

Pär Sandin is a doctoral student in classical Greek at Gothenburg University.
His research is directed towards text-critical studies of Greek drama
and lyrical poetry, especially Aeschylus.

The Man of Authority

Images of Power in Virgil's Aeneid, 1.50-156

Virgil's political outlook, and in particular his opinions on the principate of Augustus, has been subject to debate since at least the 1960's. Unchallenged for about nineteen centuries was the opinion that the *Aeneid*, the European classic *par excellence* according to T. S. Eliot (see below),¹ was an apology and a propaganda piece, written at least partly for the purpose of vindicating and glorifying the Roman rule of Augustus. The foremost Virgilian critic in antiquity, the Roman grammarian Servius (*fl.* c. 400 AD), stated 'the intention of Virgil' in words characteristically prosaic and matter-of-fact: *intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus* ('The intention of Virgil is this: to imitate Homer and to praise Augustus by praising his parentage').²

Throughout the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and well into the eighteenth century this was taken as the plain truth, and no one had any complaints. Virgil was the greatest poet and his subject, too, was the best: war, and a eulogy of the polity that was the earthly analogue of the Divine Government, Absolute Monarchy. (And if Virgil was a heathen, that was all right, too, for he was an *anima natural-*

iter Christiana, a Christian before Christ, as it were. It was agreed that, in his fourth *Eclogue*, he had foretold the birth of the Saviour.)

Things, however, started to stir in the *Weltgeist* towards the end of the eighteenth century. Enlightenment, romanticism, and liberalism were the names of some of the strange new patterns of thought that were to change the ways of Europe, and by extension the world, for good. The romantic opinion of Virgil is well-known: he was a mere imitator of Homer, and 'artificial' and 'mannered', not 'natural' and 'simple' like his great model. But apart from this aesthetic judgement, there also arose for the first time now the rudiments of what two hundred years later was to become a paradigm of academic criticism: the Left-wing critical perspective on literature. In the case of Virgil, this states that propaganda for tyranny (i.e., Augustus' imperial rule) is a disgrace, and not a subject worthy of a real poet.

As long as Virgil was regarded as an inferior poet, this was not a problem: inferior poets do write courtly poetry and eulogies to their masters. In the twentieth century, however, a re-evaluation of Virgil's poetical stature began to take place, in part perhaps related to the reaction against romanticism among

English and American poets during the first decades of the century. At least it was one of these poets, T. S. Eliot¹, who definitely was to establish the position that Virgil has kept during most of the twentieth century: for better or worse, Virgil was *the* Western literary classic. Absorbing the entire world of Greek mythology and literature (Virgil was extremely well-read in the Greek classics) and incorporating it into the history of imperial Rome, the state that was to form Europe in its entirety, Virgil, and in particular the *Aeneid*, influenced art, thought and literature throughout the Christian era.

Virgil: a crypto-liberal?

When after World War II liberalism definitely took over the American universities, even the Classics departments, Virgil must have become something of an embarrassment. So great a poet, and such an unworthy subject: not only the eulogy of a tyrant, but unvarnished militarism and imperialism as well. The 'solution' to the dilemma was discovered, one could say, at Harvard University in the early sixties, and published in a couple of articles which were to have a huge impact on Virgilian scholarship throughout the rest of the century.³

The revolutionary idea was that Virgil had been speaking darkly, with a 'cloven tongue', as it were. On the surface the *Aeneid* was what it had always seemed to be, a eulogy of Augustus and the glory of war and conquest. But Virgil's heart was not in it, we were told: between the lines of his poem another message was to be found, a 'private voice' opposed to the 'public' one celebrating the empire: a voice of regret, of sadness, of subversion, even. While a certain inclination to melancholy had long been noted in the poet,⁴ this was now taken as proof that Virgil was not the propagandist he previously had been imagined to be. Beneath the superficial laudatory phrases, the real Virgil loomed, dark, pessimistic, and critical of the Augustan monarchy, indeed of imperialistic Rome itself. 'The im-

perial ideology [...],' David Quint writes in a characteristic statement, 'is not identical to the "meaning" of the *Aeneid*, which devotes a considerable part of its energy to criticizing and complicating what it holds up as the official party line.'⁵

This notion of a 'subversive' Virgil was supported by intricate close readings of certain passages of the *Aeneid*. While there is no room here for a detailed review, I shall quote a typical example of this way of reasoning from what perhaps became the most influential article of its kind, written by Adam Parry:

In the third book [Aeneas] visits his kinsman Helenus in Epirus, and there he sees a copy of Troy, laid out in miniature. Aeneas is at first hopeful as he asks the prophetic Helenus for advice [...]. But a little later, when Anchises enters, and he must set sail again, Aeneas falls into despair: "May you live happy, for your destiny is accomplished; but we are called from one fate to another ... You have peace, you have no need to plow up the sea and follow forever the forever receding shores of Italy."

Arva neque Ausoniae semper cedentia retro
Quaerenda [3. 495-96]

What this and other like passages impress upon us is something subtly at variance with the stated theme of the poem. Instead of an arduous but certain journey to a fixed and glorious goal, there arises, and gathers strength, a suggestion that the true goal of the Trojan and Roman labors will never arrive.⁶

In a like manner several expressions of doubt, melancholy and tragic sensitivity in Virgil have been interpreted as evidence for a doubtful, critical attitude to the Augustan project, pervading the entire *Aeneid*.⁷ This critical approach was dubbed the 'Harvard school' by W. R. Johnson,⁸ as most of its original advocates were in one way or another affiliated with Harvard University.⁹ Its counterpart, the 'conservative' order of critics who maintained that

Virgil on the whole was positively inclined towards Rome and Augustus, Johnson called the 'European school',¹⁰ since it was seen to follow the tradition of pioneering twentieth-century German scholars like Heinze, Norden, and Pöschl,¹¹ as well as adhering to the decisive critical declaration of T. S. Eliot (for all practical purposes an Englishman).

The followers of these two 'schools', as well as several scholars trying to take an intermediate position, have produced quite a large amount of scholarship throughout the late twentieth century pertaining to the subject of Virgilian politics, without however taking much notice of each other's arguments – 'two voices' talking past each other, as it were.¹²

I shall add this article to the number. Its purpose is to clarify the meaning of an 'ideological allegory' at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, in a passage which seems to me hitherto to have been insufficiently understood, although it has long been considered to be of central importance for the understanding of the *Aeneid* as a whole.¹³

The Statesman and the Storm

The Storm (*Aeneid* 1.50-156) has been one of the most discussed passages of the *Aeneid*. It may be summarised as follows. Troy has fallen and Aeneas is on his way to Italy. Juno, his sworn enemy, calls on her vassal king Aeolus, lord of winds (cf. *Odyssey* 10.1-76), and orders him to release a storm to hinder Aeneas on his mission. As a reward for his services he is promised the fair nymph Deiopea in marriage. Aeolus raises the storm, letting the winds out of their prison. They cause havoc among Aeneas and his crew. Neptune takes notice and stills the storm, furious at this attempt to usurp power over his domain, the sea.

The actual description of the storm (1.81-123) is framed by two passages of fairly equal length, in which Aeolus (1.50-80) and Neptune (1.124-56), respectively, are described. It has been noted that a contrast between the two gods is implied, perhaps first explicitly stated by Michael Putnam:

The chief contrast ... is that between the characters of Aeolus and Neptune, the one impelled by base motives to misuse his royal power, the other filled with piety, capable of quieting the mob once it is out of hand.¹⁴

Putnam is referring to the famous simile towards the end of the Neptune passage, in which the sea is likened to a riotous mass of people (1.148-54):

ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est
seditio saevitque animis ignobile vulgus 150
iamque faces et saxa volunt, furor arma ministrat;
tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
conspexere, silent arrectisque auribus astant;
ille regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet:
sic cunctus pelagi cecidit fragor.

Just as when disorder arises among the people of a great city and the common mob runs riot, wild passion finds weapons for men's hands and torches and rocks start flying; at such a time if people chance to see a man who has some weight among them for his goodness and his services to the state, they fall silent, standing and listening with all their attention while his words command their passions and soothe their hearts – so did all the crashing of the sea fall silent.¹⁵

This simile is extremely striking: it is quite unique in that the forces of nature are illustrated by the behaviour of humans, not the other way around, as was usual in ancient literature and the convention of Homeric similes.¹⁶ 'The reader is meant to notice,' as J. H. Bishop rightly puts it.¹⁷

Many critics have wished to see in the image of the statesman a reference to Cato Uticensis, the famous martyr for the free Republic, whose appearance at a riot in 54 B.C. was well-known (see Plutarch, *Cato Minor* 44.4-6).¹⁸ Viktor Pöschl's discussion on this matter is rewarding, taking into account some of the political implications that such an allusion would have, and stressing the ideological force of such an obvious portrait of a Great

man of the Republic (see my discussion below).¹⁹ Two of Pöschl's followers have developed the 'political allegory' further: Oliver Phillips, who stresses the fact that Aeolus had no legal authority over the sea, which was the domain of Neptune;²⁰ and John Sarkissian, who suggests that in overstepping the bounds of his legal jurisdiction, Aeolus symbolises that same trend among magistrates of the Late Republic.²¹

Two studies, however, of conclusive importance for the interpretation of the simile, as well as for understanding the over-all ideological significance of the passage of the storm, have been published in later years.

Virgil: a critic of monarchy

Jean-Luc Pomathios, firstly, has made a groundbreaking observation concerning Virgil's portrayal of Aeolus.²²

The Lord of Winds, he sees, is depicted as a full-fledged *rex* (1.52, 62, 137, 10.37, 1.78 *regni*, 141 *regnet*),²³ with *sceptra* (1.57, 78), residing in an *aula* ('royal palace', 1.140; also found pejorative in *Georgicon* 2.504). 'On retrouve,' Pomathios writes, 'concentrée sur sa personne, la vieille suspicion romaine à l'égard de la royauté, si fréquemment observée dans l'*Énéide*.'²⁴ To this picture we may add that Aeolus' reign is obviously that of a tyrant: (1.54, cf. 1.141) *imperio premit ac vinclis et carcere frenat* ('he spurs with command and curbs with fetters and prison'); his subjects are (1.55) *indignantés* ('angered'). The image of Aeolus' cave as a jail is (in all likelihood) an innovation of Virgil's.²⁵ P. R. Hardie also notes that Virgil's King of Winds is 'a far more authoritarian functionary than the Homeric Aeolus, described as *tamiēn anemōn*, "steward of the winds" (*Odyssey* 10.21)'.²⁶ For *vinclum* (the absence thereof) in the context of governmental policy, cf. *Aeneid* 7.203.

Neptune on the other hand, is never called *rex*. 'Neptune,' Pomathios continues, 'dépourvu de tout titre officiel, est le symbole de l'homme d'État idéal, que recommandent sa piété et les services rendus à la collectivité,

capable de maîtriser dans la sérénité une populace déchaînée (I 151 *sq*).'²⁷ As we shall see, however, this picture of Neptune may be significantly concretised.

The concept of *auctoritas*

A good distance towards that end has been covered in the other important study on the matter, presented by Karl Galinsky in his recent monograph.²⁸ Without taking Pomathios' work into consideration, Galinsky still manages to offer one of the most rewarding studies on the simile in later years. He does so by associating the image of the ideal statesman with the concept of *auctoritas*. In this he is indeed following Servius, who explained the words *pietate gravem* ('heavy with piety') with *quia illi auctoritas ob pietatem est gravis* ('since his authority is great by virtue of his piety'). The significance of the concept, however, has been studied and specified many times over since Servius wrote his commentary on Virgil.²⁹ Galinsky, for all his merits, is still somewhat vague in his interpretation of its meaning in this context:

[T]he simile shares a deliberate multiplicity of meanings with the concept of *auctoritas* that it expresses. *Auctoritas*, as we have seen, could mean different things to different people; its prevailing connotation depended on the recipient and the context. [...] Vergil's simile is easily applicable to various Roman leaders, including Augustus and for that matter, Aeneas: the programmatic characterization of Aeneas as *insignem pietate virum* (1.10) is echoed by that of the statesman as *pietate gravem virum* (1.151). The simile does not express one simple equation, but is generic and paradigmatic, and it calls for the reader's involvement.³⁰

While Galinsky certainly does justice to the always many-layered and complex Virgilian imagery, I believe it is possible to give the concept of *auctoritas*, if we are to introduce it here (and I think we should), a more precise meaning, especially in the light of the obser-

vation of Pomathios. If we return to the simile, we may observe that the conduct of Neptune in one very important respect is the exact opposite of that of Aeolus: in the exercise of power. While Aeolus as a traditional monarch enforces his will by *imperium* ('command'), and like a tyrant curbs his indignant people with *vincla* and *carcer* ('fetters and prison'), Neptune's methods are the opposite: *regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet* ('with words he rules the spirits and softens the hearts').

By simply showing himself and talking to the crowd, Neptune (at least as pictured in the simile) takes control, just like Cato and Mene-nius Agrippa.³¹ Galinsky adds Popilius Laena, a priest calming a crowd in the fourth century B.C. (cf. Cicero, *Brutus* 56), as another example of what obviously was commonplace in Republican political discourse.³²

The essential message of the image, then, is that the great statesman relies on *natural authority* rather than royal command; and this is also what the concept of *auctoritas*, ingeniously invoked by Galinsky, should mean in this context: natural authority, the unofficial power given to a great man who has earned it honestly, through his virtue (*pietas*, *clementia*, *iustitia* etc.) and his accomplishments (*merita*). *Auctoritas* is the positive antithesis of the absolute power of the king, which was abhorred by the Romans (and declined, in theory, by all absolute rulers from Julius Caesar and onwards): it denotes the power belonging to a great man of the free Republic.³³ As used in ideological and juridical contexts, the concept of *auctoritas* is the opposite of *potestas*, *imperium* and *vis*, the absolute powers of the sovereign,³⁴ since it spares the *libertas* of those hearkening to it: the Romans were free men, only guided by the *auctoritas* of their betters.

Augustus

Examples of Great Men of Authority from the history of the Republic abound: Cato Uticensis was one; in earlier Roman history we find

men like Cato Censor and Appius Claudius Caecus.³⁵ Following this tradition of Republican Men of Authority, Virgil created his image of the ideal statesman, elegantly contrasting the Republican virtues of the man in the simile to the impotent royalty of Aeolus.³⁶ The image finds its exact counterparts in official Augustan propaganda. Pictures on gems and coins show that Augustus after the battle of Actium identified himself with the sea-god Neptune.³⁷ It is also clear that he made use of the popular Republican ideals: he maintained that he had restored the free Republic, that his power was subject to its laws, and that it was through his *auctoritas*, not his *potestas*, that he held his position.³⁸ Thus in the *Monumentum Ancyranum* (*Res Gestae* 34):

...per consensum universorum [potitus rerum omn]ium rem publicam ex mea potestate in senat[us populique Romani a]rbitrium transtuli. quo pro merito meo senatu[s consulto Augustus appe]llatus sum ... [et clupeus aureu]s in [c]uria Iulia positus, quem mihi senatum [populumque Romanu]m dare virtutis clem[entiaequ]e iustitia[e et pietatis causa testatum] est pe[r]eius clupei [inscription]em. Post id tem[pus auctoritate omnibus praestiti, potest]atis au[tem] nihilo ampliu[s habui quam ceteri qui m]ihi quoque in ma[gis]tra[t]u conlegae [fuerunt].

...at a time when with universal consent I was in control of affairs, I transferred the republic from my power to the dominion of the senate and people of Rome. For this service of mine I was named Augustus by decree of the senate, ... and a golden shield was set in the Curia Julia, which, as attested the inscription thereon, was given me by the senate and people of Rome on account of my courage, clemency, justice, and piety. After this time, I excelled all in influence [*auctoritas*], although I possessed no more official power than others who were my colleagues in the several magistracies.³⁹

The ideological outlook and vocabulary are the same as in the *Aeneid*. *Pro merito meo* ('for this service of mine'), Augustus says, *Augustus*

appellatus sum ('I was named Augustus'); and among the virtues for which he is rewarded we find *pietas*. These are the epithets of the man in Virgil's simile, who is *pietate gravis ac meritis* ('heavy with piety and merits').

Virgil then, at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, elegantly combines two major images of Augustan propaganda: the mighty Lord of the Sea, and the pious Roman statesman in the old Republican tradition. The latter image we saw in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*; for the former we may recollect *Georgicon* 1.29-31, where a Virgil at his most servile asks Augustus what sort of god he would prefer to be, a god of the earth and the winds...

an deus immensi venias maris ac tua nautae 30
numina sola colant, tibi serviat ultima Thule,
teque sibi generum Thetys emat omnibus undis

...or will you come as a god of the endless sea, and the sailors will worship your powers only, outermost Thule serve under you, Thetys acquire you as son-in-law with a dowry of all waves...

Virgil goes on to suggest, for the sake of completeness, divine authority over the air and the underworld.

Virgil: an Augustan mouthpiece

On a final note, we may ponder the possibility that using the image of the troublesome little King Aeolus, Virgil has hinted at Augustus' defeated arch-enemy, Mark Antony.⁴⁰ There is no way of proving that such was his intention (and we should of course never speak of clear-cut, logically consistent *Allegorien* in Virgil,⁴¹ only intricate webs of hints, allusions and symbols), – but apart from the kingly attributes (cf. Plutarch, *Antonius* 54.6-9), the focus on Aeolus' libido (1.71-75, cf. Cicero, *Oratio Philippica* 2.105, Plutarch, *Antonius* 9.5-9, 24.1) may suggest as much; also, Aeolus' subservience to Juno may just conceivably be a reminiscence of the picture of Antony as completely in the hands of his Egyptian queen, Cleopatra.⁴² We may also compare the picture of Augustus and Antony



Augustus as Neptune, cameo (21 mm), 31-27 B.C. (Francis Bartlett Fund, Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Reproduced with permission ©1999 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. All Rights Reserved.)

on the shield of Aeneas, which seems to be envisaged as a parallel to the conflict between Cato and Catiline (i. e., between Republic and Tyranny),⁴³ and the cameo on which Augustus is pictured as Neptune, with his horses trampling an enemy who is struggling in the waves – probably Antony.⁴⁴

In the very overture to the *Aeneid*, and in a passage which has been agreed to be of central importance for the interpretation of the work as a whole, Virgil combines two major images of Augustan ideology. While I would hesitate to claim that he was a simple propagandist, there is little doubt in my mind that Virgil was a very sophisticated and accomplished propagandist, and that he as a professional took his commission from Augustus (if such it was) very seriously. This will not in any way diminish the complexity and profoundness of his poem, or exclude multifarious symbolism in the passages, even the present one. Nor does it rid the *Aeneid* of its tragic qualities: the melancholy sorrow of things disappeared forever is certainly there, but it should not be seen as diminishing the glory of the present age, and the Augustan achievements: it functions rather as a precious backdrop, whose faded images only serve to accentuate the splendour of the main picture.

The writing of this article was made possible by a generous grant from *Harald och Tonny Hagendahls stipendiefond*.

- 1 T. S. Eliot, *What is a Classic?*, London 1945.
- 2 The translations offered of Latin passages are my own, unless otherwise noted.
- 3 A. Parry, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2, 1963, pp. 66-80; W. Clausen, 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68, 1964, pp. 139-47. Forerunners, however, were R. A. Brooks, 'Discolor aura: Reflections on the Golden Bough', *American Journal of Philology* 74, 1953, pp. 260-80, and F. Sforza, 'The Problem of Virgil', *Classical Review* 49, 1935, pp. 97-108.
- 4 Matthew Arnold, 'The Modern Element in Literature', inaugural lecture as Oxford Professor of Poetry, 1857, in H. Super (ed.), *Matthew Arnold on the Classical Tradition (The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold 1)*, Ann Arbor 1960, pp. 34-36; and the poem *To Virgil* by Alfred Tennyson (1882).
- 5 D. Quint, 'Epic and Empire', *Comparative Literature* 41, 1989, p. 3.
- 6 Parry (n. 3), p. 75.
- 7 See, e.g., Parry (n. 3) on 7.759-60, 2.792-94, 6.86, 4.381, 4.617-20, 1.461-64, 4.449; Clausen (n. 3) on 12.894-95, 12.948-52, 6.822, 6.868-70, 6.893-96; and R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford 1992 (1 ed. 1987) on the Dido episode: 4.330-71 (pp. 19-23), 4.69-73 (pp. 194-198) and on Ascanius: 7.476-502 (pp. 198-200), 9.621-62 (pp. 200-205), 12.435-40 (pp. 205-206).
- 8 W. R. Johnson, *Darkness Visible. A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*, Berkeley 1976, p. 11.
- 9 The eighties were probably its period of greatness. Something of a reaction has taken place since: see the early misgivings of J. Farrell, 'Which Aeneid in Whose Nineties?', *Vergilius* 36, 1990, pp. 74-80, and, e.g., the impressive 'conservative' *magnum opus* of R. Jenkyns, *Virgil's Experience. Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places*, Oxford 1998; see especially pp. 631-77.
- 10 Johnson (n. 8), p. 9.
- 11 R. Heinze, *Vergils epische Technik*, 3 Aufl., Leipzig etc. 1915 (1. ed. 1903); E. Norden (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneis. Liber VI*, 3 Aufl., Leipzig etc. 1927 (1. ed. 1903); V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Vergils. Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis*, 3 Aufl., Berlin etc. 1977 (1. ed. 1950).
- 12 A bibliography (up to 1980) on the subject is presented by W. Suerbaum, 'Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung: Eine systematische Arbeitsbibliographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Aeneis', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 31.1, pp. 47-50, 92-98, with an index of scholars in *Aufstieg und Niedergang II* 31.2, pp. 1359-99. See also R. Rieks, 'Vergils Dichtung als Zeugnis und Deutung der römischen Geschichte', *Aufstieg und Niedergang II* 31.2, pp. 829-46. For a limited bibliography of the eighties (and earlier), see S. J. Harrison, 'Some Views of the Aeneid in the Twentieth Century', in Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford 1990, pp. 1-20.
- 13 See, e.g., Pöschl (n. 11), pp. 19-23; B. Otis, *Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oxford 1963, pp. 227-30; R. D. Williams (ed.), *The Aeneid of Virgil. Books 1-6*, Edinburgh 1992 (1 ed. 1972), p. 172; F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan epic*, Cambridge 1989, pp. 94-95.
- 14 M. C. J. Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid. Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1965, p. 11; cf. Otis (n. 13), pp. 228-33.
- 15 Translation by D. West, *Virgil, the Aeneid. A New Prose Translation* (Penguin Classics), London 1990, p. 8.
- 16 As such, the likening of a mass of people to a stormy sea (i.e., the opposite of Virgil's simile) goes back as far as to *Iliad* 2.144-49; in Roman literature see Cicero, *Pro Cluentio* 138, Livy 28.27.11. See R. G. Austin (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis liber primus*, Oxford 1971, pp. 68-69.
- 17 J. H. Bishop, *The Cost of Power. Studies in the Aeneid of Virgil (University of New England Monographs 4)*, Armidale 1988, p. 10.
- 18 See R. S. Conway (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis liber primus*, Cambridge 1935, p. 45; and also Austin (n. 16), pp. 68-69. J. Morwood, 'Virgil's Pious Man and Menenius Agrippa: a Note on *Aeneid* 1.148-53', *Greece & Rome* 45, 1998, pp. 195-98, suggests an identification with the senator Menenius Agrippa, who was said to have pacified a rioting mob in 490 B.C. (Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Antiquitates Romanae* 6.45-90; Plutarch, *Coriolanus* 5.3-7.1; Livy 2.32-33).
- 19 Pöschl (n. 11), pp. 20-23.
- 20 O. Phillips, 'Aeole, namque tibi', *Vergilius* 26, 1980, pp. 18-26.
- 21 J. Sarkissian, 'The Idea of *imperium* in *Aeneid* 1.50-296', *Augustan Age* 4, 1985, pp. 51-56, at p. 51.
- 22 Jean-Luc Pomathios, *Le pouvoir politique et sa représentation dans l'Énéide de Virgile (Collection Latomus 199)*, Brussels 1987, p. 276. See also pp. 149-50, 217.
- 23 Contemptuously stressed by Neptune in his speech to the winds: *regique haec dicite vestro* (1.137).
- 24 Pomathios (n. 22), p. 276. His claim for a discernible Virgilian anti-royalism is substantiated in pp. 25-83. For a radically different opinion, see Cairns (n. 13), pp. 1-84, on the present passage pp. 27, 94-95.
- 25 Conway (n. 18), p. 30.
- 26 P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid. Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986, p. 92.
- 27 Pomathios (n. 22), p. 276.
- 28 K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton 1996, pp. 20-24.
- 29 See, e.g., T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 3.2 (*Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer* 3.2), Leipzig

- 1888, pp. 1032-34, 1037-43; R. Heinze, 'Auctoritas', *Hermes* 60, 1925, pp. 348-66; A. Magdelain, *Auctoritas principis* (Collection d'études latines 22), Paris 1947; J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Publications de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'université de Lille 11), Paris 1963, pp. 295-320; J. Fueyo, 'Die Idee der „auctoritas“: Genesis und Entwicklung', in *Epirrhosis. Festgabe für Carl Schmitt*, 1 Bd., Berlin 1968, pp. 213-35; E. Wistrand, 'Auctoritas', in *Vetenskap och omvärdering. Till Curt Weibull på hundraårsdagen*, Gothenburg 1986, pp. 235-45; E. S. Ramage, *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res gestae"* (*Historia, Einzelschriften* 54), Stuttgart 1987, pp. 38-54.
- 30 Galinsky (n. 28), p. 23.
- 31 See above, n. 18.
- 32 Galinsky (n. 28), p. 21.
- 33 A comprehensive study of *auctoritas* as a central concept of Republican polity is given in E. Wistrand, 'Statsmakt och medborgarfrihet i Rom' in Wistrand, *Politik och litteratur i antikens Rom*, 2 uppl., Gothenburg 1978, pp. 203-19 (summary in English pp. 263-64.).
- 34 See Magdelain (n. 29), p. 5, and Hellegouarc'h (n. 29), pp. 308-10, both of whom present several classical examples.
- 35 See, e.g., Cicero, *De senectute* 15-17, 60-62, *De officiis* 1.79, *In Verrem* 2.3.209-10, *Pro lege Manilia* 43; and also *De republica* 2.67-69 on the Ideal Statesman, he who *levi admonitu aut tactu* ('with gentle exhortation or touch') guides the great beast, the people. For further examples, see Ramage (n. 29), pp. 52-53, n. 101.
- 36 It is typical, however, that Virgil takes more interest in the poetically useful imagery of ideology than its factual realities: Neptune is of course a *de facto* sovereign of his domain (with *imperium*, see 1.138-39), but he certainly carries himself like a magistrate of the free Roman Republic.
- 37 R. M. Wilhelm, 'The Chariot/Ship: Vehicle of Augustan Ideology', *Augustan Age* 3, 1983-84, pp. 73-94, at pp. 76-77. See Galinsky (n. 28), pp. 21-23, and also the depiction of the battle of Actium on Aeneas' shield, where Neptune, Venus and Minerva (8.699) stands by Augustus against Antony and the dread demons of Egypt.
- 38 See, e.g., R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, pp. 322-30, *passim*; E. Hohl, 'Das Selbstzeugnis des Augustus über seine Stellung im Staat', *Museum Helveticum* 4, 1947, pp. 101-15; Magdelain (n. 29), pp. 39-47, *passim*; Ramage (n. 29), pp. 52-54, 60, *passim*; Galinsky (n. 28), pp. 42-79, *passim*.
- 39 Text and translation cited from P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore (eds), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, London 1967.
- 40 See J. Cochez (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis 1* (*Philologische Studien* 7-9), Leuven 1934, pp. 54-63, 77-90; and Galinsky (n. 28), p. 21.
- 41 Pöschl (n. 11), p. 21.
- 42 See K. Scott, 'The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 11, 1933, pp. 7-49, at pp. 43-45.
- 43 *Aeneid* 8.668-88. Cf. Pöschl (n. 11), p. 20.
- 44 Galinsky (n. 28), pp. 21-22. For the propaganda war between Octavian and Antony, see, e.g., C. B. R. Pelling (ed.), *Life of Antony*, Cambridge 1988, pp. 252-53 (on Plutarch, *Antonius* 55), and the comprehensive study by Kenneth Scott (n. 42).