ addition of a ‘Thirteenth Book’ reveals his failure to understand the close-knit unity of Vergil’s twelve books, and furthermore it was quite unnecessary, since ... the reader already knows what is going to happen after the death of Turnus.” Kallendorf is followed by Philip Hardie, *The Last Trojan Hero* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014), 84–85.
Vegius’ own writings, because both Fichter and Allen rely entirely on Brinton, without developing her arguments.\(^{74}\)

In contrast to these scattered voices, a formidable *communis opinio* over the last 50 years has ignored or dismissed an allegorical intention behind the composition of the *Supplementum*. Preempting Kallendorf’s later interest in epideictic rhetoric, Hijmans in 1971 interpreted the poem as a *laudatio* of the virtuous Aeneas and a *vituperatio* of the vicious Turnus. He points out Vegius’ success at creating multifaceted characters, arguing that complexity of feeling and characterization is foreign to allegoresis. Allegory, in his view, is naturally one sided, simplistic, and harmful to a complex and truly Virgilian ethos, so for instance, “Latinus’ funeral speech to

\(^{74}\) Also, see Barbara Bono, *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 44: “The Renaissance humanists Pier Candido Decembrio and Mapheus Vegius write neo-Vergilian thirteenth books for the *Aeneid*, in which Aeneas’s marriage to Lavinia and the pious end of his life foreshadow the Christian marriage supper of the Lamb and the eternal heavenly reward.” Similarly, Richard Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, 283, notes briefly that “[t]hroughout Vegio’s *Supplement*, the Christian and the allegorical element is to the fore” and that “[t]he apotheosis of Aeneas bridges the pagan and Christian worlds as Venus ‘leads the blessed soul with her up to heaven’ (628 *felicemque animam secum super aera duxit*), where he is worshipped as a god, in what smacks of a blending of pagan catasterism and Christian ascent.” Although Thomas sees Vegius as “brilliant” and a “skillful rhetorician,” like Brinton, he does not escape the itch to castigate the purpose of the *Supplement*. See *ibid.*, 283: “If we accept the closure, as editors and translators who printed Vegio’s work implicitly did, we remove the Virgilian Aeneas’ final act from the sphere of human shortcoming, and by assigning to Jupiter the anger and rage of Aeneas, we can finally achieve the comfortable banality, denied by Virgil, for which so many have hungered at the poem’s end.” A sensible look at the effect of the popularity of allegory on the reception of the *Supplementum* can be found in Paul Gerhard Schmidt, “Neulateinische Supplemente zur Aeneis. Mit einer Edition der Exsequiae Turni des Jan van Foreest,” in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis*, eds. J. Isewijn and E. Keßler (München: Leuven University Press, 1973), 518: „Neben den formalen Vorzügen der Dichtung hat ein weiterer Umstand nicht unwesentlich zu ihrem großen Erfolg beigetragen. Es ist dies die im Mittelalter und bis weitin die Renaissance hinein geübte allegorische Interpretation, die im Falle der Aeneis nach einem befriedigenderen Abschluß verlangte, als Vergil ihn bot. Wer die Aeneis allegorisch interpretierte – und wer seit Fulgentius tat dies nicht? –, der sah in den Irrfahrten ihres Helden die Pilgerreise einer Seele durch die Gefahren und Versuchungen des Lebens. Am Ende einer solchen als „Pilgrim’s Progress” verstandenen Dichtung konnte aber nicht eine innerweltliche Episode stehen; die Aufnahme des Helden in den Himmel war der einzig sinnvolle Abschluß des Werks.” He clearly follows Brinton’s argument; since his concern is with Forestus’ *Exsequiae Turni*, he does not pursue this line of thinking further. Oertel, 179–180, presents a concise and, in my view, almost entirely correct assessment of Vegius’ contribution: “Vegio ging es nicht um ein neues Drama, sondern um das Zudenfenfuhren der virgilischen Aeneishandlung, allerdings aus der Sicht der mittelalterlich-christlichen Tradition.” Since he is largely concerned with Forestus and Villanova, he similarly does not develop this view at length. See also Sonja Eckmann, “Das Aeneis-Supplement der Pier Candido Decembrio – die die pessimistische ‘Stimme’ der Aeneis?” *NLJ* 4 (2002), 69, who uncritically follows Brinton in her analysis of Decembrio: “So legt Maffeo Vegio Aeneas’ Weg allegorisch aus: Aeneas ist der heilige Anführer der trojanischen Gesandschaft, ein Vorbild an Frömmigkeit. Er besteht zahlreiche Gefahren und meistert dabei alle Bewährungsproben, die seine arme Seele in Versuchung führen, um am Schluss für seine *pietas* und *fides* die Belohnung zu erhalten.”
Turnus shows a curious mixture of sorrow and anger and a complete absence of the feeling of relief one would expect in view of the victory of Virtue over vice, so that one may wonder whether Vegius has not caught something of the Virgilian sympathy.”75 In analyzing the character of Turnus, he concludes that “It might be wiser … to omit the word allegory altogether.”76 While he does admit that Vegius allegorizes in the *De perseverantia*, he argues that such an allegory has not interfered with Vegius’ reading of Virgil: “The identifications [Vegius] makes in his treatise *On Perseverance in Religion*, the Latins-worldliness, Turnus-the-devil, Lavinia-the soul … seem to have hampered his understanding of the *Aeneid* rather less than might have been expected.”77

Ross develops this argument further, claiming that “Vegio himself probably did not [allegorically] interpret Aeneas’s apotheosis when he wrote the supplement … A Christian interpretation of the supplement, though possible, runs into the problem that Vegio added nothing explicitly Christian to Ovid and Virgil.”78 The essence of this argument is developed later by Putnam: If the *Supplementum* is Christianizing, why does it read like a pagan poem? But unlike Schneider and Putnam (see below), Ross does discuss the uncomfortable existence of the *De perseverantia*. In the *De perseverantia*, he argues that “Vegio ransacked sacred and profane literature for examples of perseverance.”79 “Thus,” he continues, “Vegio did not misinterpret Vergil; he consciously distorted him to fit the book he was writing, *De perseverantia*. Moreover, the care he exercised in extracting the theological meaning makes it unlikely that his interpretation was common property to all humanists or that anyone else instantly equated

76 ibid., 154.
77 ibid.
78 Ross, “Maffeo Vegio’s ‘short Cristyn wark,’” 219–220.
79 ibid., 218.
Latium with heaven. Vegio himself probably did not so interpret Aeneas’s apotheosis when he wrote the supplement.\(^{80}\) Thus Ross argues that the *De perseverantia* is an awkward and forced reading, unusual for its time, unusual for Vegius, and foreign to the irreligiousness of Vegius’ “goliardic” youth.

In his meticulous critical edition, Bern Schneider focusses on Vegius’ adaptations and allusions to classical authors. His learned notes list many parallels with Virgil, as well as Ovid, Lucan, and Statius. In his view, Vegius undertook to compose the *Supplementum* in order to finish the unrealized plot of the *Aeneid*, cut short by the death of its author: “Man darf annehmen, daß Maffeo meinte, mit seinem Supplement die Handlung der Aeneis nach dem von Vergil selbst noch beabsichtigten Plan, den zu verwirklichen ihn sein Tod hinderte, zu Ende zu führen.”\(^{81}\) Schneider’s concerns are with allusion, structure, and formal aspects of Vegius’ work, not with the philosophical or theological motivations that may have prompted him to write as he does. Thus, he includes the *Supplementum* with Vegius’ *Astyanax*, *Convivium deorum*, and his other early “secular works,” as opposed to the later Christian poems, such as the *Antonias*.\(^{82}\)

Schneider also provides an alternative motive for composition from an anonymous *vita* in the *Maxima bibliotheca patrum*, which explains that Vegius composed the *Supplementum* not to complete the *Aeneid*, but to exercise his poetic *ingenium*.\(^{83}\)


\(^{81}\) Schneider, 19.


\(^{83}\) Schneider, 19: *Carmine quidem librum de ultimis Aeneae gestis & obitu, quam tertium decimum Aeneidos nuncupavit, non quasi imperfectum esse opus Maronis putaret, sed ut in Poeticis ingenium ad quae ferebatur, exerceret: idque exemplo Quinti Smyrnaei, qui Homero παραλειπόμενα lib. 14 addere est ausus.*
More recently, Putnam has advanced an anti-allegorical position in the introduction to his 2004 *I Tatti* edition of Vegius’ *Short Epics*. His forceful exposition, verging on the dramatic, is worth quoting at length:

Vegio’s act of closure seems a sign on Vegio’s part of unwillingness to allow interpretation of his poem to take the step towards anagogy … he avoids any step that would lead the reader toward any medieval, anagogical interpretation of the hero’s life … Vegio chooses not to have Aeneas, in however oblique a manner, suffer the change from paganism to Christianity. There is no hint that the stellification of Aeneas’s *anima* is the equivalent of his admission into the Christian heaven … There is no reference, in Aeneas’ celestial transmutation, to God’s eternal grace extended to his mortal soul and every possibility that Vegio wished us to see Aeneas’s deification as the result of his notable achievements as ancestor of, and moral paradigm for, future Romans and their Renaissance descendants. In this respect, too, Vegio is inexorably classicizing.\(^{84}\)

He adds a sweeping and restrictive interpretive dictum: “[I]t is in the classical literary background that [Vegius’] interest lay and that should be the focus of attention for his contemporary readers as well.”\(^{85}\) In Putnam’s view then, Vegius presents Aeneas “as the noblest of pagans,” not an anagogical representation of the Christian *vir sapiens* in pursuit of *beatitudo* and eternal happiness. His Vegius is overwhelmingly, if unrealistically, interested in classical allusion, the complex rhetorical and poetic gamesmanship that delights Putnam himself in the ancient world.\(^{86}\)

Putnam’s rejection of any allegorical reading has found immediate favor among his reviewers—the relief is palpable, as if a young, freethinking poet has been snatched from the claws of superstitious allegorists. Kallendorf at once falls into line: “As Putnam shows, however, the poem continues the *Aeneid* on Virgil’s terms, not those of later readers, so that Christian

---

\(^{84}\) Putnam, xviii.

\(^{85}\) *ibid.*

\(^{86}\) Classical scholars can appear allergic to the idea of allegory. See L. A. MacKay, “Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*,” *TAPhA* 94 (1963), 160: “Vergil was writing myth, not allegory; fiction, not displaced history.”
allegory can only be inserted into the poem by those who have decided in advance that they are going to find it there.”87 Maxson is similarly convinced: “Putnam’s introduction does an excellent job of tracing the classical sources and allusions throughout the poem. He then uses this evidence convincingly to reject an anagogical reading of the events.”88 McGill is no less effusive and no more critical: “[Putnam] convincingly argues that the echoes reveal Vegius’s ‘inexorable classicizing’ (xviii), or his interest in affiliating his work with the classical past rather than with Christianity and the Christian interpretation of the Aeneid.”89 Most interestingly, Putnam’s thesis is not even considered to be contentious by Kennedy; it is merely accepted: “Vegio’s 1428 Supplement to the Aeneid (or Book XIII of the Aeneid) penetrates deeply into Virgil’s linguistic world, and it refuses to Christianize the hero with anagogical interpretations.”90

Following Putnam, the anti-allegorical reading has become commonplace. Buckley, examining the intertextuality between the Aeneid and the Supplementum, argues that “the sophistication and deliberation of Vegius’ critical rewrite bespeaks not a medieval-minded

87 Craig Kallendorf, “Review: Short Epics: by Maffeo Vegio, Michael C. J. Putnam, James Hankins,” Virgilius 50 (2004), 219. It is important to note that the idea that “Christian allegory can only be inserted into the poem by those who have decided in advance that they are going to find it there” is not found in Putnam’s introduction, and must be assumed to be Kallendorf’s own. If true, Vegius has improperly “inserted” allegory into his own poem in the De perseverantia, as we will see. Similarly, Emanuele Cutinelli-Rendina, “Reviewed Work: Short Epics by Maffeo Vegio, Michael C. J. Putnam, James Hankins,” BibliH&R 68.1 (2006), 179: “Nell’introduzione viene rapidamente ripercorsa la vicenda delle riscritture e soprattutto delle continuazioni del poema epico virgiliano durante il Medio Evo, sottolineando come il Vegio, nel suo proposito più propriamente classicistico, sia guidato dal rifiuto di cristianizzare l’eroe virgiliano con interpretazioni analogiche o allegorizzanti.” Although he effusively praises Putnam’s work, a more guarded response can be found in David Scott Wilson-Okamura, “Review: Maffeo Vegio, Short Epics, Edited and Translated by Michael C. J. Putnam with James Hankins,” CB 81.2 (2005), 242. “But when we get to Vegio himself, none of it seems to matter. There is no allegory, no history of interpretation, and (in the mythological poems) almost no Christianity. instead there is a sequence: not a sequence of authors but a sequence of texts, whispering across a no-man’s land. What’s missing here is the sense of Virgil as an author, speaking to Vegio not just in time but through time. How important is this? More than anything Vegio wanted to revive Virgil’s language, to put Virgil’s voice back in play” (underlining mine).


90 William J. Kennedy, “Short Epics by Maffeo Vegio; Silvae by Angelo Poliziano,” RenQ 58.2 (2005), 585.
unveiling of the *integumentum* that concealed the true spiritual meaning of the *Aeneid*, but rather a forwards-looking and typically humanist manipulation of words for their own ends.”91 This chauvinism sees the medieval world as “backwards,” and predilection for allegory simplistic and morally restrictive; by contrast, the “forwards-looking” Renaissance is more congenial to modern classicists whose sensibilities are too secular and far too sophisticated for the small-mindedness of allegory. Thus, Buckley claims Vegius as an enlightened man of the Renaissance and in her analysis of the poem is concerned with rhetorical and poetic gamesmanship, with which, like Putnam, she also assumes that Vegius was concerned. Buckley’s Vegius “retrospectively patterns” the *Supplementum* on the *Aeneid* in order to effect “ruthless” closure: “As Vegio ruthlessly progresses the story of Aeneas to its end point, his apotheosis, he is at the same time retelling the story of the *Aeneid*, repeating the *Aeneid* otherwise, running its order backwards and effecting a powerful form of closure on the text.”92

Instead of a poem that is alive with theological and philosophical concerns, Vegius’ *Supplementum* has become a brittle poem for modern classicists, a composition concerned with the petrified minutiae of intertext, allusion, and genre.93 Instead of reflecting the theological concerns of its day, it reflects the dynastic concerns imputed to Virgil by O’Hara. This is even more evident in Rogerson’s claim that Vegius, by highlighting the inconsistency in Virgil’s treatment of Ascanius, destabilizes the very closure that his own thirteenth book attempts to provides and thereby erases the hopefulness that Ascanius represented in Virgil’s text.94 The

91 Buckley, “Closure and Continuation,” 110.
92 *ibid.*, 117.
93 Buckley thanks Putnam for his help in her work; she has been clearly influenced by his thinking about allegory.
94 Anne Rogerson, “Vegio’s Ascanius,” 106–125. This argument is interesting, but would assume that Vegius 1) pre-empted some of the observations made in O’Hara’s book on epic inconsistency, 2) cared enough about obscure Roman dynastic questions to adjust his narrative focus accordingly, and 3) did not elide Ascanius (and other characters) towards the end of the *Supplementum* because he was more concerned with the supreme act of closure: the catasterism of Aeneas. The “over-classicizing” of Vegius by postmodern classicists is obvious in this case;
sorts of concerns that animate Hardie, O’Hara and Putnam are forefront in their consideration of Vegius’ text; any concern for what Vegius may believably have found important in Virgil, why he composed the supplement, and what he wrote about his own writing and reading of the Supplementum, has vanished entirely.

More hopefully, however, Rogerson has recently suggested that a Christian reading of the Supplement is possible in connection with Sebastian Brant’s woodcuts, and has questioned Putnam’s rejection of allegory, particularly in her reading of Vegius’ kite simile in 13.107–116.⁹⁵ In addition, Rogerson points out several moments where Vegio appears to have been influenced by Scripture and the Christian tradition in his development of Aeneas as a type for Christ; however, she does not develop the overall allegory of the Supplementum at length, as I do below.

II. VEGIUS READING VIRGIL

1. Reading and Writing Allegory

How did Vegius read Virgil? Even more difficult: How did Vegius read his own Virgilian Supplementum? In the following, it will become clear that he was deeply imbued with allegorical methods of reading and writing, common throughout the Middle Ages and finding their sources in the early church. In his scriptural exegesis, Vegius’ spiritual master, Augustine, frequently applied the allegorical method, by which he could reconcile the seeming contradictions and

---

⁹⁵ Rogerson, BCPSR, 267–294.
absurdities within the text.\textsuperscript{96} As Augustine recounts in the \textit{Confessiones}, when he first attempted to read scripture literally, he could not enter its lofty interior, which was veiled in mysteries;\textsuperscript{97} furthermore, when read literally, the scriptures were indefensible against Manichean attacks.\textsuperscript{98} It is only when he heard Ambrose, who drew aside the veil (\textit{remoto mystico velamento}) and displayed the spiritual or allegorical meaning of passages, that Augustine began to understand the truths of scripture.\textsuperscript{99} Consequently, we see this allegorical method of reading practiced in the thirteenth book of the \textit{Confessiones}, which ties spiritual reading both to conversion and the practice of confession itself: “What does anyone who speaks about you really say?”\textsuperscript{100} It is as if Augustine learns to speak to God through the spiritual meanings he reads in scripture.\textsuperscript{101}

In the centuries after Augustine, the allegorical or spiritual reading of scripture was codified (with some variation) into the “fourfold” method: literal reading, allegory, moral allegory (tropology), and anagogy. This method was suffused throughout medieval writing, interpretation, and exegesis and formed a backbone of interpretive hermeneutics through the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{102} A famous explication of this system appears in Thomas Aquinas’s magisterial \textit{Summa theologiae}, seen by many as the high point of medieval Scholasticism, where he defines two types of reading connected to the interpretation of scripture (but widely applicable to many other texts as well). The first is the “historical or literal sense” (\textit{sensus historicus vel litteralis}),

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{96} Augustine was following a long tradition of allegorical reading in the early church, particularly notable in Clement of Alexandria and Origen.
  \item \textsuperscript{97} Augustine, \textit{Confessiones}, 3.5.9.
  \item \textsuperscript{98} ibid., 5.11.21.
  \item \textsuperscript{99} ibid., 6.4.6.
  \item \textsuperscript{100} Augustine, \textit{Confessiones}, 1.4.4: \textit{aut quid dicit aliquis cum de te dicit?}
  \item \textsuperscript{101} ibid., 13.25.38: \textit{volo etiam dicere, domine deus meus, quod me consequens tua scriptura commonet, et dicam nec verebor. vera enim dicam te mihi inspirante quod ex eis verbis voluiisti ut dicerem. neque enim alio praeter te inspirante credo me verum dicere, cum tu sis veritas, omnis autem homo mendax, et ideo qui loquitur mendacium, de suo loquitur, ergo ut verum loquer, de tuo loquor.} Of course, Augustine allegorized scripture throughout his career as bishop and teacher.
\end{itemize}
by which words simply signify things. This is the basis of all subsequent interpretation. The second is the “spiritual sense” (*sensus spiritualis*), by which words signify things, which have in themselves an additional signification. This spiritual sense is sub-divided into three parts. First, things in the past can signify or foreshadow events that are to come; this is properly the “allegorical sense” (*sensus allegoricus*). Second, actions as they are described can signify the things that we ought to do; this is the “moral sense,” known as “moral allegory” or “tropology” (*sensus moralis*). Finally, things can signify the things that relate to eternal glory; this is the “anagogical sense” (*sensus anagogicus*):

> et ideo, cum in omnibus scientiis voces significant, hoc habet proprium ista scientia, quod ipsae res significatae per voces, etiam significant aliquid. illa ergo prima significatio, qua voces significant res, pertinet ad primum sensum, qui est sensus historicus vel litteralis. illa vero significatio qua res significatae per voces, iterum res alias significant, dicitur sensus spiritualis; qui super litteralem fundatur, et eum supponit. hic autem sensus spiritualis trifariam dividitur. sicut enim dicit apostolus, ad Hebr. VII, lex vetus figura est novae legis, et ipsa nova lex, ut dicit Dionysius in ecclesiastica hierarchia, est figura futurae gloriae, in nova etiam lege, ea quae in capite sunt gesta, sunt signa eorum quae nos agere debemus. secundum ergo quod ea quae sunt veteris legis, significant ea quae sunt novae legis, est sensus allegoricus, secundum vero quod ea quae in Christo sunt facta, vel in his quae Christum significant, sunt signa eorum quae nos agere debemus, est sensus moralis, prout vero significant ea quae sunt in aeterna gloria, est sensus anagogicus.}

---

103 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q.1, a.10, co.: “Therefore, although in all sciences words have a signification, this science alone [i.e. theology] has the property that the things signified by words also have another signification. Therefore, that first signification, by which words signify things, pertains to the first sense, which is the historical or literal sense. But that signification by which the things signified by words again signify other things is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal and supposes it. This spiritual sense is divided into three parts, just as the Apostle says (Heb. 10:1), *The old law is a figure of the new law*, and as Dionysius says in his *Celestial Hierarchies* (1), *The new law itself is a figure of future glory*. Also, in the new law, the things which are done by our head (i.e. Christ), are the signs of those things which we ought to do. Therefore, insofar as those things which are of the old law signify those things which are of the new law, there is the allegorical sense. But insofar as those things which are done in Christ or in those things which signify Christ are signs of those things which we ought to do, there is the moral sense. But as they signify those things which pertain to eternal glory, there is the anagogical sense.” Other permutations were certainly influential as well. Hugh of St. Victor, for instance, included the anagogical sense under the allegorical sense, and came up with a threefold method or reading: historical, allegorical, and tropological. See Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis christianae fidei*, 4.4.pr., and Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1, q.1, a.10, ad 2. I use the standard fourfold approach throughout this paper—again, 1) literal meaning, 2) allegory proper, 3) tropology, 4) anagogy. I use the word “allegory” to refer loosely to allegory, moral allegory, and anagogy.
These allegorical methods of reading scripture were incorporated into school curricula and numerous memory aids attest to their widespread use. In his *Rotulus pugillaris* (1260), a theological handbook intended “for the simple” (*simplicibus*), Augustine of Dacia records a distich on the four senses of scripture. Although there were more imaginative and sophisticated poetic treatments of the four senses, this remained the entry-level mnemonic due to its simplicity and charm, even finding its way into the current *Catechism of the Catholic Church*:

*littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,\n  moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.*

Similarly, in his *Summa theologica*, Philippe de Gamaches (1568–1624) provides a fuller and more imaginative version of the mnemonic:

*dicitur historicus quem verba ipsa resignant,\n  et allegoricus priscis qui ludit in umbris;\n  moralis per quem vivendi norma tenetur,\n  quid vero speres anagogicus altius offerit.*

Turning to Vegius’ theory of allegory displayed in two of his prose works, the *De educatione* (1444) and the understudied *De perseverantia* (1448), it will become clear that Vegius is immersed in the same theories of allegorical reading and writing. First, he describes allegory as a covering, a veil, or a wrapping, using the vocabulary common from Augustine and

---

107 P. A. Walz (ed.), “Augustini de Dacia O.P. ‘Rotulus Pugillaris’,” *Angelicum* 6.1 (1929), 256: “The literal sense teaches events, the allegorical sense teaches what you should believe; the moral senses teaches what you should do; the allegorical sense teaches where you should be going.”
108 Cited in de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, 272, n. 13: “What words themselves disclose is called the historical sense; the allegorical is the sense that plays in the ancient shadows; the moral is the sense through which the pattern of life is understood; anagogy, in a superior fashion, offers what you should hope for.”
Macrobius to Landino. Second, he discriminates between different sorts of allegorical reading, namely, moral allegory and anagogy. Third, Vegius offers a “strong” theory of allegory. In his view, authors intend to write allegorically; they are knowingly inspired. In this respect, he differs from Salutati and Boccaccio. Finally, in his view, allegory is not remote or arcane; rather, it is easily understandable and explicable—for those with the proper education. Therefore, beginning with an analysis of the De educatione, I will argue that Vegius distinguishes between moral allegory and summa philosophiae mysteria in the Aeneid—an important clue to his intentions in the composition of the Supplementum. It will become evident that these highest mysteries of philosophy are anagogical readings of the Aeneid. Consequently, in the De perseverantia, Vegius reads the Aeneid as an anagogical allegory of mankind’s salvation through virtue and perseverance, and this reading of Virgil underlies the composition of the earlier Supplementum, fully explaining its presence in both Vegius’ oeuvre and within the context of 15th Century readings of Virgil.

2. Moral Allegory and the Highest Mysteries: the De educatione

Completed at Rome in 1444, Vegius’ De educatione was one of the most popular and influential quattrocento tracts on education. In the eighteenth chapter of the second book, Vegius defends classical literature and learning against the charges of an impudent nugator, a “trifler,” who had attacked the practice of teaching Virgil and Cicero as part of an early

---

109 Fanning and Sullivan, De educatione. Unlike much of Vegius’ oeuvre, this work has received significant scholarly attention: F. J. Kohler, Pädagogik des Mapheus Vegius: Vorsteher der Datarie unter dem Pontificate Pius II (Schwab: Verlag der Verfassers, 1856); Andrea Franzoni, L’Opera Pedagogica de Maffeo Vegio (Lodi: Società Tip. Succ. Wilmant, 1907); Horkan, Educational Theories and Principles. For other educational literature of the time, see Craig Kallendorf, Humanist Educational Treatises (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).
education. He marshals an impressive array of authorities against the critic, citing passages from the *City of God* and the *Confessions* in which the young Augustine praised (according to Vegius) Virgil (*poeta magnus omniumque praecarissimus*) and turned towards God through a reading of the then-extant *Hortensius*. Thus, Vegius’ most beloved Christian theologian defends his most beloved Pagan poet. Following the example of Augustine, Vegius recommends numerous Greek and Latin texts as a fundamental part of the educational *cursus*—in addition to a rigorous regimen of Christian works. First, the *fabellae* of Aesop, due to their simplicity of style and their charm, which incite the mind towards further studies. Next, the Catilinarian orations of Cicero, due to their elegance and briefness. The tragedians should not be neglected. But most importantly, Vegius recommends the teaching of epic poetry, primarily Homer in Greek and Virgil in Latin, because of their greatness and elevation of spirit.

Even if Virgil is eminently beneficial, Vegius claims that students will be unable—at least at first—to grasp fully the hidden content of his works. The unnamed *nugator* had objected to the poetic license and moral content of the fourth book of the *Aeneid*—perhaps (ironically) for reasons similar to Augustine’s. But Vegius castigates the *nugator* (here = *reprehensor*) mercilessly for his incomprehension, not only of the fourth book, but of the importance of the entire *Aeneid*:

---

111 *ibid.*, 2.18.29, p. 83 – 2.18.1–9, p. 84. See Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 1.3; *Confessiones*, 3.4.7.
112 *ibid.*, 2.18.31, p. 86 – 2.18.4, p. 87: quare qui tragoedias scripsissent non erunt repudiandi; qui vero heroica, ante omnes recipiendi propter grandiori rem elevatioremque eorum spiritum, cui longe praestabat ab unguiculis pueros assuefacere, et quae legerint non facile cuncta perciere queant. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini makes a similar point in his *De liberorum educatione* (1450). In his view, boys should commence reading Virgil even before they can fully understand him: *veteres instituerunt, ut ab Homero atque Vergilio lectio inciperet, quamvis ad intelligendum eorum virtutes opus esset firmiori, sed huic rei superest tempus, neque enim semel legentur. Interea vero et subtilitate heroici carminis animus puellis assurget et magnitudine rerum spiritum ducet et optimis imbuetur* (61).
In contrast to the simple morals found in Aesop, something much greater lies hidden beneath the text of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Vegius distinguishes between the importance (*quid ponders*) of *Aeneid* 4 apropos of his current discussion (the moral allegory suitable for the education of children), and the hidden mysteries of the *tota Aeneis* (the highest mysteries of philosophy). Although in the next section he explicates the moral allegory from *Aeneid* 4, he does not discuss the “mysteries” in the *De educatione*.

Furthermore, the language used by Vegius to describe the hidden nature of the highest mysteries of philosophy (*summa philosophiae mysteria sub poeticorum figmentorum ornamento abscondita*) recalls other theological and anagogical allegoresis of the *Aeneid*. The tradition of philosophical allegory hidden in classical poetry begins in Late Antiquity and continues, gaining in intensity, throughout the Renaissance. We might readily compare Macrobius (*sub pio figmentorum uelamine*), Bernardus Silvestris (*sub fabulosa narratione veritatis involvens*).

---

114 Vegius, *De educatione*, 2.18.4–13, p. 87: “Let that talkative critic [reprehensor] prattle as much as he wishes, whose arguments, by which he was attempting to crush the famous name of Virgil, are not worth a trifle. And as for Virgil’s license in poetic composition, which he was violently blaming, we will not reply—we have explained our reasoning on this point elsewhere in another work. He scarcely was understanding what importance the fourth book of the *Aeneid* contains within itself. For the sake of this, he ought to know that the entire *Aeneid* has the greatest mysteries of philosophy hidden under an ornament of poetic stories. Unless I were now hurrying to expound other things, I would perhaps discuss them.”

115 Macrobius, *Commentariorum*, 2.8.1: *aut sacrarum rerum notio sub pio figmentorum uelamine honestis et tecta rebus et uestita nominibus enuntiatur et hoc est solum figmenti genus quod cautio de diuinis rebus philosophantis admittit.*
intellectum), Boccaccio (sub verborum cortice), Coluccio Salutati (sub figmento), and the Disputationes Calmadulenses of Vegius’ contemporary, Cristoforo Landino (ex intimis philosophiae arcanis). In short, it cannot be doubted that Vegius read Virgil within an allegorical tradition common from Late Antiquity through the Renaissance, and that he considered the moral allegory distinct from a deeper anagogical reading and subordinated the former to the latter in hermeneutic importance.

Next, he expounds the moral allegory found in Aeneid 4. Although the educational worth of the Dido episode had caused significant disagreement among quattrocento humanists, Vegius easily defends Virgil from his critics:

\[\text{\footnotesize Source Text References:}\]

116 Bernardus Sylvesteris, Commentum super sex libros Eneidos Virgillii, p. 3: modus agendi talis est: in integumento descriptibit quid agat vel quid paciatur humanus spiritus in humano corpe temporaliter positus ... integumentum est genus demonstrationis sub fabulosa narratione veritatis involvens intellectum, unde etiam dicitur involucrum. utilitatem vero capit homo ex hoc opere, scilicet sui cognitionem; homini enim magna est utilitas, ut ait Macrobius, se ipsum cognoscere. unde dictum est, “de celo descendit nothis elitos” id est, cognosce te. Unfortunately, Bernardus mangles the Greek γνῶθι σεαυτόν into nothis elitos.

117 Boccaccio, Genealogia deorum gentilium, 14.8: pauci tamen ... quadam diuinae mentis instigatione commoti carmina peregrina mensaris et temporibus regulata, et in dei laudem laudata, tum falsa, sicut apud litterarum secularium poetas sepius reperitur, id tamen quod sub figmento relinquitum omnino sit verum, aut saltem pro vero receptum apud omnes gentes seu quamlibet philosophorum heresim vel hominum nationem, ut etiam in reconditis sensibus exquisita et prorsus irreprehensibilis veritas non curetur, salvo quam in sacris litteris, in quibus nefas est non vera secundum litteram scribere et abominabile, imo sacrilegum facinus intellectum qui non sit ipsa veritas applicare. See Ronald G. Witt, “Coluccio Salutati and the Conception of the Poeta Theologus in the Fourteenth Century,” RenQ 30.4 (1977), 538–563.

118 Qtd. in Craig Kallendorf, “Cristoforo Landino and the Humanist Critical Tradition,” RenQ 36.4 (1983), 524, n. 13: quod autem petis, id et multo divinis est et magis in obscouro latet et a nullo, quod ego quidem sciam, hactenus sua serie patefactum, quod neque grammaticus neque rhetor noverit, sed sit ex intimis philosophiae arcanis eruendum. vis enim nosse, quid per sua illa aenigmata de Aeneae erroribus deque eius hominis in Italiam profectione sibi Maro voluerit.

120 Franzoni, L’Opera Pedagogica, 148. Vegius is more concerned to exonerate Virgil than Bruni, who claims in his De studiis et litteris, 27, (c. 1424) that when reading Aeneid 4 he does not pay attention to the immorality of Dido and Aeneas’ affair, so struck is he by the beauty of Virgil’s verse: equidem, si quando Didonis Aeneaque amores apud Virgilium lego, ingenium poetae admirari soleo, rem autem ipsum, quae fiant esse scio, nequaquam attendere. Quod idem mihi accidit in alius fictionibus poetarum. In his De liberorum educatione, 66, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini warns against the amatoria of the poets, but does not mention Virgil specifically: nam, cum pleraque in his amatoria vitiosaque sint, non omnibus, quae ab ipsis dicuntur, adhibenda est mens.
He argues that the moral allegory found in the story of Aeneas and Dido can be used safely by schoolmasters to inculcate virtue in their students, both male and female. Aeneas, of course, consistently offers a positive moral exemplum through his virtuous actions in both tribulations and successes. Dido, however, offers either a positive or a negative exemplum, depending on the passage in question. Prior to the arrival of Aeneas, her city-building, administration of laws, and fidelity to her husband’s memory offers an exhortation to industriousness, justice, and chastity. Yet her insanity, abandonment of duty, pursuit of pleasures, grief, and eventual suicide prove the unfortunate result of obsessive lust, negligence, and moral degeneracy. As Kallendorf rightly notes, “[a]ny doubts about Virgil’s version of the story have disappeared, for Vegius sees Dido

121 Vegius, De educatione, 2.18.15–33, p. 87: “For although Virgil wished to show, under the persona of Aeneas, a man gifted with every virtue both in unfavorable circumstances and in favorable ones, he similarly desired also to admonish women . . . through the figure of Dido, about the principles with which they ought to order their lives, either for the reward of praise or with the fear of infamy and finally a wretched death. For who, hearing of Dido when she had time to attentively build the walls of so great a city, or justly administering the rights and laws for the people, or preserving the faith and trust of her bed when her husband was dead, with the greatest praise and respect and the fear of all her neighbors—who would not be moved by her example and greatly inflamed to the study of virtue? And on the contrary, who could perceive her going insane from the love of her new guest, ceasing from the construction of the city and the governance of her people, indulging instead in games and banquets, and finally abandoned by her lover, grieving and afflicting herself, and with all hope lost, voluntarily determining on her own death—who would not be disturbed in spirit, who would not be terrified, who would not tremble all over, who would not prefer to embrace chastity, although severe, rather than the allurements of licentiousness, since the fruits of licentiousness are always the most bitter in the end, while the fruits of chastity are always the most sweet?”
as a vehicle for the praise of virtue and condemnation of vice." In Vegius’ view, Virgil knowingly wrote the moral message into Aeneid 4.

This passage gives essential information concerning Vegius’ reading of Virgil, although Allen in his study of Renaissance allegory has obfuscated rather than elucidated its meaning, while arguing that the moral allegory explicated in the De educatione provided Vegius the impetus to compose the Supplementum:

Vegio’s expressed opinion [is] that if explained according to reason, the Aeneid, with the exception of the perverse Fourth Book, “hides under the ornament of poetic figment the highest mysteries of philosophy.” And what are these mysteries? Vegio sums them up. “Through the person of Aeneas, Virgil wishes to show a man provided with all virtues.”

This is difficult to unravel. First, according to Allen, Vegius considers the fourth book “perverse,” but Vegius argues the opposite, defending the moral value of the fourth book against the nugator and offering a nuanced reading of Aeneas and Dido as both positive and negative exempla. Second, Allen argues that the “highest mysteries of philosophy” are the moral allegory of Aeneid 4. Yet Vegius explicitly says that he does not discuss the “highest mysteries of philosophy” in the De educatione. The hidden secrets of the whole work and the (relatively) easy moral allegory of the fourth book are distinct. Finally, nowhere does Vegius show any signs of “displeasure” at the ending of the Aeneid as it stands. Rather, he always considers Virgil and his works in the most reverent of tones. Thus, Allen appears confused about the content of the De educatione, as well as the purpose of the Supplementum and Vegius’ attitude towards Virgil.

---

122 Kallendorf, In Praise of Aeneas, 103.
123 Allen, Mysteriously Meant, 141.
124 e.g. Vegius, De educatione, 2.19.4–5, p. 91: non immerito igitur Virgilium, tanquam poetarum omnium elegantissimum atque gravissimum, pueri in primis quam maxime legendum suscipiunt.
In his examination of Renaissance epideictic rhetoric, Kallendorf argues that Vegius composed the *Supplementum* as an epideictic exhortation “to pursue virtue and avoid vice.”\(^{125}\) Although he admits the pervasiveness of Virgilian allegoresis from late antiquity through the Renaissance, he “wonders whether such approaches as these really anchor the *Supplementum* firmly enough in fifteenth-century Italian culture to explain fully its development there.”\(^ {126}\) The complete explanation, Kallendorf argues, is that Vegius considers the *Aeneid* primarily as an epideictic tale of moral praise and blame, by which students are given lessons on virtuous living. He adduces the “relevant passage” from *De educatione* 2.18.15–33, cited above, in support of this view: “It is clear from his passage that Dido and Aeneas are to serve as models by which the schoolmaster can inculcate correct behavior in his students.”\(^ {127}\) Thus, following Hijmans,\(^ {128}\) he claims that “Vegio was reading the *Aeneid* through the same epideictic filter as so many other humanists of the early Italian Renaissance.”\(^ {129}\) Yet, there is no discussion of the previous passage (2.18.4–13) in which Vegius claimed that the *summa philosophiae mysteria* were hidden in the entire *Aeneid*. While Vegius does provide moral allegories of *Aeneid* 4 and defend their suitability for children, he points to a higher and more potent reading of the poem that may be inappropriate for the very young. Kallendorf thus ignores half of the passage, focusing on the section that supports his view of Renaissance epideictic rhetoric, and ignoring the high importance that Vegius himself attaches to allegorical reading and writing.\(^ {130}\)

\(^{125}\) *ibid.*, 2.18.7–8, p. 88: *quod eorum carminibus virtute sequi vitiaque fugere maxime doceamur.*


\(^{127}\) *ibid.*, 103.

\(^{128}\) Hijmans, “Vegio’s Supplementum.”

\(^{129}\) Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 104.

\(^{130}\) We can see the influence of this view in Tarrant, *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*, 33: “By focusing his *Supplementum* on the qualities of A. as an ideal leader, Vegio boldly seeks to transform the *Aeneid* into a Renaissance mirror for princes.”
Thus Kallendorf claims that Vegius’ desire “to tie up the ethical loose ends” with epideictic rhetoric ultimately led him to compose the Supplementum: “[I]f the Aeneid was designed to praise the virtues of its hero, is the poem as Virgil left it really complete?”\textsuperscript{131} Obviously, he is correct that Vegius presents Aeneid 4 through the lens of epideictic rhetoric in the De educatione. This reading is the most suitable for schoolchildren, as we have seen, and it provides them with both positive and negative exempla. But for Aeneas to be a model of good behavior and for Dido to be a model of good or bad behavior hardly warrants the addition of a thirteenth book of the Aeneid. The moral allegory of the fourth book as presented in the De educatione is complete as it stands; epideictic rhetoric alone does not explain the existence of the Supplementum. To reiterate: The moral allegory of the fourth book explicated in the De educatione is clearly subordinated in Vegius’ mind to the highest mysteries of philosophy hidden in the entirety of Virgil’s poem.\textsuperscript{132} As I will argue, it is a theological and anagogical reading of Virgil—not merely generic moral allegory—that anchors the Supplementum in fifteenth-century Italian culture and fully explains its development there.\textsuperscript{133}

That Virgil presents theological truths in his poems was hardly an unusual view in educational treatises during the fifteenth century. Indeed, other authors were more extreme in

\textsuperscript{131} Kallendorf, \textit{In Praise of Aeneas}, 104.

\textsuperscript{132} There is little other scholarly attention to this passage. Franzoni, \textit{L’Opera Pedagogica}, 147, does not distinguish between the “highest mysteries of philosophy” and the moral allegory: “In tutta l’Eneide – egli afferma – vi sono misteri di filosofia altissima, ornati del velo di deliziose finzioni poetiche. La figura di Enea ci rappresenta l’uomo fornito di ogni bella virtù, battuto dalla varia fortuna ma sempre vincitore …” He agrees that Vegius reproduced “il concetto stranamente allegorico” but is generally dismissive of the practice of allegory: \textit{ibid.}, 148: “e veramente arzigogolando in mille modi si riusciva a cavare la dimostrazione, con la quale credevano sul serio gli umanisti di aver conciliato la sapienza cristiana con la poesia classica.” One might compare the arrogant dismissal of allegorical reading and writing in Comparetti, \textit{Virgil in the Middle Ages}, 113. Horkan, \textit{Educational Theories and Principles}, 153, unhelpfully focuses on the moral allegory alone: “[Vegius] will not permit any criticism of this poetic genius [i.e. of Virgil]. There is a moral aspect to the Aeneid which is, indeed, praiseworthy. Aeneas represents the man who perseveres in virtue; the fate of Dido is intended to point out to women the way to a happy life.”

\textsuperscript{133} Sentence rephrased from Kallendorf, \textit{In Praise of Aeneas}, 101.
attributing Christian wisdom to Rome’s greatest poet. Leonardo Bruni,\textsuperscript{134} for instance, in his \textit{De studiis et litteris} written to Lady Battista Malatesta of Montefeltro (c. 1424), praises Virgil as the \textit{deus ac deliciae litterarum nostrarum}.	extsuperscript{135} However, the great value in reading Virgil is not merely his literary style, but the \textit{sapientia} that he reveals like an oracle of God. After citing 6.724–31, he asks, \textit{quae cum legimus, quem philosophum non contemnimus? aut quis unquam de natura animi tam enucleate scienterque locutus est?} He then goes on to describe how Virgil, \textit{quasi deo plenus}, prophesied the coming of Christ through divine inspiration in the \textit{Eclogues} as a true \textit{vates}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{nempe mentem divinam inesse poetis sapientissimi veterum tradidere vatesque inde nuncuparunt, quod non tam ex se quam concitatione quadam animi afluxuque divino loquerentur ... Vergilius autem multa post Sibyllam natus saecula venire iam id tempus recognoscit, “novamque progeniem caelo” dimitti velut admirabundus stupensque denuntiat.\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

Other educational writers are similarly effusive in their praise of Virgil—although they differ in their approaches. In Piccolomini’s \textit{De liberorum educatione} (1450), Virgil forms the backbone of an education, exalting the minds of children with \textit{subtilitas} and the \textit{magnitudo rerum}.	extsuperscript{137} He is to be preferred above all others.\textsuperscript{138} In his \textit{De ordine docendi et studendi} (1459) the straightforward Baptista Guarino recommends that Maphaeus Gambara begin to learn Virgil.

\textsuperscript{134} Vegius corresponded with Bruni and dedicated two books of epigrams to him. See Horkan, \textit{Educational Theories and Principles}, 6; Brinton, 10.

\textsuperscript{135} Bruni, \textit{De studiis et litteris}, 8.

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{ibid.}, 22: “The wisest of the ancients tell us that the divine mind dwells in the poets, and that they are called \textit{vates} because they speak not so much of their own accord as through a divine inspiration, in a kind of higher mental state ... Virgil, born many ages after the Sibyl, recognized that the time was now come and announced in wonder and amazement ‘the new offspring sent from Heaven.’”

\textsuperscript{137} Piccolomini, \textit{De liberorum educatione}, 61. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini so thoroughly imbibed Virgilian allegory that upon accession to the papacy in 1548 took the name “Pius” as a sort of allegorical pun. See Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, and Philip Krey, \textit{Reject Aeneas, Accept Pius} (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 50: “It referred not only to a predecessor, as tradition required, but to Virgil’s hero, the ‘pious Aeneas.’ This famous play on the dual nature of his name, personal and regal, can be taken in two ways: on the ‘Pius’ side, to represent his spiritual journey from council to pope and on the ‘Aeneas’ side, the worldly youth he felt compelled to explain.”

\textsuperscript{138} Piccolomini, \textit{De liberorum educatione}, 69.
first,\textsuperscript{139} taking care to understand the teachings concerning daily life that are hidden beneath the surface of the stories: \textit{in quibus verisimilium figmentorum subtilitatem admirabuntur, et ad quotidianae vitae institutionem sub fabulamentis contextam revocabunt}.\textsuperscript{140} In Guarino’s view, Virgil and the Latin poets are good sources for everyday moral allegories embedded in the myths and legends.

For Vegius, however, the story of Dido and Aeneas does not merely provide everyday moral allegories for schoolchildren; indeed, in his view, not a word, not even a thought expressed by the \textit{prudentissimus poeta} was written in wantonness: \textit{operae pretium autem est, videre quam ne petulanti unquam vel verbo vel sententia in horum descriptione prudentissimus poeta usus fuerit, quam honestissime modestissimeque singula explicaverit}.\textsuperscript{141} Virgil, in his reasoning, turns moralizing into an exquisite art, masterfully weaving epideictic lessons into the fabric of \textit{Aeneid} 4. Virgil’s art and story are perfect. Vegius, in turn, discusses the submersion of moral allegory in \textit{Aeneid} 4 in terms like his description of the highest mysteries in \textit{tota Aeneis}. Like Guarino, he argues that moral allegory also lies “beneath the veil of fictions”: \textit{quod eorum carminibus virtutem seque vitiaque fugere maxime doceamur, licet sub figmentorum quorundam velamento, quod ornandi magis illustrandique poematis causa est inventum}.\textsuperscript{142} Therefore, understanding the moral message of \textit{Aeneid} 4 concealed beneath the \textit{velamentum} of the Dido and Aeneas episode is hermeneutically similar to understanding the highest mysteries concealed beneath the \textit{ornamentum} of the \textit{tota Aeneis}. An inability to grasp the lesser signifies an inability to grasp the greater. The unfortunate \textit{nugator} should return to school.

\textsuperscript{139} Guarino, \textit{De ordine}, 24.
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{ibid.}, 23.
\textsuperscript{141} Vegius, \textit{De educatione}, 2.18.33–34, p. 87 – 2.18.1–2, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{142} \textit{ibid.} 2.18.7–9, p. 88.
3. Anagogical Unity and the *De perseverantia*

But does Vegius anywhere explicate the highest mysteries of philosophy that he believes that the *Aeneid* contains? It is my contention that he expounds these *mysteria* in his allegorical reading of the *Aeneid* found in his *De perseverantia*. In the preface, Vegius recalls his own involvement in their education—which must have been extensive, if they were to appreciate the astonishing breadth of profane and sacred citations contained within this work.¹⁴³ It is to his great satisfaction and joy, then, that both Elizabeth and Monica decide to enter the spiritual life. The text, then, serves as an extended exhortation and meditation on the virtue of perseverance. It is an encyclopedia for the moral life and above all a gift. It is not merely by a good education, Vegius reminds the reader, but by unswerving constancy in virtue that mankind travels through the innumerable miseries of this turbulent world, and finally reaches the heavenly harbor promised to the faithful.¹⁴⁴

Throughout the *De perseverantia*, Vegius scours Pagan and Christian antiquity for positive or negative examples of the unswerving pursuit of virtue. In the fifth chapter of his first book, *de dignitate perseverantiae ex tesimoniiis gentilium auctorum*, he advances an anagogical reading of the story of Orpheus and Eurydice from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 10. In Ovid’s famous account of the myth, the *nupta* Eurydice perishes suddenly after having been bitten by a serpent while wandering *per herbas*. Distraught, her lover Orpheus descends to the dead and charms the rulers of the underworld with the melodious sound of his lyre. Eurydice is returned to him, but

¹⁴³ *ibid.*., 1.1 (fol. 1): *vos scilicet dilectissimae sorores, vos dulcissimae filiae; neque enim vos aliter ac filias amavi aut educavi. non parva certe est quae ex recordatione vitae vestrae mihi laetitia oritur.*
¹⁴⁴ *ibid.*
with the fateful dictum: Orpheus must not look back at her before they leave the underworld. In sight of the upperworld, and unable to control himself, Orpheus looks back at her, amans and avidus videndi. She sinks away, with a final vale!\(^{145}\)

Vegius allegorizes the myth in two sections. First, the death of Eurydice stands for the death of the soul (anima), caused by the seductions of the world and the devil. He asks:

\[
\textit{quid aliud significare uoluit poeticum figmentum tam dulci narrationis inuolucro quam quod christiana edoctos nos auctoritate supra ostendimus? quid aliud dum legimus euridicem per aprica prata uagantem morsu serpentis interfici, sub tartaraque demergi, interpretari aptius possumus quam animam nostram illecebrosis mundi huius uoluptatibus irretiti asstutia antiquae serpentis dyaboli interemptam, sub infimaque et obscura loca detrusam.}\(^{146}\)

Note that Vegius explains Ovid himself wished to signify this allegory within the\(\textit{Metamorphoses},\) a “strong” allegorical approach. Furthermore, in terms that recall Fulgentius’ explication of the same myth in his third book of \textit{Mythologiae},\(^ {147}\) Vegius goes on to explain how Orpheus is the Christian \textit{vir sapiens}, who fails in his quest to order the lyric ratio of his soul:

\[
\textit{quid deinde Orpheum cum ea ex inferis captis dulci lyrae eius sono ad superos redeuntem quam sapientem virum restituta conversaque in melius anima sua ex his mundi tenebris composita iam instar argutae lyrae animi sui ratione ad superna caeli regna remeantem? quid demum vero cum retroflexis oculis quod obtinuerat vir sapiens perdit? aliud demonstratur, quam neglectum sanctae de qua agimus perseverantiae beataeque spei donum.}\(^ {148}\)

\(^{145}\) Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 10.1–85; cf. Virgil, \textit{Georgics} 4.453–527. Although Vegius does not specify, it seems likely that he is working from Ovid. He mirrors Ovid’s phraseology in several locations, and ignores Aristaeus’ attempted rape in Virgil’s version. When she is bitten by the snake, Vegius’ Eurydice is not fleeing headlong along a river from Aristeus, but wandering in sunny fields. Correctly, then, the marginal note in the 1511 edition of the \textit{De perseverantia} states “Ovidus.x.metha.”

\(^{146}\) Vegius, \textit{De perseverantia}, 1.5 (fol. 11): “What else did Ovid wish his poetic fiction to signify in so sweet an envelope of a story, than what we pointed out above that we learned by Christian authority? When we read of Eurydice wandering through the sunny fields, killed by the bite of a serpent, and plunged into Tartarus, what else are we able to expound more properly than our soul entangled by the seductive pleasures of this world, killed by the cunning of the ancient serpent, the Devil, and thrust into deep and shadowy places?”

\(^{147}\) Fulgentius, \textit{Mythologiae}, 3.10.

\(^{148}\) Vegius, \textit{De perseverantia}, 1.5 (fol. 11): “What is a more fitting interpretation of Orpheus returning with Eurydice from the spirits who were captivated by the sweet sound of his lyre, than the wise man returning to the upper regions of heaven, with his soul restored and oriented towards the good, from the shadows of the world, by the ratio of his
Here, the truly allegorical nature of this passage is evident. The wise man (Orpheus) attempts to save his soul (Eurydice) by *ratio* (his melodious lyre) from the evils of the world (the underworld) so that he might reach eternal happiness (the upperworld) without failing in perseverance (looking back). Although in this case the wise man fails to save his soul, this tale is still important for a Christian aspiring to heaven. The failures of exemplars in literature can be used to warn the faithful away from sin (negative moral allegory) or to demonstrate the loss of happiness and eternal life that such sin implies (negative anagogy).\(^{149}\)

Vegius then argues that the allegory of Orpheus and Eurydice was both intended by Ovid and easily accessible to a properly educated reader. Regarding the author, he asks: What else besides Christian truth could Ovid have meant through this beautiful and fitting *figmentum*? This is not a Christian message hidden away darkly from the uncomprehending masses—hidden even from the author himself—like the theories of allegory found in Boccaccio and Salutati. In Vegius’ view, the ancient poets purposefully submerged Christian messages beneath the sweet coverings of their poems: *ita ergo perseverare, ita bene sperare sub tam dulcibus velamentis poetae docuerunt*. Although, as in the *De educatione*, one must be properly trained to read the classics, ultimately, for Vegius, allegorical meaning is not arcane, not submerged in the corners of a text like the etymologies riddled by Fulgentius and the allegories of Macrobius; rather, moral and anagogical allegory in Ovid is easily explicable and patently consonant with Christian moral teaching, a clear Christian message in a beautiful Pagan envelope.\(^{150}\)

---

\(^{149}\) For allegorical interpretation of Ovid in the Renaissance, see Allen, “Mysteriously Meant,” 163–199.

\(^{150}\) This should highlight the importance of proper education in allegorical techniques. If a student does not learn to allegorize texts that do not have a morally successful ending (such as Orpheus and Eurydice) or lack morally
qui enim ex tenebroso huius mundi tot erroribus ac peccatis pleno carcere ad supernam illam eternamque lucem quae vera est una expectanda beatitudo evadere contendit, solidam necesse est gerat sper semper fixam et immotam, nullaque refractam terrenarum rerum cupiditate.\textsuperscript{151}

What else, indeed, could Ovid have intended to mean through his tale of the Thracian bard?

Turning to his beloved Virgil, Vegius argues that the anagogical allegory contained in the \textit{Aeneid} is as pious as the message of any Christian writer. He recounts Aeneas’ famous speech (1.198–207), in which Aeneas exhorts his men to endure their misfortunes and strive for their promised home in Latium. Vegius claims,

\begin{quote}
\textit{nescio quid his sanctius fideique nostrae accommodatus a christiano ullo auctore dici potuerit ... nam ... si pro latio caelum, pro Troia uitam immutantes uerba dicamus, quid obstiterit quin ex officina pauli apostoli deprompta ista esse uideatur?}\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

Vegius’ point is perhaps more complimentary to Virgil than it first appears. The words of Virgil, \textit{as they stand}, are as pious as any Christian’s. But if the words are changed, they could be spoken by St. Paul himself, an author inspired by the Holy Spirit and canonized in the scriptures of the church:

\begin{quote}
\textit{per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum tendimus in [caelum]; sedes ubi fata quietas ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere [uitae].}
\end{quote}

wholesome content (such as Aeneas and Dido), he or she will not be able to gainfully read the classics. The \textit{nugator} would presumably be faced with difficulties throughout all of Ovid.

\textsuperscript{151} Vegius, \textit{De perseverantia}, 1.5 (fol. 9): “Whoever attempts to escape from the dark prison of this world, full of so many errors and failings, to that high and eternal light which is the only true blessedness to be expected, it is necessary that he bear constant hope, always fixed and immovable, and broken by no desire of earthly things.”

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{ibid.}: “I do not know anything by a Christian author that is able to be said more piously and more favorably disposed to our faith than these words of Virgil … For if we should speak these lines, substituting the words ‘heaven’ for Latium and ‘life’ for Troy, what will prevent these words from appearing to be taken from the work of the Apostle Paul?”
Here, Vegius’ alteration of Virgil signifies his desire for him not only to be the greatest of pagan poets, but to be the greatest of Christian poets as well. Evidently, the substitution of “heaven” for “Latium” and “life” for “Troy” is not undertaken due to “displeasure” with Virgil, as Allen has argued. Rather it is an expression of his admiration for the Aeneid and its author, so close is the Aeneid to scripture. Vegius does not prune, explain away, or prevaricate. His creative additions to Virgil’s poetry are a natural outgrowth of his admiration for Virgil’s excellence; he wishes to show his two sisters, and all future readers, how saintly and how Christian Virgil truly is. Furthermore, his substitutions fit metrically, a small detail that may have a larger significance for Vegius: Not only does he want Virgil’s spirit to harmonize with Christianity, he wants to harmonize alterations to Virgil’s text as well.

Continuing through the story of the Aeneid, Vegius allegorizes the angry Scylla (3.548–587) and the dangers of the sea (1.81–123) as the disturbances of life and the assaults of the devils. Aeneas—like Orpheus, the allegorical representation of the vir sapiens—learns to endure a life of misfortunes; but even more significantly, he learns how to endure the favorable advent of love by spurning the blandishments of that madwoman, Dido, and obeying the celestial commands of the gods. After the pleasures of the world seduce Palinurus to a watery death (5.835–871), virtus and perseverantia allow Aeneas to remain awake, sailing on the dark seas of the world, and guiding the ship of life with the oar of vigilance (remum sollicitudinis). In the sixth book, he looks on the punishments of the underworld, which signify the miseries of each

---

153 Virgil, Aeneid, 1.204–207 (modified): “Through various misfortunes, through so many crises of things, we are heading for [heaven]: where the fates point out quiet abodes; there, it is fitting that the kingdoms [of life] arise again. Endure, and preserve yourselves for favorable things.”
stage of earthly life: *tum Averni penas quae significant mundi miserias revisit, contemplans quibus primo infantia, dehinc adolescentia ac reliqua omnis aetas malis subiecta est.* Anchises and the others in the fields of Elysium are those blessed and holy men who have an eternity to devote to letters and God (*deo et litteris vacantes*). They have found a heaven for lovers of learning.\(^{155}\)

Finally, Vegius arrives at the second half of the *Aeneid*. Here, his interpretation is clearly anagogical; the journey of Aeneas represents the salvation of a human being, as he does battle with the demons and the world for his soul, and finally reaches his heavenly fatherland:

\[
tum priusquam promissam latio quiete assequatur turnum id est dyabolum infestum habet, latinos quoque id est mundum; bella geruntur ardua; pugnatur pro launia, quae anima accipienda est; sed superat turnum, subiugat latinos, fit compos launiae. Italiae regno quietus fruitur, deusque tande
\]

Thus, like Fulgentius, Vegius allegorizes the entirety of Virgil’s poem as the story of a wise man who perseveres through his trials and tribulations until he reaches his heavenly reward.\(^{158}\) Unlike

---

\(^{155}\) Vegius, *De perseverantia*, 1.5 (fol. 10): “Then he goes over the punishments of Avernus, which signify the miseries of the world, and he contemplates to what evils first infancy, then adolescence, and the rest of life is subject.”

\(^{156}\) *ibid.*

\(^{157}\) *ibid.*: “Then before [Aeneas] achieves the peace promised to Latium, he has Turnus as his enemy (that is, the Devil); the Latins also (that is, the World); difficult wars are waged; they fight over Lavinia, who ought to be considered the soul. Aeneas overcomes Turnus; he subjugates the Latins; he gains possession of Lavinia. In tranquility he enjoys the rule of Italy. Finally, he is made a god. This is the reward; this is the end of a persevering man … for after many disturbances of the world, after long and sad wars with the devil, the world is trampled, the devil is conquered, the soul is well cared for, a safe and tranquil life is led, and at last immortal and eternal happiness is acquired.”

\(^{158}\) Allegorizations of the journey to wisdom as a *via ad patriam* were common throughout the Middle Ages, particularly in educational literature. For a classic example, see the *De animae exsilio et patria* (c. 1111) of Honorius Augustodunensis (PL 172, 1241D–1246A). See Robert Darwin Crouse, “Honorius Augustodunensis: The Arts as Via ad Patriam,” in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au Moyen Age* (Montréal: Institut d’études médiévales Paris, 1969), 531–539; Joseph M. Miller, “Honorius of Autun, Concerning the Exile of the Soul and its Fatherland; also called, About the Arts,” in *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, eds. Joseph M. Miller, Michael H. Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973), 198–206; Paul Michel, “‘Ignorantia exsilium hominis’: Zu einem enzyklopädischen Traktat des Honorius Augustodunensis,” in *Strenarum lanx. Beiträge zur Philologie und
Bernardus Silvestris, Vegius does not end with Book 6; rather, he shows that the entirety of the
\textit{Aeneid} is consonant with a Christian vision of sanctification.

Yet, Vegius does not complete an anagogical reading of the \textit{Aeneid} alone. Following the
phrase \textit{sed superat Turnum} he is no longer properly allegorizing Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid}; rather, Vegius
has seamlessly moved into an allegorical reading of his own storyline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot Event</th>
<th>Allegorical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{bella geruntur ardua}</td>
<td>\textit{multi mundi vexationes}, \textit{longa et tristia dyabolis bella}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.1–22) \textit{superat Turnum}</td>
<td>\textit{vincitur dyabolus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.23–446) \textit{subiugat Latinos}</td>
<td>\textit{proculcatur mundus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.447–535) \textit{fit compos Laviniae}</td>
<td>\textit{animae bene consulitur}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.536–592) \textit{Italies regno quietus fruitur}</td>
<td>\textit{vitae ducitur tuta et tranquilla}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.593–630) \textit{deus efficitur}</td>
<td>\textit{immortalis et eterna beatitudo acquiritur}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One could argue that each of these events is explicit in the prophecies found in the \textit{Aeneid},\textsuperscript{159} yet,
the phrases \textit{deusque tandem efficitur} and \textit{immortalisque demum et eterna beatitudo} surpass
anything found in the Virgilian prophecies, which foretell his heroic catasterism, not the eternal
happiness promised in a Christian heaven.

This anagogical, protreptic allegory of the \textit{Aeneid} presented in the \textit{De perseverantia}
requires an \textit{Aeneid} of thirteen books; it requires the \textit{Supplementum}. Without the final \textit{beatitudo},
without the “kingdoms of life” enjoyed by the \textit{vir sapiens}, without the final triumph over the
\textit{mundus} and the \textit{dyabolus}, Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} would appear similar to Ovid’s apotrepetic tale of
Orpheus. Granted, in Vegius’ view, Ovid still teaches Christian truth in the \textit{Metamorphoses}; but

\textsuperscript{159} The marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia: 2.780–784 (Creusa), 6.86–97 (the Sibyl), 7.96–101 (the oracle of Faunus),
7.255–258, 268–273 (Latinus), 12.821–825 (Juno), 12.937 (Turnus); the founding of Lavinium: 1.258–269 (Jupiter),
12.193–194 (Aeneas); the union of Trojans and Latins: 12.187–193 (Aeneas), 12.834–840 (Jupiter); three-year reign
of Aeneas: 1.263–266 (Jupiter to Aphrodite), 4.618–620 (Dido); catasterism of Aeneas: 1.259–260 (Jupiter),
12.794–795 (Jupiter).
the tale of Orpheus is cautionary, an allegory of a Christian journey uncompleted, the *dyabolus* overcome, but ultimate *beatitudo* unachieved. Virgil’s *Aeneid* is of a higher order, containing the *summa philosophiae mysteria*, almost scriptural in its ability to provide a template for the successful moral life of a Christian *vir sapiens*. Without the *Supplementum*, Aeneas’ anagogical journey to immortality and eternal happiness would be foretold but incomplete, hardly a tale worthy of the Apostle Paul, who challenges his followers to “take hold of the eternal life to which you were called.” It is reasonable to conclude, then, that the “highest mysteries of philosophy” referenced in the *De educatione* refer to the story of human salvation brought about through the redemption of Christ. In Vegius’ view, this is the secret that the *tota Aeneis* hides within itself, a reading that transcends the moral allegories within individual books, but which requires an education in allegorical reading to understand properly.

In summary, the *De educatione* and the *De perseverantia* highlight points critical to understanding Vegius’ allegorical writing. First, he argues that pagan poets, particularly Virgil and Ovid, present Christian truths allegorically through their poems. Second, he claims that the truths found in the allegorical works of the pagan poets are manifest and easily explicable, not remote or arcane. Finally, by including the plotline of his own *Supplementum* in his allegorical reading, Vegius implies that the protreptic allegory of Virgil’s *Aeneid* is dependent on the addition of his allegorical thirteenth book. Moreover, Vegius continued to allegorize classical myths throughout his life. For a different example, in his *Disceptatio inter solem, terram et aurum* (1452), we find Vegius interpreting the story of Phaethon as an authoritative historical

---

160 1 Tim 1:12: *certa bonum certamen fidei adprehende vitam aeternam in qua vocatus es et confessus bonam confessionem coram multis testibus.*
allegory signifying the destructive effects of the sun. True history lies under the veil of mythological stories.\footnote{\textit{Vegius, Disceptatio inter solem, terram, et aurum} (Paris: Rembolt), fol. 12: \textit{sciscitemur et solem, an et ipse radiis suis intuentium oculos ledit, an et ipse calore suo nonnunquam caput obtrudit, an et plus equo aliquando estuans et ardens sata omnia arborumque fetus omnes ipsa quoque animantia corrumpit, quod eo maxime illi tempore contigit quoniam conficta est phaetonis fabula, sub cuius velamento certa veraque latet hystoria.}}

III. THE ALLEGORICAL SUPPLEMENTUM

Turning now to the \textit{Supplementum}, I argue that an allegorical reading based on the schema found in the \textit{De perseverantia} can be consistently and successfully applied to the \textit{Supplementum}; furthermore, such a reading explains otherwise inexplicable passages, such as Jupiter’s promise to catasterize Aeneas’ followers. First, Vegius’ reworking of Turnus’ death in spiritual and diabolic terms reflects Turnus’ identification with the \textit{dyabolus}. Second, the respectively saintly and wicked characterizations of Aeneas and Turnus throughout the \textit{Supplementum} create a sharply delineated allegorical chiaroscuro—Aeneas’ saintliness vividly contrasts with Turnus’ wickedness. Third, Vegius presents Lavinia as a moral and visual counterpart to Aeneas, representing a fitting unity of the hero with his soul. Finally, the catasterism of Aeneas represents the final triumph of the Christian \textit{vir sapiens}, ultimately pointing to Christ, whose triumph over evil opened a way for others to reach heaven through imitation of him.

1. Linguistic Integrity: Vegius’ Virgilian Style
Before approaching the allegory of the Supplementum, it will be helpful to briefly analyze Vegius’ use and adaptation of Virgil. Schneider and Kallendorf have observed that “to create an aura of genuineness with language, Vegio works … through reminiscences and variations on the Virgilian model.”¹⁶² By contrast, the centoists such as Proba assembled their famous “patchwork” poems almost entirely from Virgilian lines and part-lines.¹⁶³ Although Vegius extensively borrows and reworks Virgil, he seldom repeats a Virgilian phrase wholecloth. An interesting example of a cento-like insertion in the Supplementum is 13.39, where Aeneas bestows the body of Turnus on the Latins, arma virumque. For an example of his usual practice, Vegius models Turnus’ weeping horse after Pallas’ horse Aethon, who attends his youthful master’s bier with human-like tears:

post currus Phrygia sudantes caede sequuntur.
it lacrimans, et ducit equum docta arte Metiscus
rorantem et fletu madidum qui vexerat ante
victorem Turnum, atque hostili strage furentem. (13.193–196).¹⁶⁴
ducunt et Rutulo perfusos sanguine currus.
post bellator equus positis insignibus Aethon
it lacrimans gutquisque umectat grandibus ora.
hastam alii galeamque ferunt, nam cetera Turnus
victor haber. (11.88–92).¹⁶⁵

Much has changed. Vegius exchanges the blood-types that splatter the chariots: Phrygian in Vegius, Rutulian in Virgil. The somewhat awkward sudantes replaces the Virgilian perfusos. Mesticus is swapped out for Virgil’s Achoetes (11.85). As with montibus altis above, Vegius

¹⁶² Kallendorf, In Praise of Aeneas, 114; see Schneider, 21.
¹⁶⁴ “Behind follow the chariots sweating with Phrygian gore. Weeping, Metiscus goes and with learned art he leads Turnus’ horse, dripping and wet with tears, who before had carried the victorious Turnus as he raged amid the havoc of his enemy.”
¹⁶⁵ “They also lead chariots splattered with Rutulian blood. Behind them, the war-horse Aethon, with his trappings laid aside, goes weeping, and he wets his face with great tears. Others carry the spear and the helmet, for the victorious Turnus had the rest.”
exactly reproduces the phrase *it lacrimans*, calling attention to his reworking of Virgil. Most importantly, Virgil’s procession is part of the funeral for Turnus’ victim, Pallas, whose belt eventually costs Turnus his life. In Vegius, the funeral procession of Turnus is ironically modeled on that of his Virgilian victim. Notice the contrast of *victorem*, dead Turnus in the accusative in 13.196, that recalls *victor*, alive Turnus in the nominative in 11.92.\textsuperscript{166}

Philological precision alone does not motivate his intricate reworkings of Virgil’s language, nor does Vegius attempt to deceive or delude the reader by creating a clever forgery of a classical poem. He undertakes this work for love of his model, whom as a young man he considered the closest thing to God on earth,\textsuperscript{167} not from a desire to surpass or supersede. He does not superimpose anything on Virgil, like an apprentice painting over a masterwork.\textsuperscript{168} The *Supplementum* can be compared to the background or horizon that a pupil in a Renaissance atelier adds to the edges and background of a nearly finished painting, mimicking his teacher’s brushwork and style in order to bring the whole work to a harmonious and united completion. Thus, it strives in its language to be naturally and genuinely Virgilian. He expresses ideas that he imagined Virgil to be expressing, in the words that he imagined Virgil using.\textsuperscript{169}

2. Beginning at the Ending

\textsuperscript{166} See Oertel, 184, for a somewhat negative assessment of this passage (and the funeral procession of Decembrius).
\textsuperscript{167} Vegius, *De perseverantia*, 1.1 (fol. 1).
\textsuperscript{168} Brinton, 28–29: “[I]t is no wonder that an ardent youth … should have imposed upon the artistic completeness of Virgil’s poem his own enthusiastic version of the heavenly reward.”
\textsuperscript{169} Attempts to separate the form and content of Vegius’ work, I would argue, are misguided. Although Oertel, 204, generally accepts the allegorical reading of Vegius from Brinton (his concern is not to interpret Vegius, but to examine Forestus and Villanova), he assumes that allegory and moralization is not an integral part of Vegius’ poetic program, and can be dismissed as a general feature of Vegius’ time: “Daß [Vegius] dabei neue Akzente gestezt hat, seinen Helden moralisiert und allegorisirt, muß kein poetisches Programm gewesen sein: Diese Interpretation war ihm einfach aus der Tradition und dem Zeitgeist vorgegeben.” Cf. ibid., 14–18.
Although Vegius is often considered to be a slavish or “loyal” supplemen-
ter of Virgil, he begins the Supplementum by reconceptualizing the end of the Aeneid. The last lines of the
Aeneid have already taken place, so to speak. Virgil’s Turnus is dead. His limbs are cold, and his
\( \textit{vita} \) has already resentfully fled with a groan beneath the shadows:

\[
hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit
fervidus; \textit{ast illi solvuntur frigore membra}
vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras. \( (12.950–952) \).
\]

Vegius, however, does not begin his narrative immediately after the death of Turnus, with
Aeneas standing over a corpse. Rather, in the first two lines of the Supplementum, Vegius’
Turnus is still alive—albeit dying—still pouring forth a fleeing soul:

\[
\textit{Turnus ut extremo devictus Marte profudit}
effugientem animam medioque sub agmine victor
magnanimus stetit Aeneas, Mavortius heros,

\( \textit{obstipuere omnes gemitumque dedere Latinis, et durum ex alto revomentes corde dolorem}
concussis cecidere animis, ceu frondibus ingens
\textit{silva solet lapis boreali impulsa tumultu}. \( (13.1–7) \).
\]

Wrapped in eternal shadow for fifteen-hundred years, Turnus has momentarily come back to
life. Putnam astutely notes that Vegius’ initial line recalls the first lines of the last book of the
Aeneid \( (\textit{Turnus ut infractos adverso Marte Latinos / defecisse vider} \ [12.1–2]) \), and cautions that

---

170 Phrasing borrowed from Buckley, “Ending the ‘Aeneid,’” 112.
171 “Saying this, he buries his sword right into Turnus’ chest seething in anger; then Turnus’ limbs are released in a
chill and his life with a groan flees resentfully beneath the shadows.”
172 “As Turnus, conquered in his final battle, poured forth his fleeing soul, and amid the great battle line great-souled
Aeneas stood as the victor, the Mavortian hero, all the Latins were amazed and gave a groan, and vomiting their
harsh sorrow from the depth of their hearts they fell down with shattered spirits, as when a mighty tree is driven by
the surge of the north wind, and its leaves fall.”
173 Oertel, 182, seems not to notice the significance of this repetition, remarking only that Vegio accentuates a new
beginning through the repetition of the content of the Aeneid’s final verse: “Vegio den Neuanfang akzentuiert,
indem er den Schlußvers der Aeneis (inhaltlich) wiederholt.” His analysis of the scene, \textit{ibid.}, does not advance
beyond plot summary.
readers are “about to witness in some form a replay of the final book of the *Aeneid*.” The “replay” begins with the death of Turnus; throughout the thirteenth book Vegius will recast the death of Turnus again and again in terms that are spiritually darker and darker, and Aeneas in terms that are ever saintlier. Regardless, the startling re-vivification of Turnus’ corpse escapes Putnam’s close reading: “Now [i.e., in the *Supplementum*], however, [Turnus] is in the form of a lifeless corpse, rather than a vanquished suppliant.” He sees a “change of Turnus from living to dead, as we move from one poem to another.” Yet the reverse is the reality: Turnus has returned, however briefly, from the classical land of the dead, only to die once again in the Italian Renaissance.

Why does Vegius so cruelly put Turnus to death for a second time? It is notable that in rewriting the death of Turnus, Vegius replaces Virgil’s *vita* with *anima*; life is exchanged for soul. This is deliberate and programmatic, demonstrating a larger shift from a story of arms, men, and dynastic considerations to a story of souls and spiritual concerns. Such a change is consonant with the anagogical approach taken by Vegius in the *De perseverantia* and hinted at in the *De educatione*, in which the stories of Orpheus and Aeneas ultimately represent the journey

---

174 Putnam, xix.
175 ibid.
176 ibid.
177 Other recent treatments of the scene miss this simple observation. See Rogerson, “Vegio’s Ascanius,” 110: “These lines reveal a scene following immediately from the end of the *Aeneid*; Turnus has poured forth his soul, and it flees to the underworld, while Aeneas again stands still, having shed the impassioned emotions of *Aeneid* 12.” Thus, her claim, “Vegio’s 630-line text is in many ways a tour-de-force of closure,” should be questioned here. For a similar oversight, see Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 106: “The plot of Vegio’s *Supplement* picks up where Virgil left off.” This is echoed by Buckley, “Ending the ‘Aeneid,’” 112: “Vegio plunges straight in, picking up the Virgilian narrative at the exact moment it left off, over the body of Turnus.” Importantly, Schneider, 56, n. *ad loc.*, points out that 13.1–2 recalls 12.1–2; Vegius’ *Supplementum* thus begins with a rewritten ending that recalls another beginning, or rather, recalls the beginning of the ending of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Cf. Putnam, xix; Buckley, “Ending the ‘Aeneid,’” 112; Rogerson, “Vegio’s Ascanius,” 109. Interestingly, none of the other supplementers feel the need to rewrite Virgil’s ending. Forestus begins his poem with Turnus as a lifeless body, stretched out in the dust. Similarly, Villanova begins with Turnus already among the Stygian shades.
178 Cf. Putnam, 3, where he characteristically “Virgilianizes” Vegius in his translation: “When Turnus, beaten in the final bout of war, poured forth his fleeting life.”
of the *vir sapiens* through material existence and the eventual salvation (or loss) of his *anima*.\(^{179}\)

In the first seven lines of the *Supplementum*, Vegius uses *anima* three times. In the *Aeneid*, Turnus was a human obstacle in the way of Aeneas’ destiny; here, as I will argue, he represents an spiritual force: the *dyabolus*. Should Turnus have won, Aeneas would never have been *magnanimus*; like Orpheus, he would have lost his soul at the very moment when he could have made it great through victory. This conceptual shift also recalls Vegius’ word substitutions from the *De perseverantia*, in which he christianized Aeneas’ prayer by changing two words, “heaven” for “Latium” and “life” for “Troy.” His shift in attention towards the *animae* of the participants overwrites the scene of Turnus’ death and Aeneas’ victory into a narrative of the fall and victory of souls.\(^{180}\)

Yet Vegius is not content to rewrite the death scene of Turnus once. He narrates the death of Turnus again, as Daunus watches Ardea consume itself in flames:

\[
\text{inscius at tantos Daunus superesse dolores}
\]
\[
\text{et natum extremo consumptum Marte superbam}
\]
\[
\text{effudisse animam largisque ad moenia duci. (13.204–206).}\(^{181}\)
\]

Here, he re-writes his own adaptation of Turnus’ death scene from the beginning of the *Supplementum*, repeating much of the same vocabulary (*extremo ... Marte [13.205] = extremo*

---

\(^{179}\) Of course, such a reading will be wedded to a moral allegory, making my reading at several points similar to the analysis in Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 110. Kallendorf’s reading can be summarized as follows: “Assuming that Vegio was motivated by a desire to amplify the praises of Aeneas, to clarify and complete the moral structure of Virgil’s poem as he read it, it is in the speeches that we would expect the epideictic flavor of the *Supplement* to be most pronounced.” Thus, he mostly confines his analysis to the speeches. By contrast I would argue that if Vegio was motivated by a desire to present Virgil’s Aeneas as a triumphant Christian saint, to complete the allegorical structure as he read it, we would expect a presentation of Aeneas consistent with that of the *vir sapiens*, Turnus with that of the *dyabolus*, the Latins with the world, Lavinia with the soul, and the catasterism with an eternal reward.

\(^{180}\) This reading becomes even more secure if the allegorical readings from the *De perseverantia* are considered. In both *Metamorphoses* 10 and the *Aeneid*, Vegius allegorizes the mythological stories as events involving souls, *animae*.

\(^{181}\) “But Daunus, unaware that such great sorrows remained and that his son was destroyed in the final conflict of the war and had poured forth his haughty spirit, and was being accompanied towards the walls.”
Importantly, however, he has included *superbam* as a modifier for *animam*, and he calls attention to this addition by placing it in a prominent final position. Vegius has now turned decisively away from Virgil’s depiction of Turnus, whose *anima* was never called *superba*. Rather, Vegius recalls Lucius Junius Brutus’ famously arrogant soul in Virgil’s underworld: *vis et Tarquinius reges animamque superbam / uleris Bruti, fascisque videre receptos?* (6.817–818).¹ eighty-two Turnus’ soul has now become “prideful.” Thus, Vegius darkens his own retelling of Turnus’ death that undercuts the somewhat ambivalent treatment of Turnus in Daunus’ speech (13.257–296).

Granted, neither of these retellings *per se* point to allegory, yet Vegius retells the death of Turnus a third time, fashioning it in allegorical terms and strongly suggesting through biblical allusion that Turnus represents the *dyabolus*. Drances arrives with the embassy to extend greetings of peace from King Latinus. In his extended speech (13.331–373), he describes Turnus with the following lines, which Aeneas receives “with a cheerful expression” (13.375)¹ eighty-three and the Trojans with a roar of approval:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nec nostrae potuere preces inflectere durum} \\
\text{nec divum portenta animum, quin acrius ignem} \\
\text{spumabat ferus ore vomens bellumque diebat.} \\
\text{at vero dignum invent pro talibus ausis} \\
\text{exitium, qui te tandem victore monordit} \\
\text{nigrantem prostratus humum.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

¹ eighty-two Cf. Putnam, *Virgil’s Aeneid*, 199, n. 48, where the line is called, “one of the poem’s most trenchant ambiguities with Brutus receiving the attribute of the tyrant he had killed.”
¹ eighty-four “Neither were our prayers able to dissuade [Turnus’] unfeeling soul, nor were the portents of the gods. No, beast-like he was frothing and vomiting fire more fiercely from his mouth, and he was rousing war. But truly he found a ending fitting for such outrages when, after your final [i.e. Aeneas’] victory, he lay face downwards and chewed the dark dirt.” For a comparison of Vegius’ Drances with Virgil’s Drances see Oertel, 190: “Drances’ Feindschaft gegenüber Turnus (330f.) ist nun nicht mehr eine (tadelnswerte) persönliche Haltung des Widersachers wie bei Vergil, sondern ein berechtigter Haß gegen den Hauptschuldigen am Krieg.”
Vegius’ Turnus is characterized with fiery monstrous imagery, reminiscent of (and fiercer than) Virgil’s Cacus, the monster who stole Hercules’ cattle in Evander’s story from *Aeneid* 8. Indeed, Vegius references the passage with a verbal echo, *ore vomens*:

\[
\text{huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros} \\
\text{*ore vomens* ignis magna se mole ferebat. (8.198–199).}\]

Another possible parallel from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* would draw a dark comparison between Turnus and Typhoeus:

\[
\text{eiectat flammamque ferox *vomit ore* Typhoeus. (Ovid, Metamorphoses, 5.353).}
\]

Through these intertextual references, Vegius makes Turnus a monster; he does not merely castigate him for vice as part of a youthful exercise in epideictic rhetoric.\(^{186}\) As Kallendorf aptly remarks, “the name Cacus is easily recognizable as a transliteration of the Greek ‘kakos’ or ‘evil one’”—and it is no wonder that Turnus is *improbus* (13.354).\(^{187}\)

So why does Vegius once again rewrite the dying moments of Turnus in a way that diverges so radically from 12.950–952? When Aeneas kills Turnus in the *Aeneid*, Turnus is presumably facing Aeneas and he receives the sword in his chest (*adverso sub pectore*). Here, however, the orientation is reversed: Turnus lies prostrate on the ground (*prostratus*), face down, and chews (*momordit*) on the black earth. This representation is entirely different from Virgil’s account. This deliberate shift away from Virgil recalls the image of the cursed snake from Gen

---

\(^{185}\) “Vulcan was this monster’s father; his [Vulcan’s] were the black flames that he vomited from his mouth as he moved with a massive bulk.” Cf. *hic Cacum in tenebris incendia vana vomentem / corripuit in nodum complexus, et angit inhaerens / elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur* (8.259–261); *super omnia Caci / speluncam adiciunt spirantemque ignibus ipsum* (8.303–304). See Schneider, 97, n. *ad loc.*

\(^{186}\) Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 119, considers this characterization an attempt to make Turnus “less than human” as part of the epideictic rhetoric of the speech.

3:14: *quia fecisti hoc maledictus es inter omnia animantia et bestias terrae super pectus tuum* gradieris et terram comedes cunctis diebus vitae tuae.\(^{188}\) The logic of both passages is the same; great evil has been done and a recompense has been meted out in accordance with the gravity of the crime. Thus, Vegius does not paraphrase the death of Turnus from the last few lines of Virgil’s epic; he rather reimagines the final moments of the *Aeneid* as the triumph of a Christian saint overcoming the *dyabolus* at the end of a long pilgrimage through the trials of the world. In summary then, the first retelling of Turnus’ death in 13.1–3 recasts the end of the *Aeneid* in terms of *anima*; the second retelling in 13.204–206 provides a moral castigation of Turnus’ *superba anima*, and the third retelling moves decisively in the direction of anagogical allegory. Vegius reimagines Turnus as the devil, whose ultimate *superbia* doomed his *anima* to an everlasting death. Indeed, now Turnus will lead an infernal army, engage in an infernal marriage, and live out eternity in Tartarus, in an “ironic parody of the *Aeneid*”:\(^{189}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nunc improbus aedes} \\
\text{Tartareas visurus eat quaeratque sub imo} \\
\text{nunc alias Acheronte acies aliosque hymenaeos. (13.354–356).}^{190}
\end{align*}
\]

Putnam, eager to show that Vegius “purges Aeneas of violence,” claims that “We leap, as it were over the [*Aeneid*’s] intense conclusion into a story of the dead mourned and buried, treaties affirmed rather than broken, a marriage celebrated and the principal protagonist deified.”\(^{191}\) Rather, Vegius has purposely lingered on the conclusion of the *Aeneid*, rewriting it with new intensity so as to point to an underlying allegorical meaning.

\(^{188}\) Cf. Micah 7:15–17.
\(^{189}\) Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 119.
\(^{190}\) “Now, the wicked man goes to see the abodes of Tartarus, and under the deep Acheron now he seeks other battle lines and other weddings.”
\(^{191}\) Putnam, xxi–xxii.
3. The Devil and the Saint

Yet, Putnam is correct that Vegius tries to “purge Aeneas of violence”—or anything unbefitting a *vir sapiens*. As he rewrites aspects of the last scene of the *Aeneid*, Vegius consistently recasts Aeneas as a triumphant saint and Turnus as the wrathful *dyabolus*.192 If we recall Turnus’ final moments in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Aeneas’ last words were spoken in a savage spirit (*saevo ... pectore* [12.888]); the words themselves are *ferida* (as appreciated by Turnus [12.894–895]); he himself is *ferox* (also focalized through Turnus [12.895]); catching sight of the baldric, Aeneas is *furiis accensus et ira / terribilis* (12.946–947), as he hot-bloodedly buries his sword in Turnus’ chest. Yet, looking up from the body of Turnus moments later, fifteen centuries later, Vegius’ Aeneas speaks “with a peaceful countenance”: *tunc Turnum super adsistens placido ore profatur / Aeneas* (13.23–24). As Kallendorf remarks, “There is no hint that Aeneas is ‘out of control’.”193 But even more impressively, there is no hint that Aeneas *was ever* out of control. Similarly, Rogerson convincingly argues, “Aeneas disowns the *furor* that characterized him in the *Aeneid* and apportions it to his enemy, a claim repeated obsessively throughout the *Supplement*.194 In his first speech to the Trojans, Vegius’ Aeneas accuses Turnus of *furor*, displacing the responsibility for any out-of-control warfare:

---

192 Vegius absolves Aeneas of the slaughter of Turnus; the necessity of this has been noticed by other readers. See Edgeworth, “The Silence of Virgil,” 9: “Many previous readings of this scene [i.e. the death of Turnus] have fallen short in part because the legacy of the Christian interpretive tradition has imposed a false dichotomy: to do evil is never acceptable, hence the killing must either be not really evil or else be utterly reprehensible.” Vegius chooses the prior option. Perhaps it does not need to be said by now that I do not believe that Vegius’ reading falls short because he makes this decision.

193 Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, 110. Kallendorf and I have similar readings of Vegius’ opening lines. Kallendorf generally focuses on the speeches of the *Supplementum*, and provides helpful observations throughout.

194 Rogerson, “Vegio’s Ascanius,” 110. Also, *ibid.*, “The question of Aeneas’ surrender to passion at the end of the *Aeneid* is thus resolved: *furor* and *ira* are disassociated; *pius* Aeneas looks divine; while Turnus is cast as a
Vegius’ Turnus suffers from *dementia* in his mind (*quae tanta animo dementia crevit* [13.24]), recalling the insanity of the Trojans from *Aeneid* 2 that led to their ultimate destruction (*quae tanta insania, cives?* [2.42]). Furthermore, Turnus will serve as a negative *exemplum*, reminding future generations what results come to those who incite shameful wars. As with the story of Dido and Aeneas, and Orpheus and Eurydice, Vegius is adept at redeeming “immoral” characters by using them as an opportunity to warn against vice, and thereby to teach virtue. Here Kallendorf’s reading of the *Supplementum* as a work of epideictic rhetoric has substantial value:

> ecce suprema dies aliis exempla sub aevum
> venturum missura, Iovem ne temnere frustra

On the other hand, Vegius stresses that Aeneas went to battle unwillingly, driven by the *furiae* of the opposing Latins. His Aeneas only fights in defense of his compatriots, not out of vengeance or fury:

> ergo sidera iuro:
> numquam acies, numquam arma libens in proelia movi,

---

195 “Behold the final limit of so great a madness is at hand, by which you agitated the race of Ilium by a broken treaty, against laws and faith.”
196 “Behold your final hour will serve as a warning for the ages to come, that it is not right to scorn Jove in vain, and to inflame unworthy commotions of war.”
Thus, in his first scene Vegius presents a calm and collected Aeneas, who goes to war to defend innocent lives against the *furor* of Turnus and the *furia* of the Latins.

Another subtler argument is advanced to support Aeneas’ innocence. As Aeneas addresses the defeated Turnus (13.23–48), he attributes Turnus’ downfall to divine *ira*, not human *furor*:

\[
\textit{discerem revereri et iussa facessere divum.}
\textit{magnum etiam capit ira Iovem, memoresque malorum sollicitat vindicta deos} (13.28–30).
\]

Anger consumes even Jupiter himself, and so, even if we were to ignore Vegius’ whitewashing of Aeneas’ *furia*, Aeneas is still justified in acting as wrathfully as he did at the end of the *Aeneid*, since he followed the example of the greatest of the gods. As Putnam notes, “The *odia* that Turnus imputes to Aeneas in his last words (12.938) Vegius distributes between the righteous animus of the gods (295) and Turnus’s own negative hatred (342). Anger (*ira*), too, is given to the heavenly powers and their reaction to Turnus (13.29, 295, 429).” This serves to “cover the bases.” Whether or not we remember that Virgil’s Aeneas acted out of *furor*, his actions are justified. Latinus too adds his authority to this reading:

\[
\textit{quamquam humana furens nimirum ausa licentia sanctas turbarit leges et divum exciverit iras} (13.428–429).
\]

---

197 “I swear on the stars: never did I willingly agitate soldiers or arms into warfare, but driven by your madness I hoped to defend the Trojan factions with all my strength—and it was right to do so!”

198 “Learn to respect Jove, and to complete the commands of the gods. Anger has even seized great Jove, and a desire for vengeance arouses the gods, who are mindful of evils.”

199 Putnam, xx.

200 “Although human license, raging overmuch, agitated the holy laws and aroused the wrath of the gods.”
Here, metonymy elides Turnus completely; he becomes *furens licentia* itself, a force of madness that has destroyed the sanctity of earthly rule and angered the rulers of heaven.

Throughout the *Supplementum*, the intensely polarized characterizations of Aeneas and Turnus demonstrate the allegorical intention behind the poem. Vegius’ Aeneas is a portrait of the *vir sapiens*, who orders all things in proper proportion and sequence, who proves himself to be as wise in victory as he was steadfast in battle, and who brings joy to a war-torn cosmos. As he happily (*laetus* [13.49]) returns to the Trojan camp, the exulting band of youth follow him, chiding and rebuking the Latins as *ignavi* (13.53–54). Although concerned for the burial of the dead, he first offers sacrifices to the gods by traditional customs (*patrio ... ex more* [13.59]).

First things first. The result is happiness, on earth as it is in heaven:

\[
\textit{tum plausus per tecta movent magnumque Tonantem}
\]
\[
\textit{extollunt Veneremque et te, Saturnia Juno,}
\]
\[
\textit{—iam placidam et meliorem ingenti laude fatentur—}
\]
\[
\textit{Mavortemque ipsum.} \quad (13.67–70).^{201}
\]

Aeneas urges his men to treat the Latins justly, with kindred spirits, and to honor Latinus (13.95–96). The son of Venus is the glorious center of the newfound peace. Throughout the scenes of celebration, Vegius never tires of praising Aeneas. He speaks with a “placid voice” (*placida ... voce* [13.84]) and is “prior to all in gentleness” (*ante omnes mitior* [13.72]),^{202} towering in stature, and surpassing all with the depth and renown of his goodness (13.121–124). The positive adjectives continue: *pius* (13.375; 406), *inclitus* (13.331), *magnus* (13.451), *clarissima lux*

---

201 “Then applause moves through the homes and extols the great Thunderer, Venus, and you, Saturnian Juno—with great praise they confess that you are placid and more serene—and Mars himself.”

202 Rogerson, “Vegio’s Supplement,” 286–287, correctly points out the Christ-like nature of this adjective, as can be seen in Matt 11:29: *discite a me, quia mitis sum, et humilis corde.*
(13.425), *maximus heros* (13.538). Aeneas performs a “huge work of piety,” an *ingens /...*
Pietatis opus (13.393–394), and sprinkles honor from his sidereal eyes (13.420–421).

On the other hand, as we have seen above Vegius depicts Turnus with an equally detailed and opposite characterization. Virgil’s frequently sympathetic descriptions of him are all but absent in the *Supplementum*. Daunus’ lament is the exception. Stricken at the loss of Ardea and Turnus together, he mourns the passing of Turnus in words that truly express a father’s bereavement. Only here is Turnus momentarily a man and not a monster:

\[
\textit{iam mutum et sine voce caput, quo pulchrior alter}
\textit{non futi in tota Ausonia nec gratior ullus}
\textit{eloquio nec quis sumptis ingentior armis.} (13.271–273)\]

Otherwise, Vegius’ demonic Turnus possesses *rapidas furor* (13.341–342), *cupido* (13.146), *impatientia* (13.161), *tanta insania* (13.166), *superbia* (13.205), and *violentia* (13.378). Among the adjectives used to describe him throughout the work, *horrendus* (13.269), *furens* (13.269), and *infestus* (13.378) are typical. Not only is supreme responsibility for all violence placed on his shoulders, but the war against the Trojans is recast as a rebellion or sedition against a rightful rule. Turnus is the origin of *all* rebellion, *omnis origo / seditionis*, and the author of such a great crime, *tanti criminis auctor* (13.434–435). This polarization—and in a sense, simplification—of the moral complexity that surrounds Virgil’s characters is necessary for the execution of the Virgilian allegory detailed in the *De perseverantia*.

Furthermore, Rogerson has convincingly suggested that Vegius’ simile comparing Aeneas to a mother hen protecting her chicks may not be an allusion to Achilles at Troy,\(^{204}\) as

---

\(^{203}\) “Now, a silent head without a voice—no other in all of Italy was more handsome, no other was more pleasing in eloquence, nor greater in donned arms.”

one determined to classicize the *Supplementum* might argue, but rather a reference to the Gospel of Matthew, where Christ is described in similar terms.\textsuperscript{205} Vegius’ simile is, at first glance, rather strange:

\textit{velut exiguis cum ex aethere gyrans}
\textit{incubuit pullis et magno turbine milvus}
\textit{insiliens avido ore furti stragemque minatur,}
\textit{tum cristata ales concusso pectore mater}
\textit{consurgit misero natorum exterrita casu,}
\textit{rostrum acuit totisque petit conantibus hostem}
\textit{et multa expulsum vi tandem cedere cogit,}
\textit{dehinc perturbatos crocitans exquirit et omnes}
\textit{attonitos cogit pro caris anxia natis}
\textit{et tanto ereptos gaudet superesse periculo} (13.107–116).\textsuperscript{206}

However, when placed alongside a passage from the Gospel of Matthew that registers Christ’s concern for the children of Jerusalem in an identical simile, Vegius’ imagistic choice becomes comprehensible:

\textit{Jerusalem, Jerusalem, quae occidis prophetas, et lapidas eos, qui ad te missi sunt,}
\textit{quoties volui congregare filios tuos, quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas, et noluisti?} (Matt. 23:37).\textsuperscript{207}

In this passage, Vegius takes another convincing step beyond classicism and even beyond moral allegory, as Rogerson argues, and suggests that Aeneas is a type for Christ.\textsuperscript{208} In addition to her observations, the differences between the simile in Matthew and Vegius should be noted. In

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{205} Rogerson, “Vegio’s Supplement,” 285.
\item \textsuperscript{206} “Just as when a kite, circling from the air, threatens the little chicks, and rages with a great whirlwind and a greedy mouth, and threatens slaughter, then the tufted mother bird with shaken heart rises, terrified by the miserable fate of her children. She whets her beak and with all her efforts seeks after the enemy and compels him to yield when he is driven out with much force. Then, cackling, she seeks after her disturbed chicks, and gathers them all together, stupefied as they are. She is anxious for her dear children and rejoices that they have survived and been snatched from such danger.”
\item \textsuperscript{207} “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together, like a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you would not.”
\item \textsuperscript{208} Rogerson, “Vegio’s Supplement,” 286: “Vegio’s use of the imagery of the hen, her chicks and the kite thus indicates that he presents Aeneas in the *Supplement* not only as a paradigm of virtue, but also as a type of Christ.”
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Matthew’s gospel, Christ longs to protect the children of Jerusalem from the bloody rejection of the prophets sent to help her. Vegius, by contrast, introduces the figure of the kite (milvus) unknown to the biblical story, who “rages” (furit) and “threatens destruction” (stragemque minatur). Through these details, the kite models Turnus’ furia reviewed above. Furthermore, Matthew’s gospel recounts a prophetic threat and lament, not a triumph of good over evil and the subsequent rejoicing, as Vegius does. Thus, through the simile, he does not just present Aeneas as a type of Christ (as Rogerson suggests), but also a Turnus-like kite as a type of the Devil. These two figures unite in an allegorical representation of the triumph of Christ over Satan, which relies for its complete intelligibility on the broader allegorical framework established in the De perseverantia.

4. Trampling on the World

The defeat of the Latins signifies the trampling of the “world”—proculcatur mundus—a process of pacification by which the passions are quelled and order is restored to the universe. At the sight of Aeneas’ magnanimity and Turnus’ soullessness, the conquered Latins are stupefied and give a groan. Their own spirits are shattered (concussis animis). As if undergoing an exorcism, the Italians “vomit up” and expel their durus dolor; soldiers disarm, blame the violence, and shudder at their insane love of warfare (13.8–10). At once they pray for pardon, peace, and an “end of all evils,” et veniam orare et requiem finemque malorum (13.12), humbly

---

209 See Ps. 17:8–9, where deadly enemies are present, as well as Ps. 57:1, 61:4; Deut. 32:11; Ruth 2:12.
210 Vegius’ use of revomentes (5) has been frequently remarked upon with disfavor. Although it is used literally in 5.182 as Menoetes vomits out salt water, Brinton, 153, claims that “Its figurative use is late, and with corde bad.” J. S. Scaliger found Vegius’ similes equal to those of Lucan or Statius. He remarks regarding 13.5, tolle enim vocem illam revomentes, caetera omnia optimi poetae opinione digna sunt.
accepting the results of captivity and defeat, the *frenum* and the *collum captivum*. Furthermore, they begin to follow the example and glory of the *vir sapiens* and trust in his vision of eternal happiness and peace:

\[
\textit{inclita malunt}
\]
\[
\textit{arma sequi et Phrygium Aeneam foedusque precari}
\]
\[
\textit{pacis et aeternam rebus belloque quietem.} \text{(13.20–22).} \textsuperscript{211}
\]

This newfound *quies* of the *Supplementum* is similar to the state of *quies* described in the *De perseverantia* as the result of perseverance in virtue (*tum priusquam promissam latio quietem assequatur*). As expected, Vegius describes the peace of the *Supplementum* not merely in terms of a temporal ceasefire, but of an eternal rest (*aeternam quietem*); again, recall the *De perseverantia*’s description of the final reward of the *vir sapiens*: *immortalisque demum et aeterna beatitudo acquiritur*. Words for “peace and quiet” are among the most common found in the *Supplementum*, and the promise of *quies* and *pax* is repeated almost obsessively throughout the speeches.\textsuperscript{212}

Aeneas’ speeches to Iulus (13.75–82) and the allies (13.85–102) demonstrate unequivocally the anagogical purpose behind the *Supplementum*. In his speech to Iulus, he begins by emphasizing the present, earthly rewards of peace and happiness resulting from their successful victory:

\[
nate, \textit{in quo spes una patris, per tanta viarum quem variis actus fatis discrimina duxi, ecce inventa quies, ecce illa extrema malorum aerumnis factura modum acceptissima semper atque optata dies, quam dura in bella vocatus}
\]

\textsuperscript{211} “They prefer to follow the famed arms and Phrygian Aeneas, and to implore the treaty of peace, and eternal quiet for their affairs and for war.”

Turning to his men, he describes the past horrors that they have overcome, horrors that recall some of the most terrifying of the dangers from the *Aeneid*:

{o socii, per dura et densa pericula vecti
per tantos bellorum aestus duplicesque furores
armorum, per totque hiems, per quicquid acerbum
horrendum, grave, triste, ingens, et quicquid iniquum,
inhaustum et crudele foret, convertite mentem
in melius! iam finis adest: hic meta laborum
stabit, et optatam Latia cum gente quieted
iungemus. (13.85–92).}

In the main, Vegius adapts both speeches from Virgil’s famous exhortation to his men in book 1.

“*o socii*—neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum—
o passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.
vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis
accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopea saxa
experti: revocate animos, maestumque timorem
mittite: forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.
per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum
tendimus in Latium; sedes ubi fata quietas
ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere Troiae.
durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.” (1.198–207).

---

213 “My son—you are the only hope of your father! Driven by various misfortunes I have led you through so many crises of our journeys. Behold! We have found rest! Behold that longed-for and most welcome day, an end of our evils, making a limit to our trials. As I was called into the harsh battles often I remember that it would be remembered by you under auspicious gods.”

214 “O allies, who have passed through harsh and frequent dangers, through so many passions of wars, and double furies of arms, through so many winters, through whatever bitter, dreadful, painful, sad, enormous, and whatever unkind, unfortunate, and cruel came your way, turn your mind to better things! Now the end is here: here will be the limit of our labors, and we will unite our desired quietude with the Latin race.”

215 See Schneider, 66–67; Brinton, 154, with a reference to the *Vellus Aureum*, 1.140–142.

216 “O allies—truly, before this we have not been ignorant of evils—you who have suffered worse things, a god will give an end to these also. You drew near to the wrath of the Scylla and the deep-echoing crags, you experienced the rocks of the Cyclopes: Recall your spirits, banish gloomy fear! Perhaps someday it will please you to recall these things. Through so many misfortunes, through so many crises of things, we are heading for Latium, where the fates
Vegius mentions this speech in the *De perseverantia*, the speech which could *almost* be spoken by St. Paul, if only a few words were changed. Yet so far, in the *Supplementum*, the speeches only point to the fulfillment of Aeneas’ promises from the *Aeneid*. Indeed, Virgil’s famous line *forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit* (1.203) is explicitly used to show Vegius’ Aeneas now taking pleasure in his painful memories: *et quae perferre molestum / ante fuit, meminisse iuvat* (13.120–121).

Proceeding, we can detect that Vegius consciously rewrites—or “touches up”—Virgil’s words to suit his allegorical purposes. In the *Aeneid*, before Aeneas rushes from the Trojan camp to face Turnus in *Aeneid* 12, he briefly addresses Ascanius, promising him great rewards:

\[
\text{disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem} \\
\text{fortunatum ex aliis. nunc te mea dextera bello} \\
\text{defensum dabit et magna inter praemia ducet.} \\
\text{(12.435–437).}^{217}
\]

For Virgil’s Aeneas, these great rewards include peace, prosperity in old age, and the noble example of one’s ancestors (12.338–440). But Vegius believes that the story of the *Aeneid* points towards the superior and eternal rewards of heaven. Consequently, following the defeat of Turnus and the pacification of the Italians, with peace accomplished and prosperity imminent, his Aeneas promises that he will lead each one of his men to even *greater* rewards than those they have already received:

\[
\text{quae gloria nobis} \\
\text{cesserit, in promptu est; sed caelum et sidera testor:}
\]

---

217 “Learn about virtue from me, my boy, and true labor; learn about fortune from others. Now my right hand will give you a defense from war, and will lead you to great rewards!”
The promise of even greater rewards offered universally to the Trojans illustrates the anagogical purpose behind the Supplementum. They have trampled on the evils of the world and overcome the dyabolus through virtue and perseverance—yet, the longed-for home of Latium and the defeat of the Latins is not the final quies; greater things await. Following his practice from the De perseverantia, Vegius changes single Virgilian words while staying close to his model—in this case an apparently minor shift from magna to maiora. But as we will see, in Vegius’ universe these greater rewards will be celestial divinization for all those who act virtuously after the model of Aeneas, a reward that far exceeds any promises or prophecies in Virgil’s epic.

5. The Marriage of the Soul

The marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia represents the harmonious unity of the hero with the soul that has been “well cared-for” (bene consulitur) throughout the trials and tribulations of the world. Again, the allegory of Aeneas, who gains his soul (Lavinia) after fighting successfully for her, is the protreptic counterpart of the apotreptic allegory of Orpheus, who loses his soul (Eurydice) in a different contest against the diabolic powers. Vegius’ allegorical intention is evident in the intratextual identification of Lavinia and Aeneas suggesting the harmonious unity of the hero with his soul and the spiritual excellence of Lavinia compared to her Virgilian

---

218 “The glory which has been granted to us is plain to see. But I call the sky and the stars to witness that I, who snatched you from the destruction of such great evils, I, the same one, in power, will lead you to greater rewards.”
models. First, he stresses that Aeneas and Lavinia are, so to speak, identical. As Aeneas arrives at Laurentum in triumph, he radiates excellence, and sprinkles regal honor from his sidereal eyes:

\[
\textit{namque omnes super excellens atque altior ibat}
\textit{et late regalem oculis spargebat honorem}
\textit{sidereis. (13.419–421).}^{219}
\]

Applause rings out through the halls and Aeneas catches sight of his bride:

\[
\textit{haec inter matrum innumera nuruumque caterva}
\textit{in medium comitata venit Lavinia virgo}
\textit{sidereos deicta oculos; quam Troiis heros}
\textit{virtute et forma ingentem, mirabile dictu,}
\textit{ut vidit, primo aspectu stupefactus inhaesit. (13.466–470).}^{220}
\]

Surrounded by a crowd of mothers and nurses, Lavinia enters the chamber. Her description deliberately echoes that of Aeneas from fifty lines before; both have eyes that shine with a heavenly light. Furthermore, like Aeneas, Lavinia has impressed (\textit{ingens}; cf. 13.394–395) in both virtue and form; compare once again the description of Aeneas after he speaks to his men:

\[
\textit{verum altior idem}
\textit{ingenti et clara Aeneas supereminet omnes}
\textit{virtute excellens (13.121–123).}^{221}
\]

Her attributes are a pastiche of words already used to describe Aeneas; she combines the same excellence of form and the moral perfection that have characterized the pious hero throughout

---

219 “He proceeded, preeminent above all and more exalted and he was broadly sprinkling regal honor from his heavenly eyes.”
220 “While this was happening, the virgin Lavinia came in their midst, accompanied by an innumerable troop of mothers and nurses, her heavenly eyes cast down. As the Trojan hero saw her, remarkable for her virtue and beauty, a marvelous sight to behold, he was stunned and clung to the sight of her.”
221 “Truly Aeneas towers in his greatness and surpasses all in the excellence of his illustrious virtue.”
Spiritually, she is the mirror image of the hero. His response is wonder (not lust or desire) and the two are united with an eternal bond: Tum vero aeterno iunguntur foedera nexu (13.474).

Throughout the wedding scene, Vegius recomposes Virgilian scenes as the backbone of his descriptions, but he “corrects” Virgil in order to make Lavinia into the perfect moral and spiritual counterpart of Aeneas. Virgil’s Lavinia approaches the temple to sacrifice with her mother:

subvehitur magna matrum regina caterva,  
dona ferens, iuxta comes Lavinia virgo  
causa mali tanti, atque oculos deicta decoros. (11.478–480).

Vegius retains much from the Virgilian scene, but his omissions are telling. Virgil describes Lavinia’s eyes as “seemly,” and darkly reminds the reader that she is the cause “of so great an evil” between the Trojans and Latins. Vegius, eager to spiritualize Lavinia, gives her “heavenly” eyes. As the soul of a virtuous man cannot be the cause of evil, Vegius appropriately assigns virtus to her instead of the causa malorum. As we have seen, the blame for evils of war is reserved entirely for Turnus (cf. 13.434–435).

---

222 Wilson-Okamura, Virgil in the Renaissance, 242, points out the parallel between 13.121–123 and 1.478–480 and asks “How do we interpret these eyes?” He blandly ascribes it to Lavinia’s virtue: “This is how Aeneas can tell that she is ‘virtuous, as well as beautiful.’” Focused as he is on intertextuality between the Aeneid and the Supplementum, he does not notice that Vegius is drawing intra-textual connections as well.

223 Putnam, 31, downplays the language of eternity: “And so the marriage compacts are joined in enduring bond.” Interestingly, marriage was never seen in the Christian tradition as having an eternal duration but was rather dissolved after death (Matt 22:30; Luke 20:27–38). Thus, it is more fitting that this unity should refer to the soul and the body, which would be eternally united after the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:35–49).

224 “The queen approaches with a great company of matrons, bearing gifts, and the virgin Lavinia accompanies her alongside, the cause of so great an evil, with her decorous eyes downcast.”

225 Wilson-Okamura, Virgil in the Renaissance, 242, points out that Badius Ascensius (Giunta 1544, fol. 493v) recognized this parallel long ago; Wilson-Okamura’s analysis, however, does little more than rephrase the obvious: “The ancient commentator T. C. Donatus (who had not been discovered yet when Vegio was writing) gives two options: ‘Lavinia casts her eyes down, perhaps on account of her current unpopularity [as the source of her country’s
The otherworldly virtue of Vegius’ Lavinia also stands in sharp contrast with Virgil’s Dido, whose triumphant entry in *Aeneid* 1 is another model for Vegius’ marriage scene:226

\[\text{regina ad templum, forma pulcherrima Dido,}\]
\[\text{incessit, magna juvenum stipante caterva.}\]
\[\text{qualis in Eurotae ripis, aut per iuga Cynthi}\]
\[\text{exercet Diana choros, quam mille secutae}\]
\[\text{hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades: illa phaertram}\]
\[\text{fert unero, gradiensque deas supereminet omnes.}\]
\[\text{Latoneae tacitum pertentant gaudia pectus.}\]
\[\text{talis erat Dido, talem se laeta ferebat}\]
\[\text{per medios, instans operi, regnisque futuris.}\]
\[\text{tum foribus divae, media testudine templi}\]
\[\text{septa armis, solioque alte subnixa resedit}\]
\[\text{iura dabat, legesque viris: operumque laborem}\]
\[\text{partibus aequabat iustis, aut sorte trahebat.}\]

Virgil’s Dido is identified primarily by the overwhelming beauty of her body (1.496), and by her illustrious social status as a queen, her efficiency in rule, and her just administration of law. She rules over men. By contrast, Vegius has removed all material considerations from Lavinia; power has been replaced with piety, and her beauty has been combined with the good of virtue.

Virgil’s Dido is terrestrial in her varied allurements, while Vegius’ Lavinia is spiritually perfect.228

---

\[^226\] *ibid.*, 243–245.
\[^227\] “The queen advanced to the temple, Dido, most beautiful in form, with a great crowd of youth accompanying her. Just as on the banks of Eurota, or through the ridges of Cynthius, Diana trains her choruses, and thousands of Oreades here and there gather around her. She carries a quiver on her shoulder, and as she walks she towers over all the goddesses; and joys ply the silent heart of Latona. Such was Dido, and she carried herself so happily through their midst, urging on the work and her future kingdoms. Then at the doors of the goddess, in the middle vault of the temple, surrounded with arms, enthroned on high, she took her seat. She was giving orders and laws to men, and she was distributing the work and the labor with equal justice, or she was assigning them by lot.”

\[^228\] The analysis of the same intertextual reference in Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance*, 245, is well made, but ultimately he does not argue for the presence of allegory in the *Supplementum*. Furthermore, he wrongly focuses on Vegius’ physical description of Lavinia, which Vegius specifically downplays, and he ignores the moral excellence that Vegius attributes to Lavinia (*virtus*), which is entirely original: “This is a way of presenting Lavinia as a corrected version of Dido, and as such, there is always the danger that it will drain both parties of the very
When Vegius’ Aeneas first sees Lavinia he is stupefied by her virtue and form: *ut vidit, primo aspectu stupefactus inhaesit* (13.470). Wilson-Okamura points out that Vegius recomposes the reaction of Aeneas to Lavinia from two distinct moments in the *Aeneid*: Turnus’ response to Lavinia’s blush (*illum turbat amor, figitque in virgine vultus / ardet in arma magis* [12.70–71]) and the moment when Dido looks at Aeneas (*obstupuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido* [1.163]);229 however, Wilson-Okamura eagerly sexualizes—and thereby problematizes—the scene, arguing that in Vegius’ use of *stupefactus* we should understand that “love retains its power to ‘stun’ (literally, to stupefy)” and that Lavinia has “the power to compel an erotic response in Aeneas.”230 Yet this does not accord with Vegius’ use of *stupefactus* elsewhere in the *Supplementum*. Aeneas’ “stupefied” response to Lavinia almost precisely mirrors the response of the Latins and Trojans to Aeneas’ *pietas* after Aeneas finishes speaking to Drances:

*dixerat, et tanto affatu conversa tenebant ora simul stupefacti omnes et apertius ingens mirantes pietatis opus*. (13.392–394).231

It would be a mistake, I submit, to assume stupefied arousal in this passage as well. Rather, it seems that throughout the *Supplementum*, the typical response to virtue and excellence is stupefaction and wonder. Aeneas is also stupefied (*obstipuit*) by the portentous sight of Lavinia’s flaming hair (13.543) and by his mother’s words foretelling his peaceful rule and catasterism qualities that made Dido attractive in the first place. But in comparing Lavinia to Dido as she seemed to Aeneas in her prelapsarian state, Vegio is careful to avoid the impression that Aeneas is just looking for a capable administrator. He does this in part by eliminating any reference to Lavinia’s role in the government of Latium and in part by emphasizing Lavinia’s physical beauty (as Virgil had emphasized Dido’s).” Oertel, 193, misses this point, merely remarking on the similarity between the Lavinias of Vergil and Vegius: “Lavinia tritt *expressis verbis* nur einmal auf und rückt für wenige Verse ins Blickfeld, ohne ein Wort zu sagen; ihr schüchtern-züchtiges Verhalten erinnert an die eben zitierte Aeneisstelle aus dem 11. Buch [i.e., 11.480, when Lavinia casts down her eyes].”

230 *ibid.*, 245.
231 “[Aeneas] had spoken, and all together in stunned amazement at his magnificent speech were holding their gaze turned towards him, openly admiring his huge work of piety.”
(13.584). Neither of these scenes appears particularly erotic. And so, as the Latins and Trojans wondered (*obstupuere*) at “great-souled” Aeneas (13.4), now Aeneas wonders at the glorious *virtus* and *forma* of his bride. Of course, following Aristotle’s *De anima*, prominent theologians commonly used *forma* to signify the soul, not the material shape of the body:

> sic igitur, cum sit triplex substantia, scilicet compositum, materia, et forma, et anima non est ipsum compositum, quod est corpus habens vitam: neque est materia, quae est corpus subiectum vitae: relinquitur, per locum a divisione, quod anima sit substantia, sicut forma vel species talis corporis, scilicet corporis physici habentis in potentia vitam.\(^{232}\)

Thus, as the virtuous Aeneas wonders at the soul (*forma*) and its habits (*virtus*), we avoid the strange prospect of Aeneas admiring the virtue of Lavinia at the same time as he is being aroused by her physical shape.

6. Ascending into Glory

Among all the indications throughout the *Supplementum*, Jupiter’s promise to Venus alone would decisively prove an anagogical intention behind the poem. After the years of Aeneas’ pacific reign over Latium, Venus begs Jupiter to hold true to his promise from *Aeneid* 1, and to convey Aeneas among the stars, since his virtue is now mature: *iamque optat matura polos Aeneia virtus* (13.605). The omnipotent Jupiter assents and furthermore declares that the virtuous followers of Aeneas can also achieve heaven through the imitation of Aeneas’ *virtus*:

---

\(^{232}\) Aquinas, *In Aristotelis de anima commentarium*, 2.1.221: “Thus, since there are three kinds of substance, namely, the compound, matter, and form, and the soul is neither the compound itself, which is the body having life, nor is it the material, which is the body subject to life, we are led to conclude that the soul is a substance in the manner of a form or species of such a body, i.e., a body of a physical thing having life potentially.”
This pledge is entirely without precedent in Virgil; nowhere is divinity promised to the followers of Aeneas who follow his example of virtue.\textsuperscript{234} The anagogical meaning of the passage is overt and the allegory is clear: After Aeneas struggles through the trials and tribulations of the world, defeats the demonic Turnus, attains earthly happiness, ascends to heaven, and serves as an example of virtue for future generations, he becomes the perfect \textit{vir sapiens}, whose followers can also attain catasterism through his virtue. In this, he is an allegorical representation of Christ, whose triumph overcomes sin and death, and whose victory opens the path to heaven to those who act \textit{in imitatione Christi}. The Christian promise of salvation glimmers beneath the patina of Vegius’ Classicism.\textsuperscript{235}

Finally, Venus arrives to immortalize the soul of her son and conduct it to the stars. She washes his body in the Numicius, taking away his mortality, and conducting his fresh and happy \textit{anima} above the air. Fixed in the stars, the \textit{Iulia proles} name him as \textit{indigites} and honor his cult:

\begin{quote}
\begin{flushleft}
\textit{tu, si quid in ipso mortale est, adime, atque astris ingentibus adde. quin si alios sua habet virtus, qui laude perenni accingant sese et gestis praestantibus orbem exornent, illos rursum super aethera mittam.} (13.615–619).\textsuperscript{233}
\end{flushleft}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{233} “Yours is the task to take away whatever is mortal in him and add him to the mighty stars. Also, if others possess his virtue, who gird themselves with immortal praise and adorn the world through excellent deeds, I will send them in turn beyond the aether.”

\textsuperscript{234} See Fichter, \textit{Poets Historical}, 13–14. The closest is the penates’ promise to raise Aeneas’ descendants to the stars, but this obviously pertains to the future rulers of Rome in Aeneas’ direct line (3.158-159): \textit{idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes / imperiumque urbi dabimus.}

\textsuperscript{235} Although he is primarily discussing Villanova and Forestus, Oertel, 200, notes that the promises of Roman dominion characteristic of the Virgilian prophecies are less prominent in Vegius: “Andererseits erkennt man eine Verschiebung des Schwerpunktes: Die Prophezeiung der Weltherrschaft erscheint eher wie ein Zugeständnis und die Tradition: Der Name des Augustus kommt nicht vor, die endgültige Friedensherrschaft bleibt unerwähnt ... Die teleologische Grundaussage der \textit{Aeneis} wird also eingeschränkt, erscheint fast peripher; Vegio geht es vor allem um die persönliche Zukunft des Aeneas, sein Glück und seine Ehrungen, die deshalb auch gewichtig am Ende der Rede stehen.” The reason for the lack of prominence afforded to the telos of the Virgilian poems is that the telos has been replaced with a promise allegorically representing Christian sanctification. Vegius is not merely concerned with what will happen to Aeneas—but what will happen to those who follow Aeneas as well. Still, Oertel’s observation is a helpful corrective to Punam’s overly classicizing view.
As Putnam and Schneider point out,²³⁶ this scene rephrases two moments from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The closest model, expectedly, is the catasterism of Aeneas at the end of Ovid’s “Little Aeneid.” Vegius’ method of rephrasing Virgil and Ovid is the same. A single phrase is repeated (*vicina Numicius undis*); otherwise words are shifted in form and position:

²³⁶ Putnam, xiv–xvi; Schneider, *ad* 624–630.

²³⁷ “Then, borne aloft through the yielding air by her harnessed doves, she came to the Laurentian coast, where the river Numicius, winding through beds of sheltering reeds, pours its fresh waters into the neighboring sea. She bade the river-god wash away from Aeneas all his mortal part and carry it down in his silent stream into the ocean depths. The horned god obeyed Venus’ command and in his waters cleansed and washed quite away whatever was mortal in Aeneas. His best part remained to him. His mother sprinkled his body and anointed it with divine perfume, touched his lips with ambrosia and sweet nectar mixed, and so made him a god, whom the Roman populace styled Indiges and honoured with temple and with sacrifice.” (Trans: Miller).
Vegius has a clear—and pragmatic—motive for adopting Ovid as his model instead of Virgil: There is no extended model for the catasterism of Aeneas in the Aeneid besides two brief prophecies in 1.258–260 and 12.793–795. Let us examine how Vegius supplements his model from Metamorphoses 14 with material from Metamorphoses 15. Reading closely, we may see that he models the descent of Venus and the washing in the Numincius on the passage from Metamorphoses 14, yet offers no parallel to Metamorphoses 14.604b–607a (bracketed) in 13.323–360. Vegius’ Venus does not nourish Aeneas with nectar and ambrosia, the immortality-granting food of the pagan gods whose typical fragrance is described in Ovid (divino odore). Thus, Vegius’ Aeneas does not become a god through special food or immortal ointment. Indeed, in this passage he is not said to become a god at all.

This, I think, is because Vegius wishes his poem to be about the perfection and immortal life of the anima—a spiritual purification that leads to eternal life, rather than a mythological or magical divinization whose physical means (nectar and ambrosia) are separate from the virtus of the soul. Consequently, he reaches for another Ovidian model that is more consonant with an allegory of the ascent of the anima: the catasterism of Julius Caesar at the end of Metamorphoses 15, where we find that the focus is on the anima of the recently murdered Julius Caesar. Thus,

---

238 “Scarcely had he spoken when fostering Venus took her place within the senate-house, unseen of all, caught up the passing soul of her Caesar from his body, and not suffering it to vanish into air, she bore it towards the stars of heaven.” (Trans: Miller). Vegius’ scene also looks back, more remotely, to 1.258–260 and 12.793–795, as is pointed out in Putnam, xvii.

Vegius reworks the phrase *recentem animam*, a borrowing that is consonant with his larger purpose. He ends the *Supplementum*, a poem about the trials and triumph of Aeneas’ *anima*, as he began it.\textsuperscript{240}

Regarding these final lines of the *Supplementum*, Putnam argues that classical allusiveness is “a further indication of Vegio’s unwillingness to progress, in whatever manner, beyond Virgil and Ovid, a step which might have taken the form of a Christian twist to the hero’s catasterism.”\textsuperscript{241} This view can be simply stated as follows: Because Vegius relies on Ovid to finish Virgil, he cannot have an allegorical intention behind the poem. But the conclusion of this argument does not follow necessarily from its premises. Indeed, this is not even properly an argument at all, but an assertion. Again: “This is as if to say that it is in the classical literary background that [Vegius’] interest lay and that such should be the focus of attention for his contemporary readers as well.”\textsuperscript{242} He provides no reason why Vegius cannot have used Ovid as a model for a fitting ending to Virgil, considering that an appropriate catasterism is necessary for an ending to an allegorical *Aeneid*.

\textbf{IV. Conclusions}

\textsuperscript{240} A different interpretation is found in Putnam, xvi: “Vegio’s allusions achieve several effects at once. By using Ovid to cap Ovid, he grants to Aeneas the catasterism that Ovid withholds from him but allows to Julius Caesar. But, by nesting the heavenly ascent, borrowed from *Metamorphoses* 15, within the description of the purification by the Numicius (or, elsewhere, Numicus), which comes largely from Ovid’s preceding book, Vegio honors him with the catasterism which Ovid had reserved for Caesar but then returns us immediately and forcefully to Ovid’s Aeneas, in the poem’s final line, with verses 629–30...serving as careful reminder of *Metamorphoses* 14.607–8. Though Vegio steps beyond Ovid, while adopting and adapting him, in dealing with the catasterism of Aeneas, his act of closure returns carefully back to Ovid’s earlier immortalized but still terrestrial Aeneas.”

\textsuperscript{241} \emph{ibid.}, il. n. 15.

\textsuperscript{242} \emph{ibid.}, xviii.
To review, scholars have made several distinct arguments against the presence of
allegory in the Supplementum. Each can be successfully answered:

First, it is an unfounded assertion that Vegius was disinclined to Christianity before a
supposed religious conversion. On the contrary, Vegius’ childhood and upbringing were
infused with Christian thought. His education in classical literature under the priests and tutors
was likely to have included “medieval” allegorical and moral readings of Virgil and other pagan
poets. Furthermore, he did not undergo a “conversion” at any point during his life; rather, he re-
oriented himself to the study of Augustine and other Christian authors during his twenties while
he was studying and teaching at Pavia, as he explains in the De perseverantia and the De
educatione. Indeed, we have evidence for Vegius’ piety practiced from childhood on, a teneris
annis. The journey from pagan subjects to overtly Christian poetics was part of a process of
poetic maturation and reflection, rather than the result of a jarring theological or moral shift, as
we can see from the abundant classicism which remains in the Antonias.

Furthermore, it has been argued that an allegorical reading was unusual in Vegius’
humanistic milieu. This is incorrect. Vegius’ famous humanistic predecessors, such as
Bocaccio and Salutati, were accomplished allegorists. Furthermore, we have seen that other
educational literature of the time, such as that by Bruno, Guarino, and Piccolomini, stresses
moral and allegorical readings of classical texts and Christianizes the classics through tropology
and anagogy. Such readings continued well into the Renaissance. See, for example, the

---

243 e.g., Ross, “Maffeo Vegio’s ‘schort Cristyn wark,’ 219–220: “Vegio himself probably did not [allegorically]
interpret Aeneas’s apotheosis when he wrote the supplement, for he had undergone a serious religious conversion
between his goliardic youth, when he wrote it, and his later life.”
244 e.g. ibid.: “[T]he care [Vegius] exercised in extracting the theological meaning [in the De perseverantia] makes it
unlikely that his interpretation was common property to all humanists or that anyone else instantly equated Latium
with heaven.”
Disputationes Calmadulenses of Cristofero Landino in Vegius’ generation for a wholehearted endorsement of allegorical reading. Similarly, in the next generation, the renowned Erasmus argues that allegorical reading is necessary if one wishes to profit properly from reading the ancients:

*sed uti divina scriptura non multum habet fructus, si in litera persistas haereasque, ita non parum utilis est Homericæ Vergilianæ poesis, si memineris eam totam esse allegoricam, id quod nemo negabit, qui modo veterum eruditionem, vel summis labiis degustarit.*

Thus, on the contrary, it is Vegius who would be unusual if he did not read the *Aeneid* allegorically to some extent. As was the case with many in his time, Vegius was a synthetic reader and writer who looked back to both the classical and Christian worlds and attempted to affect a synthesis between them. As in the Middle Ages, allegory provided a means by which the moral value and authority of the ancient world could be maintained even as Christian truth was explicated without compromise. Thus, Augustine’s concerns about the moral value of classical texts could be addressed. Furthermore, the stories of Aeneas and Dido, Odysseus and Calypso, as well as questionable texts such as Ovid’s *Ars amatoria,* could be safely used as material for education and spiritual edification. Vegius did not betray his Church by his devotion to the classical poets, nor did he deny the beauty and moral excellence of the classical poets even as he served as a canon in the greatest basilica of western Christendom:

*denique poeta summus uti singulari ceteros excessit ingenio, ita nihil aliud toto suo opere quo Eneam decantavit videtur exponere voluisse quam perseverantiae originem,*

---

245 Erasmus, *Enchiridion militis Christiani,* 2: “But just as divine scripture is not very fruitful if you remain and cling to the literal sense, in the same way the poetry of Homer and Virgil is of no small profit, if you remember that it is entirely allegorical. No one will deny this who has had just a taste of the wisdom of the ancients, even with the utmost part of his lips.”

246 See Vegius, *De perseverantia,* 5.1 (fol. 48).
Finally, it is incorrect that the Supplementum’s classicism is devoid of Christian content. It is not surprising that Vegius does not openly break the language of classicism or the arc of the Virgilian plot to include a scene of cherubs, trumpets, and a triumphant Christus Rex reigning in glory. If he had, the Supplementum would no longer be an allegory, nor would it be an effective ending to the Aeneid on stylistic or structural grounds. Such an overtly Christianized Supplementum would be more like the heavily Virgilian Lycidas of Milton, replete with solemn troops of saints nectaring their oozy locks in heavenly bliss. By contrast, Vegius remains within the classical setting and language of Virgilian epic, not because he does not wish to take the step to Christianity, but because he believes that Virgil’s words are already as pious as those of any Christian author. We should not assume that he expresses sanctification in Virgilian terms because he was primarily concerned with Putnam’s view of classical allusion. We may rather suppose that he alludes to and completes Virgil’s Aeneid in order to express his belief that Virgil’s poetry is allegorically compatible with a Christian view of sanctification, a belief that we find fully developed in his De perseverantia. Vegius may be inexorably classicizing, but he is also inexorably allegorical.

247 Vegius, De perseverantia, 1.5 (fol. 11): “Indeed just as the greatest poet exceeded all others in his remarkable intellect, thus, in the entire poem in which he sang about Aeneas, he seems to have wished to express nothing else than the origin, progress, power, and end of perseverance. Anyone who wishes to pay attention will understand how beautifully and elegantly, how fittingly and skillfully he has expressed this.”

248 e.g. Putnam, xviii: “On the occasion when Vegio would be expected to add even an indirect Christian element to Aeneas’s final progress not only is nothing forthcoming but his language is almost completely dependent on his great Roman predecessors.”

I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike Vegius’ allegorical *completion* of the *Aeneid*, Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni* is a true *continuation* that episodically expands Virgil’s poem. Throughout its course, the body of Turnus structures its action and provokes different reactions from its primary characters: Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, Pilumnus, and Daunus. To this end, I examine five major subplots of Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni*: 1) Aeneas’ struggle for self-composure at the beginning of the poem (13.1–26), 2) King Latinus’ attempt at suicide and the intervention of Mercury (13.87–97, 176–259), 3) Lavinia’s response to Turnus’ body and her wedding dream (13.115–140; 14.275–351), 4) Pilumnus’ arrival and pacification (13.243–610; 14.174–228), 5) Juturna’s visit to Daunus and his dream (14.229–274). I also suggest that Forestus uses the story of Aeneas’ establishment of peace in Latium to reflect on the complex process of achieving a lasting peace after prolonged warfare. What emerges is a poem whose strengths rely on precisely the opposite qualities of those claimed in recent scholarship by Schmidt (1973) and Oertel (2001). I do not argue that Forestus is a slavish imitator of Virgil, as does Schmidt; rather he creatively re-uses and challenges Virgil’s epic in each of these scenes. Nor does he present the arrival of Pilumnus as the work’s single important *dramatischer Kern*, as Oertel argues. Unlike Vegius and Villanova, who systematically conclude each prophecy of Virgil’s *Aeneid* in a single book, Forestus

---

1 An earlier version of this chapter was delivered as “Continuing the *Aeneid*: Dramatic Structure and Characterization in the *Exequiae Turni*,” at the KFLC Languages, Literatures and Cultures Conference, Lexington, KY, April 20, 2018. I thank the respondent Dr. Terence Tunberg and his wife Dr. Jennifer Tunberg for their helpful advice and a delightful conversation over lunch at Windy Corner Market in Lexington.
develops and continues smaller narrative arcs, rather than correcting or completing the broader plotlines of his timeless model.

1. The Life and Works of Johannes Forestus

Fast approaching the twilight of his life in 1648, the statesman, scholar, and poet Johannes Forestus dedicated his *magnum opus*, the *Exequiae Turni*, to Queen Christina of Sweden.² Seemingly insecure, he wrote in a letter to Daniel Heinsius in 1649 that this poem was a “winter fruit” grown to maturity late in the lifetime of his poetic endeavors, one which he feared might still not be fully ripe. *Insipidus*, the author called it, “tasteless”:

> *memini me puerum tibi vovisse studiorum meorum primitias, Graecum nempe poematum quoddam; nunc autem senex oblatum tibi venio extremum mei ingenii, si quid id fuit, conatum. alter praecox, alter hibernus fructus, uterque insipidus.*³

Perhaps Forestus had good reason to be insecure. After all, in these two books, the elderly Dutchman attempted to supplement Virgil’s *Aeneid*, as Maphaeus Vegius had done before him.

He died three years later, in 1651.


³ “I recall that as a boy I dedicated to you the first-fruit of my studies, some of my Greek poems; but now as an old man I come to bring you the final attempt of my talent, if it was anything at all. The former was premature, the latter is a winter fruit, both are tasteless.” Qtd. in Oertel, 208. The “first-fruits” refers to Forestus’ first book of poems published in 1605 (reviewed below).
Johannes Forestus was born on October 9, 1586, in Alkmaar, to Jacob and Maria van Foreest. His family’s illustrious and noble heritage is well documented: His mother was the daughter of Adriaan van Egmond van den Nyenburgh. His father Jacob, who served as the secretary and associate councilor of West Friesland and North Holland (Noorderwartier), was the son of Dirk van Foreest and the brother of a famous physician Pieter and an obscure Latin poet Nanning. Although Forestus could be said to have both poetry and politics in his blood, poetry was his earliest enthusiasm. As a child, he attended a Latin school at Hoorn. In an undated letter to his father, he described his daily routine at school where he received an education focused on the traditional subjects of the classical trivium: grammar (Latin and Greek), dialectic, and rhetoric:

hora octava Graecam grammaticam et figuras. hora decima Terentium, nempe Andriam, hora secunda Virgilium, scilicet quartum librum Aeneidos, hora quarta vel argumentum vel carmina compono. vesperi per me Terentium lego, nimirum adelphos, feriatis diebus syntaxin et grammaticam repefo.5

As Oertel remarks, in the letter Forestus described his general love for poetry (quoniam magno poesios desiderio teneor) and his specific love of Virgil, the poetarum princeps. He was a prodigious poet even at a young age. As an example of his diligence at school, for instance, he sent his father an elegiac poem. Upon his graduation, Forestus dedicated some of the fruits of

---

4 See de Vries, Het dichtwerk, 9–10; Oertel, 30–31.
5 “At eight o’clock, Greek grammar and forms. At ten o’clock Terence, namely, the Andria. At two o’clock, Virgil, the fourth book of the Aeneid, of course. At four o’clock I compose either essays or poems. In the evenings, I read Terence, obviously the Adelphi; on holidays I review my syntax and grammar.” Qtd. in Oertel, 33. See also J. L. Price, Dutch Literature in the Golden Age (London: Reaktion Books, 2011), 138–139: “The curriculum prescribed in 1625 gives an idea of what was regarded as the essential core of a humanist education: apart from Latin (and Greek) grammar, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid and Horace, together with some Aesop and Homer. An educated man was expected to be fluent in Latin, capable of composing Latin verse, and able to produce an apt classical tag for all occasions.”
6 ibid.
7 ibid.; de Vries, Het dichtwerk, 10. The poem concludes proudly with the following distich: jam dudum cupio patri componere carmen, / ut noscat, noster quis arte stylos.
his scholarly endeavors to his parents, including a Dutch translation of pseudo-Epiphanius’ 
*Physiologus*.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, considering his uncommon talents, on February 11, 1600, at the tender age of 13, Forestus enrolled in the University of Leiden—“eine humanistische Hochburg des protestantischen Europa”—to study philology. At Leiden, he had access to the brilliant scholars in the circles around Joseph Justus Scaliger (1549–1609), whose impressive cross-cultural studies such as the *Thesaurus temporum* (1606) were coupled with numerous editions of classical texts, including Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius (1577), and Manilius (1579). Scaliger’s post at the University of Leiden, held from 1593 to 1609, famously did not require teaching. His presence was enough, and “from his throne at Leiden he ruled the learned world; a word from him could make or mar a rising reputation; and he was surrounded by young men eager to listen to and profit by his conversation.” Scaliger’s students included Justus Lipsius, the famed scholar of Tacitus and Roman History, who left Leiden in 1590 to re-convert to Catholicism. Among the literary and scholarly stars present at Leiden during Forestus’ school days were Janus Dousa (1545–1604), the lord of Noortwyk and governor of Leiden during its victory against the Spanish in the siege of 1574, best remembered for his work on Roman comedy, and his younger son, Franciscus Dousa (1577–1606), who produced “a memorable

8 Beets, “Een word over Jan van Foreest,” 158.
9 Oertel, 23.
13 The university was founded in the following year; universities were also set up in Franeker (1585), Gronigen (1614), Utrecht (1636), and Harderwijk (1648). See Price, *Dutch Literature*, 155.
edition of the fragments of Lucilius, in which the influence of Scaliger is apparent.”15 Among Forestus’ fellow students could be numbered Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), the “miracle of Holland,” who published an edition of Martianus Capella’s De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii (1599) at the direction of Scaliger.16 Besides its prodigious classical scholarship and flourishing universities, this period also produced a flowering of poetry in the Low Countries; among the authors, Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655) and Sidrionius Hossichius (1596–1653) remain particularly worthy of note.17

Like many others, Forestus found in Daniel Heinsius, Leiden’s “literary star,” a lifelong friend and patron for his poetic endeavors.18 Heinsius was Scaliger’s student and close friend; he specialized in Greek subjects, especially Aristotle’s Poetics and influenced countless authors across the continent through his publication of the De tragoediae constitutione (1611).19 Besides his scholarly work, his poetic and oratorical output in the classical languages was prodigious, and his impact even in vernacular literature was significant.20 But Heinsius was not merely a scholar—his influence extended into the stormy world of contemporary politics. His connections with Queen Christina of Sweden in particular proved essential for a generation of scholars and artists looking to broaden their influence and cultural horizons beyond the relatively narrow

15 ibid. His older son, also Janus Dousa, had died in 1597.
18 See Oertel, 25–26 and 33 (with n. 90): “Er muß sich bald, wie auch Hugo Grotius, dem Studentenkreis um den jungen Daniel Heinsius angeschlossen haben, der damals (1602) seine Lehrtätigkeit aufnahm, und zu seinem Lehrer und Verwandten ein eniges freundschaftliches Verhältnis gefunden haben, das das ganze Leben anhielt.”
19 Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, 315: “It was through this work that [Heinsius] became a centre of Aristotelian influence in Holland.” During Forestus’ stay at Leiden, he published Danielis Heinsii emendationes et notae in Theocriti idyllia bucolica (Heidelberg, 1603). See Oertel, 34.
20 Maria A. Schenkeveld, Dutch Literature in the Age of Rembrandt (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991), 17: “For the burgeoning Dutch literature it was no small triumph that this author of international renown did not consider it beneath his dignity to use his mother tongue as a vehicle for literature.”
confines of the Low Countries and the Dutch-speaking world. For both literary and political reasons—as Forestus clearly understands in his 1649 letter (reviewed below)—Heinsius was an important man to befriend.

Alongside Heinsius and the luminaries of Leiden, the young Forestus launched into ambitious creative endeavors of his own. In 1605 he published his ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΑ Η ΗΡΩΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΙΑ ΤΙΝΑ, his first substantial poetic work. In the remarkable proemium addressed to Cornelis van der Mijle (Cornelius Mylius [c. 1578–1642]), his relative and a fellow student of Scaliger at Leiden, he insists on the importance of poetry as a diversion for those who are exhausted by the business of state. Indeed, without the assistance of poetry, he boldly claims, rulers would be unable to rule:

\[ \text{nisi quoque suppetant, qui prudentium aures deliniant, mentemque assiduis curis exhaustam aliqua suavitate reficiant, iam non amplius oneri ferendo pares esse possent: sic ut utraque pars, qua republica probe munita est, simul tandem labefactaretur.} \]

Forestus holds up the figure of Achilles as an example; he is both a warrior and a poet, and exhibits (better even than Alexander the Great!) the stable, twofold foundation of a state built on the wisdom of politics and art:

\[ \text{nemo enim sibi persuadebit fortem Achillem sola arma secum asportasse, ac non etiam citharam; nempe ut defessas gladio manus plectro rursus sedaret. quod satis constat ex hoc Homerico:} \]

\[ \text{τὸν δ’ εὐρον φρένα τερπόμενον φόρμιγγι λιγείη.} \]

---

21 ibid., 149: “Especially Daniel Heinsius had strong ties with Swedish diplomats, and among the Dutch scholars that were invited to the Swedish court during the reign of Queen Christina was Heinsius’ son Nicolaas.”


23 See Oertel, 34–36, and a text and Dutch translation in de Vries, Het dichtwerk.

24 Forestus, ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΑ Η ΗΡΩΕΣ, 3: “Unless there are also those who soothe the ears of the wise and restore with a certain sweetness their minds exhausted by constant worries, then they would not be able to bear their burden any longer—with the result that both parts by which the state is properly protected would together collapse at last.”
Forestus already foreshadows the political concerns of much of his mature poetry, as well as his view of poetry as a diversion—a *iuvenilis lusus* that has an important social and political value beyond relaxation. Even surrounded by his muses at Leiden, he clearly intended a future in government, as he makes clear in his valediction.26

The first part of the book comprises hexameter idylls on Greek heroes, particularly those of the tender and youthful variety such as Ganymede, Hylas, and Adonis. The second part is addressed to Daniel Heinsius himself and prefaced in humorously obsequious terms. Heinsius, whose mind discourses on divine topics from a celestial watchtower, will receive only *vulgaria munera* from his young admirer.27 These *munera* include an epitaph for Janus Dousa (who had died the year before [1604])—with a solemn pastoral refrain in the style of Moschus or Bion: αἲ ἀπῴχετο Δούσα, γόος μόνος ὅμιμν ἐλείφθη28—and a number of Heinsius’ own Latin poems translated literally into Greek.29 A good example of Forestus’ own Greek verses are the

25 *ibid.*: “No one will convince himself that Achilles only brought weapons to Troy and not also a cithara, obviously so that with the plectrum he might soothe his hands which were tired from war. This is clear enough from this verse of Homer: ‘They found him delighting his soul with the clear sounding lyre’ (Homer, *Iliad*, 8.186). Therefore, since my nature has given me over to this flock of followers, I do not think that I am wholly a useless burden to my fatherland, provided that I can cheer up your soul, occupied by your long worries, with this youthful trifle.”

26 See *ibid.*: Postea (*ut spero*) ubi mihi aetas non amplius inviderit, patriae utilior ero, et genere nostro, teque imprimis dignior. *Semper enim illud Homericum meis auribus insusurrat: μή τι γένος πατέρων αἰσχρόντων. This confirms the suspicion voiced in Oertel, 35: “Aber selbst bei diesem *iuvenilis lusus* dachte er wohl schon an seine Karriere.”

27 Forestus, ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΑ Η ΗΡΩΕΣ, 47: *mens enim vestra in sublimi atq. excelsa specula collocata est, ubi cum rebus caelestibus rationem inuit, quam ne ad humiliora quidem revocare sustineam ne ex tam alta arce si despexerit, e sordibus aliquid nostris contrahere cogatur.*

28 *ibid.*, 64–68.

29 For an example and an assessment of Forestus’ translations see Oertel, 35.
following elegiac lines taken from a poem addressed to Heinsius, in which he extolls the power of Eros over the poetic inspiration of Apollo:

κεῖνος Ἔρως δύναται αὐτοῖς βελέσσιν ἐφήβους
παρθενικὰς θ’ ἀπαλή θελγέμεν ἐν κραδῇ
καὶ μένος ὑμνόπολοις τεῆς ἀκραίος αῦρης
φέρτερον ἐμπνεῦσαι μάρτυς εἰ Εἰνσίαδη.\(^{30}\)

Similar themes and images reappear in the *Exequiae Turni*, particularly in the wedding dream of Lavinia, where Eros appears with devastating results (14.275–350).

Despite his early publications and scholarly milieu, however, Forestus was not destined for an academic career.\(^{31}\) After the outbreak of the Thirty Years War (1618), he served on the council of the city of Hoorn and became its mayor in 1636. From his father he inherited the office of secretary of the council of West-Friesland and the Noorderkwartier (now part of North Holland), which he passed on to his son Dirk in 1638.\(^{32}\) In addition, he was one of the directors of the West India Company. Until his death in 1651, throughout a period of intense European instability and epoch-making change, he remained a member of the High Council of Holland, Seeland, and West-Friesland in the Hague:

So hat er an verantwortlicher Stelle zunächst dem erneut ausbrechenden Krieg gegen Spanien sorgenvoll entgegengesehen, die langjährigen Kämpfe und schließlich die Siege miterlebt, die Bündnispolitik gegen die Iberer mitgestaltet und zum Schluß die langwierigen Verhandlungen mitberaten, die endlich zum Frieden von 1648 führten.\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{30}\) Forestus, *ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΑ Η ΗΡΩΕΣ*, 72: “Eros can enchant youths and maidens with his arrows in their soft hearts, and his might is stronger than your strong-blowing breath for the inspiration of the poets; you are witness to this, Heinsius.” For text and Dutch translation, see de Vries, *Het dichtwerk*, 132–135 and the brief grammatical commentary *ad loc.*


\(^{32}\) Forestus married Josina van Segwaard (1585–1657) and had five children (Antoine, Dirk, Adriaan, Anthonia, and Maria).

\(^{33}\) Oertel, 38.
His motto, appropriately enough, was *vincat amor patriae*, and his devotion in political affairs gained recognition abroad.\(^{34}\) In 1635, Louis XIII of France knighted him in the Order of St. Michael.\(^{35}\)

Throughout his political career, Forestus continued to engage with classical literature—not unusual for an educated man of letters from his time. From the regional archive in Alkmaar, Oertel has helpfully compiled a list of his unpublished and uncompleted works that demonstrate wide reading and scholarly industry.\(^{36}\) They include a commentary on the first five books of Justinian’s *Institutes*, a partial translation of Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*, and a Dutch translation of Musaeus’ *Hero and Leander*. An archived notebook reveals numerous citations from Juvenal, Livy, Martial, Sallust, Seneca, Tacitus, Valerius Maximus, and many others.\(^{37}\) He engaged just as fluently with the world of contemporary scholarship; like Vegius, his correspondence reads like a “Who’s Who” of scholars and philosophers of the 17th century: Caspar Barlaeus, Isaac Vossius, René Descartes, and, of course, Daniel Heinsius.\(^{38}\)

Forestus also continued to write and publish poetry; the works composed during his earlier career display intensely partisan themes and engage with the political tensions of the day. In 1620 he published his *Merita principis Auraicae in Belgas sive crudelitas Hispana, quam princeps ille a foederatis Belgis avertit* (1620).\(^{39}\) The book includes panygerics to Maurice, Prince of Orange (1567–1625), and numerous elegies condemning Spanish atrocities in the New

\(^{34}\) Bruinvis, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek* I, 881.

\(^{35}\) *ibid.*; Oertel, 38, n. 120.

\(^{36}\) This paragraph summarizes *ibid.*, 36–37. Oertel remarks (38, n. 119) that Forestus’ political activity has yet to be subject to a detailed treatment. For a description of the unpublished work and the archived material see de Vries, *Het Dichtwerk*, 28–34.

\(^{37}\) Oertel, 38.

\(^{38}\) *ibid.*, 37.

\(^{39}\) For a brief overview of this work, see *ibid.*, 39–41; for extensive grammatical commentary, see de Vries, *Het Dichtwerk*. 
World, which draw on the popular account by the Spanish priest Bartholomé de las Casas.\(^{40}\) The twelve-year truce with the Spanish was due to expire in 1621 and all sides were preparing for war. Unlike the pacifist views expressed in the later *Exequiae Turni*, the younger Forestus clearly supports the Dutch war of independence against the Spanish\(^{41}\) and spares the reader no graphic detail in his descriptions of the atrocious crimes committed by the Spaniards against the women and children of the New World:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Infantes pro pila habent} \\
o \text{sce\textit{lus!} infantes prendens } \text{pede}\  \text{iactat ad auras} \\
hoc\  \text{exercitium est, hoc}\  \text{recreator Iber} \\
an\  \text{pretio quemquam}\  \text{meministis ludere tanto?} \\
\text{hiuic}\  \text{puer est, aliis quod solet esse pila}.\(^{42}\)
\end{align*}
\]

Two years later, Forestus published his *Hispanus redux sive exitus induciarum Belgicarum ad foederatos Belgas*, in which he continues many of the political themes of the earlier collection.\(^{43}\) Following the expiration of the twelve-year truce,\(^{44}\) his poetry is unabashedly warmongering. In an opening poem, he recalls the history of the conflict with the Spanish, casting in vivid detail the horrors wrought by Fernando Álvarez de Toledo, the Duke of Alba (1507–1582), in his attempted suppression of the revolt in the Netherlands (1567–1573):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{prae\textit{sidet}\  } \text{Albanus, quem}\  \text{legerat ipse, Senatu,} \\
\text{accusans damnansque simul; fitque omnis Iberi} \\
\text{Belgica mancipium, dominoque addicitur uni.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{41}\) *ibid.*, 10–11: “Als jonge man was hij een fel voorstander van het voortzetten van de oorlog met Spanje, maar aan het einde van zijn leven gaf hij er blijk van, begrip te hebben gekregen voor der oorlogschootheid; dan wordt de wens uitgesproken dat er vrede mag komen.”
\(^{42}\) See *ibid.*, 27: “The Spanish use children for balls: What a crime! The Spaniards take babies by the feet and hurl them in the air. This is practice; this is how a Spaniard relaxes. Can you recall anyone who plays for such a prize? They use babies in the same way that others use balls.”
\(^{43}\) Johannes Forestus, *Hispanus redux sive exitus induciarum Belgicarum ad foederatos Belgas* (Hoorn: Aegidius Nicolaus, 1622).
\(^{44}\) See *ibid.*, 1: *otia bissenos Belgis Hispanus in annos / fecerat armorum.*
Ergo ruunt rapiuntque imis a sedibus urbes,  
et delere parant omne cum nomine gentem.  
a procerum jugulo coeptum, dein vilia passim,  
corpora caeduntur. nulli sua profuit aetas,  
nec genus aut sexus. matris cadit abditus infans  
visceribus, funus natalem praevenit, aut vix  
editus in lucem summis affigitur hastis,  
invalidique senes innixi stipites flagrant.  

Echoing Lucan’s descriptions of the madness of civil war, Forestus cries out against the 
madness of internecine conflict and demands that the Dutch take up arms against the external 
enemy who has committed so many murderers: quare agite, o cives, convertite robur in hostem.  

Happily, not all of his mature poetry explicitly encourages such violence. In 1641, Forestus, now 
an older man at the height of his career, composes the Hymen Auriacus, in commemoration of 
the marriage of William II, Prince of Orange, and Mary Henrietta of England (then aged nine 
years) on May 2, 1641. Although Forestus does take the opportunity to castigate the cruelty of 
the Spanish, much of the poem turns towards the same themes of love, concord, and 
reconciliation that characterize the Exequiae Turni. Perhaps the Hymen Auriacus explains why

---

45 ibid., 6–7: “Alba rules the council, chosen by the council itself; he both accuses and condemns. All the 
Netherlands becomes a slave to Spain and is awarded to a single master. Therefore, they pillage and destroy the 
cities from their deepest foundations, and they prepare to destroy the entire race along with its name. They begin 
with the slaughter of the nobles; then everywhere the bodies of the peasants are slaughtered. No one is protected by 
their age, nor by their class or sex. The infant in the womb of his mother is hewn out, and his death proceeds his 
birth, or just born, he is fixed on the top of spears, and weak old men burn, affixed to stakes.”

46 Lucan, Bellum civile 1.8: quis furor, o cives, quae tanta licentia ferri?  
47 Forestus, Hispanus redux, 2: quis furor, o cives, vos successistis Ibero?  
48 ibid., 10. Oertel, 42, rightly contrasts “die kriegerischen und patriotischen Töne” of Forestus’ earlier poems with 
die ganz andere Musik” of the Exequiae Turni. See ibid., 43, for brief descriptions of other minor works published 
in Forestus’ mid-life, including In victoriam navalem ad Portum Steenbergae (1629), Apotheosis Gustavi Magni 
Suecorum, Gothorum, Vandalorum etc. regis (1632), and In natalem magni Galliarum Delphini, Ad regem patrem 
(1638).  
49 Johannes Forestus, Hymen auriacus sive gratulatio ad celsissimum principem Guilielmum Frederici Henrici (Ex 
Officina Elseviriorum, 1641). But see ibid., 4, where Forestus claims to sing voce ... senili. Singing about young 
men in love seems to have had an invigorating effect for the mature author, see ibid., 8: e sene tu juvenem facis, et 
juvenilibus aptum.  
50 ibid., 1–134.  
51 See Oertel, 43–47. Oertel’s analysis of the poem is generally correct (ibid., 45): “Für das Verständnis der 
Exequiae ist der Hymen Auriacus in doppelter Weise bedeutsam: Zum einen finden wir Motive vorgeformt, die Van
Forestus did not treat the marriage of Lavinia and Aeneas in his later poem; he had recently completed a prominent marriage poem when he turned to compose his *magnum opus*.

In the background of this flourishing artistic and scholarly work—indeed, for nearly his entire professional career—the Thirty Years War raged throughout the Holy Roman Empire, involving France, Spain, the Low Countries, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, and Italy. Its various phases, punctuated by abortive treaties, invasions, and widespread discontent, lasted roughly from the so-called Defenestration of Prague in 1618 to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It was this “Christian, universal, and perpetual peace,” concluded at Osnabrück on October 24, 1648 in terms identical to the Spanish and Dutch negotiations concluded in the Treaty of Münster on May 15, 1648, that forms the historical backdrop of the *Exequiae Turni*. But Forestus would not enjoy the universal peace for long; he died three years later.

The experience of the Thirty Years War and the Peace of Westphalia clearly affected the composition of the poem in a general way; indeed, Forestus claims that the establishment of the

---


54 ibid., 303–304.

55 Oertel, 47, cites an epigram by Henricus Bruno commemorating the life and virtues of Forestus:

*columnen senatus, officina musarum*
*mensura justi, vita disciplinarum*
*medulla suadae, candor ipse virtusque*
*Forestus isto requiescat in busto.*

He also provides a succinct analysis of the epigram and of Forestus’ life as a whole: “Hier werden lapidar die verschiedenen Fähigkeiten und Verdienste des Toten zusammengefaßt: seine Rechtsgelehrsamkeit, seine lebhaft Tätigkeit auf verschiedenen Gebieten des Geistes, speziell seine Dichtkunst und, an erster Stelle, sein politisches Engagement.”
peace at Westphalia is dimly reflected (literally “silhouetted” or “made in outline” [adumbratur]) by the Exequiae Turni:

\[ conciliabit fortasse sibi quoque aliquantum favoris a lectore alter ille titulus, videlicet Exequiae Turni, quibus Martis nostri obitus et pax a Belgis et ab ipso Hispano, tantum desiderata, quodam consensu et transitione in animis adumbratur. \]

One might be tempted to go beyond this statement and find specific characters and events of the Thirty Years War represented within the poem. For example, Forestus’ King Latinus, who seems initially unequal to the task of ruler and is beset with suicidal thoughts (13.176–197), could evoke the melancholic Rudolf II (1552–1612), who, possibly experiencing depression, withdrew from public affairs and preferred to spend time with alchemical experiments and among the exotic animals of his royal menagerie. Similarly, Pilumnus’ excited arrival from the North and the threat of renewed hostilities (13.260–268) could point to Christian IV of Denmark (1577–1648), whose energetic entry into the war in 1625 extended the conflict and reversed earlier imperial successes. We might also consider Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden (1594–1632), another brilliant northerner whose innovative generalship and inimitable bravado made him a champion of the Protestant cause from his invasion of Germany in 1630 to his death at the Battle of Lützen. More broadly, the final peace established between Aeneas and Latinus (14.556–568)

56 “Perhaps that other title, that is, the Exequiae Turni, will bring some pleasure in the reader, by which the ending of our war and the peace between the Dutch and Spain, a peace so long desired, is dimly figured by a certain agreement and similarity in their spirits.” Qtd. in Oertel, 212–213.

57 See Wilson, The Thirty Years War, 65–66: “[H]e suffered from what contemporaries diagnosed as melancholia, or severe depression. His own intelligence probably contributed to this by making him acutely aware of the yawning gap between his sense of majesty and the stark realities of limited power ... He grew still more isolated by moving his court to Prague two years later, shutting himself away in the Hradschin palace, high above the city, refusing to see anyone for days and leaving important documents unsigned.”

58 ibid., 175.

59 ibid., 182: “Many contemporaries noted an impulsive streak. He was liable to violent outbursts which, though they usually remained verbal rather than physical, were soon regretted. Despite efforts to master his emotions, he remained acerbic and peremptory.” For more detail, see Michael Roberts, Gustavus Adolphus: A History of Sweden 1611–1632 (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1953).
could represent the Peace of Westphalia: *laeti parta bene pace fruamur* (14.555);  
*aeternum maneat, precor, atque immobile pactum* (14.530). These words could just as easily be spoken of the “Christian, universal, and perpetual peace” of Westphalia.

Yet, there are difficulties with each of these identifications. Rudolf II never recovered the full strength of his rule as Forestus’ Latinus does. Christian IV of Denmark and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden actually renewed hostilities, unlike Forestus’ Pilumnus. Indeed, Gustavus Adolphus died prematurely and never returned to his native land. Finally, the peace between Aeneas and Latinus is only ratified in the *Exequiae Turni*; it was previously established in the *Aeneid* (as pointed out at 14.531), making a precise connection with the Peace of Westphalia more difficult. With these uncertainties, and without precise indications, we must remain cautious about overly specific identifications with historical characters. Furthermore, in the letter quoted above, Forestus is deliberately vague. He does not claim that the peace between Aeneas and Latinus represents the peace of Westphalia, as Oertel assumes, rather, the drawn out development of the Peace of Westphalia, progressing through conflict, impediment, and delay, fraught with the fears of renewed war, is reflected (*adumbratur*) by the tortured process of the *Exequiae Turni*, the funeral of Turnus, threatened as it is by so many challenges to “an eternal and changeless concord” for the peoples of Italy that had been previously established in the *Aeneid* (as pointed out at 14.531). Forestus does not intend a precise historical allegory through the *Exequiae Turni*; rather, he represents the spirit of historical events in a general way,

---

60 “Now let us happily enjoy a peace which has been well established.”
61 “May the agreement ... remain eternal, I pray, and immovable.”
62 Oertel, 142, expresses a similar skepticism about precise historical identifications.
63 *ibid.*, 53.
“by a certain agreement and similarity in their spirits.”

2. Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni*: Plot Overview

The *Exequiae Turni* comprises two books of 610 and 568 lines. I will summarize the lively plotline as briefly as possible: the continuation begins immediately after the final scene of the *Aeneid*, in which Aeneas, moved to rage by the sight of Pallas’ baldric, kills the suppliant Turnus (12.940–952). After struggling to regain self-composure, Aeneas hands Turnus’ body back to the Italians (13.1–57). They carry the corpse to Latinus’ palace (13.58–146), where Latinus prepares to commit suicide, but is halted by Mercury (13.147–242). Meanwhile, Turnus’ younger brother Pilumnus returns and vows revenge (13.243–345), prompting a debate among the Italians (13.346–610). The second book commences with a council of the gods and an order of universal reconciliation from Jupiter (14.1–130). Jupiter sends the nymph Juturna to placate Pilumnus and Turnus’ father, Daunus (14.131–274), while Venus infuses love for Aeneas in Lavinia through an extended dream sequence that involves baroque cherubs casting garlands of flowers (14.275–351). Meanwhile, Turnus’ body is taken to Ardea and a concord is agreed between Latinus and Aeneas (14.476–568).

3. Review of Scholarship

Despite its importance in the history of the Virgilian tradition, the *Exequiae Turni* has remained relatively unstudied. In 1889, Beets discussed the early work of Forestus, but ignored

---

64 Indeed, as we will see below, Forestus would consider it a betrayal of poetry itself were he to constrain himself to a historical series of events in the composition of his poetry—to the *leges veritatis*. 
the poem entirely. In the first study of the Virgilian supplements published in 1896, Hans Kern summarized the plot of the *Exequiae Turni* and complained about the length of the speeches in the poem—a typical scholarly complaint about all the supplements: “Mit dem mittelalterlichen Epos ... hat es überdies die Vorliebe für weit ausgedehnte Reden—abgesehen von kürzeren Dialogen gegen 17—mit ihrer künstlichen Rhetorik gemein.” Most importantly, Kern simply and somewhat naively states the subject matter of the poem, the eponymous *Exequiae Turni*: “Wie schon der Titel zeigt, dreht sich alles um die Einbringung der Leiche des Turnus und die ihr erwiesenen Ehren; die Hochzeit wird in der Form eines Traumgesichtes nur nebenbei behandelt; als Abschluß sind die Friedensverhandlungen angehängt.” Indeed, throughout the *Exequiae Turni*, Turnus is a presence in his absence, and his body is the catalyst for numerous subsidiary plot arcs that occur as each main character encounters it.

It was not until 1971 that Hans Gerhard Schmidt published an edition of the text with an apparatus criticus and an introduction. Schmidt thinks highly of Renaissance prose continuations; he has less patience for the poetry, especially the *Exequiae Turni*, complaining that “Es enthält erstaunlich wenig Handlung.” Furthermore, he accuses Forestus of meticulous Virgilian imitation and of attempting to create an air of authenticity by referencing Virgilian obscura: “Foreest hat typische Situationen der *Aeneis* peinlich genau kopiert; wo er Eigenes hinzufügt, ist er um einen Anschluß an Vergils Bericht bemüht. Gern erinnert er dabei an nur einmal in der

---

67 Kern, 22.
68 Schmidt, 519. And see ibid. regarding the report given by Latinus to Pilumnus, “Sein Bericht ist, wie er selbst zugibt, ‘iam nota nimirum’; eine derartige Wiederholung stellt, das sei nebenbei angemerkt, das bequemste Verfahren für einen Fortsetzer dar, der sich nicht sehr weit von seinem Vorbild entfernen will.”
Throughout my analysis of the *Exequiae Turni*, I will challenge Schmidt’s accusations, by showing that, far from being a hack or a mere imitator, Forestus creatively challenges and reuses Virgilian material throughout his epic.

More recently, Hans-Ludwig Oertel produced a German translation and study of Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni* and Villanova’s *Supplementum ad Aeneida*. To summarize: he spends a chapter discussing the life and times of Forestus (“Jan van Foreest, ein holländischer Späthumanist”), a chapter discussing the *Exequiae Turni* itself (“Die *Exequiae Turni*: Gesamtbetrachtungen”) and a final chapter comparing the *Exequiae Turni* and the *Aeneid* (“Die *Exequiae Turni* und die *Aeneis*: Einzelvergleiche”). Oertel combines a historicizing approach with a strong interest in the structure of the poem. He plausibly explains that Forestus’ emphasis on peace in the *Exequiae Turni* is rooted in his experience of the Thirty Years’ War and a lifetime spent in civil service. Furthermore, he discusses at length the compositional process of the poem, analyzing what remains of Forestus’ drafts and letters, as well as the publication history of the work beginning in 1651, and the fate of the manuscript after the death of Forestus. He collates and summarizes much of his information from documentation in a regional archive in Alkmaar that includes unpublished letters, notes, and drafts.

Oertel’s analysis of the poem itself, however, is dominated by structural considerations. He considers the arrival of Pilumnus to be the central *dramatischer Kern*; other episodes are ring-composed around it. His first chapter, including a historical background and account of

---

69 ibid., 520. See also ibid., 521: “Seine ängstliche Verehrung Vergils erlaubte ihm nur ein genaues Kopieren der vergilischen Szenerie.”

70 A Dutch dissertation and commentary on selected Latin and Greek poems by Forestus makes use of the same archived material: Meta de Vries, *Het dichtwerk*. 
Forestus’ life and earlier works, is excellently researched and presented, and I have made use of it in previous sections. It is with his structural approach to the poem that I disagree.

The central claim of Oertel’s second chapter is that the funeral of Turnus and numerous other episodes of the poem are ring-composed as a frame around a dramatic core: the return of Pilumnus. He provides a structural outline of the poem demonstrating its rigid ring-composition, which I have reproduced below.\(^1\) Each numbered section in the first book corresponds to the same in the second book (1 with 1, 2 with 2, and so on). The central axis represents the division between the two books. The boxed section (beginning with the foiling of Latinus’ suicide and ending with Lavinia’s marriage-dream) is the *dramatischer Kern* of the poem. The dramatic core begins with the coming of night following Turnus’ death and ends with the dawning of the new day on which peace will be settled:\(^2\)

1a. Aeneas after defeating Turnus (Aeneas nach dem Sieg über Turnus)

2a. Turnus lies in state in the palace (Turnus’ Leichnam in den Palast des Latinus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning of Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatischer Kern</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Foiling of Latinus’ suicide (Vereitelung des Selbstmordes des Latinus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Pilumnus at the bier of Turnus (Pilumnus an der Bahre des Turnus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. The debate of the Latins (Debatte der Latiner)</td>
<td><strong>Central Axis (Mittelachse)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. The gathering of the gods (Versammlung der Götter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Juturna visits Turnus, Pilumnus, and Daunus (Juturna bei Turnus, Pilumnus und Daunus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Lavinia dreams of marriage (Lavinias Hochzeitstraum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>End of Night</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. The funeral procession to Ardea (Turnus’ Leichnam nach Ardea)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Oertel, 64.

\(^2\) For this chart, see *ibid.*
1b. The peace treaty between Aeneas and Latinus (Friedensschluß zwischen Aeneas und Latinus)

According to this view, the entire poem thus hangs on the narrative success of Pilumnus’ arrival: “Ohne Pilumnus wäre also dieses Supplement eine reine Zuentführung der Aeneis ohne eigenen dramatischen Kern.”

The rest of the poem, i.e. the eponymous funeral of Turnus (Exequiae Turni) and the peace treaty serve only to frame the real dramatic core of the poem: “Der Dichter wollte eine ringförmige Anordnung, bei der die Exequien und der Friedenschluß einen dramatischen Kern umrahmen.”

Because of its unity and tight focus, Oertel confidently pronounces Forestus’ poem “the most successful” of the Virgilian supplements.

In the following pages, I will challenge his thesis.

First, the structural markers used by Oertel to determine the limits of the dramatischer Kern are highly insecure. Oertel determines the limits of the dramatic core by the time of day, i.e., the events of the dramatic core happen at night, while the events of the frame take place during the day. The night begins at 13.147–148 and ends at 14.352–355:

Die Rahmenhandlung wird von dem Mittelteil noch stärker durch die Einbeziehung der Tageszeiten abgesetzt: Die Geschehnisse in ihr vollziehen sich bei Tage, während die Handlungen des dramatischen Kerns in der Nacht ablaufen ... die Wirren und das Toben der Leidenschaften werden auch geradezu programmatisch der Nacht zugeordnet, Ruhe und Frieden dem Tage.

As proof of the fact that passions are assigned to night and peacefulness to the day, Oertel cites the following lines:

interea pulsis subiit lux alma tenebris,
et nebulas animis pariter discussit et umbras,

73 ibid., 62.
74 ibid., 179.
75 ibid., 205.
76 ibid., 65.
While this seems to support Oertel’s point of correlating peace with daytime, there is no corresponding section that links the night with the passions. Rather, the coming of night at 13.147–148 describes the end of daily labors and the progression of duties through the camps.

Furthermore, the descent of Latinus from the wall and his passionate attempt at suicide (13.176–223) are not included within the nighttime events; instead, Forestus returns to pick up the story of Latinus from an earlier point in the daytime narrative. At 13.87 he describes Latinus gazing off from his usual spot on the ramparts; as he sees the body of Turnus arrive, he is unable to stay in his place, but rushes away to his quarters, where he remembers Turnus’ past glory:

\[
\textit{at pater e solita prospectans turre Latinus,}
\textit{unde acies primum, nunc et confligere vidit}
\textit{par insignis ducum totumque evolvere bellum,}
\textit{ut iuvenes cernit sublimen ferre nepotem,}
\textit{moenia deseruit seque in sua tecta recepit.}
\textit{non ea vis animo, non tamtum pectore robur,}
\textit{ut queat hunc oculis redeuntem cernere Turnum. (13.87–93).}
\]

This event clearly takes place during the daytime, i.e., before the coming of night (13.147–148); yet, when Forestus picks up the story again at 13.176, i.e., after 13.147–148, he returns to the moment when he left off:

---

77 “Meanwhile the darkness was scattered and the nourishing light returned, putting to flight the shadows and clouds from their spirits—a better day, which did not renew the slaughters and retreats, but brought rest from the cruelty of war and put an end to evils.”
78 “But Father Latinus gazes out from his usual spot on the rampart, from which he had first seen the battle lines and the equally matched leaders contend, and the entire war unfold. As he sees the young men carrying his nephew on high, he abandons the walls and hides himself in his own quarters. He does not have the power of soul, nor is there enough strength in his heart, to be able to see with his own eyes Turnus returning in such a condition.”
This too occurs in the daytime, otherwise the reference to the \textit{tenebris ... altis} would be difficult to understand, as would \textit{conspectum}. We can hardly imagine Latinus fleeing from the wall away from the \textit{sight} of the people and hiding himself in the \textit{shadows} of his rooms if the ramparts and the town were already shrouded in darkness that is only broken by the glittering of campfires (13.155). Thus, although Forestus describes the coming of night at 13.147–148, he returns to a moment prior to nightfall, recommencing the story of Latinus at the time when he flees from the sight of the people. When, following the frustration of his suicide, Latinus finally returns to his throne, he does so under lamplight (13.229), so it could be supposed (but only supposed) that nightfall has meanwhile taken place. But the suicide-frustration scene itself cannot be said securely to occur within the bounds of nightfall.

But this is not all. Oertel himself points out another awkward exception to the day-and-night markers of the \textit{dramatischer Kern}:\textsuperscript{80} the gathering of the gods at the beginning of book 14 happens in the unending day of the super-aethereal realm:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
non illic sidera nec sol
alternaeque vices lucisque et noctis opacae:
par sibi non ullo discrimine volvitur annus,
verque ibi perpetuum est atque aevi tempus in omne
una nitet sine sole dies imbuta perenni
lumine, supremi quod numinis ore refuglet.
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{81} "There, there are no stars, no sun, no alternating changes of day and dark night. The year is always the same and seasonless. Spring is eternal there and for time everlasting a single day shines without the sun, infused with perpetual light, which gleams from the face of the highest divinity."

79 “As the Father of the Ausonians descended from the walls of the city, he was overpowered by wild mourning. He fled from the sight of his people and the fathers and hid himself in the deep shadows.”
Additional exceptions include the fact that it is already dawn when Juturna visits Pilumnus (14.174–212). When she finds him, he is already awake, and is enjoying the coolness of the morning star, i.e., *Lucifer*, commonly used as a poetic metaphor for the morning:

*frigora luciferi captans roremque luentem
aethere ulcebat flagrantis pectoris aestus.* (14.177–178).\(^8\)

Here, Oertel’s position is impossible to maintain. If the dew and the *frigora luciferi* still signify the night (i.e., predawn), then the fact that Pilumnus is soothing the anger of his heart already signifies that the raging of passions is *not* programmatically assigned to the nighttime, as he argued.\(^8\) But if the dew and the *frigora luciferi* signify the beginning of the dawn, as I suggest, then Oertel’s strict division of a dramatic center and frame organized between angry night and peaceful day becomes even less convincing.

When the lack of clarity surrounding the supposed structural markers is considered (as in 13.147–148), as well as the exceptions outlined above—Latinus daytime descent from the wall at 13.176–178, the meeting of the gods during the day at 14.10–15, and the morning visit of Juturna to Pilumnus at 14.177–178—it seems highly unlikely that Forestus structured a dramatic center of his poem around daytime and nighttime markers. This organizing principle finds no mention in Forestus’ extant works, nor does it seem to divide the poem effectively.

Furthermore, when closely analyzed, the supposed correspondences between various episodes in Oertel’s ring-composed schema appear highly arbitrary.\(^9\) It is true that the human

---

\(^8\) “He was enjoying the coolness of morning and the dew dripping from the upper air, and he was soothing the burning passions of his heart.”


\(^9\) *Ibid.*, 64.
debate among the Latins at the end of book 13 (5a) could be said to mirror the divine debate at
the beginning of book 14 (5b)—but how does the foiling of Latinus’ suicide (3a) correspond to
the dream of Lavinia (3b)? Exact correspondences also are at least tenuous between the visits of
Juturna to Turnus, Pilumnus and Daunus (4b), and Pilumnus’ visit to the bier of Turnus (4a). In
fact, the arrival of Pilumnus and his Turnus-like anger seem to be the salient features of this
episode, and Oertel’s label “Pilumnus an der Bahre des Turnus” appears to be an artificial
try to draw it into closer thematic correspondence with the later visits of Juturna. These are
not both essentially bedside scenes. It is also difficult to see how the death of Turnus (5a)
corresponds to the ratification of the peace treaty between Aeneas and Latinus (5b). None of the
salient features of comparison between these scenes is adequately defined or defended by
Oertel. 85

There is a general contrast between the books: book 13 is more warlike, while book 14
focuses on peace and reconciliation. But specific scenes do not appear to correspond closely to
each other in the overly systematic structural patterning Oertel posits. Furthermore, he attempts
to justify his ring-composition schema by suggesting a numerological correspondence that
approaches a mystical gematria. 86 First, Oertel argues that the two-part division of the Exequiae
Turni into a human and a divine half mirrors the symmetrical composition of the Aeneid itself
into an Iliadic and an Odyssean half. 87 Yet he ignores the fact that the gods are critically active in

85 ibid., 65. Oertel does suggest that from the calm Mittelachse, events unfold with increasing intensity, but none of
the correspondences are exact: “Um dieses Zentrum [die Mittelachse] herum entfalten sich leidenschaftliche
Handlungen in gegenläufiger Heftigkeit: Im 13. Buch steigert sich die Emphase von Latinus, der sich rasch
beschwertigen läßt (Abschn. 3), zur Raserei des Pilumnus (Abschn. 4), zu dessen Umstimmung ein langes Ringen
nöigt ist: Es bedarf sowohl menschlicher Überredung (Abschn. 5) als auch eines göttlichen Befehls – dies steht
schon in B. 14 (193ff). Im 14. Buch glätten sich die Wogen der Emotionen von der wilden Klage der Juturna an der
Leiche ihres Bruders (Abschn. 2) zu den heiter-seligen Liebenträumen, die Venus in Lavinia erweckt (Abschn. 3).”
86 ibid., 66–68.
87 See ibid., 66, n. 70.
the first book of the *Exequiae Turni* (e.g. the arrival and speech of Mercury, 13.201–223).

Second, he argues that his three-part division of the *Exequiae Turni* (day, night, day) finds an analogue in the “more subtle” three-part division of the *Aeneid* (1–4, wanderings and Dido; 5–8, calmer center; 9–12, war in Italy), yet again ignores the fact that the second book is to a large extent concerned with the peace treaty between Aeneas and Latinus on a human level. In other words, none of Oertel’s correspondences are strictly observed by Forestus. Consequently, it is highly unlikely that Forestus was thinking about his composition along the lines suggested by 20th century formalist approaches to the *Aeneid*.

But why did Forestus write two books, and not one or three? Oertel suggests that he recognized the importance of the number seven in Virgil’s poem and was eager to apply it to the epic more broadly. This paragraph is worth quoting in full:

> Eine Gesamtbücherzahl von vierzehn weist auf die Sieben: Und diese Zahl spielt in der *Aeneis* eine große Rolle: Sieben Jahre dauert die Irrfahrt des Aeneas (1,755; 5,626), mit sieben Schiffen landet er in Libyen (1,170), aus sieben Lagen besteht sein Schild (8,448) usw. Auch als Strukturprinzip hat man die Sieben nachzuweisen versucht; zentrale Partien umfassen häufig sieben Verse oder sind in Siebenergruppen gegliedert: Sieben Verse umfassen das Proömium (1,1–7), eine Offenbarung des Jupiter (2,692ff.) und die Stiftung des Goldenen Zeitalters durch Saturn (2,692ff.); in sieben Teile ist die Verkündung des römischen Schicksals durch Anchises gegliedert (6,777ff.) usw. Es ist der genauen *Aeneis*-kenntnis und dem fienen Gespür des Holländers gerade auch für Strukturen durchaus zuzutrauen, daß er die Bedeutung der Sieben in dem vergilischen Epos erkannt hat und ihr mit zweimal sieben Büchern Reverenz erweisen wollte.\(^{88}\)

Again, his analysis ultimately relies on Virgilian scholarship from the early 1960s, particularly the structural readings of Otis and Halter.\(^{89}\) While it may be possible that Forestus noticed

---

\(^{88}\) ibid., 67–68.

recurring patterns of seven in the *Aeneid*, considered them important, and, calculating that fourteen was a multiple of seven, designed the broader architecture of his poetry so that the number of books of Virgil’s completed epic would at long last equal twice-seven, I find this highly unlikely.\(^90\) Oertel treats Forestus like a completer, who attempts to tie up Virgil’s epic according to perfect numerical unities; instead, I will argue that Forestus is a continuator. His interests lie in the continuation of Virgil’s plotlines, not the completion of obscure numerical correspondences.

After Oertel, Florian Schaffenrath has rightly pointed out that the sixteen similes of the *Exequiae Turni* rework passages from Virgil and other neo-Latin epics (such as Vida’s *Christiad*) in complex and interesting ways.\(^91\) This “rehabilitation” should by now be uncontroversial. Yet, he also argues that the similes of the *Exequiae Turni* are important for their “text structuring function,”\(^92\) but fails to substantiate this larger claim. For instance, although he does demonstrate that there is a significant number of weather similes in the thirteenth book (six), he does not prove any sort of larger structural function for them; rather, a storm describes the stormy emotions of Aeneas (13.1–15), and pacific weather describes the pacification of Pilumnus (13.601–607). In other words, the similes serve a descriptive, not a prescriptive purpose; they are, after all, similes.

---

\(^90\) Oertel, 185, also finds another ring composition in the scene of the actual funeral of Turnus (14.387–451a). The supposed correspondences seem somewhat arbitrary, and its appearance is not clearly explained.

\(^91\) Florian Schaffenrath, “Die Gleichnisse in Jan van Foreest’s Aeneissupplement im Kontext der Neulateinischen Epik,” *HumLov* 60 (2011), 276: “[Die Gleichnisse] stellen ein ideales Textfenster für intertextuelle Bezüge dar.” Unlike previous scholars such as Schmidt (see above), who viewed Forestus as a slavish imitator, or Oertel, 203, who dismisses his similes as “one-sided” (“Bei Van Foreest sind die zahlreichen, meist von Vergil angeregten Gleichnisse von auffallender Einseitigkeit [Naturerscheinungen]”), Schaffenrath carefully attempts to understand the complexities of Forestus’ similes and appreciatively notes their artfulness and elegance, e.g. *ibid.*, 273, re. the storm-simile at 13.476–481: “Auch an diesem Gleichnis lässt sich wieder beobachten, wie kunstvoll van Foreest seine Gleichnisse in die Haupthandlung integriert.”

\(^92\) *ibid.*: “[Die Gleichnisse] haben eine wichtige kompositionelle, textstrukturierende Funktion.”
Likewise, Schaffenrath argues that the atmospheric simile describing the sun appearing through the clouds in 14.424–427 (simile 15) forms a parallel with 13.402–406 (simile 9), a parallel which in his view structurally unites (“zusammenhält”) the two books. The fact that Oertel could not find a Virgilian model for these similes serves as proof for him that their main function lies in structuring and composition rather than in Virgilian aemulatio.\textsuperscript{93} Besides the obvious false dichotomy embedded in this argument, this is a grander conclusion than the evidence examined warrants. Most obviously, it must be asked how exactly the two similar similes unite the two books. Schaffenrath does not explain. While it may be true that they provide an ideal window for textual references, Schaffenrath’s structural claims, like Oertel’s, remain highly tenuous.\textsuperscript{94}

II. \textit{In ludum et recreationem ingenii mei: The Poetics of Continuation}

In pursuit of a \textit{ratio compositionis}, it may be more useful to examine Forestus’ own approach to the continuation of Virgil. In an introductory letter to Queen Christina of Sweden, to whom he eventually dedicated the poem, he describes the actual circumstances and motivation that led to the composition of the longest of the Virgilian supplements:

\begin{quote}
neve autem nullo ornatu prodirem, laciniam quandam Maronis mihi indui et titulum divini operis praetexui. non quod sperarem inimitabilem illius maiestatem (absit enim a me tantus furor!) vel longissimo intervallo assequi, multo minus, quod existimarem
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Ibid.}, 274: “Die Gleichnisse 9 und 15 bilden also eine Klammer, die die beiden Bücher des Supplementes zusammenhält. Wieder fällt auf, dass Oertel für beide kein direktes Vorbild bei Vergil finden konnte; dies ist m.E. ein Anzeichen dafür, dass die Hauptfunktion dieser Gleichnisse in der Strukturierung und Komposition der Bücher liegt, nicht in der \textit{imitatio} vergilischer Vorbilder.”

\textsuperscript{94} The influence of Oertel’s structural analysis can be clearly felt throughout Schaffenrath’s article. See \textit{Ibid.}, 265, n. 1. Other recent scholarship mostly ignores Forestus. Thus, although James J. O’Hara, “The Unfinished Aeneid?” 104, mentions Vegius, he entirely ignores the other continuators.
First, Forestus explains what he is not doing: He is not attempting to rival Virgil’s “inimitable majesty.” I think this also excludes an attempt to imitate or repeat the structural features of the Aeneid. In other words, Forestus is not trying to create a “Little Aeneid” whose plot could be divided into Iliadic and Odyssean halves after the pattern of the Aeneid, as Oertel argues. Any attempt to compete with Virgil is far beyond the humble powers of the elderly statesman, as he claims (absit enim a me tantus furor!). Second, Forestus is not attempting to complete the Aeneid, as Oertel would also have us think. This sets him apart from Vegius, a completer, who attempts to tie up the loose ends of Virgil’s poem into a theologically coherent whole. Thus, Forestus’ stated aims again diametrically oppose Oertel’s numerological theories presented earlier. Unless we assume that he was being actively deceitful, we should not suppose that Forestus thought that the Aeneid needed to be made consonant with a multiple of the number seven by the addition of two books (multo minus, quod existimarem caelesti monimento eius aliquid deesse). The question remains: Why did Forestus compose the Exequiae Turni?

95 “And so that I might not go forth without any decoration, I put on a fringe of Virgil (so to speak) and added to the title of his divine work. Not because I was hoping to rival the inimitable majesty of Virgil (indeed may such madness be far from me!), much less because I was thinking that something was lacking from his heavenly monument, or if something were lacking that it would be able to be completed by me, as if the Venus of Apelles, left unfinished by the artist, was finished by an unskilled painter.” See Oertel, 67–68. Again, cf. Forestus’ letter to Daniel Heinsius, ibid., 210–211: testor eximium candorem tuum, testor consuetudinem, vitae nostrae paene aequalem, nuncuam in mentem mihi venisses, ut inimitabilem Maronis maiestatem vel longissimo intervallo assequi sperarem, modo minus, ut existimarem caelesti monimento eius aliquid deesse, vel si quid deesset, id a me posse expleri. credis, ut spero, me, si non sapio, saltem non furere, furerem certe, si ita animum sufflassem, magis quam si quis e vulgo pictorum consummatissimam Apellis tabulam de integro elaborandam et exornandam vel Venerem ab eodem imperfectam relictam suis numeris absolvendam sibi putasset.
In the next section of his letter, he explains the *ratio* for his composition. He wrote the poem as a “pastime and entertainment” (*in ludum et recreationem ingenii mei*), i.e., “Feierabendbeschäftigung.”\(^96\) when he was allowed some respite from the affairs of state:

> sed haec sola, quam Maiestati tuae exponam, instituti mei ratio fuit. quaerebam in ludum et recreationem ingenii mei, ubi a laboribus Curiae paulum respirare licuisset, fabulam aliquam non humilis nec ignobilis argumenti.\(^97\)

It was in his leisure moments that Forestus entered the protean world of poetic composition, a world whose creations he describes in soaring and imaginative rhetoric:

> nescio enim quo pacto ficta magis quam vera poesi conveniant: in illis ingenium liberius, ut fieri solet in somnis, vagatur et inter mille imagines errans extra se, super et Garamantas et Indos abripitur. in his vero legibus veritatis ceu vinculis quibusdam astricta coercetur nec copias suas explicare poetest, adeo ut huiusmodi poesis multum sui amisisse et propemodum a se alienata esse videatur.\(^98\)

This passage uses dense figurative language that is difficult to unpack: Forestus states that *ficta* rather than *vera* are more fitting to poetry. Poems that are constrained by *vera* are not able to “unfold their powers” and are, as it were, barely poems.\(^99\)

\(^{96}\) ibid., 36.

\(^{97}\) “But this alone was the *ratio* of my intention, which I will expound to your Majesty: I was seeking some story, not of a humble nor of an ignoble argument, for the entertainment and the recreation of my spirit when it had been permitted to me to enjoy a respite from the affairs of state.” In an earlier letter to Daniel Heinsius (dated December 1, 1649), Forestus describes a similar motive for the composition of the *Exequiae Turni* (here *per ludum*): *non alia mihi mens fuit, nisi ut per ludum, ubi ab opere Curiae vacare licuisset, experirer, si ea, quae de singulis dicendi figuri a praeceptoribus artis illius acceperam, argumento quodam mihi proposito versibus exprimere et tanquam Proteus aliquis formas quascumque pro materia induere possem.*

\(^{98}\) “ Somehow imaginary things rather than true things are fitting for a poem. In imaginary things, the spirit roams more freely, as it does in dreams, and among countless images it wanders beyond itself, above even Libya and India. A poem constrained in the laws of truth is tied down, as it were, by chains, and thus is not able to unfold its true powers, to the point that a poem of this sort seems to have lost much of itself and is nearly estranged from itself.” Qdt. in Oertel, 224–225.

\(^{99}\) Oertel, 59, takes this to mean that Forestus preferred mythological epic to historical epic: “Ein fiktiver Gegenstand, wie es die antike Mythologie und Dichtung seien, erlaube dem Dichter eine freiere Entfaltung, als wenn er – wie etwa im historischen Epos – durch Fakten gebunden wäre.”
This then is Forestus’ approach to poetic composition and helps to explain his motives for continuing the *Aeneid* in the way that he did. In the composition of the *Exequiae Turni* he did not wish himself to be constrained by *leges veritatis*, which, in this case, include the unalterable laws of Virgil’s world set down by the numerous prophecies and foreshadowings of the *Aeneid*, and which extend to Virgil’s characterizations and storylines. Rather, he felt free to invent new storylines and characters, ignoring the well-trodden and familiar future assiduously completed by Vegius in his earlier *Supplementum*. Forestus is not trying to complete the *Aeneid*. This desire to wander dreamfully, lawlessly, *liberius*, led him to develop the episodes in which the ancient Latin king attempts to take his own life, in which Lavinia faints at the sight of her fallen lover and must be duped by the gods to entertain a marriage, and in which a long-lost brother of Turnus returns on a dark night from wars in the barbaric north and demands vengeance. These episodes are entirely foreign to Virgil’s epic. Indeed, if we were to assume that the plot and characters of Virgil constitute a *lex Virgiliana*, Forestus would find it a betrayal of *poesis* to follow such a law. Safely in the realm of *ficta*, he desires neither to compete with Virgil nor to complete the *Aeneid*. Only then could he compose poetry that was truly free and not estranged (*alienata*) from itself. Such a view of poetic inspiration and composition accords with his earlier vision of poetry expressed in the preface of his first poetic collection (reviewed above): Poetry is important because it creates a diversion from the business of state.

It is my contention that the *Exequiae Turni* is composed episodically, as a close analysis of its structure reveals. If the poem may be said to have a broader organizing theme, it is the eponymous *Exequiae Turni*.100 Turnus’ body is a presence throughout; each character (Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, Pilumnus, Juturna, Daunus) encounters the body and must resolve the emotions

---

100 See Kern, 22.
and complications which the encounter engenders. Aeneas encounters the body immediately and must overcome the lingering anger from the end of the *Aeneid* (13.1–77). Then Latinus views the body from the walls and must defeat his despair at having lost the war (13.87–97, 176–242). Meanwhile, Lavinia views the body and must become reconciled to the idea of marrying Aeneas, the murderer of her betrothed hero (13.118–140; 14.275–351). Pilumnus arrives and bursts into anger at the sight of the body; he must be debated for the remainder of book 13 and then pacified by Juturna (13.243–610; 14.174–228). Finally, Daunus encounters Turnus in a dream and has already accepted the death of his son by the time Juturna arrives (14.229–274). The responses to the body vary in length and emotional intensity. By the end of the poem, Forestus has created and resolved at least five plot arcs centered around each of the main characters. It is only when each individual resolution has been detailed, that the *Exequiae Turni* can close with the promise of peace in Latium (14.352–555).

Forestus’ heightened interest in the fearful emotionality of his Virgilian and extra-Virgilian characters, as well as his deep preoccupation with peace, may be rooted in the experience of the Thirty Years War. Commenting on the work of well-known contemporary poets such as Daniel von Czepko (1605–1660), Johann Moscherosch (1601–1669), Andreas Gryphius (1616–1664), and Friedrich von Logau (1605–1655), Wilson argues that “Their work was a direct response to the war that they struggled to comprehend, comment on and suggest ways to overcome the violence.”\(^\text{101}\) He is cautious about drawing larger conclusions, however, claiming that much of the poetry of the time is “introspective” and “open to diverging interpretation.”\(^\text{102}\) Yet, despite various aims, the concern with peace is clear in many of these.

---

\(^{101}\) Wilson, *The Thirty Years War*, 815.

\(^{102}\) *ibid.*
writers. The hymn-writer, Johann von Rist, for instance, whose own house was plundered in 1643, wrote two dramas concerning the peace of Westphalia: *Das friedewünschende Deutschland* (1649) and *Das friedejauchzende Deutschland* (1653), as well as the 572 verse *Friedens-Posaune* (1646). Although he does employ classical imagery, such as the allegorical figures of Mars and Peace in *Das friedewünschende Deutschland*, his primary aim is to reestablish moral uprightness as the only basis for lasting peace. Although diverging greatly in genre and in details from writers like Rist, peace also figures prominently as a theme throughout Forestus’ work.

III. CHARACTERIZATION AND CONTINUATION

In the following section, I will show how Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni* is a true *continuation* that episodically expands Virgil’s *Aeneid* and is characterized by an innovative engagement with Virgilian material. Throughout the poem, the body of Turnus will appear as the chief catalyst of its action, prompting various reactions from its five primary characters in five subplots. These are: Aeneas’ struggle for self-composure at the beginning of the poem, King Latinus’ attempt at suicide and the intervention of Mercury, Lavinia’s response to Turnus’ body and her wedding


104 *ibid.*, 254: “Only sincere penance can bring about true peace. Misery and catastrophes are caused by the fact that people live entirely inadequate Christian lives.”

105 Connections can easily be drawn between Forestus and contemporary writers in other spheres as well. For a brief analysis of Gryphius’ contemporary expressions of emotionality in a poem commemorating his sickness, *Thränen in schwerer Krankheit*, see Judith Ryan, *The Cambridge Introduction to German Poetry* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), esp. 62–64. Some of Gryphius’ emotional depictions share a broad similarity with Forestus’, in particular the lack of facial color and the use of storm metaphors. Ryan suggests a connection with contemporary medical literature, *ibid.*, 63: “According to seventeenth-century medical theory, the emotions directly affected physical states. Thus, although the speaker’s cheeks turn pale and his eyes lose their brilliance, these are actually signs of a spiritual agitation.”
dream, Pilumnus’ arrival and pacification, and Juturna’s visit to Daunus and his dream. What will emerge is a poem whose strengths rely on precisely the opposite qualities of those claimed by Schmidt and Oertel. I argue that Forestus is not a slavish imitator of Virgil, as Schmidt argues; rather, he creatively re-uses and challenges Virgil’s epic in each of these scenes. Nor does he present the arrival of Pilumnus as its single important dramatischer Kern as Oertel argues. Instead, we will see throughout how Forestus uses the story of Aeneas to reflect on the complicated process of forming a lasting peace after prolonged warfare.

1. The Troubled Hero

The first of Forestus’ characters to encounter the body of Turnus is Aeneas. The Exequiae Turni begins as the hero looks down at the body of Turnus sprawled in dust; here, seventeen centuries earlier, Aeneas had caught sight of Pallas’ baldric and wrathfully buried his sword into the chest of his pleading adversary. We recall that as the Aeneid ended, pious Aeneas was furis accensus et ira / terribilis. Yet, seventeen centuries have not been time enough for the flames of Aeneas’ anger to subside:

106 To be fair to Oertel, in his analysis of the different Szenen of the Exequiae Turni, he is aligned more closely with my views. See ibid., 88: “Für jede Szene lassen sich Vorlagen aus der Aeneis finden; aber trotz der oft engen Anlehnungen ist es Van Foreest jedesmal gelungen, eine Szene mit eigenständiger Dramatik oder mindestens mit eigenem Akzent zu gestalten.” The main distinction to be drawn here is that while Oertel admits that there is an independent drama or accent in each of Forestus’ scenes, throughout his analysis he does not relate the scenes organically to the entirety of the Exequiae Turni. For him, the exterior episodes serve to frame the real point of the poem: the arrival and pacification of Pilumnus. In my view, each episodic scene is built around an encounter with the Exequiae Turni and engenders a new challenge to Virgil’s epic. Similarly, Oertel rightly emphasizes the emotionality of the poem, but again, always insists on the primacy of the Pilumnus episode. See ibid., 181: “Forestus bringt vor allem seelische Vorgänge, sein Supplement konzentriert sich im wesentlichen auf eine Handlung, ein Drama.” This point even provides the main thrust of his comparison of Forestus and Villanova in ibid.: “Während der Holländer seine Dichtung axialsymmetrisch um dieses Seelendrama aufgebaut hat, herrscht bei dem Franzosen der Kontrast als Aufbauprinzip vor.” I will consider Oertel’s views of Villanova in the following chapter.

107 12.946–947; 951.
In this passage, it is apparent that Forestus is in no hurry to sanitize Aeneas of his anger; rather, he lingers on the furious cocktail of emotion that many readers have found distasteful in a hero marked by piety. Aeneas surveys Turnus with a pitiless glance (lumine ... torvo). Subtly recalling Vergil’s displaced fervidus (12.956), turbidus (13.4) is violently enjambed, mimetically expressing Aeneas’ disjointed frame of mind. Furthermore, Forestus likens Aeneas’ rage to waves of a dark sea (13.7–11). The effect is ghostly: The *ira* of the ocean seethes (*fervet*) and shivers (*horrescit*) with black waves (*fluctibus atris*) even after their motive force has ceased. A desire to redeem Aeneas may have motivated Vegius to write his *Supplementum*, which began

---

108 “But after Father Aeneas had finished the slaughter of Turnus, he looks with a pitiless glance over the mass of the lifeless body stretched in the dust, and in confusion his gaze wanders over it all. But the same baldric—the avenger of the blood of beloved Pallas—which first had hindered Turnus’ prayers as he pled for his life, does not allow the waves of Aeneas’ anger to subside. Similarly, discordant winds clamor on the sea, until Boreas compels them all to yield by his command alone, and finally ceases victoriously from his own gusts as well. Yet, the anger of the sea does not wholly subside at once, but still seethes and shudders everywhere with black waves—just so did the grief of Aeneas rage in the depth of his heart. Before his waking eyes Pallas, Evander, and the whole bereft house come wandering, although he had already placated the noble spirits and the just wrath of Father Evander with the blood of his enemy.”

109 See Oertel, 88.
with a saintly Aeneas looking placidly up from his murderous deed. But here an even more frightening possibility is suggested: Aeneas may continue to rage beyond the confines of Virgil’s poem, a possibility that would render its ending doubly dissatisfying. Forestus even subtly reminds the reader that any continuation of a war of vengeance would be unjustified, since Aeneas has already satisfied the just wrath (iustamque ... iram) of Evander by killing Turnus and avenging the death of his son, Pallas.

Examining the opening lines more closely, we find that Forestus describes Aeneas in 13.3 (lumine metitur torvo totamque pererrat) using imagery that recalls some of the most monstrous moments of the Aeneid. When fleeing with Aeneas from the island of the Cyclopes in Aeneid 3, the frightened sailors look back and see the monsters rolling their pitiless eyes:

\[
\textit{cernimus astantis nequiquam lumine torvo} \\
\textit{Aetnaeos fratres caelo capita alta ferentis.} \textit{(3.677–678).}^{111}
\]

Even more: the phrase totamque pererrat, is a clear borrowing from Aeneid 7, when the snake thrown by Allecto coils itself beneath the clothing and in the hair of Amata, instigating the very war that has resulted in the death of Turnus:

\[
\textit{his ubi nequiquam dictis experta Latinum} \\
\textit{contra stare videt, penitusque in viscera lapsum} \\
\textit{serpentis furiale malum totamque pererrat,} \\
\textit{tum vero infelix ingentibus excita monstris} \\
\textit{immensam sine more furit lymphata per urbem.} \textit{(7.373–377).}^{112}
\]

---

10 Vegius, Supplementum 13.23–24: tunc Turnum super adsistens placido ore profatur / Aeneas. See Kallendorf, In Praise of Aeneas, 110; Putnam, xix–xxii; Rogerson, “Vegio’s Ascanius,” 110: “Aeneas disowns the furor that characterized him in the Aeneid and apportions it to his enemy, a claim repeated obsessively throughout the Supplement.”

111 “We see them, standing impotent with glaring eye, the Aetnean brotherhood, their heads towering to the sky.” (Trans: Fairclough).

112 “When after trying in vain with words, she sees Latinus stand firm against her—when the serpent’s maddening venom has glided deep into her veins and courses through her whole frame—then, indeed, the luckless queen, stung by monstrous horrors, in wild frenzy rages from end to end of the city.” (Trans: Fairclough).
Immediately Amata begins to rage (furit) just as Aeneas does in 13.12: *haud secus Aeneae furit imo pectore luctus*. Through his exploration of Aeneas’ anger and his creative reuse of Virgilian horror scenes to describe him, Forestus dramatically raises the possibility that the broader Virgilian plotline of reconciliation, marriage, and the founding of the Roman state may not be fulfilled. For a moment we face a future in which Aeneas turns into a nightmare Achilles and tosses away hopes of the peaceful concord between Trojans and Latins in favor of a blood-soaked and impious ἀριστεία; we face a past in which prophecies have failed and the accords of destiny have been madly shattered. For a moment both the promises and the premises of Virgil’s *Aeneid* are insecure.

Yet, Forestus resolves the narrative tension in favor of the Virgilian future. Piety reasserts itself (*sed non prisca viri pietas e corde recessit* [13.16]), and then the unthinkable happens. Aeneas feels a sudden swell of pity for Turnus and notices how similar the fallen Latin hero is to Hector:

*dum stupet in vultu mentemque et lumina fixus
non iam, Turne, tuo sensimque rigescere cernit
terribiles oculos letho morientiaque ora,
suspirans graviter, *qualis sit*, corde volutat
attonito, *quantum Turno mutatus ab illo*,
inclusus mediis *qui quondam* moenibus hostis
bis pepulit totis turbantibus agmina castris.*

---

113 The Virgilian phrase *imo pectore* carries with it the context of Turnus’ blazing response to Drances (11.377) and Opis’ dismayed reaction to the death of Camilla (11.840). Neither suggest a pacific future. See Lee M. Frantuono and R. Alden Smith, *Virgil, Aeneid 5* (Boston: Brill, 2015), 439.

114 Turnus’ similarity to Hector in the *Aeneid* has also been noticed by modern scholars. See, for example, Carl P. E. Springer, “The Last Line of the ‘Aeneid,,” *CJ* 84.2 (1987), 312, where he claims, “Elsewhere in the last six books of the *Aeneid* Turnus reminds us of Hector, but nowhere so much as here. Like Hector, he is the defender of a homeland invaded by aliens. The death of Turnus means the death of the hope of the native Italians. Now with their champion gone, they will surely be crushed beneath the Trojan war machine... Like the *Iliad*, then, the *Aeneid* ends on a note of loss and a suggestion of further war and suffering.” For a close comparison of the Homeric and Virgilian death scenes, see David West, “The Deaths of Hector and Turnus,” *G&R* 21.1 (1974), 21–31 and Otis, *Virgil*, 48–51.
As Aeneas stands there, he sees the physical changes of death come over the countenance of Turnus. First, he becomes aware of the pathos of his death, how different he is in death from the Turnus who attacked the Trojan camp in book 9. Lines 13.20–21 (qualis sit ... quantum ... mutatus ab illo) are vividly reminiscent of Aeneas’ famous dream from Aeneid 2, in which Hector warned Aeneas to depart from Troy (ei mihi qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo / Hectore [2.274–275]). Here, however, the details have been mixed with Turnus’ exploits from the later books of the Aeneid. But Forestus is not satisfied; Aeneas then is astonished (percussus) to realize how similar Turnus is to Hector himself. He discovers, as it were, the surprising allusion in the poem (13.24–26). An additional line secures the connection, as 13.25 (and cf. quondam in 13.22) reuses 2.272 (raptatus bigis ut quondam). Through this intricate reworking of Virgil’s famous dream-sequence, the poet creates a narrative arc that is both unexpected and significant for the peaceful resolution between the Trojans and Latins.  

As he questions and then restores Aeneas’ self-control and piety, Forestus indicates that, for the bloodshed to end, Aeneas must first realize a similarity between the Italians and the

115 “While he stands stupefied and fixes his attention and his gaze on the face of his enemy (a face no longer yours, Turnus), he gradually discerns that the terrible eyes and the expiring mouth grow cold with death. He sighs deeply and considers the state of Turnus in his astonished heart, how changed in death he is from that Turnus who formerly, as an enemy in the midst of the Trojan walls, had twice driven back the Trojan battle lines, setting the whole camp in turmoil. Then, at once he is struck as he recalls in his mind the image of the lifeless Hector, as Achilles dragged his mangled body from his chariot. His eyes well up with tears, and he pours forth these laments from his mouth.”  
116 Oertel, 183, considers Aeneas’ initial wavering momentary and insignificant: “Seine wilde Erregung (1–6) dauert nicht lange: Nach kurzem inneren Kampf (7–15, verdeutlicht durch ein Sturmgleichnis) obsiert seine prisca pietas (16): Er betrachtet stuendenden seinen toten Widersacher (17ff.) und denkt mitleidig an dessen Kriegstaten (20ff.), ja bedauert in lebhafte Rede seinen Tod (43) ... Sein Gedicht ist also gleich von Anfang an auf Ausgleich und Versoehnung gestimmt.” In his efforts to make the poem primarily about Pilumnus and peace, he ignores the importance of shorter scenes that in his mind only serve to frame the reditus Pilumni.
Trojans, between Hector and Turnus. Looking at Turnus’ body, he finally understands that “Like Hector, [Turnus] is the defender of a homeland invaded by aliens.” As the Trojans fought against the Greeks, so the Italians fight against the Trojans. It is because of this similarity that Aeneas can begin to unite the two peoples. A failure to appreciate this similarity, on the other hand, would result in a continuous war whose end would be like the destruction and dissolution of Troy. No peace and no golden age would follow for either side. Thus, we might say that the Aeneas of Forestus realizes, through an identification of the Italian Turnus with the Trojan Hector, the discomfort that generations of readers have had with his actions at the end of the Aeneid, and this realization leads to a resolution of his anger that makes a lasting peace possible.

Consequently, Aeneas’ first speech addresses Turnus not as a wicked enemy, but as a fallen ally. If he had remained an ally, Aeneas laments, Turnus would have been another Hector whose presence would have brought fear anew into the hearts of the Greeks:

\[
\text{quantum perdiderit res Troia iuncta Latinae praesidium! ni sors vitam tibi saeva negasset,}
\]
\[
\text{inventus Danais alter foret hostibus Hector,}
\]
\[
\text{et licet eversam metuisset Graecia Troiam. (13.33–36).}
\]

118 Kern, 22, ignores this section in his analysis, noting only that “Allein trotz seines Unmutes läßt der pius Aeneas dem Feinde Gerechtigkeit widerfahren.” Oertel, 88–89, mostly offers plot summary of the passage, as often: “Diese Szene knüpft unmittelbar an das Ende der Aeneis an und führt die Handlung äußerlich fort, ist aber auf der Gefühlsenebene ihr Gegenstück: Während der vergilische Aeneas nach seinem Sieg über Turnus zunächst (12,938bff.) zur Nachsicht neigt, dann aber in schrecklichste Wut ausbricht (945ff.), hängt der Blick des Foreestischen Helden anfangsnoch voll wildem Zorn (13,3f. lumine ... torvo ... | turbidus – mit wirksamem Enjambement!) an seinem Gegner; dann aber beginnen sich die Wogen zu glätten: Seine alte pietas (16) gewinnt wieder die Oberhand, auch angesichts des erstarrenden, kraftlosen Leichnams (17ff.), der ihn an das Traumbild des toten Hektor erinnert (24f.; vgl. 2,268ff.).”
119 “How great a guardian has been lost to the unity of the Trojan and Latin endeavor! If savage fate had not denied you your life, you would have been found to be another Hector against our Greek enemies, and Greece would have feared even a defeated Troy.”
Aeneas does not blame Turnus’ madness, bloodthirstiness, or anger, as did the characters of Vegius’ *Supplementum*; instead, he hails Turnus as the *decus Italiae iuvenis* and the *stirps certa deorum*, a youth who rivaled the virtues of the ancients (13.27–28). Indeed, Turnus’ demise was caused by an excess of virtue: *non te mea dextra peremit, / sed tua te virtus!* (13.29–30). Oertel notes that Aeneas’ speech over Turnus’ body contains numerous reminiscences of his speech over Pallas’ body in the *Aeneid* (10.42–58), as does the following scene in which he replaces Pallas’ armor with his own. Thus, Aeneas mourns Turnus as one of his own, taking the first steps towards unity of the Italians and Trojans.

In the first scene of the *Exequiae Turni*, we have seen that Forestus is not a copyist or a hack, as Schmidt suggests. Although he often reuses Virgilian phrases or expressions, the context of his borrowings challenges and transforms these sources. For a moment, we see Aeneas clothed in the descriptions of Virgil’s monsters, and the entire resolution towards which Virgil’s epic strove is thrown into jeopardy. But this is only the first of several episodes in the *Exequiae Turni* through which Forestus constructs an exciting and compelling poem. We will see that there is no single *dramatischer Kern* to the *Exequiae Turni*, as Oertel argues, but rather that each scene, in its own way, contributes to a poem that episodically creates and resolves suspense through numerous narrative arcs. As the opening comes to an end, Forestus resolves the suspense in favor of a future favorable to the expectations of Virgil’s epic. At the command of Aeneas, Catillus

---

121 Conveniently, Aeneas elides over Turnus’ recent failure to live up to the strength of past heroes though his unfortunately short stone-cast (12.903–907).
122 Oertel, 88–89: “Die Worte, die er voll Mitgefühl an seinen erschlagenen Gegner richtet (27–46), erinnern an seine Rede vor dem gefallenen Pallas (11,42ff.): In beiden Reden klagt er darüber, daß so junge Helden gefallen sind (13,43 und 11,42ff.), daß Ausonien einen großen Mann verloren hat (13,31 und 11,58), und er gedenkt der unseligen Väter der erschlagenen Söhne (13,44 und 11,45ff.).”
123 *ibid.*, 89.
and Coras, the *Tyburtia proles*,\(^\text{124}\) take up Turnus’ body and march towards Latium accompanied by the Trojans and Italians together (13.78–86).\(^\text{125}\)

2. The Despairing King\(^\text{126}\)

King Latinus’ encounter with Turnus’ body causes the aged king to despair and attempt suicide; he is stopped in the nick of time by the *deus ex machina* intervention of Mercury. In this *dramatische Episode*, Forestus vividly depicts the psychological state of Latinus, using Virgilian allusions to suggest that he will fail to recover emotionally from the events of the war. Specifically, Forestus suggests that Latinus will follow his wife, Amata, in suicide. This scene imperils the peace envisioned by Aeneas at the beginning of *Aeneid* 12; without Latinus, Aeneas may be unable to ensure a peaceful unity between the Trojans and Italians.

Picking up from his last appearance at 12.707–709, Father Latinus looks down from his accustomed place on the walls of the *arx Laurens* (13.87–89).\(^\text{127}\) He catches sight of Turnus’ funeral procession approaching (13.90) and hides himself away in his quarters, unable to bear the sight of his slaughtered *nepos* (13.91–94):

---

\(^{124}\) *ibid.*, 241, n. 9; cf. 7.670ff.

\(^{125}\) Forestus builds tension in other passages as well. For instance, in his description of the opposing camps, he describes how the men still long for conflict, although it appears that things have quieted down following Turnus’ death: *sic licet armorum tempestas saeva residat, / spesque sit unius satiatum sanguine Martem, / bella ciente animis tamen, et Mars aestuat intus* (14.163–165). Furthermore, the Italians are disgruntled that their fate was decided by the death of Turnus alone (14.174–175).

\(^{126}\) This important scene is mostly ignored in previous scholarship. Kern, 23, simply states that “Den Eindruck, welchen der Anblick auf den betagten Latinus hervorbringt, schildern die Verse: [90–94].” Oertel, 90, notices a helpful similarity between 12.600 and 13.189 (see below) and suggests as a model for Mercury’s arrival 4.238ff. Otherwise, he does not develop an analysis of this scene.

\(^{127}\) We already have a hint of Latinus’ coming grief in Aeneas’ opening speech to Turnus’ body: *at non morte tua nec luctu patris acerbo* (13.42). In the following lines, Aeneas imagines Turnus’ safe homecoming (13.44).
Following Latinus’ initial appearance, Forestus shifts the scene to other concerns: the crowds view the body as it is brought to the Temple of Picus, where Lavinia recognizes Turnus and faints (see below). But at 13.176, Forestus returns to Latinus and creates an intense psychological portrait of despair. Having fled into the depths of his house, Latinus yields the reigns of his mind to grief and grovels in the dust. He is entirely unable to exercise his powers as king of Latium:

at pater Ausonium, muris ut cesserat urbis
funere perculsus saevo, populique patrumque
conspectum fugiens, tenebris sese abdidit altis.
dein animo totas in luctum cedit habenas
fusus humi faciemque immundo pulvere foedans,

Forestus emphasizes the aggregated sufferings of the king who has endured the rerum series (13.182) that now rests on him as a mentis onus. Indeed, he drowns in suffering (mergitque senem [13.183]): the twice-betrayal of Aeneas, the bloody conflicts, and now the death of his wife and nepos—Forestus cleverly reminds us that Latinus is related by marriage to Turnus

---

128 “But Father Latinus gazes out from his usual spot on the rampart, from which he had first seen the battle lines and the equally matched leaders contend, and the entire war unfold. As he sees the young men carrying his nephew on high, he abandons the walls and hides himself in his own quarters. He does not have the power of soul, nor is there enough strength in his heart, to be able to see with his own eyes Turnus returning in such a condition.”

129 “As the Father of the Ausonians descended from the walls of the city, he was overpowered by wild mourning. He fled from the sight of his people and the fathers and hid himself in the deep shadows. There he yielded all the reins of his mind to grief. He casts himself on the ground and befouls his face with filthy dust. He cannot prevail against the unspeakable weight of his sorrows.”
(nepotem [13.91]), who is the nephew of Amata. As the king considers this increasing mass of sufferings maesto sub pectore (13.188), he blames himself and plunges into despair, deciding that the best solution will be his death:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
quae simul ut maesto sub pectore cuncta volutat, 
se caput exclamat solum causamque malorum, 
omne sibi quodcunque nefas sit morte piandum, 
ex quo passus erat dissolvi foedera pacta 
cum duce Dardanio, Turnique accesserat armis.\end{align*}
\end{quote}

(13.188–192).

Forestus builds additional tension through a simile comparing Latinus’ state of mind to a stream, which rises in the winter weather and finally bursts through its banks, snatching everything with it (et rapit omnia secum [13.197]). This suggests that his suicide will have far-ranging and destructive effects. Finally, Latinus attempts to kill himself, but is stopped by Mercury, who appears suddenly at the command of Jove:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
et nunc ipse suo maculasset sanguine dextram 
ni celer e summo Cyllenius aethere missus 
afforet et magni patris mandata referret.\end{align*}
\end{quote}

(13.198–200).

While the opening scene of the Exequiae Turni imperiled the possibility of any peace between the Trojans and the Italians, this dramatische Episode challenges the specific future envisioned by Aeneas at the beginning of book 12. Regardless of the view one adopts towards

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Oertel, 243, n. 10; cf. Servius, \textit{ad} 6.90.}
\footnote{“As he considers all these things in his mournful heart, he exclaims that he alone is the source and cause of the evils, and that all the wrongdoing ought to be expiated by his death, from the time when he allowed the treaties he had established with the Trojan Aeneas to be dissolved and had allied himself with the forces of Turnus.”}
\footnote{“And now Latinus would have stained his right hand with his own blood, had not swift Mercury been sent from the heights of heaven and reported the commands of the mighty father Jupiter.”}
\end{footnotes}
Latinus’ past failures as a king in the *Aeneid*, his survival—more properly, his ability to rule—is crucial under the proposed terms of peace:

\[
\text{sin nostrum adnuerit nobis victoria Martem}
\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \text{(ut potius reor et potius di numine firment),}
\text{non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo}
\text{nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae}
\text{invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.}
\text{sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,}
\text{imperium sollemne socer; mihi moenia Teucri}
\text{constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen. (12.187–194).}
\]

Aeneas’ demands are reasonable and conciliatory—they can hardly even properly be called demands. The only concession he requests from Latium is religious: He wishes to introduce the *penates* of Troy to Italy as Hector formerly enjoined on him (2.293). Otherwise, his desire is for true concord: legal equality between Trojans and Latins. Latinus, already called a *sacer*, is to keep his arms and military command (*imperium*). Aeneas makes clear that he is not seeking to depose Latinus, nor is he entering Latium at the head of an invading army. The Trojans will build a new city for Aeneas which will be named for Latinus’ daughter, thus further cementing

---

133 Latinus’ failures as a king have been extensively debated in scholarship. Recently, for instance, see Robert Cowan, “On the Weak King according to Vergil: Aeolus, Latinus, and Political Allegoresis in the *Aeneid*,” *Vergilius* 61 (2015), 113–114, esp. n. 37: “[T]he critical debate is ... how culpable [Latinus’] actions are in ceasing to oppose the war and hiding in his palace.” For Latinus as a “good king” (qtd. in *ibid.*, as are the following) see Francis Cairns, *Virgil’s Augustan Epic* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 66. An accommodating view of Latinus’ rule can be found in Christel Balk, *Die Gestalt des Latinus in Vergils Aeneis*, Diss. Heidelberg, 1968, 80: “Doch ist sein Zusammenbruch wirklich eine Folge mangelnder Charakterfestigkeit? Ich finde an dieser Stelle keinen Hinweis auf schwächliches Versagen ... Vielmehr muss das Scheitern des Latinus im Licht seines Widerstandes gesehen werden. Er hat sich mit allen Mitteln gegen Ereignisse gewehrt, die er als frevelhaftes Unrecht gegen göttlichen Willen erkannt hat.” Cf. Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A commentary* (Brill: Leiden, 2000), ad 7.591. For an opposing view, see Gordon Williams, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 187: “[Latinus] is someone who always wants the easy way out, who is unwilling to face unpleasant reality, who knows what he should do but cannot stand firm.”

134 “But if Victory grant that the battle be ours—as I think more likely, and may the gods so confirm it with their power!—I will not bid the Italians to be subject to the Teucrians, nor do I seek the realm for mine; under equal terms let both nations, unconquered, enter upon an everlasting compact. I will give gods and their rites; Latinus, my father-in-law is to keep his wonted command. The Teucrians shall raise walls for me, and Lavinia give the city her name.” (Trans: Fairclough).

the unity between the two peoples following the marriage. But again, for this future to be realized after the death of Turnus, Latinus must survive the war—even more, he must be capable of rule along with Aeneas.

Latinus’ behavior in 13.88–94 and 13.176–181 is initially reminiscent of his behavior in Aeneid 7. Although he at first stands firm against Amata (7.373–374; cf. 7.585ff.), he abdicates his rule, and hides himself away when bidden to open the Temple of Janus:

\[
\text{nec plura locutus}
\]
\[
\text{saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas (7.599–600).}^{136}
\]
\[
\text{abstinuit tactu pater aversusque refugit}
\]
\[
\text{foeda ministeria, et caecis se condidit umbris (7.618–619).}^{137}
\]

When describing the despair of Latinus at the sight of Turnus’ body, Forestus draws heavily on these passages but creatively shifts their emphasis. In 7.599–600 Latinus abdicates political power; in 13.179 he abandons his sanity. The abdication is now interior rather than exterior. This connection is reified by verbal parallels (e.g., \textit{reliquit habenas} [7.600] \(\approx\) \textit{cedit habenas} [13.179]). Also clear are the parallels between 13.178 (\textit{tenebris sese abdidit altis}) and 7.619 (\textit{caecis se condidit umbris}); even if few words are directly borrowed, the constructions and word placement are almost identical. In this case, Forestus replaces Virgil’s “blind shadows” with “deep darknesses,” demonstrating the increased seriousness of Latinus’ situation.\(^{138}\) As the scene progresses, it is clear that Forestus’ Latinus is caught in the same cycle of despair that rendered

\[^{136}\] “And saying no more he shut himself in the palace, and let drop the reins of rule.” (Trans: Fairclough).
\[^{137}\] “But the father withheld his hand, shrank back from the hateful office, and buried himself in blind darkness.” (Trans: Fairclough).
\[^{138}\] Similarly, Latinus’ reaction to the council in Aeneid 11 provides a partial model for Forestus. As the Latins rush to their arms, Latinus deserts the council: \textit{concilium ipse pater et magna incepta Latinus / deserit ac tristi turbatus tempore differt, / multa se incusat, qui non acceperit ultro / Dardanium Aenean generumque adsciverit urbi.} (11.469–472). While verbal parallels mark a connection between Forestus’ and Vergil’s scenes (\textit{deserit 11.470 = moenia deserit 13.91; pater ... Latinus 11.469 = 13.87}), the primary similarity here is thematic: Latinus blames himself for the evils which have come to Latium, as he will in Forestus’ poem (13.188–192).
him unable to act at the end of Aeneid 12. His miserable response to the death of Amata provides the clearest model for his response to the death of Turnus:

\[
\text{demittunt mentes, it scissa veste Latinus,}
\text{coniugis attonitus fatis urbisque ruina,}
\text{canitiem \textit{immundo} perfusam \textit{pulvere turpans}.} \ (12.609–611).^{139}
\]

13.180 repeats many of the details, again with key words changed. The phrase \textit{immundo} ... \textit{pulvere} is repeated with the position of \textit{immundo} shifted; \textit{turpans} is swapped out for \textit{foedans}. Since his hair (\textit{canitiem}) is presumably still dirty from 12.611, Forestus’ Latinus befouls his face instead (\textit{faciemque}). Fusus humi remains as a faint echo of \textit{perfusam}.^{140}

Finally, Forestus suggests that Latinus will follow Amata and commit suicide. Although the expected Virgilian scenes involving Latinus have hitherto been employed as models, here he changes his model to the scene in which Amata ends her own life:^{141}

\[
\textit{se causam clamat crimenque caputque malorum} \ (12.600) \\
\textit{se caput exclamat solum causamque malorum} \ (13.189).
\]

Through this allusion, Forestus brings to a critical point the tensions built through the beginning of the Exequiae Turni. Again, he casts into doubt the prophecies of the Aeneid, in which Latinus and Aeneas share joint rule while Trojans and Italians willingly mingle their bloodlines. We face instead the prospect of Aeneas entering a leaderless town, whose inhabitants must be compelled to submit by force of arms. His marriage to Lavinia would amount to the unauthorized seizure of

---

139 “Hearts sink; with rent raiment goes Latinus dazed as his wife’s doom and his city’s downfall, defiling his hoary hairs with showers of unclean dust.” (Trans: Fairclough).

140 Although the direct model of \textit{fusus animi} may be 6.423; see Oertel, 250 n. \textit{ad loc.}

141 The similarities between 13.189 and 12.600 are noticed by \textit{ibid.}, 90: “Latinus’ Selbstvorwürfe klingen an die letzten Worte seiner Gattin an.”
an orphan whose parents had both committed suicide in despair, and whose betrothed had been slaughtered in cold blood. There would be no one to give her away.

The brutality of this future is only narrowly avoided by the *deus ex machina* Mercury who arrives and stops Latinus from the self-slaughter he is about to commit (13.189–200). As with the opening scene, Forestus creates a powerful tension but resolves it in favor of a Virgilian future. Latinus heeds the commands of Jupiter, pulls himself together, and the epic returns to the familiar tracks set out in the prophecies of the *Aeneid*. Following the speech of Mercury, Latinus is filled with new vigor and returns to his throne, spreading happiness in his wake, the image of a king at the height of his power: *sic proceres inter maiorque et laetior heros / emicat, et gradiens circumfert gaudia secum* (13.234–235). He settles on his throne to attend to affairs of state (*regni de rebus agebat* [13.237]). For the remainder of the *Exequiae Turni* he will play key roles: welcoming Pilumnus (13.346–396), demanding peace (13.525–596), and brokering the final treaty with Aeneas (14.451–568). All is now as it should be; the situation of Latinus returns to 7.46–47: *rex arva Latinus et urbes / iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat ...*

Forestus has complicated Virgil’s ending through a psychological inquiry into Latinus’ character. While Vegius’ Latinus immediately rejoiced at the defeat of Turnus and welcomed the victorious Aeneas to the promised peace in Latium, Forestus’ Latinus realistically retains—at least at first—many of the same weaknesses that he displayed in Virgil’s epic: He cannot face conflict or sadness, but rather hides from his responsibilities as he did so often in the *Aeneid*.\(^{142}\) Furthermore, the death of Turnus deeply affects the old man. But this should be expected; after all, Turnus is related to Latinus, and the king has just lost his wife and many of his countrymen.

\(^{142}\) As pointed out by Oertel, 89, but without additional analysis: “Latinus, der hier den Anblick des Toten nicht erträgt und sich in seine Gemächer zurückzieht (13,87ff.), flieht auch dort wiederholt vor der Schrecklichkeit der Realität.”
Forestus suggests that these disasters cannot be merely papered over. Peace will not be as easy as the removal of Turnus, and the achievement of a golden age will not be straightforward. Latinus’ attempt at suicide provides another challenge to the future foretold in the *Aeneid*, and dramatically threatens to upend the unity of Latins and Trojans.\[^{143}\] Thus, again it is evident that Forestus creatively reuses Virgilian material—and once again the arrival of Pilumnus proves to be not the exclusive *dramatischer Kern*, but rather one of many *dramatische Episoden* that repeatedly challenge the afterlife of Virgil’s epic.

3. Married in a Dream\[^{144}\]

Aeneas has controlled his wrath; the gods have filled Latinus with new hope—but what about Lavinia? As with Aeneas and Latinus, Forestus’ psychological characterization of Lavinia dramatizes what Vegius’ *Supplementum* presents as a straightforward postwar romance. The sight of Turnus’ body causes the virgin to faint in shock and horror (13.118–140). To convince her to marry Aeneas, the gods must conspire to send Venus to infuse her mind with amorous dreams involving the Trojan captain (14.275–351). In this *dramatische Episode*, Forestus suggests that Lavinia may not fall in love with Aeneas—or wish to marry him. This sequence imperils the peace envisioned by both Aeneas and Latinus, as well as the many prophecies of the *Aeneid* (2.780–784, 6.86–97, 7.96–101, 7.255–258, 268–273, 12.821–825, 12.937). The consummation of the union is left insecure and the marriage never happens outside of Lavinia’s

\[^{143}\] See Eckmann, 68, who agrees with this assessment of Latinus’ importance: “Für das historische Telos der *Aeneis* ist es notwendig, dass der König der Latiner, dessen Volk sich mit den (unverwandten) Trojanern verbünden soll, die göttliche Mission anerkennt und affirmiert, damit das Heimkehr-Motiv der Trojaner zu ihrem eigentlichen Vaterland legitimiert wird und deren ‘Landnahme und Herrschaftsanspruch kein Akt der Aggression darstellt’.”

\[^{144}\] See Oertel, 89–90 and 94–95, for brief analyses of the passages reviewed in this section. Kern, 28–29, only offers plot summary, as usual.
dream. At the end of the poem, the nuptials are put off for a happier occasion (14.556–568). In other words, Forestus never completes this moment of continuation.

In the Aeneid, Lavinia is an enigmatic—and controversial—figure whose silence belies her importance, an importance felt throughout the epic. Already in the second line of the first book, the adjective “Lavinian” is emphatically juxtaposed to the “fugitive” Aeneas: *Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit / litora* (1.2–3). The shade of Creusa commands Aeneas to leave Troy without her and sail to the land of Hesperia (yet unknown to Aeneas), where he will find *res laetae, a regnum*, and a *regia coniunx* (2.783). In book 6, the Sibyl references the marriage-to-be (6.93–94), and Anchises shows Aeneas the spirits of his descendants yet unborn who will come about from his marriage to the Italian princess (6.760–766). When we meet Lavinia at last in Latium, she is the focus of a portent which presages war (7.71–80). In a dream, Faunus clarifies to King Latinus the meaning of the portent with a prophecy whose words confirm the destiny of Lavinia (7.91–101). It is for her sake that the war is fought in Latium between Aeneas and Turnus; the poet singles her out as the *causa mali tanti* (11.480).

The most extended description of Lavinia occurs at the beginning of book 12. When Turnus announces his intention to return to war, Lavinia famously (and cryptically) blushes, a blush that has been read as concealing amorous feelings for the headstrong Latin hero:

\[
\text{[诗句]} \\
\text{accepit vocem lacrimis Lavinia matris} \\
\text{flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem} \\
\text{subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.} \\
\text{Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro}
\]


Regardless of her feelings for Turnus, Lavinia is in a difficult situation. As Formicula has recently pointed out, Virgil’s Lavinia “must abandon her fiancé and marry his very assassin, whose deed shall provoke her mother’s suicide, and who shall sit upon the throne her father presently occupies.”

In my analysis of Forestus’ treatment of Lavinia, it will become apparent that the Dutchman is sensitive to the difficulties of Lavinia’s position at the end of the Aeneid and presents us with a Lavinia who has indeed fallen in love with Turnus.

In the Exequiae Turni, as Turnus’ body is carried into the hall, Lavinia watches from behind a screen, accompanied by her attendants. As she encounters the body of her betrothed, she is a regia virgo; her appearance is at once dispassionate and emotional, a whirl of complexity; Forestus gives her an interior life:

nullus in ore colo, nihil est in lumine laetum;
sed lacrymae gemitusque absunt, nec visa dolore
nec gaudere novo tantarum turbine rerum
volvit ibi venterTacito sub pectore sortes
fatidici moitusque patris portentaque divum,
haec quamcunque ferant fortunam, ferre parata. (13.121–126).

What has happened? Instead of Vegius’ joyful and starry-eyed bride, we meet a pale woman without happiness in her eyes (nihil est in lumine laetum), stoically prepared to endure Aeneas’

---

147 “Lavinia heard her mother’s words, her burning cheeks steeped in tears, while a deep blush kindled its fire, and mantled o’er her glowing face. As when one stains Indian ivory with a crimson dye, or as when white lilies blush with many a blended rose—such hues her maiden features showed.” (Trans: Fairclough).
149 “Her face is colorless and happiness is gone from her eyes. Nevertheless, she does not weep or sigh, nor does she appear to mourn or rejoice at the new whirlwind of great events. There she considers the ancient fates silently in her heart, the warnings of her prophetic father, and the portents of the gods. She is prepared to endure whatever fortune these things bring.”
arrival. But this is more color than she ever had in Virgil. As Oertel rightly points out, “Die Lavinia des Supplements erscheint konturenreicher und selbstbewusster.” Forestus understands that Lavinia’s position is not an easy one, and so he graces her with an interior strength, a determination in the face of misfortune. Regardless, her relative obscurity in the *Aeneid* gives Forestus a wide berth to develop her character in the *Exequiae Turni*.

Oertel does not list any Virgilian parallels for this passage, but Forestus still subtly challenges Virgil’s epic by upending his famous descriptions of the maiden and suggesting that Lavinia remains in love with Turnus. In 13.121–126, he deliberately undoes each aspect of Virgil’s famous description. While Virgil’s Lavinia bathed her cheeks in tears (*flagrantis perfusa genas*), the Lavinia of Forestus has dry cheeks (*sed lacrymae gemitusque absunt*). While Virgil’s Lavinia blushed like ivory stained with crimson dye, the Lavinia of Forestus remains pale (*nullus in ore color*). Virgil’s fiery imagery (*ignem, calefacta*) is entirely absent, as is the weeping of 12.64–69 and 12.607–609. The amorous glow of Virgil’s Lavinia has been replaced with a pallor and a cold resolution. Catching sight of Turnus’ menacing and unrecognizable face, Lavinia

---

150 To bring additional life to Lavinia’s situation, Forestus also borrows from Ovid, *Amores*, 2.11.28, in which the poet describes Corinna’s hypothetical fear on a stormy sea: *quam tibi nunc toto nullus in ore color!* This borrowing may bring with it a context of fear of separated love. But while Ovid uses the phrase to refer to the fearful poet’s imagination of Corinna’s distress following her departure, Forestus applies it to Lavinia’s distress following the permanent departure of her lover. Once again, his re-use of his classical sources—not only Virgil—is creative and unexpected. Ovid, *Medicamenta*, 98, is another possible source, but lacks the context of separated love.

151 Oertel, 89. As usual he, *ibid.*, 90, summarizes the scene but offers little analysis: “Wir erfahren von ihren Gefühlen (122f.) und Gedanken (124ff.) und von ihrem Entschluß, sich dem Schicksal, d. h. der Verbindung mit Aeneas, zu fügen: eine gute Basis für das Wirken der Liebesgöttin in Szene 14.3!”

152 Lavinia’s main appearances in the *Aeneid* are the prodigy-scene (7.71–78), the famous blush (12.64–69), the temple of Pallas (12.477–480), and her mourning for her mother (12.604–607). For a similar emotional development of a character in the context of a “continuation,” see the adaptation of Agamemnon in the 1st century *Ilias Latina* (13–80), and Glei, *BCPSR*, esp. 38–40. Some of the same problems that have plagued scholarship on Forestus can also be seen in Glei’s piece, i.e., scorn and unfavorable comparisons with prior poems with drastically different contexts and aims, e.g., *ibid.*, 49, “Despite its shortcomings regarding narratology and emotional value, the I L *Ilias Latina* can be seen as a Roman continuation of the *Iliad* following in Virgil’s footsteps, though his shoes prove too large to fill.” There is clearly more work to be done here.
collapses—*labitur exsanguis* (cf. *sanguineo* [12.67])!—and is borne off by her companions to her bedchamber. At the same time, Turnus is placed in a bier in the middle of the hall:

*labitur exsanguis comitumque excepta lacertis mollibus, in thalamum fertur stratoque locatur: et simul in strato media dux Daunius aula floribus extracto variis et suavibus herbis porrigitur; lacrymisque humescunt atria fuscis.* (13.130–134).

Forestus increases the pathos, reminding us of Turnus’ father (*dux Daunius*), and joining Lavinia and Turnus in a mocking shadow-marriage: *stratoque locatur / et simul in strato*. Thus, cruelly, both go to bed together; but one is literally and the other figuratively dead, and each is placed in a different bed by others. Forestus’ Lavinia is in no shape to marry anyone, much less the murderer of Turnus.

While Lavinia’s response to Turnus’ death only *suggests* that she loves him, it is Jupiter who recognizes her feelings for Turnus and understands the importance of ending them quickly. If Lavinia refuses to marry Aeneas, the entire *Aeneid* is for naught. Jupiter’s last—and perhaps most important—command at the council of the gods (14.1–51) is to Venus:

*tu, Cytherea, tuis pectus rude virginis ure ignibus; Aenean animo fac induat omnem atque abole Turni si quidquam corde supersit.* (14.49–51).

Jupiter commands Venus to “clothe” the mind of Lavinia with Aeneas, an action that is mirrored by the concatenated word order (*Aenean animo fac induat omnem*). Furthermore, she is to

---

153 And Camilla’s death at 11.818; Oertel, 246, n. 130.
154 “Lavinia grows pale, faints, and is caught up by the gentle arms of her companions. She is carried to her chamber and laid on her bed. Meanwhile Turnus is laid out on a bier in the middle of the great hall, a bier piled with various flowers and pleasant herbs. The hall is wet with tears shed by the mourners.”
155 “And you, Venus, inflame the inexperienced heart of the virgin with your fires. Make her love Aeneas entirely and destroy whatever remains of Turnus in her heart.”
destroy whatever of Turnus remains in her heart. Thus, even if Lavinia were not still in love with Turnus, she is certainly not in love with Aeneas. But as things stand, action is required on both counts. Perhaps it is significant to point out that Jupiter commands Venus to create love for Aeneas “in her mind” (animo), and to destroy what remains of Turnus “in her heart” (corde).

Venus’ ability to induce unwilling Virgilian heroines into self-destructive spirals of amorous infatuation requires little introduction. The language of Jupiter’s command is a striking return to the Virgilian imagery of fire and love (ure, ignibus), which characterized Lavinia’s blush in 12.64–69—but more appropriately, it recalls Cupid’s destruction of the memory of Sychaeus in the mind of Dido:

\begin{quote}
\textit{at memor ille}
\textit{matris Acidalitae paulatim abole} \\
\textit{Sychaeum}
\textit{incipit et vivo temptat praeverttere amore}
\textit{iam pridem resides animos desuetaque corda.} (1.719–722).\footnote{156 “But he, mindful of his mother, little by little begins to efface Sychaeus, and essays with a living passion to surprise her long-slumbering soul and her heart unused to love.” (Trans: Fairclough).}
\end{quote}

While Virgil’s Cupid effaces the memory of her husband in Dido (abolere Sychaeum), Forestus’ Jupiter commands Venus to destroy any remnants of Turnus in Lavinia (abole Turni si quidquam ... supersit). Furthermore, the heart of Dido, which has grown unaccustomed to love (desuetaque corda), is replaced with the virgin Lavinia’s innocent and inexperienced breast (pectus rude). Once the memory of Sychaeus is removed and the living passion has returned, Dido is seized with blind fire (caeco carpitur igni [4.2]) which leads her ultimately to self-delusion and suicide. Similarly, Forestus’ Jupiter commands Venus to burn the heart of Lavinia with her fires (tuis ... / ignibus). When Forestus’ Virgilian models are accounted for, the actions of his Venus and Cupid take on a sinisterly purposeful tone.
The actual seduction of Lavinia is ruthless. Venus and Cupid come upon the girl as she gently sleeps, exhausted by the heartbreaking day. After recovering from her earlier faint, Lavinia has spent the night in tears, weeping for the sad fate of her house and her cares for the future, sadness for the loss of Turnus and Amata, and concern for her upcoming nuptials to the vagabond Asiatic whose arrival has wreaked such destruction in Italy (14.280–283). First, Cupid gets to work: He scatters all anxieties from Lavinia’s mind, removing the political and prophetic concern which has so far been a refreshing but un-Virgilian characteristic of the Forestian Lavinia (see 13.124–126 above). In its place he adds different feelings and emotions: *datque alios sensus, alios dat pectore motus* (14.285). Lavinia’s mind is disposed to love and she is homoeerotically embraced for the first time by Venus, who kisses her and drugs her with a dream:

\[sic\ Venus affectae geminis affunditur ulnis\]
\[incumbens leviter nymphae roseumque iacentis\]
\[applicat os ori roseo, captisque sopore\]
\[sensibus illudens inspirat mille figuras.\] (14.287–290).\(^\text{157}\)

Forestus mimetically presses the divine mouth against the rosy mouth of the virgin *os ori roseo*, and the sibilant “shushing” sounds mimic Venus’ deceiving whispers: *captISque SOPore /
SENSIBUS illuDENS inSPIrat mille figuRAS*. The sleeping mind of the maiden is whisked above the aether (14.291).

The marriage dream is both deceptive and effective. As cupids soar through the heavens like dolphins, Lavinia meets a handsome and unreal Aeneas. The cupids, eager for booty (*par vulgus Amorum / exercet studium praedae* [14.307–308]), strip (*carpunt* [14.310]) golden apples and plunder the fields of their flowers (*floribus halantes hortos et suavibus herbis / depopulant*

\(^{157}\) “As Lavinia’s mind was changed, Venus embraced the girl with both arms. Leaning lightly over the maiden, Venus pressed her lips to the rosy lips of the sleeping girl, and teasingly inspires a thousand images into her sleep-entangled senses.”
alii [14.311–312]), creating a background tinged with undertones of violence (and cf. the

*Georgics*-derived battle-bee simile [14.302–307]). Meanwhile, Lavinia is completely infatuated

with her shadow-lover, endlessly gazing upon him and delighting in his presence:

\[
\text{praesens illum desiderat usque}
\]
\[
\text{praesentem gaudetque tuens sine fine tueri}
\]
\[
gratus ab Aenea est omnis locus, omnis ab illo
\]
\[
\text{forma placet ludi. (14.325–328).}^{158}
\]

Yet, Venus is still concerned that Lavinia is not fully reassured:

\[
\text{neve aliquid vero falsa sub imagine desit}
\]
\[
\text{connubii speciem nurui Cytherea futuri}
\]
\[
\text{exhibet atque animum propiori pignore firmat. (14.332–334).}^{159}
\]

These lines are immediately reminiscent of Forestus’ theory of poetic composition from the
dedication to Queen Christina and the letter to Daniel Heinsius quoted above:

\[
\text{nescio enim quo pacto ficta magis quam vera poesi conveniant: in illis ingenium liberius,}
\]
\[
\text{ut fieri solet in somnis, vagatur et inter mille imagines errans extra se, super et}
\]
\[
\text{Garamantias et Indos abripitur.}^{160}
\]

Lavinia is doubly deceived. She wanders among *mille figuras* (14.290, \(\approx\) *inter mille imagines*)

that are inspired into her *sopitam ... mentem* (14.291, \(\approx\) *in somnis*) in which she travels *longe

super aethera* (14.291, \(\approx\) *super et Garamantias et Indos*). Furthermore, the goddess is explicitly
duping her (*illudens*) and freeing her wandering senses (*errantes ... sensus* [14.350], \(\approx\) *errans
extra se*). The “true” vision of the wedding is hopelessly celestial, with the entire assembly of the

---

158 “When she is in his presence, she desires that he always be present, and she rejoices to look at him, gazing on

him endlessly. Every place pleases her because of Aeneas, and all the games are pleasing because of him.”

159 “So that nothing might fall short of the truth and present a false appearance, Venus shows an image of the

wedding of her future daughter-in-law and reassures her mind with a more appropriate pledge.”

160 Qtd. in Oertel, 224–225.
gods in attendance (namque affuit omnis / caelicolum coetus [14.341–342]). Lavinia is seated next to Jupiter, with Juno to the left of Aeneas (14.342–343); Juno, Minerva, and Venus drink together, forgetting their ancient quarrel and bringing the Trojan conflict to an end (14.343–345). But Lavinia will never be married in heaven at the side of Jove. Although it all appears true, nothing that she sees is the truth; all of it is a dream within a poem.

Thus, the wedding dream sequence is hardly a “cheerful counterpart” to Virgil, as Oertel claims: “Diese Tragödie hat Van Foreest zur Vorlage genommen, um ein heiteres Gegenstück zu gestalten.” For a few lines (13.118–126), Forestus presented Lavinia with political acumen and interior strength of will, whose decision to marry Aeneas could have been the result of genuine love or a sacrifice to save her people and fulfill the prophecies given to her father. Indeed, it seemed entirely possible that Lavinia could have refused her marriage and overturned the prophecies of Virgil’s epic. Yet, the gods cannot allow Lavinia to develop, to mature, or even to speak; instead, they delude and dupe her, molding and melting her concerns and resolve like wax in the fire of desire, the same desire which inflamed both Dido and Turnus. The maiden is seduced in a glorious haze: shiny, baroque, and entirely unreal. The blossom-clad Aeneas and god-attended wedding are a far cry from whatever her actual marriage will be. This resolution is particularly deceitful: Lavinia is forced to fall in love, as we know she must. But Forestus has allowed us to glimpse a world in which this never happens.

To summarize so far: I have first demonstrated how Forestus dramatizes Aeneas’ wrath as he gazes on the body of Turnus. Rather than a quick and easy resolution, his Aeneas struggles to maintain composure and almost continues his ἀριστεία. I have subsequently argued that

\[161\] Oertel, 94. Contrast also *ibid.*, 195, where he interprets the wedding scene as an encomium to Forestus’ basic theme of peace: “Forestus hat also auch diese Szene durch und durch in echt vergilischer Kunst mit seinem Grundmotiv, der Verwirklichung des Friedens, gefärbt.”
Forestus follows the same narrative pattern with King Latinus: Latinus encounters the body, and his despair at the loss of his nepos causes him to attempt suicide. Now here, I have examined a broader plot arc that spans both books of the *Exequiae Turni*. Lavinia is not initially a willing bride; rather, as she gazes on Turnus’ body, Forestus hints that she was in love with Turnus. Venus and Cupid must seduce her into assenting to the marriage with Aeneas. Each one of these scenes is similar: An encounter with Turnus’ body (the *exequiae Turni*) leads to an emotional complication in one of Virgil’s characters, which, after intense dramatization, is resolved in favor of the future foretold in numerous Virgilian prophecies.

4. Vengeance from the North

The narrative arc which comprises the arrival of Turnus’ brother, Pilumnus, and the subsequent fallout largely follows Forestus’ previously mapped *modus operandi*. Like the three prior episodes, Pilumnus arrives and encounters Turnus’ body (13.243–345); this encounter leads him to demand a renewal of hostilities against the Trojans (13.397–469); the tension is resolved through a debate under the leadership of King Latinus (13.470–596), and Pilumnus’ willingness to surrender his anger is finally confirmed by a visit from Juturna (14.174–228). The primary difference between this episode and the previous three is of course that Pilumnus does not appear as a character in the *Aeneid*; instead, Forestus creates his character and background out of whole cloth and inserts him into a story that was otherwise tending steadily (if tensely) towards a conclusion. I will show that in this episode Forestus uses his sources creatively (primarily the *Aeneid*) as previously. I will also argue that, although the character of Pilumnus is un-Virgilian,
Forestus retains the familiar pattern of encounter with the *Exequiae Turni*, emotional complication, and resolution.

He begins the story of Pilumnus by implanting him in the family tree as the younger brother of Turnus, creatively challenging and combining classical sources:

\[ \text{ediderat Dauno quater alma Venilia prolem} \\
\text{foemineam semel atque iterum, bis deinde virilem.} \\
\text{horum Turnus erat maior; Pilumnus avito} \\
\text{nomine praeclarus, minor haud virtute, sed annis.} \quad (13.243–246) \]

As far as antiquity knew, Venilia (the daughter of the elder Pilumnus) gave birth to three children only: Turnus (10.76), Canens,\(^{163}\) and Juturna (12.138–139). The father of Canens, however, was Janus, not Daunus.\(^{164}\) Here, Forestus securely unites Venilia and Daunus, giving them two daughters (Juturna and, presumably, Canens) and two sons (Turnus and Pilumnus). In the *Aeneid*, Pilumnus is Turnus’ grandfather: Turnus rests in Pilumnus’ grove at the beginning of *Aeneid* 9,\(^{165}\) and Pilumnus is mentioned by Juno as the grandfather of Turnus in her speech to Jupiter in *Aeneid* 10.\(^{166}\) Forestus nods to Virgil, reminding us that the younger Pilumnus is named for his illustrious ancestor (*avito / nomine praeclarus*; cf. 10.76). Furthermore, Pilumnus appears to be Turnus’ equal in virtue (*minor haud virtute*), which should be disturbing to the

\[^{162}\] “Kindly Venilia had given four offspring to Daunus, two daughters and then two sons. Of the two sons, Turnus was the elder. His brother Pilumnus possessed the illustrious name of his ancestors and was equal to Turnus in virtue, but younger in years.”

\[^{163}\] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 14.338. Canens is not named in the *Aeneid*, but a younger sister, the wife of Numanus, is mentioned at 9.590–594. See Oertel, 257, n. 29.


\[^{165}\] 9.3–4: *luco tum forte parentis / Pilumni Turnus sacrata valle sedebat.*

\[^{166}\] 10.74–76: *indignum est Italos Troiam circumdare flammis / nascentem et patria Turnum consistere terra, / cui Pilumnus avus, cui diva Venilia mater.* Otherwise, mentions of Pilumnus are scarce in antiquity: Minutius Felix, *Octavius*, 25.8; Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia*, 18.3.
reader, since it was the *virtus* of Turnus which (according to Aeneas) led to his destruction (13.29–30).

But where has Pilumnus been all this time?\textsuperscript{167} Why has he missed the war? Here too Forestus is required to manipulate classical sources to create a fitting alibi: Since Daunus had allied himself to a certain king Brennus, who was engaged in a war against Antenor and his Venetian allies, Pilumnus had been sent north to aid the northern Italians against another Trojan menace. The war had been unsuccessful, and Pilumnus had taken leave of King Brennus (13.247–259; also, the *argumentum*). Brennus is known from Livy as a chieftain of the Senones; he famously sacked Rome in 387 B.C.\textsuperscript{168} Antenor appears in 1.242–249, where Venus tells the story of his escape from Troy and his peaceful founding of Patavium (Padua)—an obvious counterpoint to Aeneas’ struggles:

\begin{quote}
  *hic tamen ille urbem Patavi sedesque locavit*
  Teucrorum et genti nomen dedit armaque fixit
  Troia; nunc placida compostus pace quiescit.* (1.247–249).\textsuperscript{169}
\end{quote}

Forestus’ brief story of the war against Antenor follows the same narrative pattern that has characterized the *Exequiae Turni*. Virgil’s Antenor never encounters conflict—he founds the town of Padua, names his people, hangs up his arms, and remains at peace. Indeed, it is precisely the ease with which he has achieved his goals that causes Virgil’s Venus to use him as an example in her speech to Jupiter. But here we learn that things were not as peaceful as they appeared in the *Aeneid*. Apparently, the Italian natives regroup and counterattack the Trojan invaders and their (anachronistically) Venetian allies. Ultimately, Antenor is successful:

\begin{footnotes}
\item[167] Oertel, 82 and 257, n. 30.
\item[168] Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 5.38ff.
\item[169] “Yet here he set Padua’s town, a home for his Teucrians, gave a name to the race, and hung up the arms of Troy; now, settled in tranquil peace, he is at rest” (Trans: Fairclough).
\end{footnotes}
Brennus’ forces are broken, and the Trojan and Venetian races are happily united (13.251–255). It is important to note that here again Forestus dramatizes the afterlife of a Virgilian story—in this case, a minor one—but ultimately returns to the familiar plotline of the *Aeneid*. He follows the same pattern, even in the background.

Pilumnus’ return to Latium shatters the momentary stability that descends after Latinus’ return to the throne (13.224–237). As frequently, Forestus employs Virgilian allusions to suggest that hostilities between the Trojans and the Latins will resume. The rumor of Pilumnus is sensed by the youth of Italy, and, suddenly, *tumultus* reigns again:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ut se composuit solio patribusque vocatis} \\
&\text{et ducibus primis regni de rebus agebat,} \\
&\text{miscuit ingenti nova res oblata tumultu} \\
&\text{moenia cum castris Rutulum Troianaque castra} \\
&\text{arma fremit, rapit arma simul Mavoria pubes. (13.236–240).}\end{align*}
\]

The description of *Mavoria pubes* raging for their weapons has several Virgilian models, including the famous scene when Turnus is driven mad by Allecto and rages wildly for weapons:\(^{171}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit;} \\
&\text{Saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli,} \\
&\text{ira super. (7.460–462).}\end{align*}
\]

Another model is furnished by the description of Italian youth, who rage for arms as the Italian council dissolves into renewed warfare:

---

\(^{170}\) “As he settles himself on his throne and calls the fathers and the princes, he begins to consider the most important affairs of state. But a new event comes to their attention, which stirs up the walls and camps of the Rutulians and the camps of the Trojans into confusion. The warlike youth clamor for arms and snatch them up at once.”

\(^{171}\) See Oertel, 254, n. *ad* 13.240.

\(^{172}\) “For arms he madly shrieks; arms he seeks in couch and chamber; lust of the sword rages in him, the accursed frenzy of war, and resentment crowning all.” (Trans: Fairclough).
Both Virgilian models mark acute crises where fighting begins (Turnus) or resumes (the Italian youth). Here again, Forestus suggests that the coming of Pilumnus marks the reemergence of conflict in Italy. Virgil’s words are rearranged and set into another strongly dactylic line that crackles with excitement.

As with Aeneas, Latinus, and Lavinia, Pilumnus’ encounter with Turnus’ body creates an emotional complication that builds a tension. Pilumnus arrives (13.260–268), meets the sad townsfolk (13.269–284), and is debriefed by Messapus (13.285–295). An understanding of the true state of events in Latium begins to dawn. As he approaches the bier of Turnus, he realizes that the stories of the townsfolk and Messapus are true, and that his brother truly has fallen:

\[
\text{tum vero, haud animi dubius de funere fratis,} \\
\text{quod videt, e luctu in furiæ exarsit et iras,} \\
\text{sed lacrymas cum voce premit. furor micat ore} \\
\text{scintillatque oculis atque irae fulmina vibrat. (13.299–302)}.
\]

Pilumnus’ response to Turnus’ body is not a wavering anger (as in the case of Aeneas); it is not despair (as in the case of Latinus) or mourning (as in the case of Lavinia), but wrath. His emotions pass from the grief (\textit{e luctu}) he felt upon initially hearing the news, to rage (\textit{in furiæ ... et iras}) now that he sees the body. The body of Turnus continues to exert agency over characters and events in Latium.

---

174 “Now there was no longer in his soul any doubt remaining about the death of his brother. Turnus’ body lay before him. Turning away from grief, Pilumnus blazes into fury and anger, but he represses his tears with his voice. Wrath shines from his face, his eyes throw off sparks and flash forth bolts of anger.”
Indeed, Forestus deliberately models Pilumnus’ response to Turnus’ body on Turnus’ arming scene from *Aeneid* 12. After tearing himself away from the blushing Lavinia, Virgil’s Turnus arms himself and picks up his great spear. His eyes and face flame out wildly:

\[ \textit{his igitur furiis, totoque ardentis ab ore} \]
\[ \textit{scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis}. \] (12.101–102).\(^{175}\)

Once again, he creatively recombines Virgilian language. Pilumnus’ *in furias / furor* matches Turnus’ *furiis; ore, micat, and oculis* are reused. Forestus’ bright verb *scintillat* clearly alludes to (and perhaps even enlivens) Virgil’s *scintillae absistunt*. More subtly, where Turnus had threatened to defile Aeneas’ crimped (*vibratos*) locks (*et foedare in pulvere crinis / vibratos calido ferro murraque madentis* [12.99–100]), the face of Pilumnus flashes (*vibrat*) thunderbolts of anger. Forestus replaces an image of Aeneas’ supposed Eastern decadence with a Jove-like vision of Pilumnus blasting firebolts. Such allusions clearly create the expectation that, like Turnus, Pilumnus will kindle a war with the Trojans. Yet, Forestus goes beyond merely recasting Pilumnus as a second Turnus; he reuses Virgil’s description of Allecto blazing up into wrath (*exarsit in iras*) upon finding Turnus intransigently refusing to engage in a war over Lavinia.\(^{176}\)

\[ \textit{talibus Allecto dictis exarsit in iras} \]
\[ \textit{at iuveni oranti subditus tremor occupat artus deriguere oculi}. \] (7.445–447).\(^{177}\)

This allusion clearly suggests that Pilumnus will not merely be inflamed with wrath but will inflame others as both an Allecto-like agent and a Turnus-like instrument of a new war. As with

\(^{175}\) “Such is the frenzy driving him: from all his face shoot fiery sparks; his eager eyes flash flame.” (Trans: Fairclough).

\(^{176}\) See Oertel, 260, n. 300; Oertel also cites Psalm 73:48 as a parallel.

\(^{177}\) “At these words Allecto blazed forth in fury. But even as the young man spoke, a sudden tremor seized his limbs and his eyes set in fear.” (Trans: Fairclough).
Aeneas in the opening scene, Forestus combines different descriptions of Virgilian monsters to suggest a terrifying future in which Pilumnus shatters the fragile peace and throws the entirety of Latium into renewed violence. Everything hangs in the balance once again.

Even more surprisingly, one of the Virgilian models for Pilumnus’ wrath proves to be Aeneas himself. After Latinus receives Pilumnus and tells him the history of the Italian wars (13.346–396), Pilumnus responds with anger and an intense conflagration of emotions:

\[\textit{sedet ille aversus et iras terribiles vultu referens; pallorque ruborque igneus alternis incerto fluctuat ore.} \] (13.399–401).

Whereas using Turnus as a model for Pilumnus might have been expected, the phrase \textit{iras / terribiles} recalls instead the moment that Aeneas sees the trophy of Pallas, the \textit{monumenta doloris}:

\[\textit{ille, oculis postquam saevi monumenta doloris exuvias hausit, furiis accensus et ira terribilis.} \] (12.946–947).

Although Forestus has changed the forms and cases of the words, the memorable enjambment and repeated words suggest that we are in some way about to witness a replay of the final scene of the \textit{Aeneid}. Whereas Aeneas was moved to rage at the sight of the \textit{monumenta} of Pallas’ baldric and killed the perpetrator Turnus, here Forestus may suggest that Pilumnus, moved to rage by Turnus’ body, will kill the perpetrator of his death, i.e., Aeneas. Turnus—his body, at

---

178 “He sits opposite to them and his expression displays terrible anger. Paleness and a fiery blush by turn alternate in his uncertain countenance.”

179 “Aeneas, as soon as his eyes drank in the trophy, that memorial of cruel grief, ablaze with fury and terrible in his wrath.” (Trans: Fairclough).

180 Furthermore, \textit{pallorque ruborque} hints at both Turnus’ frantic anger (12.221) and Lavinia’s enigmatic blush (12.66).
least—would be the catalyst of his own revenge. On the one hand, we have already witnessed the calming of Aeneas *ira terribilis*, suggesting that Pilumnus’ *ira terribiles* too perhaps can be tamed. On the other hand, a hint of *aemulatio* can be felt in Forestus’ plurals (*iras / terribiles*), suggesting that Pilumnus’ wraths, over his lost brother, mother, countrymen, and nation, will be more destructive than Aeneas’. Consequently, Pilumnus’ speech is a thunderous endorsement of war. Forestus strips him of any cause besides revenge, distinguishing him from both Aeneas, who fought for a kingdom (*regnum Ausoniae*, cf. 2.783), and Turnus, who fought to preserve his bride (*coniunx Lavinia*, cf. 12.80).181 In lieu of revenge, Pilumnus seeks only death:

> *non deerit miles Turno vel luce carenti.*
> *aut adeo si bella, pater, sis corde perosus,*
> *ut servire tuos quam bello vincere malis,*
> *me sine Dardanio solum certare tyranno,*
> *et comitem vel me vel victum mittere fratri*
> *his mihi nec coniunx Lavinia quaeire tur armis*
> *nec regnum Ausoniae, sed pulcri gloria lethi.* (13.463–469).182

The response of the Rutulian leaders to Pilumnus’ speech is the watershed moment in which the Italian armies are poised on the brink of war. Messapus and the other leaders rise up and roar for arms, cursing peace:

> *dixerat. assensu magno Messapus et omnes*
> *ductores Rutulum Pilumni dicta secuti*

---

181 See Oertel, 272, n. 468.
182 “Turnus will not lack soldiers, even though he lacks life. Or if in your heart you now are so disgusted by war, father, that you prefer to guard your people rather than to triumph in battle, allow me to vie with the Dardanian tyrant alone, and to send either Aeneas or myself to the underworld to be a comrade for my brother. Through this conflict I do not seek Lavinia as a wife, nor the kingdom of Ausonia, but rather the glory of a beautiful death.”
arma fremunt, pacem simul execrantur inertem
et se quisque ducis certatim devovet umbrae. (13.470–473).\footnote{He had spoken. With loud applause Messapus and all the Rutulians support the words of Pilumnus and they roar for weapons. All together they curse the weakness of peace, and each soldier consecrates himself eagerly to the ghost of Turnus.}

Once again, as with 13.240, the model is 11.453 (\textit{arma manu trepidi poscunt, fremit arma iuventus}) combined with an echo of Turnus’ speech from \textit{Aeneid} 11, where he mockingly repudiates peace:

\begin{quote}
\textit{si tam deserte sumus et semel agmine verso}
\textit{funditus occidimus neque habet Fortuna regressum,}
\textit{oremus pacem et dextras tendamus inertis.}
\textit{quamquam o si solitae quicquam virtutis adesset!} (11.412–415).\footnote{“If we are so forlorn and in one repulse of our forces have fallen on utter ruin, and Fortune cannot retrace her steps, let us pray for peace and stretch forth helpless hands!” (Trans: Fairclough).}
\end{quote}

Yet, as with the previous episodes, Forestus resolves the tension and returns the story to a future foretold in Virgil’s epic. By the end of the first book of the \textit{Exequiae Turni}, Pilumnus has retreated to diffuse his anger, calmed by the words of Drances (13.480–514) and Latinus (14.525–596). Accompanied by a simile which describes a calming storm (13.601–605), the gales of anger begin to depart from Pilumnus. He leaves to overcome his wrath:

\begin{quote}
\textit{pectore sic iuvenis sensim cecidere procellae tempestasque animi placido sermone Latini.}
\textit{iamque alius nec iam, qualis successerat, altis egreditur foribus seque in secreta recepti, concoxisse queat crudum si corde dolorem.} (13.606–607).\footnote{Thus, slowly the gales in the heart of the young man relented and the storms in his mind were calmed by the speech of Latinus. He was already a different man from the man who had entered. He departed from the lofty portals and retired by himself in private, to see if he were able to overcome the fresh pain in his heart.” Schaffenrath, “Die Gleichnisse,” 271, is entirely correct in his analysis of this passage: “Das erste Gleichnis ist aber auch mit anderen Gleichnissen in Buch 13 verbunden. Wie im Anfangsgleichnis wütet auch im letzten Gleichnis des Buches ein Seesturm: Obwohl es zunächst danach ausgesehen hat, dass der Krieg unter Turnus’ Bruder Pilumnus wieder aufflammen wird, lässt er sich am Ende des Buches durch die Rede des Latinus besänftigen, gibt seine Kriegspläne auf und trauert um seinen Bruder.”}
\end{quote}
Despite the signs that his anger has already abated, and that he is a different man, *alias*, Pilumnus has not completely relented at this point—he remains dangerous, a smoldering fuse. In the council of the gods, Jupiter recognizes the danger of any anger remaining in Pilumnus. In retrospect, we see that the danger was perhaps more dire than it seemed. In a clear act of inter-authorial *aemulatio*, Forestus’ Jupiter declares that Pilumnus’ anger is *greater* than Virgil’s Turnus’ anger ever was, an anger that could have brought the Gauls prematurely into Latium and overturned the nascent founding of the Roman state (14.25–32). When last we saw Juturna, she was fleeing the field of battle and bemoaning her immortality (12.869–886). Called back from her mourning for Turnus, Juturna is now commanded to visit her other brother (14.41–43); yet, when she arrives the next morning, he is already peaceful and calm, enjoying the weather and beginning to fall asleep:

*ille sub antiqua lauro (gens unde Latina, (a Latio quae dicta prius, Laurentia dicta est) frigora Luciferi captans roremque pluentem aethere mulcebat flagrantis pectoris aestus. (14.175–178).*

After Juturna relates the commands of the gods (14.192–212), Pilumnus relents and responds happily (*laetus* [224]) to a propitious omen from Jupiter (14.213–228).¹⁸⁷ Once again, all is as it should be. Forestus’ continuation returns to the familiar future laid out in the *Aeneid.*

¹⁸⁶ “Pilumnus was sitting under an ancient laurel tree (from which the Latin race, whose name originally came from Latium, was called ‘Laurentian’). He was enjoying the coolness of morning and the dew dripping from the upper air, and he was soothing the burning passions of his heart.”

¹⁸⁷ Oertel, 93, detects Anchises’ acceptance of Jupiter’s portent in *Aeneid 2* as the model for this scene: “Pilumnus’ Reaktion auf das göttliche Gebot, von Krieg und Rache abzulassen (14.174–228), trägt Züge vom Verhalten des Anchises bei der Flucht aus Troja (2.692ff.): Auch jener Greis erklärt knapp seine Bereitschaft, dem göttlichen Gebot zu folgen (allerdings erst nach langem Widerstreben, so wie Pilumnus im 13. Buch Widerstand gegen den Frieden geleistet hat), bestärkt durch ein Donnerzeichen (14.221ff. entspricht 2.692f.).”
5. The Ghost of Turnus

In the first half of Forestus’ poem, the characters continually refer to the threat posed to the peace by a potentially unwilling Daunus. Daunus remains in the background of the larger events surrounding Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, and Pilumnus—yet there are a few notable exceptions. Immediately after regaining control of his anger, Aeneas admonishes the Rutulians to send an embassy to the elderly man, a consideration that signifies his importance (13.60). More importantly, in the story of Pilumnus, Forestus reminds the reader that Daunus is allied to Brennus and has sent warriors to aid him in repelling the Trojan Antenor (13.243–259). The old man thus has a threatening history of political and military actions that have vigorously opposed the Trojans elsewhere in Italy. Furthermore, Pilumnus in his fiery speech reminds the Italians that the final word on the peace rests with Daunus, as father of Turnus (here called dux Daunius [13.434]); it is Daunus, not Latinus, who must decide to leave Turnus unavenged. The old man holds all the cards:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at gentem Rutulam pactis non vinxit iisdem,} \\
\text{nec potuit: Dauni patris fuit illa potestas.} \\
\text{illius arbitrium est, an natum linquat inultum} \\
\text{totque animas fortes populi sub Tartara missas.} 
\end{align*}
\] (13.450–453)\(^{188}\)

King Latinus responds diplomatically that Daunus has no wish to go to war:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iam subiit portum vitae, iamque anchora iacta est:} \\
\text{non illi libeat retro dare vela per altum.} 
\end{align*}
\] (13.567–568)\(^{189}\)

\(^{188}\) “But Turnus did not bind the Rutulian race by the same pacts, nor was he able to bind them. That power belongs to his father Daunus, and it is his decision whether he should leave his son unavenged, along with so many strong souls of his people who were sent to Tartarus below.”

\(^{189}\) “For now he has sailed into the harbor of his life. Now his anchor is cast and he would not wish to spread his sails back through the deeps of the sea.”
Yet a few lines later, he recommends that legates be sent to Daunus to report the terms of peace hoping that Aeneas will do the same (13.586–591; cf. 14.451–461 and 14.462–475 for the two embassies) and again suggesting the importance of Daunus for the success of the peace. Most importantly, during the council of the gods, Jupiter commands Juno to send Juturna to Pilumnus (as reviewed above) and to Daunus:

\[
\begin{align*}
et \ pariter \ properet \ uni \ praevertere \ luctum \\
atque \ animi \ vulnus \ iam \ nunc \ mollire \ futurum. \end{align*}
\] (14.44–45).\(^{190}\)

Thus, throughout the first book and into the second, Forestus continually recalls Daunus’ presence and importance, hinting that his anger at the loss of his son could imperil the peace between the Trojans and the Latins.

Indeed, when Juturna arrives, she expects that the response of Daunus will be violent and difficult to control—mirroring the concerns of Aeneas, Latinus, and Jupiter. The goddess stands above her father’s bed, uncertain of the best words to allay his emotions (\textit{ut queat instantes animi praevertere motus} [14.233]). It is telling here that the projected emotional response of Daunus is undefined (\textit{instantes ... motus})—perhaps grief, as Latinus suggested, or perhaps anger. Importantly, the tension of this moment is not caused directly by an encounter with Turnus’ body, but rather by anticipation of Daunus learning of Turnus’ death. Considering the complicated and fraught responses of Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, and Pilumnus, it is natural to assume that Daunus’ response to the news (and eventually to the sight) of his fallen son will raise fresh concerns and challenges to the nascent peace. The structure of this scene provides an elegant \textit{variatio}.

\(^{190}\) “And then let her hasten to forestall the grief of Daunus and mitigate the future pain in his soul.”
Surprisingly, Daunus has already encountered Turnus—in a manner of speaking. Before Juturna can speak, Daunus rises from the bed and explains how Turnus had already appeared to him and informed him of his death at the hands of Aeneas, the end of the war, and the terms of peace:

\begin{quote}
quo tu, nata, loco, Turnus vixque inde recessit. rettulit ipse mihi pugnae legemque modumque fortunamque suam, niveamque a corpore vestem deducens, \textit{medio} vastum \textit{sub pectore} vulnus atque alius laevo \textit{femori} nudavit adactum seu geminum sidus bellique insigne decorum. (14.238–243).
\end{quote}

In this scene, Turnus’ body does not cause a local narrative tension; rather, his shade resolves a tension which has been lingering in the background of the poem since the beginning.\textsuperscript{192} While Turnus’ body has been fomenting crises throughout the poem, Turnus’ spirit works to soothe Daunus’ emotions. While Turnus’ body is menacing (13.129), Turnus’ spirit is shining and glorious. By the time Juturna arrives, Daunus understands that Turnus’ death was necessary, and he freely obeys the admonitions of the gods (14.272–274).\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{191}“In the place where you now stand, my daughter, Turnus stood and has barely left. He himself reported to me the treaty and the end of the war and his own fortunes. Drawing back the white robe from his body he exposed a vast wound in the middle of his chest and another driven through his left thigh, like twin stars and a decorous badge of battle.”

\textsuperscript{192}Oertel, 188, does not appreciate the narrative tension of this moment, although he does note that the reaction of Daunus to the news is surprising (especially when compared to Virgil’s Evander): “Auch er hat schon wie Euander, die Kunde erhalten, und zwar in einem Traumbild von dem Toten selbst, der ihm seine Wunden zeigte. Aber überrascherweise wirft das den Greis nicht zu Boden, im Gegenteil: Die Wundmale sind ihm ein Ehrenzeichen (14,243), der Heldentod ist ihm, ganz im Gegensatz zu Euander, der höchste seiner Wünsche (14,241ff.), da der Sohn für seine Mitbürger gefallen ist (249) und da er seinem Vaterland einen würdigen Frieden hinterlassen hat.”

\textsuperscript{193}Oertel, 93–94, suggests the scene in which Evander learns of Pallas’ death as a model. He admits that the parallel is far from precise; Virgil’s Evander wants revenge, but Forestus’ Daunus has no such inclination: “Auch Daunus nimmt die Nachricht vom Tode seines Sohnes Turnus ähnlich auf (14,229) wie Evander, als ihm Pallas’ Leiche vor Augen kommt (11,139ff.): Beide haben schon vorher das Unheil gesehen bzw. erfahren (14,236ff. und 11,154ff.), und die überraschend gemäßigte Reaktion des Daunus hat ihre Entsprechung in der ausdrücklichen Versicherung des Euander, er beschuldige Aeneas nicht, und in dem Trost, daß Palas eines würdigen Todes gestorben ist (11,164ff.). Freilich ist der Schluß dieser Szene wieder gegensätzlich: Der Vater des Pallas forder Rache (11,176ff.), der Vater des Turnus läßt sich von Juturnas Friedensbotschaft trösten (14,252ff.).”
In this scene, Forestus replays the final scenes of the *Aeneid*, using Virgilian allusions to recast the death of Turnus in a glorious new light. 14.241 and 14.242 take 12.950 and 12.926 respectively as models:¹⁹⁴

\[
\textit{h}oc \textit{dicen}s \textit{ferrum adverso sub pectore condit} (12.950).
\]

\[
\textit{per medium stridens transit femur. incidit ictus} (12.926).
\]

The vast wound (*vastum ... vulnus*) in the middle of Turnus’ chest is framed by a snowy garment (*niveamque ... vestem*). He shows the wound to his father, as well as the wound on his thigh; these marks gleam like twin stars (*geminum sidus*) or a graceful emblem (*bellique insigne decorum*).

Thus, in a manner of speaking, Daunus also encounters the *Exequiae Turni*, but as we have seen, Forestus includes several *variationes* that distinguish this encounter from the previous ones. First, the primary tension in the narrative does not result from an encounter with the body, but rather from an anticipation of the encounter. Second, Daunus does not actually encounter Turnus’ body, but rather meets his spirit, which appears both wounded and glorified. Finally, the encounter allays Daunus’ emotions rather than stoking them. While the body of Turnus may be a continual threat to war, the spirit of Turnus understands the will of the gods and works to fulfill it. At the end of this scene, we realize that the main political opposition to the unification from Turnus or his family has been removed.

6. The Universal Peace in Italy

¹⁹⁴ See *ibid.*, n. 241–242.
Finally, the funeral of Turnus can begin. The final lines (14.381–568) recall and catalogue the various resolutions already established throughout the poem: 1) Aeneas remains at peace as he considers Turnus’ body and he emphasizes his own peacefulness in his speech to Latinus (14.404–432; 527–555); 2) Latinus meets with Aeneas and admits his past weaknesses, including his attempted suicide (14.496–526); 3) seeming to grow younger, Pilumnus becomes a little brother and dutifully follows the funeral without a hint of violence (14.450–451); 4) embassies are sent to the placated Daunus (14.451–475); and 5) the wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia is ratified, but put off for another occasion (14.556–568). Thus, the end of Forestus’ poem resolves his own plot arcs: Aeneas does not prolong the war; Latinus does not commit suicide; Pilumnus does not reignite conflict; Lavinia is safely in love with Aeneas; Daunus supports the peace. Aeneas and Latinus together establish a lasting concord along the lines of the treaty already worked out at 12.176–211. But nothing further is accomplished, and the open-ended aspects of Virgil’s narrative and the Virgilian prophecies are left untouched: The Roman state is not founded; Lavinia remains unmarried; Aeneas does not ascend into heaven. By the end of the Exequiae Turni, it is clear that Forestus is not interested in the completion of Virgil’s narrative; rather, he has created and resolved his own narratives that continued the stories of Virgil’s characters. Each of his own narratives and resolutions appears briefly in the final scene.

1) Forestus absolves Aeneas from any final thoughts of vengeance, completing his own narrative arc from 13.1–77. Although Turnus’ body still seems to incite violence, Aeneas shows no sign of vengeful wrath and instead works closely with Latinus to establish a lasting peace in

---

195 See ibid., 72.
Latium. As Turnus’ corpse is carried out from Laurentum, his body at first still flashes and seethes with the possibilities of new violence:

\[\textit{nec sua maiestas Turno cum luce recessit,} \]
\[\textit{ardet adhuc pheretroque impostus fulgura mittit,} \]
\[\textit{non clypeo galeaque, at puri tegminis auro,} \]
\[\textit{in quo cernere erat Troum Rutulumque labores,} \]
\[\textit{et veterem rerum faciem. \textit{fervere} videtur} \]
\[\textit{caede nova Turnus recidivaque bella ciere} \]
\[\textit{terribilis vultuque suo (14.398–404).}\]^{196}

The phrase \textit{fervere ... caede nova} clearly recalls the height of the Virgilian conflict in Italy;\^{197} nevertheless, although Turnus’ appearance is still \textit{terribilis} and although he still seems (\textit{videtur}) to incite new wars (\textit{recidiva bella}), the images of war are now only dimly seen through the depths of the ekphrasis on his breastplate. Forestus subtly recasts one of Virgil’s most poignant lines, recalling the tearful images of the Trojan war seen by Aeneas and Achates on the newly built temple of Carthage, those that bring to mind the \textit{labor} of Troy (1.460; cf. 14.401). The images on Juno’s temple were the \textit{lacrimae rerum} (1.462); similarly, the images on Turnus’ breastplate are now a \textit{vetus facies rerum}. Like the fall of Troy, Turnus’ war has entered the unalterable past. A few lines later, the terror of Turnus has changed into an \textit{imago} and an \textit{inanis umbra}, a memory of fury that only leads to a placid philosophical reflection on the mutability of mortal affairs:

\[\textit{iameque animis maior spectantum surgit imago} \]
\[\textit{et venerabilior Turni. locus exhibit idem,} \]
\[\textit{qualis caede furens hesterna luce ruebat} \]
\[\textit{fulminis in morem rapidi vel turbinis atri} \]
\[\textit{et qualis socium minibus portatur inanis}\]

\^{196}“Turnus’ majesty did not depart with his life, but he still burns, and even from his bier he sends forth lightning, not from his shield and helmet, but from the gold of his pure breastplate, in which it was possible to see the labors of the Trojans and Rutulians, and the ancient likeness of things. Turnus still seemed to boil with new slaughter and still seemed to incite new wars. His appearance was terrifying.”

\^{197}Cf. 9.692–3: \textit{hostem / fervere caede nova et portas praebere patentis}; Oertel, 316, n. 402.
Indeed, Turnus’ face now shines, Aeneas-like, with pietas and virtus (14.412–413). With this, we recall the resolution of Aeneas’ anger from the opening lines of Forestus’ poem and the virtus he saw in his fallen opponent (13.27–30). The war is over.

2) As Aeneas meets Latinus, he absolves himself from any blame for the conflict in Italy, preferring instead to lay the blame squarely on Turnus. Indeed, he characterizes the entire war as a personal suffering and claims that the blood shed by the Italians seemed to be his own (14.547–549):

\[
tot me cum premerent infestis millia telis
non tamen in quemquam placuit mihi stringere ferrum.
unus erat tantum nobis tot in hostibus hostis
ille, meis quem iam sacravit Iupiter armis.
moverat ille unus bellum, nunc sustulit unus.
quod superest, laeti parta bene pace fruamur. \text{(14.550–555)}.
\]

Similarly, Forestus references the narrative of Latinus’ attempted suicide (see 13.87–97; 176–242). In his speech to Aeneas, Latinus recognizes his own past mistakes and agrees to the conditions of the treaty that was established in 12.176–211. He begins by recognizing Aeneas’ divine parentage, hailing him as nate dea (14.501), and appealing to his virtus (14.501), pietas,

---

198 “And now in the minds of the spectators the greater and more venerable specter of Turnus arose. Together they see how he was charging furiously the day before, like a swift bolt of lightning or a black whirlwind, and how now the lifeless shade of this man is carried by his companions. Each person considered how fleeting are the affairs of sorrowful mortals and how little they can be trusted.”

199 Interestingly, Forestus provides another vision of an alternate universe where the funeral procession is instead Turnus’ procession of triumph following the defeat of Aeneas: quis funus dixerit, illam / prospiciens seriem? quis non, o Turne, triumphum / ducere Dardanio reducetem credat ab hoste? \text{(14.447–449)}.

200 “Even when so many thousands were attacking me with hostile weapons, it was not pleasing for me to draw my sword against anyone. I had one enemy alone among so many enemies: that man whom Jupiter sacrificed by my arms. He alone waged the war and now he alone has finished it. Now let us happily enjoy a peace which has been well established.”
and *mens benigna* (14.503). Cleverly, he reminds Aeneas of his new status as son-in-law (*care gener* [14.507]):

\[
sed te, care gener, delusaque numina testor
foederis: invito me ruptum foedus utrumque;
necte sponte mea gestas, nec bella nefanda
auspicis hucusque meis ab origine duxa.
eguicquam titulus regniqne insignia gessi,
in caput ipse meum populique in viscera nostri. (14.507–512).\(^{201}\)
\]

Latinus’ position is difficult. He insists that he did not want the war; but he also admits that he acted against his own life (*in caput meum*) and against the interests of his people (*populique in viscera nostri*). With his attempted suicide exposed and his weaknesses admitted, he begs Aeneas to ratify the treaty according to its former conditions. Forestus thus neatly references his own narrative arc and resolves the private sins and failings of Latinus publicly and openly: *quid firmare vetat, quod iam nunc foedere cautum est?* (14.526).\(^{202}\)

3) Pilumnus, whose narrative arc provided another threat to the nascent peace (see 13.243–610; 14.174–228), makes a final cameo appearance. Amid the procession, Aeneas catches sight of him, and notices how similar he is to Turnus:

\[
neclatet Aenean Pilumnus in agmine tanto,
dum Turni meminit, tantum namque instar in illo est;
corporis hos artus, haec oris signa ferebat (14.414–416).\(^{203}\)
\]

\(^{201}\) “But I call upon you, dear son-in-law, and the betrayed gods who were present at the treaty: I was unwilling that the treaties be broken. The events were not conducted as I wished. The wicked wars were not waged under my command from the beginning until now. In vain did I possess the titles and marks of rule and I myself acted against my own life and against the heart of our people.”

\(^{202}\) “What prevents us from ratifying what has already been established by a treaty?”

\(^{203}\) “Nor did Aeneas fail to spot Pilumnus in the vast battle line, while he thought of Turnus. So similar was the likeness between them! Pilumnus had the same frame, and the same features as his brother.”
But despite the many similarities, Pilumnus no longer rages and is no longer a threat; he is just one of many faces in agmine tanto. In a reversal of his earlier appearance, where Messapus and the other Rutulian ductores followed (secuti) his words and roared for a renewal of the war (13.470–471), Pilumnus is whittled down to a younger germanus who follows (sequitur) among the youth and other leaders:

\[ \text{germanus sequitur Turni cum flore iuventae} \\
\text{et ducibus primis (14.450–451).}^{204} \]

This is the last that we hear of Pilumnus. Any concerns for any possible vengeance remain unmentioned in the peace negotiations between Latinus and Aeneas, in which he plays no part.

4) The tensions surrounding Daunus (see 14.229–274) resurface briefly as well. Realistically, Latinus and Aeneas cannot know that Daunus has been placated by Turnus’ ghost; both promptly send envoys to Daunus to prevent the old man from interfering with the promising beginning of the peace (14.451–475). The ambassadors from King Latinus deliver twelve majestic horses covered with purple and embroidered cloth (14.456–461); they also deliver a (now unnecessary) threat:

\[ \text{et moneant animum placidae submittere paci (14.455).}^{205} \]

Aeneas, on the other hand, commands his men to console Daunus (sortemque patris solentur iniquam [14.465]) and to offer themselves as foster-sons to the father of their former enemy (seque loco patris Daunum testentur habere [14.466]). Not to be outdone by Latinus, he sends various reliquiae from Troy (14.467–471) that emphasize the new unity of the Trojan and Latin

---

204 “The brother of Turnus follows with the flower of youth and the senior captains.”
205 “[King Latinus sends delegates] … to warn him to submit his mind to the gentle peace.”
peoples, as well as twelve horses copiously ornamented with gold (14.472–475). Thus, Forestus briefly returns to the already resolved tensions surrounding Daunus, only to remind us that the old man will not interfere with the proposed peace between the Trojans and the Italians and to showcase the diplomatic foresight of Aeneas and his new father-in-law.

5) Lavinia does not reappear once her narrative arc is completed (13.118–140; 14.275–351), except as a condition of the treaty between Aeneas and Latinus. We never see the wedding; Aeneas and Latinus decide that the funeral of Turnus is neither the time nor the place for the marriage of Turnus’ bride:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{connubii ritus et sacri gaudia festi} \\
\text{differri placuit, dum laetior aethere Titan} \\
\text{fulserit, et luctus tristes lustraverit umbras,} \\
\text{funeraque exequiasque animis excusserit omnes (14.558–561).}\]

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As I have shown, the Exequiae Turni is hardly an improper name for Forestus’ work, as Oertel claimed, rather, the funeral of Turnus is fundamental to the organization and structuring of its eponymous poem. Encounters with the body of Turnus engender numerous, episodic complications in Virgilian and non-Virgilian characters alike: Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, Pilumnus, and Daunus. The body remains a central presence throughout the poem, creating wrath, fear, and doubt, which endanger the future promised through the prophecies of the Aeneid.

---

206 “They decided to postpone the rites of marriage and the joys of a sacred feast, for the time when a happier day should dawn in heaven, and grief should purify the sad shades, and drive away the funerals and obsequies from their memories.”

207 Oertel, 72: “In Zentrum steht ... der Frieden, um den die Gedanken aller dieser Figuren, ihn behindernd oder ihn fördernd, kreisen: In diesem Punkt wollte Forestus mit seinem Supplement vielleicht sogar die Aeneis ergänzen oder gar korrigieren: endet diese doch mit furor und Mord, auch wenn aus vorausgehenden Szenen (bes. 12,791 ff.) feststeht, daß der Friede dereinst kommen wird. So trifft der Titel des Supplements auch nicht den Kern der Sache: Die eigentlichen Exequiae Turni bilden nur den Inhalt der Rahmenpartien.”
Certainly, *exequiae Turni* should not be taken to refer narrowly to the final procession alone (14.381–451); rather, the “obsequies” or “burial rites” of Turnus should include Aeneas’ viewing of Turnus’ body, the funeral procession observed by Latinus from the walls, the wake in Laurentum viewed by Lavinia and Pilumnus, the ghost’s appearance to Daunus, and the final procession which closes the poem.

Forestus himself explains in his letter to Heinsius that he wanted the name of his poem to be understood with the universal peace established at Westphalia in mind. In the same letter quoted at the beginning of this chapter, Forestus explains his title:

*conciliabit fortasse sibi quoque aliquantum favoris a lectore alter ille titulus, videlicet Exequiae Turni, quibus Martis nostri obitus et pax a Belgis et ab ipso Hispano, tantum desiderata, quodam consensu et transitione in animis adumbratur.*

To be sure, he does not say that the peace treaty between Aeneas and Latinus represents the peace of Westphalia. Rather, he explains that the funeral of Turnus represents the ending of the war (*Martis nostri obitus*) and the peace forged between the Dutch and the Spanish (*pax a Belgis et ab ipso Hispano*). Thus, the drawn-out process of Turnus’ funeral, beset as it is with so many challenges to a truly lasting peace in Italy, serves as a reflection on the contemporary process of forming a lasting peace with its vicissitudes and setbacks, its various threats, and the specter of renewed conflicts. This is why the funeral of Turnus is so important, why it structures the poem, and gives it its title.209

208 “Perhaps that other title, that is, the *Exequiae Turni*, will bring some pleasure in the reader, by which the ending of our war and the peace between the Dutch and Spain, a peace so long desired, is dimly figured by a certain agreement and similarity in their spirits.”

209 Forestus’ poem is not just about Pilumnus, otherwise is would be called the *Pilumniad* (or the *Reditus Pilumni* [see 13.347]), which it is not, and for good reason.
The widespread uncertainty caused by the Thirty Years War may even be seen in the progression of encounters with the funeral of Turnus. Each generation is tested: the older generation (Latinus and Daunus), Turnus’ generation (Juturna), and the younger generation (Pilumnus). Similarly, both men (Latinus, Daunus, and Pilumnus) and women (Juturna and Lavinia) experience the difficulties of the perilous approach to peace. Wilson explains how the insecurity caused by the war pervades contemporary accounts:

Sudden changes of fortune became a defining characteristic of the conflict. It engendered a sense of impermanence and the unpredictability of events. Despite the official stress on patience and fortitude, many people clearly lived for the moment, grabbing what opportunities they could ... The precariousness and capriciousness of life were embodied in literature and art as Fortuna, a naked woman balancing on a ball and holding a sail.210

It is true that Forestus’ poem ends with a measure of security in the ratification of the peace. But the difficult work of bringing the Italians and Trojans together remains, as it did for the Catholic and Protestant communities at the end of the Thirty Years War.211 By the end of the poem, the wedding between Aeneas and Lavinia has not taken place, and Aeneas remains an untested leader who has not yet achieved a fruitful tenure of rule, much less ascended to the stars. Much remains to be done, and much could still go wrong.

That Forestus is not trying to complete or correct the Aeneid is made clear from the fact that the poem ends without fulfilling the plotlines foretold in the various Virgilian prophecies.

210 Wilson, The Thirty Years War, 845. See ibid., 779, for a description of the widespread destruction and its effects in contemporary accounts: “Contemporary texts and images do convey a sense of all-pervasive violence and unremitting destruction. The war in the Empire had already become a benchmark for atrocity elsewhere in Europe before 1648. British readers were informed by publications like Dr Vincent’s illustrated The Lamentations of Germany (published in 1638), showing murder, mutilation and mayhem in graphic detail.”

211 ibid., 846: “Peace celebrations were relatively muted in Catholic areas, suggesting that many regarded the war as a defeat. Militants especially felt they had been cheated of victory, having beaten the Protestants both by 1629 and again by 1634, only to be forced to concede their demands by foreign invasion.” Note the different reactions to the peace in the Trojan and Latin camps in 13.156–175.
and in the prologue of the *Aeneid*. Oertel claims the opposite: “In Zentrum steht … der Frieden, um den die Gedanken aller dieser Figuren, ihn behindern oder ihn fördernd, kreisen: In diesem Punkt wollte Forestus mit seinem Supplement vielleicht sogar die *Aeneis* ergänzen oder gar korrigieren.” But in fact, he provides a good argument against his own position: “[E]ndet diese doch mit *furor* und Mord, auch wenn aus vorausgehenden Szenen (bes. 12,791 ff.) feststeht, daß der Friede dereinst kommen wird.” We know from Virgil that peace and happiness will one day arrive in Latium (2.781–784); his epic does not need correcting on that point. Furthermore, as above, in his dedication to Christina of Sweden, Forestus clearly and unequivocally states that he has no desire to correct or complete Virgil. He would have blatantly and repeatedly lied, both to Heinsius and to Christina, if Oertel were correct. The relevant section from the dedication is worth repeating:

> neve autem nullo ornatu prodirem, laciniam quandam Maronis mihi indui et titulum divini operis praetexui. non quod sperarem inimitabilem illius maiestatem (absit enim a me tantus furor!) vel longissimo intervallo assequi, multo minus, quod existimarem caelesti monimento eius aliquid deesse, vel si quid deesset, id a me, tanquam ab imperito pictore Venerem Apellis, ab ipso imperfectam relictam, posse expleri.

Unlike Vegius, Forestus does not attempt to complete systematically the Virgilian prophecies from the *Aeneid* or correct Virgil’s ending. As mentioned above, by the end of the *Exequiae Turni*, it is true that a peace has been established, but he is more interested in the creation of his

---

212 Oertel, 72.
213 *ibid.*
214 “And so that I might not go forth without any decoration, I put on a fringe of Virgil (so to speak) and added to the title of his divine work. Not because I was hoping to rival the inimitable majesty of Virgil (indeed may such madness be far from me!), much less because I was thinking that something was lacking from his heavenly monument, or if something was lacking that it would be able to be fulfilled by me, as if the Venus of Apelles, left unfinished by the artist, was finished by an unskilled painter.” Qtd in Oertel, 67–68. Again, cf. his letter to Daniel Heinsius, *ibid.*, 210–211.
215 Forestus is clearly aware of the prophecies and his characters allude to them briefly. Juno reaffirms that her anger has indeed relented and recalls the decision to mingle the Trojan and Italian bloodlines (14.124–125): *stat vertere Troiam / in Latium inque unam geminas confundere gentes.* Juturna’s report to Pilumnus is similar (esp. 14.205). See Oertel, 200.
own narrative arcs and the challenges to Virgil’s narrative that these new developments entail. Thus, although both Forestus and Vegius have been considered “continuators” of Virgil, I suggest that the title of “continuator” properly belongs to Forestus alone. Unlike Vegius, “a completer,” who systematically concludes each prophecy of Virgil’s *Aeneid* in a single book, he develops and continues smaller narrative arcs, rather than correcting or completing the broader plotlines of his timeless model.

I have also argued that Schmidt’s accusations of plagiarism are unfair. The *Exequiae Turni* presents an Aeneas clothed in the descriptions of Virgil’s monsters, a Latinus whose despair suggests a future suicide like Virgil’s Amata, a three-dimensional Lavinia whose forced marriage echoes the beginning of the tragedy of Dido, a brother who rages like a reborn Turnus, and a Turnus who graciously reappears like Virgil’s Hector. Forestus’ Virgilianism is both creative and unexpected; his characters are at once realistic and imaginative. He is certainly not shackled to Virgil, as for example we saw from his description of Lavinia, whose pale and passionless expression deliberately contrasts with her famous blush in *Aeneid* 12. Indeed, entire sequences, like the marriage-dream are notably un-Virgilian in style, content, and execution. When Forestus does make use of Virgilian material, we find that, instead of a mindless copyist, he emerges as a poet who meaningfully employs Virgilian characters, language, and allusions to challenge the imagined future of Virgil’s epic. His poem is about the *Exequiae Turni*—the funeral of Turnus—and about Turnus’ afterlife in the lives of Virgil’s characters.
CHAPTER THREE: SERIEM ET ORDINEM PRO VIRIBUS TENUI: VILLANOVA CORRECTS THE UNFINISHED AENEID

I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike Forsetus’ episodic continuation, Villanova’s Supplementum ad Aeneida attempts to correct Virgil’s unfinished Aeneid. He organizes his poem along the lines of the Virgilian prophecies, systematically justifying each according to Aristotelian norms of composition. Every plot-point is faithfully placed just where Virgil (and Aristotle) would have wished, and each of his corrections is explained in detailed annotationes that accompany the poem. Following the outline laid out in his praefatio, I examine five subplots of Villanova’s Supplementum: 1) the burial of Turnus and the construction of his tomb (13.1–37), 2) the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia (13.38–317), 3) the war with Lauzellus and the reconstruction of Laurentum (13.345–690), 4) the establishment of laws and customs in Latium (13.691–776), and finally 5) Aeneas’ death, apotheosis, and succession (13.777–827). But although Villanova carefully follows Virgil’s intended plotline in each of these episodes, he also boldly challenges Virgilian aesthetics with scenes of magnificence undreamed of in any ancient universe. He even attempts to subsume the entire epic of Virgil into his own poem through a series of prophecies in which he foretells the advent of the Aeneid and of its greatest supplementer: himself. The goal of this chapter is to reconcile Villanova’s devoted antiquarianism and his competitive modernism—his desire both to correct faithfully the Aeneid’s deficient plotline while outdoing Virgil’s poetry with spectacular literary opulence. Consequently, I suggest that his role in the contemporary Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns is more complex than has previously been appreciated by contemporary scholarship, which has assigned him to the side of the Moderns.
1. C. S. Villanova and the *Fin de Siècle*

At the beginning of the French Enlightenment, as the value of Classical forms and models was challenged throughout the glittering court and salons of Louis XIV’s Paris, C. S. Villanova (C. Simonet de Villaneuve) published his *Supplementum ad Aeneida seu Aeneidos liber decimus-tertius* (1698),¹ which stands as the final chapter in the history of Virgilian supplementation in Latin verse. He remains simultaneously the most enigmatic and the most transparent of the supplementers. Little more is known of his life than what can be found on the titlepage of the *Supplementum*, where his name appears as follows: *Authore C. S. Villanova, Ducis Aurelianensium Tricliniarcha ordinaris.*² Yet, unlike Vegius or Forestus, Villanova leaves behind a lengthy *praefatio* to his *Supplementum* that details in great precision his reasons for the composition of the poem. Vegius’ theory of supplementation must be divined indirectly from his other writings (especially the *De perseverantia religionis* and the *De educatione librorum*) and from his *Supplementum* itself. Forestus appends a dedication to Queen Christina of Sweden, but

---

¹ Claudia Schindler, “Das *Aeneis*-Supplement des Claude Simonet de Villeneuve – Ein Anti-Supplement,” in *Supplemente antiker Literatur*, eds. Martin Korenjak and Simon Zuenelli (Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 2016), 41, sensibly points out that this title provides generic expectations: “Wenn Villeneuve seiner *Aeneis*-Ergänzung den Doppeltitel … gibt, dann verweist er explizit auf die Tradition des Epos-Supplements, die zu seiner Zeit voll ausgebildet ist und deren generische Spezifika seinen Rezipienten bekannt sind.” If we assume a knowledge of the previous tradition, Villanova can be seen to be supplementing the supplements.

² C. S. Villanova, *Supplementum ad Aeneida seu Aeneidos Liber Decimus-Tertius* (Paris: Aubouyn, 1698). His poem is dedicated to the heir of his employer, Philip II of Orléans. For reconstructions of Villanova’s life and times, see Kern, 30–39 and Oertel, 117–122. Oertel, 117, admits that, “Über diese spärlichen Angaben hinaus ist nichts Konkretes über die Person des Autors in Erfahrung zu bringen.” Villanova apparently served in the court of the Duke of Orléans during the second half of the seventeenth century, placing him close to the political, intellectual, and artistic centers of power. As Oertel surmises, Villanova was the *maître d'hôtel servans par quartier*, which he Latinizes as *tricliniarcha*. Oertel, *ibid.*, develops the following picture of Villanova’s duties which requires no addition: “Er tat im vierteljährlichen Wechsel Dienst als Serviermeister an der herzoglischen Tafel … Zu seinen Pflichten gehörte es, mit dem mit Silber und Gold verzierten Stab in der Hand das Auftragen der Speisen zu überwachen und dem Fürsten vor dem Mahl die angefeuchtete Serviette zu reichen, damit dieser sich die Hände reinigen konnte.” For these details, Oertel draws on N. Besongne, *L’État de la France où l’on voit tous les princes, ducs et pairs, maréchaux etc.* (Paris, 1698). Schindler, 39, agrees: “Über den Verfasser, der sich selber latinisiert Villanova nennt, ist so gut wie nichts bekannt.”
it does not spell out his theory of supplementation nearly to the extent that Villanova does in his praefatio.

Hardly more than a decade before the publication of Villanova’s Supplementum, Charles Perrault ignited the Quarrel between the Ancients and the Moderns when he presented his scandalous poem, *Le Siècle de Louis le Grand*, on January 27th, 1687, to the members of the Académie française.³ In the poem, Perrault claimed that the artistic productions of contemporary French culture rivaled anything offered by the long-revered world of antiquity:

La belle antiquité fut toujours venerable,
Mais je ne crus jamais qu’elle fut adorable.
Je vois les Anciens, sans plier les genoux,
Ils sont grands, il est vrai, mais hommes, comme nous.
Et Ton peut comparer, sans craindre d’être injuste,
Le Siècle de Louis au beau Siècle d’Auguste.⁴

Furthermore, as he argued in his subsequent *Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes* (1688–1696), one should not be surprised if subsequent ages, especially those with the stability and peace afforded by monarchs like Louis XIV, produce works that are more perfect and mature

---


than those produced in earlier ages. The imperfections of even the greatest works of the ancient world are manifest. After all, he argued, Virgil should have carried his poem through the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia if he wanted to stay true to his subject matter: the founding of the Roman state:

L’action de l’Eneïde a deu estre la fondation de l’Empire Romain: auquel cas, ce que nous voulons que Virgile eust ajouté seroit une partie de cette action là, ou pour mieux dire, en seroit l’accomplissement, sans quoy cette action est imparfaite. Et où est-ce que le Pere Galluci a pris, que le marriage d’Enéé eust fait une seconde action dans le poème de l’Eneïde? Ce marriage n’auroit fait, comme je viens de le dire, que d’achever ce qui n’est encore que commence: il auroit establi & affermi cette fondation d’Empire, qui est l’action de l’Eneïde.

Perrault’s claims prompted furious responses from admirers of ancient literature such as Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux, who took up the cause of the Ancients in his *Reflexions Critiques sur Quelque Passages du Rhétour Longin* (1694). Rejoinders came swiftly from abroad as well. In England, William Wotton dedicated a chapter of his *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694) to Perrault’s theses, arguing that he had grossly failed to appreciate the unity of the *Aeneid* and the appropriateness of its ending:

And it does not seem possible to contrive any Poem whose Parts can have a truer or more artful Connexion than *Virgil’s Æneis*: And though it is now objected by Monsieur Perrault as a Fault, that he did not carry on his Poem to the Marriage of Æneas and Lavinia, yet we may reasonably think that he had very good Reasons for doing so; because, in Augustus’s Court, where Matters of that sort were very well understood, it was received with as great Veneration as it has been since.

---

5 *Parallèle*, 1.59–60: “Ainsi comme notre siècle est postérieur à tous les autres, et par conséquent le plus ancien de tous, que quatre-vingts ans de repos dans la France … lui ont donné cette maturité et cette perfection où je viens de faire voir qu’il est parvenu, pourquoi s’étonner si on le préfère à tous les autres siècles?”

6 *Parallèle*, 3.130–131.

7 Boileau had published *L’art poétique* (1674), an earlier codification of the Ancient position.


By contrast, in his *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes* (1688), Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle largely agreed with Perrault’s assessment of the *Aeneid*’s excellence.¹⁰ Importantly, he too remarks on the *Aeneid*’s incomplete state even as he praises Virgil’s versification:

La plus belle versification du monde est celle de Virgile; peut-être cependant n’eût-il pas été mauvais qu’il eût eu le loisir de la retoucher. Il y a de grands morceaux dans l’Énéide, d’une beauté achevée, et que je ne crois pas qu’on surpasse jamais. Pour ce qui est de l’ordonnance du poème en général, de la manière d’amener les événements et d’y ménager des surprises agréables, de la noblesse de caractères, de la variété des incidents, je ne serai jamais fort étonné qu’on aille au-delà de Virgile.¹¹

Fontenelle argues that particular passages of the *Aeneid* will remain forever unsurpassed, yet the poem’s structure, production of suspense, characterization, and *variatio* leave ample room for improvement. Thus, Fontenelle’s criticism of Virgil—and other ancient authors—is hardly one-sided. By his reasoning, men are of generally similar intelligence and abilities throughout history.¹² Virgils and Ciceros are indeed men of true genius and excellence, but surely not limited to the ancient world; indeed, a comparison of the archaic Greeks with the Golden Age of Augustus demonstrates that progress took place even in antiquity. Yet since the perfection of the literary arts happened faster than that of the sciences, Fontenelle cannot imagine Cicero or Livy ever being surpassed.¹³ Virgil’s work is less perfect; he will be surpassed in some ways, but not in others.

---


¹² Fumaroli et al., *La Querelle*, 295: “Toute la question de la prééminence entre les Anciens et les Modernes étant une fois bien entendue, se réduit à savoir si les arbres qui étaient autrefois dans nos campagnes étaient plus grands que ceux d’aujourd’hui.”

Indeed, Norman points out that the participants in the Quarrel such as Fontenelle rarely held single-minded or absolutist viewpoints, and complicates our view of the period. He points out that even Boileau, the steadfast warden of ancient literature, surprisingly wrote in a 1701 letter to the scandalous Perrault that Ancients and Moderns were “differently of the same opinion”:

Vous voyez, Monsieur, qu’à proprement parler nous ne sommes point d’avis différent sur l’estime qu’on doit faire de notre nation et de notre siècle; mais que nous sommes différemment de même avis.  

Thus, in Norman’s view, contemporary accounts of the Quarrel tend to reinforce a caricature of the quarrel as a stark combat between, on the one side, the conservative defenders of a collapsing ‘ancient’ tradition and, on the other, a ‘modern’ revolt against the stifling authority of the past. The emphasis given by some historians to this reductive dichotomy seems to constitute a conspiracy to render the quarrel as futile—and as boring—as possible.

By contrast,

The truly revealing ‘quarrel’ is thus the one fought out inside each thinker’s mind, inside each Fontenelle who hesitates between his acknowledged debt to the past and his denigration of its supposed achievements, and inside each Boileau, who veers from praise of modern rational precision to ecstasy before the ancient sublime.

In Fontenelle, Virgil’s *Aeneid* is a locus where the complexities of the Quarrel are particularly evident. The *Aeneid*, a product of the civilized age of Augustus, appeared in many ways to be a Modern work, especially when compared with its rude Homeric counterparts. Yet, while Virgil

---

14 Qtd. and trans. in Norman, *The Shock of the Ancient*, 15: “You see, Sir, that, strictly speaking, we have no difference of opinion on the matter of the esteem in which our nation and our century should be held; rather, we are differently of the same opinion.”
15 *ibid.*, 14.
16 *ibid.*, 16.
the poet had many perfections, and could compose the “most beautiful versification in the world,” as a final product the Aeneid still seemed to possess many shortcomings. These could be related to the poem’s lack of polish—recognized, of course, from antiquity in Donatus’ vita. This view of Virgil, as a poet who is capable of the highest perfection but whose greatest work was not properly finished or polished, remains somewhere in between the “reductive dichotomies” of the Ancient and Modern positions.

A similar complexity is evident in Villanova’s praeefatio and Supplementum ad Aeneida. Whereas most modern scholars have considered him to be a devotee of the Modern side of the Quarrel, it is impossible to assign his commitments securely to one side or the other. On the one hand, like the Ancients, he is devoted to what he perceives to be the absolute perfection of Virgil’s original plan as determined by the prophecies in the Aeneid itself. Consequently, he strives to complete Virgil’s work in accordance with its original Aristotelian vision ad amussim, providing copious annotationes to explain each choice and to argue for its closeness to Virgil’s intentions. Indeed, this commitment remains in the mold of other Ancients such as Racine, whose plays remained true to Aristotle’s unities—as opposed to more radical contemporaries, such as Corneille, who, in the previous generation, had the temerity to break the rules laid down

---

17 Certainly, in Villanova’s praeefatio and Supplementum ad Aeneida, we never see any blanket repudiation of Virgilian poetics, as Scaliger previously had done with the Homeric poems in his 1561 commentaries on Aristotle’s Poetics.

18 See Jean Racine, “Préface,” in Phèdre (New York: Penguin, 1991 [1677]), 22: “Aussi Aristote a bien voulu donner des règles du poème dramatique; et Socrate, le plus sage des philosophes, ne dédaignait pas de mettre la main aux tragédies d’Euripide. Il serait à souhaiter que nos ouvrages fussent aussi solides et aussi pleins d’utiles instructions que ceux de des poètes.” Similarly, in the preface to his Iphigénie (1674) he berates detractors who criticize Euripides and other Greek dramatists; to this end he cites Quintilian 10.1.26: Modesto tamen et circumspecto iudicio de tantis viris pronuntiandum est, ne, quod plerisque accidit, damnet quae non intellegunt. Ac si necesse est in alteram errare partem, omnia eorum legentibus placere quam multa displicere maluerim. Racine even partially translated Aristotle’s Poetics: “La tragédie est donc l’imitation d’une action grave et complete, et qui a sa juste grandeur …” See also Brian Nelson, The Cambridge Introduction to French Literature (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 33: “Every formal element of [Racine’s] plays contributes, in a tightly interwoven, highly economical manner to their tragic purpose. Strict adherence to the unities (of time, place, and action) and a remarkably small vocabulary … give Racine’s tragedies their sharpness of focus.”
by antiquity. On the other hand, like Perrault and the Moderns he considers the *Aeneid* as it stands woefully incomplete and even blameworthy, since it fails to complete the storyline that it set out to accomplish. Furthermore, throughout his poem he composes opulent and often seemingly anachronistic scenes that compete in magnificence with specific moments in Virgil’s poetry and shatter the illusion of continuity between the two poems. As a product of an age divided between antiquarianism and modernity, we will find that he too is “differently of the same opinion.”

2. Review of Scholarship

As mentioned above, previous scholarship has considered Villanova to be a convinced Modern partisan—and has generally criticized his Latinity. In this view, he appears to be something of a failure; while attempting to overcome Virgil through literary *aemulatio* in the spirit of the Moderns, he remains manifestly unable even to live up to the standards of the poetics of the ancient world. It is Kern who first suggests that he might have been a follower of Perrault

---

19 Pierre Corneille failed to follow the Aristotelian unities in his wildly popular *Le Cid* (1637). A bitter pamphlet war ensued, known as “The Quarrel of *Le Cid.*” Corneille was finally castigated by the Académie française and returned to the safety of harmonious Aristotelianism in his subsequent plays. For a brief introduction to the controversy see Brian Nelson, *The Cambridge Introduction to French Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 29–30. Corneille, “Of the Three Unities of Action, Time, and Place,” in *The Continental Model*, 131, sums up his position concerning the rules of the ancients: “It is easy for critics to be severe; but if they were to give ten or a dozen plays to the public, they might perhaps slacken the rules more than I do, as soon as they have recognized through experience what constraint their precision brings about and how many beautiful things it banishes from the stage.”

20 Little scholarly work exists on the *Supplementum ad Aeneida* in German and almost none in English. As with Forestus, the only substantive treatments of the poem remain the summary in Kern, 30–43, and two chapters in Oertel, 117–176. No significant research appears to have been undertaken on the *Supplementum ad Aeneida* during the entirety of the twentieth century.
and intended his *Supplementum* for a Modern social or literary circle.\(^{21}\) With nearly the same breath, he criticizes the excesses of his Latin style:

> Wunderliche Konstruktionen, abstruse und geschmacklose Wendungen, eigentümliche Wortverschränkungen und eine bis zur Dunkelheit gesteigerte Prägnanz des Ausdruckes würden das, was der Verfasser sagen will, da und dort ganz unklar lassen, wenn nicht eine unter dem Texte fortlaufende, freie Übersetzung dem Verständnisse nachhälse.\(^{22}\)

Otherwise, he mostly provides plot summary, as he did with Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni*. Similarly, in the introduction to his edition of Forestus, Schmidt implies that Villanova took the side of the Moderns, but does not develop his observation.\(^{23}\) As to his language and thematic matter, he only mentions that it remains far from Virgil, in contrast to the more Virgilian Forestus.\(^{24}\)

Like his predecessors, Oertel considers Villanova to be among the party of the Moderns. Following Schmidt, he compares Forestus and Villanova: “Während sich Jan van Foreest in seinen *Exequiae Turni* bemüht hat, in Wortwahl, Stil, Metrik und Szenengestaltung ... wollte sich Villanova auch als Anhänger der *modernes* zeigen.”\(^{25}\) Like Kern, in his analysis of the various aspects of Villanova’s *aemulatio*, his arguments frequently lapse into unhelpful criticisms that denigrate Villanova’s efforts in comparison to the *Aeneid* and fail to understand their functions and successes within the *Supplementum* itself.\(^{26}\) For instance, when analyzing Villanova’s

---

\(^{21}\) Kern, 34: “Perrault hatte offenbar druch seine Philippika gegen die Alten nicht nur Widerspruch erregt, sondern auch manche überzeugte Anhänger gewonnen. Möglicherweise zählte gerade der gesellschaftliche oder literarische Kreis, für den das Supplement zunächst berechnet war, zu der Partei der ‘Modernen’.”

\(^{22}\) ibid.

\(^{23}\) Schmidt, 520–521; e.g. regarding the *praefatio*, *ibid.*, 521: “Punkt für Punkt hält [Villanova] ihm vor, welche Episoden er in der *Aeneis* hätte darstellen müssen, um ein nach den Regeln der Dichtkunst vollendetes Werk zu schaffen. Sein Verdikt lautet: *Virgilius ... epici carminis ... ad amussim non observaverat regulas*. Damit macht sich Villanova einen Vorwurf zu eigen, der in den Diskussionen seiner Zeit eine große Rolle spielt.”

\(^{24}\) ibid., 520.

\(^{25}\) Oertel, 137.

\(^{26}\) That said, Oertel, 117–146, provides a thorough account of Villanova’s cultural background, intellectual milieu, and the artistic world of baroque France, which provides a solid basis for my own study—as does his second chapter, *ibid.*, 147–176, in which he analyses the language of the *Supplementum ad Aeneida* itself, including its word-choice, metrics, rhetoric, and style.
descriptive passages (i.e. the palace of Latinus [13.104–113]) he criticizes their “superficial magnificence” in comparison to Virgil: “Während solche Beschreibungen bei Vergil überall in innerem Bezug zur Handlung stehen, dienen sie im Supplementum vordergründiger Prachtentfaltung.”

Similarly, Villanova’s characterizations of Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia, and Mnestheus are roughly dismissed as one-dimensional when compared with the characters of the Aeneid: “Dabei bleibt Villanova im Typischen, Eindimensionalen, ohne Vergils Vielschichtigkeit zu erreichen.” As with Kern and Schmidt, in Oertel’s reading, Villanova appears to be a tragicomic figure, who tried to prove the excellence of modern literature through an often unsuccessful and linguistically convoluted attempt at competition with Virgil’s Aeneid.

Subsequently, Villanova has earned an unfortunate highlight in The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin, where Schaffenrath briefly reviews the scanty details of Villanova’s life and sums up his contribution as follows: “Literary history places de Villeneuve’s supplement within the context of the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, as he criticizes Virgil in his preface for having left out quite an amount of material in the Aeneid, which it is now his task to supply.”

Following Kern, Schmidt, and Oertel, he assigns Villanova solidly to the Modern camp, and unceremoniously gives him the role of an aeneomastix, rather than a more complex and three-dimensional role within the history of Virgilian supplementation.

---

27 ibid., 167.
28 ibid.
29 ibid., 145–146.
31 See ibid., 67. Conspicuously, the survey leaves out Forestus entirely, listing instead Thomas May’s supplement to Lucan published in seven books in 1639 and Giovanni Pontano’s Urania sive de stellis (1475–1502) which fills in Manilius’ Astronomica with material derived from Firmicus Maternus. Finally, it would not be amiss to recognize a recent article that examines the Télémaque of Fénelon, published in Paris in 1699, as an example of popular epic supplementation (of the Odyssey) in the vernacular roughly contemporaneous to the Supplementum ad Aeneida. See Jardar Lohne, “Epic Continuation as a Basis for Moral Education,” BCPSR, 175–188.
characterization of Villanova demonstrates the negative effects of thoughtless scholarly
generalizations: A three-dimensional work is reduced to two dimensions, and finally whittled
away to a rude characterization in a popular collection of essays that will further serve to solidify
a one-dimensional view of a multifaceted and complex poem.\textsuperscript{32}

Beyond the anglophone world, Schindler has subjected the \textit{Supplementum} to a recent
article-length treatment, in which she claims that Villanova’s poem should not be treated as a
product of the Quarrel. Her general thesis is unobjectionable: The \textit{Supplementum} is innovative
and plays with its genre: “Villanova legt also mit seinem \textit{Liber decimus-tertius} ein \textit{Aeneis}-
Supplement vor, das in innovativer Weise mit der literarischen Konzeption des Supplements
spielt.”\textsuperscript{33} Yet, her arguments to this effect are presented in tortured logic that strains the limits of
credulity. When faced with editorial roughness and stylistic difficulties in the \textit{Supplementum},
Schindler claims that such mistakes may have been intended by the author, who wished to
simulate an unfinished poem to craftily challenge the very form of supplementation itself:

Im Gegenteil spricht sogar Verschiedenes dafür, dass das bizarre Latein Villeneuves und
vielleicht sogar die redaktionelle Unfertigkeit des Gedichts nur den äußeren Rahmen für
eine innovative und experimentelle Form der Supplementdichtung bilden, die sowohl
Vegios \textit{Aeneis}-Ergänzung als auch die Supplement-Mode des 17. Jhs. unterläuft. Was die
Nachlässigkeiten im Druck angeht, so kann dies zwar auf redaktionelle Unfertigkeit
hindeuten, doch ist nicht sicher, ob Villeneuve nicht diese Unfertigkeit lediglich
simulieren möchte. Ebenso könnte man vermuten, dass er keine “wissenschaftliche”
Ausgabe schafft, sondern möglicherweise nur den äußeren Eindruck einer

\textsuperscript{32} Along with other French supplementers of the seventeenth century, Villanova also receives a brief mention by
Bobby Xinyue, “Augustus in Morisot’s ‘Book 8’ of the \textit{Fasti},” in \textit{Afterlives of Augustus, AD 14–2014}, ed. Penelope
J. Goodman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 199, n.8. Xinyue remarks that “The shortage of
critical examination of Neo-Latin texts deprives us of a full understanding of the reception of Augustus in France in
the seventeenth century.” Several other references to the \textit{Supplementum} can be found in modern scholarship. See
World}, ed. Craig Kallendorf (Leiden: Brill, 2014), consulted online, for whom the \textit{Supplementum} is “a baroque
flourish of visual descriptiveness.”

\textsuperscript{33} Schindler, 58.
wissenschaftlichen Ausgabe erwecken wollte, bei dem es nicht relevant ist, ob die Verszalen stimmen oder nicht.\textsuperscript{34}

Villanova remarks apologetically on the difficulty of his own style in the \textit{praefatio};\textsuperscript{35} it is for this reason that he includes a side-by-side \textit{interpretatio} and \textit{annotatio} that are very useful, even today, when attempting to translate the poem.\textsuperscript{36} In short, the footnotes and \textit{interpretatio} exist to explain the poem; the poem does not exist to provide an opportunity for footnotes.\textsuperscript{37} Problems plaguing some of his footnotes (most seriously, the corruption between \textit{ad} 264 and \textit{ad} 269, discussed below) are also probably not intended as a subtle innovation within the supplementary genre.\textsuperscript{38} After all, most of the footnotes are correctly placed.

More seriously, Schindler challenges the idea that the \textit{Supplementum} should be viewed within the context of the Quarrel. She argues that the Quarrel is not mentioned in the \textit{praefatio}, nor are its primary participants. The only contemporaries named are Carolus Ruaeus, i.e., Charles de La Rue (1643–1725), and Segresius, i.e., Jean Regnault de Segrais (1624–1701):

Dennoch stellt sich die Frage, inwieweit es sich bei Villeneuves Supplement in erster Linie um einen Beitrag zur Querelle handelt. In der \textit{praefatio} finden sich keine expliziten Stellungnahmen zu diesem Literaturstreit. Kein einziger Vertreter der Querelle wird namentlich genannt; an zeitgenössischen Autoren führt Villeneuve allein den Vergil-Kommentator Ruaeus und den Vergil-Übersetzer Segresius auf.\textsuperscript{39}

But Ruaeus was not just a “commentator of Virgil,” nor was Segresius only a “translator of Virgil.” Ruaeus was an involved contemporary of the Quarrel, whose poetry on the victories of

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{ibid.}, 46.
\textsuperscript{35} Villanova, \textit{praef.} 8.
\textsuperscript{36} See the footnotes in Oertel, 333–403.
\textsuperscript{37} As Schindler, 46, argues: “Viemehr gewinnt man den Eindruck, als habe er in seinem Supplement bewusst einen erläuterungsbedürftigen Text schaffen wollen, der eine Prosa-\textit{interpretatio} erforderlich machte.”
\textsuperscript{38} I wish to add here, for the sake of posterity, that any mistakes in my footnotes are unintentional.
\textsuperscript{39} Schindler, 51.
Louis XIV was translated by Corneille. Even the introduction to Ruaeus’ *Argumentum Aeneidos* begins by insisting that Virgil does not break from Aristotelian unities—a betrayal of his engagement with the broader concerns of the Ancient side of the Quarrel, and one that Villanova takes up in his *praefatio* (to be reviewed below). As for Segresius, his involvement with the Modern side of Quarrel is unquestionable: “He admired Malherbe – not the Malherbe of the official, national odes, but the anti-traditionalist, the Modern ... Segrais himself is resolutely modern.” Instead of citing characters like Perrault and Fontenelle, whose treatment of Virgil was more superficial and embedded in broader concerns, Villanova chose to engage with the specialists of his part of the Quarrel—those particularly concerned with Virgil; his concern is with the local battle, so to speak, and its more intimate participants.

Schindler instead provides what she considers to be a more probable explanatory context for Villanova’s poem. Her argument is as follows: At the beginning of the *praefatio*, Villanova cites several authors to prove the excellence of the *Aeneid*. Along with Juvenal (*Satires*, 1.150–151) and Statius (*Thebaid*, 12.816–817), Petronius appears:

> *immo mentis inops diiudicandus quicunque sibi confideret subsequi uirum, de quo sic Eumolpius in Petronio: sententiae in carminibus non eminent extra corpus orationis expressae; intexto uestibus colore nitent, mens illius ingenti litterarum flumine inundata; ab omni uerborum uilitate et a plebe sunt semotae eius elocutiones.*

---


42 It is interesting that Villanova engages with both an Ancient and a Modern in his *praefatio*; this further supports my thesis that he engages with both sides of the Quarrel. *Contra* Schindler, Villanova’s participation in the Quarrel has been universally affirmed by previous scholarship.

43 Schindler, 51–54.

44 “Rather, whoever attempts to rival him [i.e. Virgil] should be considered foolish. Eumolpus spoke about this very point in Petronius’ *Satyricon*: ‘The thoughts in poems do not stand out from the body of the speech; they shine with color that is woven into the material; the mind is steeped by the great flood of letters; and his elocutions are divorced from popular usage.’”
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The citation is loosely adapted from *Satyricon*, 118:

>ceterum neque generosior spiritus vanitatem amat, neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata, refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat, 'odi profanum vulgus et arceo.' praeterea curandum est, ne sententiae emineant extra corpus expressae, sed intexto vestibus colore. Homerus testis et lyrici Romanusque Vergilius et Horatii curiosa felicitas.\(^{45}\)

It is obvious that Villanova has modified and somewhat misconstrued the original passage.

Eumolpus was discussing his poetic theory, and Virgil only appears among other poets (Horace and Homer). Schindler points out that Villanova seems to have cared more about citing from the *Satyricon* than he did about representing Petronius’ content.\(^{46}\) But why?\(^{47}\) Schindler reminds the reader of the forged additions to the *Satyricon* published by François Nodot in 1693,\(^{48}\) and finally concludes that Villanova cited Petronius in order to deliberately position himself against Nodot:

> Dass Villeneuve in der Einleitung zu seinem Supplement auf Petron verweist, ohne dass seine zeitgenössischen Rezipienten sich an die inkriminierten Ergänzungen der Nodot’schen Fälschung erinnert fühlen, scheint kaum denkbar. Vielmehr liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass Villeneuve Petron zitiert, um sich gegenüber Nodot bewusst als “seriöser” Supplementdichter zu positionieren, der sich sämtliche sprachlich-stilistischen

\(^{45}\) “But nobler souls do not love such coxcombry, and the mind cannot conceive or bring forth its fruit unless it is steeped in the vast flood of literature. One must flee away from all diction that is, so to speak, cheap, and choose words divorced from popular use, putting into practice, ‘I hate the common herd and hold it afar.’ Besides, one must take care that the epigrams do not stand out from the body of the speech: they must shine with a brilliancy that is woven into the material.” (Trans: Heseltine). On Eumolpus’ literary theory more generally, see Edward Courtney, *A Companion to Petronius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 181–184.

\(^{46}\) Schindler, 51.

\(^{47}\) See *ibid.*, 52, where Schindler initially suggests that it may have been that Villanova, as a “tricliniarch” felt some commonality with Petronius, an *arbiter elegantiarum*: “Ein Grund dafür könnte gewesen sein, dass sich der französische tricliniarca dem arbiter elegantiarum aus Tacitus’ Annalen aufgrund der biographischen Gemeinsamkeit verbunden fühlt.” She sensibly does not press this point, which is clearly unprovable.

\(^{48}\) For a history and edition of the supposedly forged fragments, see Christian Laes, “Forging Petronius: François Nodot and the Fake Petronian Fragments” *HumLov* 47 (1998), 358–402, esp. 360–363. Note that while the first criticisms of the fragments were made by Henri Basnage de Beauval in 1692 and Georges Pelissier (Claude-Ignace Brugière de Barante) in 1694, the “final attack” was not made until Burmann’s edition of 1709. Their authenticity has continued as a matter of debate, and they have been published with the *Satyricon* up through the twentieth century.
The problems with this argument are numerous. Most easily, Schindler must suppose that Nodot’s forgery would have been well known among Villanova’s readership and that Villanova conceived and composed the poem after 1693 (or later). But more serious is the fact that Villanova nowhere mentions Nodot, nor does he give any indication that he places any significant importance on the quote from Petronius, embedded as it is between quotes from Juvenal and Statius. It is hardly positioned in a way that suggests that it should be considered programmatic for his entire Supplementum and poetic program. Finally, if Villanova had wished to include a subtle reference to Nodot for perceptive readers, surely, he would have imitated Nodot by forging a quote by Petronius—or even included a quote from Nodot’s fragments—rather than modifying and re-orienting a genuinely Petronian passage.

Ultimately, Schindler rejects the notion that the Supplementum was intended as part of the Quarrel because no participants from the Quarrel were mentioned (a claim that is incorrect). She then proceeds to argue that Villanova instead intended to enter into dialogue with a work whose author is also unnamed and who is reached by a tenuous and otherwise unsupported association. She provides no compelling argument that Villanova intends his readership to recall Nodot.

II. *Virgilianae Historiae Proprior*: Villanova’s *Praefatio, Annotationes, and Interpretatio*
1. The *Praefatio* of the *Supplementum ad Aeneida*

Turning now to Villanova, he begins his *praefatio* by sharply distinguishing between two different aspects (*facies*) of Virgil and his poetry. The first aspect is of a man who writes poetry (*ut poesim duntaxat scribentem*); the second is of an author of an epic poem (*ut carminis epici autorem*). Considered under the first aspect, as a work of poetry, the *Aeneid* is obviously perfect: *si hac facie laus una ei debetur: nihil de ipsius Aeneide detrahendum, nihil ipsi addendum.*

Villanova cites Petronius and the final lines of Statius’ *Thebaid* in defense of the *Aeneid*’s perfections. He ends the section by clothing himself in Statius’ humility: *non tu diuinam Aeneida tenta / sed longe sequere, et uestigia semper adora.* Through the addition of the *Supplementum*, Villanova assures his reader that he is not attempting to “attack” or “test” (*tenta*) the *Aeneid*; rather, he is following at a distance (*longe sequere*) and rendering due praise to the poetic excellence of the divine poem. As we have seen, this is essentially an Ancient position. The marshalling of Classical authorities such as Petronius and Statius is nearly indistinguishable from the historical arguments made by many Ancient partisans, who piled up authorities, both classical and post-classical, to demonstrate the universal acclaim given to ancient literature, which Longepierre called the “universal consent of the ages.”

---

50 This section necessarily recapitulates some ground already covered by Oertel, 126–129.
51 Villanova, *praef.1. Schindler*, 41, argues that the *praefatio* “confirms the reader’s expectations” by treating the question of the *Aeneid*’s completeness and incompleteness: “Die *praefatio* zum Supplement-Text bestätigt die Leserwartung insofern, als der Verfasser sich hier in Auseinandersetzung mit zeitgenössischen Forschungsmeinungen ausführlich mit der Frage der Vollständigkeit oder Unvollständigkeit der *Aeneis* befasst und sein Vorhaben mit dem Hinweis auf verschiedene unabgeschlossene Handlungsstränge legitimiert”; however, it seems that a *praefatio* to a supplement of the *Aeneid* that begins by proclaiming the perfections of the *Aeneid* would certainly have been unexpected.
such as Perrault insisted on the progress made since classical antiquity, only praising Virgil by contrasting him with earlier poets such as Homer.\textsuperscript{54}

Having praised Virgil’s poem, Villanova proceeds to consider the \textit{Aeneid} under the second aspect, that is, as an epic poem. After defining the true nature of epic poetry, he pronounces Virgil’s undisputed masterpiece imperfect and unfinished:

\begin{quote}
\textit{si vero altera facie, id est carmen epicum scribentem lector attenderit, ne temeritatis et audaciae obiurgatum ipse et rei litterariae periti me velint … enim vero cum poema epicum definiatur imitatio actionis unius illustris completae etc. aliquid ad perfectionem \textit{Aeneidos} desiderari videtur, cum ex omni parte non sit completa.}\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

Although the classical \textit{locus} for Villanova’s theory of epic poetry is obviously Aristotle’s \textit{Poetics},\textsuperscript{56} his Aristotelianism is filtered through an introduction to an edition of the \textit{Aeneid} (1675) by Carolus Ruaeus, in which the learned Jesuit defines epic poetry \textit{ex doctrina Aristotelis}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{poema epicum sive epopoeia, sic dictum est ab ἔπος, verbum, quia totum poetae dictione seu narratione continetur. definitur \textit{ex doctrina} Aristotelis: imitatio actionis unius, illustris, completae, certae magnitudinis. quae narratione et versu hexametro viros principes cum admiratione et delectatione ad primarias virtutes excitat.}\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54} E.g. Perrault, \textit{Parallèle}, 3.125.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Villanova, \textit{praef}.2: “But if the reader will consider Virgil under the other aspect, that is, as one writing an epic poem, may he and those who are learned in literary affairs not wish me to be scolded for temerity and rashness. … Indeed, since an epic poem is defined as the imitation of an action that is single, clear, complete, etc., it appears that the perfection of the \textit{Aeneid} is lacking, since it is not complete in every way.”
\item \textsuperscript{56} Aristotle, \textit{Poetics}, 1459b. Aristotle defines tragedy in \textit{ibid.}, 1449b: ἔστιν οὖν τραγῳδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας μέγεθος ἐχούσης, ἥδυσμενῳ λόγῳ χρώς ἐκάστῳ τῶν εἰδών ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δρώντων καὶ οὐ δὴ ἀπαγγέλλας, δὴ ἕλεου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν. In 1459b he distinguishes epic from tragedy by its length (about as long as a series of tragedies given in one hearing) and its meter (hexameters).
\item \textsuperscript{57} Villanova mentions Ruaeus in \textit{praef}.9, making the presumption of direct influence secure.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Carolus Ruaeus, \textit{P. Virgili Maronis Opera} (Paris: Sumptibus Fratrum Barbou, 1722), 240: “An epic poem or \textit{epopoeia} (ἐποποεία) is derived from ἔπος, i.e. ‘word,’ because the entirety consists in poetic speech and narrative. It is defined by the teaching of Aristotle: the imitation of an action that is single, clear, complete, and of a certain magnitude, which with narration and hexameter verse rouses excellent men to distinguished virtues.”
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Significantly, when discussing the “completeness” of the \emph{Aeneid}, Ruaeus condemns Vegius’ \emph{Supplementum}:

\begin{quote}
completam negavit Maphaeus Vegius, ideo sibi posse visus est decimum-tertium librum Aeneidi assuere, quo dolorem Rutulorum, Turni funus, Aeneae nuptias et apotheosin complexus est, temere omnino ... cetera, quae ad pompam luctumque pertinent, frigida et puerilia, certe minime necessaria.\footnote{ibid., 241: “Maffeo Vegio denied that \textit{the Aeneid} was completed, and for this reason he considered himself able to add a thirteenth book to the \textit{Aeneid}, in which he included the mourning of the Rutulians, the funeral of Turnus, and the wedding and apotheosis of Aeneas … The rest, which pertains to the procession and mourning, is lifeless and juvenile, and entirely unnecessary.” As Oertel, 178, plausibly argues, it is likely that Villanova was acquainted with Vegius’ work through Ruaeus’ introduction, if not from the frequent inclusion of the \textit{Supplementum} at the end of numerous editions of the \textit{Aeneid}: “Man kann annehmen, daß sich auch Villanova ein Exemplar des Vegio verschafft hat.”}
\end{quote}

Ruaeus reminds the reader of the prophecies and promises concerning Aeneas’ rule, marriage, and apotheosis; furthermore, he considers the funeral of Turnus to be an entirely unworthy motive for supplementation. Although he does not mention Forestus by name, this criticism could be made more specifically against the \textit{Exequiae Turni}. Ruaeus’ final verdict is that the \textit{Aeneid} is indeed a perfect imitation of an action;\footnote{ibid., 242: \textit{mores ubique aequabiles et ad imitationem ac delectationem aptissimi. sententia autem et dictio sic absoluta ac perfecta est, ut hoc utroque nomine princeps poetarum Virgilius habendus sit.}} the additions—the plural again signifying that he may have Forestus in mind as well—are frigid, childish, and unnecessary.

\textit{Contra} Ruaeus, however, Villanova argues that the \textit{Aeneid} is unfinished according to the same Aristotelian definition.\footnote{Oertel, 126: “[D]er Autor [i.e. Villanova] … kritisiert auch die herrschende Epostheorie seiner Zeit, die sich auf die Poetik des Aristoteles stützt, für Villanova leicht greifbar in den poetologischen Ausführungen in der Aeneis-Ausgabe des Ruaeus bzw. der Übersetzung von J. R. de Segrais.” Villanova does not criticize the Aristotelian theory of epic; rather he criticizes the application of this theory to explain the perfections of Virgil’s epic. According to Villanova, when interpreted correctly, the Aristotelian theory allows the reader to understand the imperfections of Virgil’s poem \textit{qua} epic poetry.} In his five-part argument, he claims the following:
1) Virgil detracts from the piety of Aeneas by including nothing about the funeral of Turnus, especially since Turnus pleaded with Aeneas regarding the return of the body (12.935–936).\(^6^2\)

2) The marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia is not included in the *Aeneid*, something required by Turnus’ final words (*tua stat Lavinia coniunx* [12.937]). Furthermore, Villanova claims that it is necessary for Virgil to show the deeds by which Aeneas brought the marriage about, seeing that Lavinia was previously angry with him—as her famous blush supposedly demonstrates (12.64–65)!\(^6^3\)

3) In 1.263–266, Jupiter had promised Venus that Aeneas would wage a war in Italy, crush nations, and establish laws and city walls. None of this is fulfilled in Virgil’s epic; instead, the entire epic vanishes (*evanescit*) with the death of Turnus.\(^6^4\)

4) Even more seriously, Virgil omits the passing of laws, establishing of cults, and administration of justice; these were promised previously to Latinus. Villanova characterizes this as carelessness deserving of castigation.\(^6^5\)

\(^{62}\) Villanova, *praef.2*: *quod a pietate Aeneae summopere deflectit*. Modern scholars have also felt dissatisfied with the lack of a burial for Turnus. See Edgeworth, “The Silence of Virgil,” 4–5: “Turnus makes two pleas, offering Aeneas his choice: *either* spare my life, *or* return my body to my aged father Daunus (12.932–36). Aeneas does not reject the first plea; but it is astonishing that Virgil refuses to tell us whether the second plea will be granted or denied.” On the contrary see Jenkyns, *Virgil’s Experience*, 67 (qtd., in Edgeworth, “The Silence of Virgil,” 5, n. 1): “Virgil is moving with such rapidity that he does not pause to tell us if this supplication [*return my body*] is granted, but he does not need to, for we are sure that it is.” Edgeworth, *ibid.*, doubts this confident reading.

\(^{63}\) ibid., 2–3: *demonstrare adhuc fuit necesse, qui Aeneas Latino fecisset satis, illius iram mollisset, ob Laurentem ab ipso obsessam, et paene dirutam; quibus factis Latinum adegerit Regem ad ipsi Laviniam concedendum, et concessam hanc sibi devinixerit, multum ipsi antea iratum, ut hoc versu notum: accepit vocem lachrymis Lavinia matris / flagrantes perfusa genas (12.64–65).

\(^{64}\) ibid., 3: *cum ipse solummodo regnare incoeperit, bella gerere, ponere leges, et moenia post mortem Turni, Turnoque animam vix exhalante, Aeneae et Aeneidos totum evanescit hoc versu: vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras* (12.952).

\(^{65}\) ibid., 3–4: *praeterit quas leges Aeneas tum de ritu colendi tum de iuris dandi ratione sanciverit et eo magis castiganda haec incuria mihi videtur, quod in solemni sacramento cum Latino ad haec sese obligarat his verbis: sin nostrum annuerit victoria Martem / ... / sacra deosque dabo* (Virgil, *Aeneid*, 12.187, 192).
5) Finally, Virgil ignores Aeneas’ death, apotheosis, and succession.\footnote{ibid., 4: Nihil inserit de morte, mortis genere, et apotheosi, nihil de Silvio eius filio posthuno ab Anchise praedicto.} Regarding the apotheosis, he writes:

\begin{quote}
insuper longe haec oracula contra me stare dicantur, quin ex illis concludere facillimum est a Virgilio apothesan Aeneae describendam debuisse, qua omnimodo omissa, mearum esse partium adiuvavi, qua de ratione inter superos, morte, et mortis genere expositis, Aeneas fuerit annumeratus.\footnote{ibid., 4–5: “Furthermore, it is impossible that these oracles may be said to contravene my position; rather, from these passages it is very easy to conclude that the apotheosis of Aeneas ought to have been described by Virgil. But since these events were entirely omitted, I thought that it was up to me to describe in which way Aeneas was numbered among the gods, after describing his death, and the manner of his death.”}
\end{quote}

Unlike Ruæus, Villanova does not consider the oracles and prophecies to be sufficient for the fulfillment of each of these plot-points.\footnote{Villanova tracks these points carefully in his poem and in the annotationes included with his 1698 edition, i.e., ad 345: cum Aeneas tres in Latio regnavit a morte Turni annos, ut probavimus in præfato. duos consumptos existimavi describendos quibus et tranquillitas et otium et voluptates et festa regnavere. ultimum vero bellis gestis, legisbibus sanctis, ritui ordinato, Laurenti urbi reparatae et tandem apotheosi destinavi.} Ultimately, he claims to agree with Virgil himself regarding the incompleteness of the \textit{Aeneid}.\footnote{See Oertel, 128: “Vergil, so die Praeafatio weiter, habe selber bemerkt, daß er die epischen Regeln nicht streng beachtet habe (\textit{Epici carminis ... ad amussim non observaverat regulas}); darauf deute die Nachricht Donats, daß er die Aeneis kurz vor seinem Tod habe verbrennen wollen.”} He reminds the reader that Virgil wanted to burn the poem at the end of his life:

\begin{quote}
haec prae ceteris regnat et me movet: Virgilium morientem petiisse Aeneida comburendam, eo impulsum, non quod lacunae in ea dehiscerent, ut plurimi temere diiudicarunt, verum quoniam epici carminis, ut mox probavimus ad amussim non observaverat regulas.\footnote{Villanova, \textit{praef.} 5: “This [reason] holds sway before all the rest and convinces me, that as he lay dying Virgil begged that the \textit{Aeneid} be burned. He was compelled to this not because there were gaping \textit{lacunae} in it, as most have blindly thought, but because as we just demonstrated, the poem had not observed the rules of epic poetry exactly.”}
\end{quote}
This story clearly derives from Donatus’ *vita*; however, Donatus strongly suggests that the half-lines are the primary source of the *Aeneid*’s incompleteness. Villanova dismisses this idea as a rash interpretation (*temere*) and concludes that Virgil’s final anguish came about not because *lacunae* (i.e., the half-lines) remained in the poem, but rather because the poem did not precisely (*ad amussim*) follow the Aristotelian *regulae* governing the composition of epic. He is so committed to these Aristotelian *regulae* that he ignores the obvious incompleteness of the half-lines in favor of an explanation based on the structures outlined in the *Poetics*. Furthermore, he argues that Virgil himself would agree with this explanation regarding the faults of his own work. Thus, although Villanova criticizes the *Aeneid*, he does not do so as a Modern might, by comparing Virgil with the glories of modern French literature; rather, he argues that Virgil intended the *Aeneid* as a perfect Aristotelian unity, but was stymied by his untimely death. This is an *apologia* for the perfection of the *Aeneid*’s intended plan, according to the rules of poetry established by ancient authors, particularly, Aristotle.

Next, Villanova engages directly with Ruaeus’ criticism of Vegius’ supplement. Ruaeus claims that Aeneas’ possession of Lavinia and the kingdom of Italy is already confirmed by Turnus’ words at the end of the *Aeneid*: *iam Lavinia regnumque Latii a Turno moriente Aeneae permittitur l. 12.937: tua est Lavinia coniunx*. Therefore, a supplement is entirely unnecessary.

Villanova responds with two points. First, he claims that, by granting Lavinia to Aeneas, Turnus was merely attempting to prolong his own life; in other words, we should not take Turnus’

---

71 Donatus, 39: *egerat cum Vario, priusquam Italia decederet, ut siquid sibi accidisset, Aeneida combureret; at is facturum se pernegarat; igitur in extrema valetudine assidue scrina desideravit, crematurus ipse; verum nemine offerente nihil quidem nominatim de ea cavit.*
72 ibid., 41: *edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos, si qui erant, reliquerit.*
73 See Oertel, 128.
promise seriously. Second, if the foundation of the Trojan kingdom in Italy was all that was required to fulfill the action of the *Aeneid*, then the founding of New Troy on the Tiber (7.157–159) would be a fitting end of the poem! His final argument is in the form of a syllogism that recapitulates his position:

\[
\textit{cui objectioni sic facio satis, vel sufficit ut oracula quiddam praedixerint, ut teneatur factum, vel nec sufficit. si sufficit ratio adversariorum ruit; si non sufficit iusta de causa Virgilio meum adiunxi supplementum, cum in eo tum multa promissa ab Aenea dignoscantur imperfecta, tum maxima oracula, ut modo in praefatione annotavi, nec adimpleta redarguantur.}
\]

Thus, either oracles are sufficient for the completion of an action, or they are not. If the oracles are sufficient, then the *Aeneid* should end much earlier (i.e., in book 7); if the oracles are not sufficient, then the supplementation of the *Aeneid* is justified. Clearly, the *Aeneid* does not end much earlier than it does; therefore, his Supplementum is justified. *quod erat demonstrandum!*

Having attended to Ruaeus’ 1722 introduction, Villanova turns his sights on *doctissimus Segresius*, i.e., Jean Regnault de Segrais (1624–1701), well-known for his 1668 verse translation of the *Aeneid* into French. Villanova approvingly cites Segresius’ dictum that an author should be commended on his ability to fulfill what he fittingly sets out to do:

\[
\text{Pour louer ou pour blâmer un Auteur, il me semble que la premiere chose à remarquer est son dessein; car s’il a bien fait ce qu’il a voulu faire, & qu’il ait dû le vouloir, non seulement de quoy le peut-on repandre? mais de quoy le peut-on louer davantage?}
\]

---

75 Villanova, praef.5–6: *perfectis autem his omnibus, quiqvid concludendum, amice Lector (si fundatio regni in Italia ad completionem Aeneidos una et sola sufficeret), Virgilium nempe Aeneidi finem imponere debuisse libro septimo vix incepto, cum ex illis versibus Aeneas propositum Maronis executus videatur, et adveniendo in Italian et regnum fundando et Laviniam ducendo uxorem.*

76 *ibid.*, 6: “Either whatever the oracles foretell is sufficient as proof of completion, or it is not sufficient. If it is sufficient, the argument of my adversaries fails. If it is not sufficient then I have added my supplement to Virgil’s poem with good reason, since so many promises made by Aeneas are recognized as incomplete, and a number of oracles, as I have just remarked in my preface, are unfulfilled and unproven.”

But while Segresius employs this dictum to prove the perfection of the *Aeneid*, Villanova explains how Virgil fails to fulfill his aims stated at the beginning of the poem. The fifth line of the poem explains how Aeneas endured many things in war until the founding of a city (1.5). This city, he argues, should not be considered the New Troy founded in *Aeneid* 7, but rather a rebuilt Laurentum to which Aeneas gives a Lavinian name following his marriage to the princess. Since Virgil has passed over the founding of this city, we should consider his poem unfinished, according to the internal criteria of its own stated aims.\(^7\)

Thus, to summarize so far, despite his criticisms of the currently incomplete form of the *Aeneid*, throughout the *praefatio*, Villanova affirms that it is necessary to recognize the manifold perfections of the *Aeneid* as it was intended. Virgil’s work remains a complete and inimitable tribute to the enduring excellence of the ancient world: *nihil de ipsius Aeneide detrahendum, nihil ipsi addendum!* On the other side, he provides three main arguments for the incompleteness of the *Aeneid* as an epic poem. The first is based on the prophecies contained within the *Aeneid* itself, such as the apotheosis and marriage to Lavinia, which remain unfulfilled at the end of the poem. The second utilizes the story found in Donatus, which indicates that the *Aeneid* remained substantially unfinished at the time of Virgil’s death. The third, related to the first, is that, according to the stated aims of the *Aeneid*, especially in 1.5, the poem ought to continue beyond the death of Turnus.\(^9\)

\(^{78}\) Villanova, *praef.* 8: *propositum hoc versu, multa quoque et bello passus dum conderet urbem, non fuit executus. itaque omnino non integer est accusandus.*

\(^{79}\) But finally, should all these arguments fail, Villanova reminds the reader that the *Supplementum ad Aeneida* is ultimately intended for the entertainment of its readers—and that its poet is not a poet, but a tricliniarch (Villanova, *praef.*, 8): *attamen si liber iste decimus-tertius felicem ad portum non fuerit appulsus, attendas, lector, tricliniarchem cuius tota et una fuit mens animum tuum vacuis horis recreare.* Oertel, 145, is rightly suspicious of Villanova’s claim that he only wishes to entertain his readers during their leisure hours; rather, he points out that Villanova attempts to compete with the *Aeneid* in numerous ways: “Und in fast allen Bereichen ... wetteifert Villanova mit
Consequently, Villanova dutifully corrects Virgil’s unfinished plot in his *Supplementum*, paying careful attention to the precise fulfillment of each of the prophecies of the *Aeneid*, as well as to the rites and legislation of the new Trojan and Latin community.\(^8^0\) As Oertel notes, Villanova structures his poem around the five unfinished plot points recognized in his *praefatio*:\(^8^1\) the funeral of Turnus (required by Turnus’ just pleas [12.935–936]), the marriage of Lavinia and Aeneas and the deeds by which Aeneas brings the marriage about (required by Turnus’ relinquishment of his suit for Lavinia [12.937]), the war in Italy and the establishment of a city (required by Jupiter’s promise to Aphrodite [1.263–266]), the passing of laws, establishment of cults, and administration of justice (required by Aeneas’ promises [12.187, 192]), and the death, apotheosis, and succession of Aeneas (as foretold by Anchises [6.763–766]):

1. The Funeral of Turnus (13.1–37)
   - The Desire of the Trojans to Bury Turnus (13.1–16)
   - The Construction of the Tomb and Monument (13.17–37)

2. The Marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia (13.38–317)
   - The Triumphal Entry into Laurentum (13.38–103)
   - Aeneas’ Reconciliation with King Latinus (13.104–164)
   - The Engagement with Lavinia (13.165–191)
   - The Chronicle of Faunus (13.192–238)
   - The Wedding Feast (13.239–317)

3. Additional Wars in Latium and Reconstruction (13.318–690)
   - The Golden Reign of Aeneas (13.318–344)
   - Juno Incites Lauzellus (13.345–370)
   - Help Requested from Evander (13.371–478)
   - The War (13.479–577)
   - The Victory Celebration in Pallanteum (13.578–616)
   - Report of the Events to Aeneas (13.617–667)
   - Reconstruction of Laurentum/Lavinium (13.668–690)

seinem großen Vorbild (*aemulatio*), sei es mit rhetorischen, gewissermaßen quantitativen Mitteln, sei es durch inhaltliche Modernisierung im Sinne des Zeitgeschmacks.”

\(^8^0\) Much of this section necessarily recapitulates and summarizes previous structural analyses of the poem from Oertel, 132–137 and Kern, 30–43.

\(^8^1\) Following Villanova, *praef.* 2–4.
(4) Legislation, Establishment of Cults, and Administration of Justice (13.691–776)
   Establishment of Cults (13.691–756)
   Moral Codes (13.756–776)

(5) Aeneas’ Death, Apotheosis, and Succession (13.777–827)\textsuperscript{82}

Oertel’s structural reading cannot, in the main, be repudiated here, since Villanova himself provides us with the outline in his \textit{praefatio}. Nevertheless, I depart from Oertel and remain true to Villanova’s own outline on two main points. First, the main thrust of (2) is not the “Aussöhnung mit den Latinern,” as Oertel states,\textsuperscript{83} but rather the marriage between Aeneas and Lavinia. The reconciliation between the Latins and Trojans is only one of the steps Aeneas must take to win Lavinia and thus fulfill the Virgilian prophecies. Recall that Villanova assumes that Lavinia was angry with Aeneas, as demonstrated by her famous blush.\textsuperscript{84} Second, the reconstruction of Laurentum should be included in (3), since Villanova separates it from the legislation and establishment of cult in the \textit{praefatio}.\textsuperscript{85} Clearly, (3) deals with the resolution of political and martial issues, (4) with the establishment of moral and legal codes.

But the ring-obsessed Oertel cannot help himself. Following the sensible division of the poem into the five structural units established by the author himself in the \textit{praefatio}, he creates a new ring-composed structure, divided “according to the laws of contrast”:

\begin{quote}
   Doch über die Einflüsse der \textit{Aeneis} hinaus hat Villanova seinem \textit{Supplementum} eine eigenständige Struktur verliehen, gesponnen nach den Gesetzen des Kontrastes: Teil I und V, die kürzeren umrahmenden Erzählpartien, haben beide den Tod zum Inhalt; in beiden werden die Toten hochgeehrt; aber Teil V erzählt von der Himmelfahrt des Verstrobenen und stellt insofern eine Steigerung dar und zugleich einen Kontrast. Teile II und III, die längeren epischen Hauptstücke, haben einander entgegengesetztes Kolorit: Teil II schwelgt in Versöhnung und Liebe, in Teil III toben Haß und Feindschaft: Freiheit und Krieg stehen einander gegenüber! Auch die Teile II,6 und IV,2 sind aufeinander bezogen:
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{82} Oertel, 132–134.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{ibid.}, 132.
\textsuperscript{84} See Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 12.64–65; Villanova, \textit{praef}.2–3.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{ibid.}, 3–4.
Beide stellen zwar Idealzustände dar, aber in II hören wir von einem Goldenen Zeitalter in der Vergangenheit, an das man sich nur sehnsuchtsvoll erinnern kann, in IV geht es um Gebote für eine wünschenswerte Zukunft, die es zu verwirklichen gilt.²⁶

Whatever these governing “laws of contrast” are, we never discover. Villanova certainly never mentions them. Consequently, Oertel’s contrasted elements appear somewhat arbitrary. For instance, it is true that both (1) and (5) deal in some way with death. In (1), the dead Turnus is buried and in (5) Aeneas dies. But (1) does not deal with an apotheosis, nor does Turnus pass on his line by succession. Indeed, one could draw up a nearly infinite list of contrasts and divergences between any of the five sections. (1), for instance, deals with the construction of a tomb, and (3) with the construction of Laurentum/Lavinium. But that clear thematic contrast does not fit the pre-conceived structure of ring-composition. It is more likely that (1) comes at the beginning because it was the first element that needed to be fulfilled following the end of the Aeneid and (5) is obviously the last. The structure of the Supplementum is organized according to the logic of realizing the Virgilian prophecies set forth in the Aeneid and reviewed in the praefatio, not by ring-composition and the structured correspondence of themes like “death,” “peace,” or “war.” Although far-fetched, unlike the structural analysis of the Exequiae Turni, this does not bend Oertel’s reading in drastically unhelpful directions, since Villanova’s praefatio outlines the structure of the Supplementum and provides a solid metric for interpretation.

More importantly, as we have seen in the praefatio, each of these five plot points was clearly foretold in the Aeneid. Therefore, although Villanova considers Virgil’s poem as it stands unfinished, he remains true to Virgil’s plotline and executes it according to Virgil’s own plan—the plan which Virgil did not live long enough to see finished (at least, according to Donatus).

²⁶ Oertel, 136.
Villanova gives no indication that he considers Virgil’s supposedly intended plotline in any way blameworthy. Rather than acting as a fully-fledged Modern partisan of his age, Villanova instead demonstrates that Virgil’s epic can be (and presumably would have been) easily fulfilled according to Aristotelian standards of composition. It was not a hallmark of the Moderns to insist that poems from antiquity must be made to conform to Aristotelian standards of perfection and unity. Rather, they argued that the Aristotelian standards themselves must be modified or rejected.87

Villanova declares his loyalty to Virgil’s plotlines at the end of his praefatio; this is the clearest testimony of his compositional methods. He claims to hold “with all his might” (pro viribus) to the succession (series) and order (ordo) of events known from the Aeneid following the death of Turnus. The order of events seemed to him more suitable to the proper time of a literary work and closer “to Virgilian history”:

rerum gestarum ab Aenea, extincto Turno, seriem et ordinem pro viribus tenui; quemque ordinem habui, hunc et temporis magis accommodam, et Virgilianae historiae propriorem adjudicavi, si quis in hoc peccasse me quoquomodo existimet; ipsius judicio sto libens, cum ad unguem res ut sese habuerint tenere difficillimum sit. (praef.9).88

Once again, he anticipates future detractors; he does not assume that his readers will take issue with his close obedience to Virgilian or Aristotelian norms, but rather that he did not adhere to Virgil’s plot in the proper way, i.e., ad unguem—“to a hair” or “perfectly.” An area of conflict would almost certainly have been the story of Lauzellus, by which he attempted to fulfill Virgilian prophecies that foretold additional conflicts (1.263–264), but left unclear their precise

88 “With all my might I kept to the order and succession of the things done by Aeneas after the death of Turnus. I judged this order to be more fitting to the time and closer to Virgilian history, if anyone should think that I have erred in any way in this, I stand cheerfully by this judgement, since it is difficult to hold exactly to the events as they are constituted.”
nature. Similarly, Virgil left no specific instructions regarding Aeneas’ divinization. Thus, a dilemma: To hold to Virgil he must go beyond Virgil. Invention must help to fill in the (unintended!) defects and omissions of his model. For this he begs the generosity of his audience, cum hoc opere expurgando et politius limando nihil non olei et temporis consumpserim. (praef.9).89

2. The Interpretationes and Annotationes

Before approaching the Supplementum itself, a final feature of the text requires some clarification. Villanova acknowledges that the difficult Latin and the historical references of his Supplementum may require explanatory aids; to this end, he includes an interpretatio and annotationes along with the poem. As he writes in the praefatio, the interpretatio is a prose paraphrase set beneath the poem in its 1698 printing; the annotationes are notes that rest below the interpretatio to provide additional clarifications and explanations:

interpretationem adjunxi, ut multis lectoribus compleam qui historiae materiam sine intermissione legere avidi, saepe saepius difficile intelligent factum poëma, tunc propter strictiorem sensum, verborum transpositionem, terminorum novitatem, tum propter poëtae licentiam. (praef.9).90

Villanova understands the lack of fully functional Latinity among his readers—as well as the difficulty of his own verse. Thus, the interpretatio paraphrases or explains the compressed

89 “… since by editing this work and polishing it more smoothly I was extravagant with my oil and my time.”
90 “I added a prose gloss to please many readers who desire to read historical background without interruption. Often they perceive that the poem is made repeatedly difficult, both on account of its tightly-woven sense, the transposition of words, the unfamiliarity of endings, and poetic license.” It is clear that Villanova considers the annotationes and the interpretatio together in this passage, since the interpretatio itself does not help with the historical material, and the annotationes frequently explain poetic license.
diction (\textit{strictiorem sensum}), the transposition of figures (\textit{verborum transpositionem}), the
“novelty of endings” (\textit{terminorum novitatem}), and the poetic license (\textit{poetae licentiam})
throughout. Furthermore, he includes historical explanations (\textit{historiae materiam}) to allow for an
uninterrupted experience of reading.

First, as promised, his \textit{interpretatio} provides invaluable assistance with his frequently
difficult style throughout the poem. For instance, the lines following the firework show are
difficult to understand without the \textit{interpretatio}:

\begin{verbatim}
regia tecta petunt, diversa lampade fulgent
interiora domus, lucent genialibus altis
aurea fulcra toris, discreto murice, et auro
aulaea invictis mirantur facta parentum (13.268–271).
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Invictis} is especially unclear; it lacks a referent. Literally, this passage could be translated as:

They retire to the royal halls. The interiors of the house shine with a different lamp, the
golden posts on the high festive couches shine, with variegated purple and gold, they
wonder at the tapestries made with the unconquered [things] of their parents.

The \textit{interpretatio} immediately lends clarity:

\begin{verbatim}
eunt ad regiam: internae partes fulgent variis lampadibus, fulcra aurea thoris
superimposita relucent altis genialibus; admirantur avorum facta celebria in tapetibus
contexta cum auro et murice.
\end{verbatim}

They go to the palace: the internal parts glow with various lamps, the golden bedposts
above the high festive couches shine; they admire the famous deeds of the ancestors
woven into the tapestries with gold and purple.

Yet in other places, even where the Latin is clear, the \textit{interpretatio} provides a simplified prose
summary to aid readers who struggle with the “novelty of endings” (\textit{terminorum novitatem}).
Consider the following passage, in which Evander begs Aeneas for aid—a passage which is readily understandable in verse:

\[
\textit{forte lacessitus turmis, ferroque nepotis} \\
\textit{Mezentii Evander, legatos mittere regi} \\
\textit{Aeneadum statuit socia arma virosque rogantes} (13.371–373).
\]

When Evander was attacked by the troops and swords of the grandson of Mezentius, he decided to send legates to King Aeneas, asking for allied men and arms.

The prose summary removes difficult vocabulary, swapping \textit{turmis} ("squadrions") for \textit{copiis} ("troops"); it clarifies the poetic titles of various characters, adding \textit{Lauzelli} to \textit{nepotis Mezentii} to remind the reader exactly who the “grandson of Mezentius” is, and substituting the simple \textit{Aeneae} for the wordy \textit{regi / Aeneadum}. It exchanges the participial construction for a simple relative clause of purpose and an expressed indirect object (\textit{eis}). The subject \textit{Evander} is moved to an easier position at the beginning of the sentence. Overall, the lines are streamlined and given a composition reminiscent of schoolboy exercises:

\[
\textit{forte Evander, lacessitus copiis et ferro Lauzelli nepotis Mezentii, statuit mittere legatos} \\
\textit{Aeneae, qui rogent eum viros et arma socia dare eis.}
\]

So when Evander was attacked by the troops and iron of Lauzellus, the grandson of Mezentius, he decided to send legates to Aeneas, to ask him to give them men and allied arms.

By contrast, the \textit{annotationes} attempt to clear up historical problems or explain Villanova’s inventions (\textit{ficta}) within the historical world of Virgil’s (and Ovid’s) poetry. This may indicate that the author perceived himself to be writing for an audience that would not have the inclination to pursue each reference to the Latin classics themselves, or lacked the in-depth knowledge required to immediately recognize sources and parallels.\footnote{Vegius, by contrast, sees no need to footnote his Ovidian borrowings in the story of Ardea, nor to explain some of his more obscure similes.} Yet, at the same time,
Villanova also assumes that many among his amateur antiquarian readership will be interested in the historical material surrounding the poem. Most importantly, they assume the historicity of Virgil’s plotline and characters and meticulously document Villanova’s additions. For instance, when he is forced to invent a war with Lauzellus to fulfill a Virgilian prophecy, he reminds the reader that his war is “unhistorical” and was invented (fingitur) to fill a gap in Virgil’s narrative (ad 13.370). When he resumes “historical” material, i.e., material clearly stated in Virgil, he is sure to let the reader know:

historia resumitur et mentio fit Aeneae apud Evandrum olim profecti et commorantis, quae historia legitur lib. 8 Aeneid. (ad 13.390).

In his passage, he refers the reader back to the Aeneid to confirm the historicity of Aeneas’ visit to Evander.

III. COMPETITION AND CORRECTION: VILLANOVA’S SUPPLEMENTUM AD AENEIDA

In the following section, I will show how Villanova’s Supplementum ad Aeneida corrects the perceived deficiencies of Virgil’s Aeneid and is characterized throughout by a competitive appropriation of Virgilian material. As we have seen in the praefatio, the poem is organized around five specific plot points required by the Aeneid itself. These are the burial of Turnus and the construction of his tomb, the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia, additional wars in Latium and the reconstruction of Laurentum, the establishment of laws and customs, and finally Aeneas’

---

92 “The historical material is resumed, and mention is made of Aeneas at the time when he had formerly set out and remained with Evander. This history can be read in book 8 of the Aeneid.”

93 Some of the annotationes provide specific historical details taken from Virgil. Who was the brother of Corax mentioned during the siege of Pallanteum (illa cum fratre Corax obsessa premebat [13.545])? Villanova explains: intelligitur Catillus, vide lib. 7. Aeneid. v. 672.
death, apotheosis, and succession. Furthermore, the construction of the tomb of Turnus, the rebuilding of Laurentum, the wedding scene, and the images of Latium at peace and embroiled in conflict provide Villanova the opportunity to challenge Virgil’s aesthetics through clever appropriation and literary aemulatio. Unlike previous scholarship, which has assigned Villanova to the Modern side of the Quarrel and has generally criticized his engagement with Virgil, what will emerge is a poem whose antiquarian devotion to completing Virgil’s plotline ad amussim rests alongside his imaginative and unexpected attempts to contend with the Aeneid through the recasting and embellishment of Virgilian material.

1. The Funeral of Turnus

The opening of the Supplementum demonstrates Villanova’s desire both to correct unsatisfactory elements of the Aeneid and to showcase his own poetic prowess. Turnus’ opulent funeral gives Aeneas the opportunity to exhibit the piety he supposedly lacked at the end of the Aeneid, while allowing Villanova to engage in magnificent descriptions of the construction of Turnus’ tomb. As mentioned in the praefatio, the omission of any satisfactory burial “greatly detracted from the piety of Aeneas.”94 When incapacitated by Aeneas’ spear and rapidly nearing his end, Virgil’s Turnus had stretched out his right hand in supplication, begging Aeneas to have pity on his aged father and return his body to his family:

\[
\text{ille humilis supplex oculos dextramque precantem}
\]
\[
\text{pretendens } \textit{“equidem merui nec deprecor” inquit;}
\]
\[
\text{utere sorte tua. miseris te si qua parentis}
\]
\[
\text{tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis}
\]

94 Villanova, praef.2: Virgilius de funere Turni nihil refert. corpus ad Rutulos remissum oblivioni tradit, licet de eo remittendo Turnus Aeneam fuerit his verbis deprecatus: et me seu corpus spoliatum lumine mavis / redde meis [12.935–936], quod a pietate Aeneae summopere deflectit.
Villanova was clearly moved by these lines and found Aeneas’ response in the Aeneid entirely insufficient. First, in the praefatio he points out that Virgil does not treat the funeral of Turnus (Virgilius de funere Turni nihil refert). This much is obvious. Second, he claims that Turnus’ body is returned to the Rutulians and consigned to oblivion (corpus ad Rutulos remissum oblivioni tradit). Such a contravention of Turnus’ last wish appears to detract greatly from Aeneas’ piety (quod a pietate Aeneae summopere deflectit). This accusation, however, is not entirely true, since the Aeneid ends immediately after Turnus’ death, and Virgil does not describe Aeneas contravening Turnus’ last wish or doing anything at all regarding the body.

Thus, Villanova begins his poem by correcting this supposed incompleteness. At the beginning of the argumentum, Aeneas’ gentlemanly response to Turnus’ last wish is emphasized. Similarly, in the first lines of the Supplementum itself, Aeneas immediately (extemplo) considers the duties owed to Turnus’ corpse:

extemplo iubet Ascanium Troasque vocari
quos sic alloquitur: “vario mens fluctuat aestu:
mactandus dextra Turnus: ’te deprecor,’ inquit,
‘corpora redde meis’; lecta stipante corona
reddamus Rutulis? mandamus corpora terrae?
o socii! quae nunc animo sententia surgit?” (13.3–8).

95 “In supplication he lowered his eyes and stretched out his right hand: ‘I have earned it,’ he cried, ‘and I ask no mercy; use your chance. If any thought of a parent’s grief can touch you, I beg you—you too had such a father in Anchises—pity Daunus’ old age, and give me—or, if you prefer, my lifeless body—back to my kin” (Trans: Fairclough).
96 Villanova, praef.2.
97 ibid., arg.: occiso Turno, corpus eius ad suos summo cum honore remittit Aeneas.
98 “Immediately, he orders that Ascanius and the Trojans be summoned. He addresses them with the following words: ‘My mind fluctuates with various passions. Turnus, whom I had to strike with my right hand, said to me, ‘I beg you! Return my body to my people!’ Should we now return the body to the Rutulians with a chosen band of attendants? Or should we entrust his body to the earth? O allies! What opinion now rises in your hearts?”
Indeed, Villanova’s Aeneas very nearly quotes directly from Turnus’ last words in the Aeneid. Both *deprecor* (13.5) and *corpora redde meis* (13.6) make the locus of correction unmistakable. Yet, he cleverly finds room for his correction that does not exist in Virgil’s text. Notice that Turnus had very clearly not begged (*nec deprecor*) for mercy. Villanova’s Aeneas, by contrast, represents him as begging (*te deprecor*), thus adding to the directness of his plea. What was in Virgil a defiant refusal to beg and a courteous request is now reimagined as a pathetic supplication that Aeneas is bound by his piety to accept. Consequently, Ascanius’ response to Aeneas’ question affirms the importance Villanova attaches to attending to the proper disposal of Turnus’ body. Piety is mentioned three times in six lines:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{tunc sic affari Ascanius:} & \quad \text{"dux maxime Teucrum,} \\
& \quad \text{cui semper pietatis honos, cui sola deorum} \\
& \quad \text{relligio curae: prius umbris debita Turni} \\
& \quad \text{solvantur, Rutulis placeat dimittere corpus.} \\
& \quad \text{hac pietate tua flectentur sanguine manes,} \\
& \quad \text{hoc pietatis opus tollent ad sydera nati."} \text{ } (13.9–14) \tag{99}
\end{align*}\]

Not only is the act of piety consonant with Aeneas’ character from the Aeneid (13.10), but it ends a cycle of vengeance and satisfies the ghost of Turnus (13.13). Furthermore, through this act of piety Aeneas will gain the adulation of his descendants and eternal fame (13.14). Ascanius’ response thus serves to justify Villanova’s correction. Aeneas’ subsequent reply makes it clear that he agrees wholeheartedly: *quam tua dicta iuvant, animus venit omnibus idem!* (13.16).\(^{100}\)

\(^{99}\) “Then Ascanius spoke as follows: ‘Greatest leader of the Trojans, you who always have the honor of piety, you who care only for the worship of the gods: First, due honors should be paid to the shades of Turnus. Then the body should be bequeathed to the Italians. By this act of piety, you will turn the shadows of the dead away from blood. Your sons will raise this work of piety to the stars.’”

\(^{100}\) “How your words delight me! We all have the same intentions.”
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Consequently, Turnus’ body is treated with the same reverence that was formerly given to Pallas’ \textit{(Pallanti ut quondam, similis sic gloria Turno [13.35])}.

In this initial episode Villanova does not only correct Virgil’s supposedly incomplete \textit{Aeneid}; he also takes the opportunity to affirm his own poetic prowess. After Ascanius and the Trojans agree that the wishes of Turnus should be honored, Villanova describes the building of a great \textit{sepulchrum} for Turnus at Aeneas’ orders in a passage that demonstrates clear \textit{aemulatio} with his Virgilian models. Villanova’s Trojans press on to their labor, hauling wood, cutting stone, offering sacrifices, and decorating a vast skyscraper-like edifice:

\begin{quote}
tunc operi incumbunt \textit{omnes}; \textit{pars} nutat onusta robore, \textit{pars} durum repetitis ictibus illa marmora et incidit, ponentes ordine \textit{.saxa} jamque videre \textit{alios}; pubes sortita laborem acrius indulget: tumulus jam vertice coelum exsuperat, strepit insolitis clamoribus aether. \textit{pars} cineri libat, \textit{pars} pocusa maxima fundit. \textit{hi} taxis molem et \textit{ferales ante cupressos constituant, alii} mirrha sertis coronant. \textit{hi} choreas agitant; \textit{alii} dum carmina condunt, extollit senior \textit{pars} vivida \textit{manibus} aras; coetera \textit{pars} illis diversa animalia coedit; \textit{unanimes} illis etiam immortale canebant. (13.20–32)\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

He calls attention to several Virgilian passages here, for example, the description of the Tyrian workers busily building Carthage:

\begin{quote}
\textit{instant ardentes} Tyrii \textit{pars} ducere muros, molirique arcem et \textit{manibus} subvolvere \textit{saxa}, \textit{pars} optare locum tecto et concludere sulco.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{101} “Then all the men press on at their task: Some stagger under loads of wood, while others cut into hard marble with repeated blows. Now one could see others placing the blocks in order. Assigned to their tasks, the young men vie to work with a greater energy. The top of the tomb now surpasses the sky, and the heavens resound with unusual shouting. Some offer libations to the ashes, others pour out great cups. Still others adorn the tomb with yew-trees and plant funereal cypresses before it. Others adorn it with myrrh and garlands. Some lead choruses, while others compose songs. A sprightly group of elders raises altars, the rest slaughter various animals, and all together they were singing songs of immortal fame to the shades.” A number of the verbal echoes are listed in Oertel, 338.
While the series of correlatives and the general theme of construction clearly link the two passages, Villanova limits his verbal echoes—the most significant being saxa in final position (1.424 = 13.22). Interestingly, both passages use manibus (1.424 = 13.30), but Virgil’s is a form of manus, whereas Villanova’s is from manis—a clever “shadow” of Virgil’s original passage. Similarly, the burial of Misenus (6.212–235) provides a model of tomb-construction and the performance of funeral rites that is linked by the use of pars … pars (6.218, 222) and a clear verbal echo (feralis ante cupressos / constituunt).103

Although Villanova calls attention to his model through deliberate borrowings, he attempts to outdo Virgil through his vast collections of correlatives: more workers, more contrasts, more activity—even un-Virgilian exoticisms like mirrha—a huge business intended to overshadow the simplicity of Virgil’s language and subject matter.

102 “Eagerly the Tyrians press on, some to build walls, to rear the citadel, and roll up stones by hand; some to choose the site for a dwelling and enclose it with a furrow. Here some are digging harbours, here others lay the deep foundations of their theatre and hew out of the cliffs vast columns, fit adornment for the stage to be” (Trans: Fairclough).
103 As Oertel, 333, ad 28, points out, Villanova also echoes 4.506: intenditque locum sertis et fronde coronat.
104 “At first they raise a huge pyre, rich with pitchy pine and oaken logs. Its sides they entwine with somber foliage, and in front funereal cypresses, and adorn it above with gleaming arms. Some heat water, setting cauldrons bubbling on the flames, and wash and anoint the cold body” (Trans: Fairclough).
Villanova’s use of rhetorical devices and formal poetic techniques is more complex than first meets the eye. While the language of 13.20–32 may seem repetitive, the passage is intended as a mimetic tour-de-force. The lines are bustling, filled with endless listings and parallelisms that simulate the motion and distribution of labor: pars … pars (13.20–21), alios (13.23), pars … pars (13.26), hi … alii (13.27–28) / hi … alii (13.29); pars … coetera pars (13.30–31). The lists are not monotonous, but variatio reigns throughout, for instance in the use of pars … pars. A line-break separates the first (13.20–21) and last (13.30–31) correlative pair; another pair (13.26) balances the beginnings of the hemistiches of a single line. Similarly, a line break separates the first correlative pair of hi … alii (13.27–28), while the second pair balances the beginnings of the hemistiches of a single line (13.29). A single alios (13.23) remains uncorrelated. With deliberate precision, he never repeats the same patterns.

The alternations of different correlative patterns, along with anaphora, chiasmus, antitheses, and isocolon depict a sense of ordered chaos within the variegated divisions of labor. The three sets of correlative anaphoras, for instance, in 13.26–29 are set against the variation in 13.30–31. A number of lines display parallelism (ABAB) in noun-verb patternings (e.g., pars cineri libat, pars pocula maxima fundit [13.26]); others are chiasically (ABBA) constructed (e.g., tumulus jam vertice coelum / exsuperat, strepit insolitis clamoribus aether [13.24–25]). The different pairs of workers form elegant antitheses: Some carry wood, while others cut and place stone; some pour out libations, while others pour cups of wine; some sing songs, while others compose them.

Some regularity is constructed through isocolon in 13.26 and 29, but is broken through variatio in the other lines. The beginning and ending of the passage emphasize the collective and the single goal of the labor through an elegant bracketing: omnes (13.20) corresponds to
unanimes (13.32). The bracketing of the passage, however, displays the same combination of order and irregularity; the first half of 13.20 (tunc operi incumbunt omnes) parallels the entirety of 13.32 (unanimes illis etiam immortale canebat). On a broader level, the passage is almost exactly divided into two seven-line passages illustrating the building of the tomb (13.20–25) and the funeral decorations and preparations (13.26–31). The construction of the sepulchrum is thus represented in the construction of the lines of poetry, whose phrases fit together like differently sized but well-ordered blocks of stone.

2. Reconciliation and Marriage

Villanova’s second corrective addition to the Aeneid describes the reconciliation of Aeneas with Latinus and his marriage to Lavinia. This process culminates in a sumptuous wedding scene that once again allows Villanova to demonstrate his poetic prowess vis-à-vis his Virgilian models. In the praefatio, he points out that, although Turnus had promised that Lavinia would be Aeneas’ wife (12.937), it was still necessary to work out the resolution in detail. In his estimation, two obstacles remain. First, Latinus would have been very angry because of the siege of Laurentum. But more importantly, he argues that Lavinia’s famous blush signifies her anger with Aeneas and concludes that he would need to win her over before she would agree to marry him.  

It is interesting to note that both Villanova and Forestus identify similar points of tension in the plotline of the Aeneid, although they approach their solutions very differently. As

---

105 Villanova, praef.2–3: non describuntur Aeneae et Laviniae nuptiae, nec fit mentio ludorum in illarum honorem celebrantium, licet enim semianimis Turnus dixerit Aeneae victori, tua stat Lavinia conjux [12.937], demonstrare adhuc fuit necesse, qui Aeneas Latino fecisset satis, illius iram mollisset, ob Laurentem ab ipso obsessam et pene dirutam, quibus factis Latinum adegerit regem ad ipsi Laviniam concedendam et concessam hanc sibi devinserit, multum ipsi antea iratam, ut hoc versu notum: accepto vocem lachrymis Lavinia matris / flagrantes perfusa genas [12.64–65].
discussed above, Forestus explores Latinus’ despair at the end of the war as well as Lavinia’s sorrow at the death of Turnus, and in both cases employs a *deus ex machina* to redirect the plotline safely in the direction intended by Virgil. Villanova by contrast will content himself with natural means.

But once again, questions arise regarding his reading of Virgil. It seems plausible that Latinus may have needed some mollification following the destruction of the war; yet, the idea that Lavinia’s famous blush signifies anger with Aeneas remains questionable. The final book of the *Aeneid* opens with Latinus and Amata attempting to dissuade Turnus from his *violentia*. At the end of her impassioned speech, Amata declares her intention to die with Turnus and her refusal to accept Aeneas as her son-in-law:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{qui te cunque manent isto certamine casus} \\
&\text{et me, Turne, manent; simul haec invisa relinquam} \\
&\text{lumina nec generum Aenean captiva videbo. (12.61–63).}\text{106}
\end{align*}
\]

It is then that the famous blush steals across Lavinia’s face:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{accepit vocem lacrimis Lavinia matris} \\
&\text{flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem} \\
&\text{subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.} \\
&\text{Indum sanguineo velutι violaverit ostro} \\
&\text{si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa} \\
&\text{alba rosa, talis virgo dabat ore colores. (12.64–69).}\text{107}
\end{align*}
\]

Villanova interprets this blush not as an expression of love for Turnus, as seems to have been the case with Forestus, nor as an expression of maidenly chastity, but as a furious agreement with

---

106 “Whatever perils await you in that combat await me also, Turnus; with you I will quit this hateful light, and I will not in captivity see Aeneas as my son” (Trans: Fairclough).
107 “Lavinia heard her mother’s words, her burning cheeks steeped in tears, while a deep blush kindled its fire, and mantled her glowing face. As when someone stains Indian ivory with crimson dye, or white lilies blush when mingled with many a rose—such hues her maiden features showed” (Trans: Fairclough).
Amata’s refusal to accept Aeneas into the royal family. While this is a possible reading, it does not find overt support in the text.

Regardless, Villanova attempts to remedy the *Aeneid* by describing the reconciliation of Aeneas with both Latinus and Lavinia. Latinus is first. Following the triumphal procession (13.38–57) and his entry into Laurentum (13.69–113), Aeneas delivers a speech to the aged king in which he uses flattery, petition, self-justification, prophecy, and solemn oaths to persuade the king to accept him as a son-in-law. First Aeneas declares Latinus’ continued status as king and praises his personal excellence in almost hyperbolic terms:

*deliciae divum, princeps, terraeque voluptas!*
*imperio fati solus nunc arbiter orbis.*
*seu pacem, seu bella geras, justissimus unus!*
*Teucrum corda virum, Troiano pectore, pacem aeternam obtestantur, Teucris una sit et lex, quae vestris, nostraeque adolescent ignibus arae.* (13.116–121).

Notice how Aeneas attributes Latinus’ continued rule to the command of fate (*imperio fati*), while using titles that emphasize his sole and absolute authority: *princeps, arbiter, justissimus unus*. Aeneas’ rhetoric is clearly designed to reduce the threat presented by the invading Trojans. The victors are cast in the place of suppliants begging for peace (13.120). Second, he emphasizes his wish that the Trojan and Latin peoples are to be united under a single law and religion (13.120–121).

Third, Aeneas reminds Latinus that the death of Turnus was a lover’s quarrel (*crimen amantis*) in which no guilt can be assigned:

---

108 “Delight of the gods, king, and desire of the earth! By the command of fate, you alone are now the lord of the globe! You are the epitome of justice, whether you wage war or peace! By this Trojan heart, the hearts of the Trojan men beg for eternal peace. May the same law bind both the Trojans and the Latins and may our altars blaze with fires.”
Notice that Aeneas cleverly claims that, in addition to his own virtus and the beauty of the princess, it was actually the great exemplum of Latinus that led him to the struggle with Turnus (13.133). Here too he intends to flatter the old king by treating him as a powerful influence in affairs that he clearly failed to control (12.45–46).

Fourth, Aeneas affirms that the marriage is predestined by the fates, insinuating that it will be guaranteed by the same power that preserves Latinus’ reign (13.117):

insuper et vates connubia nulla Latinis carminibus dixeret sui: qui Tybridis oras prenderet, externo societur regia coniunx nunc fatis igitur, si qua est iniuria Turno. (13.137–140).110

---

109 "Indeed, I yield, and do so in good faith. But what I have done was the crime of a lover, and there is no guilt in this offense! Or was it preferable to abandon my dowry which I sought on the unwilling sea, and [allowed Turnus] to pluck the flowers from the virginal lap, not [even permitted] to the gods, and to have abandoned my undertaking in defeat? Your great example and my knowing virtue and the figure of the princess coming in a divine body—these things compel a love which was offended by the blood of my enemy. Who has not been inflamed by the glory of such things?” Parts of this passage are nearly incomprehensible without the accompanying annotatio: fateor equidem et vera est fama, sed crimen in proco, tale quale fuit meum, temere culpa haec criminis nuncupatur. numquid potui linquere dotes quasiasitas invito mari et ventis? num potui permittere ut ille depereret in sinu virgineo flores, quos non divis quidem fuisse licitum carpeare? me hoc suspepto desistere quasi victum me confererer? tua magna exempla, mea virtus mihi conscia et interna, pulchritudo reginae veniens magis ac magis in corpore divino, haec omnia cogunt amores laesos ad profundandum sanguinem rivalis. quem gloria rerum tantarum non inflammat?

110 “Furthermore, the seers have already spoken in their songs that there would not be marriage with the Latins, that the queenly consort would be joined with a foreigner who would land on the shores of the Tiber. Therefore, if Turnus has now received any injury, it is by the hand of the fates.”
This point is central both to Aeneas’ reconciliation with Latinus and to Villanova’s correction of the *Aeneid*. In case the reader should fail to be persuaded by Aeneas’ words, he includes an *annotatio* proving that the marriage was indeed foretold by Virgil:

*Aeneas attestatur oracula olim praedicta de eius cum Lavinia connubio. haec enim in eius gratiam a Fauno, ut videre est Lib. 5 &c. his versibus 96 & seq. (ad 13.137 [*]).*\(^{111}\)

Here, he predictably cites parts of the oracle of Faunus:

> *ne pete connubiis natam sociare Latinis*
> ...
> *externi venient generi, qui sanguine nostrum nomen in astra ferant.* (7.96, 98–99).\(^{112}\)

Fifth and last, Aeneas promises that he will always treat Lavinia with dignity:

> *dulce meum semper regina; fidemque receptam nec temerasse unum argue rit: vos iuro, Penates, venturam et subolem, famam quae terminet astris!* (13.148–150).\(^{113}\)

Latinus’ effusive response demonstrates the effectiveness of Aeneas’ rhetorical appeals. He relinquishes his crown and scepter to Aeneas, and readily agrees to the marriage. To emphasize that Virgil’s plotline has now been properly fulfilled, Villanova puts the final words of Turnus very nearly into the mouth of Latinus:

\(^{111}\) “Aeneas testifies to the oracles formerly made about his marriage with Lavinia. For these were made regarding him by Faunus, as can be seen in book 5 and in the verses 96 and following.” Villanova refers to 7.96, 98–99, and provides an incorrect citation. The note also is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.137, not 13.157.

\(^{112}\) “Seek not, my son, to ally your daughter in Latin wedlock … Strangers shall come, to be your sons, whose blood shall exalt our name to the stars” (Trans: Fairclough).

\(^{113}\) “The queen will always be my delight, nor ever will she claim that I have violated the faith that she has given me. I swear by you, Penates, and my future race, whose fame will reach the stars.”
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At the end of Latinus’ response, Villanova provides one of his longer annotationes that details Aeneas’ five-part rhetorical strategy and proclaims it sufficient to convince the king:

lectis rationibus quibus adducitur Latinus ut Laviniam Aeneae det uxorem quinque mihi videntur: prima Latinum arbitrum orbis agnoscat; secunda illum obtestatur ut eius una sit et lex et eadem religio; tertia se Turnicidii excusat ipsius exempla et virtutem attestatus nec non nimiam Laviniae pulchritudinem; quartà fata pro se dicentia introducit; quinta inviolatam uxori fidem et eternum amorem promittit solemni jurejurando. quae omnes rationes et dignitati et pietati et autoritati et virtuti regis Latini adularia deebant, et ideo hunc impellere ut Aeneae petita cuncta concedat. (ad 13.157).

Once Villanova has removed any potential obstacle to the marriage on the part of Latinus, he must also resolve the supposed anger that Lavinia has towards Aeneas. Unlike the

---

114 “You are the victor; and the Ausonians have seen me stretch forth my hands as the vanquished: Lavinia is your wife; do not press your hatred further” (Trans: Fairclough).
115 “I accept you as my son-in-law. Lavinia is your wife. I will treat Trojans and Italians without difference. The Ausonians will understand your words as commands. Now as an old man happily and willingly I leave the scepter to you. May it be the will of the almighty that you rule over unknown lands, and may he protect your dear wife and beloved children!” Interestingly, Villanova also adapts a line from Dido’s welcome speech to Ilioneus promising safe treatment to the Trojans on equal terms with her own Carthaginian peoples: Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur (1.574). See Oertel, 348, n. ad 160. By this, Villanova may suggest that everything that Dido promised and desired in Carthage—the peaceful unity of two peoples and a marriage with Aeneas—is now finally ready to be fulfilled in Italy.
116 “Upon reading the reasons for which Latinus is persuaded to give Lavinia to Aeneas as a wife, there seem to me to be five: First, he acknowledges Latinus as ruler of the world. Second, he implores that there be one and the same law and religion. Third, he justifies the death of Turnus, having called to witness his example and virtue, and the overwhelming beauty of Lavinia. Fourth, he reminds him that the fates speak on his behalf. And fifth, he promises with a solemn oath that his faith and love for his wife will remain eternally inviolate. All these reasons are enough to court the dignity and piety and authority and virtue of King Latinus, and for this reason compel him to concede to Aeneas all that he seeks.”
pacification of Latinus, for which he provided extensive justification, the wooing of Lavinia happens almost immediately and without any accompanying explanation besides their mutual attraction. As Lavinia approaches, Aeneas is rendered nearly speechless and can only embrace her and survey her with desire:

\[
altius acceptae quam mira potentia flammae
horret, turbatur, vacui sine munere sensus.
\]
\[
incipit effari, mediaque in voce resistit:
“tu mea lux,” inquit; sensim sub eburnea colla
immotus cadit. errant tunc lumine cunctas
appetit uxoris dotes, fas omne nefasque. (13.175–180).^{117}
\]

Villanova reuses a line that describes Dido’s inability to speak to Aeneas as she leads him through the city, unhappily struck with the arrow of love: \textit{incipit effari, mediaque in voce resistit} (4.76). Aeneas now feels for Lavinia the same stupefying desire that Dido felt for him. His wandering eyes and pregnant imagination, however, do not have similar Virgilian parallels.

This Lavinia is not prudish, despite being \textit{dignissima}. She is apparently pleased by the amorous stupor of her soon-to-be husband. Lifting his head, which has already somehow found its way to her breast (\textit{sublevat affixum mammæ} [13.180]), she addresses him with gratifying words, praising his virtue and her own luck:

\[
non concessa tibi? quem maxima turba dearum
nec dedignentur thalamis, sociare jugali
me vinclo potuit, felicem terque beatam
indigetis sociam! ast casus felicior esto! (13.185–188).^{118}
\]

^{117} “He shudders at the marvelous power of love’s deeply impressed fire! He is confused. His senses are vacant and directionless. He begins to speak and stops in the middle of his speech. ‘You are my light,’ he says, and slowly he falls motionless on her ivory neck. Then with a wandering eye he desires all the delights of his wife, everything right and everything wrong.”

^{118} “Am I not yielded to you? It is possible that I am united in the conjugal bond, with him whom a great number of goddesses would not consider an unworthy lover! O three and four times blessed, that I am the wife of a deified hero!”
The couple then go their way, talking to each other with flattering words (\textit{talibus inter se blandis} [13.191]), not to be seen again until the wedding festivities begin (13.239). It appears that Villanova’s solution to the anger of Lavinia was her attraction to the hero and her realization that incredibly good fortune would come from marriage. Turnus is promptly forgotten.

The wedding takes place against the backdrop of Latinus’ palace (13.104–113), which Villanova describes with incredible visuality and poetic virtuosity. He uses Virgil’s description of Latinus’ palace from \textit{Aeneid} 7 as his model, making this an ideal \textit{locus} for \textit{aemulatio} and competition in architectural poetics. As the Trojan procession enters the palace of Latinus, Villanova presents a stunning spectacle of opulence fitting to a 17\textsuperscript{th}-century European monarch.\footnote{Oertel, 186–187, insightfully points out how Villanova distinguishes his triumphal procession from the (gloomier) funeral processions found in Virgil, Vegius, and Forestus: “[Villanova] will vielmehr ein prunkvolles Gegenstück an die übliche Stelle der \textit{pompa funebris} setzen, einen echten Triumph.”}

\begin{quote}
Aeneas marvels at its beauty:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Troianus nec plura; undantem principis aulam accessit meditans \textit{centum sublime columnis tectum ingens} miratus; quo diffusa refugel \textit{vestibulum} ante ipsum pictura; nitescit et aere intermixto ebori series gradus, undique gemma, cristallosque errans duplicat laquearibus aurum. inlicus solio, dextraque insignia gestans quondam atavum, ornatus victrici tempora lauro eminet Ausonium princeps; densusque viro vir hunc tegit impatiensque ardet vacua atria circum. (13.104–113).\footnote{“Aeneas said no more. Thoughtfully he approaches the flowing hall of the king, wondering at the vast roof, supported on high by a hundred columns, where a painting that faces the very vestibule shone in all directions. The rows of steps shine with bronze inlaid with ivory. Jewels were everywhere, and twisted gold reflects the crystal in the paneled ceiling. The king of the Ausonians is prominent, resting on his throne and in his right hand carrying the emblems of his office which he had inherited from his ancestors. His temples were ornamented by victorious laurels. Densely packed, man on man defended him, and impatiently blazed about the echoing halls.”} }
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}

As with the previous passage, Villanova calls attention to his Virgilian model through a single, recognizable phrase (\textit{centum sublime columnis / tectum ingens} [13.105–106]) and the re-use of
vestibulum in first position (13.107). While Virgil’s Aeneas marks out the boundaries of New Troy, he commands a hundred envoys to visit the palace of Latinus:

\[ \textit{tectum augustum, ingens, centum sublime columnis} \\
\textit{urbe fuit summa, Laurentis regia Pici,} \\
\textit{horrendum silvis et religione parentum.} \\
\textit{hic sceptra accipere et primos atollere fasces} \\
\textit{regibus omen erat; hoc illis curia templum,} \\
\textit{hae sacris sedes epulis; hic ariete caeso} \\
\textit{perpetuis soliti patres considere mensis.} \\
\textit{quin etiam veterum effigies ex ordine aorum} \\
\textit{antiqua e cedro, Italusque paterque Sabinus} \\
\textit{vitisator curvam servans sub imagine falcem.} \\
\textit{Saturnusque senex Ianique bifrontis imago} \\
\textit{vestibulo astabant, aliique ab origine reges,} \\
\textit{Martiaque ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi. (7.170–182).}^{121} \]

Once the home of Picus, the tectum of the Virgilian Latinus is still awe-inspiring due to its sacred groves and the religio of its ancestors. The envoys gaze on the hoary images of antique kings carved from ancient cedar: Sabinus, Saturn, Janus, and the other archaic fathers stand solemn watch over the vestibule (\textit{vestibulo astabant}), along with the images of men wounded in war and trophies taken in ancient battles. Throughout, Virgil lends the palace a simple majesty and rustic religiosity.\(^{122}\)

---

121 “Stately and vast, towering with a hundred columns, his house crowned the city, once the palace of Laurentian Picus, awe-inspiring with its grove and the reverence of generations. Here it was auspicious for kings to receive the scepter, and first uplift the fasces; this shrine was their senate house, this the scene of their holy feasts; there, after the slaughter of rams, the elders were wont to sit down at the long line of tables. There, too, in order are images of their forefathers of long ago, carved of old cedar—Italus and father Sabinus, planter of the vine, guarding in his image the curved pruning hook, and aged Saturn, and the likeness of two-faced Janus—all standing in the vestibule; and other kings from the beginning, and men who had suffered wounds in the war, fighting for their fatherland.”

122 Importantly, in Villanova’s supplement we see the palace through the eyes of Aeneas—not, as in the \textit{Aeneid}, through the legates—a focalization which increases the authority of his account. Aeneas becomes the ideal reader of gilded architectural poetry; he contemplates the house (\textit{meditans} [13.105]) and then marvels at its magnificence (\textit{miratus} [13.106]). In this, Villanova’s Aeneas is unlike Oertel, who all but ignores this passage, accusing Villanova of “superficial opulence” when compared with Virgil’s description of Latinus’ palace in 7.170–191. Virgil, he claims, dedicates only a single line to the “outer splendor,” while the rest points to \textit{pietas} and the worship of the ancestors—topics which Oertel apparently finds less superficial.
Villanova attempts to outdo Virgil’s description of Latinus’ palace through rhetorical splendor and visual effects. As Aeneas enters the vestibule, a *pictura*—we are not told of whom—shines in all directions. The word *vestibulum* (13.107) is clearly meant to recall Virgil’s vestibule (*vestibulo* [7.181], also in first position), which contains the wooden images of kings and the archaic trophies; thus, Villanova specifically chooses a prominent architectural feature of his Virgilian model and composes his own scene in direct contrast. The stairs of his palace are enameled with bronze and ivory (13.107–108), jewels glitter everywhere (13.108), and the ceiling gleams with intertwined crystal and gold (13.109). Nothing like this is found in Virgil’s rustic palace. Furthermore, while the images of ancient kings (*veterum ... avorum*) decorated Virgil’s halls, Villanova’s Latinus himself bears the marks of his regal lineage (*dextraque insigna gestans / quondam atavum* [13.110–111]) and stands out (*eminet* [13.112]). Once again, Virgil’s plain verbiage, appropriate for a country hall—*fuit, erat, astabant*—is replaced with colorful words that gleam, shine, and intertwine: *refulget, nitescit, duplicat, eminet*. Villanova’s passage is also rich in mimetic effects. Through mimetic imbrication, the gold winds its way through the ceiling (*cristallosque errans duplicat laquearibus aurum* [13.109]) and juxtaposition (*densusque viro vir* [13.112]—borrowed from a battle context in 10.361!) describes the press of men closely against each other in the throne room.\(^{123}\)

\(^{123}\) Cleverly, Villanova adapts Virgil’s description of close combat to an entirely new peacetime setting.

\(^{124}\) Each of these passages recalls Perrault’s comparison of classical and modern architecture in his *Le Siècle de Louis le Grand*, perhaps connecting Villanova with the Modern desire to surpass the ancients in opulence and artistic beauty:

\begin{quote}
Tout art n’est composé que des secrets divers,  
Qu’aux hommes curieux l’usage a découverts,  
Et cet utile amas des choses qu’on invente,  
Sans cesse, chaque jour, ou s’èreure, ou s’augmente;  
Ainsi, les humbles toits de nos premiers aîeux,  
Couverts négligemment de joncs et de glaieux,  
N’eurent rien de pareil en leur architecture,  
À nos riches palais d’éternelle structure  
Ainsi le jeune chêne en son âge naissant,
\end{quote
After the wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia, which is treated in a single line (13.240), Villanova treats his audiences to a display of fireworks (13.246–259). As Oertel points out, these are among the most visually stunning of his lines; they also appear wildly anachronistic:

impete sic tanto tubuli tolluntur ad auras,
vix acie possint oculi servare videntum.
desiluere solo, glomeratas undique stellas
praecipites labi; repetito sulphure vivus
sic aliis crescit splendor, sic vertitur orbis;
audeat ut quisquam surgentes dicere soles. (13.250–255).126

The fireworks leap up before the amazed eyes of the viewers, as if the stars are falling and new suns are rising in the sky. It is evident why one might make the argument that these lines amount to a declaration of Villanova’s allegiance to the Modern cause; after all, his poetry seems to display modern technology undreamed of in Virgil’s universe. Furthermore, a moment of creative aemulatio in 13.251 calls to mind the moment when Aeneas follows Venus’ twin doves to the golden bough:

pascentes illae tantum prodire volando
quantum acie possent oculi servare sequentum. (6.200).127

---

125 ibid.: “Die Kulissen und Maschinen des Feuerwerks und der Wasserspiele bei eben jenem Fest erwecken die Illusion lebendiger Wesen.”

126 “With such force the rockets were hurled to the sky, that the eyes of the spectators could scarcely follow them. They leapt from the ground, and amassing like stars on all sides, glided down headlong. Elsewhere, the flashing repeated and the living splendor springs forth, and a sphere whirls around—and anyone would venture to say that suns were rising.”

127 “As they fed, they advanced in flight just so far as a pursuer’s eyes could keep them within sight” (Trans: Fairclough). See Oertel, 356, n. 251.
Instead of a pair of hard-to-follow doves, Villanova’s characters gaze upon majestic fireworks falling and rising like the celestial bodies in the firmament.

Several lines later, however, Villanova provides an explanation for the fireworks:

Although allowed at Aeneas’ wedding, Jupiter later wished for the use of incendiary devices to remain unknown for many ages to prevent their destructive use in warfare:

\[
\text{post ubi confectos ignes (quos plurima saecla)} \\
\text{Iuppiter ignotos voluit, ne caede cruenta} \\
\text{deterior pecudumque virumque incresceret usus} \\
\text{regia tecta petunt. (13.265–268).}^{128}
\]

Furthermore, in one of his lengthier annotationes, Villanova explains the contemporary displeasure caused by this episode and provides an additional flurry of excuses:

\[
\text{multi hanc ignis artificiosi descriptionem impugnant, dicendo temporibus Aeneae ignes artificiales nullos esse; nec in Virgilio ullam de illis mentionem fieri: verum ab hac licentia sic me purgo; cum Virgilius plurimam ludorum descriptionem cecinerit, in repetitionem plagarius iri nolui; nil nihil enim adeo fastidit lectorem, insuper posita ratione qua illis ignibus homines multi saeculis interdixit Jupiter. (ad 13.264).}^{129}
\]

Although he understands the argument that fireworks did not exist at the time of Aeneas, and although he admits that Virgil does not include anything similar, he goes on to remind the reader that Virgil describes many games, and it would be difficult for him not to plagiarize without departing from his stockpile of Virgilian scenes. Departing from Virgil’s repertoire of images is a requirement, by this reasoning, for the faithful supplementation of the Aeneid. Should this

---

128 “After the fireworks were finished—which Jove wished to remain unknown for many ages, lest their use grow worse through the slaughter of men and animals—they retire to the royal halls.”

129 “Many people censure this description of fireworks, saying that at the time of Aeneas there were no fireworks; nor is there any mention of them in Virgil. But I absolve myself from this poetic license as follows: Since Virgil wrote many descriptions of games, I did not want to become a plagiarizer through repetition. Nor should this be displeasing to the reader, especially with the explanation given that Jupiter forbade men the use of these fires for many years.”
explanation fail to convince, he returns staunchly to the excuse made at 13.265–267; notice that he intensifies his explanation from “Jupiter wished” (voluit) to “Jupiter forbade” (interdixit).

But Villanova also argues that there are classical precedents (beyond poetic license) for the use of fireworks in a poem:

\[
\text{verissimile est ignes illos in usu fuisse potuisse, si non omnino verum; quod poëtis licitum est, ut innuit Hor. in Arte Poët.: ficta voluptatis causa sint proxima veris; insuper Persius in Sat. insinuat in diebus genialibus ignes admitti praeertim in fenestris: at cum / Herodis venere dies unctaque fenestra / dispositae pinguem volumeb nebulam / et illi coalescere possunt. (ad 13.264 [?]).}^{130}
\]

Here, he cites two classical authorities. From Horace’s Ars poetica he attempts to prove that poets can stretch what is true (vera) to what is like truth (verissimile, i.e., proxima veris).

Furthermore, he suggests that there were firework-like things in antiquity, citing a passage from Persius’ Satires which describes the Jewish festival celebrating Herod’s birthday.\(^{131}\) Thus, on the grounds of classical precedent, his wild anachronism is entirely justified—fireworks were at least able to have been in use. He ignores the obvious criticism that a citation from an Imperial author can hardly be used to justify the existence of a technology in archaic Rome. He indulges in a measure of poetic license (justified by Horace) to avoid the fault of plagiarism.

---

\(^{130}\) “It appears to be true that those fireworks were able to have been in use (if not wholly true)—and poets can use the appearance of truth, as Horace points out in the Ars poetica (338): ‘May things invented for the sake of pleasure be close to what is true.’ Furthermore, Persius in his Satires (5.179–181) suggests that on festive days fires were placed especially in the windows: ‘But when the days of Herod come, and the lamps arranged on the oiled window spew out a fatty cloud.’ They are using those lamps; why are they not artificial? Both are able to be constructed from the same material.”

\(^{131}\) I disagree with Oertel, 130, regarding the ordering of the notes. The original annotationes are clearly corrupt between ad 264 and ad 269. The note ad 264 ends with interdixit Jupiter, and is then broken by a note regarding the use of aulaea in 269; he then returns to verissimile ignes ... before repeating verissimile est ignes on the next page. All this material relating to the propriety of fireworks belongs with the note ad 264.
Following the fireworks, Villanova describes fountains of wine and honey powered by compressed air:

\[
\textit{institit medium, candenti corpore, cygnus;}^{132} \\
\textit{hic, Iove compresso, per mille foramina, montes} \\
\textit{sibilat et Bacchi et mellis, iam roscidus imber} \\
\textit{prosilit, et dubplici per compita fonte recurrit.} \quad (13.256–259)^{133}
\]

Set in the middle of the party is a shining swan, which through a thousand spouts pours forth streams of wine and honey that onomatopoeically hiss (\textit{sibilat}) and leap (\textit{prosilit}). In the accompanying \textit{annotatio}, he again attempts to justify his descriptions. For the swan, he explains:

\[
\textit{ponitur hic cygnus prae caeteris, cum cygnus fuerit Veneri matri Aeneae sacer, et poëta} \\
\textit{quae ad heroem spectant intendere semper debet.} \quad (ad 13.255)^{134}
\]

\[
\textit{ponitur Ioue pro aëre, ut multoties in autoribus reperitur.} \quad (ad 13.258)^{135}
\]

Classical precedent justifies the swan.\textsuperscript{136} For the strange use of \textit{Ioue} instead of \textit{aere}, Villanova merely cites the broad usage of metonymy in similar cases (presumably also from antiquity). Curiously, he does not feel the need to defend the actual use of compressed air; if pressed, he could most likely have found sufficient verisimilitudinous examples of fountains from classical antiquity (cf. 13.677).

The masked ball (13.279–298) remains one of the most fantastical scenes in the \textit{Supplementum}. Villanova’s use of \textit{larvae} to mean “masks” (\textit{nec non larvas simul accipit omnes}

---

\textsuperscript{132} Notice how Villanova recasts one of Virgil’s similes (9.563) into a real object.

\textsuperscript{133} “In the middle, with a shining body stood a swan. Here with compressed Jove, through a thousand spouts it hissed masses of wine and honey, and now the dripping fountain leaps and returns crosswise in a double spring.”

\textsuperscript{134} “Here a swan is chosen instead of other birds, because the swan was sacred to Venus, the mother of Aeneas, and a poet always ought to represent the things which pertain to the hero.”

\textsuperscript{135} “Jove’ is used instead of ‘air,’ as is often found in other sources.”

\textsuperscript{136} See Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 9.708.
could appear strange, but it has a handy classical precedent in Horace’s *Satires* (1.5.64). He dwells at length on the costumes of Aeneas, Lavinia, and Ascanius:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{induerat vestes Aeneas oraque Bacchi} \\
\text{prae manibus pateras, hederis et tempora cinctus} \\
\text{regina incessu simulat comptisque capellis} \\
\text{et palla instructa Minois sanguine cretam.} \\
\text{Ascanius finxisse suam non immemor olim} \\
\text{sit faciem dignatus Amor gaudensque referre} \\
\text{una eadem pharetam rapuitque Cupidinis arcum. (13.280–287).}^{137}
\end{align*}
\]

Aeneas and Lavinia fittingly disguise themselves as Bacchus and Ariadne; the phrase *sanguine cretum* describes Aeneas in 4.191,\(^{138}\) and is now reused by Villanova to emphasize the mingling of Trojan and Italian blood. Regarding Ascanius’ costume, he points the reader to the *Aeneid*:

\[
hanc mutationem lector leget magnifice discriptam, lib. I. v. 664. & seq. (ad 13.284).^{139}
\]

The rest of the men don blackface (13.288) and dress up as Hercules (13.289–290), Gauls (13.291–292), and Spanish soldiers (13.295–298). Here, the notes are strangely silent. It is possible that nothing about a masked ball struck either Villanova or his readers as unduly anachronistic. After all, the costumes worn in Virgil’s hunting scene are both magnificent and exotic (4.129–159).

Numerous smaller passages throughout the wedding festivities contribute to the opulent, “jeweled,” style of Villanova’s poetry. While providing classical justifications for blatant anachronisms, he never abandons the need to allude to and outdo his Virgilian models. For instance, the description of Lavinia dancing at the masked ball recalls several Virgilian passages while displaying numerous stylistic devices of its own:

\[137\] “Aeneas put on the clothing and the face of Bacchus. He held bowls in his hands and his temples were crowned with ivy. By her walk, the adornment of her hair, and the arrangement of her dress, the queen masqueraded as someone born from the blood of Minos. Ascanius did not forget that Love had once thought it fitting to feign his appearance, and he happily puts on a quiver as he snatches up the bow of Cupid.”

\[138\] Oertel, 358, n. 284.

\[139\] “The reader will read about this metamorphosis marvelously rendered in Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.664–722.”
This passage exhibits several colorful mimetic effects, primarily repetition and chiasmus. In the first line, Lavinia is united next to (iuxta) her husband (Lavinia sponso [13.299]). Next, Lavinia’s circular motions are mirrored in the mimetic encircling of 13.300 (varios se flectit in orbes). Villanova employs numerous repetitions. Symmetrical movements are elegantly displayed by itque reditque (13.301); the crossing passes of the dance are shown by dextra tum parte sinistra (13.301) and the turns by the enjambment of dat cursum into the next line (13.302). Adapting Georgics, 1.40 (da facilem cursum), he adds another repetition within a graceful chiasmus (dat cursum, cursumque movet [13.302]). The continual use of -que gives an additional sense of movement and repetition: cursumque ... numerisque modisque (13.302).

Finally, the reiteration of seu ... seu in 13.303–304 demonstrates the variations of Lavinia’s motions. The chiastic structure of pede suspenso, librato corpore (13.303) elegantly expresses the balanced motions of her body. Her motions are not just delightful to the internal audience within the poem (festiva placet praestantia motus [13.304]; they are intended to delight the

140 “Next to the bridegroom, Lavinia leads the choruses. She dances with a thousand motions and turns herself in various circles. She advances her step and returns. She moves to the right and then to the left, and changes her step to the numbers and measures. Her step is light, and her body balanced as her foot strikes the earth. The festive excellence of her movement is delightful.”

141 mille trahens varios adverso sole colores (4.701); mille iacit varios adverso sole colores (5.89).

142 itque reditque viam (6.122). Oertel, 360, n. ad 301.

143 ibid., n. ad 302.

144 numerumque modumque (11.328); Oertel, 360, n. ad 302.
reader through their colorful mimesis and *uariatio*.

3. Peace, War, and Reconstruction

Once Turnus has been buried and Aeneas safely married to Lavinia, Villanova corrects Virgil’s failure to depict the three years following the death of Turnus. Again, he takes the opportunity to engage in competitive poetics, describing sumptuous images of peace, horrific scenes of war, and the construction of majestic edifices in the rebuilding of Laurentum. In his view, this too was guaranteed at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, when Jupiter had prophesied that for three years Aeneas would wage a great war in Italy, crush proud peoples (the plural is important), establish laws, and build walls for his people:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bellum ingens geret Italia populosque feroces} \\
\text{contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet,} \\
\text{tertia dum Latio regnantem viderit aestas,} \\
\text{ternaque transierint Rutulis hiberna subactis.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(1.263–266).\(^{145}\)

Villanova finds this prophecy woefully unfulfilled in the *Aeneid* as it stands. As he argues in the preface, when Turnus dies the *Aeneid* “vanishes” as the work of Aeneas in Italy is only just beginning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{verum quommodo de Aeneae regno per triennium confirmato, de bellis in Latio gestis,} \\
\text{populis ab ipso debellatis quidpiam potuisset afferri. cum ipse solummodo regnare} \\
\text{incoeperit, bella gerere, ponere leges, et moenia post mortem Turni, Turnoque animam} \\
\text{vix exhalante, Aeneae et Aeneidos totum evanescit hoc versu: vitaque cum gemitu fugit} \\
\text{indignata sum umbras. (praef.3).}^{146}\end{align*}
\]

\(^{145}\)“He shall wage a great war in Italy, shall crush proud nations, and for his people shall set up laws and city walls, until the third summer has seen him reigning in Latium and three winters have passed in camp since the Rutulians were laid low” (Trans: Fairclough).

\(^{146}\)“In accord with this confirmation of Aeneas’ three-year reign, Virgil should have been able to add something about the wars waged in Latium and the people conquered by Aeneas. But when Aeneas had only just begun to
Yet, once again, there are difficulties with his reading of the _Aeneid_. Jupiter’s prophecy continues after 1.263–266, describing the reign of Ascanius (1.267–270), the movement of the seat of power from Lavinium to Alba Longa (1.270–271), and the three-hundred-year reign of “Hector’s race” until the birth of Romulus (1.271–277). From him will come the Roman people, to whose rule Jupiter has set no limit (1.278–291): _imperium sine fine dedi_. Clearly Virgil did not intend to depict the entire history of the rise of Roman power in the _Aeneid_, and this passage does not seem to have been designed as a table of contents for his poem. Thus, the choice to understand 1.263–266 as being part of the intended subject matter of the _Aeneid_ could appear somewhat arbitrary.

Regardless, Villanova briefly dispatches the golden rule of Aeneas in twenty-six lines that, as we will see, draw heavily on the _Georgics_ for their abundant agricultural imagery. But he runs into conceptual trouble when he is required to invent an entirely un-Virgilian war within the three years between the defeat of Turnus and the apotheosis of Aeneas. Since the period of two years does not appear in Virgil, Villanova provides a careful explanation based on a division of the three-year reign foretold by Jupiter to Venus 1.263–66. His _annotatio_ estimates that two years were spent in peace and tranquility, while the final year was given over to the establishment of laws, the restoration of Laurentum, the last war, and the apotheosis:

\[
\text{cum Aeneas tres in Latio regnaverit a morte Turni annos, ut probavimus in praefat. duos consumptos existimavi describendos quibus et tranquillitas et otium et voluptates et festa regnavere. ultimum vero bellis gestis, legibus sanctis, ritui ordinato, Laurenti urbi reparatae, et tandem Apotheosi destinavi. (ad 13.345).}^{147}
\]

__147__ “Since Aeneas ruled three years in Latium from the death of Turnus, as we have proved in the preface, I have estimated that two years should be described as spent in which tranquility and peace and pleasures and festivals reign, to wage wars, to establish laws and walls after the death of Turnus—when Turnus was still breathing forth his spirit—Aeneas and the entirety of the _Aeneid_ vanishes with this verse: ‘And with a moan his life fled resentfully to the shades below.’”
Thus, he explains that the war occurs when it does according to a well-calculated guess about the approximate timeline of the future laid out in the *Aeneid*. Rather than inventing extraneous material, he constructs only what he needs to save Virgil’s plotline from “an improper omission,” as he argues in the *praefatio*.  

Similarly, Villanova must reconcile the promise made by Venus, that Aeneas will “crush proud nations” (*populosque feroces contundet* [1.263–264]), with the reality of a newly pacified Juno who supposedly has sworn to refrain from inciting additional wars after Turnus’ defeat: *et nunc cedo equidem pugnasque exosa relinquo* (12.818). Virgil had promised additional wars! Villanova shrewdly points out that technically Juno only swore to refrain from the war between Latinus and Aeneas; the queen of the gods is still free to encourage new conflicts between the neighbors and allies of the Trojans without contradicting her Virgilian promise to Jupiter:

\[
\text{licet Iuppiter Iunoni expresse prohibuerit iram ulteriorem his vocibus ulterius tentare veto} \\
\text{et ipsa Iuno reapsoe polllicita eodem libro 12.} \\
\text{et cedo equidem pugnasque exosa relinquo} \\
\text{iratam adhuc posui; attendendo Iovis mandata, hoc Trojanos tantummodo spectare non vero eorum vicinos et confoederatos; sicut illas punugs attendi debere de Latino tantum ceu statu Aeneae, non vero de reliquo orbe terrarum. (ad 13.346)."} 
\]

---

149 “Although Jupiter clearly forbade Juno from further anger with these words, ‘I forbid you to try further,’ [12.806] and in the same book Juno promised to obey, ‘For my part I yield, and I relinquish my hatred and warfare,’ [12.818] I have posited that she is still angry. Paying close attention to the commands of Jove, this applies only to the Trojans and not to their neighbors and allies. Similarly, the warfare should be understood to be concerning Latium only, or the position of Aeneas, not the rest of the world.” The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.347, not 13.346.
Regardless, in this case there is no option but *inventio*. Villanova develops the tale of Lauzellus, the stepson of Lausus and grandson of Mezentius.\(^\text{150}\) Lauzellus was left behind with his mother during the fateful expedition of the Tuscans to aid Turnus. As a result of her wise stewardship during the war, her son is given the reins of the kingdom, and thus can bring about (at Juno’s instigation) a renewal of hostilities against Evander.\(^\text{151}\) Notice that in both his notes (*ad* 13.205, 13.370), Villanova clearly describes the Lauzellus story as “invented” (*fingitur*). This is not a Virgilian story, but an invention tastefully developed to satisfy what should have been (and presumably *would* have been) a perfect Aristotelian plotline, had Virgil lived long enough to finish it.\(^\text{152}\)

Villanova’s competition with Virgil is not limited to celebrations and architectural descriptions; he also composes horrific images of war and dazzling images of peace that attempt to surpass Virgil in their respective savagery and richness and that demonstrate a wide stylistic

---

\(^{150}\) For Lausus, see 7.651–654. The deaths of Lausus and Mezentius dominate 10.762–908. This is one of Villanova’s very few real improvisations on Virgil’s plotline. See Schindler, 42, who comments on the closeness of the *Supplementum*’s content to that of the *Aeneid*: “Inhaltlich schließt Villeneuve an Vergil an: Ort der Handlung im Supplement ist wie in den späteren *Aeneis*-Büchern Mittelitalien; die Protagonisten sind die Protagonisten der *Aeneis* oder stehen zu ihnen in einem verwandtschaftlichen Verhältnis, so etwa der von Villeneuve neu eingeführte Lauzellus oder Lauzellus, der u.a. durch die Namensähnlichkeit mit Lausus als Enkel des Mezentius ausgewiesen wird.”

\(^{151}\) See Villanova, *ad* 13.370: *hic Lauzellus quem nepotem Mezentii descripsi, privignus *fingitur* Lauzi. Lauzus enim matrem Lauzelli secundam uxorem duxerat, & illa Lauzo absente sic de Thyrrenis fuerat bene merita, illorumque animos sic conciliarat, ut mortuo Lauzo marito, bene memoris animi testimonia conferre Thuscii volentes, Lauzello impertire moderamen regni, ipsumque ad summam dignitatem extulere, praeterguam quod ipse Lauzellus aetate jam adulta, tantis animi dotibus erat insignis, regisque optimi & maximi vultum sic perite simulabat, ut cunctorum animos nullo excepto pelliceret. And ibid., *ad* 13.205: *Lauzellus hic de quo loquitur, fingitur nepos Mezentii, qui ira compulsus in Evandrum, quod olim consilium Æneae dederat regnum avi sui expugnare aliquando insurget, Pállantaeumque obsidebit; Mnestheus vero ab Ænea electus erit, qui ferat Evandro opes & copias & obsidionem liberet.*

\(^{152}\) Villanova uses his *annotationes* to separate Virgilian fact from his own likely fictions. When the legate from Evander arrives to request aid from Aeneas, he mentions the welcome given to Aeneas in the past (13.384–412). Villanova, *ad* 13.390, points out that this is “historical,” citing the relevant book of the *Aeneid: historia resumitur, & mentio fit Aeneae apud Evandrum olim profecti & commorantis: quae historia legitur lib. 8 Aeneid*. Even when he invents something to fill in a gap, he justifies its chronology. Perhaps the clearest example of Villanova’s chronological precision is in his *annotatio* on the prophecies made in the book of Faunus given by Latinus to Ascanius as a present during the wedding feast. Faunus reports a period of nine-hundred years between the death of Turnus and the composition of the *Aeneid*, and “five-hundred” lustra until the composition of the *Supplementum* (13.210–215).
virtuosity. After the marriage of Lavinia and Aeneas, the two “golden years” follow immediately prior to the war with Lauzellus; here, Villanova can fulfill the prophecy made by Creusa in *Aeneid* 2.\(^{153}\) The *Goldene Regierungsjahre* of Aeneas are described in opulent, jeweled language:

Orchards are laden with fruit (13.334–335), storehouses are full (13.336), husbandmen are busy at the plow (13.332–333), housewives are busy at the loom (13.338–339). All is as it should be:

\[
\textit{auspice sub tanto gentes sub legibus aequis} \\
\textit{innocuos soles tranquilla per otta agebant.} \\
\textit{his animus studiumque agiles in retia cervos} \\
\textit{cogere sectarique feras et cingere saltus.} \\
\textit{mane novo agricolae ductos ad aratra juvencos} \\
\textit{sole cadente reducebant, nec furtar dolosve;} \\
\textit{Pomona impavida fructu se fertilis arbor} \\
\textit{vestibat, largumque extenta cucurbita ventrem} \\
\textit{horrea gaudebat frumento rupta colonus;} \\
\textit{autumnumque uvas Baccho indulgente premebat.} \\
\textit{tunc admota lares lenibat carmine curas} \\
\textit{matrona, intorto telasnectebat et auro} (13.328–339).\(^{154}\)
\]

As Oertel has noted,\(^{155}\) in this section Villanova adapts lines and phrases from the *Georgics* primarily. Once again, he attempts to compete with Virgil in these images of fertility and abundance, so that he can claim at the end of the passage—cleverly referring to both the rhetoric of his *Supplementum* and the golden years described by the poem—that the kingdoms of Saturn

---

\(^{153}\) *et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva / inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris. / ilic res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx / parta tibi (2.781–784).* See Villanova, ad 13.345: *cum Aeneas tres in Latio regnaverit a morte Turni annos, ut probavimus in praefat. duos consumptos existimavi describendos quibus et tranquillitas et otium et voluptates et festa regnavere.*

\(^{154}\)* “Under these auspices the people were spending their days safely in tranquil peace under fair laws. They had the desire and intention to drive nimble deer into nets and to hunt wild animals and lay snares in the woodland passes. Early in the morning the farmers were leading young bulls to the plows, and when the sun fell, they led them back. There were no tricks or frauds. Since Pomona was unafraid, the fertile trees were clothing themselves in fruit, and the gourd was extending its large belly. The colonist was rejoicing in his storehouses bursting with grain. In the autumn he was pressing grapes under a favorable Bacchus. Then, settled by the hearth, the matron was soothing her cares with a song, and was binding up her warp with twisted gold.”

never saw such days of abundance: *non alios, donec Saturnia regna manebant, / crediderim illuxisse dies melioraque fata* (13.343–344).156

This passage illustrates several subtle instances of Villanova’s creative and competitive *aemulatio*. The phrase *in retia cervos* (13.330), for instance, clearly recalls Virgil’s *ad retia cervum* (Virgil, *Georgics*, 3.413), where he instructs the reader in the care of dogs. Virgil’s passage is structured around two finite verbs (*turbabis* and *premes*), which govern two parallel clauses describing the hunting of boars and deer:157

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{saepe volutabris pulsos silvestribus apos} \\
\text{latratu turbabis agens, montisque per altos} \\
\text{ingentem clamore premes ad retia cervum} \\
\end{align*}
\] (Virgil, *Georgics*, 3.411–413).158

Villanova ignores the dogs and focuses on the hunt itself; he compresses Virgil’s three expansive lines to two and introduces a frenetic series of infinitives (*cogere sectarique ... et cingere*), which describe in rapid succession the hunting of stags and wild animals. Always sensitive to the charge of plagiarism, he changes Virgil’s single, large stag (*ingentem ... cervum*) into a number of agile deer (*agiles ... cervos*):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{his animus studiumque agiles in retia cervos} \\
\text{cogere sectarique feras et cingere saltus} \\
\end{align*}
\] (13.330–331).159

---

156 “I would not believe that there were better fates and better days that shone while the reign of Saturn was remaining.”
158 “Oft you will rout the boar from his forest lair, driving him forth with the baying pack, and o’er the high hills with loud cry will force a huge stag into the nets” (Trans: Fairclough).
159 “They had the desire and intention to drive nimble deer into nets and to hunt wild animals and lay snares in the woodland passes.”
Similarly, in his description of the gourd, Villanova clearly recalls Virgil’s description of a swelling cucumber from the *Georgics*:\footnote{Oertel, 362, n. ad 13.335.}

\begin{quote}
*tortusque per herbam
cresceret in *ventrem* *cucumis* (Virgil, *Georgics*, 4.121–122).\footnote{“...how the cucumber, coiling through the grass, swells into a paunch” (Trans: Fairclough).}
\end{quote}

Virgil’s passage displays a subtle combination of rhetorical effects; the hyperbaton of *tortusque* ... *cucumis* mirrors the swelling of the gourd, while the separated enjambment also demonstrates the twining of the vines through the grass. Villanova, sensitive to the visuality of Virgil’s passage, imitates his mimetic hyperbaton, but extends the great “stomach” of the gourd (*largumque* ... *ventrem*), and replaces Virgil’s three-syllable cucumber (*cucumis*) with a four-syllable swelling gourd (*cucurbita*). Despite Virgil’s clear influence, the only repeated word is *ventrem*:

\begin{quote}
*vestibat, largumque extenta cucurbita ventrem* (13.335).
\end{quote}

Villanova’s attempts to compete with Virgil—whether they be considered successful or not—are not merely limited to the *Aeneid*, as we can see here. He considers the entire Virgilian oeuvre fertile ground for a challenge.

Apart from Virgilian aemulatio, Villanova attends closely to the rhetoric and visuality of his passages throughout. The first lines describe the tranquility of Aeneas’ new order. In 13.328, the people (*gentes*) are perfectly balanced between two similar prepositional phrases (*auspice sub tant* *gentes sub legibus aequi*), mirroring the harmony that arises under Aeneas’ governance. The repeated passing of peaceful days is demonstrated in 13.332–333; the new
morning begins 13.322 (*mane novo*) and the setting sun sinks into the next line (*sole cadente*), providing an elegant contrast in first position with the morning above. As we have seen in 13.335, Villanova is sensitive to mimetic effects throughout this passage. In the following line, the barns are mimetically full-to-bursting with grain: *horrea gaudebat frumento rupta colonus* (13.336). Similarly, the warps of the looms are tied up with twisted gold: *intorto telas nectebat et auro* (13.339).

Numerous other examples could be adduced here to demonstrate Villanova’s constant poetic competition with his Virgilian models. Worthy of a note is his tendency to frequently insist on the never-before-seen largeness or beauty of his own images and characters, claims which bring him into direct competition with Virgil. Still in the previous section, Villanova had insisted on the superlative beauty of Aeneas as he enters Laurentum in triumph; never has Virgil’s hero looked better; never has his nobility been so illustrious:

> *bellator nusquam processit gratior illo! namque oculis laetos genitrix afflarat honores; nobilitas major nusquam sub fronte reluxit* (13.62–64).\(^{162}\)

The textual echoes immediately call to mind the famous transformation of Aeneas through Venus’ artistry before the encounter with Dido (1.584–593)\(^{163}\) or on his horse at the beginning of the hunt (4.150). Similarly, Villanova insists on the superlative horror of his beast that threatens the fields of Lauzellus and begins the movement towards war:

---

\(^{162}\) “Never did a more graceful warrior march in procession! Indeed, his mother breathes propitious dignity into his eyes. Never did greater nobility shine from his brow.”

\(^{163}\) Especially 1.590–591: *caesariem nato genetrix lumenque iuventae / purpureum et laetos oculis adflarat honores.*
bellua, Thyrrenis qua non immanior usquam
visa fuit campis, segetesque gregesque virosque

This bellua is thus greater than Cacus, the horrible son of Vulcan described by King Evander to Aeneas (8.184–279). Thus, even though Villanova frequently vies with Virgil implicitly by reworking his scenes with dramatic opulence and jeweled imagery, he often explicitly claims superiority or greatness for his characters, while playfully alluding to the famous Virgilian scenes that he has supposedly surpassed.

He also vividly describes the horrors of war throughout his account of Mnestheus’ campaign against Lauzellus. For example, when Evander’s legate encourages Aeneas to send aid to the elderly king, his description of the disaster that could follow Aeneas’ inaction is a rhetorical tour-de-force of horrors:

nec mora: Lauzellum lectis invadere sellam
obstes et trabeam; hunc terris regnoque repelle!
sin urbem antiquam videas angustaque tecta
janjam aequata solo, statuas fontesque cruore
manantes, laceras vittas et diruta templ.
deseret hic matrem, vix nuptum deseret uxor,
lacte vel expulsi siliqua pascentur et herbis,
semincesque fame discerptos dentibus artus
absument matres: bellum undique et undique bellum;
arma socer genero, seseque ad bella vocabunt
germani; tellus imbuta cruore rubescet
fraterno; innumerisque albescent ossibus agri:
tantus et ille labor divis compescere nec fas! (13.400–412).

164 “A beast, the greatest that had ever been seen on the Tyrrhenian fields, with its teeth was laying waste to crops and flocks and men, and insatiably devouring them.”
165 Subtle intertextual references give away Villanova’s reliance on this scene, e.g., 8.230: dentibus infrendens.
166 “Do not delay! Oppose Lauzellus’ invasion of the throne and mantle of the king with his chosen men. Repel this man from our lands and kingdom! Otherwise you may see the ancient city and our poor houses soon levelled to the ground, the statues and fountains dripping with blood, the mangled fillets and the overthrown temples. The son will desert his mother, and the wife will abandon her newly wedded husband. In exile they will feed on milk and seeds and grass. Half-dead with hunger the mothers will consume their limbs and tear them with their teeth: war on all sides and on all sides war. The father-in-law will raise arms against his son-in-law. Brothers will call themselves to
Several of these images come from Virgil. 13.407 is adapted from a scene in the *Georgics*, in which a plague causes the animals to rip their own limbs with their teeth:

*discissos nudis laniabant dentibus artus.* (Virgil, *Georgics*, 3.514).\(^{167}\)

Villanova intensifies Virgil’s already repulsive image of moribund animals and creates a scene of auto-cannibalism, describing a possible future in which the Arcadian women will be forced to consume their own bodies. Similarly, Virgil’s pacific description of the open sea is now refigured in 13.408 into an expression of the all-encompassing nature of the destruction to come:

*ut pelagus tenuere rates nec iam amplius ulla occurrit telus, maria undique et undique caelum.* (5.8–9).\(^{168}\)

Even in seemingly minor ways, Villanova attempts to intensify Virgil’s imagery. 13.401 is adapted from Latinus’ speech to Turnus, in which he reminds him of the costs of the war:

*recalescent nostro Tiberina fluenta sanguine adhuc campique ingentes ossibus albent.* (12.35–36).\(^{169}\)

Villanova clearly works from Virgil’s line, swapping *agri* for *campi* and *albescent* for *albent*, with only *ossibus* remaining unchanged. The most significant adaptation, however, is the replacement of *ingentes* describing *campi* with *innumeris* describing *ossibus*. Villanova’s bones

---

\(^{167}\) “[The animals] rent and mangled their own limbs with bared teeth” (Trans: Fairclough). See Oertel, 368, n. *ad* 407.

\(^{168}\) “When the ships gained the deep and no longer any land is in sight, but sea on all sides and on all sides sky…” (Trans: Fairclough). See Oertel, 368, n. *ad* 408.

\(^{169}\) “Tiber’s streams are still warm with our blood, the boundless plains still white with our bones” (Trans: Fairclough).
are “without count” or “numberless” signifying the outrageous loss of life that will follow from the war, rather than the large size of Virgil’s Italian plains.

Following the successful termination of the war and the unfortunate death of Mnestheus, Aeneas orders the Trojans to begin building the walls of Lavinium. Villanova’s attempts to outdo his Virgilian models are on display once again in an architectural setting. As in 13.20–32, he describes a furious rush of labor, as the workmen erect a citadel, moat, and forum:

construist hic arcem, praecincto hic aggere firmat;
 hic doctus fossas quaesitis fluctibus implet;
 hic cavat excisa sublimes rupe columnas
 porticibus vastis, nec non pars fontibus instant.
 illa patens Euro incumbit platanis et obumbrat
 Austros illa forum. sortitus quisque laborem,
aesque chalibsque fluens tumida fornace liquescit
(ut quondam artis opisque suae Venus arma rogasse
Vulcanum fertur prolem coelestibus armis
invictam exoptans); crepitant incude metalla,
caelanturque modo tectis decora alta futuris.
atria se tollunt augusta, superba figuris
limina se variis fingunt auroque relucent.
dextra tanta operi, tanta est industria formae
audiat ipse faber se se ostentare Minervam
dicere nec timeat: naturam vicimus arte! (13.675–689).\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{170} “One constructs the citadel. Another strengthens it with a surrounding rampart. A skilled laborer fills the ditches with artificial waters. Another cuts away lofty columns from quarried stone for the vast colonnades. Some work on the fountains. Some laid the marketplace, which was to be open to the east, and protected it with shady plane-trees to the south. Each man was assigned to a task. Bronze and iron melted and liquefied in the bellowing furnace (as Venus is said to have asked Vulcan for arms forged by his own art and power, because she hoped that her son would remain unconquered under the protection of heavenly weapons). They hammer out the metals on the anvil, and now high ornaments are carved for the future houses. Tall halls are erected, and haughty thresholds are fashioned with various figures, and they shine with gold. The artisans worked with such skill, and fashioned their works with such industry, that they could dare to liken themselves to Minerva, nor would they fear to say, ‘We have conquered nature through art!’”
As with the previous examples, this passage calls attention to its Virgilian model (1.423–429) through clear textual echoes, but Villanova carefully changes most of Virgil’s verbal texture, leaving only *columnas* unaltered in final position.

Throughout 13.675–689, he attempts to outdo Virgil’s language through vivid word choices and copious listings. Virgil’s columns may be “huge” (*immanis*), but Villanova’s are “exalted” (*sublimes*). The participle of Virgil’s prosaic *excidunt* (“cut out”) is re-used as a modifier (*excisa*) and the verb itself is replaced with the vivid *cavat* (“hollow out,” “excavate”). Throughout the passage, Villanova colorizes and “one-ups” Virgil’s architectural descriptions: For instance, Virgil’s builders surround the building site with a furrow (*concludere sulco* [1.424]), while Villanova’s fill ditches with artificial water to form a moat (*hic doctus fossas quaesitis fluctibus implet* [13.676]). The sheer variety of the fortifications, buildings, and monuments far outstrips Virgil’s humble listing in 1.423–429; Villanova’s workmen build a citadel and wall (13.674), the surrounding moat (13.675), monumental columns in vast porticoes (13.676–677), fountains (13.677), decorative metalwork (13.683–684), atria (13.685), and statuary (13.685–686)—they even plant trees (13.678–679). Throughout the passage, Virgil’s rather prosaic verbs such as *instant, effodiunt, locant, excidunt* are replaced or mixed with flamboyant verbs such as *obumbrat, liquescit, crepitant, caelantur, and relucent*. Everything is intended to impress.

Like 13.20–32, the high rhetorical register displays complexity and *variatio*. The lines display the same listings and parallelisms that signify the assignments of labor: *hic ... hic*

---

171 Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.423–429 (see above): *hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris / fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas / rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora alta futuris.*

172 Several other parallels are listed by Oertel, 390.

(13.675), *hic ... hic ... pars* (13.676–678), *illa ... illa* (13.679–680). The first correlative pair is chiastically arranged with the verbs in 13.675 (*construit hic arcem, praecincto hic aggere firmat*); the second correlative pair of *hic ... hic* begins the next two lines (13.676–677) and is joined by an outlying *pars* in the next line (13.678); a third correlative pair consists of *illa ... illa* (13.679–680). Villanova shifts his rhetorical strategy in 13.687–688, giving agency to the buildings themselves, which raise themselves up, shape themselves, and shine out (*relucent*) [13.688]) in seemingly magical acts of self-fashioning:

\[
\textit{atria se tollunt augusta, superba figuris}
\]
\[
\textit{limina se variis fingunt auroque relucent}. \text{(13.685–686)}.
\]

Within these lines, the hyperbaton of *atria ... augusta* mirrors the expanse of the new palaces, and the interlocking (ABAB) word order of *superba figuris / limina ... variis* mirrors the intricacy of various shapes and forms on the proud thresholds. So marvelous is the construction that the craftsmen claim to have conquered nature through their art: *naturam vicimus arte!* (13.689). But the *faber* is not just the Trojan or Italian artist building the structures of Lavinium, but the poet Villanova himself, who builds these fantastic images through rhetorical and visual effects in his lines, and ultimately in the imagination of the reader. He ends the reconstruction of Laurentum (now Lavinium) by reminding the reader of the fulfillment of 12.193–194:

\[
\textit{constructae imposuit conjux Lavinia nomen} \text{(13.690)}.
\]

Thus, to recapitulate so far, Villanova argues that the *Aeneid* is significantly unfinished in several ways, and each of his corrective additions to Virgil’s plot provides him the opportunity to indulge in creative competition with Virgilian poetics. In the opening scene, the burial of Turnus,

\[174\] “Tall halls are erected, and haughty thresholds are fashioned with various figures, and they shine with gold.”

\[175\] “Aeneas’ wife Lavinia lent her name to the new construction.”
which was required by Turnus’ last words and Aeneas’ piety, allowed him to describe a fantastically elaborate tomb, whose construction rivaled Virgilian descriptions of the construction of Carthage and the burial of Misenus. Similarly, the wedding of Lavinia was necessitated by Turnus’ last words and by the oracle of Faunus. While correcting Virgil’s plot on this point as well, Villanova creates a magnificent wedding scene featuring spectacles undreamed of in the Virgilian universe—fireworks, soda fountains, and masked balls—all copiously annotated and justified with reference to classical models. Furthermore, when describing the additional wars and the reconstruction of Laurentum foretold in the Aeneid, Villanova creates additional scenes of opulence, carnage, and architectural grandiosity.

4. The Establishment of Laws and Customs in Latium

Next, Villanova describes a list of laws and customs established by Aeneas for his newly united kingdom. In the praefatio, he lays particular blame on Virgil’s “carelessness” (incuria) for having left unfulfilled Aeneas’ promise to Latinus to establish such laws:

praeterit quas leges Aeneas, tum de rite colendi numinis, tum de iuris dandi ratione sanciverit, et eo magis castiganda haec incuria mihi videtur, quod in solemni sacramento cum Latino ad haec sese obligarat his verbis. (praef. 3–4).176

Specifically, by the short-lived treaty established at the beginning of Aeneid 12, Aeneas had promised that both Trojans and Italians would be treated under equal terms. Latinus would keep

---

176 “Virgil passes over the laws which Aeneas ratified, first concerning the ceremonies for the worship of god, then, concerning the method of executing justice. This carelessness seems to me to be more blameworthy, because, in the solemn oath with Latinus, Aeneas bound himself to carrying out these things.”
his command and Aeneas would establish “gods and rites.” A city would also be founded and named for Lavinia, a point foretold from the second line of the *Aeneid*:

non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo  
ne mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus amvae  
invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant  
sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,  
imperium solemne socer; mihi moenia Teucri  
constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen. (12.189–193).\(^{177}\)

Villanova once again intends to call attention to his fulfillment of this unfinished plotline:

principis imperio *Lavinii* gloria muri  
civibus ut reedit veterisque imitata crematae  
arcis iam Troiae, mores ritusque *sacrorum*  
et leges et iurae *dedit*. (13.691–694).\(^{178}\)

Aeneas’ laws establish the cult of Jupiter (13.696–701), the care of eagles (13.702–707), the festival of Mars (13.708–716), sacrifices for Bacchus and Ceres (13.717–728), sacrifices for Neptune (13.729–736), sacrifices to Anchises and Venus (13.737–743), sacrifices to Father Tiber (13.744–750), sacrifices for the Penates (13.751–756), general moral legislation (13.757–767), and rules regarding candidacy for the magistracies (13.768–776). Interestingly, Villanova does not provide an *annotatio* discussing his choices in this section, although he includes a few explanations regarding confusing aspects of particular laws. The points of competition with Virgil are also less easily discernable. It may be that this section merely attempts to accomplish

---

\(^{177}\) “I will not bid the Italians be subject to the Teucrians, nor do I seek the realm for mine; under equal terms let both nations, unconquered, enter upon an everlasting compact. I will give gods and their rites; Latinus, my father-in-law, is to keep the sword; my father-in-law is to keep his wonted command. The Teucrians shall raise walls for me, and Lavinia give the city her name.” (Trans: Fairclough).

\(^{178}\) “When by the authority of the king the glory of the Lavinian wall was given to its citizens, and it now imitated the ancient citadels of burned Troy, Aeneas bestowed customs and sacred rites and laws and law codes.”
what it sets out to accomplish in the praefatio: the correction of improper omissions in the Aeneid as it was left by Virgil.

Throughout, Villanova takes his cues from Virgil: Aeneas establishes feasts for gods and goddesses prominent for their helpful actions in the Aeneid (with the exception of Ceres and Bacchus). A good example are the sacrifices established for Father Tiber:


In 13.745, Villanova reuses 8.39, a line from the ghostly scene in which Father Tiber appears to Aeneas in a dream and confirms that he has arrived at the site of the future city and a place of rest from his many wanderings (8.46). Ever attentive to the charge of plagiarism, he points out the borrowing with an annotatio: totus et integer hic versus in Virgilio et hic a Thyberi fluvio fuit manifestus. (ad 13.745). The establishment of sacrifices to Father Tiber following Aeneas’

179 Oertel, 165–166, helpfully connects most of Villanova’s choices with particular gods in the Aeneid (and the Iliad): “Die Gründe für diese Stiftungen hat Villanova durchaus aus der Aeneis entnommen, worauf er auch wiederholt ausdrücklich hinweist: Der Kriegsgott Mars (708ff.) hat der Hilfsexpedition des Aeneas für Euander (Absch. III.3) Erfolg beschieden und auch sonst dem Aeneas viel Siege gebracht; Neptun (729ff.) hat dem Trojaner das Leben im Zweikampf mit Achill gerettet (Hom. Il. 20,290ff.) und hat ihn sicher an dem gefährlichen Kirkeischen Vorgebirge vorbeigeleitet (7,21ff.); durch den Fluß Tiber (744ff.) wurde er vergewissert, daß er endlich am güttergewollten Ziel ist (8,36ff.). Anderen dieser Gottheiten stand Aeneas besonders nahe, wie seiner Mutter Venus und seinem göttlich verehrten Vater Anchises (737ff.), seinen ständigen Helfern während der Irrfahrten und (wenigstens Venus) während der Kämpfe in Italien, oder den Penaten (751ff.), die er aus dem brennenden Troja mitgenommen hat (2,717; vgl. auch 2,747 und 3,12) und die ihm durch ihre Weissagung das Ziel gewiesen haben (3,147ff.).” Specific connections are unable to be found for Ceres and Bacchus.

180 “Aeneas commanded that the greatest glory of the gods be given to Father Tiber, [because when] he had landed at the mouth of Laurentum, on the shores of [New] Troy, as he considered many things, Tiber comforted him: ‘Here is your safe home. Your household gods are safe. Do not desist!’ At the beginning of spring, when the streams flow again from their broken prisons, the people should bind their temples with poplar branches and offer sprinkled grain and a huge sea-beast to the river.”

181 “This verse is whole and complete in Virgil [8.39] and this was revealed by the river Tiber.” The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.745, not 13.743.
victory is foretold by the river god himself later in his address: *mihi victor honorem / persolves* (8.61–62). It is a possibility that Villanova’s *hic* modifies an understood *ritus*, and that he is referring to his fulfillment of Father Tiber’s words.

5. The Apotheosis of Aeneas

As he argues in the *praefatio*, the death and apotheosis of Aeneas is the final plot point missing from the *Aeneid*. Also absent is some mention of Silvius, Aeneas’ son by Lavinia:

>nihil inserit de morte, mortis genere, et apotheosis, nihil de Sylvio eius filio posthumo ab Anchise praedicto. (praef.4).\(^{182}\)

Villanova quotes two separate Virgilian oracles to confirm this failure. In the first, Jupiter promises Aeneas’ apotheosis to Venus at the beginning of the *Aeneid*. In the second, he reminds Juno of the same fact:

>parce metu, Cytherea; manent immota tuorum
>fata tibi; cernes urbem et promissa Lavini
>moenia, sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli
>magnanimum Aenean; neque me sententia vertit. (1.257–260).\(^{183}\)

>quaie iam finis erit, coniunx? quid denique restat?
*indigetem* Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris

---

182 “Virgil adds nothing about Aeneas’ death, or manner of death, and apotheosis, and nothing about his son Silvius predicted by Anchises after his death [6.769].” Further below he concludes again that he must describe Aeneas’ death and apotheosis: *insuper longe haec oracula contra me stare dicantur, quin ex illis concludere facillimum est a Virgilio apothosim Aeneae describendam debusisse, qua omnimo omissa, meam esse partium adiudicavi, qua de ratione inter superos, morte, et mortis genere expositis, Aeneas fuerit annumeratus. (praef.4–5).*

183 “Spare your fears, Lady of Cythera; your children’s fates abide unmoved. You will see Lavinium’s city and its promised walls; and great-souled Aeneas you will raise on high to the starry heaven. No thought has turned me.” (Trans: Fairclough).
Within the Supplementum he adds additional prophetic allusions to Aeneas’ divinization. In an apparently ironic prophecy, Lavinia describes herself as a wife of indiges, Aeneas’ divinized name following his death: *felicem terque beatam / indigetis sociam!* (13.187–188). The position of the word echoes Jupiter’s promise in 12.794. Furthermore, the book of Faunus given to Ascanius by Latinus at the wedding (to be discussed below) overtly promises that Aeneas’ divinization will come to pass:

\[
\textit{patris nec non illustria facta,} \\
\textit{donec fas illi mensis accumbere divum.} (13.237–238).
\]

However, although Virgil foretold the death and apotheosis of Aeneas, he left no specific instructions regarding the scene. As in the case of the war against Lauzellus, Villanova finds himself in a difficult situation: To complete the Aeneid properly, he must go beyond the material bequeathed to him by Virgil. Yet, unlike the war with Lauzellus which he invented in its entirety as a plausible fiction, other classical authorities treated the death and apotheosis of Aeneas, particularly Ovid. It is to him as well as other “historians” (*historici*) that Villanova turns for material and details, as he explains in one of his annotationes. The result is a “history adorned with contrivances” (*historiam commentis adornatam*), which is “partly historical and partly fictitious” (*partim historica partim fictitia*), but which he judges to be not far from the truth of the matter:

\[
\textit{quae inseruntur tum de Anna sorore Didonis, tum de Aeneae morte et apotheosi, partim historica partim fictitia. quae casus Annae et eius mortem designant licet ratione}
\]

---

184 “What now shall be the end, wife? What remains at the last? You yourself know, and admit that you know, that Aeneas, as Hero of the land, is claimed by heaven, and that the Fates exalt him to the stars.” (Trans: Fairclough).

185 “[You will read of] the illustrious deeds of your father, until it is right for him to take a place at the tables of the gods.”
Before turning to Villanova’s treatment of the apotheosis, I will briefly review his classical sources, primarily Ovid’s *Fasti*.

In Ovid’s *Fasti*, following the death of Dido, her old suitor Iarbas the Moor invades Carthage (3.551–564). Like Aeneas, Anna sails away from Carthage and steers for the island of Melite (now Malta), where she gains the protection of King Battus (3.565–574). During the third year of her exile, her brother and enemy Pygmalion appears and she is once again forced to flee by sea. She is shipwrecked and washes up on the shores of Italy (3.757–600). By chance, Aeneas and Achates meet her on the shore:

\[\textit{iam pius Aeneas regno nataque Latini auctus erat, populos miscueratque duos. litore dotati solo comitatus Achate secretum nudo dum pede carpit iter, aspicit errantem, nec credere sustinet Annam esse: quid in Latios illa veniret agros?} \]


---

186 “The stories which are inserted here both about Anna, the sister of Dido, and the death and apotheosis of Aeneas, are partly historical and partly fictitious. The accounts that describe the misfortunes of Anna, although in a different manner, are taken from the third book of Ovid’s *Fasti*. But since all the histories agree that Aeneas died at nearly the same time as Anna, and they affirm that the body of Aeneas was found in the same Lake Numicius in which she drowned herself, I judged that I was able to add a history adorned with inventions not far from the truth, and to send our hero in this way from mortal to immortal life.”


188 For Dido and Anna’s brother, see Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.340–341.

189 “Now pious Aeneas had gained the kingdom and the daughter of Latinus, and he had mingled the two peoples. When, accompanied by Achates alone, he made his way barefoot along a lonely path on the shore dowered to him by his wife, he saw Anna wandering there, and could not believe that it was she: Why had she come to the lands of Italy?” (Trans: Frazer).
Aeneas and Anna are reconciled (3.601–626). She is introduced to the court and entrusted to Lavinia (3.627–632); however, Ovid’s Lavinia is deeply jealous and plots to destroy the sister of her rival: *furialiter odi / et parat insidias et cupit ulta mori* (3.637–638).\(^{190}\) Warned in a dream by a Hector-like Dido, Anna flees and runs away through the night (3.639–645). Ovid relates the legend that Anna was drowned in the Numicius:

```
corniger hanc tumidis rapuisse Numicius undis
créditor et stagnis occuluisse suis. (Ovid, Fasti, 3.646–647).\(^{191}\)
```

When the distraught searchers find her tracks along the river, Anna appears and declares that she is now a nymph of the river:

```
ipsa loqui visa est “placidi sum nympha Numici:
anna perenne latens Anna Perenna vocor.” (Ovid, Fasti, 3.653–654).\(^{192}\)
```

Several aspects of this story will be important for Villanova’s account: in particular, Anna’s general prominence and the notion of *insidiae*, which in the *Supplementum* are set by Messapus for Aeneas.

It is important to note that Aeneas’ apotheosis is not depicted in the *Fasti*, although it does appear in *Metamorphoses*, 14.581–608, which may have been among the other “historical” accounts that Villanova consulted. The obvious precedent for this was set by Vegius, who, as we have seen, used Ovid’s “Little Aeneid” as material for scenes that were unprecedented in Virgil, in particular, the burning of Ardea and the death of Aeneas. Ovid’s account of the divinization of

\(^{190}\) “She had a hatred like a fury, and prepared traps, and longed to die avenged” (Trans: Frazer).

\(^{191}\) “It is believed that the horned Numicius snatched her away in the swollen waves and hid her in his pools” (Trans: Frazer).

\(^{192}\) “She appeared to speak: ‘I am a nymph of the calm Numicium. In the perennial stream I hide and am called Anna Perenna’” (Trans: Frazer).
Aeneas in the *Metamorphoses* involves a pacific bath in the Numicius River, an anointing with perfume, nectar, and ambrosia, and the subsequent construction of a temple. It lacks the slightest hint of violence:

> perque leves auras iunctis invecta columbis
> litus adit Laurens, ubi tectus harundine serpit
> in freta flumineis vicina Numicius undis
> hunc iubet Aeneae, quaecumque obnoxia morti
> abluere et tacito deferre sub aequora cursu
> corniger exsequitur Veneris mandata suisque
> quidquid in Aenea fuerat mortale, repurgat
> et respersit aquis: pars optima restitit illi.
> lustratum genetrix divino corpus odore
> unxit et ambrosia cum dulci nectare mixta
> contigit os fecitque deum,
> quem turba Quirini nuncupat Indigitem temploque arisque recepit. (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 14.598–608).\(^\text{193}\)

The succession of Ascanius follows immediately, without any concern about what Lavinia might have thought of her husband’s sudden disappearance. There is no mention of foul play.\(^\text{194}\)

Unlike Vegius, who substantially draws upon Ovid’s language, Villanova draws thematically from the various Ovidian accounts, particularly the story of Anna from the *Fasti*, but so heavily Virgilianizes the language that few textual echoes from the *Fasti* or the *Metamorphoses* can be discerned. Furthermore, although the basics of the story are clearly

\(^{193}\) “Then, born aloft through the yielding air by her harnessed doves, [Venus] came to the Laurentian coast, where the river Numicius, winding through beds of sheltering reeds, pours its fresh waters into the neighboring sea. She bade the river-god wash away from Aeneas all his moral part and carry it down in his silent stream into the ocean depths. The horned god obeyed Venus’ command and in his waters cleansed and washed quite away whatever was mortal in Aeneas. His best part remained to him. His mother sprinkled his body and anointed it with divine perfume, touched his lips with ambrosia and sweet nectar mixed, and so made him a god, whom the Roman populace styled Indiges and honoured with temple and with sacrifice.” (Trans: Miller).

\(^{194}\) Villanova may also have consulted Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*, 1.2.6, which concludes with the burial of Aeneas by the banks of the Numicius: *secundum inde proelium Latinis, Aeneae etiam ultimum operum mortalium fuit. situs est, quæcumque eum dici ius fasque est, super Numicum flumen; Iovem indigetem appellant. Another account of Aeneas’ death can be found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, 1.64.4–5: μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτέρας οὐ πρόσω τοῦ Λαουϊνίου καὶ πολλῶν ἐκατέρθεν απολομένων τὰ μὲν στρατεύματα νικτὸς ἐπελθοῦσις διελύθη, τὸ δὲ Λάινεον σῶμα φανερόν οὐδαμῇ γενόμενον οἱ μὲν εἰς θεοὺς μεταστήναι εἰκάζον, οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ, παρ᾽ ὦν ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο, διαφθαρῆναι. καὶ αὐτῷ κατασκευάζουσιν οἱ Λατῖνοι ἡρώων ἐπιγραφὴν τοιῷδε κοσμούμενον: πατρὸς θεοῦ χθονίου, ὃς ποταμοῦ Νομικίου ρεῖμα διέπει.
Ovidian, as he himself points out in the *annotatio*, he changes significant details. Most importantly, the entire story of Anna is reported to Aeneas by Achates only once she has died: After fleeing Iarbas, she landed in Italy and drowned herself out of despair, not realizing that she had arrived in a friendly land. Neither Aeneas nor Lavinia ever meets her, and the unsavory Ovidian details of Lavinia’s revenge plot are ignored:\(^{195}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{non tuit offensos ignes } & \textit{despectus Iarbas} \\
\text{Didonem ulcisci impatiens, } & \textit{Carthaginis arces} \\
evertit Tyriasque domos. \textit{Annam ille sororem} \\
iam dudum & \textit{immanis sequitur terraque marique}. \\
haec postquam & \textit{variis illincque erroribus acta}, \\
nec sit & \textit{quid sperare detur, se fluminis undis} \\
submersisse ferunt: \textit{portus heu! nescia amicos sit delata; sororque tibi sub pectore praesens}. (13.782–789).{^{196}}
\end{align*}
\]

There appear to be few, if any, direct verbal reminiscences of Ovid. Instead, the account is dense with Virgilian echoes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{non Libyae, non ante Tyro; } & \textit{despectus Iarbas} \textit{ (4.36)}. \\
hic amor, haec patria est. si te & \textit{Karthaginis arces} \textit{ (4.347; also 1.298)}. \\
\textit{Annam, cara mihi nutrix, huc siste sororem} & \textit{ (4.634)}. \\
talia dicentem & \textit{iam dudum aversa tue tur} \textit{ (4.362)}. \\
noctis iter, iam quae passus & \textit{terraque marique} \textit{ (10.162; also 9.492)}. \\
attulerint. pelagine venis & \textit{erroribus actus} \textit{ (6.532)} \\
deicias domini, & \textit{nec quid speraret habe bat} \textit{(Virgil, Eclogues, 2.2)}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{195}\) Notice that Dido remains *sub pectore*; perhaps Ovid’s Lavinia was right to have some concern. 

\(^{196}\) “When Jarbas was rejected, he could not endure that the flames of his love were offended. He was impatient to avenge Dido and he destroyed the citadels of Carthage and the Tyrian houses. For some time now he has cruelly pursued Dido’s sister, Anna, over land and sea. Afterwards, when she was driven from Carthage through various wanderings, she did not have anything to hope for and they say that she drowned herself in the waves of the river. Alas! She did not know that she had arrived at friendly ports and that her sister remains always in your heart.”
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cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam (3.389; also 6.714).
nunc, si cui virtus animusque in pectore praesens (5.363).

Continuing through Villanova’s account, Aeneas has already been warned of the dangers posed by the Numicius and Messapus by the ghost of the fallen Mnestheus (13.617–636); nevertheless, after he hears that Anna has drowned, he rushes off to the river, where Messapus urges him closer “to traps” or “snares” (13.796), promising that he will learn about the fate of Dido:

venerat, insidiis propriis succedere fallax
instat Messapus linguam simulatus et ora. (13.796–797).197

Villanova is clear that Messapus had constructed the traps—of what kind we are not told. Were the traps constructed under the water? Or on the shore? He is studiously vague. Aeneas’ legs and feet are injured as he falls (or rather, “leaps”) into the river, and he drowns beneath the waves. Aeneas is “forgetful” (immemor) and “unfortunate beyond measure” (infelix nimium); his death is “unwilling” (invitae):

immemor Aeneas Mnesthaei praedictaque somnis
janjam oblita: illi Messapo nulla fides sit,
qui struit insidias invitae occumbere morti;
credidit infelix nimium, curruque reverso
prosilit in flumen; sed laeus crura pedesque

197 “[Aeneas] arrived, and Messapus treacherously urges him to approach closer to the ambush, deceiving him with his words and his expression.”
198 “Aeneas failed to remember Mnestheus, and the predictions in his dream were already forgotten. Mnestheus had warned him of Messapus’ faithlessness, and that Messapus had constructed traps to make him meet with an unwilling death. Unfortunate beyond measure, Aeneas trusted Messapus. He turned his chariot around and leapt into the flood, but he injured his legs and his feet, and his body was heavy. The water took away his life beneath the waves.”
This death scene is Villanova’s own fabrication, entirely unlike Anna’s suicide in the *Fasti* or the gentle divinization recorded in the *Metamorphoses*. Again, he draws from Virgilian sources:

\[
\text{seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti. (2.62).}
\]

\[
\text{condidit adverso et moriens animam abstulit hosti. (9.443).}
\]

The deification occurs as a fragrant breeze arises; Aeneas is borne, shining from the water, and rises into the air:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{exurgit subito fragranti venus odore;} \\
\text{scintillam renitens inter sic fertur ab unda} \\
\text{sic fugat ille novum densissima nubila sydus} \\
\text{spectantumque oculos puro sic flamine stringit (13.810–813).}
\end{align*}
\]

Upon hearing of her husband’s death and catasterism, Lavinia is understandably full of diverging emotions: bewildered happiness and fear. She promptly gives birth to Silvius Albus, and constructs a beautiful marble palace for her deified husband, inscribing an epitaph on the door:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{laetitia haec stupuitque metu; sic frigidus horror} \\
\text{membra quatit; partu sub luminis edidit auras} \\
\text{(Anchisae quondam qui certa oracula firmet)} \\
\text{susceptum Aenea, cui nomen Silvius Albus.} \\
\text{uxor constructum jussit de marmore templum;} \\
\text{illustratum genetrix divino corpus odor} \\
\text{susceptum Aeneam divi, pietate vel armis} \\
\text{aequalem fecere sibi; gens omnia speret.” (13.824–827).}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
199 \text{ But see Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 5.433: caerulei crines digitique et crura pedesque.}
\]

\[
200 \text{“Suddenly a breeze arose with a fragrant odor. Shining among sparks, he is borne from the water. Like a new star, he causes the densest clouds to flee, and he brushes the eyes of the onlookers with pure flame.” Here, a few Ovidian reminiscences are possible: lustratum genetrix divino corpus odor (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 14.605); scintillam subito prosiluisse ferunt (Ovid, *Fasti*, 4.796; cf. prosiluit [13.808]). But see Virgil, *Aeneid*, 12.102 and 7.480.}
\]

\[
201 \text{“A frigid horror shook her limbs. Into the light she gave birth to a son of Aeneas (which confirmed the reliable oracles given by Anchises long ago), whose name was Silvius Albus. His wife dedicated the waters as sacred to Aeneas, on the shores she ordered that a temple be constructed of marble, and she wrote his name on the doorposts with an inscribed poem: ‘Because of his mores, his piety, and his arms, the gods made Aeneas equal to themselves. Thus the people can hope for everything.’”}
\]
Villanova is inspired by Ovid’s content, although he heavily Virgilianizes the language. Ovid records the building of a temple for Aeneas: *nuncupat Indigetem temploque arisque recepti* (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 14.608). Furthermore, in the *Fasti*, Ovid’s Anna similarly commemorates Dido with a two-line epitaph at Carthage before the attack of Jarbas:

```quote
praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis etensem:  
```

Besides the identical positioning of *Aeneas* in 13.826, there is little indication that Villanova drew substantially on Ovid’s language here. Instead, his lines are once again filled with Virgilian echoes:

```quote
laetitia mixtoque metu, nec iam amplius hastae (11.807; also 1.514).

et terram tabo maculant. mihi frigidus horror  
membra quatit gelidusque coit formidine sanguis (3.29–30).

furtivum partu sub luminis edidit oras (7.660).

praeterea fuit in tectis de marmore templum (4.457).

Silvius Aeneas, pariter pietate vel armis (6.769).
```

Furthermore, in 13.826 he subtly prioritizes Virgil’s account of the royal succession over Ovid’s by alluding to a line from later in Anchises’ prophecy that describes Aeneas Silvius, a later descendant in the line of kings (6.769). This king is notably absent from Ovid’s list. Thus,

---

202 “Aeneas supplied the blade and the cause of death; Dido used her own hand to kill herself” (Trans: Frazer).
with Aeneas’ deification and his succession secure, Villanova has completed two incomplete plot points foretold in the *Aeneid*, both of which were set out in the *praefatio*.²⁰⁴

Unlike the third section, in which Villanova fabricated an “unhistorical” war to fill in a plot-point that remained completely undeveloped in the *Aeneid*, this final section does have specific Virgilian prophecies available to guide its composition. Nevertheless, Virgil leaves the details unclear. Once again, Villanova realizes that to complete the *Aeneid* he must go beyond the meager indications left by Virgil. Thus, he again fabricates. Yet, although he takes such cues from Ovid—particularly the story of Anna from the *Fasti*—he refuses to treat such non-Virgilian accounts as historical and follows none of them closely. The story of Messapus, Anna’s suicide, and Aeneas’ death by treachery is his own concoction, one that he hopes will be sufficiently plausible considering the available data. Here it may be helpful to review his statement from the *praefatio*. He attempted to follow the succession of events that he judged to be close to Virgilian history, but he acknowledges the difficulties in doing so.²⁰⁵

It is also important to note that in this final section, as with the previous listing of religious rites and laws, Villanova’s desire to compete with and outdo Virgil’s poetry in splendid and dramatic effects appears to fall away. The subject matter becomes much less anachronistic and the lines are packed with Virgilian half-lines and phrases sometimes almost to the point of cento-like density. Instead, he seems eager to make his ending as Virgilian as possible. The tone of the *praefatio* takes over in his *annotationes*, and instead of apologizing for the presence of

²⁰⁴ He calls attention to his fulfillment of Anchises’ prophecy regarding the birth of Silvius in an *annotatio*: *de partu Sylvii in Elisiiis campis Anchises monuerat Aeneam lib. 6 Aeneid.* v. 762.
²⁰⁵ Villanova, *praef.* 9: *rerum gestarum ab Aenea, extincto Turno, seriem et ordinem pro viribus tenui; quemque ordinem habui, hunc et temporis magis accommodum, et Virgilianae historiae pricipiorem adjudicavi, si quis in hoc peccasse me quoquammodo existimet; ipsius judicio sto libens, cum ad unguem res ut sese habuerint tenere difficillimum sit.*
fireworks, they point out the specific ways in which each Virgilian prophecy is fulfilled. It may now be relevant to point out that the work itself has reached 827 lines, almost exactly the average length of a book of the *Aeneid* (825 lines). At least in this respect Villanova’s *Supplementum* is the most Virgilian of all the supplements. Vegius’ *Supplementum* has 630 lines and the two books of Forestus’s *Exequiae Turni* have 610 and 568 lines respectively. Although it is “adorned with inventions” (*commentis adornatam*), Villanova wishes to write a “history” (*historiam*) that is true to Virgil’s work, and so finally “to send our hero in this way from mortal to immortal life” (*ad* 13.779). As he pointed out in an earlier *annotatio* (*ad* 13.264), he has remained in line with Horace’s dictum: “May things invented for the sake of pleasure be close to what is true.”

6. Virgil Supplements the *Supplementum*

   In a way, the true ending of the *Supplementum* is not the deification of Aeneas and Silvius’ succession; rather, Villanova playfully suggests that it is Virgil who will complete the story that he himself has begun. To conclude, we will return to the middle of the *Supplementum*. Following the betrothal of Lavinia, Latinus presents the magical book of Faunus to Ascanius (13.192–238). The hoary tome foretells the entire future of the Roman people, including Virgil’s *Aeneid*, to be written nine-hundred years later. Here, Villanova boldly subsumes Virgil within his own epic universe by foretelling the advent of the *Aeneid* and its greatest suppleanter, himself. In so doing, he claims priority for his own poetic world, while passing silently over the other supplements.\(^{207}\)

---

\(^{206}\) Horace, *Ars poetica*, 338: *ficta voluptatis causa sint proxima veris.*  
\(^{207}\) It is at least certain that Villanova was aware of Vegius, since he engages with Ruaeus’ criticism of Vegius in his *praefatio.*
Furthermore, through Faunus’ prophecy, Latinus foretells the entirety of Virgil’s poem, making a “Little Aeneid” within the Supplementum:

> cum terris novies centena cucurrerit aetas,  
> et patrem et socios, Turnus dum sceptrum teneret,  

> “When nine hundred years will have passed by in these lands, our descendants will report that Virgil sang about your father and his allies in the days when Turnus ruled in Italy.”

> “In this chronicle you will read of the fires of renowned Troy, the causes of the flames, and how, through the ravaging flames on every side, Aeneas, unharmed, led his men in safety to the mountain. You will read about hostile Juno and her avenging angels, how many labors your father Aeneas endured on land and on sea, how, with his goddess mother favoring him, he reached the stronghold of Carthage, and how wrathful and how great was Dido’s love for him. You will read how he remained unyielding to the tears and prayers of the queen. Then you will read of the sad fate of Anchises and the games which took place soon after at his funeral, and the rewards which the victors saw, how at the command of Apollo he descended to the shades of Erebus by traversing the path, and the entire race of shades was stupefied. Carried beyond the seething shallows of Circe’s mountain, he landed here at these shores by a favorable wind. You will read how Aeneas was promised to my daughter and how Turnus took up arms, by what trickery the wife of Jupiter stirred up passions, how in vain the Ausonians attempted to utterly overturn the citadels of New Troy when the walls were constructed. You will read of the sad deaths of Nisus and Euryalus, the siege of Laurentum, and the defeat of Turnus in a single battle, and the illustrious deeds of your father, until it is right for him to take a place at the tables of the gods.”
Ever attentive to chronology, Villanova reorders the early books of the *Aeneid* into a proper temporal sequence and unfolds Virgil’s narrative origami into a historical account. 13.217–219 describe *Aeneid* 2 and the subsequent lines (13.220–222) return to the trials suffered at the beginning of *Aeneid* 1 (and recounted in 3). The remainder of the summary follows the *Aeneid* closely, albeit with some gaps in the second half.²¹⁰ Most importantly, like Vegius in the *De perseverantia*,²¹¹ Villanova adds another *Aeneid*-supplement at the end of the “Little *Aeneid*” (13.238), obsessively finishing the plotline of the *Aeneid* even when it appears in miniature within the *Supplementum*. So even when prophetically foretold, the story of the *Aeneid* appears with a perfect plotline, with a divinized hero, finished before its inception as Virgil doubtlessly would have wished.

Throughout, Villanova plays with the notion of allusion by suggesting that Virgil borrowed famous lines from Villanova’s account of the book of Faunus. As we have seen, he is often sensitive about the possibility of attracting accusations of plagiarism.²¹² But his description of the *Aeneid* boldly alludes to Virgil’s famous opening lines:


*vi superum saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram* (1.4).²¹³

The conceit here is that Virgil’s subsequent poem will borrow from the words of this prophecy recounted in Villanova’s poem. It is Virgil who will plagiarize Villanova and Villanova who reveals the advent of Virgil’s work centuries before Propertius.²¹⁴ Thus, the *Supplementum*

---

²¹⁰ The most attention in the summary (four lines) is paid to *Aeneid* 7, a sensitive focalization of Latinus’ own concerns.
²¹¹ Vegius, *De perseverantia*, 1.5 (fol. 10).
²¹² See, for instance, his note *ad* 13.264.
²¹³ Other allusions can be found in Oertel, 352 and 354.
²¹⁴ Propertius, *Carmina*, 2.34.65–66.
dizzily foretells the poem it follows, and a sequel becomes a prequel that delimits narratively and historically the work that has in reality determined its own scope and plotline. No other supplement enhances its own position as a supplement and contests Virgil’s preeminence as a model so pointedly.

Thus, the implicit claim is that the Aeneid itself is a supplement to the story told in the Supplementum. To drive the point home, Villanova foretells the composition of his own poem:

\begin{quote}
quingentis Titan lustris cum luxerit orbi, 
Aeneam cecinisse, ducis post funera Turni, 
\end{quote}

Here, he does not display any of Vegius’ loving deference or Forestus’ express desire not to vie with Virgil. Instead, the prophecy commemorating his poem skips over the Aeneid entirely and commemorates the 500th lustrum (2,500 years) from the death of Turnus. Villanova does not measure his Supplementum from the death of Virgil or the composition of the Aeneid. Furthermore, he describes his project not as a supplement to the Aeneid, but as a song about Aeneas (Aeneam cecinisse). In other words, both he and Virgil are ontological equals, both singing songs about Aeneas, albeit treating different parts of Aeneas’ adventures. This equality is demonstrated in the three lines given to each poet (13.210–212 [Virgil] and 13.213–215 [Villanova]). And both poets are explicitly included together as students of Faunus: placato sed enim Jove Faunus utrumque docebit (13.216). Thus, Villanova aims for the same prize as Virgil, the honor due (meritum honorem) to one who has undertaken so great a task. The accompanying annotatio clarifies and broadens these commitments, setting up the age of Louis XIV against the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
215 “And after Titan bathes the earth in light for five hundred lustra, someday Villanova will claim the deserved honor to have sung of the deeds of Aeneas after the funeral of the leader Turnus.”
216 Oertel, 210.
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
age of Augustus, as Villanova’s *Supplementum* has already been set up against Virgil’s *Aeneid*.\(^{217}\)

By comparison, not even Petrarch, who famously “envisioned his poetic career as the attempt to equal, if not surpass, the achievement of Virgil,”\(^{218}\) had the temerity to advance such a mischievous or tendentious claim. In his unfinished *Africa*, self-consciously modeled as a counterpart to the *Aeneid*,\(^{219}\) Scipio’s future is foretold in a retelling of Cicero’s *Dream of Scipio*. One day, an Etruscan poet, an *Ennius alter*, i.e., Petrarch from Arezzo, will recount the deeds of Scipio:

\[
cernere iam videor genitum post secula multa
finibus Etruscis iuvenem qui gesta renarret,
nate, tua et nobis veniat velut Ennius alter.
carus uterque michi, studio memorandus uterque:
iste rudes Latio duro modulamine Musas
intulit; ille autem fugientes carmine sistet. (Petrarch, *Africa*, 2.441–446).\(^{220}\)
\]

As Regn and Huss point out, Virgil’s absence is conspicuous and polite:

\[\text{[T]he author of the} \text{ Aeneid is not mentioned by Petrarch in this context, and for good reasons. To claim superiority over Virgil, the foremost writer of classical Rome, would have been to display an ostentatious and inappropriate pride. It would have thwarted the project of a ‘rebirth’ of classical culture as Petrarch conceived it.} \text{\cite{Regn and Huss, “Petrarch’s Rome,” 89.}}\]


\(^{220}\) “Now, my son, I seem to see a young man, born after many years in the lands of Etruria, who will recount your deeds and will come to us as a second Ennius. Both are dear to me, and both should be remembered for their diligence: For the one brought the rustic Muses to Latium with his unpolished style, but the other restrained them with his song as they fled away.”

\(^{221}\) Regn and Huss, “Petrarch’s Rome,” 89.
Petrarch can vie with Ennius—even surpass him. After all, Ennius’ muses were “rustic” (*rudes*) and his versification was “harsh” (*duro*). Villanova, by contrast, has none of Petrarch’s polite compunction. The Frenchman was, after all, the representative of the age of Louis XIV, writing from a position of strength, with the insecure rebirth of the quattrocento Renaissance far behind him.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, Villanova obsessively attempts to correct the plotline of the *Aeneid* according to what he judges to be nearest to “Virgilian history.” His *Supplementum* is thus structured according to the logic of the future foretold in Virgil’s prophecies and promises, not according to Oertel’s “rules of contrast.” Following the *praefatio*, the poem can be divided into five distinct sections: 1) the burial of Turnus and the construction of his tomb (13.1–37), 2) the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia (13.38–317), 3) the war with Lauzellus and the reconstruction of Laurentum (13.345–690), 4) the establishment of laws and customs in Latium (13.691–776), and 5) Aeneas’ death, apotheosis, and succession (13.777–827). Throughout, in his *annotationes* Villanova provides meticulous documentation, including additional arguments for the possibility, necessity, and sufficiency of his various corrective scenes. He reasons, for instance, that Aeneas’ rhetoric is enough to mollify Latinus (ad 13.157), and he points out that Juno could incite additional conflicts under precise conditions (ad 13.346). Finally, even where he believes that he is required to go beyond the guidelines provided by the *Aeneid*, either to avoid plagiarism (as in the case of the fireworks [ad 13.264]) or because he does not find

---

222 Oertel, 136.
sufficient direction in Virgil (as in the case of the apotheosis [ad 13.779]), he carefully documents his sources and defends each necessary fabrication. He is sure to remind his readers that he intends to remain close to the truth of Virgil and begs their pardon for any defects in his execution.

Second, I have argued throughout for a renewed appreciation of Villanova’s engagement with the fabric of Virgil’s verse. Instead of dismissing his efforts as “superficial,” “absurd,” or “tasteless,” like Kern and Oertel, I have shown how Villanova’s allusions to and appropriations of the Aeneid are frequently both creative and competitive. The tomb of Turnus rises up into the heavens like a skyscraper, gloriously outstripping Virgil’s descriptions of Carthage, which it is designed to recall. The fluttering of Virgil’s shy doves is recast into brilliant rockets whose thunderous path through the heavens leads them to burst into flame like new celestial bodies. A swan with a shining body may be captured by an eagle in Virgil’s simile (qualis ubi aut leporem aut candenti corpore cyolum [9.563]); however, in the Supplementum, the same swan stands in the midst of the wedding guests as a fountain that shoots streams of wine and honey (institit medium candenti corpore cygnus [13.256]). Besides these glittering reworkings of Virgilian material, other allusions serve an indexical function, pointing out the exact moment that Villanova fulfills a prophecy, such as when his Latinus speaks very nearly with the words of Virgil’s Turnus: tua stat Lavinia coniux (13.159 ≈ 12.937). Hardly “superficial,” such allusions help to structure the Supplementum and are integral to the program of correction that Villanova sets out to complete in the praefatio.

Finally, while most previous scholarship has assigned Villanova to the Modern side of the Quarrel, I have complicated this view by demonstrating that Villanova stands between the “reductive dichotomies” of the Ancient and Modern views. Throughout the poem and praefatio,
I examined his adherence to decidedly ancient positions, including his devotion to the
Aristotelian unities, his tireless antiquarianism, and his belief in the perfection of Virgil’s
original plan for the *Aeneid*. None of these commitments is easily compatible with the Modern
side of the quarrel. Even his choice to write in Latin at a time of increased publication in the
vernacular points towards a deep commitment to the ancient world. Indeed, as we can see from
the wildly popular publication history of Fénelon’s *Télémaque* (1699), an epic supplement
following ancient models could still be wildly popular—as long as it was in the vernacular!223 If
Villanova had been a convinced modern partisan, he would have had every reason to compose
his *Supplementum* in French, not Latin.224

However, this does not mean that Villanova is shackled to an Ancient position. On the
contrary, his frank acknowledgement of the *Aeneid*’s blameworthy incompleteness is itself
characteristic of the Modern side of the Quarrel, which placed the glorious works of antiquity
under new and rigorous analysis. Furthermore, his relentless attempts to outdo Virgil and
overawe the reader with scenes of unparalleled magnificence and glorious anachronisms
demonstrate that he is not merely a poetic archaeologist or a humorless copyist. Indeed, as we
have seen, when he alludes to Virgil, he often does so specifically with an eye to validating and
exalting his own status as a poet, and in the book of Faunus he does this explicitly, placing
himself on par with Virgil as a fellow singer of the tale of Aeneas.

223 Lohne, “Epic Continuation,” 175: “[The *Télémaque* was] a literary sensation, the most sold book in France from
its publication until Rousseau’s *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1761).”
224 For Renaissance interactions between Latin and the vernacular, see Philip Ford, *The Judgement of Palaemon*
(Boston: Brill, 2013); Grahame Castor and Terence Cave (eds.), *Neo-Latin and the Vernacular in Renaissance
France* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). Recently, see Florian Schaffenrath and Alexander Winkler (eds.), *Neo-
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is my hope that the framework set out in the introduction and applied to each of the supplementers will help to make sense of the varied and often misunderstood natures of the supplements to the Aeneid and allow for a clearer understanding of the nature of supplementation more broadly. To review, in my introduction I subdivided the genre into four distinct subgenres: (re)construction, correction, continuation, and completion. In a reconstruction, a work is supplemented whose text and overarching concept both are considered incomplete. None of the supplementers examined in this dissertation fell under this category. In a correction, by contrast, the broader concept or storyline behind the supplemented work is considered complete by the supplementing author, but the text has remained unfinished or incomplete. In a completion the text of the supplemented work is considered complete, but the concept or story behind the text appears incomplete or unresolved. Finally, a continuation simply extends a story that is otherwise seen by the supplementing author to be already finished, both in its concept and in its execution.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, the supplementers often have been misunderstood, both in scholarship and in popular writing. This is especially true for Vegius, since his Supplementum has found a relatively broad readership. In this respect, Forestus and Villanova may have been fortunate in their obscurity. To take one final and illustrative example, the Lord John Somers, jurist, political scientist, and advisor to William III, makes an unlikely entry into the history of the reading of Virgil and Virgilian supplementation in a Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects. He opines on the sorry state of Virgil’s poetry:
Though it is granted by all, that the action of the Aeneis was equal to the greatness and magnificence of the Roman empire, yet it is vicious and mangled, in the condition we have it ... It is true, that by [Turnus’] death, and that of Amata, great obstacles are removed, yet is not Aeneas settled king of Latium. The reader cannot be fully satisfied to behold the affairs of Aeneas at a stand in so fair a progress. He wants to see him marry Lavinia, and by that means take possession of the kingdom of the Latins, without which one may justly question whether it ever came to pass. This marriage would only have completed what is yet begun; it had settled the foundation of the Roman empire, which is the main action of the poem. Thus then, though Virgil’s Aeneis has a beginning and a middle, yet wants it still an end, to compleat the action.\(^1\)

Like many of his time, Villanova included, Somers applies the Aristotelian doctrine of the necessity of a single, completed action to the Aeneid; yet, unlike any of the supplementers, he argues that the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia is the natural telos of the Aeneid. If he were to have written a supplement, it seems, the entire book would most likely have culminated with a wedding that would have settled the lineage of Aeneas and cemented his rule over Latium. It is also likely that his concern with William’s famously fraught succession may have influenced his interpretation of Virgil at this point.

Somers cites Perrault, the Scaligers, and Donatus on the matter—and he might very well have cited Ruden.\(^2\) In this view, as we have seen, Virgil had intended additional books, and it was because of the architectural incompleteness of the poem that he begged for the “vicious and mangled” Aeneid to be destroyed upon his death:

As to the compleatness of the action, both the Scaligers, and after them Perrault, Paral. des Anciens et Modern, 2 vol. hold, that Virgil’s action is not compleat nor finished; and all the ancients held, adds Joseph Scaliger, that Virgil intended twenty-four books, in imitation of Homer. But being prevented by death, he therefore ordered his Aeneis to be burnt, (ibid ad ignes) knowing it to be but a piece of a great work, unfinished, as the unfinished verses also demonstrate. This made Mapheus Vegius add a thirteenth book to the Aeneis.

---

Leaving aside his reading of Virgil, Somers certainly misreads Vegius and misunderstands the purpose of the *Supplementum*. Here, like many modern scholars, we can see that he treats the poem like a correction of the *Aeneid*, hastily concluding that the desire to finish the *Aeneid* is an indication that the author believes something to be lacking in the text of the poem that he supplements. Although he is not wrong that such a motivation is possible—indeed, we see a version of this view in Villanova’s *praefatio*—his assumptions about the nature of supplementation lead him away from a true appreciation of Vegius’ purpose.

In the first chapter I argued that Vegius’ *Supplementum* is an allegorical completion of the *Aeneid*. Vegius never suggests that the text of Virgil’s poem is in any way unfinished or deficient. Indeed, he has nothing but admiration for the *Aeneid*, being, as it was, so very nearly Christian. One might say, rather, that Christ fulfilled what was lacking in the whole of the pre-Christian world, of which Virgil was among the saintliest literary representatives. Vegius’ allegorical ending is thus like a baptism, which allows the greatest of the ancient poems to take its place among the Christian texts that could safely lead young students like Augustine to eternal salvation. His *Supplementum* is a testimony to the *Aeneid*’s excellence, just as Aquinas’ numerous commentaries on Aristotle are witnesses to the exalted and very nearly Christian metaphysics of “the Philosopher.” Following the outlines provided in the *De perseverantia* and the *De educatione*, the Aeneas of the *Supplementum* is a *vir sapiens*, cleansed of violence, gentle and placid, with the brutality of Virgil’s ending rewritten and forgotten. Turnus, by contrast, vomits fire, passion, and fury, and is labeled the “origin of all rebellion.” The forces of the Latins are pacified. Lavinia, sparkling with moral excellence and otherworldly beauty, is safely married.
Finally, Aeneas’ soul is conducted to the stars, and divinity is promised to others who follow his example of virtue.

Vegius’ lifelong devotion to Augustine and Monica may provide an additional motivation beyond the allegorical outline of the De perseverantia. In his De educatione, as he derides the nugator who had criticized the use of Cicero and Virgil in the schoolroom, Vegius argues that Augustine supported the reading of both great fathers of the Latin language by young students:

oratores vero poetasque omnes pessime criminabat, sed praecipue linguae latinae parentes Virgilium simul atque Ciceronem, quos et accrime detestans prohibebat ne pueri ullo modo legendi darentur. non viderat hic doctus ut sibi videbatur theologus quod theologorum princeps Augustinus dicat Virgilium propter a puellis legi, ut videlicet poeta Magnus omniumque praeclarissimus atque optimus adversus animis non facile oblivione possit aboleri. non noverat quoque quod idem scribat dum adolescens adhuc legeret Hortensium Ciceronis (sic enim liber ille inscribatur; nunc negligentia posteritatis deperit) mutasse adeo ex lectione eius omnes affectus suos atque ad deum spem omnem vertisse.³

Here it is arguable that Vegius misconstrues the beginning of the Civitas Dei, in which Augustine mocks the Romans for worshipping the very gods who were unable to defend Troy—victos penatis (1.68)—a lesson that they should have absorbed from their boyhood studies of the Aeneid.⁴ This is hardly a ringing endorsement for the educational value of Virgil’s poetry.

Furthermore, while it is true that the Hortensius marks a shift in Augustine’s intellectual trajectory, as he himself describes in the Confessiones,⁵ the Aeneid receives no such favorable

³ Vegius, De educatione, 2.18: “[The nugator] was denouncing in a most horrid way all the orators and poets, but especially the parents of the Latin language, Virgil and Cicero, whom he sharply detested. He forbade them to be given as reading material to boys. This learned theologian—or so he seemed to himself—had not understood that the captain of theologians, Augustine, says that Virgil should be read by young boys for this reason, ‘So that the great poet who is best and most illustrious of all, when drunk in by their tender minds, might not easily be able to be lost from their memory.’ He did not know also that the same Augustine writes that when as a young man he read the Hortensius of Cicero—for so the book was called, but now the negligence of posterity has destroyed it—by reading it he transformed all his passions and turned all his hope to God.”
⁴ Augustine, Civitas Dei, 1.3.
⁵ ibid., Confessiones, 3.4.7: sed liber ille ipsius exhortationem continet ad philosophiam et vocatur Hortensius. ille vero liber mutavit affectum meum, et ad te ipsum, domine, mutavit preces meas, et vota ac desideria mea fecit alia.
treatment. His literary studies overall were beneficial, but his castigation of Virgil is particularly harsh:

nam utique meliores, quia certiores, erant primae illae litterae, quibus fiebat in me et factum est et habeo illud, ut et legam, si quid scriptum invenio, et scribam ipse, si quid volo, quam illae, quibus tenere cogebat Aeneae nescio cuius errores, oblivus errorum meorum, et plorare Didonem mortuam, quia se occidit ab amore, cum interea me ipsum in his a te morientem, deus, vita mea, siccis oculis ferrem miserrimus.⁶

Indeed, taste for the high rhetoric and artistry of pagan literature, especially the Aeneid, developed in his pernicious studies under the grammatici eventually causes Augustine to disdain the comparative unsophistication of the scriptures before he is introduced to Ambrose’s allegorical methods of reading.⁷

Thus, I suggest that Vegius may have wanted to write the ending of an Aeneid for which his statement in the De educatione could be true, an Aeneid that Augustine could wholeheartedly have endorsed as part of his program of education. Although in the De educatione it is true that Dido can be redeemed to a certain extent as a negative exemplum to promote chastity, it is still necessary for the entire Aeneid to be baptized for its centrality in a program of study to be justified. When read backwards through the Supplementum, the Aeneid becomes a different poem, one charged with the drama of salvation and oriented to a celestial goal. The Supplementum leaves none of Virgil’s work unchanged. The Aeneid is now the story of a vir sapiens, overcoming lust and passion in Carthage, sailing watchfully over the dark and stormy

---

⁶ *ibid.*, 1.13.20: “Those early lessons in literacy were unquestionably more profitable because more dependable; by means of them I was gradually being given a power which became mine and still remains with me: the power to read any piece of writing I come across and to write anything I have a mind to myself. Far more useful, then, were those studies than others in which I was forced to memorize the wanderings of some fellow called Aeneas, while forgetting my own waywardness, and to weep over Dido, who killed herself for love, when all the while in my intense misery I put up with myself with never a tear, as I died away from you, O God, who are my life” (Trans: Boulding).
⁷ *ibid.*, 3.5.9.
seas of the world, waging spiritual wars against the prince of darkness, returning to his heavenly homeland, and finally providing his followers a holy example so that they may do the same:

\[
\text{quin si alios sua habet virtus, qui laude perenni}
\text{accingant sese et gestis praestantibus orbem}
\text{exornent, illos rursum super aethera mittam. (13.617–619).}^8
\]

In a way Vegius’ *Supplementum* is the most radical of all the supplements, because it demands the essential reorientation of the entirety of Virgil’s poem towards the end of sanctification for the hero, while reconfiguring all of Aeneas’ trials and tribulations through allegory and anagogy.\(^9\) The *Aeneid* is a new work. No longer does it proclaim the foundation of an earthly empire without end; instead, by Aeneas’ example it points its readers to the heavenly city and the peace that is eternal repose, the peace that knows no evening.\(^10\)

Despite the radical nature of Vegius’ *Supplementum*, his allusions to Virgil remain mostly faithful and subdued. Although he rearranges, rewrites, and changes forms, Virgil’s words form the background, the scenery, and the style of his work, which often approaches a cento-like density of allusion. Indeed, many of his allusions to Virgil’s poetry are highly predictable: Scenes of a particular type in the *Aeneid* are often reworked into scenes of the same general type in the *Supplementum*. For example, when Vegius’ Trojans and Italians feast together following the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia, they recount the history of Latium.

---

8 “Also, if others possess his virtue, who gird themselves with immortal praise and adorn the world through excellent deeds, I will send them in turn beyond the aether.”

9 Augustine remains a compulsive allegorist throughout his works, e.g., *In Evangelium Ioannis tractatus centum viginti quatuor*, 25.6 (regarding the miracle of Christ walking on water in John 2:1–21): *ad eos ergo qui implent legem, venit Iesus. et venit, quomodo? calcans fluctus; omnes tumores mundi sub pedibus habens, omnes celsitudines saeculi premens. hoc agitur quantum additum tempori, et quantum accedit actas saeculi. augentur in isto mundo tribulationes, augentur mala, augentur contritiones, exaggerantur haec omnia: Iesus transit, calcans fluctus.*

10 *ibid.*, *Confessiones*, 13.35.50.
Vegius reworks Virgil’s etymological explanation for the name “Latium,” an explanation Virgil gave to Evander in 8.319–323:

```latex
magnorum heroum Latiiique antiqua potentis
gesta recensebant, fugientumque horrida nati
arma sui Saturnum Italis latuisse sub oris:
hinc Latium dixisse, genusque in montibus altis
composuisse vagum, legesque et iura dedisse (13.517–521).^{11}
```

```
primus ab aetherio venit Saturnus Olympo
arma lovis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis.
is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis
composuit legesque dedit, Latiumque vocari
maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris. (8.319–323).^{12}
```

Notice how Vegius adds, subtracts, reshapes, and changes morphological forms. Although line 13.520 is almost entirely composed of words appearing in the Virgilian model, only a single phrase (montibus altis) and one word in first position (arma) are directly repeated. His reuse of Ovidian scenes is similar; for example, his description of the immortalization of Aeneas (13.623–630) is closely dependent on the catasterism of Aeneas in the Metamorphoses (14.598–608).

Despite the label of “continuator” being frequently applied to all the supplementers, only Forestus truly continues the Aeneid without implying that anything, either in concept or in execution, is unfinished or lacking in Virgil’s “heavenly monument.” Thus, in the second chapter, I present Forestus’ Exequiae Turni as a continuation of the Aeneid that explores various plotlines left open by Virgil, without ever completing any of the prophecies. I examine the five

^{11} “They were recalling the ancient deeds of great heroes and of Latin power, and that Saturn had hidden away on the shores of Italy when he fled the horrible weapons of his son; for this reason he called the land “Latium” and he brought together the wandering race in the high mountains and gave them laws and rights” (Trans: Fairclough).

^{12} “First Saturn came from heavenly Olympus, fleeing the weapons of Jove, and, exiled from his lost kingdoms, he brought together the ignorant race that was scattered in the high mountains, and he gave them laws. He chose that the land be called Latium, because he had hidden safely on these shores.”
major plot-arcs of the poem, showing how in each Forestus develops Virgil’s characters in unique and compelling ways, while creatively alluding to and appropriating Virgilian material. Even in his development of Pilumnus, a non-Virgilian figure, Forestus displays intense engagement with Virgil’s text, particularly the descriptions of Turnus. But ultimately, apart from the renewal of peace already established between Aeneas and Latinus, none of the prophecies from the *Aeneid* are fulfilled. Aeneas never ascends to the throne, much less to the stars, and the wedding with Lavinia is put off for a happier time that we never see.

Apart from the experiences of the Thirty-Years War discussed in the chapter, Forestus’ approach to supplementing the *Aeneid* may also have arisen through a deliberate choice to contrast himself with Vegius. That Forestus knew Vegius’ work can be proved from a letter sent from Heinsius to Forestus on June 11, 1616:

> Maphaei Vegii, ut volebas, appendiculam aut divini Supplementum operis, hic mitto. quam in paucissimis virgilianis codicibus, vel potius editionibus, cum plures habeam, ex raro nunc comperio. diu est, cum eam legi. nunc autem obiter percurri. mirum est, quam longe ab eo absit, quem imitari saltem debuit, et nonnumquam, licet impari successu imitatus est.13

It is difficult to imagine two works treating the same general subjects and supplementing the same poem that are more dissimilar in almost every way: in plot, scope, characters, and ending.14 Whereas Vegius ends with an apotheosis; Forestus ends with a preliminary treaty. Vegius’ poem

---

13 “As you wished, here I am sending Maphaeus Vegius’ appendix or *Supplementum* to the divine work of Virgil. I now rarely find it in a few Virgilian codices, or rather editions, since I have many. It has been a long time since I have read it. Now I have scanned it in passing. It is amazing how distant it is from the work which it ought at least to have imitated, and, although with unequal success, sometimes did imitate.” Oertel, 177–178, sensibly concludes: “Aus diesem Brief geht nicht nur die geringe Wertschätzung hervor, die Heinsius dem Supplement entgegenbringt, sondern auch, daß Van Foreest das Gedicht des Vegio schon in jungen Jahren in Händen hatte, lange bevor er den Plan faßte, selber eine Fortsetzung zu schreiben.”

14 Oertel, 180, rightly insists that Forestus differentiates himself from Vegius: “Obwohl der Holländer also das Supplement des Vegio schon langen kannte, hat er einen ganz neuen Ansatz gewählt.”
covers several years; Forestus’, several days. The characters are in many cases diametrically opposed. For instance, even in the opening scene, Vegius’ Aeneas is saintly and subdued, whereas Forestus’ is wrathful and passionate. Most importantly, perhaps, Vegius’ poem concludes an allegory of the earthly struggles that lead to sanctification and eternal rest, whereas Forestus’ pointedly reflects the difficult process of establishing peace on earth. Forestus shows that he does not merely desire to rush Virgil’s epic to a close or tie off loose ends; instead, he continues to savor the development of his characters over another fourteenth book. At the end of Forestus’ continuation, those longing for a Vegius-like completion may feel that more still needs to be done. What will happen when Aeneas and Lavinia finally meet? How will Aeneas manage his rule with Latinus? And what will the death of Aeneas look like? We can be sure that, had Forestus’ treated these scenes, they would have been rich with his usual attention to characterization and psychological detail. But unlike Vegius his aim was not to complete the Aeneid. Ultimately, Forestus is true to the words of his introductory letter: He is less attached to Virgil and more willing to wander freely beyond his world.

Thus, if Vegius’ poem is the most radical in its totalizing completion of the Aeneid’s purpose and meaning, Forestus’ is the most imaginative and creative, particularly in his invention of compelling narrative arcs and development of intense characterizations. Virgil’s secondary characters are brought into color. Throughout his poem we explore the desires and inner life of Lavinia as she struggles to accept the death of her betrothed. We see the despair of Latinus as he contemplates self-harm, and the fluctuating emotions of the hot-blooded brother of Turnus, Pilumnus, who reappears suddenly in the night demanding vengeance. We see Daunus’ magnanimous forgiveness after a vision of his fallen son, and Aeneas’ struggle to achieve the self-mastery that he may have lost at the end of the Aeneid. Reading the Aeneid back through the
*Exequiae Turni*, Lavinia’s blush, Amata’s suicide, and Aeneas’ wrathful response to Pallas’ baldric, are now charged with additional significance. Aeneas must first conquer himself before he can rule a pacific Latium. Latinus is as fragile as his wife and is governed by powerful emotions. Turnus may die at the end of the *Aeneid*, but his fury will live on in the blood of his brother. And Lavinia is not merely a blushing bystander, but a princess on whose decision will rest the future of the Roman people. Forestus shows us that the emotional lives of these characters can be fuller and more developed than they were in the *Aeneid*, and this itself is a testament to the fecundity even of Virgil’s silences.

Indeed, even in his allusive use of Virgil’s language, Forestus shows the greatest willingness to depart creatively from Virgil. Unlike Vegius who generally uses similar Virgilian scenes as the foundation for his own scenes, in the *Exequiae Turni* Virgil’s lines and words reappear in astonishing ways. In his initial description of Turnus, as we have seen, Forestus borrows from Virgil’s descriptions of the cyclopes in *Aeneid* 3 and the frightening snake thrown by Allecto in *Aeneid* 7:

*at pater Aeneas iam Turni caede peracta*
*corporis exanimi porrectam in pulvere molem*
*lumine metitur torvo totamque pererrat turbidus.* (13.1–4).

*cernimus astantis nequiquam lumine torvo*
*Aetnaeos fratres caelo capita alta ferentis.* (3.677–678).

*his ubi nequiquam dictis experta Latinum*
*contra stare videt, penitusque in viscera lapsum*
*serpentis furiale malum totamque pererrat,*

---

15 “But after Father Aeneas had finished the slaughter of Turnus, he looks with a pitiless glance over the bulk of the lifeless body stretched out in the dust, and his gaze wanders confusedly over its entirety.”
16 “We see them, standing impotent with glaring eye, the Aetnean brotherhood, their heads towering to the sky.” (Trans: Fairclough).
Notice how the movements of the maddening venom of Allecto’s serpent through the body of Amata in the *Aeneid* become the movements of Aeneas’ eyes over the body of Amata’s nephew in the *Exequiae Turni*. And we for a moment may have forgotten that *lumine torvo* is an effective poetic singular in the *Aeneid* because the cyclopes only have one eye. Thus, even when Forestus re-uses Virgilian lines and images, he does so to suggest new dramatic possibilities within the setting that he has created for them. It is through Virgil’s own words that we catch glimpses of possible futures that depart wildly from the futures foretold in the *Aeneid*, creating the dramatic tensions that drive the episodic plot of the *Exequiae Turni*.

In the final chapter, I examined Villanova’s *Supplementum ad Aeneida* as a correction of the *Aeneid*. Although he admits that the *Aeneid* as it was intended is inimitable and perfect, he provides what is to his mind conclusive proof of the unfinished nature of the text as it stands, and in his *praefatio* he details each element of the *Aeneid* that was left uncompleted by Virgil. The unfulfilled prophecies and promises of the *Aeneid* thus structure the *Supplementum*: Turnus is buried with reverence befitting Aeneas’ legendary *pietas*. Latinus is rhetorically pacified, making the long-foretold reconciliation between the Trojans and Latins finally possible. Lavinia is easily wooed and wedded. Finally, since Virgil promised additional wars in Latium, Villanova invents a new conflict with Lauzellus, who is incited by Juno to keep alive her quarrel with the Trojans. After his defeat, Laurentum is reconstructed and receives Lavinia’s name. Aeneas establishes laws and customs in accordance with the treaty from *Aeneid* 12. After his assassination at the

---

17 “When after trying in vain with words, she sees Latinus stand firm against her—when the serpent’s maddening venom has glided deep into her veins and courses through her whole frame—then, indeed, the luckless queen, stung by monstrous horrors, in wild frenzy rages from end to end of the city.” (Trans: Fairclough).
hands of Messapus, he is divinized, and his succession is assured through the birth of his son Silvius. Each of these plot-points is meticulously detailed in the accompanying annotationes.

Thus, Villanova has the paradoxical distinction of remaining closest to Virgil in form and straying farthest from Virgil in matter. As far as the plot is concerned, Villanova is the most Virgilian of all the supplements. Ardea remains firmly grounded without a phoenix-like transformation, and no amorous dreams are inserted into Lavinia’s head. Similarly, broadly speaking, none of his characters develop in radically un-Virgilian directions. Lavinia is neither radiant with otherworldly beauty, nor does she prove to have intense romantic attachments to her fallen fiancée. When she speaks, she speaks only to confirm a predictable Virgilian vision for her future: She will be the happy wife of a divinized hero and will bear him sons to ensure his lineage and the future of Rome. On the other hand, the language used in the poem to describe, as it were, the backdrop and scenery—the palaces, constructions, celebrations, etc.—is radically un-Virgilian. Fireworks explode in the dark skies over Latium, workmen overcome nature through the magical artistry of their constructions, and the rustic ceilings of the seats of archaic governance now glimmer with intertwined crystal and gold. Nevertheless, even as he describes radically anachronistic scenes, his accompanying annotationes attempt to justify them through classical models and Horatian dictums regarding poetic license.

As with Forestus, Villanova’s poem seems, in some ways, to deliberately contrast itself with Vegius’ Supplementum. Apart from its general popularity, it is likely that Villanova was aware of Vegius’ poem through Ruaeus’ introduction to the Aeneid, as mentioned above.\textsuperscript{18} Notice, however, that Ruaeus accuses Vegius’ work as being “lifeless, juvenile, and entirely

\textsuperscript{18} Oertel, 178.
unnecessary.”¹⁹ Villanova tries to avoid all these criticisms in his own poem: He certainly attempts to create a lively supplement, avoiding all of Vegius’ predictability and pietism. Instead, he charges the poem with flirtations between Aeneas and Lavinia that culminate in an (albeit awkward) intercourse scene, a lively night-raid and battle that ends in the vicious suicide of Lauzellus in a pool of blood, the haunting appearance of Mnestheus’ ghost, and the nail-biting assassination of Aeneas in the Numicius. Similarly, through his annotations he cultivates an air of classical learning and the sophisticated reading of classical texts; footnotes may be misplaced, but the poem does not read like a piece of juvenilia. Most importantly, unlike any of his predecessors, he strives to show why a supplement is an entirely necessary and important endeavor, considering the incompleteness of the Aeneid. It is for this reason that he devotes so much time to the study of Virgilian minutiae in his praefatio and annotationes. Even through the length of his poem he attempts to remain closer to Virgil—his 827-line poem is the closest of all the supplements to the Aeneid’s average of 825 lines. Similarly, while he uses Ovid’s accounts from the Fasti and Metamorphoses for general inspiration, particularly regarding Anna and Aeneas’ death, he refuses to let Ovid’s language permeate his own work to the extent that Vegius did, for example, in his descriptions of Ardea’s transformation and the catasterism of Aeneas.

In his engagement with Virgil, Villanova displays an incredible complexity and virtuosity. As I have demonstrated, some of his allusions are indexical, in that they point to the specific Virgilian promise or prophecy that is being fulfilled. For example, when Latinus agrees to the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia, he does so in the words of Turnus, and thus signifies the fulfillment of the unfinished plot-point that he lamented in his praefatio:

¹⁹ Ruæus, Opera, 241: completam negavit Maphaeus Vegius, ideo sibi posse visus est decimum-tertium librum Aeneidi assuere, quo dolorem Rutulorum, Turni funus, Aeneae nuptias et apotheosin complexus est, temere omnino ... cetera, quae ad pompam luctumque pertinent, frigida et puerilia, certe minime necessaria.
Elsewhere, however, Villanova’s allusions to Virgil point out instances of competition and aemulatio, particularly in the scenes of construction and the descriptions of architectural marvels. In innumerable specific instances he recasts Virgil’s words. For instance, Virgil’s Sibyl expresses her unwillingness to continue her catalogue of crimes and punishments in Tartarus:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{non mihi si linguae \textit{centum} sint oraque \textit{centum},} \\
&\text{ferrea vox, omnis scelerum comprehendere formas,} \\
&\text{omnia poenarum percurrere nomina possim. (6.625–627).}^{22}
\end{align*}
\]

These are, of course, well known lines, used elsewhere by Virgil and imitating Homer’s description of the innumerable multitudes of the Greeks. Villanova attempts to surpass Virgil and the tradition by creating statuary at Aeneas’ wedding that actually possesses a hundred heads and a hundred mouths, and what is more, vomits (and re-vomits) magnificent pyrotechnics:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dextra parte leo frendens ruit, illius ore} \\
&\text{aera per medium tormenta feruntur et ignes.} \\
&\text{laeva parte draco \textit{centum} capita \textit{oraque centum}} \\
&\text{mille vomit revomitque nitrato pulvere culmos. (13.246–249).}^{25}
\end{align*}
\]

\[20\] “You are the victor; and the Ausonians have seen me stretch forth my hands as the vanquished: Lavinia is your wife; do not press your hatred further” (Trans: Fairclough).
\[21\] “I accept you as my son-in-law. Lavinia is your wife.”
\[22\] “Nay, had I a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, and a voice of iron, I could not sum up all the forms of crime, or rehearse all the tale of torments.” (Trans: Fairclough).
\[23\] Virgil, \textit{Georgics}, 2.43–44.
\[25\] “On the right side a gnashing lion rushes, from his mouth through the middle of the air are carried shafts and fires. On the left side a hundred-headed dragon with a hundred mouths. He spewed and re-spewed a thousand rockets with nitrous powder.”
What is an adynaton in Virgil thus becomes a reality in the *Supplementum*. Other instances of allusive *aemulatio* adorn countless lines: The swan from Virgil’s simile (9.563) becomes a real mechanical swan that pours out streams of wine and honey for the wedding guests (13.256), and Virgil’s shy doves (6.200) become the bold fireworks hurtling through the sky (13.251). Unlike Vegius or Forestus, Villanova seizes on allusion precisely as a way of outdoing and competing with his model. While he corrects what Virgil left unfinished centuries before, he creates scenes of magnificence that are astonishing even in his own time. It may be the voice of the poet that we hear in the fearless shout of his workmen: “We have conquered nature through art!” (13.689).

Looking forward, this study could be expanded to treat the numerous other supplementers who attempted to complete other supposedly unfinished classical texts. Most of them appear to be corrections, aimed at finishing incomplete or mutilated works. For instance, at the end of his edition of Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica* (1519), dedicated to Cardinal Giulio d’Medici, Giovan Battista Pio adds another three books with further commentary by Giulio Cesare to complete the poem. Giulio Cesare explains Pio’s reasons for the addition:

> opus plenum pietatis aggressus est Pius pater, nam qui videbat opus aureum Flacci intempesta morte mutilatum summporeque a latinis desiderari etiam necessario, cum ex hoc uno fonte et praetera nullo, latinitas id hauriat, hanc argonautarum historiam non ulterior disserendam ratus, publicae latinarum musarum utilitati consuluit, ex Apollonio Rhodio longe graecorum poetarum doctissimo, praesens poema interpretatus.

Prior to the onset of COVID-19, I had the good fortune to be able to attend a stunning exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, entitled *Making Marvels: Science and Splendor at the Courts of Europe* that displayed many fantastical items from early modern palace culture, including intricate fountains and other mechanical marvels that bring the technology of Villanova’s time into focus. For a catalogue of the exhibit see Wolfram Koeppe (ed.), *Making Marvels* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2019).

“Father Pius approached this work full of piety, for he saw that the golden work of Flaccus was mutilated by his untimely death and still of necessity was greatly desired by the Latins, since from this one source and no other Latinity has received this story. He thought that this history of the Argonauts should not be put off any longer and considered its public usefulness for the Latin muses. He construed the present poem from Apollonius of Rhodes, by far the most learned of the Greek poets.”
This appears to be a correction, one which bears many similarities to Villanova’s approach to the
*Aeneid*. After all, Flaccus’ *Argonautica* leaves off rather sharply as Medea begs Jason to take her
back to Athens. Furthermore, Quintilian’s lament, and no doubt the model of Virgil’s own
premature death, gave Flaccus’ death the sense of an untimely passing: *multum in Valerio Flacco
nuper amisimus.*

Similarly, Claude-Barthélemy Morisot’s supplement to Ovid’s *Fasti* or Thomas May’s supplement to Lucan’s *Pharsalia* appear to be corrections.

By contrast, other supplements are clearly continuations of classical works, and as was
the case with Forestus, they lack the polemical and critical edge found in some of the corrections.

For example, René Rapin’s *Horti* supplements Virgil’s *Georgics*, pointing out that Virgil left
room for other continuators to follow him, thereby absolving him of the accusation of *audacia*
that might follow one who attempted to follow such a *poeta omnium excellentissimus* whose
work was *perfectissimum*:

*verum haec ipse equidem spatiis exclusus iniquis

Thus, Rapin can claim that posterity has been given this topic by Virgil himself (*quae pro
scribendi argumento proponatur universae posteritati*), and he goes on to sing of the things that

---

28 Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 10.1.90: “We have lost much in the recent death of Valerius Flaccus.”
29 Claude-Barthélemy Morisot, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri duodecim, quorum sex posteriores a Claudio
Bartholomaeo Morisoto Divionensi substituti* (Dijon: Guido-Annam Guyot, 1649). See Bobby Xinyue, “Augustus in
Morisot’s ‘Book 8’ of the *Fasti,*” in *Afterlives of Augustus, AD 14–2014*, ed. Penelope J. Goodman (New York:
30 Thomas May, *A continuation of Lucan’s historicall poem till the death of Iulius Caesar* (London: James Boler,
1630). There also exists an English translation: Thomas May, *Supplement to the Pharsalia of Lucan*, trans. Edmund
Poulter (London: Caddel, 1786).
31 René Rapin and Gabriel Brotier, *Renati Rapini Hortorum Libri IV, et Cultura Hortensis. Hortorum Historiam
addidit Gabriel Brotier* (Paris: Barbou, 1780), xxi: *audacia videbitur non tolerabilis, operis totius antiquitatis
perfectissimi partem eam carmine velle persequi, quae praetermissa sit a poeta post hominum memoriam, omnium
excellentissimo. See Ruth Monreal, *Flora neolatina: die Hortorum libri IV von René Rapin S.J. und die Plantarum
libri VI von Abraham Cowley* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 100.
32 “But I, barred by these narrow bounds, pass by this theme, and leave it for others after me to tell.”
Virgil did not have time or inclination to write about, such as additional kinds of fruit trees.33 He is clear: The *Georgics* are themselves nothing less than perfect—both as a poem and as a model to be continued.34

The importance of the supplements in the history of the Virgilian tradition by now may need no defense. But why should classicists concern themselves with Neo-Latin supplementation? First, and most generally, in a discipline like Classics that currently appears to be struggling for relevance, the study of the broader tradition, including Neo-Latin and Virgilian supplementation, makes the study of Latin (and Greek) more compelling to new generations of readers, without sacrificing rigor or devotion to the Latin language. In other words, one can be a Latinist and study the Carolingian renaissance, Scholasticism, the Thirty-Years War, the Colonization of the Americas, or the history of Catholicism in Australia. Just as the study of classical architecture cannot be limited to Rome and Athens, but now includes almost every major city in the world and has a global reach, so the study of Classics need not be limited to the Latin and Greek literature of the Ancient Mediterranean from Homer to Marcus Aurelius. But this is also a challenge, since it was frequently the intricate and broad knowledge of the Latin language and the Classics that united these various poets, artists, philosophers, and scholars across the ages and around the world. Without attention to Latin or the classical world, the contributions of those in the later tradition remain locked away and inaccessible. As demonstrated in this dissertation, part of what makes the supplements so interesting is precisely their engagement with Latin and the classical world. One cannot separate the language from its tradition, or the tradition from its language.

34 *ibid.*, xxiv–xxv.
Second, Neo-Latin works more generally, and the supplements in particular, often preserve interesting insights and readings of the classical texts with which they engage. As I reviewed in the introduction, Martindale rightly observes that the *Bellum civile* “can prompt us into fresh ways of perceiving the *Aeneid* which might otherwise have remained invisible to us.”

It is not only classical authors who have such insights. I would remind the reader of the various readings of Lavinia found in the supplementers reviewed in this work. They study the *Aeneid* closely—even memorize much of it, in Vegius’ case—and they each find in the silent heroine an importance that she is rarely accorded by most casual and many serious readers of Virgil’s poetry. Vegius discovers what few would today imagine: a mirror for Aeneas soul, sparkling, radiant, and celestial. She contrasts with the carnality of Virgil’s Dido and signifies Aeneas’ redemption from the trials and tribulations of the world. By contrast, Forestus reads into her silence a great love for Turnus and alerts us to the trauma she must endure in a war that so often is only seen through the concerns and destiny of Aeneas. But along with her heartbreak and exhaustion, he also reminds us of the power she possesses to make or break the fate of Latium. Finally, Villanova reads anger in her famous blush, but then dramatically shows the power of sexuality and self-interest in her calculated embrace of the future that Virgil wanted for her. She is an ally of the Virgilian plot, and she realizes the benefits of its realization. Attention to such readings alerts us to the broader possibilities that lie within Virgil’s epic, and gives us fresh options for interpretation that arise from times and places that are very different from our own.

Finally, the Neo-Latin supplements can lead us to a new appreciation of the supplements already present within the well-trodden classical canon. For example, when one looks back on Ovid’s engagement with Virgil, it becomes apparent that he too is a supplementer—but one who

---

35 Martindale, *Redeeming the text*, 49.
cleverly engages in continuation, correction, and completion at various moments within his treatments of the story of Aeneas. Some of his stories in the *Metamorphoses* are truly continuative, for instance, when he develops the tale of the Sibyl, who rejected the amorous advances of Apollo. He deeply humanizes her, giving her concerns about age and her own beauty and lovability, as she grows immortally older.36 He tells the backstory of the Scylla as well, and develops Macareus of Ithaca, another companion of Ulysses, who has been left behind on the shores of Italy. In the *Fasti*, the story of Anna Perenna is another moment of continuation, complete with a Lavinia who develops an extra-Virgilian appetite for jealousy.37

Similarly, Ovid playfully—or pedantically—suggests corrections to Virgil’s narrative, such as the famous moment when Virgil describes the landing at Caieta (6.900) before the port was properly named after the death of Aeneas’ nurse (7.1–4). Ovid’s account will have no such prolepsis: *litora adit nondum nutricis habentia nomen*.38 Finally, he completes the story of Virgil’s poem through his depiction of Aeneas’ divinization,39 but immediately proceeds into a continuation that traces the course of subsequent Roman history, beginning with Ascanius, Silvius, and the Alban kings. This relentless metamorphosis between various forms of supplementation is another of Ovid’s many innovations, one that the Neo-Latin supplements can help us to recognize and appreciate more fully.

This is to say that, like the recent work of Simms and others, I do not consider my work to be the last word on the Neo-Latin Virgilian supplements, much less Renaissance supplementation, classical supplementation, or supplementation in general.40 It is, however, the

---

40 Simms, *BCPSR*, 5.
first extended study of all three complete Neo-Latin supplements to the Aeneid and the first extended treatment of Forestus and Villanova in English. Amid recent calls to diversify the field of Classics, it helps to broaden Virgilian studies, especially in the Anglophone world, where the supplements to the Aeneid, apart from Vegius, remain virtually unknown. In particular, the appended translations of Forestus, Villanova, and Decembrius can help those without Latin to get a general sense of these texts, which are often stylistically difficult and inaccessible. Villanova’s poem moreover can be especially challenging, even in translation, so I have also translated his annotationes and interpretatio in a simple style so that they will serve the same purpose as in the original.

It is my hope then that Forestus and Villanova will be introduced from their undeserved obscurity to new generations of scholars whose horizons are broader and whose taste in what is worthy of study in literature is more adventurous. As we have seen, to many in previous scholarship the works of these authors appeared highly imperfect. For instance, Forestus’ speeches were too long and Villanova’s footnotes out of place. Yet, such criticisms miss the originality in these works, the profound theological significance of Vegius’ completion, the poignant and subtle developments of Virgil’s characters in Forestus’ continuation, and Villanova’s careful corrections of the Aeneid hidden within his exuberant and seemingly anachronistic imagery. Each of these poems contributes in interesting and even important ways to the marvelous story of Virgil’s afterlife in the poetic imagination of the greater world of Latin literature, one that extends far beyond the borders of classical antiquity and holds many delightful, strange, and uncharted regions. I hope that this work will serve as an aid in the continuation of research in that world that is surely to come.
APPENDIX ONE: EGO NEMPE EQUUM MEUM AGNOVERIM: DECEMBRIUS AND THE LIBER DECIMUS- TERTIUS ENEIDOS

I. INTRODUCTION

Although it is chronologically the first of the Virgilian supplements, predating Vegius’ vastly more famous Supplementum by about a decade, all that remains of the Liber Decimus-Tertius Eneidos (1419) of Pier Candido Decembrio (Decembrius) is a fragment of eighty-nine lines. Furthermore, the poem figures less prominently in the scholarship than a subsequent letter written by Decembrius to Florio di Castro Novate (1428) in which he accuses the young Vegius of plagiarism. In this appendix, I first examine the Liber Decimus-Tertius and provide a slight corrective to Eckmann’s overly pessimistic reading of the poem. Second, I discuss the possible influence of Decembrius’ work on Vegius, refuting the charge of plagiarism and calling seriously into doubt the supposed textual echoes collected by Schneider. Overall, I argue that his fragment appears to provide a sympathetic and poignant view of human suffering that concentrates on the postwar experiences of the defeated Latins, perhaps influenced by the traumas of his youth. I speculate that the Liber Decimus-Tertius was intended as a completion of the Aeneid—a completion that lacked the theological motivations of Vegius. Unfortunately, not much more can be known about it, and more substantial hypotheses must remain solidly in the realm of speculation or be treated with extreme caution.

1. Decembrius the Humanist
The life and extensive works of Decembrius have been adequately treated elsewhere;¹ here a summary of his young life will be sufficient to contextualize the Liber Decimus-Tertius.² Decembrius was born in Pavia in 1399, the son of Uberto Decembrio and Catarina Marazzi; he was named for Peter of Candia, who would be elected as Alexander V in 1409. His first garden of letters was in Milan, where he accompanied his father in service to Gian Maria Visconti. Here he began his studies under his father (a humanist himself) in the liberal arts and Greek; he also associated with the renowned Hellenist, Emanuele Crisolora, invited from Constantinople by Coluccio Salutati to teach Greek once again to the descendants of Rome.

From a young age Decembrius felt the repercussions of the political world; in 1411 his father was imprisoned and the budding scholar was forced to flee to Genoa, where he continued his education under the direction and protection of Paolo Doria.³ There he had access to the rich library of Tommaso Fregoso, to whom he dedicated his first work, De septem liberalium artium inventoribus.⁴ It was also about this time of uncertainty and conflict that he would have written his Liber Decimus-Tertius. The remainder of his life was spent in the courts of popes and kings: For about thirty years, beginning in 1419, he was secretary to Filippo Maria Visconti; following, he worked in the chancery of Nicolas V, the court of Alfonso the Great, and was secretary to Pius II. He died in 1477 in Milan, and is buried under the narthex of the Basilica of San

² Following Ditt, Pier Candido Decembrio, 22.
³ Ditt, Pier Candido Decembrio, 22: “Quando nel 1411 Uberto fu messo in carcere perché si era immischiato nelle divergenze familiari dei Visconti, Pier Candido col fratello minore Paolo Valerio si trattennero a Genova nella casa D’Oria.”
⁴ ibid.
Ambrogio in Milan.

2. Review of Scholarship

Little scholarship has treated Decembrius’ fragmentary Liber Decimus-Tertius Eneidos, and much of it has been content to disparage the poem. In his Historia Literario-Typographica Mediolanensis, Saxus provides the first eight lines, claiming that they are plurimum ab imperito amanuense vitium.\(^5\) Kern only partially agrees with this sentiment; he blames the existence of the poem on an “exaggerated admiration” of Virgil,\(^6\) and elsewhere fusses about repetitions and awkwardness of expression that reveal the youthfulness of its composer.\(^7\) Raffaele wonders whether he should be considered a poet at all.\(^8\) Viti is blunt: His work is “di limitatissimo valore,” especially in comparison with Vegius.\(^9\) Apart from other brief mentions in the scholarship,\(^10\) Wilson-Okamura provides an introduction, short bibliography, and questionable English translation online.\(^11\)

In the only recent, article-length exploration of the Liber Decimus-Tertius, Eckmann argues that Decembrius provides a pessimistic counterpart to the optimism of Vegius’

\(^5\) Antonius Josephus Saxus, Historia Literario-Typographica Mediolanensi, vol. 1 (Milan, 1745), col. 103.
\(^6\) Kern, 13: “So ist auch bei ihm der Gedanke an eine Fortsetzung dieses Epos in erster Linie aus übertriebener Bewunderung Vergils hervorgegangen.”
\(^7\) ibid., 17: “Übrigens verrät sich das Fragment als Jugendarbeit ...” Citing ibid., Eckmann, 59, also complains about the youthfulness of the poet: “So verrät sich das Supplement insgesamt ‘durch die Unbeholflichkeit des Ausdrucks’ und die sprachlich-syntaktischen sowie metrischen Schwächen als Jugendarbeit des Dichters.”
\(^8\) Raffaele, Maffeo Vegio, 25: “Qual è il valore poetico del Decembrio? Quale la sua attività poetica? Lo conosciamo, attraverso i migliori storici della letteratura, come scrittore di biografie, di lettere, di trattati sull’amministrazione politica dei Romani; valoroso grammatico, rettorico e di mente versatile. Ma poco, ben poco abbiamo che attesti dell’attività poetica dell’umanista milanese.”
\(^9\) Viti, “Decembrio.”
\(^10\) Brief discussions of the poem can be found in Ditt, Pier Candido Decembrio, 66; Brinton, 19; Schneider, 17–19, 136–138 (reviewed above); Oertel, 13–14.
Supplementum, a relationship that pre-empts much modern scholarship, such as the “Two-Voices-Theory” of Parry.\textsuperscript{12} In this view, Vegius cuts through any ambivalence suggested by the final scene of the Aeneid and provides a glorious view of Aeneas’ triumph; Decembrius, by contrast, focuses on the cost of war and mourning for the dead, thus offering a more somber and pessimistic view:

Diese ‘Stimmen’ aber, die die ambivalenten Züge der Aeneis widerspiegeln, hat nicht erst die moderne Forschung für sich entdeckt – bereits im Aeneis-Supplement des humanistischen Autors Pier Candido Decembrio nimmt A. Parry’s ‘second voice’ der Aeneis Gestalt an, ja wird inszeniert.\textsuperscript{13}

But Eckmann’s view goes beyond what may reasonably be concluded from the eighty-nine-line fragment; she argues forcefully in several passages that Decembrius displays anti-Trojan tendencies throughout the poem. First, she suggests that the overall focus on the Latins represents a critical approach to Trojan victory.\textsuperscript{14} This is only a negative argument that could support additional positive evidence, were such evidence forthcoming. Second, she argues that the uncertain future implied by the Latin’s unconfident prayers (\textit{nec multum felicia vota} [15]) and Latinus’ fears for the Latins under their future leader (\textit{heu miseri, sub quo duce pergitis?} [54]) together represent a pessimistic view of the new power soon to be wielded over the Latins by Aeneas and the Trojans. But neither of these examples proves her point. Regarding the first, it is almost certain that the defeated Latins will feel abandoned by the gods; likewise, regarding the

\textsuperscript{12} See A. Parry, “The Two Voices of Virgil’s Aeneid,” Arion 2.4 (1963), 6–80.

\textsuperscript{13} Eckmann, 71: “Fast hat es den Anschein, als hätten die humanistischen Autoren, Pier Candido Decembrio und Maffeo Vegio, die ‘Two-Voices-Theory’ schon vorausgeahnt. Beide Verfasser erscheinen gleichsam wie Avantgardisten einer kontroversen Auseinandersetzung mit der Aeneis, auf die sich in der Moderne ganze Forschungsrichtungen und Schulen gegründet haben: Während Vegio die ambivalente Sichtweise der Aeneis vereindeutigt, indem er ‘klare Verhältnisse’ schafft, scheint Decembrio, die mahnende, pazifistische ‘second voice’ der Aeneis aufzugreifen und zu thematisieren.” Eckmann also includes a German translation and commentary on the poem.

\textsuperscript{14} ibid., 61: “Der Dichter unterlässt es bewusst, die eigentlichen Helden des Epos, die nun am lang ersehnten Ziel angekommen sind, (in ihrer Freude) darzustellen, und vertritt damit einen kritischen Ansatz.”
second, it is certain that some measure of anxiety would be felt by the transfer of power.

Furthermore, it is not clear that Latinus is bemoaning a shift in political rule—since Turnus was never king (*rex*)—rather than mourning the loss of an able military commander (*dux*).

Regardless, nothing negative is said—or even implied—about the future rule of Aeneas.

Finally, Eckmann points to the fact that the Trojans are called *hostes* by Latinus in his lament for Turnus as evidence of Decembrius’ anti-Trojan sentiment: *hic est – / macte animi –, vestros cecidit qui stratus in hostes* (54–55). Regarding these lines she writes:

> Bezeichnenderweise spricht Latinus von den Trojanern als Staatsfeinden ... Zudem ist es auffallend, dass zum gegebenen Zeitpunkt, an dem ein Bündnis zwischen beiden Völkern geschlossen werden soll (s.o.), überhaupt der Terminus *hostes* verwendet wird.¹⁵

Nevertheless, Latinus’ statement is literally true. Turnus did fall in a fight against the enemies of the Latins; he certainly did not fall in a fight against their friends. If he is to be honored at all, it is on these grounds. The fact that friendship is subsequently to be concluded between the two peoples is immaterial to the point being made *qua* the honoring of Turnus. While it is significant that Turnus is honored in the way that he is—a way that emphasizes his loss to the Trojan side—Eckmann presses the evidence too far in her conclusions that Decembrius is attempting to paint the new conquerors as “enemies of the state.”

II. THE *LIBER DECIMUS-TERTIUS ENIDOS*: SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

But this much of Eckmann’s thesis is true: Decembrius clearly focuses on the pathos and sufferings of the Italian peoples in a way that sets him apart from all subsequent supplementers.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, 64.
Perhaps the confusion and disruption in his early schooling contributed to his sensitivities to the horrors of war. First, his opening scene focuses almost entirely on Turnus and Latinus, rather than celebrating Aeneas and the Trojans’ victory. Second, he describes the sufferings of the Latin people and the devastation in Latium. Third, Latinus’ speech emphasizes the glorious aspects of Turnus. The mourning of the Italian woman at the approach of Turnus’ body is silenced only by the end of the fragment.

Unlike Vegius, who would begin his *Supplementum* with a celebration of Aeneas’ virtue, Decembrius opens the *Liber Decimus-Tertius* with a sympathetic glance at Turnus, granting him the epithet *magnanimus* (13.1).  

Turnus’ anger takes on heroic proportions as he expires (*ingentes ... iras* [13.2]), and his death represents an expiation for the shades of Troy:

\[
\text{postquam magnanimus morientia sanguine fudit}
\]
\[
\text{pectora et ingentes exspirans luminis iras}
\]
\[
\text{Daunius Iliacos satiavit vulnere manes} \ (13.1–3).  
\]

Decembrius respects the finality of Turnus’ death from the *Aeneid*. Unlike Vegius, he does not bring Turnus back to life and overwrite Virgil’s final scene in order to cleanse the *Aeneid* of its violence or any possible offence to Aeneas’ *pietas*. Indeed, it is surprising that Aeneas does not appear at all. In its very moment of victory, the entire Trojan army has vanished. This sets Decembrius apart from the other supplementers who tend to focus on the emotional response of Aeneas and the Trojans to Turnus’ death.

---

16 Vegius reserves *magnanimus* for Aeneas. See *ibid.*: “Mit einem *postquam*-Satz, der das Moment des Todeskampfes noch einmal kurz aufnimmt, wird ein fließender Übergang hergestellt. Bezeichnend ist, dass Turnus schon im ersten Vers als *magnanimus* (*Daunius*) charakterisiert ist—ein Epitheton, das in der Aeneis hauptsächlich Aeneas zukommt.”

17 “After the great-hearted son of Daunus poured his blood out over his expiring chest and appeased the Trojan ghosts with his wound as he released the vast wrath of his life.”

18 Oertel, 14: “Die Handlung spielt ausschließlich bei den Italern und beschränkt sie ihm wesentlichen auf Sorgen des Latinus nach dem Zweikampf (Aeneas tritt nicht auf).”
Instead, he turns to the labors and sufferings of the conquered Italian people.¹⁹ Notably, Latinus is the subject of the first sentence; he immediately begins the work of rebuilding Latium, ordering the walls to be constructed, the siege towers destroyed, and the fires extinguished from the rooftops:

\[
\text{componit senior regni iam fracta Latinus}
\]
\[
\text{culmina. disiectos urbis iubet aggere muros}
\]
\[
\text{attolli; quibus aeraeas}²⁰ \text{deducere turres}
\]
\[
\text{cura sit et summis Vulcanum pellere tectis,}
\]
\[
\text{imponit. priscis reddit cultoribus agros (13.4–8).²¹}
\]

Decembrius’ view lingers on the unappreciated aspects of the war in Latium, reminding his readers of the broken world left behind by Virgil’s heroes. Recalling the displaced shepherds from the shattered bucolic environment of Eclogues 1 and 9, he even points out that the battlefields will need to be reassigned to the farmers who once cultivated them (priscis ... cultoribus).²² As Eckmann points out, “Formulierungen wie priscis reddit cultoribus agros lassen an ein zuvor zum Krieg gezwungenes Bauernvolk denken.”²³ Like Virgil’s shepherds, these Italians are in love with their homeland, even in its decline and defeat:

\[
\text{sponte tamen se quisque premit patriaeque ruentis}
\]
\[
\text{cogit amor: pars alta suis pendentia tectis}
\]
\[
\text{roborosa, quis proprios animus dabat ense penates}
\]

²⁰ Wilson-Okamura reads aeraes for aeriae: “the bronze towers are to be taken down.” I again concur with Eckmann, 73: “er ordnet an ... die hohen Belagerungstürme auzureißen.”
²¹ “The elder Latinus rebuilds the now-broken homes of his kingdom. He orders that the ruined walls of the city be raised again with a rampart; he commands that the men take care to demolish the high siege-towers and to extinguish the fires from the rooftops. He gives back the fields to their former inhabitants.”
²² Much of the vocabulary in these opening lines is reminiscent of Eclogues 1 and 9. See fracta cacumina (9.9) and culmina (1.82).
²³ Eckmann, 62.
The following lines are flooded with sadness as Decembrius fills out the details of his portrait of Italian grief. Latinus laments in his heart (maerenti corde [13.19]) and is stung by very “sharp care” (acrior cura [13.20–21]). Turnus may have died, but he does not depart from Latinus’ “great heart” (ingenti pectore [13.21])—the adjective ingens associates Latinus with Turnus (13.2). The unburied shades are “dear” to Latinus (cari [13.22]); the city of Ardea is “longed-for”; Daunus is “miserable” (miserique [13.23, cf. 13.83]) and “unhappy” (maestum [13.24]). But Latinus’ emotions do not get the better of him. Although he mourns Turnus’ fall, he remains to order the removal of the body. Meanwhile, Italian soldiers are uncertain without their leader (suspensi [13.26]), and even Turnus’ body is “beloved” (amatum [13.25]). His official duties now discharged, Latinus slumps in his chair and begins the first speech of Decembrius’ poem.25

Latinus’ speech is a wholehearted lament for Turnus’ death. In his imagination, Turnus appears, pitifully pierced through the throat (perfossus iugulo [13.22]) instead of the chest (12.950), recalling the heroic death of Hector,26 and thus dimly recalling the pathos of Hector’s Virgilian entrance in 2.268–297.27 The dead heroes of the ancient world—Trojan and Latin—

24 “Nevertheless, the men press on voluntarily at their tasks, and the love of their failing fatherland compels them. Some of them cast down the high beams hanging from their roofs, in which they intended to guard their household gods from the sword, and to defend the doubtful lot of their fatherland, and they open up the city with its walls.”
25 27–28: ipse autem solio non altus in aula / consedit paucis ruptique silentia verbis. Compare Wilson-Okamura’s translation (“In the court, though, Latinus stands tall, his throne empty. His words, though few, shatter the silence.”) with Eckmann’s (“Er selbst aber ließ sich niedergeschlagen auf seinem Thron im Palast nieder und brach mit wenigen Worten das Schweigen”).
26 Homer, Iliad, 22.326–327
27 Eckmann, 80-81, suggests the influence of contemporary depictions of Turnus, as well as the death of Mezentius (10.907).
have begun to resemble one another. He also emphasizes his emotional relationship to his would-be son-in-law: He “cherished” Turnus “with a dear heart” (colui dilecto pectore [13.32]), almost like a son (nosto genitus si sanguine [13.33]). He addresses Turnus as nate (13.38) as he reminds him how the Latin fields are already soaked with enough Latin blood (13.39–40). Not even the laments of Forestus’ Latinus are as heartfelt.

But his speech is also an encomium to Turnus’ valor. Once again Decembrius contrasts with the other supplementers, especially Vegius, whose opening speech in the mouths of Aeneas and Latinus strongly castigated Turnus’ furor. Although Decembrius’ Latinus is quick to point out that he attempted to dissuade Turnus from fighting (13.38–41), his vision of Turnus is glorious and proud, shining still in arms (13.35–37). Turnus wears a breastplate of lightning (fulmineum thoraca) and a sword; he demands (poscens) a battle with a mighty opponent (magnum ... Teucrum). Latinus’ appeals were in vain—for a Fury appeared, pressing a “helm of triumph” (galeam ... ovantem) on his head (13.41). Even his ghost is illustrious (13.48), and his soul is worshipped (macte [13.55]).

The speech ends with a miserable series of laments, punctuated by direct address and other expressions of emotion:

\[
\text{avos ultus cecidit. vos plangite magnum ulorem Italiae, Rutuli! ciet agmina quisquam fortius? heu miser, sub quo duce pergitis? hic est—macte animi—, vestros cecidit qui stratus in hostes (13.52–55).}
\]

---

28 “He fell while avenging your ancestors. Rutulians, lament for the great avenger of Italy! What stronger captain will lead your battle lines? Ah, miserable men, under what leader will you proceed? This one is—ah! honored soul!—one who was laid low in the fight against your enemies.”
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Again, Decembrius emphasizes the suffering—both to Latinus personally and to the Italians as a whole—that has resulted from the death of such an excellent leader. As he finishes speaking, Latinus floods his face with tears (*largoque profundens / imbre genas* [13.56–57]) and the crowd around him groans in misery (13.57–58). He rises from his throne and pathetically wanders off, like a disconsolate mother who has lost her nursing calf (13.58–62). Turnus’ funeral procession is a tribute to the best hits of the fallen hero. Predictably, even the horse weeps (*accessuntque fero lacrimae* [13.66]). Latinus can barely speak through his tears, but he buries Turnus according to custom (13.77–78). Unlike Forestus’ *Exequiae Turni*, there is no indication that hostilities are to be renewed or that Turnus will be avenged. This is the end. The Italians are utterly defeated.

The poem ends with Rumor, who spreads the news of Turnus’ funeral throughout the city. The mothers leap up, pitifully wailing and crowd to the gates, waiting for the return of the funeral procession. Even here, Decembrius sensitively depicts the tension and anxiety of the women who wonder if their sons, husbands, or fathers have also been killed in battle:

```
turbatae exsiliunt matres magnoque ululatu
lugentes plenis exspectant agmina portis:
templa deum natosque putes patriosque penates
divelli et totis Vulcanum fervere tectis (13.86–89).
```

Thus, the poem abruptly ends.

Ultimately, in its unfinished state, it is difficult to decide whether the poem would have been a correction, continuation, or completion of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. On the one hand, we can imagine a completion, where the plight of the local yeomanry is resolved and Italy it put to right through rebuilding and marriage. Certainly, there is no indication that Decembrius is motivated

---

29 “The mothers are thrown into confusion. They leap up and lament with a loud wailing as they wait for the return of the battle lines at the crowded gates: you would think that the temples of the gods and their sons and ancestral gods were being torn up and that fire was tearing through their houses.”
by a theological or allegorical desire to complete the work, as Vegius was. Rather, his motivations appear more political and social. Similarly, we could imagine a continuation, in which the Italians, overcome by grief at the death of Turnus, reopen hostilities, or perhaps a new Pilumnus-like leader arrives to take control of the Italian forces. Decembrius does give indications of beginning a longer-term character development of Latinus, considering the initial focus. Certainly, the focus on Latinus makes it seem highly unlikely that Decembrius was looking to write a correction of the *Aeneid*, by systematically finishing its plot-points in the foretold order. Were this the case, it would have been logical to begin the supplement with Aeneas, not with Latinus. It seems more likely, therefore, that Decembrius was attempting to complete or continue the *Aeneid*. I would speculate that his early experiences with conflict in Italy led him to attempt a completion, where the aftermath of the Italian war was peaceably resolved. Of course, in its fragmentary state, I must admit that a continuation is also a distinct possibility. It is entirely unclear whether Decembrius finished the poem—in a later letter he suggests as much, but he also suggests many other things that we will have reason to question. It is to this letter that we now turn.

III. VEGIUS THE PLAGIARIZER?

In his 1428 letter *ad Floridum, ducalem familiarem* (to Florio di Castro Novate), Decembrius famously accuses Vegius of plagiarism in the composition of his vastly more famous *Supplementum*.\(^{30}\) He begins by offering some hurried praise of Vegius’ work—“well and

---

elaborately written”; however, he quickly expresses surprise that the *Supplementum* was highly acclaimed by a certain Cato (most likely Catone Sacco, another humanist from Lodi). Vegius’ accomplishment is praiseworthy, Decembrius admits, but would be even more praiseworthy if he had not borrowed other men’s verses. The accusation is worth quoting at length:

> Mapheus vero iste non mediocri laude mihi dignus visus est, qui in etate iuvenili tantum opus aggredi, quantum ne senex quidem perficere posset, conatus sit, licet uberiori laude quoque dignum existimarem, si suis versibus non alienis opus illud perficere potius tentavisset. non enim solum Virgilio addictus est, cuius versus omnibus fere in locis circumcidit, sed meos etiam quosdam versiculos, quos adolscendentior edidi, consectatur eosque, cum simili amentia percitus olim perscripsissem, nescio quo pacto ad illius manus pervenerint; presertim, cum illos semper studiose suppresserim, quod scio eum nequaquam pro sua modestia insimulatum, etsi audeat, minime possit.

He provides two examples to prove the supposed plagiarism. First, he includes several of his own lines from the funeral procession of Turnus:

> hinc sonipes timida quem nunc regit aure Metiscus.  
> *it lacrymans dubioque fremit parere magistro* (Decembrius, *Supplementum*, 13.73–74).

And compares it with Vegius’ similar line:

---

31 See Petrucci, *Epistolarum iuvenilium libri octo*, 280: *postquam a te discessi, nactus oiciandi tempus, versiculos illos Maphei cuiusdam Vegii, prius a me visos et a te collaudatos, denuo revidere et lectitare institui: namque bene scripta sunt et ornate, ut ait Flaccus: “decies repetita placebunt.”*

32 ibid., 277.

33 *ibid.*, 280: “It seems to me that Maphaeus deserves substantial praise for attempting to undertake so great a work at a young age—something not even an old man would be able to complete. But I would think him worthy of even greater praise, if he had not attempted to complete his work with other men’s verses. For not only is he addicted to Virgil, whose verses he has stolen almost everywhere, but he even rooted out some of my verses that I wrote as a younger man, since I wrote them when I was excited by a similar madness. I have no idea how he got ahold of them, since I have always kept them closely under lock and key. I know that he will not hide behind his modesty; and if he should dare to do so, he would not be able. Certainly, I would recognize my horse, even if it were led to me, with its tale mutilated, its ears cut, and its hair shaved. Likewise, I easily recognize my verses, which in certain places he distorts, bends, and changes.”

34 *ibid.*, 280-281.
To make this accusation watertight, he claims that Metiscus is not mentioned in Virgil (huius Metisci nulla mentio est apud Virgilium, quod meminerim). If this were true, it would be difficult to deny that Vegius had used Decembrius’ poem. But there are several problems. First of all, Metiscus is indeed mentioned in Virgil—five times in the twelfth book alone! Second, both of Vegius’ lines are very similar to Virgil’s lines from book 11 (reviewed above), suggesting that both poets may have used a common source:

\[
ducunt et Rutulo perfusos sanguine currus. \\
post bellator equus positis insignibus Aethon \\
it lacrimans guttisque umectat grandibu \\
ora. hastam alii galeamque ferunt, nam cetera Turnus \\
victor habet. (11.88–92).^{37}
\]

Indeed, Vegius’ line is much closer to Virgil than Decembrius: Both it lacrimans and a form of equus make an appearance in 11.88–92. Vegius also places Metiscus in final position, imitating Virgil’s use of Aethon and Turnus, as well as Virgil’s use of Metiscus in final position in all five examples from book 12.^{38} Whether we attribute Decembrius’ claim to forgetfulness, jealously, or malice, this example cannot prove his case.

His second example is even more tenuous; again he returns to the funeral procession:

\[
principio currus raptorum insignia Teucrum, \\
vexilla et clypei (Decembrius, Supplementum, 13.68–69).
\]

---

^{35} ibid.  
^{36} Virgil, Aeneid 12.469, 472, 623, 737, 784. This was pointed out long ago by Sabbadini and qtd. in Raffaele, Maffeo Vegio, 22.  
^{37} “They also lead chariots splattered with Rutulian blood. Behind them, the war-horse Aethon, with his trappings laid aside, goes weeping, and he wets his face with great tears. Others carry the spear and the helmet, for the victorious Turnus had the rest.”  
^{38} E.g. Virgil, Aeneid, 12.469: aurigam Turni media inter lora Metiscum.
And provides an example of Vegius’ supposed plagiarism:


And once again, a collection of Virgilian lines can easily be adduced as Vegius’ models:

\textit{multaque praeterea Laurentis praemia pugnae aggerat et longo praedam iubet ordine duci; addit equos et tela quibus spoliaverat hostem} (Virgil, Aeneid, 11.78–80).

\textit{post bellator equus positis insignibus Aethon} (Virgil, Aeneid, 11.89).

Decembrius claims that he holds many other instances in reserve.\(^39\) If they are of this quality, it is unsurprising that he did not provide them. Neither of the examples he adduces (presumably the strongest of the lot at hand) support his accusation of plagiarism.\(^40\) In the end, it seems that all Decembrius wants is his due praise—no matter what lengths he must go to get it:

\textit{mihi tamen non ingratum est meos versus tanti existimari ut cum virgilianis iniungi mereantur, dummodo grates mihi referat, quas ego illi maximas ago, qui me ac mea tanti facere dignatus sit.}\(^41\)

Most earlier scholars have been content to dismiss these accusations. Kern calls the accusations “ludicrous” (“dünnelhaft”).\(^42\) Raffaele is suspicious of the example of Metiscus: “Occorre

---

\(^{39}\) Petrucci, \textit{Epistolarum iuvenilium libri octo}, 280: \textit{ex his igitur, quod omnes exequi longum foret, gustum quempiam tibi sufficiam, ut et Franciscum nostrum, virum eruditum, ac consocios tuos veritas ipsa non lateat.}

\(^{40}\) For the second example, see Raffaele, \textit{Maffeo Vegio}, 23–24: “La somiglianza tra i versi del Vegio con quelli del Decembrio è innegabile, ma non piú che due sono le parole simili, perché insignia ricorda insignibus di Virgilio, e gli altri versi del Vegio attestano che la vera falsariga fu Virgilio, piú che altro. Comunque sia, il fatto è singolare, e non è certo agevole (almeno a noi) ridurre questa lettera al suo vero valore. Diremo che il Decembrio era in buona fede?” See also Kern, 13: “Daβ Vegio Decembrios Werke gekannt hat, ist wahrscheinlich; doch lassen sich die Ähnlichkeiten in beiden Gedichten unscher auch aus der beiden gemeinsamen Mache erklären.”

\(^{41}\) Petrucci, \textit{Epistolarum iuvenilium libri octo}, 280: “But I do not find it unpleasant that he thinks so much of my verses that they merit to be joined with Virgil’s, as long as he gives me the credit which I give to him, as one who makes so much of me and my poetry.”

\(^{42}\) Kern, 18.
veramente una forte dose d’ingenuità per credere a un caso di smemoratezza di questo genere."\textsuperscript{43}

Petrucci remains somewhat critical: “Tuttavia, l’argomentazione decembriana presentata per dimostrare il plagio si rivelera debole.”\textsuperscript{44}

**IV. THE THESIS OF SCHNEIDER**

Contrary to previous scholarship, in his 1985 edition of Vegius’ *Supplementum*, Schneider defends some of Decembrius’ claims against Vegius:

> Wenn dabei auch die Begründung für den ersten Beweis nicht stichhaltig ist – Vergil erwähnt Metiscus, den Wagenlenker des Turnus, fünfmal in zwöften Buch der Aeneis –, so kann doch insgesamt kaum ein Zweifel darüber bestehen, daß Maffeo für sein Supplement an verschiedenen Stellen Decembrios Versuch benutzt hat. Über die von Decembrio selbst angeführten Stellen hinaus weist nämlich Maffeos Werk eine Reihe motivischer und sprachlicher Parallelen auf, die sich nicht allein durch gemeinsame Abhängigkeit von Vergils Aeneis erklären lassen. Es ist möglich, ja durchaus wahrscheinlich, daß Maffeo überhaupt erst durch Decembrios Verse die Anregung zu seiner eigenen Aeneisfortsetzung bekam.\textsuperscript{45}

Although Decembrius’ first example is unfounded (“nicht stichhaltig”), Schneider argues that Maffeo employs a series of thematic and linguistic parallels (“motivischer und sprachlicher Parallelen”) that cannot be explained by appeals to Virgilian models. Consequently, he argues that it is probable (“wahrscheinlich”) that Maffeo was first inspired by Decembrius’ work. First we will review his list of thematic parallels:


\textsuperscript{44} Petrucci, *Epistolarum iuvenilium libri octo*, 278.
\textsuperscript{45} Schneider, 18.

Schneider claims to have found clear thematic correspondences (“deutliche Entsprechungen”) in plot between Vegius and Decembrius. First, he claims that in both poems Latinus works to rebuild Latium and reassure its citizenry; componit is used in both places. Second, Latinus addresses the corpse of Turnus, comments on the changeability of human affairs, and reminds the Latins (and the reader) that he opposed Turnus’ involvement. Third, there is an impressive funeral march in both poems. Fourth, fama announces the advent of the procession and both authors use a similar phrase (adventare novum funus). Each of these examples is weak for different reasons.

1) Schneider’s first example certainly does not establish Vegius’ dependency on Decembrius, much less plagiarism:

```
interea ipse urbem labefactam et vulgus inerme
componit solidatque animos requiemque futuram
spondet et aeternam ventura in saecula pacem. (Vegius, Supplementum, 13.316–318).
```

```
componit senior regni iam fracta Latinus
culmina. disiectos urbis iubet aggere muros
attolli; quibus aeras deducere turres
cura sit et summis Vulcanum pellere tectis,
imponit. priscis reddit cultoribus agros.
```

46 ibid., 18–19, n. 37.
47 “Meanwhile he pacifies the ruined city and the defenseless crowd, and strengthens their spirits and promises future rest and eternal peace in the ages to come.”
sponte tamen se quisque premit patriaeque ruentis
cogit amor. (Decembrius, Supplementum, 13.4–8).48

While the overall action is somewhat similar, the two actions take place at very different points in the narrative. Vegius’ lines come almost exactly halfway through the poem, after the funeral procession and well after Turnus’ death; Decembrius begins his poem by focusing on Latinus. Second, Vegius’ Latinus both restores the city and the spirits of the crowd, while Decembrius’ Latinus only focuses his attention on physically rebuilding the city. Third, the appearance of the common verb componit in both passages is not enough to establish a connection, especially since many similar uses can be found in Virgil.49 The simple fact that Latinus cares for his people and his kingdom—in short, the simple fact that he acts like a king—is not enough to establish a dependency. What else would we expect Latinus to do?

2) It is true, as Schneider claims, that Latinus addresses the corpse of Turnus in both poems.50 But again, both addresses come at different points in the narratives. In Decembrius’ poem, Latinus’ speech is the first and is delivered almost immediately (13.27–55); in Vegius’ Supplementum, Latinus addresses Turnus’ body only after speeches by Aeneas and the beginning of the funeral procession itself (13.142–184). Perhaps more importantly: Although, as Schneider points out, both speeches do remind the reader of Latinus’ opposition to Turnus’ involvement and comment on the changeability of human affairs, both are radically different in their treatment

48 “The elder Latinus rebuilds the now-broken homes of his kingdom. He orders that the ruined walls of the city be raised again with a rampart; he commands that the men take care to demolish the high siege-towers and to extinguish the fires from the rooftops. He gives back the fields to their former inhabitants.”
49 E.g. Virgil, Aeneid, 12.822: component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent. Indeed, this seems like a logical model, since it comes towards the end of the Aeneid and concerns the future of the Latin and Trojan people.
of these themes. For instance, Vegius’ Latinus bemoans fate in the context of blaming Turnus for the pursuit of power:

\[
\begin{align*}
o & \text{ fragilis ruitura superbia sceptri!} \\
o & \text{ furor, o nimium dominandi innata cupidio,} \\
mortales & \text{ quo caeca vehis? quo gloria tantis} \\
inflatos & \text{ effers animos quaesita periclis? (Vegius, Supplementum, 13.145–148).}^{51}
\end{align*}
\]

Vegius’ moralizing tone is heavy, as Latinus berates the fallen Turnus for his attachment to the things of the world: \textit{heu, dulce venenum / et mundi letalis honos!} (13.151–152). Overall, his speech castigates his would-be son-in-law for a failure to live a life of virtue, indulging instead in \textit{furor, audacia}, and \textit{violentia}. By contrast, Decembrius’ Latinus’ bemoans the wickedness and changeability of fate itself; indeed, he practically delivers a speech of consolation in which the aged king reminds himself of the transient nature of earthly affairs and the inexorable nature of Fortune:

\[
\begin{align*}
sed & \text{ quid ego haec? quanto volvantur saecula motu} \\
scire & \text{ licet: nulli nostrum fas cernere claros} \\
solis & \text{ equos, quos prima polo lux orta remittet} \\
quosve & \text{ premet, si laeva velit Fortuna. malorum est} \\
inscius, & \text{ Eoo spectat qui Hyperiona caelo. (Decembrius, Supplementum, 13.42–46).}^{52}
\end{align*}
\]

Most tellingly, Vegius shows no significant textual debt to Decembrius. It is therefore highly probable that both Vegius and Decembrius were influenced by different scenes in Virgil, such as Aeneas’ address to the corpse of Pallas (10.42–58). Decembrius’ emphasis on \textit{Fortuna} certainly

---

51 “How fragile is the transient pride of power! O fury, o innate desire for domination, whither do you blindly drag mortal men? Whither, glory, pursued by such dangers, do you bear puffed-up minds?”

52 “But why do I say these things? We know with what great an instability the ages pass. If unpropitious Fortune wills it, to none of us is it guaranteed to see the bright horses of the sun, which the first rising light will send into the sky and restrain again in the evening. The one who sees Hyperion in the morning sky is still unaware of the evils that may come.”
suggests the influence of 10.42–44. As usual, Vegius creates a mosaic of Virgilian reminiscences, e.g., Virgil, *Aeneid*, 4.412: *improve* Amor, *quid non mortalia pectora cogis!*

3) Third, Schneider suggests that the funeral procession of Turnus is another clear correspondence between the two authors (Vegius, *Supplementum*, 13.186–200; Decembrius, *Supplementum*, 13.63–80); however, such a procession is easily suggested by the funeral procession for Pallas at 11.59–138.

4) Schneider’s fourth example of Decembrius’ supposed influence on Vegius is the arrival of Rumor, who announces the arrival of the funeral procession in both poems. This is the most likely point of influence, since there appear to be clear textual correspondences between the two passages. It seems that Vegius has reused Decembrius’ *funusque novum adventare*, as well as *implet*, while swapping out *clamoribus* for Decembrius’ *clangoribus*:

```latex
haec inter magno volitans praenuntia motu
fama ruit latisque animos clamoribus implet
adventare novum magno cum milite funus
```

```latex
Fama gradu et magnis implet clangoribus aures
regalem domum miserique in tecta parentis
perfiari—huc totis perricibus incita pennis
```


54 “Among these events, with a great motion, Fate, fluttering, rushes and fills their souls with great clamors, announcing that a new funeral is at hand with a great press of soldiers, and that Turnus is lifeless and conquered by a mortal wound.”

55 “Meanwhile raging Rumor is carried through the middle of the city and fills the ears and the kingly household with great clamors, and it rages up to the houses of the miserable parent—from here, headlong with all her agile wings she flies, and speaks that a new funeral is happening.”
Yet, once again there are clear Virgilian models; among many other examples, we might look to the appearance of Rumor that foretells the disaster of Pallas’ death in the ears of Evander:

\[
\text{et iam Fama volans, tanti praenuntia luctus,}
\]
\[
\text{Evandrum Evandrique domos et moenia replet,}
\]
\[
\text{quae modo victorem Latio Pallanta ferebat. (Virgil, Aeneid, 11.139–141).}^{56}
\]

To explain the shared appearance of \textit{funus novum adventare} we must go instead to Ovid, who uses \textit{adventare} and \textit{cum milite} in the context of the arrival of the Greeks to the shores of Troy:

\[
\text{Fecerat haec notum, Graias \textit{cum milite} forti}
\]
\[
\text{adventare rates, neque inexspectatus in armis}
\]
\[
\text{hostis adest. (Ovid, Metamorphoses, 12.64–66).}^{57}
\]

Both \textit{adventare} in the same position and the use \textit{cum milite} link Vegius’ lines with the Ovidian model, while Decembrius’ only shared word is \textit{adventare} in a different position. It therefore seems more likely that Vegius looked to Ovid and derived the line independently of Decembrius.

The two-word phrase \textit{novum funus} is not enough to prove a connection between the passages of Decembrius and Vegius, and certainly not enough to prove a substantial connection between the two authors—especially considering the other classical models available.\(^{58}\) Indeed, it seems to fit with Vegius’ \textit{modus componendi} that he returns to the beginning of the Trojan conflict as presented by Ovid at the precise moment that he ends the Trojan conflict as presented by Virgil.

\(^{56}\) “And now flying Rumor, the harbinger of such a great distress, fills Evander and the houses of Evander and the walls—Rumor, who now was telling of Pallas’ victory in Lazio.” Other Virgilian models abound: \textit{prima patrum magnis Salius clamoribus implet} (5.341); \textit{sed circum late volitans iam Fama per urbes} (7.104); \textit{interea pavidam volitans pennata per urbem / nuntia Fama ruit matrisque adlabitur auris / Euryali} (9.473–475). See Schneider, 85.

\(^{57}\) “[Rumor] made this known, that the Greek ships had arrived with a mighty soldiery; thus the enemy army arrived not unexpectedly.”

\(^{58}\) E.g., Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 13.518.
Vegius thus ends Virgil with Ovid once again. With this, all of Schneider's thematic connections have been shown to be unconvincing.

Schneider goes on to claim eight textual connections between Vegius and Decembrius:


---

59 Cf. Punam, xvi-xvii.
60 Schneider, 19, n. 38.
While this may appear to be an impressive list, it easily falls apart under closer analysis:

1) This consists of a single adjective and noun with clear Virgilian parallels, e.g., *quique satis largum caelo demittitis imbrem* (Virgil, *Georgics*, 1.23).

2) One of Forestus’ own examples, and has been shown above and by Raffaele to be more likely a common use of 11.78–89.\(^1\)

3) The other of Forestus’ own examples; it has likewise been shown to more likely stem from a common use of 11.90.

4) Again, this is a common phrase—and similar lines are used by Virgil (5.327).

5) This has been reviewed in detail above.

6) This may be a point of similarity and is not clearly dependent on any Virgilian or Ovidian model; there are other classical models, including a strikingly similar line in Claudian’s Panegyricus.

7) This has been reviewed above, and the shared use of the name Latinus does not constitute a textual echo.

8) This two-word phrase is a very weak connection, indeed, made weaker still by the similarity of 1.637: *at domus interior regali splendida luxu.*

When taken all together, the only possible textual echo is 6), and that alone is not enough to prove a substantial connection between the two authors. Schneider shows the weakness of his case by doubling the examples he gives from the two categories; he repeats under “sprachlicher Parallelen” the examples he treats under “motivischer Parallelen.”

Was Vegius aware of Decembrius’ *Liber Decimus-Tertius*? Considering their close relationship and correspondence, Vegius may very well have been aware that the older Decembrius had composed a supplement to the *Aeneid*; however, it does not appear that the fabric of Decembrius’ work had a discernable influence on Vegius’. There are no clear thematic parallels—besides obvious ones that could easily be common to anyone attempting to supplement the *Aeneid*—that cannot be explained from a common use of Virgilian material, and only a single textual echo that cannot be accounted for in a similar manner. It seems that Decembrius too was baffled by the possibility of the young Vegius ever getting his hands on the earlier poem, since he admits that he had always guarded it so closely. The young humanists’

---

62 Yet, for *motu* in final position, see Virgil, *Aeneid*, 12.217, 12.505; for *saecula* in fifth position, see 1.291, 1.445, 6.235, 12.826.

63 Claudian, *Panegyricus*, 1–2: *sol, qui flammigeris mundum complexus habenis / volvis inexhausto redeuntia saecula motu*.

64 Cf. Schneider, 18–19, n. 37–38.

systematic knowledge of Virgil, and their intricate reworking of Virgilian lines and words is more than sufficient to explain most of the similarities. Both men were drinking from the same part of the same font of the Muses. This should suffice to call into question Schneider’s claim of a clear relationship between the two texts.66

66 Schneider’s arguments have been repeated in subsequent scholarship; Oertel, 14, for instance, argues that the accusation of plagiarism is justified on the basis of Schneider’s findings: “Sein Freund Vegio muß dieses Fragment aber gesehen haben und dadurch angeregt worden sein, selber ein Supplement zu verfassen. Decembrio hat ihm jedenfalls den Vorwurf des Plagiats gemacht – sicher nicht zu Unrecht.” Cf. ibid., n. 76: “Das der Vorwurf berechtigt ist, zeigt Schneider 18 anhand von Similien und Motiven.”
APPENDIX TWO: TRANSLATION OF DECEMBRIUS’ LIBER DECIMUS-TERTIUS ENEIDOS

THE THIRTEENTH BOOK OF THE AENEID

by Pier Candido Decembrio

The beginning of the thirteenth book of the Aeneid, undertaken by the young P. Candido:

[1–8] After the greathearted son of Daunus drenched his expiring chest with blood and appeased the Trojan ghosts with his wound as he released the vast wrath of his life, old Latinus rebuilds the now-broken homes of his kingdom. He orders that the ruined walls of the city be raised again with a rampart; he commands that the men take care to demolish the high siege-towers and to extinguish the fires from the rooftops. He gives back the fields to their former inhabitants.

[9–18] Nevertheless, all the men press on willingly at their tasks and the love of their failing fatherland compels them. Some of the men, who were eager to protect their household gods with the sword and to defend the doubtful fate of their fatherland, now cast down the high rafters hanging from their ceilings and they open the city with its walls. Others are busy depositing weapons and plumed helmets at the temples of the gods, and offering not very happy prayers. Just as the bees of verdant Hybla throng the dewy fields and their troops sweat in the colorful flowers; the work seethes and the swarms buzz loudly in the broad plains.

[19–28] Although his heart is mournful, Latinus does not allow himself to hasten for home through softness. A sharper sadness enters him, and (the images of) Turnus, pierced through the throat, and the dear unburied shades do not depart from his great heart. Therefore, he decreed

---

1 Wilson-Okamura previous translation into English contains numerous inaccuracies and mistranslations. It can be found online at http://virgil.org/supplementa/decembrio.htm.
2 Wilson-Okamura interprets this passage very differently: “High-spirited, his chest soaked with his dying blood, preternatural anger streaming from his eyes, the son of Daunus appeased the ghosts of Troy with a wound.” Eckmann, 78, n. 66, notices and translates the passage far more literally: “indem er seine zu Lebzeiten gewaltige Kampfeswut aushauchte.” Her note, ibid., 78, is correct: “Das Substantiv luminis in der Bedeutung “Leben” fungiert vermutlich als Genitivus auctoris. Turnus haucht mit seiner Kampfeswut gleichsam sein Leben aus.”
3 Wilson-Okamura reads aereas for aerias: “the bronze towers are to be taken down.” I again agree with Eckmann, 73: “er ordnet an ... die hohen Belagerungstürme auzureißen.”
4 I generally follow Eckmann in reading this passage. Wilson-Okamura’s translation differs significantly: “Some take down the high-hanging beams, in which they thought to hide their household gods from the sword, to prop up their fatherland’s wavering fate: with the timber from their own houses, they wall the city.” The construction of city walls does not seem to appear in this passage.
5 Wilson-Okamura: “Others toil to render offerings to the deity in the temple: weapons and matching shields—mirthless gifts.”
6 Again Wilson-Okamura’s translation is radically different: “His heart yielding to grief, Latinus took little pleasure in the rapid construction work.” Eckmann, 80, remains closer to the text: “Keineswegs lässt sich Latinus in seinem trauernden Herzen von Nachgiebigkeit dazu bewegen, nach Hause zu eilen.” This passage is somewhat obscure, and the use of obsequio (19) is difficult. Eckman, ibid., claims that “Auch die Anordnung von drei aufeinander folgenden Ablativen ist stilistisch unschön”
7 Eckmann, 80–81, points out the lack of congruency between this description and 12.950.
8 Wilson-Okamura: “Turnus—pierced through the base of the throat, his shade divided from the soil it loved—yielded no ground.”
to send Turnus to his beloved city and the house of his miserable father, whom far away the walls of Ardea protect as he grieves. He orders the Rutulians, who wait in uncertainty, to gather up the beloved body of Turnus and the ashes of their friends. But in the hall Latinus sat slumped in his throne and broke the silence with a few words:  

[29–41] “As long as Fortune willed, the commanders and the gods were allowing these things to happen. For my part, I by no means need to call to witness the gods and the cursed fates of the Trojans. For you have seen how I wholeheartedly cherished powerful Turnus (alas, all too much!), almost as if he was born from my own blood. You know, o Dorylas, and you, Enipheus, who are mourning his death. Behold, his sad shade appears in my mind’s eye; I restrained him when he glittered after putting on his flashing breastplate and his sword and was challenging great Aeneas to a battle. I said, ‘What are you preparing to do, my son? Now consider the treaty! The time has come! Already the fields are red with too much of our blood; our spirits have fallen.’ But a wicked Fury was present and pressed a rejoicing helmet on his head.

[42–55] But why do I say these things? We know how insecurely the ages pass. If Fortune is unpropitious, none of us are guaranteed to see the bright horses of the sun, which the first rising light will send into the sky and restrain again (in the evening). The one who gazes upon Hyperion in the morning sky is still unaware of evils that may come. So come now, all you young men, give the pious gifts of death to the illustrious ghosts—little trickles of dust—and pour earth on their ashes, and may Turnus see his people. Alas, thus, Daunus, you will give him kisses with the face of a father (who has lost his son); you will be one such man. Thus, Daunus, Turnus enters your city without loss of dignity. He fell while avenging your ancestors. You Rutulians, lament for the great avenger of Italy! What stronger captain will lead your battle lines? Ah, miserable men, under what leader do you march? Here he is—ah! honored soul!—one who was laid low in the fight against your enemies!”

[56–62] After he said these things, he rose from his seat and a great flood of tears poured over his cheeks. Then, at the same time the vast surrounding crowd groaned together with him as he spoke. Closely surrounded he approaches his familiar thresholds. He walks like a mother after the death of her shining calf, whom a wolf or a harsh shepherd dragged from her breast; no fountains move her eyes, no rivers, and the verdant forests cannot turn her away.

[63–80] Then, at the command of the king, Enipheus brings forth a swift horse. At once he leans over his harness and fixes his cold lips to the harsh bit, and the beast begins to weep. Latinus
himself orders that the spoils and trophies of war be led out in order. First the chariot, the insignia of the captured Trojans, banners and shields and tunics interwoven with gold are fitted out. Then in the back, they carry the darts by which he defeated his trifling enemies, and the helmets decorated with crests, and the ornaments of swift horses which he took. Here a horse, which Metiscus now leads with timid skill, follows and frets to obey a doubtful master. Afterwards the Rutulian horsemen and footmen advance together, having reversed their shields and with their spears carried on their backs. But Father Latinus wept, and when he could speak, in a low voice he led the last rites according to custom. Through the thickets, by the narrow path which leads to the citadel, they march in exhaustion to the plains of Pilumnus.

[81–89] Meanwhile, raging Rumor is carried through the middle of the city, and fills the ears and the kingly household with great clamors, and it rages up to the houses of the miserable parent. From here, headlong with all her agile wings she flies, and announces that a new funeral is happening. The disturbed mothers leap up with a great cry, and they mourn as they wait for the return of the battle lines at the full gates. You would think that the temples of the gods and their children and household gods were being torn down, and that fire was raging on all the roofs …
APPENDIX THREE: TRANSLATION OF FORESTUS’ EXEQUIAE TURNI

THE FUNERAL OF TURNUS
or
THE THIRTEENTH BOOK OF THE AENEID
by Johannes Forestus

Argument

Aeneas hands over the lifeless body of Turnus to the Rutulians, along with his arms, keeping only the belt of fallen Pallas to console his father, and substituting his own. He also grants a truce for the next night. The Latins carry the body of Turnus on a shield to the palace of King Latinus. The king, unable to bear the dreadful spectacle, comes down from the walls into the palace, where he hides himself. As he prepares to commit suicide from grief, he is prohibited from this by Mercury at the behest of Jupiter and is ordered to call a meeting of the senate. He obeys both orders. After the council is begun, Pilumnus, the younger brother of Turnus, who had been discharged by King Brennus, arrives with the remainder of his troops. Pilumnus had been sent by his father to King Brennus as a reinforcement against Antenor. When he understood that his brother had died, seeing the funeral bier which was in the atrium, he filled the entire palace with unaccustomed mourning. This was reported to the king, who in a kindly manner led him into the council, briefly explained the state of the affairs and consoled him by praising his brother’s virtue. Then the king continues the interrupted peace-council. Inflamed with passion, Pilumnus argues against peace, while Drances strives for peace. The king soothes the anger of both sides with a calming oration, and, advising peace, he dismisses the meeting until the next day.

Aftermath of the Death of Turnus

[1–15] But after Father Aeneas had finished the slaughter of Turnus, he looks with a pitiless glance over the mass of the lifeless body stretched in the dust, and in confusion his gaze wanders over it all. But the same baldric—the avenger of the blood of beloved Pallas—which first had hindered Turnus’ prayers as he pled for his life, does not allow the waves of Aeneas’ anger to subside. Similarly, discordant winds clamor on the sea, until Boreas compels them all to yield by his command alone, and finally ceases victoriously from his own gusts as well. Yet, the anger of the sea does not wholly subside at once, but still seethes and shudders everywhere with black waves—just so did the grief of Aeneas rage in the depth of his heart. Before his waking eyes Pallas, Evander, and the whole bereft house come wandering, although he had already placated the noble spirits and the just wrath of Father Evander with the blood of his enemy.

[16–26] But Aeneas’ former piety did not depart from his heart. While he stands stupefied and fixes his attention and his gaze on the face of his enemy (a face no longer yours, Turnus), he gradually discerns that the terrible eyes and the expiring mouth grow cold with death. He sighs deeply and considers the state of Turnus in his astonished heart, how changed in death he is from that Turnus who formerly, as an enemy in the midst of the Trojan walls, had twice driven back the Trojan battle lines, setting the whole camp in turmoil. Then, at once he is struck as he recalls

1 I have used Oertel’s text and have consulted his translation on difficult passages throughout.
in his mind the image of the lifeless Hector, as Achilles dragged his mangled body from his chariot. His eyes well up with tears, and he pours forth these laments from his mouth:

_Aeneas’ Speech to Turnus_

[27–46] “O splendor of the Italian youth, true offspring of the gods, you who equal in your virtues the flowering of ancient heroes and who surpass them in spirit! It was not my right hand that destroyed you, but your own virtue! Would that this virtue had been restrained! Then you would have been a great commander of Italy and the glory of my kingdom, a partner in all my works and my praises. How great a guardian has been lost to the unity of the Trojan and Latin endeavor! If savage fate had not denied you your life, you would have been found to be another Hector against our Greek enemies, and Greece would have feared even a defeated Troy. O Turnus, I call to witness your shade and the spirit of your divine sister Juturna, as well as your father Daunus and King Latinus, that I unwillingly fought against you, and in this way have now obtained a marriage to your bride. Lavinia ought to have been granted to me by the agreement of her father and at the behest of the Gods themselves, but not by your death nor by the bitter grief of your father. O would that I was able to return the life taken from you! You would then return in safety to your homeland and your father. I will do what I can: I will return your arms and your lifeless body to your father. May these be my gifts to you.”

_Removal of the Baldric_

[47–57] Thus he spoke and he removed the spoils of his friend Pallas from the body of Turnus, a miserable keepsake for his sad father, and handed them over at once for safekeeping to Achates, who was standing by. He then replaced the baldric with his own, which he had captured from Demoleon at Troy. It was equal to Pallas’ in weight and craftsmanship, and on it an ancient legend was embossed in solid gold. A wretched maiden, bound with chains to a cliff, weeps. Nearby a dreadful beast bristles with scales and teeth, as she cries out in fear. But a young man glides above the sea on a winged horse and considers how to make precise wounds on the beast with his curved blade.

_Aeneas Promises Peace_

[58–70] Then Aeneas also admonished the Rutulians to raise up their fallen king swiftly and carry him to the dwelling of King Latinus, and then relate these sorrows and consolations to the elderly Daunus: Aeneas would soon send gifts, pledges of peace. The war between the Trojans and Rutulians was over. The struggle for honor, which had taken place between himself and Turnus, he now declared finished with a final decree, and with the gods themselves as witnesses. Moreover, at dawn of the next day, the king of Ausonia would answer questions and take care of all other matters. As for the rest, they should restore their spirits and care for their bodies, and none of the Trojans or the Latins should have any fear of arms. When he had said these things, the entire Laurentian army happily gives thanks. One voice rings out from so great a cohort:

[71–77] “Hail, great son-in-law and ally of King Latinus, our captain, son of Anchises! May Lavinia be your wife!” Together they all raise their applause to the stars. Such a shout did they make, as when battle lines under hostile standards charge together, or when they make a stand and struggle against each other, and then one side at last appears to retreat in exhaustion, and the other side presses on victoriously.

_The Funeral Procession of Turnus_
Meanwhile, the famous twin brothers, the descendants of the Tiber, Catillus and Coras, arrived, accompanied by the foremost princes. After they give thanks to kindly Aeneas and offer their write hands, the captain returns equal honors to them. Then, on a shield, they raise up the body of their friend and carry him aloft. On one side, the Italians stand in a long line. On the other side, the Trojans stand with their strong allies. This is the funeral of Turnus. His enemy is present at the funeral with all his forces, and his enemy gives him the highest honor.

**Latinus Watches the Funeral Procession**

But Father Latinus gazes out from his usual spot on the rampart, from which he had first seen the battle lines and the equally matched leaders contend, and the entire war unfold. As he sees the young men carrying his nephew on high, he abandons the walls and hides himself in his own quarters. He does not have the power of soul, nor is there enough strength in his heart, to be able to see with his own eyes Turnus returning in such a condition. In his mind’s eye he sees the chariots and the flowing helmet plumes and the battle lines as they rushed forward wherever Turnus went. And before his eyes Turnus appears as he did when he challenged Aeneas to the fateful battle, although Latinus and his wife had opposed him.

**The Latin Crowd Laments**

Then the crowd rushes from the gates. Some climb the turrets, while others take stations on the roofs. All have the same frenzy to see Turnus, now that he is finally deprived of life. The mournful army appears. The corpse appears, carried aloft on the shield and is recognized by his familiar weapons. The crowds mingle dreadful groans. The upper air is shattered by their cries, and the houses resound with their sorrowful weeping. But not for you alone are there so many lamentations, Turnus, nor for you are so many tears shed. Each mourner bewails their own relatives killed in the war, but they impute their tears to one man. Likewise, springs which have begun from different mountains enter into separate waterways and for a long time each one flows with its own waters, until they join forces and come together into a single river, and together they rush into the sea as one.

The funeral procession had progressed to the ancient citadel of Picus, and the crowds there were equal in size. Some stand on the top of the temple. Others stand on the steps. Still others throng in all the windows.

**Lavinia Watches the Funeral Procession**

At the very front of the temple there was a bronze screen. From this vantage point, the royal virgin, unseen by anyone, for a long time watches the funeral procession, accompanied by a few handmaids. Her face is colorless and happiness is gone from her eyes. Nevertheless, she does not weep or sigh, nor does she appear to mourn or rejoice at the new whirlwind of great events. There she considers the ancient fates silently in her heart, the warnings of her prophetic father, and the portents of the gods. She is prepared to endure whatever fortune these things bring.

**Lavinia Sees the Body of Turnus**

As Turnus comes nearer, reclining on his shield and on the shoulders of those carrying him, his friends can scarcely recognize him. His eyes are menacing in death, and he wears a ghastly expression on a face that is no longer his. Lavinia grows pale, faints, and is
caught up by the gentle arms of her companions. She is carried to her chamber and laid on her bed. Meanwhile Turnus is laid out on a bier in the middle of the great hall, a bier piled with various flowers and pleasant herbs. The hall is wet with tears shed by the mourners. Similarly, a twig, which is planted and tended by the hand of its master, grows up most happily of all the trees in the forest and raises its head first among the other shrubs. Now it is a tree, and now it is attired with a snowy crown of flowers, when it is torn up from the very roots by the raging of the South Wind, and its lovely treetop covers the earth.

The Rutulians Bid Turnus Farewell

[141–146] After all things were duly completed in accordance with the beginning of mourning, the Rutulian leaders said, “Farewell, forever, best of generals! You have fulfilled your destiny, and each of us must now complete our own. We do not refuse an end like yours!” When they had said this, they returned to the camps with rapid steps.

The First Day Ends

[147–155] Meanwhile the sun finishes its course and brings to an end the strenuous exertions of the Trojans and the Italians at the same time. Nevertheless, the duties in the camps on both sides do not cease. Evening arrives with its usual tasks. Watches on the wall continue. Here and there Mnestheus and Atinas arrange the guards, and they often make their rounds among the posts, supervise them, and direct the changing of the sentries. Messapus directs the activity on the walls, since the highest military command had been entrusted to him after the death of Turnus. The city and all the fields glitter with fires.

The Two Camps

[156–175] Just as when a rapid whirlwind twists the air and combines the night with pitch-black vortexes and clouds teeming with storm-winds, the rains mixed with hail stream down and lightning shatters forth from the broken clouds. But if by chance the raging of the sky and the sea suddenly subsides and promises calm weather for seafaring, the sailors do not dare to trust the doubtful serenity. Likewise, although the savage tempest of arms resides and there is hope that Mars is satisfied by the blood of Turnus, still the souls of the soldiers are roused by thoughts of war, and Mars boils inwardly. On both sides the leaders have the same concerns and the same zeal, but their attitudes are entirely different. For the Trojans, all things are joyful: The song of victory resounds everywhere, announcing that the enemy was vanquished by one man, and that so many trophies were acquired by victory. Aeneas, the son of Anchises, abundantly thanks the gods from his heart and heaps the heavens with prayers to confirm the omens that they had given and his recent treaties as well. But the demeanor of the Latins in their camps is very different. They all bewail their leader and they complain that their battle lines and the ancient honor of their people were destroyed by the death of Turnus alone.

King Latinus Attempts Suicide

[176–200] As the Father of the Ausonians descended from the walls of the city, he was overpowered by wild mourning. He fled from the sight of his people and the fathers and hid himself in the deep shadows. There he yielded all the reins of his mind to grief. He casts himself on the ground and befouls his face with filthy dust. He cannot prevail against the unspeakable weight of his sorrows. The entire sequence of events comes together, increases the burden of his sick mind, and drowns the old man: Noble Aeneas who had twice become an enemy, the Tiber
overflowing three times with the blood of the Laurentians, his wife and Turnus dead, the virgin Lavinia twice betrothed to a man in vain—and in addition, his citizens and faithful allies were armed in hostility. As he considers all these things in his mournful heart, he exclaims that he alone is the source and cause of the evils, and that all the wrongdoing ought to be expiated by his death, from the time when he allowed the treaties he had established with the Trojan Aeneas to be dissolved and had allied himself with the forces of Turnus. In this way a stream swells up when it has begun to flow during the first rainfall and increases little by little during the winter weather. It does not stay within its banks nor within its levies, but is carried along in a vortex, confused like the ocean, and it snatches everything with it. And now Latinus would have stained his right hand with his own blood, had not swift Mercury been sent from the heights of heaven and reported the commands of the mighty father Jupiter.

Mercury Intervenes

[201–223] Mercury snatched the sword and hand of the king, and said, “O true offspring of mild Saturn, what wild fury has incited your hand against your own vitals—an act that your kindly mind scarcely permitted to be committed against an enemy? Stop—the father of the gods commands it—sheathe your sword! This is not your fault! It was not you, revered father, it was not you who broke the treaties and caused the war. A greater authority controls the affairs of Latium. Jupiter’s great queen is behind it all, the goddess who is the patron of your marriages. She divided your people through Rutulian arms. It is also she who reunites you with the same arms now that a treaty has been concluded. Up till now she pursued Aeneas on land and sea, but now with her entire power she cherishes him and will cherish him forever. With a single wedding she will join him to your daughter and the Trojans to the Latins, and she will mingle two peoples into one. So come, father, lift your spirits which have been beaten down by the whirlwind of past events! Look to the affairs of your future rule, which is prophesied to extend for you over the whole world. Assume a mind that is equal to this future. Take up this scepter, call a council, and henceforth remember that you are a king!” Thus, Mercury speaks and keenly incites the heart of King Latinus, and rekindles the doused flames of his mind, and at once rises back into the heavens on snowy wings.

King Latinus Recovers

[224–242] But the king of the Ausonians perceives the vigor and strength of youth in his body and a new force in his heart. He trusts in the admonishments of Jove, and prays for an omen to favor him and to lend aid to his undertakings. Then, standing straight he walks into the middle of the assembly and gleams suddenly in the bright lamplight. Just as when the air parts after a rainstorm has fallen and the joyful sun at last comes forth from the broken clouds that kept the day closed away, the plowman rejoices, the sheep rejoice in the fields with the melodious birds—similarly, among the princes the hero seems mightier and more joyful, and as he proceeds he spreads happiness with his arrival. As he settles himself on his throne and calls the fathers and the princes, he begins to consider the most important affairs of state. But a new event comes to their attention, which stirs up the walls and camps of the Rutulians and the camps of the Trojans into confusion. The warlike youth clamor for arms and snatch them up at once. Each side is a source of fear for the other, until finally a reliable messenger from the city explains the cause of each side’s fear.

The Story of Pilumnus
[243–259] Kindly Venilia had given four offspring to Daunus, two daughters and then two sons. Of the two sons, Turnus was the elder. His brother Pilumnus possessed the illustrious name of his ancestors and was equal to Turnus in virtue, but younger in years. Since his father Daunus was allied by an ancient treaty to Brennus, Daunus had sent Pilumnus to provide aid to him with a select band of young warriors. Antenor had fled from his Trojan fatherland and settled in Brennus’ fields, where he gathered together the remainder of the Trojans and Venetians from every side. Now, as a single race with a single name formed from two people, they ruled over the same boundaries and rejoiced in their control over the entire ocean. They had the same fate as the Trojans who came together with the Latins: the image of ancient Troy and Rome in power.

When Pilumnus perceived that the rule of Brennus was shattered and that the will of the gods had opposed him, and when he had heard of the disturbances in Latium, he yielded to the will of the gods, begged pardon of the king, gathered his remaining companions, and returned to his fatherland.

_Pilumnus Arrives in Latium_

[260–268] And now Pilumnus had arrived at the gates. When the attentive guard on the wall perceives the snorting of the horses far off through the darkness, he at once challenges: “Under whose banners do you come here? Stand still, men! State the purpose of your journey and your country of origin!” Pilumnus replies: “I am not unknown to you, nor am I a foreigner, but formerly was part of the army and an ally in your struggles—struggles which I endured with you and which I will not refuse to endure again—for this is the entire purpose of my journey! Tell Turnus that his brother has come to aid him with his soldiers!”

_Pilumnus Learns of Turnus’ Death_

[269–284] When they had heard Pilumnus’ words, the watchmen raise a shout to the stars. The temples of the gods and the palace of King Latinus reverberate: “Pilumnus has returned!” Again and again the cries repeat. Without any thought of Turnus’ funeral, they forget that the weapons of pious Pilumnus will be of no use to his dead brother. But then at once the grief rises in their sad hearts, and they stop in the middle of their shouting. In this way the wind rushes forth in a dark whirlwind and falls upon a forest with all its strength and with a great crash, tearing up the trunks from the ground and scattering the trees over the soil. It rages through the wreckage. Soon, it grows silent when its clouds have been completely exhausted through their gusting. But Pilumnus is disturbed by the funereal silence, the broken sobs, and the suddenly broken gladness of the applause. So many mouths seem to speak to him of the cruel fate of his brother and he hears of Turnus’ miserable death from so many witnesses. Already he inwardly laments the death of Turnus.

_Pilumnus Meets Messapus_

[285–293] Meanwhile, Messapus arrives. He opens the gates and welcomes the returning hero, falling on his neck, clinging to him, and weeping. With a groan he reveals that his dear Turnus is dead. Pierced in his soul by a new wound, Pilumnus calls out: “Where is Turnus? Or if he is nowhere, allow me to follow his shade, for a brother ought to stay with his brother.” Once the strong descendant of Neptune had recovered his voice, he speaks: “Commander, have no fear! The one whom you seek is in the great hall. I myself with my own hand will bring you to your dear brother.”
Pilumnus Arrives at the Great Hall

[294–298] When the unlucky man arrives at the threshold of the great hall, accompanied by torchbearers, he catches sight of the halls crowded with dignitaries. In the middle of the hall, the body of Turnus rests on a bier of leaves and aromatics. All around him, the mothers and fearful daughters of Ausonia are seated, dressed in black mourning robes and with their hair untied.

The Anger of Pilumnus

[299–306] Now there was no longer in his soul any doubt remaining about the death of his brother. Turnus’ body lay before him. Turning away from grief, Pilumnus blazes into fury and anger, but he represses his tears with his voice. Wrath shines from his face, his eyes throw off sparks and flash forth bolts of anger. Inwardly, he boils. He mixes heaven and hell as he invokes the avenging furies, considering things that surpass his own powers. He dedicates Aeneas, the Trojans, and himself, as funeral offerings for Turnus. Then he speaks out loud:

[307–317] “Did it seem possible to conceal so great a crime, and to hide the death of Turnus? Was he so unknown to his allies and his enemies, when he was strong and landed on the shores of the vast conflict, both a soldier and a general of Latium? So this is how he has died? Does anyone fail to notice when the sun sinks from the middle of the sky or when it hides itself in the ocean? The soldiers have not remained silent about the death of Turnus. The ramparts themselves, enclosed by men and ditches, speak out that Turnus is dead! Walls would not contain him, nor would the camps, but beyond the ramparts he would attack thousands of thronging foes, if his strength and his spirit were still governing his limbs.”

Pilumnus Addresses Turnus

[318–345] When he had cried out these words, he frantically tears himself away from the crowd, heads towards his brother’s bier, and takes up the dead man in his arms. He touches his face to the cold face of his brother, washing his whole countenance with tears, and he speaks: “Is this how I find you, brother, most dear to my soul? Did I finish such a long journey through weapons and enemies, Turnus, and endure such sufferings in order to attend a bitter funeral instead of seeing my brother? O great leader of the Venetian race—before all this I ought to have poured out my soul by your hand on the Illyrian plains among the Celts and their Latin comrades. But I thought in my heart that everything was well. I thought that the Trojans were expelled from Latium, that the limbs of Aeneas were scattered over the battlefields, that you had hung up his captured arms to Jove in thanksgiving, that you led joyful triumphs in your four-horse chariot, and that you had married the daughter of Latinus as a reward for your warcraft. But it seemed otherwise to the gods. And now all things are turned to their opposites. Although the fates compelled me, I betrayed you, brother. While I accompanied foreign camps, I deserted my brother. I refused my arms to you, but I brought them to Brennus. The blood which we poured out in vain on the Alpine shores was owed to our fatherland and to you. I ought to have met the Trojans in battle with these weapons. With this shield I ought to have opposed the death of my brother. Perhaps I would have been able to prevent your death by my own death or the death of our enemies. But although Pilumnus was not able to prevent your death, yet he will not leave it unavenged, O brother—or he himself will be your comrade in death.” Pilumnus says no more and departs.

Latinus Receives Pilumnus
But as Father Latinus observes the return of Pilumnus from the holy temple, he postpones his duties in the assembly, assumes an expression of mourning, and goes to embrace his nephew. As far as he can, he comforts Pilumnus’ grief with kindly words. In order, he describes for him the beginning of the unhappy war, how Turnus’ courage was unbroken when the battle lines were shattered, and how he continued to conquer even when his own soldiers were conquered. He describes Turnus’ numerous and illustrious trophies, and the triumphs that he held over the victorious enemy, and how he himself offered the terms of single combat to the Trojan commander and hastened to die an illustrious death. When the king had soothed the heart of the young man with these words, little by little Pilumnus’ mind returns from his maddened grief and his fury departs. Nevertheless, his former sadness still smolders in the depths of his heart. While he submits to the king and humbly implores pardon for his violent grief, he begs for time to mourn. Although Pilumnus hesitates, Latinus leads him by the hand into the spacious council chamber and places him in his usual seat. Then in the middle of the hall he sits on the throne of his fathers. Once again, he prays to the gods, and then begins a speech:

The First Speech of King Latinus

“Princes of Latium, I give thanks for my good fortune, and announce what is acceptable to the propitious gods: The brother of Turnus has arrived at such a time, while this council is held to discuss the deeds of his brother, so that he does not happen to find some reason for reproach, since he was not there. I will report to you what first compelled us to make the treaty with the Trojan leader and with the household gods of Troy, and what has recently befallen us. I will unfold the unfortunate events that are now well known to you all, but should be known to my nephew. To this end, in a few words, I will trace back the entire cause of the conflict from its origin. Terrified by the omens and the warnings of the gods, I had promised to marry my daughter to the king of the Trojans. But the resolve of my soul was weakened by the tears of my wife, Amata, and the prayers of Turnus. I broke the treaties, and waged war against Aeneas and his allies, despite the unfavorable auspices. Twice we saw the Tiber flowing with Latin blood and twice we saw the fields strewn with the bodies of our citizens. What efforts did I not undertake before the beginning of the fighting or after the first battles, since I desired to moderate the rage of the great-souled young man, and avert his impending death? The more I resisted him, the more violently did he rush headlong towards his death and drive headlong towards his own fate. Then, persuaded by the constant complaints and anger of the people, he challenged Aeneas to settle the conflict. In vain did I forbid this. They agreed that the war should cease when one of them was defeated, and that Lavinia should marry the victor. But this treaty was suddenly thrown into confusion by our weapons. By chance, Aeneas was wounded by an arrow shot by an unknown hand and he returned to the Trojan camps. There, he tended to his wound and returned even more angrily to battle. He called the gods to witness and turned his war upon the city. Turnus met him on the way and ended both his life and the war. Princes, this was the end, as you know, of the hateful conflict. But deliberate now, whether you want peace or war!”

The Face of Pilumnus

Latinus had spoken. But the fathers and commanders in a long line intently keep their faces and eyes fixed on Pilumnus alone. He sits opposite to them and his expression displays terrible anger. Paleness and a fiery blush by turn alternate in his uncertain countenance. Just as when the sun is veiled by black clouds: First it is hidden and fades in the clouds with its sphere
concealed, but then it returns from the shadows and glitters with rays and light. Its face does not remain the same, but again and again it appears differently in the heavens, as if it is doubtful whether it is night or day. When the pathways of his voice, which were choked by his grief, had barely opened, Pilumnus rises, stretches out his hand, and speaks with a voice of thunder:

The Speech of Pilumnus

[409–434] “I was hoping to gain some solace from your words, most reverend father, but an empty hope deceives my heart, and a more painful grief burns in my chest. Until now there was only one cause of my grief: Learning of the death of my brother tortured my mind. But now that I know the one who caused his death I am again tormented. With tremendous force the Fury seizes upon me and urges me to revenge and a thousand forms of vengeance. Would that the gods might allow Turnus to still be safe and able to speak his own opinion, and that everything might be as it was when he was alive! Then there would be no need for a council and lengthy debating! Either the common glory of Latium should be defended by the common arms of Ausonia, or we should all die a common death. It was not right that a single man was sacrificed on behalf of thousands. But now the entire state of Latium falls with its leader, and there is no possibility for a true pledge. The victor has taken this away. Now we must obey those laws which he gave to you with this sweet peace. And now you uselessly ask the Latins whether they prefer war or the treaties. This is the decision of the enemy leader. Now by his command you should put down your arms and bridle yourselves. For shame! That the king of Latium would serve Aeneas! Rutulians, do not allow this evil and recall the virtue of your ancestors and Turnus, unless the hearts of the Laurentians are not tormented with concern—if they think that their king is worthless, and their liberty, and the gods and penates of their fatherland.

[435–453] They say that the same law and the same religion unites the Rutulians. Turnus assisted the sacred altars. He himself was the origin of the unequal struggle, since he was obviously urged on by the constant complaints of his father-in-law and the people, and inflamed by too much love for his bride and for glory. I confess that he had bound himself in obligation to these things. And he himself fulfilled the conditions of the treaty. Surely, he did not avoid the fighting? Did he not stand against Aeneas? What else is left? With his illustrious death he fulfilled his noble deeds undertaken for his fatherland. He even added the loss of his own life to his remarkable merits on behalf of his bride and father-in-law. He relinquished every right which he had obtained for himself through treaties and his brave arms. Now he no longer wants to acquire your daughter, nor the old marriage treaties, nor Latium as a dowry, nor the scepter of Latinus. All these things should belong to the victor—and it is fitting that Turnus has died. But Turnus did not bind the Rutulian race by the same pacts, nor was he able to bind them. That power belongs to his father Daunus, and it is his decision whether he should leave his son unavenged, along with so many strong souls of his people who were sent to Tartarus below.

[454–469] But if the Rutulians do not intend to avenge the harsh fates of their leader and to protect the glory and the name of their fatherland—and may the deep earth swallow them before this happens, I pray, and may all of them accompany Turnus to the shades of Erebus!—I will shake Italy with war and I will stir up all the people from the farthest reaches of the kingdom, from where the Rhine flows from the heavens and enters the Alps, seeking the seas in swift career, and from where Aetna thunders into heaven with sulfuric fires, and the Scylla echoes back to wild Charybdis. Turnus will not lack soldiers, even though he lacks life. Or if in your heart you now are so disgusted by war, father, that you prefer to guard your people rather than to
triumph in battle, allow me to vie with the Dardanian tyrant alone, and to send either Aeneas or myself to the underworld to be a comrade for my brother. Through this conflict I do not seek Lavinia as a wife, nor the kingdom of Ausonia, but rather the glory of a beautiful death.”

The Response of the Council

[470–479] He had spoken. With loud applause Messapus and all the Rutulians support the words of Pilumnus and they roar for weapons. All together they curse the weakness of peace, and each soldier consecrates himself eagerly to the ghost of Turnus. But the Laurentians remain quiet on the other side, and in silence show forth their disapproval with their expressions alone. But there is a low murmur and indistinct muttering in the entire temple. One can hear such a shuddering noise in the tops of trees or on the waves of the sea, when the air senses the coming of Boreas and trembles, and the breezes are still playful, while the storm clouds delay.

Drances Responds

[480–514] Finally, Drances leaps up and bursts into his former wrath, unable any longer to endure the hostility which surges in the depths of his heart and had not subsided with the death of the Rutulian leader. He speaks out: “O monarch, most worthy of the scepter of Latium, thanks be to the gods that you are kept safe while we live, and thanks be to you, because you have revealed the secrets of your heart to us. No one knows these things, which seemed fitting to be shown to the fathers, better than you. In so great a crisis of events, it was important to summon you alone to the council. Great king, the only cause of our misfortunes is that we formerly spurned your advice and the commands of your gentle old age. From the moment when we rebelliously decided to fight against the fates of the gods and your councils, from the moment when we took up wicked arms against our allies and your son-in-law and the divine penates, how many penalties have we paid for our crimes? How many funerals have we endured? The men of Ausonia and the land of Italy are exhausted. The avenging gods and even the author of evils has had enough of slaughter and the shedding of blood. It was determined that the war which was kindled by the rage of one man be extinguished by his blood. The gods are called to witness the treaty. Scarcely made, the treaty is broken! But the mindful gods do not ignore evil! The entire earth is strewn with bodies, Trojan fires whirl through our walls, and Aeneas stands victoriously in our very gates, threatening destruction if the victims owed to the sacred altars are not given. And at once it is given. The Trojan son of Anchises offers it and the divine anger is placated. Is it your will to incite this anger again? Just as one man pays the deserved punishments for all of us, so should all of us pay the price for the treachery of one man? The soldiery will fail: So may the wars be approved by all. We have barely enough to man the walls. If we must open our gates for the Trojans, decide whether Aeneas enters the city as a son-in-law or as an enemy. And if you have any reverence for the gods, do not take away your daughter from her betrothed, to whom Turnus gave her as he lay dying.”

The Laurentians Beg Latinus for Peace

[515–524] When Drances had spoken, the fathers and the leaders of the Laurentians rise and add to the pleas of Drances. With one voice they beg Latinus for peace. They ask that he does not deny his people the peace the enemy had granted. While the Laurentians plead with him, the Rutulian leader murmurs, and in his heart he weighs nobility and shame against each other. As he stands up to speak from his high throne, the Ausonian fathers and Drances rise opposite to
him. Their zeal and their spirits swell, and would have risen higher, but Latinus rose and spoke with a friendly countenance:

The Second Speech of King Latinus

[525–541] “O brave youth, you are too similar to your brother Turnus! You have the same strength of soul and the same virtue that is unafraid of death. But this virtue was too fiery and hardly propitious for your miserable brother. May the ruler of Olympus desire to turn your virtue for the better! I look at you, dear nephew, and I marvel as you speak, and I remember the roaring of Turnus and his fiery words. And now Turnus himself seems to stand before me and to speak. Indeed, two stars of the Latin race would now be standing, if Turnus had not cast my warnings to the winds. How much comfort and how much joy would it have brought to your father Daunus to have embraced both of you together and to have greeted both of you in your welcome return. Now your solitary return will bring grief, and it will not allow your father to forget his missing son. And what if—fates forbid it!—a cruel day should take you away as well, and Daunus’ old age should be wholly childless? Ah! Have pity on your father! Believe me, your father would say the same things to you if he were present as well, and your dead brother would agree!

[542–575] Did you think that your brother had less virtue or warcraft than you, since you desire to rush against Aeneas one on one? Not even if your right hand surpassed strong Diomedes, not even if it surpassed great Achilles, would you be a match for him, Pilumnus. For King Jupiter guides this conflict, not pious Aeneas. Or would you attempt to fight with Jove and go hand to hand with him? Did you not notice that the gods were against us when you experienced the Trojans in combat? Neither do I, nor the fathers, as you suppose, have any resentment against the fatherland or your brother. While he was living, the war was waged by his decision, and we yielded to him. But never did he anywhere lack virtue or reason: the malevolent power of fate opposed him from the beginning. Not even if your virtue and right hand had been present would you have been able to stop the headlong fall of your brother. No one should raise the objection that Turnus owes anything to the treaties or to the enemy. Nevertheless, it is due to him that the Rutulians are bound under settled treaties that he himself proposed. The herald Idmon brought this agreement to Aeneas in the name of Turnus. Should a soldier invalidate the commands of his commander? Should a soldier be the arbiter of peace and war and the interpreter of the terms of a treaty? It would not be right even for Daunus to unbind the agreements. He would not have handed over the supreme command to his son, if he thought that the acts of Turnus would be rescinded. And if it should now be permitted, he would not wish to do so. For now he has sailed into the harbor of his life. Now his anchor is cast and he would not wish to spread his sails back through the deeps of the sea. His sister-in-law and his son, victims of the deadly war, stand before his eyes, and you are now his only remaining offspring. Nor is it more fitting for you to provoke a war, o Pilumnus. For you would wage it against your own family, against me and my kingdom. For now, Aeneas is my son-in-law, as are the Trojans and Latins. Your brother wished this as he died. His last words to Aeneas were these: ‘May Lavinia be your wife.’

[576–581] Therefore, O Rutulian princes and princes of Latium, trust that this was the final will of Turnus. It is holy and entirely inviolable for all the nations. Obey him willingly with me! Instead of a legacy, unanimously accept the venerable pledge of peace, which he left to you in death.

[582–596] This is my opinion concerning the war. We still must understand how entirely to eradicate wicked wars, destroy the remembrance and the name of the war, and then demolish
whatever signs are unfavorable to joyful peace. Therefore, I think it best to send ambassadors to Daunus and his allies to report the terms of the peace, the current situation in Italy, our plans for the future, and what great events prophesied by the gods will result from this treaty. I hope that Aeneas also would send a similar gift and soothe the grief of Daunus with placid words. But first, we must take care for Turnus’ unburied body. This is what frightens Ausonia. This disturbs all the lands. At first dawn we ought to carry the body to the dwelling of his father with his arms and with all the honor of the dead. The new day will show us whatever else needs to be done.”

Pilumnus Weeps for Turnus

[597–610] When the king of the Italians had said these things, no other speeches followed. The captain of the Rutulians himself is silent, the rage leaves his heart, the clouds of his gloomy mind thin out, and at last he learns to mourn fittingly for the dead man. Similarly, the sea is thrown into tumult by a storm whirling rapidly with waves—and now it seems to rise up into mountain ranges and threaten heaven with a curved swell—but as the waves decrease together with the winds, the sea is laid out like a pool and the smooth surface of the water is motionless. Thus, slowly the gales in the heart of the young man relented and the storms in his mind were calmed by the speech of Latinus. He was already a different man from the man who had entered. He departed from the lofty portals and retired by himself in private, to see if he were able to overcome the fresh pain in his heart.
THE FUNERAL OF TURNUS

or

THE FOURTEENTH BOOK OF THE AENEID

by Johannes Forestus

Argument

Jupiter calls a council of the gods and proclaims peace. He commands Juno to reveal his decree to the brother and father of Turnus, using Juturna as a messenger. Moreover, he commands Venus to make Lavinia favorably disposed to her destined marriage. Both commands are carried out. After giving thanks, the king dismisses Pilumnus and the Rutulian leaders, who now demand peace, once the funeral procession has been fittingly arranged. When these things have been completed, like Aeneas, he sends ambassadors with honorable gifts to king Daunus. Finally, both kings come together and renew the interrupted treaty.

The Assembly of the Gods

[1–16] Latinus dismissed the council from the sacred temple and allowed them a short time to rest as the night passed by. But he exhorted them to be mindful of their future work: The funeral of Turnus needed to be duly prepared as soon as possible. Meanwhile, the omnipotent father Jupiter was considering the illustrious destiny of the Dardanian race, a destiny which the violence of the young prince would have rendered useless, unless he had resisted it. He calls the gods into the vault of the highest serenity of space, beneath which the axis of heaven is spread out with stars, and where the highest air is the ground. There, there are no stars, no sun, no alternating changes of day and dark night. The year is always the same and seasonless. Spring is eternal there and for time everlasting a single day shines without the sun, infused with perpetual light, which gleams from the face of the highest divinity. Sitting in the middle of this brightness, he begins to speak as follows:

The Speech of Jupiter

[17–32] “Up until now, o gods, there was a place for our partisan pursuits. Up until now it was permitted to us to favor one side or another, whichever seemed best. But now there has been enough blood and hatred. Now it is time to make peace. You should accept what has already been accepted by both parties—and may none of you kindle the deadly weapons that the kings have placed down! May the end of the war be the same for Turnus and Aeneas and may they have the same end of their sufferings. I forbid you to struggle anymore and I forbid you to resist the fates. Do not suppose that I am saying these things because I distrust you—my wife has taken this fear away since she has reconciled with the Trojans—but because I see that Pilumnus in his heart surpasses the anger of his brother Turnus and is unable to rest anywhere in Italy. Now that he has crossed the Alps, he prepares to confound all things in destruction, to send the fierce Gauls into the plains of Latium before the fated day, and to overturn the foundation of great Rome with destruction.

[33–51] Therefore work for peace and for the confirmation of treaties with the Trojans. Now we need such spirit and strength as that with which we formerly contended at Troy and by the running Xanthus, and with which recently contended in the fields of Italy. With the passion of your heart you should take up the cause of the offspring of the gods and ally with him, and this
undertaking is a fitting one. Dear wife, this is your task. Great glory is reserved for you. The descendants of that union will be indebted to you for their dominion over the world. Send his divine sister and let her soothe the harsh heart of her brother with pleasing words. Inspire a better spirit and a love of peace. And then let her hasten to forestall the grief of Daunus and mitigate the future pain in his soul. The rest can be left to me alone. I will subdue the unbridled spirits of the Rutulians and their violent hearts, and I will refashion the moods and the intentions of the men. And you, Venus, inflame the inexperienced heart of the virgin with your fires. Make her love Aeneas entirely and destroy whatever remains of Turnus in her heart.”

The Gods Respond Joyfully

[52–79] Thus Jupiter spoke, and with a happy cheer and long-lasting applause the ceilings enameled with blooming crystal resound. Under their feet, Olympus trembles and strikes the stars. Nor is there less happiness among all the gods in all the heavens than if they were released from a long siege and a deadly war. Before their eyes again the fates of Pergamum and Troy pass by, and they are delighted to embrace each other and to clasp each other’s hands. To Jupiter’s delight, they agree among themselves to enter into the same treaties that Father Aeneas and Latinus had already undertaken. There had been a similar celebration among the gods during the triumph over the giants, when the children of earth had dared to heap mountains on mountains and to demolish the seats of the gods with their hands. But the omnipotent father enveloped them with the vast mountains and twisted them with lightning, head over heels, into a mass, and piled mountains on them with the peaks overturned. Such was the appearance of the heavenly hall, and concord reigned among all the gods. Juno’s expression was happier than usual. It was then that they first saw her smile at Venus, and even kiss her for the first time. Furthermore, this leads the goddess to obey the command of her husband: that she be pleased to join both races with the fateful bond of marriage and with her whole heart cherish the race that would arise from mingled blood. But Venus is happy that the will of the goddess is placated and, as a suppliant, begs pardon for her deeds. She asks that Juno favor the marriage of her son and lend aid to their momentous undertakings. Furthermore, she expresses her thanks and promises the honors which Juno deserves.

Iris’ Journey

[80–105] The goddesses depart and carry out the commands of Jupiter. The queen of the gods did not depart from her chamber, but she sends Iris to fetch Juturna. Iris slips soundlessly through the clear air, and does not color the air where she glides with a rainbow, her usual sign. She only tints her footsteps with a shadow of dew where she goes, and her path is distantly marked with glittering dewdrops. Just as when a star seems to be carried through the air, and shines, as it plows a thin furrow through the emptiness of heaven, beguiling mortal sight—it is not a star, but fire, which is compressed from the air and extinguishes itself into the empty atmosphere—and the stars stand in their places and do not change their course. Similarly, glittering Iris glides with extended wings to the shore of the Tiber and far away from the high atmosphere she notices the groans of weeping companions. For at the edge of the shore countless maids and the spirits of the fountains were gathered around the nymph who was mourning the miserable death of her brother. They were beating their breasts with their hands and were weeping. As Iris approached, the crowd rose, and all the goddesses departed. Iris paid them no attention, but consoled only the grief of the miserable goddess, and she related the commands of her mistress. Juturna with torn hair and rent clothing followed quickly after Iris, just as she was,
and stopped herself in the hall of Juno. The queen of the gods briefly expressed her pity for the fortune of the weeping goddess and the death of her brother, and then she began to speak:

**Juno Addresses Juturna**

[106–117] “Cease, I pray, Juturna, to bemoan the fate of your fallen brother. A life lived bravely is long enough for a man. This is the measure of a life. This is the summit of all labors. Jupiter measures the extent of a life by honor alone, not by years. The sons of the gods end their lives in the same way: Hercules died in the prime of his life, and the twin brothers, Castor and Pollux, died in the first flowering of their youth. Turnus’ death was better than a shameful old age. If I had been able to delay his fate, I would have. What arts would we not have attempted and what stratagems, if only Turnus had been able to deceive the fates? I did for him what I could, and he paid back what he owed.

[118–130] Briefly, understand why I called you, Juturna: Until now I opposed the Trojans and the commands of Jove with all my strength. I mixed heaven into hell and hell into heaven so that the Trojans might not acquire the kingdoms owed to them by the fates. Now I accept that I am defeated, and I yield to my husband. I repent from my hatred against the Trojans. I repent from my anger. And now Juno loves Aeneas. It has been decided to turn Troy into Latium and to mingle two races into one. Your task is now to be the mediator of Jove and the messenger of my will. Tell your brother not to renew the illicit battles and not to fight against me while relying on my power. Rather, he should attend the funeral and console his father. Advise Daunus of the same things and direct him towards peace.”

**Juturna Visits the Body of Turnus**

[131–138] Juturna obeys the commands of the goddess. She takes a coverlet from her watery cave which she had dyed artfully with various colors, and, in the form of Metiscus, enters the dwellings of Latinus. The body of Turnus was already washed with water and anointed, and lay spread out on a purple cloth, prepared for the funeral. The attendants lay hither and thither on the threshold and were sound asleep. Juturna approached the body in tears and for a long time remained stunned in silence.

[139–148] As her voice and her mind return, she cries out: “Must I see you laid low like this, dearest brother? Now at last I clearly perceive this wound, which I already foresaw when the enemy swung his arm. Then I knew that you had already fallen in a future death, and now again you die. Ah me, Turnus, your death is all too certain now. I mourned it when it was not yet certain. Now I have double the mourning for a single death. Accept this one remembrance with my tears. In this way at least allow me to remain with you as your sister: May they mix our burning ashes together.”

**Juturna’s Coverlet**

[149–173] As she was speaking, she unfolds the coverlet. Placing it on the shoulders of the man who lay there, she draws it to the foot of the bed. On the fabric she had woven scenes from the battles of the Trojans and Rutulians in order. She showed how Turnus had appeared and thrust the enemy back to the camps, and how the ships, frightened by fire, had cast off their moorings. You could see them grow fearful, submerge themselves beneath the deep water in fright, and escape from the Rutulians by changing their forms. Now the same number of ships that had stood on the shore swim about as nymphs through the sea. For a long time Turnus attacked the
enemy with different assaults and had invaded the gates. Surrounded by walls and the enemy, he battles alone against many thousands, but throws himself headlong into the river in full armor. In another part the Trojans approach in Tuscan ships and Turnus assaults their squadrons in the middle of the surf. Turnus urges all the Latin battle lines against the fearful Trojans, clad in the abundant spoils of slaughtered Pallas. While the Trojans were scattered over the whole battlefield, a false form with the likeness of Aeneas was fleeing the leader of the Rutulians. Turnus followed just as quickly. The spear trembles in his hand and he draws near to the one who flees from him. At this point Juturna’s art failed and her great grief suppressed the rest. As soon as she had done these things and had kissed her brother again and again, she poured divine perfumes over his limbs. She soaks his vitals and the bloodless veins within with the juices of ambrosia and allows the sweet fragrance to arise.

**Juturna Visits Pilumnus**

[174–181] Next, the goddess was delivering the commands of the Thunderer to Pilumnus. Pilumnus was sitting under an ancient laurel tree (from which the Latin race, whose name originally came from Latium, was called “Laurentian”). He was enjoying the coolness of morning and the dew dripping from the upper air, and he was soothing the burning passions of his heart. As he was falling asleep, overcome with weariness, his divine sister stood by him and roused him from his slumber with her familiar face and voice, throwing both her arms around his neck:

[182–191] “O image of my fallen brother, the only image which remains to me. You are now both Turnus and Pilumnus together for me—for you alone will have both names. Allow me to see your face and to hear your voice. As long as you live, may these alone be your gifts to me.” As she says this, her voice fails her. Pilumnus shakes off sleep and recognizes the face of his sister. “Why are you reporting to me,” he says, “the miserable death of my brother? O sister, I heard the tale already, and I already know much more than I need to know. I drank in his bitter funeral with my own eyes. O Juturna, let it be enough that I only grieve once.”

[192–212] She replies, “I have not come here to reopen our wounds. Rather, the queen of the gods by the orders of her great husband sent me here from high Olympus to warn you, dear boy, to bear with moderation the lot which the gods have given to you, and to grieve less wildly. It is not right that you envy the fulfilled destiny of your brother and the race which he finished with such an honorable death. Nor is it right that anyone now prepare other arms for the sake of Latium, nor take away the laurel which Turnus earned. With his hand he finished the war for you. With his own blood he confirmed the treaty desired by his fatherland. Now nothing remains: no wars, no enemies, no Trojans and Rutulians. Omnipotent Jupiter commands that all men be Latins, and that together they rule over the whole world. So, come now, put down the fury of insane Mars and give yourself over to the will of Jupiter. Queenly Juno also demands this: You must honor the funeral of your brother. You must lead the funeral procession of your brother to your father’s city. And you should console your miserable father with your presence. Return the body of your brother to old Daunus. Turnus will live for his father through you, Pilumnus, as long as it is possible.”

**Pilumnus Obeys the Commands of Jupiter**

[213–228] Juturna spoke and departed as if she had melted into a cloud. As she went, she let down fragrant drops from heaven on the face of her brother, renewed the strength in his heart,
and recalled his fleeing spirit. He sits there, witless with fear, and breathes in the air that wafts sweetly around him. As his wits return, he prays with a fearful heart in these words: “I am present, great father, and I repent from my deed. I am present, and I am prepared to obey whatever you order.” But the omnipotent father pitied him and thundered from the left of heaven. The laurel and the surrounding sanctuary trembled, and the paneled ceiling groaned in its vast vaulting. Then the young man rejoiced at the propitious pledge of the gods, and said, “Now I will not delay. I will follow these great omens.” He girds himself for the journey and collects his arms. He sends the entire escort, which he had brought with himself, to carry the unhappy news to miserable Daunus.

_Juturna visits Daunus_

[229–251] Meanwhile Juturna accomplishes the divine commands that were entrusted to her to be brought to her father. Having glided through the air, she stands before her father’s bed. She considers the words with which to address him in his distress and with what art she should approach him, so that she might be able to anticipate the outbreaks of grief which were sure to come. But he raises himself up. Leaning on the bed he speaks first and produces these words from his heart: “Why, Juturna, do you concoct vain reasons for your arrival? I know too well why you are here. In the place where you now stand, my daughter, Turnus stood and has barely left. He himself reported to me the treaty and the end of the war and his own fortunes. Drawing back the white robe from his body he exposed a vast wound in the middle of his chest and another driven through his left thigh, like twin stars and a decorous badge of battle. Do not trouble to bring empty consolations to me! Only the death of Turnus, the greatest of my pledges, will console me. He is the only remedy for my pain. Everyone has their fated day. Should Turnus have expected a more beautiful one? He alone fell in battle for the dignity of Latin power, for so many of his allies, so many citizens, and left peace and honor to his homeland. He did well to exchange his life then for such great honor.”

[252–274] Then the goddess of the lakes says, “How greatly, best father, how greatly the virtue of your soul encourages me! I tried to escape from saying the things that I needed to say because of my deep grief. But you bring them forth from your great heart, and your spirits are worthy of a king. Nevertheless, accept with your mind the commands of Jove, which he directed me to carry to you through the air. The gods have concluded that the conflict has been finished by the hand of Turnus. This praise belongs to him. Now wars are no longer waged against the hateful race of Venus, but rather against the powers of the gods. And do not allow the anger of Jupiter’s savage wife and her ancient hatred against the Trojans to deceive you. For now Juno has changed her mind. She exerts herself on behalf of the Trojans and protects the affairs of Troy, and so do all the other gods.” Juturna comforts her sad father in many more ways, telling him of the return of Pilumnus and how it happened that one brother was returned in place of another. She tells him that the funeral prepared with great effort would take place, that ambassadors from King Latinus and the Trojan leader would accompany the shade of Turnus, carrying the treaties and the records of the Ausonian fathers with gifts, and that at the same time they would comfort the bitter grief of the old man. The mind of Daunus is overcome and he freely recognizes the warnings of the gods and obeys them. Then he orders that all things be prepared for the future events and he proclaims the merited honors.

_Venus Visits Lavinia_
Meanwhile, when Venus had received her part of the mission, she fulfilled her duty with zeal. Indeed, this was the most pleasant task she could imagine. For Aeneas, this is the one reward for his labors, this is the harbor for a man who was driven by so many storms on the sea. Venus hastens, accompanied by her son Cupid. She arrives in the bedroom of the Laurentian maid, and finds her asleep, gently breathing and dreaming, because she had spent nearly the entire night sleeplessly weeping for the sad fate of her house and the troubles of the future. But now Cupid energetically scatters these images from her mind with his wings, gives her other feelings, moves her heart in other ways, and breathes into her the cheerful fires of his mother’s star. As Lavinia’s mind was changed, Venus embraced the girl with both arms. Leaning lightly over the maiden, Venus pressed her lips to the rosy lips of the sleeping girl, and teasingly inspires a thousand images into her sleep-entangled senses.

*Lavinia’s Dream*

Then Venus leads her sleeping mind far above the upper air, into the grove of Paphos and the beautiful forest valley of Idalia, where she introduces her to Aeneas as a comrade, along with the winged cupids, who, through the serene vaults of heaven, leap in different ways like dolphins, playing in various formations and scattering time and time again. Or they glide across the air with unmoved wings, or they hang in the air, having made a crown by joining their hands and their feet: an ornament woven for the head of the virgin.

Now hither they fly, now thither, and each one looks out from the high air for where he can achieve something and win a prize. It is no different in early spring, when the happy youth leave from the camps of the bees, and the buzzing battle lines pour out onto the whole field, and their boldness increases with their spoils. Through the fields, through the groves, and through the cultivated gardens they gather everything without danger, until they are full and the evening tears them reluctantly away from the fertile pastures. Another company of cupids is eager to seek after a prize. They eagerly pluck fruits hanging from the trees, looking for the ones which shine with the most gold, and they offer them to the bride. Others plunder flowers and sweet plants from the fragrant gardens. They place the cuttings in linen packs hanging from their shoulders, and as they fly they arrange the tender flowers with their hands and tie them into garlands. As soon as each cupid raises himself from sight on his nimble wings, he casts the garlands into the lap of the maiden. She is astounded but cannot catch sight of the one who gave her the gift. Another cupid who does not know how to weave wreaths, loosens his tunic and pours all the petals into the air. The harvest of fragrant spring descends from the upper air, onto the hair and the face and the snowy breasts of the girl, no differently than if flowers snowed from the entire sky.

*Lavinia and Aeneas*

But the cupids’ games, the pleasing quiet of the groves, and the agreeable retreat do not delight her as much as the happy dignity of Aeneas’ face and the joy of speaking to him. When she is in his presence, she desires that he always be present, and she rejoices to look at him, gazing on him endlessly. Every place pleases her because of Aeneas, and all the games are pleasing because of him. She is delighted now to walk together through the woods or through the cultivated trellises, and now to sit and to listen to him speaking, whether on the verdant ground or among the sweet grasses.

*Lavinia Dreams of Marriage*
So that nothing might fall short of the truth and present a false appearance, Venus shows an image of the wedding of her future daughter-in-law and reassures her mind with a more appropriate pledge. There was a myrtle tree, the shapeliest in all the garden. Just below it, the Trojan hero stood with the gentle virgin, as his golden mother stood between them and commanded the lovers, who were already united in spirit, to join their right hands in the pledge of matrimony. The solemn rituals took place with the sacred offerings, and the wedding song was worthy of a son of Venus. And indeed, the entire assembly of the gods was in attendance. Lavinia is seated at the middle of the table, with Jove at her right hand, while Juno sits to the left of Aeneas. Kindly Juno first takes up the cup and drinks to Venus, and she in turn drinks to Minerva, forgetful of the ancient judgement when her beauty was spurned. After this, happy conversation began, games, and sports, and at the table Concordia reclined, who had returned after a long time since she had been driven from heaven by the quarrel of the goddesses. Thus, Venus was feeding the wandering senses in the heart of the virgin and showed to her the joys of her wedding day.

_A New Day Dawns in Latium_

Meanwhile the darkness was scattered and the nourishing light returned, putting to flight the shadows and clouds from their spirits—a better day, which did not renew the slaughters and retreats, but brought rest from the cruelty of war and put an end to evils. Now, full of eagerness and good spirits, Messapus had relieved the night-watchmen, had strengthened the city with its usual sentinels, and had sent away the leaderless troops of Turnus from the city gates, before he returned to the royal palace. King Latinus sat on his throne, and the better part of the fathers was present. Now there was no longer any discordant sound in the temple, but the entire gathering has a single voice and expresses a single opinion. Both the Rutulians and Pilumnus demand peace and ask to be released. The king praises them and piles them with great thanks. He does not forbear from assigning each his due honor.

_Latinus Addresses the Latins_

And he said, “What rewards can I give you that are really worthy enough of your virtue? The greatest reward for each man is his own virtue and glory. Furthermore, I, Latinus, will resolve as the matter at hand demands, not as my own feelings dictate—for this is my lot. May that be sufficient for you all. If I wished to give to you, Pilumnus, a gift that equaled the merits of your brother, I would need to return your brother Turnus to you. But this is not in our power, nor even in the power of the gods, since the fates forbid it. Indeed, he would be standing before you, undefeated in arms, if his mind had not been blinded. Now then, accept Latinus in place of the brother who has been taken away, and believe that your father rules in my place, no longer I. This I pray, and I pray that you enjoy a better fate under my rule than your unlucky brother.” He spoke thus, and clung weeping to the neck of Pilumnus. After exchanging some final words, he entrusted messages to him for his dear father, Daunus.

_The Funeral of Turnus Begins_

The mighty hero Pilumnus did not restrain his tears either, but again and again thanked Latinus and promised him all that was required. He leaves the hall in tears, leaps onto his horse, and stands prepared for the funeral procession. The Rutulians followed him, one after another, mounted their horses, and presented themselves in black arms.
**Turnus Lies in State**

[387–404] Meanwhile the funeral procession advanced slowly from the citadel. The horse Actor, named after his fallen master, is led along, who only yesterday was Turnus’ favorite. The horse’s gait is no longer what it was, nor does he hold his neck and his eyes as he formerly did, nor does he mourn with black ornaments alone, but as he walks he washes his face with human tears. Turnus’ arms were nearby, his shield too, and the sword of Daunus. The leader Messapus had arranged the rest in a long train, where the road nearby led to the ancient city of Danae. Now the youth of the Rutulians raised up their king so that he could be seen by both camps, and they laid him in the open field. Turnus’ majesty did not depart with his life, but he still burns, and even from his bier he sends forth lightning, not from his shield and helmet, but from the gold of his pure breastplate, in which it was possible to see the labors of the Trojans and Rutulians, and the ancient likeness of things. Turnus still seemed to boil with new slaughter and still seemed to incite new wars. His appearance was terrifying.

**The Body of Turnus**

[404–432] The Laurentians mixed with the Trojans and the Etruscans mixed with the Rutulians poured over the whole plain. Everywhere they were eager to look at the funeral procession. Aeneas had chosen a high hill, which was near to the gate of the city and where the corpse was borne aloft. He looked at the crowds, and then turned his eyes to Turnus alone and allowed himself to look on the king of the Rutulians, whose corpse was marvelous to behold. He gazed at the face of the young man, which he had never seen, and—even more amazing—he was placated by the sight of his enemy, for such great piety and virtue shone from Turnus’ face. Nor did Aeneas fail to spot Pilumnus in the vast battle line, while he thought of Turnus. So similar was the likeness between them! Pilumnus had the same frame, and the same features as his brother. And now in the minds of the spectators the greater and more venerable specter of Turnus arose. Together they see how he was charging furiously the day before, like a swift bolt of lightning or a black whirlwind, and how now the lifeless shade of this man is carried by his companions. Each person considered how fleeting are the affairs of sorrowful mortals and how little they can be trusted. And just as when the sun is covered over by strange clouds and black night descends at midday, it tries to break through the blind darkness with its glittering rays, but it cannot and the light from the source of light fails to shine. Or just as when terrible lightning flashes from heaven, dragging its tail behind it with a dreadful bloodiness, it portends destruction or sorrowful wars for the peoples, announces the burning anger of the gods to all the lands, and each man fears a whip lashing down from heaven.

**The Funeral Procession**

[433–451] As the funeral bier is placed in the camp, a chariot sent from King Latinus arrives, fitted with a black arched roof. The horses, covered in black veils, mourn. All around, the servants tremble in black vestments. Immediately, with all funereal pageantry, the king of the Rutulians is lifted on a woven wickerwork with his bier, and placed in the middle of the chariot. King Latinus had added more gifts of gold and of bronze for the dead man who could now no longer perceive them. Messapus was assigned to lead the entire procession. The Rutulian horsemen ride in front and a few squadrons of footmen bring up the rear. The body is carried in the middle of the line. Chariots stuffed with spoils and the treasures of the dead proceed, and trophies taken from his slaughtered enemies, broken shields of men, shattered arms, and captured chariot wheels. Who would have called it a funeral, seeing that train of spoils? Who would not
believe, O Turnus, that you were leading a triumph returning from the Dardanian enemy? The brother of Turnus follows with the flower of youth and the senior captains.

**Latinus Sends Ambassadors to Daunus**

[451–461] After the funeral procession had passed from their sight, the mighty King Latinus sends ambassadors to the city of Acrisus in order to bring promises and the entreaties of the senate to Daunus and to warn him to submit gently to the peace. He himself chose twelve horses from the stables, the aethereal race that his daughter Circe had raised from the horses of the sun, mixing the seed of another stock, by the theft of a degenerate mother and with false marriage hymns. He commands them to be covered with purple cloth and embroidered tapestries, and to be given to the allied kings as pledges of friendship.

**Aeneas Sends Ambassadors to Daunus**

[462–475] Nor did Father Aeneas delay any further. As the procession of the Ausonians passes, he dismisses the captains of the Dardanians and he orders them all to forgive the harsh fates of Turnus. He advises that they console the unkind fate of Daunus and that they testify that they consider Daunus to be like a father. He sends various relics from Troy as gifts, formerly the work and sweet labors of the Trojan women: the scepter of his brother Eryx and the double crown which Acestes had saved and sent safely to Aeneas, when he had first brought the Trojans to the shores of Sicily. He adds twelve horses, the gift of Tarchon, whom the Etruscans picked as a leader for themselves when the tyrant was expelled. Their ornaments are golden and their manes are bound up with triple gold, and golden studs hang from their necks on their chests.

**Ambassadors from Latinus Arrive**

[476–485] And now the ambassadors arrived from King Latinus bearing olive branches, and they delivered the following message: King Latinus would arrive with offerings, and he willingly agrees to the treaties which the gods had sanctioned first with the blood of oxen and then with the blood of Turnus. The good general Aeneas had himself demanded these same treaties, when he shook the walls with a ram, and he accepted these same treaties when he met in battle with Turnus. Humbly, the ambassadors implore that the answers which they are to give be not too difficult to say. Aeneas replies briefly that he awaits Latinus and that he himself is prepared to agree to the same terms as those offered by the king.

**Latinus Leaves the City**

[486–495] The ambassadors had scarcely returned these answers, when the gates opened and the entire city pours out onto the field. Nowhere are there weapons or bows, but an unarmed crowd gathers around and prays for peace. Then the father of the Ausonians, arrayed splendidly in regal purple, is carried out in a four-wheeled chariot. The senate accompanies him and leaders of Latium shining with much gold. The commander, the son of Anchises, had already left the camp and awaits him on the road in a polished chariot. Next to him the boy Ascanius was sitting, and a great company of elders accompanied them.

**Latinus Addresses Aeneas**

[496–526] The chariot drew nearer, and Aeneas leaps first from the car, and with his hand helps King Latinus as he tries to descend. As they embrace, for a long time neither of them breaks the silence. Then the King begins by addressing Aeneas first: “Goddess-born—your own virtue and
the numerous certain omens of the gods prove this—I would scarcely be able to speak to you or even look at you, unless I knew of your piety and benign mind, and unless my mind was also conscious of the right. Behold, now I, who have been twice treacherous, come to you, and I, who twice broke the treaties, now demand other treaties. But I call upon you, dear son-in-law, and the betrayed gods who were present at the treaty: I was unwilling that the treaties be broken. The events were not conducted as I wished. The wicked wars were not waged under my command from the beginning until now. In vain did I possess the titles and marks of rule and I myself acted against my own life and against the heart of our people, whether it was because of the anger of the gods or the fates of Latium. My ambassadors asked for the same thing, when they were inquiring about the burial of the men slain in battle. You saw this with your own eyes, when our men broke the treaties, you saw this when you shook our walls with the ram. Now also you see the camps and the walls emptied of soldiery, the city emptied of people, and the gates open, and, in addition to these things, I myself am here in your presence with the entire kingdom, prepared to renew the broken rites of the treaty and the violated sacrifices. Look, here is the place and here are the sacred altars for the treaty. You see that they are still stained with the blood of a slaughtered bull, and still warm with yesterday’s fire. What prevents us from ratifying what has already been established by a treaty?”

_Aeneas Responds_

[527–555] When the King had ceased, the Trojan leader began to speak: “I do not wish to delay, dearest father. Let the treaties be ratified which were pleasing to you, to Turnus, and to the invoked gods. May Latinus have the highest power over both the Trojans and the Ausonians, only may Lavinia be my wife following the sacred rights. This is my highest prayer. This is the reward of my labors. For this reason, I have not just now come from my camps, but I have traveled from my homeland of Troy through so many vast seas. But it is well enough known to me that you are not the author of the war nor of the broken treaty. You have no need of witnesses. I bitterly waged war and I attacked the Lavinian walls with fire, not because I wished to expel you from the throne of your kingdom, but so that I might establish you on the throne of your kingdom. This wound will witness that I am also innocent—along with you—of the broken treaty. I received it from an arrow sent from the Rutulian side, while I unconcernedly worked for peace with an uncovered head and an unarmed right hand. I did not wage war against the Laurentian people, nor with the Rutulians themselves. Any blood that was shed seemed to come from my own heart. I mourned the fallen Laurentians that I saw as if they were so many slaughtered Trojans. Even when so many thousands were attacking me with hostile weapons, it was not pleasing for me to draw my sword against anyone. I had one enemy alone among so many enemies: that man whom Jupiter sacrificed by my arms. He alone waged the war and now he alone has finished it. Now let us happily enjoy a peace which has been well established.”

_Peace Is Concluded_

[556–568] When he had said these words, the priest repeated the solemn rites, and the kings renew the treaty through the same auspices. They decided to postpone the rites of marriage and the joys of a sacred feast, for the time when a happier day should dawn in heaven, and grief should purify the sad shades, and drive away the funerals and obsequies from their memories. They commanded that the remaining allies be borne with honor to their ancestral homes, that the Tuscan phalanxes and Arcadian cavalry be dismissed, and that Latinus send orators to the nearby cities to confirm the peace. When these things were done, the king returns to the city, and the
Trojan hero returns to the camp, after they had joined their hands one last time in the pledge of peace.
THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE AENEID

by C. Simonet de Villeneuve

Argument

After the death of Turnus, Aeneas returns his body to his people with the highest honors. Then he victoriously enters Laurentum with great fanfare. Several dutiful speeches are made by a Latin orator to Aeneas and vice versa. Aeneas meets King Latinus and receives Lavinia from him to be his bride. Celebrations take place to honor the wedding. After two years, because she is angry with the Etruscans for rendering aid to the Trojans, Juno stirs up Lauzzellus, the nephew of Mezentius, against the Etruscans and throws their kingdom into confusion. Aeneas sends Mnestheus against him and restores peace to Evander and the Etruscans. At this point, the death of Mnestheus is described. These things are made known to Aeneas in a dream. When honors have been added to the tomb of Mnestheus, he reestablishes demolished Laurentum, and gives laws and sacred rites to its citizens. After another interval of time, just as Mnestheus had foretold, he is buried in the waves. Here, short mention is made of his death, the manner of his death, and his apotheosis.

Aeneas Addresses the Trojans

[1–8] Victorious in battle, Aeneas had seen Turnus swim into the Stygian swamps, dripping with blood. Immediately, he orders that Ascanius and the Trojans be summoned. He addresses them with the following words: “My mind fluctuates with various passions. Turnus, whom I had to strike with my right hand, said to me, ‘I beg you! Return my body to my people!’ Should we now return the body to the Rutulians with a chosen band of attendants? Or should we entrust his body to the earth? O allies! What opinion now rises in your hearts?”

Ascanius Replies

[9–16] Then Ascanius spoke as follows: “Greatest leader of the Trojans, you who always have the honor of piety, you who care only for the worship of the gods: First, due honors should be paid to the shades of Turnus. Then the body should be bequeathed to the Italians. By this act of piety, you will turn the shadows of the dead away from blood. Your sons will raise this work of
piety to the stars.” Then Aeneas replied to him: “Child loved by your parent! How your words delight me! We all have the same intentions.”

The Burial of Turnus

[17–37] Scarcely had the sun pierced the middle of the sky in his orbit, when Aeneas commanded his companions to erect a tomb of great size, and to bury the enemy under a mound of earth. Then all the men press on at their task: Some stagger under loads of wood, while others cut into hard marble with repeated blows. Now one could see others placing the blocks in order. Assigned to their tasks, the young men vie to work with a greater energy. The top of the tomb now surpasses the sky, and the heavens resound with unusual shouting. Some offer libations to the ashes, others pour out great cups. Still others adorn the tomb with yew-trees and plant funereal cypresses before it. Others adorn it with myrrh and garlands. Some lead choruses, while others compose songs. A sprightly group of elders raises altars, the rest slaughter various animals, and all together they were singing songs of immortal fame to the shades. Then a distinguished phalanx was chosen and lifted up the illustrious corpse. They bore the corpse along, offering such honors as they formerly offered to Pallas. Thus, the glory of Turnus was similar. After they had departed, chariot-borne night gathered them to their assigned homes, and they slept peacefully.

The Triumphal Funeral Procession

[38–57] Not yet had dawn put to flight the shadows from the hills, when the delightful sound of drums beating and trumpets blaring can be heard. The soldiers leap from bed, put on their cloaks, rush to the standards, and there the ranks of the procession are formed. Joined by an everlasting treaty with the Trojans, the Arcadians make up the vanguard of the procession. Their artfully worked clothes flow down, the quivers hang from each of their shoulders, and their hair is knotted with gold. The clamor redoubles. The bugle plays joyful songs. The Tuscan, who

---

3 [9–16] With these words Ascanius responds: “Greatest leader of the Trojans, who always cultivated piety and who venerated the gods alone, my opinion is that appropriate prayers should be poured forth to the shade of Turnus before we return his body to the Rutulians. By this work of piety on your part, his shades will be turned away from the blood which has been shed, and our descendants will raise this work of reverence to heaven.”

4 [17–37] Scarcely had the sun in its course passed the middle of its orbit, when Aeneas orders his allies to raise up a tomb of great size, and to place the body of Turnus within it. All of them apply themselves to their work. One group stagers under a load of oak. Another group cuts hard marble with repeated blows. It is possible to see others placing stones in order. The young men who had received their work by lot apply themselves to the work with a vigorous attitude. The tomb is so tall that its summit surpasses the sky. The air resounds with an unusual clamor. One group offers many libations to the ashes. Another pours out wine. Some adorn the tomb with yew trees, while others plant funereal cypresses. Some adorn it with myrrh, others with flowers. Some dance, while others sing. The greatest part slaughter various animals to the shades. A group of elders who are still youthful build altars to the shades of Turnus. All together sing immortal praises to the shades. Then a phalanx was collected and assigned to the proud corpse, raises it, and while it carries it, renders such honors to it that each one would say that glory was rendered to Turnus in a similar way to the glory that was formerly rendered to Pallas. After those who were ordered to bear the corpse departed, Night, borne on her two-horse chariot, compels those who remain to return to their assigned houses and sleep sweetly.

5 v. 42. They are called Arcadians because they came to Pallanteum from Arcadia which is situated in the middle of the Peloponnese, as can be read in 10.165ff. [This appears to be an incorrect citation. Villanova may be thinking of 8.51–54.]
formerly aided the Trojans with troops and resources, rejoice to sit in the middle of the phalanx, and their purple-crested young men glitter with gold and reflect various colors in the shimmering sun. The advancing Trojans make up the rear of the triumphal procession. They are exceptional in form, and all marvel at their form. At a distance from them, among the divided crowds, the Trojan hero appears. A Thracian horse carries him, champing its yellow bit between its teeth. Proud of its mighty burden, the horse strikes the ground with his hoof. His mane tosses and plays over his neck and shoulders.6

Invocation of the Muses

[58–68] Tell me, Pierian Muses—for it is appropriate that the gods speak—tell me of the glory of the face of Aeneas, the elegance of his expression, how his hand turns the frothing mouth of his fierce horse by its bridle. Tell me of the countenance of his people and their songs! Never did a more graceful warrior march in procession! Indeed, his mother breathes propitious dignity into his eyes. Never did greater nobility shine from his brow. One could believe that he bears the face and expression of Mars! What diligence does he show in curbing his horse! Not with a reckless hand does Helios restrain or relax the reins for his horses, nor does the god of the deep sea turn his steeds in such a way.7

Triumphal Entry of Aeneas

[69–81] Poet, what do you wish to say? What were the joys of the Trojans? There was a single joy for those who had experienced until now the calamities and the angers of Juno: Now their hearts forget their labors. The Trojans sing happy songs to their king, who brought them to the happy shores and who risked his own light for glory. Among these cheers and accompanied by the honor of horsemen, he passes the watchmen, who guard the outer gates with armed soldiery, and who block the inner gates with drawn swords. Now like a triumphant general he enters the walls of the Laurentians. The young and the old pour forth and fill the path with shouting. An

---

6 [38–57] Not yet had dawn put to flight the shadows from the mountains, when the delightful sound of drums beating and the sound of trumpets can be heard. Each soldier rises from bed, and clad in his military garment, takes a place under his standard. The procession was formed in this order: The Arcadians, joined by an eternal treaty with the Trojans, support the first line of the procession. Their clothing is very artfully worked and hangs from their shoulders. Each one also wears a quiver. Their hair is tied up with golden circlets. A great shout is heard and the trumpet utters happy songs. The Tuscans who formerly came to help the Trojans, are placed in the middle of the procession. Their purple-crested youth reflect light and are shining because of the gold. From the crests various colors are reflected when the sun strikes each. The order of the triumph is completed by the advancing Trojans. Since they are so distinguished in form, all admire their beauty. Among them, at a distance, Aeneas appears in the divided crowds. A Thracian horse carries him, champing yellow gold in his teeth. He is proud of his burden and strikes the ground with his feet. His mane flows and plays about his neck and flanks.

7 [58–68] Muses speak to me, for indeed the gods ought to speak: What majesty was on the forehead of Aeneas, and what grace was on his expression, what dexterity in turning the mouth of his horse that was foaming at the bit? Tell me what the expressions of the people were and what songs they were singing. Never did a more beautiful soldier set out to march—for his mother breathed luxuriant honors in his eyes. Never did a greater nobility appear on the face of anyone. He appeared to have the face and expression of Mars. He was very industrious in restraining his horse, for the Son does not release and relax the reins of his horses with a reckless hand, nor does the god of the deep turn away his horses.
orator comes to meet him, who shook his hand according to the Latin custom and poured forth such a speech from his heart.\textsuperscript{8}

[82–89] “Goddess-born, may the immortals grant you a path free from danger! At last you are here to form everlasting covenants, you who were so long awaited! Behold, may you accept this picture inlaid with gold and ivory, brought recently from India to the king of the Ausonians. The offspring of Faunus recognizes you as a friend with this gift. Immediately Latinus desires to praise the virtue of your soul and the rewards owed for your great merits, and he longs to embrace you. Your presence will take away his cares.”\textsuperscript{9}

[90–103] Aeneas replied: “What thanks can I render to the king for choosing you, who first brought from your mouth to me the words of safety and loaded me with gifts in his name? Orator, you have always had a marvelous prudence in ambiguous situations. When the huge weight of the kingdom hangs motionless, you are the only care of the king. When war arises, you rise first in arms. When the wars become quiet, you compel the fatherland to remember you through your dutiful actions. Which should I admire more, your labors in war or your labors in peace? Happy is the king to whom fate granted that you live in his kingdom! Accept these diamonds, a pledge of our firm friendship. On them is engraved what power the princes had, and what treasures Troy possessed, as long as the kingdoms of Troy remained. May fortune follow you to Olympus!”\textsuperscript{10}

\textit{Entry into Laurentum}

[104–113] Aeneas said no more. Thoughtfully he approaches the flowing hall of the king, wondering at the vast roof, supported on high by a hundred columns, where a painting that faces the very vestibule shone in all directions. The rows of steps shine with bronze inlaid with ivory.

\textsuperscript{8} [69–81] What, O poet, do you hope? To say what were the joys of the Trojans? Those who had experienced until now many misfortunes and the anger of Juno, now their hearts had forgotten their cares, and now the Trojans address favorable things to the king, who brought them to the blessed shore and wished by a pact to exchange his life for peace and honor. Amid this tumult Aeneas passes by the guards, keeping at his side the honored horsemen. The guards keep watch at the outer gates, and then he passes the guards who protect the inner gates with unsheathed swords. After he enters the walls of Laurentum in triumph, both the young and the old run to meet him, filling the streets with shouts. An ambassador comes to meet him, and mingling hands with hands in the custom of the Latins, he pours out the following things from his heart:

\textsuperscript{9} [82–89] “Aeneas, born from a goddess, may the Gods give a happy path to you. Now long expected you come to our lands to unite an eternal treaty and peace. Behold, a painting made from gold and ivory. This recently was brought to my king from India. May you accept it. By this gift, the son of Faunus confesses that you are a friend. Latinus the king desires to embrace you and to say to you how your virtue is imprinted in his mind, and what rewards are owed to your so many and such great merits. Your presence will scatter away all his cares.”

\textsuperscript{10} [90–103] Aeneas responded to these things with many compliments: “What thanks can I say to the king, since he selected you to be the first to give pleasing words of safety to me, and in his name you pile me with gifts. O orator, in whom wonderful prudence shines forth in ambiguous things, by whom the entire massive weight of the kingdom is immovably propped up. You are the only care of the king when you rise first to take up weapons as war threatens. You are the one who, when wars quiet down, compels the fatherland never to forget you by your services. I do not know whether I should admire your labors in peace or war. Happy is the king to whose kingdom fortune wished you to be added. Take this diamond, which is a pledge of my everlasting friendship. On it is engraved the power which the Trojan leaders had when Priam was reigning. Here you will see what riches Troy formerly possessed. May fortune follow you to the sky.”
Jewels were everywhere, and twisted gold reflects the crystal in the paneled ceiling. The king of the Ausonians is prominent, resting on his throne and in his right hand carrying the emblems of his office which he had inherited from his ancestors. His temples were ornamented by victorious laurels. Densely packed, man on man defended him, and impatiently blazed about the echoing halls.11

Aeneas Addresses Latinus

[114–140] Finally, Aeneas passed through the cloud [of attendants], approached the King, knelt, and spoke: “Delight of the gods, king, and desire of the earth! By the command of fate, you alone are now the lord of the globe! You are the epitome of justice, whether you wage war or peace! By this Trojan heart, the hearts of the Trojan men beg for eternal peace. May the same law bind both the Trojans and the Latins and may our altars blaze with fires. May piety grant that it will never be painful to remember! But as for me—whom the Trojans have never seen defeated, although I was driven by diverse misfortunes and by a hostile goddess—now I approach your majesty as a suppliant, as if I have committed a crime. It is reported that haughty Turnus has fallen, and by my right hand he is said to have been thrust into the waters of the Styx. Indeed, I yield, and do so in good faith. But what I have done was the crime of a lover, and there is no guilt in this offense! Or was it preferable to abandon my dowry which I sought on the unwilling sea, and [allowed Turnus] to pluck the flowers from the virginal lap, not [even permitted] to the gods, and to have abandoned my undertaking in defeat? Your great example and my knowing virtue and the figure of the princess coming in a divine body—these things compel a love which was offended by the blood of my enemy. Who has not been inflamed by the glory of such things? Furthermore, the seers have already spoken in their songs that there would not be marriage with the Latins, that the queenly consort would be joined with a foreigner who would land on the shores of the Tiber.12 Therefore, if Turnus has now received any injury, it is by the hand of the fates.13

11 [104–113] Aeneas said nothing more, but reflectively arrives at the hall of the king, which was surging with an excessive multitude of men, like a wave. In it he admires the huge roof, supported on high by a hundred columns. Before the vestibule a painting spread out on all sides greatly shines forth, and a series of steps of mixed bronze and ivory shine. Gems are scattered everywhere, and vacillating crystals reflect the gold on the ceiling. Under this roof, the king of the Ausonians appears, leaning on his throne, and carrying in his right hand the marks of his ancestors. He is adorned with a victorious laurel about his brows. Men densely packed with each other protect him, and impatiently desire to approach the empty halls surrounding him.

12 v. 157. Aeneas testifies to the oracles formerly made about his marriage with Lavinia. For these were made regarding him by Faunus, as can be seen in book 5 and in the verses 96 and following.

“Seek not to ally your daughter in Latin wedlock,
Strangers will come to be your offspring, who will bear our
Name to the stars by their blood.”

[Villanova refers to 7.96, 98–99, and again provides an incorrect citation. The note also is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.137, not 13.157.]

13 [114–140] Aeneas finally approached the king, and, having penetrated the crowd of attendants, with his knee bent to the earth, thus speaks: “King, love of the gods, and desire of men, now by the will of fate you alone are made judge of the earth. You are most just whether you make war or peace. The Trojans, by this Trojan heart of mine, beg you to ratify eternal peace. They beg that the same law apply both you them and to your people, and that the altars burn with the same fires and smoke with the same incense. If your goodness grants these things, I affirm that they will never forget you because of them. The Trojans never saw me overthrown, although I was plagued by various misfortunes and a hostile goddess—I come as a suppliant to your majesty, as if I committed a crime. They say that
[141–150] Great-souled hero! May I alone be lucky enough to join my right hand with the hand of your daughter, and to listen with a thankful countenance as you recount your labors again and again. I am touched by this honor, and how you rule the hitherto unconquered nation and the fierce tribes in tranquil peace. If you accept my love and give me your daughter as a wife, in my eyes you will be the greatest among mortals and gods. The queen will always be my delight, nor ever will she claim that I have violated the faith that she has given me. I swear by you, Penates, and my future race, whose fame will reach the stars.”

Latinus Responds to Aeneas

[151–164] Thus Latinus responded: “The king of the Ausonians is not allowed ingloriously to contravene your deeds, your loyalty, and the gods. May you be blessed, and welcome, pious man, as the second hope of the kingdom! What could your right hand not achieve by hoping? Imperiously may it impose laws hereafter on land and on sea. In the war, it destroyed an enemy who had not been defeated. The gods have not ever gained anything more delightful than this treaty. May the city founded in Latium be the greatest of your kingdom! I accept you as my son-in-law. Lavinia is your wife. I will treat Trojans and Italians without difference. The Ausonians will understand your words as commands. Now as an old man happily and willingly I leave the scepter to you. May it be the will of the almighty that you rule over unknown lands, and may he protect your dear wife and beloved children!”

---

14 [141–150] Great-hearted among heroes: May I alone be lucky enough to join my right hand with the hand of your daughter, and to listen with a thankful countenance as you recount your labors again and again. I am touched by this honor, and how you rule the hitherto unconquered nation and the fierce tribes in tranquil peace. If you accept my love and give me your daughter as a wife, in my eyes you will be the greatest among mortals and gods. The queen will always be my delight, nor ever will she claim that I have violated the faith that she has given me. I swear by you, Penates, and my future race, whose fame will reach the stars.”

Latinus Responds to Aeneas

[151–164] Thus Latinus responded: “The king of the Ausonians is not allowed ingloriously to contravene your deeds, your loyalty, and the gods. May you be blessed, and welcome, pious man, as the second hope of the kingdom! What could your right hand not achieve by hoping? Imperiously may it impose laws hereafter on land and on sea. In the war, it destroyed an enemy who had not been defeated. The gods have not ever gained anything more delightful than this treaty. May the city founded in Latium be the greatest of your kingdom! I accept you as my son-in-law. Lavinia is your wife. I will treat Trojans and Italians without difference. The Ausonians will understand your words as commands. Now as an old man happily and willingly I leave the scepter to you. May it be the will of the almighty that you rule over unknown lands, and may he protect your dear wife and beloved children!”

---

14 [141–150] Great-hearted among heroes: May I alone be lucky enough to join my right hand with the hand of your daughter, and alone may I hear you speaking to me with a pleasing mouth of your labors. By this desire I am inflamed and in which way you will rule through tranquil time over nations that are so far unconquered, and over fierce peoples. If you will allow my love, if you will entrust the bed of Lavinia to me, you will always be for me the greatest among gods and men. The queen alone will always be my delight, nor will she reproach me that I violated the faith that I received. I call to witness the Penates, and my offspring to come, whose fame will reach the stars.”

15 vv. 157ff. Upon reading the reasons for which Latinus is persuaded to give Lavinia to Aeneas as a wife, there seem to me to be five: First, he acknowledges Latinus as ruler of the world. Second, he implores that there be one and the same law and religion. Third he justifies the death of Turnus, having called to witness his example and virtue, and the overwhelming beauty of Lavinia. Fourth he reminds him that the fates speak on his behalf. And fifth he promises with a solemn oath that his faith and love for his wife will remain eternally inviolate. All these reasons are enough to court the dignity and piety and authority and virtue of King Latinus, and for this reason compel him to concede to Aeneas all that he seeks.

16 [151–164] Thus Latinus responded: “It is not permitted that the king of the Ausonians should go without glory against your deeds, and your faith, and the gods. May you be happy, and may you come in glory, you, the other hope of the kingdom! What was your right hand unable to hope for? What laws will it not impose on land and on sea? Since in a remarkable battle it has just laid low an enemy hitherto unconquered, the God have established nothing more pleasing than this treaty which you seek. May the city of Laurentum which I founded be the most beloved of
Aeneas Sees Lavinia

[165–180] After he had said these things, he undertakes to summon the princess. She approaches in the midst of beautiful women, she herself more beautiful than they, as once upon a time the Cyprian mother presented herself, so that the shepherd, who was judge, conceded the gold as a gift to her as the more preferable. On her brow sits grace and charm and an assembly of loves. A single circlet lets down and holds up her flowing hair. A delicate robe flows back from her shoulders. Should Aeneas stop looking at her? Or should he approach closer? Aeneas was uneasy, astounded with doubt, and ignorant of himself! He shudders at the marvelous power of love’s deeply impressed fire! He is confused. His senses are vacant and directionless. He begins to speak and stops in the middle of his speech. “You are my light,” he says, and slowly he falls motionless on her ivory neck. Then with a wandering eye he desires all the delights of his wife, everything right and everything wrong.17

Lavinia Speaks to Aeneas

[181–191] The worthy woman raised him up from where he had pressed himself to her breast, and she speaks: “If you are captured with too much desire by my fragile form, what nourishment does your famous virtue not give to love? What of your divine birth? Am I not yielded to you? It is possible that I am united in the conjugal bond, with him whom a great number of goddesses would not consider an unworthy lover! O three and four times blessed, that I am the wife of a deified hero! But may a happier fortune befall me! May it be pleasing to Juno to grant me a race of children, who someday will be able to resemble you in appearance and deeds!” They speak passionately to each other with similarly charming words.18

Latinus Addresses Ascanius

your kingdom. I recognize you as a son-in-law. Lavinia, my daughter, will be your wife, and Ausonians and Trojans will be equal to me. Whatever will come from your mouth my people will receive as my commands. Now having reached a great old age I willingly and happily hand over the scepter to you. Jupiter has established that you will rule among the nations unknown to our lands, and may he preserve my beloved daughter and your dear offspring.”

17 [165–180] When he had spoken these things, he orders that the queen be summoned. She approaches in the midst of beautiful nymphs, herself more beautiful than they. She presents herself as Venus formerly did on Mount Ida, when the shepherd Paris, named judge, was compelled to give the golden apple to the shapeliest of the goddesses. On her forehead is grace and charm, and a great multitude of loves were playing. A single circlet partly allows her hair to fall, and partly gathers it up. A delicate robe wanders along her shoulders. At the sight of her, Aeneas is unsure whether he ought to retreat or go forward. He is stupefied at this hesitation. He does not know himself any longer. He is confused. He is full of fear and joy. His senses are vacant and without direction. He begins to say, “How great is the fire of love impressed in the depths of my heart,” and then he stops in the middle of his speech. “You are my life,” he says, and slowly falls motionless on her ivory neck. Then with a trembling and wandering gaze he desires the delights of his wife, both all that is right, and what is wrong.

18 [181–190] His dearly beloved wife raises him from where he was pressed to her neck, and proceeds to speak: “If by my fragile form you are captured with too much desire, what assistance will your illustrious virtue not give to my love? What should your celestial origin not dare to hope? A man wishes to marry me whom the greatest crowd of goddesses do not disdain to take as a lover. I should be called happy and blessed because I am the bride of a demigod! But so that my fate might be more blessed, let us call Juno to witness, that she deem at length to grant us children who might be able to be similar to you, both in appearance and in deeds.”
[192–216] The king calls Ascanius and congratulates him on being a constant companion to his son-in-law among both storms and warfare, and he urges him to protect his father and stepmother from domestic dangers. He says, “I would not give you a golden mantle nor javelins engraved with symbols, nor a helmet which is ringed with gold interwoven with topaz, a glory and a protection in battle. Nor does it please me to give you a horse, which is proud of its speed and its markings. Now accept this final gift from an old man! Behold, the annals of your father, which concern the time when the power of Turnus remained, as well as his deeds after Turnus was conquered. Born from the Laurentian nymph and the god Faunus, I received it. Faunus is the author of this glorious poem. With a humble mind consider these great gifts of the gods. Since Jupiter will be unhappy with your descendants, its fame will be hidden in obscurity. But Mnestheus will accept the mission to drive away Lauzellus from the kingdom of Evander, and he will urge you to lend him this chronicle. You will acquiesce, but he will be killed in an unfair conflict, his shoulders will be stripped, and the books be mangled in the flames, or they will be the playthings of the swift winds. When nine hundred years will have passed by in these lands, our descendants will report that Virgil sang about your father and his allies in the days when Turnus ruled in Italy. And after Titan bathes the earth in light for five hundred lustra, someday Villanova will claim the deserved honor to have sung of the deeds of Aeneas after the funeral of the leader Turnus. But when Jove is peaceful, Faunus will teach both poets.

The Chronicle of Faunus

[217–238] In this chronicle you will read of the fires of renowned Troy, the causes of the flames, and how, through the ravaging flames on every side, Aeneas, unharmed, led his men in safety to the mountain. You will read about hostile Juno and her avenging angers, how many labors your father Aeneas endured on land and on sea, how, with his goddess mother favoring him, he

---

19 v. 205. Lauzellus, who is spoken of here, is imagined to be the grandson of Mezentius, who was driven by anger against Evander, because he formerly gave council to Aeneas to attack the kingdom of his grandfather. At length he will rise and besiege Pallanteum. But Mnestheus will be chosen by Aeneas, to bring troops and supplies to Evander, and liberate him from the siege. These things will be narrated at length in vv. 368ff.

20 v. 210. Here the chronology is accurately observed, since from the death of Turnus to the foundation of Rome 333 years elapsed, as can be seen in 1.273–277, and from the foundation of Rome to Augustus 690 years passed, and from Augustus to Louis XIV 1600 years.

21 [191–216] King Latinus calls Ascanius and congratulates him on being a constant companion to his son-in-law both in wars and in storms. He urges him to protect his father and stepmother from domestic grievances. He says, “I will not give you a golden cloak, nor spears which are rough from the engravings which are inscribed on them. Nor will I give you a helmet, around which is overlaid gold interwoven with topaz, which nonetheless is a gift in war, both a great ornament and a great assistance. Nor will I offer you a horse which is notable for its speed and the starry markings on its face. But accept this gift of an old man. They are the annals of your father, [recording] his deeds when Turnus was reigning and after Turnus was conquered. I received these, born from a Laurentian nymph and the god Faunus. Faunus is the author of this celebrated book. With a humble mind read these great gifts of the gods. For Jove will be angry with your children, and these annals will be hidden in the obscurity of time. For Mnestheus will be commanded in a short time to expel Lauzellus from the kingdom of Evander. He will urge you to give him this volume. You will acquiesce. But when he is killed by wicked fates, and his shoulders are stripped, the book will be mangled, burned, and become the plaything of all the winds. When nine hundred years will have passed, our ancestors will say that Virgil sang of your father and his allies when Turnus was still reigning. But when the son will have shone on the earth for two thousand and five hundred years, Villanova will claim the honor for himself to have sung of the deeds of Aeneas and his companions after the death of Turnus. But when Jove is peaceful, my father Faunus will teach both the poets these annals.
reached the stronghold of Carthage, and how wrathful and how great was Dido’s love for him. You will read how he remained unyielding to the tears and prayers of the queen. Then you will read of the sad fate of Anchises and the games which took place soon after his funeral, and the rewards which the victors saw, how at the command of Apollo he descended to the shades of Erebus by traversing the path, and the entire race of shades was stupefied. Carried beyond the seething shallows of Circe’s mountain, he landed here at these shores by a favorable wind. You will read how Aeneas was promised to my daughter and how Turnus took up arms, by what trickery the wife of Jupiter stirred up passions, how in vain the Ausonians attempted to utterly overturn the citadels of New Troy when the walls were constructed. You will read of the sad deaths of Nisus and Euryalus, the siege of Laurentum, and the defeat of Turnus in a single battle, and the illustrious deeds of your father, until it is right for him to take a place at the tables of the gods.”

Fireworks and Fountains

[239–259] After he unsealed for Ascanius what was closed between the covers, the king celebrated the lawful marriage. Not far from the stone tomb which encircles the ancestors, a tall, distinguished forum is discerned. In that place a tall mound rises, and shines, thick set with unconquered statues. Then Pallas, Victory, and Mars were vying to crown Aeneas and his allies with wreaths and laurels. On the right side a gnashing lion rushes, from his mouth through the middle of the air are carried shafts and fires. On the left side a hundred-headed dragon with a hundred mouths. He spewed and re-spewed a thousand rockets with nitrous powder. With such force the rockets were hurled to the sky, that the eyes of the spectators could scarcely follow them. They leapt from the ground, and amassing like stars on all sides, glided down headlong. Elsewhere, the flashing repeated and the living splendor springs forth, and a sphere whirls around—and anyone would venture to say that suns were rising. In the middle, with a shining

---

22 [217–238] There you will read of the fires of renowned Troy, the causes of the flames, and how with the flames spread out on all sides, Aeneas safely led his men unharmed to the mountain. You will read of hostile Juno and the vindictive anger of Juno, and how Aeneas endured many labors on land and sea, with Venus aiding him, until he came to the walls of Carthage. You will read how the love of Dido raged for him, and how he unyieldingly resisted her tears and prayers. Then, the sad fates of Anchises, and the games that were famously celebrated at his tomb, and the rewards which were dedicated to the victors, and how, when Apollo ordered, he descended to the shades by wandering through the Elysian fields, and how the entire race of shades was stupefied, and how by a favorable wind he arrived here, sailing past the mountain of Circe. You will read how, when Aeneas was promised to my daughter, with what force Turnus took up arms, and with what treachery Juno confused his loves, so that the Rutulians in vain attempted to tear down the citadels of New Troy that had only been recently constructed. You will learn of the sad death of Euryalus and his friend Nisus. You will read of my city Laurentum occupied by a siege, Turnus killed in a famous battle, and the illustrious deeds of your father until he is taken up to the Gods.”

23 v. 240. This should be understood as the ancestors of Latinus, not of Aeneas, since we do not read that the ancestors of Aeneas had to this point spent any time in Latium. [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.246–241 not 13.240.]

24 v. 264. Many people censure this description of fireworks, saying that at the time of Aeneas there were no fireworks; nor is there any mention of them in Virgil. But I absolve myself from this poetic license as follows: since Virgil wrote many descriptions of games, I did not want to become a plagiarizer through repetition. Nor should this be displeasing to the reader, especially with the explanation given that Jupiter forbade men the use of these fires for many years [13.265–268]. [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.246–255 not 13.264.]
body stood a swan. Here with compressed Jove, through a thousand spouts it hissed masses of wine and honey, and now the dripping fountain leaps and returns crosswise in a double spring.

The Happy Youths

[260–264] Now it is delightful to see the innocent youths frolicking. Some of them drink wine from their palms with greedy mouths. Others lie their heads back and drink from each fountain. All of them together toast to the occasion with a cheer. The roads resound with happiness, games, and applause.

The Masked Ball

[265–298] After the fireworks were finished—which Jove wished to remain unknown for many ages, lest their use grow worse through the slaughter of men and animals—they retire to the royal halls. The interiors of the house shine with a different lamp, the golden posts on the high festive couches shine with variegated purple and gold. They wonder at the tapestries made with the unconquered deeds of their parents. Here it is pleasing to set choruses in motion, and with

---

25 v. 255. *Here a swan is chosen instead of other birds, because the swan was sacred to Venus, the mother of Aeneas, and a poet always ought to represent the things which pertain to the hero.* [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.256, not 13.255.]

26 v. 258. *“Jove” is used instead of “air,” as is often found in other sources.* [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.257, not 13.258.]

27 [239–259] After Latinus explained what was contained in this book, he ordered that the lawful wedding rituals be celebrated. Near the tomb which is made of stone and encircles the ancestors of Latinus, a high and illustrious forum can be seen. There a high mound appears and shines, set thickly with unconquerable statues: Victory, Mars, and Pallas vie to crown Aeneas and his allies with flowers. On the right a lion rushes, gnashing with his teeth, and from his mouth through the midst of the air, like bundles of grain, are borne many fires and shafts. On the left, a dragon with a hundred mouths and a hundred heads vomits and spews a thousand rockets stuffed with nitrous powder. The rockets are carried to the sky with such force that the eyes of the spectators can scarcely follow them. When they fall to earth, you would think that stars, amassed on all sides, were falling. From other rockets living splendor springs forth with a connected flash, and brilliant circles as the winds shift, so that each spectator would imagine and was able to say that suns were rising. In the middle a swan with a white body stood. Here, with compressed air, through many mouths it hissed out loads of wine and honey. A dripping rain fell and returned in a double stream through connecting apertures.

28 [260–264] Now it is pleasing to see the young men, harmless as birds. Some of them drink from their palms with greedy mouths. Others lying down with their heads turned back drink draughts from each fountain. With a shout they all toast together to the festive day. The roads resonate from the happiness and games and applause.

29 v. 267 [?]. *It appears to be true (if not wholly true) that those fireworks were able to have been in use. Poets can use the appearance of truth, as Horace points out in the *Ars poetica* (338): “May things invented for the sake of pleasure be close to what is true.” Furthermore, Persius in his Satires (5.179–181) suggests that on festive days fires were placed especially in the windows: “But when the days of Herod come, and the lamps arranged on the oiled window spew out a fatty cloud.” They are using lamps. Why are they not artificial? Both can be constructed from the same material.* [This note is not numbered, and follows immediately after the note labeled v. 296, but clearly explains 13.265–267.]

30 v. 269. *Aulea is substituted for auleis through hypallage and transposition of the case.* [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.271, not 13.269.]
melodious chords it is possible to make well-ordered and gentle motions. The participants of the ball were arranged in a threefold seating order: The interior circle is reserved for Ascanius, the king, the father-in-law, and his daughter. The next circle is reserved for the Trojan nobles, and illustrious women with claims to noble blood. The following circle is for all the others who come to the wedding. All the masks were accepted without distinction. Only King Latinus, who was too old, did not represent a persona. Aeneas put on the clothing and the face of Bacchus. He held bowls in his hands and his temples were crowned with ivy. By her walk, the adornment of her hair, and the arrangement of her dress, the queen masqueraded as someone born from the blood of Minos. Ascanius did not forget that Love had once thought it fitting to feign his appearance, and he happily puts on a quiver as he snatches up the bow of Cupid. Like black men, some spoil their faces with a dusky color, or the huge back of a Gaetulian lion hangs from their shoulders and a spear is girded to their side. Others are illustrious with their feathers, or much silk, and they proclaim themselves to be Gauls through their cloaks and trousers. Their advance is noble, and their demeanor displays excellent form, their wit is exuberant, their actions are graceful. Others march in a very stately fashion with their heads held high. They advance. Their hair is bound behind their temples and their breastplates are tight-fitting, with gauntlets extended above their arms. They carry swords of three-arms’ length and look convincingly Spanish.

Lavinia Dances

[299–304] Next to the bridegroom, Lavinia leads the choruses. She dances with a thousand motions and turns herself in various circles. She advances her step and returns. She moves to the right and then to the left, and changes her step to the numbers and measures. Her step is light, and her body balanced as her foot strikes the earth. The festive excellence of her movement is delightful.

---

31 v. 284. The reader may read of this change magnificently described in 4.664ff. [Villanova clearly refers to 1.657–663.]

32 [265–298] After the fireworks were finished—which Jove wished to remain concealed for many ages, so that their use might not be turned to evil by the bloody slaughter of men and animals—they go to the palace. The internal parts glow with various lamps, the golden bedposts above the high festive couches shine. They admire the famous deeds of the ancestors woven into the tapestries with gold and purple. Here it is pleasing to dance and to produce ordered and gentle motions with resounding chords. Those who are going to dance are distinguished by a threefold order: The interior places are reserved for Ascanius, Aeneas, Latinus, and Lavinia. The circle nearer to the interior is reserved for the nobles and noble matrons. Seats placed behind are offered to any others who arrive, and all those wearing masks are received without distinction. Since Latinus was old, he did not put on a costume. Aeneas put on the clothing of Bacchus and simulated his appearance, holding cups in his hands and binding ivy around his temples. By her walk, her arranged hair, and her appropriate dress, Lavinia feigns that she is born from King Minos. Ascanius remembered that formerly Cupid thought it worthy to assume his appearance, and, wishing to return in kind, he took up a bow and the quiver of Cupid. Others in the likeness of Moors have their faces spoiled with a black or sooty color. A huge back of a lion from Gaetulia hangs from their backs, and a spear is girded to their sides. Others are adorned with plumes and copious silk, or by their cloak or trousers proclaim themselves to be Gauls. Their advance is distinguished. Their bodies are noble and strong. There is much wit both in words and in deeds, as well as much grace. Others approach very solemnly and with their heads erect. Their hair is hidden behind their ears, their breastplates are drawn tight, their gauntlets are extended above their upper arms, and their swords are three arms long. They look convincingly Spanish.

33 [299–304] Alongside her husband, Lavinia begins the choruses, turns herself in a thousand motions, and bends herself into a thousand circles. She goes by one step and returns by another, and now she circles first to the right and
Augury and Consummation

[305–317] Among this joyousness, behold, a frightening bird with lightning enters the window, which was open because of the excessive heat of the dancing. It flew around the circumference of the room with many circlings. It hovers over the heads of the married couple and there are shadows beneath its wings. Aeneas salutes the augury with a happy shout. He ends the merrymaking and when everyone is dismissed, he heads for the inner rooms accompanied by his wife. Latinus joins the company and the servants follow. When their clothes are removed, the king prays for good and prosperous things. All of them hope for new offspring. No more. They depart. Impatient for intercourse the couple enter into the bedchamber. Aeneas marvels at the beauty of his wife in her ivory-white form. Inflamed anew, all his desires are directed to one goal alone.

The Golden Rule of Aeneas

[318–327] Happy with his lot, Aeneas’ intention was to make the years happy for his citizens and procure advantages for the foreign race. He was a very strict opponent of tributes and taxes. He imposed none. He did not offer a free ear to vultures. He commanded into exile those who spoke flatteries and those who were destructive of the fatherland and did not honor them in the slightest. Those who had the power to lead battalions and squadrons, the leaders clad in purple, and those who held the first places in the senate were not advanced by special pleading or trickery. Conspicuous piety and well-proved virtue sustained them.

then to the left, and then she moves to the music, and now to the chords. The festive excellence of her motion is delightful, whether she strikes the earth with a foot raised or with her balanced body.

34 v. 313. “Impatient of Venus” is used here in imitation of Virgil’s phrase, “impatient of a wound,” which is found in 11.639. Too much love or love that is too intense becomes a wound and a suffering. Also see Ovid in the Fasti: “Earlier I was soft and impatient of labor.” [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.315, not 13.313. Villanova also incorrectly attributes the line from Ovid to the Fasti. It is found in Tristia 3.2.10.]

35 [305–317] Among these joys, an eagle enters the window, which was opened because of the excessive heat inside. The eagle, tired out from many circlings and different revolutions to many places, hovers over the heads of the married couple and shadows them with its wings. With a happy shout Aeneas salutes this omen, makes an end to the merrymaking, and when all are dismissed, with his wife he goes to the inner chambers of the house. His father-in-law Latinus accompanies them and the servants follow. When their clothes are removed, all of them pray for a number of children, and all hope for many children. Without saying more they depart. Both of them, burning with desire, hurl themselves into bed. Aeneas admires the beauty in the ivory body of his wife and is inflamed with new fire. After many pleasurable preludes, he directs all his desires to one end.

36 v. 315. In these verses someone will accuse me of diverging from the dignity and elegance of Virgil. But, since it deals with a bride, these verses should not appear more dissolute or licentious than those which are read in book 8, when Venus asks Vulcan to make arms for her bastard Aeneas: “Having spoken these words, he gave her the desired embrace, and, pouring out into the lap of his wife, sought quiet sleep in every limb.” [8.404–406] The phrase “in every limb” clearly has a whiff of obscenity.

37 [318–327] Content with his lot, Aeneas desires to look out for the advantage and happiness of the citizens, and to deliver a Saturnian age to the foreign race. He was the bitterest enemy both of taxes and tributes. He never imposed any. Nor did he listen uselessly to leeches, but he wished these pestilences of the fatherland and flatterers to be wanderers and exiles, and to be admitted to no dignities or at least to the fewest. Those to whom he was giving military command, those who were advanced to the higher offices, and those who were seated among the first
[328–343] Under these auspices the people were spending their days safely in tranquil peace under fair laws. They had the desire and intention to drive nimble deer into nets and to hunt wild animals and lay snares in the woodland passes. Early in the morning the farmers were leading young bulls to the plows, and when the sun fell, they led them back. There were no tricks or frauds. Since Pomona was unafraid, the fertile trees were clothing themselves in fruit, and the gourd was extending its large belly. The colonist was rejoicing in his storehouses bursting with grain. In the autumn he was pressing grapes under a favorable Bacchus. Then, settled by the hearth, the matron was soothing her cares with a song, and was binding up her warp with twisted gold. During the months of winter, the husband and happy wife were sustaining each other with tales sprinkled with wit. How sound was their sleep! What a life! What pleasure! I would not believe that there were better fates and better days that shone while the reign of Saturn was remaining.  

**Juno Incites Lauzellus**

[345–350] Now another year had seen the Italians and the Trojans united in spirit. All those who had obtained the accepted peace had a single love and a will to avoid war. But Juno was not allowing the nations to live in tranquility, and she prepares tricks and traps to allow Bellona to rage everywhere and to allow a new horror of war to advance.

---

38 [328–343] Under such an auspice and under just laws they were spending safe days in tranquility. Their intention and desire was to drive the deer into nets, to lay snares in the woodland passes, and to hunt wild animals. Each new dawn the farmers were leading the young bulls to the plow, and when the sun descended they were leading them back. They had no fear of treachery and theft. Since Pomona, the goddess of fruit, was untroubled, the fertile trees were filling themselves with fruit, and the gourds in the gardens were extending their large bellies. The colonist was transported with happiness that his storehouses burst with an overabundance of grain. In the autumn he was pressing a large amount of grapes, as Bacchus revealed and smiled upon him. At this time the matron moved to the hearth and was lightening her cares with songs. She wove her warp with gold. Then as winter came on the wife and husband were nourishing each other with stories sprinkled with wit. How sound was their sleep! What a life! What pleasure! Do not believe that other days in the future shone forth better, and that the fates were more fortunate, while Saturn was keeping his kingdom.

39 **v. 345.** Since Aeneas ruled three years in Latium from the death of Turnus, as we have proved in the preface, I have estimated that two years should be described as spent in which tranquility and peace and pleasures and festivals reigned supreme. But I have reserved the last year for the waging of wars, consecration of laws, ordaining of rituals, repairing of the city of Laurentum, and finally the apotheosis.

40 **v. 346.** Although Jupiter clearly forbade Juno from further anger with these words, “I forbid you to try further,” [12.806] and in the same book Juno promised to obey, “For my part I yield, and I relinquish my hatred and warfare,” [12.818] I have posited that she is still angry. Paying close attention to the commands of Jove this applies only to the Trojans and not to their neighbors and allies. Similarly, the warfare should be understood to be concerning Latium only, or the position of Aeneas, not the rest of the world. [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.347, not 13.346.]

41 [345–350] Two years now saw the Trojans and Ausonians united in peace. Once peace was accepted, all were desiring peace, and their will was opposed to warfare. But Juno was angry that the nations were living in tranquility, and she prepares new tricks and traps by which Bellona might rage everywhere and a new horror of war might arise.
Laussellus Looks for Aid

[351–366] A beast, the greatest that had ever been seen on the Tyrrhenian fields, with its teeth was laying waste to crops and flocks and men, and insatiably devouring them. Lauzellus held the power which his grandfather formerly held under a harsh rule. He was offering incense and prayers to the altars of great Juno in order to persuade the gods and expel the pestilence. On her sacred day, Juno scolded the suppliant: “Alas! Alas! Already eternal destruction awaits the ruined lands. Already weakness and sickness and destruction and miserable poverty have devastated your people! Alas! Now they are dust and shadow. You will not be able to destroy the monster, nor will you be allowed any hope of safety, unless you first oppose Evander strongly as an enemy and surround his walls with flames. You do not lack a pretext for war. Evander himself supplies it. Whether you win or lose, there will be no traces of the monster. I swear on the implacable flame.”

Laussellus Prepares His Forces

[367–370] The words of Juno are pleasing to the king, and he touches her altar. No delay: When the troops are collected, he secretly outfits a battle party and conscribes men into arms, men whose fathers Mezentius formerly did not disdain to lead in assistance to Turnus.

Evander Sends Legates to Aeneas

[371–383] When Evander was attacked by the troops and swords of the grandson of Mezentius, he decided to send legates to King Aeneas, asking for allied men and arms. When they had saluted the king [they asked him] to honor the gifts of his old friend, even if they were small, and suddenly they brought out a document painted with gold and vermilion. By this, the Arcadians proved that they were older than the sun, and that they existed from the beginning of the world. When Aeneas had accepted these gifts he spoke with a gentle expression: “Your gifts are
delightful, but how is the elderly king? Tell me! By what fate and by what cause did a deity drive you here? I intend to assist by any means, and I have not forgotten my debt to him. The enemies of Arcadia are the enemies of Teucer, and [there will be] an attack [against them] with the same iron.”

[384–412] Thereupon the old legate poured forth these words from his heart: “The body of Evander is strong, and his old age is blooming, although night and day he weeps for the death of Pallas. This alone is the solace of his misfortune and care: that Pallas perished to fulfill your destiny while following your standards. Evander would have come here himself to beg for aid, if the fates had allowed it. But now hear what misfortunes caused [us to come] to [your] borders. Do you remember how Evander accepted you and happily made your acquaintance when you arrived [at] the shore and the coast? How the right hand of our king was joined in a treaty and sent back your allies rejoicing? Do you remember how he suggested that you go to the Tyrrhenians—although you were a foreigner—so that they might receive you and give you the honors of an exiled king? How he gave thousands of men to you and how in wrath Etruria rose and enthusiastically demanded that you receive the new royal dignity. This momentous counsel is now a cause of pain, Aeneas, and that help has impelled [us] to the shore of Laurentum. Do not delay! Oppose Lauzellus’ invasion of the throne and mantle of the king with his chosen men. Repel this man from our lands and kingdom! Otherwise you may see the ancient city and our poor houses soon levelled to the ground, the statues and fountains dripping with blood, the mangled fillets and the overthrown temples. The son will desert his mother, and the wife will abandon her newly wedded husband. In exile they will feed on milk and seeds and grass. Half-dead with hunger the mothers will consume the limbs of their children and tear them with their teeth: war on all sides and on all sides war. The father-in-law will raise arms against his son-in-law. Brothers will call themselves to war. The earth will become red, soaked with fraternal blood. The fields will whiten with innumerable bones. So great will the suffering be that the gods will no longer be allowed to restrain it!”

45 [371–383] When Evander was attacked by the troops and iron of Lauzellus, the grandson of Mezentius, he decided to send legates to Aeneas, to ask him to give them men and allied arms. When they had saluted the king of the Trojans, they beg that the gifts of his old friend be considered worthy, although they are small. At once they run to bring forth a document decorated with gold and vermillion. By this they prove that they are older than the sun and existed from the first foundation of the world. When their gifts were accepted, Aeneas responds to them kindly: “Your gifts are very pleasing to me, but tell me how is the king, and for what reason, for what cause, and by what will have you come here? I intend to support you and help you, whatever the reason. I remember the help that I received from Evander. The enemies of the Arcadians and the Trojans will be the same, and I will attack them with the same iron.

46 v. 390ff. The historical material is resumed, and mention is made of Aeneas at the time when he had formerly set out and remained with Evander. This history can be read in book 8 of the Aeneid.

47 [384–412] Then the elder ambassador poured forth these words from his heart: “The body of Evander is strong, and he enjoys an old age that is still flourishing, although he mourns night and day for his son Pallas. He has this care alone in his suffering and sadness: that Pallas perished for your destiny, while he followed your banners. He would have followed your standards if it were permitted to him by the fates. Now learn what misfortune has brought us to your borders: Do you not remember how our king happily accepted you, how the right hand of our king was joined in treaty, and how he sent back your allies rejoicing? Do you not remember how he suggested to you that you go to the Tyrrhenians, although you were a foreigner, and when you were accepted you might receive the badges of an exiled king? How he gave a thousand men to you, and Etruria rose in wrath and desired that you be admitted into new kingdoms? Alas, prince! This weighty counsel is now the cause of grieving, this help drove us to Laurentum.
[413–416] Groaning greatly, Aeneas replies: “I confess that I am the cause and the beginning of these evils, and with our powers [we must] swiftly [drive out] the enemy. Lauzellus will not in any way lay waste to the lands and fields. His troops will be scattered in every direction and he will ingloriously return to his fatherland.”

Aeneas Calls a Council

[417–427] Then Aeneas calls a council. The Rutulians, who had joined the Latins and Trojans freely after the death of Turnus, attend. The Latins who were famous for their eloquence also attended, as did the Trojans. Scarcely had silence fallen, when Aeneas forcefully expounded the fate and shameful sufferings of Evander: Peace had scarcely returned to the lands and now a horrible crop of weapons and an iron storm was imminent. With unleashed reigns, raging Vulcan, flaming rocks, and torches fly through houses and the city. He advises them to support Evander with generals and resources, and swiftly to expel Lauzellus from the pious kingdom.

[428–438] “If ever his standards are victoriously planted on those fields, Lauzellus will thirstily seek tribute from us. He will grow swollen from his favorable conquest and will invade our hearths and open homes. Therefore, come, o allies, raise up two thousand choice footmen. May a troop of a thousand horsemen be chosen. May no one call to arms men who are sluggish and have hearts unaccustomed to war. The hearts of warriors are unable to be softened. They should be able to manfully shoot the bow and hurl spears. They should not have any vain hope for glory; rather, they should recall in their minds the examples of their own people. May they shudder to attempt indecorous safety through desertion!”

Do not delay! Swiftly may you hinder Lauzellus from stealing the throne and mantle with his chosen men, and hasten to expel this tyrant from our lands. Otherwise you will see the ancient city and our small houses entirely overturned, the fountains and the statues dripping with blood, the fillets torn, the temples overthrown. Sons will desert their mothers. Wives will abandon their newly wedded husbands. Children torn from the breast will be fed on herbs and pods. And now the mothers, dying from hunger, will consume the torn and mangled limbs of their children with their teeth. Fury and horrid war will arise on all sides. The father-in-law will prepare arms against his son-in-law. Brothers will call each other into battle. The earth will grow red, soaked with fraternal blood. The fields will look white from innumerable bones. The horror will be so great that even the gods will not be able to restrain it.”

48 [413–416] After these words, groaning greatly, Aeneas spoke: “I confess that I am the cause and the beginning of the evils. Without delay the enemy must be expelled by our forces. In vain has he come to lay waste to fields and lands. He will be returned swiftly to his own people without glory, and his troops will hither and thither be put to flight.”

49 [417–427] Then Aeneas calls his council. The Rutulians are present, who after the death of Turnus freely surrendered themselves to the Ausonians and Trojans. The Latins, celebrated for their eloquence and the Trojans are among them. Scarcely did their tongues fall silent when the Trojan Aeneas expounded the fate and the shameful sufferings of Evander. He expounds how by his help scarcely was peace returned to the world, but Lauzellus nevertheless threatens with crops of weapons and a rain of spears, and how, with unleashed reigns and a raging Vulcan, fiery stones and torches rush through the city and the homes. He advises that they support Evander as quickly as possible with leaders and money. Lauzellus must be expelled from the pious kingdoms.

50 v. 429. I have written “open homes” because Laurentum, which had formerly been attacked, had not yet been repaired.

51 [428–438] He says, “Indeed if his victorious standards are planted in Pallanteum, thirsty for blood and swollen with his luck in battle, he will seek tribute from us. He will assail our homes which are not yet walled in and
He continues, “Among the strong bodies of men, a captain is useful for the soldiers. He knows how to keep the camps safely positioned and is able to lead the battle lines away from unfavorable situations. The densest places in the forests do not escape his notice—nor do springs, ditches, valleys, and places suitable for armed ambuscades. He is eager to make a decision at a timely moment in battle, for time flies irreparably. He should look at the number of enemies with contempt and be eager to attack the enemy. The soldier is inflamed by the virtue of his swiftness, endures dangers, and seeks a distinguished death through his wounds. May he teach his troops soldiery and the serious work of warfare and the labors of war, but not with an attitude or methods that are harsh or too beneficent. Whether he is sent to help an oppressed city, or whether he is sent against the enemy with a small or a large force, there is a need for well-proved strength and for the art of a teacher. But if you are pleased to confer this dignity on someone whom you suspect to be bereft of talents and bereft of an illustrious soul, there will be no hope for a triumph, and the ardor of your soldiers will be vain and useless. Alas! Evander in his helplessness would have called for help in vain, and where there should be an opportunity to attempt something, all labor would be useless!  

Now come, O citizens! Entrust to Mnestheus the command of the unconquered battle-line! You saw him entrust himself like lightning to the battle when Troy was besieged. You were amazed that with his words and his spirit he united his distraught men, who were wandering hither and thither. When Turnus was nourished by an empty hope, you saw Mnestheus repel him from our ramparts and cause him to swim swiftly away. The blood of his fathers is not unworthy of such honor. His race is the race of Assaracus, illustrious from the blood of kings. Often in various misfortunes his prudence has been tested, which, when my purpose was uncertain, led his mind towards the better outcome and landed us on safe shores.”

52 [439–458] Among the noble bodies of men a noble leader is useful. May he be knowledgeable in keeping the camps safe, and may he be able to lead the army away from unfavorable situations. He ought to know the places in the woods that are the densest. Rivers, ditches, valleys, and places that are favorable for ambushes in war—none of them should escape his notice. He should be swift to decide a timely moment in battle, for time flies irreparably. He should scorn the numbers of the enemy and be eager to meet them in battle. For a soldier who is inflamed by the virtue of his leader seeks dangers and an illustrious death through a thousand wounds. It is necessary that he teach his men both the weighty work of war and the highest labors of battle with a mind and method that is not too kindly towards the troops. When he is assigned to a city in distress or under siege, or when he is sent against the enemy with a small or large force, he has need for tested virtues, and for skillful art. But if you were pleased to bestow the command of the army on someone whom you suspect to be lacking the necessary virtues and an illustrious soul, there would be no hope of a triumph, and the eagerness of the struggling soldiers would be useless. Alas, unfortunate Evander would have asked for help in vain, and, where one could attempt something, all labor would be useless.

53 v. 458ff. These words which are spoken by Aeneas to the Latins so that they confer the command of the army on Aeneas are derived from book 9 of the Aeneid, verses 779ff [9.788–818] and from book 12, v. 127 [12.127].

54 [459–469] For this reason, come with me, my friends, and entrust to Mnestheus the command of the unconquered battle-line. You saw him join the battle like a thunderbolt when New Troy was besieged. You wondered at him when with his words he collected his men who were wandering hither and thither, and by his example they rushed towards

restored. For this reason, come, my friends, and prepare two thousand footmen, and collect a thousand choice horsemen. May no one call lazy soldiers or those with hearts unused to bearing arms. The hearts of soldiers never should grow soft! Let there be men who know how to manfully shoot the bow and throw spears. May they not uselessly hope for victory; rather, so that they might achieve it more easily, may they recall good examples to their minds, and shudder to shamefully attempt to save their life by fleeing.

52 [439–458] Among the noble bodies of men a noble leader is useful. May he be knowledgeable in keeping the camps safe, and may he be able to lead the army away from unfavorable situations. He ought to know the places in the woods that are the densest. Rivers, ditches, valleys, and places that are favorable for ambushes in war—none of them should escape his notice. He should be swift to decide a timely moment in battle, for time flies irreparably. He should scorn the numbers of the enemy and be eager to meet them in battle. For a soldier who is inflamed by the virtue of his leader seeks dangers and an illustrious death through a thousand wounds. It is necessary that he teach his men both the weighty work of war and the highest labors of battle with a mind and method that is not too kindly towards the troops. When he is assigned to a city in distress or under siege, or when he is sent against the enemy with a small or large force, he has need for tested virtues, and for skillful art. But if you were pleased to bestow the command of the army on someone whom you suspect to be lacking the necessary virtues and an illustrious soul, there would be no hope of a triumph, and the eagerness of the struggling soldiers would be useless. Alas, unfortunate Evander would have asked for help in vain, and, where one could attempt something, all labor would be useless.

53 v. 458ff. These words which are spoken by Aeneas to the Latins so that they confer the command of the army on Aeneas are derived from book 9 of the Aeneid, verses 779ff [9.788–818] and from book 12, v. 127 [12.127].

54 [459–469] For this reason, come with me, my friends, and entrust to Mnestheus the command of the unconquered battle-line. You saw him join the battle like a thunderbolt when New Troy was besieged. You wondered at him when with his words he collected his men who were wandering hither and thither, and by his example they rushed towards
Nighttime Celebrations

[470–478] Aeneas had spoken and it pleased the gods to send an omen. Thunder rolled on the left and the doors were opened. All assented and they salute Mnestheus as their king and leader. As a propitious pledge they happily lay down their swords and shields and all their gear of war. Then they enter their houses and worship the household gods with flames. One places ribs on the spits. Another burns the entrails. Some lie on couches and consume Ceres and Bacchus. The greater part spends a sleepless night in songs. 

Aeneas Addresses Mnestheus

[479–484] Scarcely was dawn shining, borne on her chariots, when they carry rich offerings to Mars, and when the sacrifices were offered, the leader Mnestheus approaches the king, who prays kindly. Because his undertakings were so great, Aeneas repeats to him, “Eternally, farewell! Always may the palm of victory be your companion! May the gods be always at your side! May you return safe and pious to the Laurentian kingdoms!”

Invocation of the Muses

[485–489] You, Calliope, now inspire me as I sing! What were the bodies and the helmets and the enemy shields that you have heard were scattered about the shores of Father Tiber? How many were there and how great were they? Also, tell me about the funerals that were caused by Mnestheus, and how on his way home he was sent to the underworld.

Mnestheus Sets Out

[490–500] Mnestheus set out against Lauzellus. Sergestus and Astur joined him as allies in war, for they were ranked second in virtue. Daring Sergestus led the cavalry. Another led the line of war and wounds. When an empty hope of victory was nourishing Turnus, you saw him expelled from the rampart and swiftly seeking safety in the river. The blood of his ancestors does not make him unworthy of this honor, since he arises from the race of Assaracus, and is from the blood of kings. His prudence was not troubled by ambiguous situations, when so often it led his mind to the better option and brought about happy outcomes—even when my mind was uncertain.”

55 [470–478] Scarcely had Aeneas finished—and what he had said was pleasing to the celestial gods—when from the left part of the sky the heavens audibly thundered, and with a crash the doors appear to open. All assent to the selection and salute Mnestheus as their king and leader. Happily, as a pledge they place down their swords and shields and whatever is used for war. Then they desire to enter their homes and with fire to incense the household gods. One of them puts the ribs of a bull or a ram on skewers. Another burns the entrails of other animals. Some, resting on couches consume much bread and drink much wine. Most of them spend the night dancing without sleep.

56 [479–484] On the next day scarcely was dawn shining, borne on her horses, when all of them bring gifts to Mars, and when the sacrifices were completed, Mnestheus, who had been made leader, goes to King Aeneas. He prayed that all be lucky and agreeable to him and spoke to him. “Farewell, beloved,” he repeated, because of his undertakings, “May the palm of victory always be your companion. May the gods always be present to you, and may you return to this kingdom in safety and virtue.”

57 [485–489] You, Muses, may you be favorable to me as I prepare to sing of great things, I pray. Tell me of what sort, how many, and how great were the bodies that you have heard were scattered on the shores of the Tiber. What helmets and shields of enemies were found? Tell me about the funerals that Mnestheus caused. At last, tell me how he was slain at the moment of his victory, as he was about to return to Laurentum.
footmen, and the laurel of victory preceded the troops. A horse carries Mnestheus with spots of different colors, with the neck of a swan, and fearlessly displaying a white forehead. It rejoices to surpass the winds as it runs. The captain fits to his shoulders a breastplate with linked mail and triple-threaded with gold, which pious Aeneas granted him to have when he arranged the rowing competition and held games at the tomb of his father. He girds himself with a faithful sword.

A Stratagem

[501–517] Now they were approaching the city and were carried along with swift steps. “Lo,” Astur shouts, “Stop! We should travel by the path where the forest is particularly dense. Sentries watch the narrow parts of the roadways, and they deceitfully cut down men in their way with greedy iron. Therefore, we must subvert their tricks with our own tricks and plots. Now let us climb,” he said, “the hill that is on our right-hand side. Here we will find a path that snakes along by a secure track. Piety, virtue, and fear wish that this path be disclosed each year to those who pray at the altars of Hercules. By this path we will be able to attack the enemy camps, and to destroy the shameful race with fire and flames. The enemy will be frightened by our arrival and truly terrified, ignorant of the way which the fates indicated to us. They will stand unarmed and they will helplessly yield their shields, ruddy crests, spears and helmets, together with their tents. They will also yield a mass of despoiled silver and gold.”

[518–525] The troops do not delay. To the right the soldiers ascend the steep slope. Once the path is found they advance with greater speed. Sergestus orders the battalions of footmen to move forward, and to guide the horses by pulling the reins forward. In this way each company

58 v. 498. You will find the breastplate that Mnestheus puts on given as a gift to him by Aeneas at the naval competition in book 5, vv. 296ff. [The citation is incorrect. Villanova refers to 5.258–265.]

59 [490–500] When Mnestheus had set out against Lauzellus, Sergestus and Astur were joined to him as comrades in battle, for they were the most noble after him. Sergestus leads the line of horsemen, while Astur leads the footmen, with the victory always preceding the troops. A horse, dappled with spots and color, carries Mnestheus. He has the neck of a swan and fearlessly shows a white star on his forehead. He rejoices to outstrip the winds in running. The leader fits to his shoulders a breastplate woven with rings and triple-threaded with gold, which pious Aeneas gave to him when he arranged the rowing competition, since he wished that honor be given to the tomb of his father. He is armed with a faithful sword.

60 v. 508. Here I have spoken of the altars of Hercules, which were especially sacred to Hercules among the Arcadians because of the death of Cacus. This superstition is amply described in the eighth book of the Aeneid [8.184–305].

61 [501–517] Now the troops were approaching the city and they were flying with swift steps, when Astur shouts, “Stop! Now we should travel by a path in which the forest most densely surrounds us. Guards are positioned and protect the passages at intervals. Hidden men cut down with iron whatever stands in their way. Therefore, it is necessary to oppose their tricks with our own tricks and plots. For this reason,” he says, “now we should climb this mountain which lies to our right-hand side. On this mountain we will find a path, with a secure route, which virtue, piety, and fear disclose only to those who each year go to sacrifice at the altars of Hercules. By this path it will be possible to attack the camps of the enemies and to overturn their ignoble race by our arms. The enemy will be pale at our approach, stupefied, and ignorant of which gods pointed out this path to us. They will be without arms and protection. They will abandon their shields, ruddy crests, swords, helmets, and whatever is in their tents. They will leave a great weight of stolen silver and gold.”

62 v. 520. Sergestus directs them to proceed pulling the reins forward because he led the cavalry.
was proceeding, observing their places in line. Murder could be read on their threatening brows. And now, under the dim light of the moon, they climbed the difficult passes and overcame each danger.\textsuperscript{63}

\textit{The Night Assault on Lauzellus}

[526–542] They approach their enemies. First, a detachment attacks Aventinus who was protecting the outlying camps and watching the trenches. It was rumored that he had come to help the Rutulians and was descended from illustrious Hercules.\textsuperscript{64} He was fearing nothing suspicious, and with his allies had indulged in total drunkenness. He had allowed his soldiers to wander about hither and thither and return at will. Here the phalanx easily deals out sudden death with their swords. They cut down Aventinus as he lies oppressed with wine and sleep. Then swiftly they fly and scatter his companions in death, companions who had heard the tears and crying and were impelled by love to return to the tents and to avenge the souls of their dying brothers. They all come to ruin, for anger and wrath now rages against them, and the measureless desire for plunder. In close combat the chest of one is rent by a darting spear. A spear strikes the temple of another man with a straight tip. On all sides there is destruction, wherever the arrows fly.\textsuperscript{65}

[543–554] Meanwhile grief and fear oppress the camps. Mnestheus speeds ahead. Silently, Sergestus and Astur from each side approach the walls of Pallanteum. Together with his brother, Corax was besieging these walls.\textsuperscript{66} Lauzellus was their leader, and their hope remained in Lauzellus alone. At first light on the next day they intended and planned to fill the ditches and scale the walls with ladders, to burst through the besieged walls with an assembled force of men, and to restrain the conquered king in shameful chains. But alas! O fallacious prudence of men!

\textsuperscript{63} [518–525] When these words are heard, the troops do not delay. The soldiers hasten to ascend the mountain, and when the path is found they advance more quickly. Sergestus orders the horsemen to proceed on foot, and each one leads his horse by pulling the reigns forward. In this manner the entire army moves forward, observing their respective places, and threatening murder on their countenances. Now, with the dim moon helping them, they climbed the difficult passes and overcame anything which could be harmful.

\textsuperscript{64} v. 527. \textit{You can see these things written in the seventh book of the Aeneid}, vv. 654ff [7.655–669].

\textsuperscript{65} [526–542] They reach their enemies. A detachment which had been separated from the army attacks Aventinus who was guarding the outlying camps and was holding the fortifications. It was rumored that he had formerly come to help the Rutulians, and that he had been descended from Hercules. Since he was suspecting nothing bad, with his companions he had given himself over to wine and pleasure. He permitted that his soldiers at ease could go where they wished and could freely return to their tents. In this way, the phalanx, which was not expected, handed all of them over to death without hindrance. They kill Aventinus who was lounging, weighed down by sleep and feasting. Then they eagerly hasten to lay low all his companions in death, the companions who desired to avenge the blood of their dying brothers when they heard their tears and cries. These men do not approach safely, for whatever anger, wrath, and the insatiable desire for plunder was able to suggest by way of vengeance, all this was visited upon them. The chest of one is pierced through by a spear thrown from close range. The head of another is struck by an arrow with a greedy point. Death arises everywhere and wherever the spears appear.

\textsuperscript{66} v. 545. \textit{His brother is Catillus. See the seventh book of the Aeneid}, v. 672 [7.672].
The day which Lauzellus had thought would be most fortunate was the greatest of evils for himself and for his people.67

The Death of Lauzellus

[555–566] Mnestheus, who certainly was angry that so many battles had arisen and that his countrymen and the city had been subdued under the hateful yoke, early in the morning orders that Astur and Sergestus advance successively with disguised footsteps. Furthermore, he orders that they encircle the brothers of the Tiber on all sides, so that Lauzellus would be surrounded and would perish. Lauzellus realized too late how vain his confidence in his troops was, and that his allies had neither arms nor weapons.68 First, he stood indecisively. He is unsure whether, as a supplicant, he should beg Sergestus to refrain from bloodshed, and with gifts and his tongue persuade him from his cruel intentions, or whether he should throw himself into the middle of his enemies. But shuddering at all the destruction, he flares up in wrath. He slaughters his own friends who are standing there and then kills himself in their blood.69

The Dispersion of the Enemy Forces

[567–577] Scarcely had the tyrant handed over his untimely fates to his sword, when the rumor is suddenly spread through the camps and through the city that Lauzellus has fallen, and that Catillus and Clausus and the cohorts of Lauzellus are crushed under the weight of iron. Horror and concerns and fear redouble through the camps. To their feet the soldiers entrust their lives and whatever they still possess. Now they despise a thousand of the greatest dangers known to them, and each becomes a new hero. One swims across rivers. Another bounds over all the ditches and ramparts in a great leap. Another despises the fierce things in the forests—so great is their love of possessions, so great is their desire for living.70

67 [543–554] While sorrow and terror redouble in the camps, Sergestus and Astur with silent footsteps arrive at Pallanteum. With Lauzellus as commander, Corax and his brother Catillus were besieging this city. Much hope had been placed in Lauzellus. Indeed, it was his plan and intention, when the next day returned light to the lands, to fill the ditches, place ladders against the walls, to invade the besieged walls with an assembled force of men, and to burden the conquered king with unworthy chains. But alas! How fallacious is the prudence of men! The day, which he had thought would be the luckiest and happiest of his life, was the last and most unlucky both for him and for his men.

68 v. 560. Because both Lauzellus and Corax were not expecting the attack, and Aventinus, who oversaw the defenses of the camp, certainly expected nothing.

69 [555–556] Indeed, Mnestheus was angry that so many wars had arisen, and that his friends and the city of Evander were now to be rendered under enemy control. At first light, he orders that Aster and Sergestus proceed successively, with disguised footsteps, and surround the brothers of the Tiber on all sides, so that Lauzellus, suddenly surrounded, would perish. Lauzellus recognized too late how he had rashly placed too much trust in his troops who were guarding the earthworks, and he understood that his allies were without weapons. He stops in doubt, uncertain whether he should beg Sergestus to abstain from the sword, and restrain him by gifts and an oration from the cruel things that he intended. He wavers. Or should he cast himself into the middle of his enemies? But seeing with horror that all things were calamitous for himself and his men, and inflamed with new anger, he takes his own life and the lives of his comrades who were present.

70 [567–577] Scarcely had the tyrant released his premature fates on his sword when the rumor goes through the city and through the camps that Lauzellus is dead, and that Catillus and Clausus and the cohorts of Lauzellus have collapsed under the weight of iron. In the camps fear and horror and concerns are redoubled. The conquered soldiers attempt to entrust their property and life to their feet. They now become heroes and despise dangers which formerly
Celebration in Pallanteum

[578–588] The happy shouting of men and noise of trumpets is heard in Pallanteum. The energetic men attempt to pass through the gates. Some leap over the walls. Others were impatient to enter and searched out other unfrequented routes. They rush out wherever they can find a gate or wherever the favorable gods allow them to be freed from the siege. From everywhere the youth happily rush to the fields. Eagerly they overturn the tents and houses and men and whatever they can find. They cut down everything they meet with iron and bring back vast spoils. They plunder weapons, shields, and sharp swords. And now it delights them to drink what is poured into the bowls of the tyrant.

Evander Addresses Mnestheus

[589–601] As Evander perceives that the war is won, that the waves of war are quieted, and that there is nothing left for the people to fear, according to custom he sacrifices five wolves to Mars and the same number of sheep to the Penates, in the presence of virgins. Then he leaves with the accompanying crowd of maidens to meet the king. After kissing him mouth to mouth, he addresses him as follows: “What thanks could I give to you, O Mnestheus, for saving my power forever and keeping our fatherland uninjured? In remembrance, may the Etruscan and Trojan youth who accompany you in merriment celebrate your deeds and lift your name to the stars. May the gods favorably repay you for such merits! May you live happily for a thousand years! And when you have returned to Aeneas, may he willingly adopt you as a partner in his power!”

71 [578–588] Then in Pallanteum the joyful shouting of men and the noise of trumpets is heard. An energetic group attempt to exit from the gates. Some are concerned that the entrances are blocked, and they leap over the walls. Some look for other places which are unfrequented. They rush out wherever a gate is opened. All the youth leave from wherever the gods first permit them to be released from the siege. They happily enter the field, and they rejoice to destroy the tents of the enemy. They trample on the houses, kill the men, and destroy whatever they come across. They gather ample spoils. They are proud to take away weapons and shields. They rejoice to put on greaves and to wear the swords of their enemies. They drink wine that is poured into the cups of the tyrant Lauzellus.

72 v. 590. He went with the virgins and the virgin chorus because all the men had left from the gates because of the desire for booty, and now only the boys and girls remained with Evander. [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.591–592, not 13.590.]

73 v. 593. The king is Mnestheus. Evander decided to salute Mnestheus as a king because of his command of the army and the liberation of the city. [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.592, not 13.593.]

74 [589–601] As Evander sees that the war is won, that the waves of war are removed, and that there is nothing more for his subjects to fear, he sacrifices five wolves to Mars, and slaughters the same number of lambs to the household gods, in the presence of virgins. Then with the virgins he goes to meet Mnestheus, and he addresses him thus after kissing him affectionately: “O Mnestheus, what thanks can I render to you for saving my reign forever and for keeping my homeland uninjured? May the Trojan and Tyrrenian youth who now accompany you in triumph celebrate your illustrious deeds and with songs bear your praises to the stars. May the gods repay you for such great services, and may you live happily for many still more fortunate days. When you have returned to Aeneas, may he not disdain to add you as a partner in his power!”

362
The Assassination of Mnestheus

[601–610] Evander had spoken. Behold! An arrow caused a cloud to shudder. By what hand and by what treachery it was shot remained unknown. Each man, fearful for his own life, sees it coming from on high, and flees it. But imminent wounds do not terrify Mnestheus. As it flies, he does not turn his body or his countenance. The death-dealing and threatening arrow transfixed his face, drained his blood, and poured his indignant spirit out with his blood. Now, alas, the deeds have clearly happened which Latinus had formerly predicted to Ascanius! 75 76

Apistus Destroys the Chronicles

[610–616] But scarcely was Mnestheus submerged in death, when, behold, another man appears: Apistus. 77 He had treacherously joined the army of the Trojans under a false name and envied pious Aeneas and the honor of his race. He now fell upon the bloodless man. As he rummages among the clothes of Mnestheus, embroidered with gold and epauletts, he comes across the books given as gifts by Iulus. What a monstrosity! Once torn apart, they are scattered to the winds. 78

The Ghost of Mnestheus

[617–636] Aeneas did not know the fate of Evander and the fates of his own men, and whether the laurel of victory belonged to his own men or to the enemy. Behold, the image of dead Mnestheus appears to him in a dream, wearing a serious face and countenance. With his cold mouth he chides the shuddering Aeneas: “It is evident that the loyalty of Messapus, who is bound to you through a close treaty, is false. As you mourn the sad fate of Anna, you will approach the sacred pools of Numicius. 79 Messapus will pretend that the ghosts disclose secrets and will cause you to approach the fountains. You will trust too much in his counsel, will draw near to the water, and will be buried in the middle of the waves! It is over for me, but I died by a scarcely unpleasant death and went down to the shadows, since now the fortune of your people and your Evander stands unshakable. Before my own eyes I saw Lauzellus die by his own hand when his battle lines and those of his allies were put to flight. By my right hand I myself saved

75 [601–610] When Evander had spoken, behold, a single arrow trembles as it is shot through the air. By what hand and by what treachery it was shot remained unknown. Each man sees it, fears it as it comes from on high, and avoids it. But an imminent wound does not terrify Mnestheus. As the arrow approaches, he does not move his body or his face. That death-dealing and threatening arrow transfixed his face, poured out all his blood, and drove his scorching spirit out of his body with his blood. Now, alas, those things were revealed which King Latinus formerly predicted to Ascanius.

76 v. 608. These things were predicted by Latinus, as you can see above, vv. 205ff [13.205–209].

77 v. 611. This name, “Apistos,” can obviously be translated from the Greek, ἄπιστος, which means a traitor, for no more suitable name was able to be assigned to this man, who pretended that he was a friend of the Trojans.

78 [610–616] Scarcely was Mnestheus dead, when, behold, another man, Apistus, who as a traitor under a feigned name had joined himself in comradeship with the army of the Trojans, and who always envied Aeneas and his race, falls upon the dead man. When he carefully examined the clothing embroidered with gold and with signs embossed upon it, he discovers the gifts given by Iulus (that is, the annals of Aeneas), and when he has found them he tosses them to the wind.

79 v. 620. The death of Aeneas is predicted by Mnestheus, and the type of death and place are also revealed. I have posited the pool of Numicius, since all those who say anything about the death of Aeneas agree on this point.
the city which was about to be overturned by its impending ruin. I myself…” As he continued to speak, the early light imposed eternal silence on his tongue, and commanded him to dissolve into the thin air.80

The Report of Victory

[637–651] Astonished by his appearance and by his words, Aeneas snatched up his sweating limbs from the bed, and wandered through the city sadly and impatiently, to find out precisely whether the shade was deceitful to him or was the herald of truth. As he was considering these things, a more trustworthy messenger hastens towards him, who speaks and takes away his cares with these words: “Now your Evander reigns and has achieved tranquil peace and the enemy now is exiled as a fugitive forever. Look now, the captive youth follow Sergestus and his companion Astur! Look! The glorious cohorts return to your kingdoms! Your dear friend, illustrious Mnestheus, would be now returning, decked with the palm of victory and the spoils of war, if he had not been struck by a harsh blow and were now gazing upon the kingdoms of Pluto and the daughter of Ceres.” Following these things, Aeneas departed into the deserted dwellings; tears stained his cheeks and sadness burned in his bones.81

The Funeral Procession of Mnestheus

[652–658] Scarcely had Titan mounted his axis once and again, when the phalanxes approached the gates of Laurentum.82 They were a pious crowd, and gathered closely about the bier of pale Mnestheus. Their expressions were mournful, and their march progressed slowly. Although

80[617–636] Aeneas did not know his fate, and the fate of his men. He did not know whether his men or the enemies had acquired the palm of victory. Behold, the image of dead Mnestheus appears to him with a severe face and expression. He chides the terrified Aeneas with his cold mouth: “The loyalty of Messapus towards you is false, although everyone agrees that he is devoted to you because of your great friendship. Scarcely will you have arrived at the sacred pools of Numicius, intending to mourn the fate of Anna, the sister of Dido. Here, false in all things, Messapus will arrange that you approach to the font to be taught the secrets which his ghost is destined to reveal. You will trust too much in his counsel and approach the water, and you will be buried in the midst of the waves. I have already lived, and I approach the shades by a pleasing death, since now the fortune of your men and your Evander remains unshaken. I saw with my own eyes, after I destroyed the troops of Lauzellus and his allies and turned them to flight, that Lauzellus was killed by his own hand. By my own hand I sustained this city of Pallanteum, which was about to be overturned with imminent ruin. I myself…” Although he wished to say more, the new daylight, already high in the sky, imposed silence upon him and compelled him to vanish into the air.

81[637–651] Astonished by this sight and these words, Aeneas lifts his body from the bed, sweaty with fear, and runs through all the city, impatient and concerned to know for sure whether the shade of Mnestheus had spoken true or false things. Meanwhile a messenger arrives, who thus began to speak to the distracted Aeneas and to take away all his cares with these words: “Now your friend Evander rules, rejoicing in tranquil peace. Now the enemy is defeated and has left his lands forever. Behold, the captive youth follow Sergestus and his ally Astur. Now your victorious cohorts return to the walls of Laurentum. Your dear Mnestheus would now be returning loaded with spoils and the palm of victory, if he had not been struck by a harsh stroke and were not now viewing the kingdoms of Proserpina and Pluto. When he had heard these things, Aeneas departs alone into his house, and his cheeks are not free from tears.

82v. 651. I have written “once and again” because there was no need for more delay to carry the body, since Pallanteum is near the Tiber, like Laurentum, and is not far away from it.
victorious, their eyes were downcast in mourning. The horn sounds, and its sound brings fresh
dread. The street was lit far and wide with a row of torches.\textsuperscript{83}

\textit{Aeneas Mourns for Mnestheus}

[659–667] As the procession approached nearer to the palaces of the king, Aeneas plunged into
the middle of the procession and threw himself over the bier, saying, “Alas! How very bitter will
this victory remain for us, a victory achieved by your death! Whoever violated your body with
this wound will pay by his death, nor will the fates allow you to die unavenged. Until I discover
what hand shot the arrow, I will avenge the spirits and shadows with much slaughter.” He
embraced Mnestheus again and showed him the final honors.\textsuperscript{84}

\textit{The Reconstruction of Laurentum}

[668–690] When the funeral rites and sacrifices had been offered at the tomb of Mnestheus,
Aeneas’s only desire was to build the Laurentian walls. His one desire was to make Laurentum
into a proud city. The town formerly was besieged and attacked by the Trojans, and, being
destroyed by battering rams and missiles, it offered a picture of vast devastation. He calls every
type of worker, every type of laborer. One constructs the citadel. Another strengthens it with a
surrounding rampart. A skilled laborer fills the ditches with artificial waters. Another cuts away
lofty columns from quarried stone for the vast colonnades. Some work on the fountains. Some
laid the marketplace, which was to be open to the east, and protected it with shady plane-trees to
the south. Each man was assigned to a task. Bronze and iron melted and liquefied in the
bellowing furnace (as Venus is said to have asked Vulcan for arms forged by his own art and
power, because she hoped that her son would remain unconquered under the protection of
heavenly weapons). They hammer out the metals on the anvil, and now high ornaments are
carved for the future houses. Tall halls are erected, and haughty thresholds are fashioned with
various figures, and they shine with gold. The artisans worked with such skill, and fashioned
their works with such industry, that they could dare to liken themselves to Minerva, nor would
they fear to say, “We have conquered nature through art!” Aeneas’ wife Lavinia lent her name to
the new construction.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{83} [652–658] Not yet had the sun ascended its course once and again, when the phalanx entered the gates of
Laurentum, standing pale around the bier of Mnestheus. Their faces were hardly cheerful, and their march was slow.
Although victorious, they kept their eyes downcast. If the trumpet made a sound, by its sound fresh horror rose. The
places shine hither and thither with rows of torches.

\textsuperscript{84} [659–667] As the funeral procession reached the halls of the king, Aeneas cast himself into the middle of the
attendants, and lying over the bier, says, “Alas, for how great a price, your death, was this victory purchased, and
how bitter it is! O! Whoever befouled your body with this wound will pay with his blood. The gods do not wish that
you die without retribution and vengeance. Until it is known what hand is responsible for this arrow, I am bound to
avenge the ghosts and shades by abundantly shedding the blood of men. Again he embraced the body of his friend
and gave him the final honors.

\textsuperscript{85} [668–690] After the funeral and ceremonies were finished at the tomb of Mnestheus, the only desire of Aeneas
was to rebuild the walls of Laurentum, and his only intention was to exalt the city to magnificence. Since it was
formerly besieged and attacked by the Trojans and had been beaten with stones and rams, it threatened to fall into
ruin. He calls together every type of artisan and laborer. One builds the citadel. Another fortifies it with surrounding
walls. A skilled laborer fills the ditches with artificial waters. Another excavates high columns, extracting them from
a carved-out cliff. One group hastens to construct vast colonnades and fountains to flow everywhere. Another group
works so that the forum may lie open towards the east, and towards the south it may be shaded with plane trees.
Aeneas Establishes Laws and Customs: Worship of Jove

[691–701] When by the authority of the king the glory of the Lavinian wall was given to its citizens, and it now imitated the ancient citadels of burned Troy, Aeneas bestowed customs and sacred rites and laws and law codes. By such laws Priam formerly was widely ruling all things with blessed sovereignty. Thus, Aeneas declared that you, Jupiter, are recognized as the only master of earth and sky, and that in different labors your power alone should be invoked. If anyone was so imprudent to call upon your power in vain, touching your holy fires or your altars, his dried hand should perish, his mouth should be closed up with burning iron, and he should wander in exile in the African deserts.\footnote{691–701}{When by the authority of the king the glory of the Lavinian wall returned to its citizens, and the city was constructed in the likeness of ancient Troy, which had burned, Aeneas established religious rites, and constituted laws and customs, in the same way in which Priam was widely governing his people with happy power. For this reason, he desired that Jupiter be recognized as the only master of heaven and earth, and that in difficult labors only his power was to be invoked. If by chance anyone was so shameless as to commit perjury by touching his sacred fires or his altars, immediately his hand should be burned up by heated iron, and his tongue by the same instrument should be pierced and remain in eternal silence. That shameless man should be exiled into Africa.}

Care of Eagles

[702–707] If by chance anyone sees an eagle, who has made various circlings, flying to the gates of his threshold, before he brings him a whole loaf of bread and piles up food in baskets, he should first wash himself with sacred water. Aeneas wished that the eagles, with their threatening beaks and wings, should demonstrate signs and be reliable omens for future victory.\footnote{702–707}{If anyone perhaps should see an eagle at the threshold of his gate, tired because of his long flight, before he brings him bread and food in baskets, he should first wash himself with sacred water. Aeneas wished that eagles, with their threatening beaks and wings, be spread out for the military standards, and, when understood, be reliable omens of victory.}

The Festival of Mars

[708–716] Because Evander was safe in his rule and his enemies were conquered, and because of the many trophies taken from different enemies, Aeneas instituted festive honors dedicated to unconquered Mars, which he wished to celebrate yearly on the first full moon.\footnote{708–716}{At the first moon of Mars, that is the full moon of the month of March, because this was sacred to Mars and the year begins from that month.} Mars would then be kind to whomever prudently offered a gift on his own behalf. On this day, all ages would engage in athletic competitions. With bare knee and lengthened mantle, the virgins would pay Each one is assigned a job. Flowing bronze and iron are melted in a burning furnace—as formerly, when Venus was said to have approached her husband, and he expended his art and labor, since she desired celestial arms for Aeneas that would make him invincible). Indeed, resounding iron and metals are beaten out on the anvils, as well as decorations for the future houses. The high palaces rise, and the haughty thresholds are decorated with various figures, and shining with gold. The work is so skillful, and the industry of the workmen is so great, that each worker is able to boast that he is Minerva, nor does he fear to say, “Nature is conquered by art!” Lavinia, Aeneas’ wife, gave the name “Lavinium” to the restored city.
tribute once to the altar of the god and the tips of their hair would be offered before the statue of the god as an immortal vow.\footnote{[708–716] Because Evander was safe in his reign, and his enemies were subdued, and because of the many trophies captured from the enemy, Aeneas instituted festive days on the first moon of each year in honor of Mars. On this day, each forethinking person would offer a gift and entreat Mars that he be propitious to him for the next year. Furthermore, Aeneas commanded that the youth and old men exercise themselves in every kind of game, and that the virgins with bare knees and lengthened mantles would once offer incense at his altar. The ends of their hair, as an immortal vow, would be cut off and consecrated before his image.}

\textit{Sacrifices for Bacchus and Ceres}

[717–728] Aeneas commanded the peasants to hang up their first flowers and consecrate their first fruits from the roof of the temple. He wished them to offer the greatest gifts to Bacchus and Ceres, who are the deities propitious for help in life. When the parching Dog-Star begins to burn the sterile fields and the bipartite sun prepares to enter in Libra, the Trojan women with unbound hair and whitened dress, with their hands aflame with gold, should boast to carry on their shoulders the images of the gods through the countryside and the cities.\footnote{v. 722. \textit{I have written “the Trojan women with unbound hair,” because then they were beginning to marry the Trojans.}} A crowd of men should follow and march in the procession in order. Incense should smoke at the altars constructed in the middle of the harvest and the grapes should be incensed in the midst of the vines.\footnote{[729–736] Aeneas commanded that the farmers on those days should hang up their first flowers, consecrate their first fruits, and hang them from the roof of the temple. Thus he wished them to offer the greatest gifts to Bacchus and Ceres, who are the gods necessary for life. When the Dog-Star begins to burn the fields which are sterile on account of their dryness, and the sun is equally divided into days and nights and falls into the sign of Libra, the women, with their hair let down, with whitened clothing and their hands illuminated with lit torches, should delight to carry the images of these gods on their shoulders through the fields and cities. A crowd of men should follow them in order and march in the procession. Incense should smoke at their altars constructed in the middle of the harvest, and their altars built in the middle of the vineyards should smoke with the incense as well.}

\textit{Sacrifices to Neptune}

[729–736] Aeneas commanded that the youth slaughter a bull at the altars of great Neptune, who had snatched him away in a hollow cloud when he joined in battle with the son of Peleus, with unequal strength and with unequal gods, and had caused him to sail past the sands of Circe so that he might not suffer the fates of Ulysses. Also, on account of the calm seas and the ships that were recovered from the rocks, when he sailed the seas of Libya as an exile, at the end of the month the youth should submerge a noble horse in the waves, while the shores widely resound with a roar.\footnote{[729–736] He wished that the youth sacrifice a bull to the god who took him away in a hollow cloud while he fought with Achilles and was outmatched in his powers and strength, and who had conveyed him past the sands of Circe, lest he experience the fate of Ulysses and his companions. He was thankful that the waves had formerly calmed down, and that he had freed his ships from the rocks while he was driven harshly as an exile and was sailing the seas of Libya. At the end of the month he wished that a horse be cast into the sea for Neptune, as the shore resounds far and wide.}

\textit{Sacrifices to Anchises and Venus}
Aeneas commanded the people to honor Anchises and his mother Venus with every type of incense. The swan, which was the love and the delight of his mother, would be for the people the most sacred of birds. The people would fear to stain their hands with its blood, since, as a prophet, the swan magically foretells its own death with a very beautiful song. The pious people would beat their breasts, scatter fresh myrtle, and heap flowers on the tomb of the bird.\(^3\)

**Sacrifices for Father Tiber**

[744–750] Aeneas commanded that the greatest glory of the gods be given to Father Tiber, because when he had landed at the mouth of Laurentum, on the shores of [New] Troy, as he considered many things, Tiber comforted him: “Here is your safe home. Your household gods are safe. Do not leave!”\(^4\) At the beginning of spring, when the streams flow again from their broken prisons, the people should bind their temples with poplar branches and offer sprinkled grain and a huge sea-beast to the river.\(^5\)

**Sacrifices for the Penates**

[751–756] Aeneas did not think that it was right to omit you, Penates, you, the love of our citizens and the guardians of our homes, whom he worshipped with great piety even in distress. He commanded, when the stars rise in heaven, that incense and wine be poured out for the sacred Penates. Furthermore, he commanded that each man enclose his Lares in a virginal box and take care lest their faces be defiled by unworthy things.\(^6\)\(^7\)

**Moral Legislation**

[757–767] The hero declared how religion languishes in contempt, unless it is sustained and grows strong by the weight of laws and customs. Those who come forward as witnesses for lawsuits under a false name, those who are delighted to harm the name of the good and the just, the enemies of the fatherland, those who are bold enough to overturn the treaties of the state, and

---

\(^3\) [737–743] He also commanded his people to honor Anchises and his mother Venus with every foreign incense. Since the swan was the delight and love of Venus, above all it was to be honored by the people. This people would fear that their hands be dishonored by its blood, since it prophetically foretells its own death with a very sweet song. The pious people would sprinkle fresh myrtle, and beating their breasts, would adorn its grave with flowers.

\(^4\) v. 743. *This verse is whole and complete in Virgil [7.39] and this was revealed by the river Tiber.* [The note is incorrectly labeled and refers to 13.745, not 13.743.]

\(^5\) [744–750] Aeneas decided that the greatest glory should be given to the river Tiber, because, when he had arrived at the mouths of the Tiber and the mouths of Laurentum, and was considering many things, the Tiber had comforted him with these words: “This home is allotted to you. Here your domestic gods are safe. Do not abandon your undertakings!” He wished at the beginning of spring, when the rivers run from their broken prisons, that the citizens bind poplar branches around their heads, give ground grain as an offering, and sacrifice a sea creature.

\(^6\) [751–756] He did not believe that it was right to have been able to ignore you, O Penates, you whom he always honored with great piety, even when in distress, you who are the love of our citizens and the guardians of our hearths. At evening, when the stars appear in the sky, he desired that wine and incense be poured out for you. At night he desired that each man enclose you in an intact box and beware lest your faces be defiled by unworthy hands.

\(^7\) v. 755. *The box is “virginal” because in this box only the Penates are enclosed and nothing else whatsoever was previously put in it.*
those who are captured by the blind love of a married woman and attempt to violate the conjugal genius of another man—Aeneas decreed that such men should endure death and exile and the most painful punishments, and that perfidious people should pay with a similar fate. Virtue should receive the rewards that are owed for virtue and crime should pay the punishments of crime with blood.  

**Candidates for the Magistracy**

[768–776] If any candidate should wish to contend for honor, he ought to be pure in life and knowledgeable of the laws. He ought to spurn all gifts demanded by seductive eyes, accept different clients with an impartial ear, take care to settle swiftly any lawsuits, punish with fines or corporal punishment those which are rashly ambitious, restrain caustic tongues, and hold a lying face in contempt. And let him not say that he is an unworthy minister, since it is agreed that he is envious of the first honor of Themis.

**Achates Reports the Death of Anna**

[777–793] When the Trojan had tended to the Lares and the forum and the sacred rites, he made sure that his subjects fared well in all things and that his kingdom was happy. Then Achates, whom Aeneas sent to tend the fields near the pool of Numicius, comes to him in concern from the font of Numicius and reports these things: “When Jarbas was rejected, he could not endure that the flames of his love were offended. He was impatient to avenge Dido and he destroyed the citadels of Carthage and the Tyrian houses. For some time now he has cruelly pursued Dido’s sister, Anna, over land and sea. Afterwards, when she was driven from Carthage through various wanderings, she did not have anything to hope for and they say that she drowned herself in the waves of the river. Alas! She did not know that she had arrived at friendly ports and that her sister remains always in your heart. The Laurentian font wends its way with different windings,

---

**Footnotes**

98 [757–767] Since religion is held in contempt unless it is sustained by the weight of laws and fair customs, our hero gave a command that those who offer false witness under a false name, those who harm the reputation and the name of the righteous, those who are hostile to the fatherland, those who attempt to disturb the peace of the kingdom, those who are captured by the love of a woman and desire to ascend the marital bed of another, all of these should suffer death and experience the harshest things. He wished that traitors and the treacherous be afflicted by the same punishments, that rewards proper to virtue are granted, and that any crime endure a fitting punishment.

99 [768–776] If any beginner attempts to arrive at the magistracy, let him be knowledgeable of the law in his manner of life. Let him spurn all gifts, especially those obtained from a concubine. Let him accept all clients by the same rule and with the same ear. Let him desire to quench lawsuits as soon as possible and punish physically or with a fine those who threaten lawsuits rashly. Above all, let him offer no insult, nor make jokes at the expense of anyone. Let him wear no mask, and may he not say that he is an unworthy minister of justice, since it is clear to all that he is very desirous of the highest honors.

100 v. 779ff. *The stories which are inserted here both about Anna, the sister of Dido, and the death and apotheosis of Aeneas, are partly historical and partly fictitious. The accounts that describe the misfortunes of Anna, although in a different manner, are taken from the third book of Ovid’s *Fasti* [3.523–710]. But since all the histories agree that Aeneas died at nearly the same time as Anna, and they affirm that the body of Aeneas was found in the same Lake Numicius in which she drowned herself, I judged that I was able to add a history adorned with inventions not far from the truth, and to send our hero in this way from mortal to immortal life.*
and by its slow current the fields of Ardea are watered. They say that the people use this river alone, when they make offerings to Vesta. It is sacrilege to offer it to others.”

_Mnestheus Deceives Aeneas_

[794–803] Aeneas listened in astonishment, and it is alleged that he went suddenly to the Numicius accompanied by Achates and Messapus. He arrived, and Messapus treacherously urges him to approach closer to the ambush, deceiving with his words and his expression. “You will understand,” he says, “the misfortune and the causes of grief; you will understand why Anna is buried beneath our waves. She will inform you thoroughly about Dido and the burning of Carthage, which happened when you were sailing the tempestuous seas with your fleet. She will tell you of the fate of Dido, which escaped your notice when you were wandering the Elysian fields. Great things await you.”

_The Death of Aeneas_

[804–815] Aeneas failed to remember Mnestheus, and the predictions in his dream were already forgotten. Mnestheus had warned him of Messapus’ faithlessness, and that Messapus had constructed traps to make him meet with an unwilling death. Unfortunate beyond measure, Aeneas trusted Messapus. He turned his chariot around and leapt into the flood, but he injured his legs and his feet, and his body was heavy. The water took away his life beneath the waves. Suddenly a breeze arose with a fragrant odor. Shining among sparks, he is borne from the water. Like a new star, he causes the densest clouds to flee, and he brushes the eyes of the onlookers with pure flame. Furthermore, the people honor him not as Indiges, but with the honor of the incense of the gods, thinking that this is the highest will of Jupiter.

---

101 [777–793] When Aeneas had taken care of his domestic gods, justice, and religion, and had seen to it that his citizens were fortunate enough to call their kingdoms happy, Achates, whom he had formerly sent to cultivate the fields near the font of Numicius, comes in concern from the font, and gives him these certain reports: “When Jarbas was despised, he could not endure for long the offended fires of his love. He wanted to seek vengeance from Dido. He destroyed the castles of Carthage and the Tyrian homes. Now for a long time he has fiercely followed her sister Anna on land and on sea. After she was badly treated everywhere and had nothing to hope for, they say that she submerged herself in the waters of the river. Alas, she did not know that she had reached friendly ports, and that Dido is always present in your memory. That font,” he said, “wends by circuitous paths through the Laurentian fields. By its flow the fields of Ardea are watered. They say that the people use it, when they offer sacrifices to the god Vesta, and it is wrong to offer it to another.”

102 v. 802. _Mnestheus warned Aeneas about the death and treachery of Messanus, as you will see at v. 600ff_ [13.617–636].

103 [794–803] Aeneas listened in terror, and without delay he hastens to the font, taking Messapus and Achates with him. Scearsely had he arrived, when the traitor Messapus urges him to approach nearer to the font, deceiving him with his words and expression. He says, “You will learn of the misfortune and the causes of the suffering of Anna. You will understand why she cast herself into the fountain. She herself will teach you of the flames of Dido, and what she did when you were sailing on the Libyan Sea after she was abandoned. When these things are known, she will instruct you of the fates which Dido herself hid from you when you were wandering the Elysian Fields. Great things await you.

104 [804–815] Aeneas had forgotten Mnestheus, and what he had predicted to him in his dream: that he should not trust the words of Messapus, since Messapus himself had thought to construct traps, so that he might make him meet with a premature death. Unlucky beyond measure, Aeneas was too credulous. He turned his chariot around and hastened to leap into the river. But his legs and feet were injured, and since he was unable to support his body, the
The Deification of Aeneas

[816–827] As soon as everyone recognized him to be a god, Achates was sent to tell his anxious wife and King Latinus that he was asked to say that Aeneas was a god by the will of fate. Lavinia was stupefied by happiness and fear. A frigid horror shook her limbs. Into the light she gave birth to a son of Aeneas (which confirmed the reliable oracles given by Anchises long ago), whose name was Silvius Albus.105 His wife dedicated the waters as sacred to Aeneas, on the shores she ordered that a temple be constructed of marble, and she wrote his name on the doorposts with an inscribed poem: “Because of his mores, his piety, and his arms, the gods made Aeneas equal to themselves.106 Thus the people can hope for everything.”107

The End

water took away his soul beneath the waves. Suddenly a wind arises from the water with a fragrant odor. Many sparks flash in the wind, and thus a flame is borne up from the waves. Like a new star it puts the densest clouds to flight, and with the purest fire it grazes the eyes of the onlookers. The people believe that they ought to honor him not as a demigod, but as a great god, thinking that this sign demonstrates that it is the will of Jupiter.


106 v. 825. I have written “because of his mores, his piety, and his arms,” because these virtues were befitting to Aeneas. I have used the ablative, and it means the same thing as “on account of his mores, his piety, and his arms.”

107 [816–827] When all recognized that he was a god, Achates was sent to inform Lavinia and King Latinus that by fate Aeneas was named a god. His wife was stupefied by fear and joy. A cold horror shook her limbs. Thus, after a certain interval of time, she gave birth to a child whom she had conceived by Aeneas, and who was named Sylvius Albus (so that he might confirm the oracles formerly given by Anchises). His wife Lavinia ordered that those waters be consecrated to him, and that a temple of marble be erected on the shores, and on its facade his name and praises be carved with this couplet: “Because of his mores, his piety, and his virtue, the gods made Aeneas equal to themselves. For this reason, our race should hope for all things.”
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