STRATEGIES OF PRAISE: THE *AENEID* AND RENAISSANCE EPIC

Philip Hardie

Modern studies of classical epic have tended to downplay the category of the 'praiseworthy' as a key to the composition and reading of narratives on the deeds of heroes. *Kleos* of course has been central to discussion of Homer[1], but the focus has been on generic issues relating to epic as 'praise poetry', or on the struggle on the part of hero and poet to achieve the deathlessness of fame, and not so much on the moral virtues that might lay a claim to immortalization. Memory, commemoration, monument and monumentalization have been the buzzwords, rather than virtues and praise. Exemplarity has received much attention recently from students of oratory and historiography, if less so from students of epic, but with greater emphasis on time, history, and memory, Uwe Walter's 'Geschichtskultur', rather than on the qualities and structures of the actual virtues exemplified. Historiography and epic have been studied together in fruitful synergy, but more often from the point of view of narrative technique and modes of authorization than of a shared celebratory function. Rhetoric-and-epic has fallen out of favour as a field of study, in the case of Latin epic partly because of a desire to escape from an older fashion for the negative evaluation of imperial epic as a poetic form infected by the excesses of the declamation schools. Epideictic informs the modern study of Greek and Roman poetry chiefly through the schemata of Francis Cairns' 'generic composition', often applied as a formalist approach little interested in the ethical and social concerns of the epideictic orator[2].

As regards the remains of ancient epic themselves, the accidents of survival – if accidental they are – have for the most part deprived us of the epics written in praise of a living ruler or great man: the Alexander epics – already much maligned in antiquity –, epics on the great men of the Roman Republic, and on the Roman emperors. The exception is the late-antique panegyrical epics of Claudian, which occupied a larger place in the consciousness of early modern readers and poets than they have in more recent Latin literary scholarship

---

[1]   I think in particular of Nagy 1999; see also, e.g., Graziosi - Haubold 2005.
[2]   Cairns 1972. Keith 2000 is an exception to the neglect of the pedagogical and exemplary function of Roman epic.

and criticism[3]. By a perhaps related accident of survival we have no Latin panegyrical oratory from the 145 years between Cicero's praise of Caesar in the *Pro Marcello* and Pliny's *Panegyricus*. The single dynastic epic surviving to us from antiquity (and the single surviving foundation epic) is the *Aeneid* (unless one counts Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* as an 'anti-foundation epic', as one aspect of its quality as an anti-*Aeneid*). To this may be added the samples of panegyrical epic in the last two books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, with a recurrent theme of apotheosis as a reward for the benefactions of the good ruler (Aeneas, Romulus, Julius Caesar, to be followed by Augustus).

When Scipio meets the soul of Homer in the Underworld in Book 13 of Silius Italicus' *Punica*, in the course of a rewriting of the Virgilian Parade of Heroes, he repeats the regret felt at the tomb of Achilles by Alexander the Great that Homer is not alive to celebrate the virtuous achievement of the present day, *Pun.* 13,793-797 *'Si nunc fata darent, ut Romula facta per orbem | hic caneret uates, quanto maiora futuros | facta eadem intrarent hoc' inquit 'teste nepotes! | felix Aeacide, cui tali contigit ore | gentibus ostendi, creuit tua carmine uirtus'*[4]. Homer is praised simply for his abilities as a praise poet[5]. This is not a view of Homer to which many modern scholars would subscribe. However in the medieval and early modern critical tradition the links between poetry, and in particular epic poetry, and epideictic were very close, with an associated emphasis on the ethical and didactic functions of poetry. Brian Vickers (1983) polemically reconstructs the horizon of expectations for a sixteenth-century reader, showing how the epideictic framework of Tiberius Donatus' *Interpretationes Vergilianae*, with its ascription of the *Aeneid* to the *genus laudatiuum*, is typical of a dominant strand in post-antique literary criticism and prescription. The landmarks include the widely circulating Latin translation by Hermannus of Averroes' twelfth-century paraphrase of Aristotle's *Poetics*, a work which begins 'Every poem and all poetic discourse is blame or praise'; and the commentary tradition on Dante, Benvenuto da Imola in particular, which sees the *Commedia* as a storehouse of examples of virtues and vices, *laudatio* and *vituperatio*. HARDISON 1962 is a thorough study of the 'didactic' criticism that prevailed in the Renaissance until the assimilation of the full text of the *Poetics* in the later sixteenth century[6]. Craig Kallendorf discusses the epideictic tradition of reading and imitating the *Aeneid*, which sees in the career of Ae-

---

[3]   See GARRISON 1975, ch. 1: Thomas Elyot and James I recommended Claudian's panegyrics as mirrors for princes; PEACOCK 2006, 66-69: Claudian as a source for Ben Jonson's celebration of James I's entry into London in 1604, and for Aurelian Townshend's masque *Albion's Triumph.*

[4]   Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 24.

[5]   Silius enhances his praise of Homer by using as a model for his appearance the younger Marcellus, climax of the Virgilian Parade: HARDIE 1993, 115.

[6]   Here Castelvetro's *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata* (1570) is the most important text.

neas the maturation of the perfect ruler and general[7]. D.L. Aguzzi's Columbia thesis (AGUZZI 1959) examines the tradition of moral allegorization of epic in the Italian Renaissance, the line which goes through Boccaccio, Salutati, and allegorizations of *Orlando Furioso*, and feeds directly into Edmund Spenser's statement of the goals of *The Faerie Queene*, in the prefatory 'Letter to Sir Walter Raleigh': 'The generall end therefore of all the booke is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline'. Coming forward into the English seventeenth century James Garrison observes that 'Dryden's theory of epic is functionally identical with the theory of panegyric as it had developed since the sixteenth century'[8].

Maffeo Vegio's book 13 of the *Aeneid* (1428) is a good example of an 'epideictic reading' of the *Aeneid* leading to new epic production[9]. The violence of the end of Virgil's text is followed by ritual and celebration: the pious Aeneas' granting of burial to Turnus and the enemy dead; clear expressions of a consensus on the mad folly of Turnus in contrast to the virtuous behaviour of Aeneas; the joyful celebration of the wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia; Venus' renewed promise to her son of the glory of his descendants; and finally the apotheosis of Aeneas, for which the models are the apotheoses in the last books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses. Honores*, the divine honours given to the temple of Aeneas Indiges, is the last word of this version of the *Aeneid*.

This kind of closure is anathema to most or many modern readers of Virgil, who have attempted to detach the poet from what they regard as the superficially panegyrical message of the epic, by looking for spaces in the text where the reader can detect criticism, or even subversion, of the ruling power. I need not elaborate on the long history of 'two-voices' readings of the *Aeneid* and variants. Students of other literatures have travelled similar paths, largely independently it would seem: in a recent book the British medievalist John Burrow calls for reassessment, and recognition, of the enduring centrality of the poetics of praise in medieval literature, and questions the fashion for ironic readings[10]. In other genres and periods of antiquity more sophisticated approaches have been developed to the mechanisms of praise that do not merely shunt it to one side as insincere flattery, or as lip-service to an autocracy. I think in particular of Leslie Kurke's book on Pindaric epinician, exemplary of an approach to praise as embedded in the social context of the audiences for such poetry, part of the processes of exchange between *laudandus*, poet, and

---

[7] KALLENDORF 1989.
[8] GARRISON 1975, 202.
[9] Conveniently available in VEGIO 2004.
[10] BURROW 2008, confronting for example modern questioning of the laudatory intentions of *Beowulf*.

the wider community[11]. Students of Latin epic have done little to recuperate the social and political functions of praise in the dynamics of the relationship between ruler and subject in the Roman empire[12].

There are older ways of putting panegyric to work, so that it is not perceived as mere flattery, most notably through the idea that panegyric presents an image of virtue to the prince for imitation, a mirror for princes[13]. If the subject of praise is a living ruler, then praise constitutes an implicit challenge to its subject to continue to live up to the virtues and achievements of the past, and offers a model of behaviour to future rulers[14]. The link between panegyric and the genre of the mirror for princes[15] is seen for example when Erasmus appends his 1504 *Panegyricus* in praise of Philip of Burgundy to the first edition (1516) of his *Institutio Principis Christiani*[16]. In a letter (*Ep.* 179,42-45) Erasmus asserts that 'No other way of correcting a prince is so efficacious as presenting, in the guise of flattery, the pattern of a really good prince. Thus do you instil virtues and remove faults in such a manner that you seem to urge the prince to the former and restrain him from the latter'. In this Erasmus follows a rationale for praise that is already fully developed by Pliny, justifying the publication of his *Panegyricus* (*Ep.* 3,18,2), *primum ut imperatori nostro uirtutes suae ueris laudibus commendarentur, deinde ut futuri principes non quasi a magistro sed tamen sub exemplo praemonerentur, qua potissimum uia possent ad eandem gloriam niti*. Viewed in this light panegyric is epideictic rhetoric, with an additional, deliberative function.

Expressions of praise may aim at the fostering of relationships of different kinds between the several different audiences and interested parties. Addressing the ruler, the panegyrist offers both gratitude and guidance, and reminds him of the need to maintain solidarity with his subjects. The panegyrist plays a mediating role between the ruler and those who also aspire to play some part in affairs of state: Susanna Braund writes recently of the multiple audiences for Seneca's *De Clementia*, including Nero and 'the members of the Roman elite, who are observing carefully his efforts to instil in the young *princeps* a proper sense of restraint and respect towards the Senate'[17]. Addressing the ruler's subjects, the panegyrist invites communal celebration of the blessings

---

[11]   KURKE 1991.
[12]   On the problems of sincerity in Roman prose panegyric see BARTSCH 1994, ch. 5 (*The art of sincerity: Pliny's* Panegyricus).
[13]   What follows is largely from GARRISON 1975.
[14]   See BRAUND 2009, 77-79 on the afterlife of Seneca's *De Clementia* in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and its importance for the mirror of princes tradition.
[15]   On which see HADOT 1972.
[16]   See ERASMUS 1997.
[17]   BRAUND 2009, 56, referring to LEACH 1989, 216-227.

of rule, and offers assurance of the ruler's continuing concern for their well-being. An ideal mutuality between ruler and ruled is sketched out in a snippet quoted by Horace, taken, according to the scholiast, from a *panegyricus Augusti* by L. Varius Rufus, *Ep.* 1,16,25-29 *si quis bella tibi terra pugnata marique | dicat et his uerbis uacuas permulceat auris, | 'tene magis saluom populus uelit an populum tu, | seruet in ambiguo qui consulit et tibi et urbi | Iuppiter', Augusti laudes agnoscere possis*[18]. Outsiders are given an advertisement of the greatness and cohesion of the ruler and state, and a warning not to try and interfere with the solidarity of the nation. Finally, and not least, there is the solidarity, or hoped for solidarity, between poet and his powerful patron; praise of the ruler, or a specimen of praise of another ruler, often looks for the reciprocity whereby the *laudandus* is expected to exchange material rewards for celebration in prose or verse.

In sum panegyric can range from the flattery extorted by fear of a tyrannical autocrat to delicate political and social negotiations between a ruler, benefactor, or military hero and his subjects or beneficiaries.

***

Virgil's Parade of Heroes

For the rest of this paper I will focus on what in formal terms is the most overtly panegyrical section of the *Aeneid*, the Parade of Heroes in Book 6. After some reflections on the workings of a panegyric conducted through a longer temporal sweep, I shall look at some of the ways in which the Parade might be read as panegyric of consensus, and conclude with a survey of some of the responses to the Parade of Heroes in Renaissance epic.

Epideictic oratory may contain narrative elements, recapitulating the upbringing and education of the *laudandus*, or sketching out the actions which are the immediate occasion for praise, but these are usually subordinated to an organization by conceptual schemata of virtues and areas of achievement. Epic, by contrast, defines itself as narrative, recounting actions over time. A standard ancient and post-antique way of reading the Homeric and Virgilian poems as epideictic epic is to trace the display of virtues and vices through the adventures of the hero or heroes over time. The *Aeneid* in particular is

---

[18] See Hollis 2007, 273-275, on the conventional topic of reciprocal goodwill, *eunoia*, between beneficent ruler and subject, referring to Doblhofer 1966, 52-66.

read as the history of the growth to perfection of the ideal ruler, with an ages of man allegory superimposed on the literal time-span of the main narrative (from the sack of Troy to the death of Turnus). Thus for example Fulgentius reads the storm in *Aeneid* 1 as an allegory of the hazardous process of birth, Aeneas' stay in Carthage as the temptations of adolescence, and so on. The *Aeneid* turns into pedagogy.

As well as narrating the history of an individual, the *Aeneid*, as is well known, also introduces much longer historical perspectives, through prophecy, vision, and ecphrasis. In the Parade of Heroes history is presented not through scenes from a narrative history as such (as is the case with the Shield of Aeneas), but through a series of individuals, from the earliest Trojan settlement in Italy to the present day, exemplary of different kinds of behaviour and achievement, and so the proper objects of praise or blame. Two individuals are of particular importance: firstly, Augustus, the *telos* of the parade that begins with the Alban kings, and secondly the internal spectator Aeneas, in one sense outside the parade, but in another inside it, from the perspective of the external spectator or reader. For both Augustus and Aeneas, individual fulfilment makes sense only within the context of the long sweep of history, and praise – or blame – is to be awarded with a view to the larger temporal patterns.

Praise, and praise's protreptic function, frame the Parade. Anchises announces his subject as the glory (6,757 *gloria*) that will attend the Italian descendants of the Trojans, and the 'famous souls' (758 *illustres animae*) who will be listed 'under our name'. At the end the narrator tells us that by showing his son all the heroes, Anchises (889) 'inflames his spirit with a love for the fame to come' (*incenditque animum famae uenientis amore*). Eduard Norden defined the Speech of Anchises as a *logos parainetikos* (or *protreptikos*, *sumbouleutikos*), with individual heroes selected and presented as *exempla* in panegyric mode. Norden cites the formulation of a rhetor on Isocrates' *Philippos*, 'he exhorts in the form of praise' (ἐν σχήματι τοῦ ἐγκωμιάσαι παραινεῖ), yielding a combination of epideictic and symbouleutic[19].

Several studies have examined the connections between the Parade of as yet unborn heroes in the Underworld and the procession of *imagines* in the upper-class Roman funeral[20], with which Virgil combines allusion to the *laudatio funebris* that followed the procession. The speech as a whole might be thought of as a kind of *laudatio* for the last named hero, the younger Marcellus, at whose actual funeral Aeneas' descendant Augustus delivered the *laudatio*. The incendiary effect on Aeneas of the vision of his great descendants

---

[19] Norden 1957, 313, followed by Von Albrecht 1967, who labels the speech 'genealogische Protreptik'.

[20] Skard 1965; Burke 1979; Flower 1996, 109-114.

replicates the normative function of the ancestral *imagines* on living Romans, as reported by Sallust (*Iug.* 4):

nam saepe ego audiui Q. Maximum, P. Scipionem, praeterea ciuitatis nostrae praeclaros uiros solitos ita dicere, cum maiorum imagines intuerentur, uehementissime sibi animum ad uirtutem accendi. scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam uim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis uiris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari, quam uirtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequauerit[21].

The most influential study of the Speech of Anchises in recent Anglophone scholarship is Denis Feeney's 1986 article, which starts from Norden's and von Albrecht's understanding that, to quote Feeney, the 'eulogistic speech is genealogical protreptic, using historical *exempla* and the promise of glory to steer Aeneas towards virtuous rule', but Feeney then goes on to argue that 'the glorifying impetus of the speech as a whole is checked and intermittently retarded by countervailing tendencies of dubiety, mourning, even disparagement. Norden discerned the elements of ψόγος within the ἐγκώμιον … Modern critics will perhaps rather refer to the qualifications that characterize the epic as a whole'[22]. Feeney thus shifts the emphasis from a rhetorical analysis of the speech to an exercise in the 'two voices' approach to the *Aeneid*. But we should perhaps not so quickly abandon the rhetorical analysis: blame is indeed a part of panegyric, working through the castigation of individuals or actions whose examples the audience is *not* meant to follow. Norden recognises the presence in Parade of Heroes of *psogos*, on the principle of *merses profundo, pulchrior euenit* (Hor. *C.* 4,4,65)[23]. David West makes the case, in response to Feeney that 'The pageant of heroes is subtle, whole-hearted and successful panegyric,' and some of his revisions of Feeney's line are telling[24].

Feeney introduces notes of division into a reading of the Speech of Anchises. I want instead to think about ways in which the Speech develops a sense of consensus and community, developing a drive to solidarity. Here too there is a parallel with the Roman funeral as described by Polybius [6,53-54] 6,53,3:

[21]   Silius Italicus' catabasis of Scipio comments on the relationship of audience and parade in Virgil: Scipio's grief is at the immediate loss of his father and uncle in Spain, and this is combined with a desire to learn about the future (*Pun.* 13,503-506). At 384 the death of the Scipiades is described as *magnumque decus magnumque dolorem*, bringing out the combination of funeral and triumph in the Virgilian Parade. Throughout Scipio is as much the object of praise as are those whom he views, an ideal mutuality of praising and being praised in the communal enterprise of Roman greatness.

[22]   FEENEY 1986, 1; 6.

[23]   NORDEN 1957, 314 refers to Hor. *C.* 1,12 for further examples of this.

[24]   WEST 1993, 283. West is particularly good on *Aen.* 6,817 ff., with what he sees as its judicious balance of praise and criticism of the Bruti (both the liberator and the tyrannicide), as part of Virgil's tactful handling, sympathetic to Augustus' own need to adjust his relationship to his adoptive father, Julius Caesar, and the tyrannicides.

δι' ὧν συμβαίνει τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀναμιμνησκομένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν τὰ γεγονότα, μὴ μόνον τοὺς κεκοινωνηκότας τῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκτός, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γίνεσθαι συμπαθεῖς ὥστε μὴ τῶν κηδευόντων ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν τοῦ δήμου φαίνεσθαι τὸ σύμπτωμα[25].

If we think of the occasion of the Parade of Heroes as the funeral of the younger Marcellus, the youth and frustrated hopes of the dead person are calculated to arouse a maximum of sympathy and pity. The immediate audience Aeneas is of course involved in the future achievements of the Julian *gens*; solidarity between the Julians and the other *gentes* is fostered by the fact that they all appear in the same procession, as if they were all part of the same family – just as the *imagines* of great Romans other than the Julians were paraded in the funeral of Augustus himself, and just as the rows of statues in the Forum of Augustus included both Julians and other Roman *summi uiri*[26]. That kind of consensus is all-important for the project of the Augustan principate, and is reinforced by Anchises' concluding, and surprising, address to his son as *'Romane'* (851), as if in Aeneas is already contained in embryo the whole Roman race.

Aeneas' solidarity with his praiseworthy descendants is reinforced by the affective bonds of love for family; *amor famae* is hard to separate from a parent's love for offspring[27]. That parental bond is stretched thin in the case say of the heroes of the middle Republic, distant relatives, but over the whole Parade is diffused the intense emotion experienced at the reunion in the Underworld of father and son, Anchises and Aeneas, an affectivity picked up in Anchises' anguished appeal to the *pueri* Pompey and Julius Caesar, and more particularly to Caesar, *sanguis meus*, and given a final charge, in the mode of lament, in Anchises' address to the younger Marcellus, behind which may be heard Augustus' own grief at the loss of a nephew. If the story about Octavia and Virgil's reading is not true, it is *ben trovato* in that it puts a finger on a crucial element in the persuasive strategy of the Parade of Heroes. All Roman readers are to share in the grief of a mother, a father, an uncle, for a child, all

[25] Referred to by Dufallo 2007, 63, in the context of a discussion of the *laudatio funebris* and consensus; Dufallo further cites Cicero's appeal to the audience's shared opinion about Pompey at *Phil.* 2,69, as recalling appeals to consensus on funerary inscriptions, such as *ILS* 3,1 *Honc oino ploirume consentiont*; *CIL* VI 10230 (*Laudatio Murdiae*) *constitit … ergo in hoc sibi ipsa ut … post decessum consensus civium laudaretur.* See also Pliny *NH* 35,2,6 (on *imagines*) *semperque defuncto aliquo totus aderat familiae eius qui umquam fuerat populus.*

[26] See Burke 1979, 223 n. 18, the Forum of Augustus as presenting 'this idea of the Roman people as a single immense family.'

[27] Cf. also the linkage of parental love and exemplarity in Aeneas' address to Ascanius in 12,432 ff., embrace and kisses, followed by instruction: *animo repetentem exempla tuorum | et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitet Hector.*

are to sense the loss that makes Roman achievement over the centuries the more valuable as it is the more fragile.

The form of the procession itself (754 *omnis longo ordine*) encourages a feeling of consensus, both of those who travel together in the procession, and those who are gathered to watch in the virtual *panegyris* of Roman citizens constituted by the readership of the *Aeneid*. GARRISON 1975 (ch. 3) talks of the 'processional topos', referring to the universal acclaim at the arrival of the ruler; the processional topos in the case of the Parade of Heroes is both funereal and triumphal. The Virgilian procession is one that translates into spatial succession a temporal succession[28], drawing into one the whole of Roman history; the vivid apostrophes to the unborn heroes extend the use of apostrophe to the dead man in the *laudatio funebris*[29], establishing a bond between present and immediate past, to make present the whole community of Romans over the course of history.

The divisions and dubieties on which Feeney dwells are of course there, but they may serve as well to draw an audience together as to divide. Anchises dwells on the harmony and consensus between Pompey and Caesar while they have yet to reach the shores of light, 826-827 *illae autem paribus quas fulgere cernis in armis, | concordes animae nunc et dum nocte premuntur*. Anchises is powerless to make Julius Caesar throw down his weapons and prevent the *discordia* of civil war – but Augustus will succeed in restoring *concordia*. A before and after is thus retrospectively built into the earlier praise of Augustus (791 ff.), in the course of which reference to a renewed Golden Age activates a different kind of before and after. The Parade of Heroes builds up a cumulative sense of Roman achievement, but also depends for its panegyrical effect on contrasts between before and after: between Rome's small beginnings and its present greatness, and between periods of decline and disharmony and periods of restoration and renewed harmony.

***

I turn finally to the numerous Renaissance imitations of the Virgilian Parade of Heroes, and consider examples of 'strategies of praise' under a number of headings.

Positive and negative exemplarity. In the Virgilian Parade of Heroes criticism is nuanced, and Aeneas and the Roman reader have to think carefully whether

---

[28]   So BETTINI 1991, 144-150.
[29]   See FLOWER 1996, 111 n. 95.

or not the behaviour of certain individuals is to be imitated or avoided. Brutus is *infelix*, but does that mean the 'love for his fatherland and his boundless desire for praise' (*Aen.* 6,823 *amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*) that drove him to execute his son is to be applauded or not? In later versions the distinctions may be much more black and white. In Book 9 of Trissino's *Italia liberata dai Goti* Belisarius has a dream vision on Monte Casino in which his father shows him the great men of both past and future. The review of the past distinguishes between good and bad Roman emperors, and Belisarius is exhorted correspondingly either to look or not to look ('guarda' / 'non risguardar'). In Pierre Ronsard's incomplete attempt at a national French epic based on a myth of Trojan ancestry, the *Franciade*, the eponymous hero Francus (the new name of Astyanax, who did not in fact die at Troy) is shown a parade of future French kings in which great virtue is set in relief by great vice: for example Merovée, enemy of the Huns and the object of particular praise is followed by Childeric, 4,1086-1088 'roy de meschante vie, … Au cœur paillard de vices surmonté'. Childeric, driven into exile, will however return and out of a sense of shame will make amends, in exemplary fashion, 1123-1126 'Pour effacer de ses pechez le nom, | Brave au combat, ne taschera sinon | Que la vertu par les armes suivie | Perde le bruit de sa premiere vie'. Near the end Francus' guide, a daughter of the king of Crete, interrupts the show to deliver explicit exhortation to Francus to learn the lesson from the examples of the bad kings, a miniature *institutio principis*. In a late specimen of historical epic, Voltaire's *Henriade*, the hero Henri IV is transported in a dream by St Louis to the heavens and the underworld, where he sees tyrants and *fainéants* kings punished in a version of Tartarus, and, in the Places of the Blessed ('lieux fortunés'), 245-248 'les bons rois qu'ont produits tous les ages; | Là, sont les vrais héros; là, vivent les vrais sages; | Là, sur un trône d'or, Charlemagne et Clovis | Veuillent du haut des cieux sur l'empire des lis'. As a final example, I take the parade of spirits of the d'Este family shown to their ancestress Bradamante by the witch Melissa in Canto 3 of *Orlando Furioso*, which reaches a climax with (3,50) 'il giusto Alfonso e Ippolito benigno'. But this show of 'la stirpe sublima' has a coda (3,60-62), in which Bradamante asks who are the two gloomy spirits sighing and with eyes cast down. Theirs is the sadness of the younger Marcellus; however the cause is not premature death, but the involvement of Ferrante and Giulio d'Este in a conspiracy against their brothers Alfonso and Ippolito, for which they were condemned to perpetual imprisonment.

Civil war and solidarity. Voltaire's *Henriade* is an epic on the civil discord of the French Wars of Religion, ending with Henri's entry into Paris. Henri's vision of future French kings in the Palace of Destiny in Book 7 ends with a

coda in which St Louis tells Henri of Madrid's acceptance of a master from Paris, in the form of the first Bourbon king of Spain, Philip V. But this is also a time of potential discord in the future, and, in a reworking of Anchises' address to Caesar and Pompey, St Louis rebukes his own royal descendants, 7,467-470 'Ô rois nés de mon sang! ô Philippe! ô mes fils! | France, Espagne, à jamais puissiez-vous être unis! | Jusqu'à quand voulez-vous, malheureux politiques, | Allumer les flambeaux des discordes publiques?' The discord here is not within a single state, but between two states with rulers from the same family. Civil war features briefly but strikingly in the Virgilian Parade of heroes; it appears more prominently in some later examples, and often with a more straightforwardly panegyrical function than in *Aeneid* 6. It is worth bearing in mind that in the Middle Ages and Renaissance a pro-monarchical reading of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* was standard, as a warning of the evils consequent on the failure to maintain political order. The 'Tudor myth' that legitimated the dynasty of Henry VII and his successors down to Elizabeth I placed great emphasis on the restoration of a strong central monarchy after the civil wars of the fifteenth century. Edmund Spenser foregrounds civil strife in the pageant of British history in *The Faerie Queene*. Spenser presents the sweep of this history, from the Trojan Brutus' building of Troynovant (London) to Gloriana (Elizabeth) in three widely separated sections, and in the three different formats of dinner-table conversation, the reading of a history book, and prophecy. The second of these is Prince Arthur's scanning of the book of *Briton Moniments* in the chamber of Eumnestes in the allegorical House of Alma, and the third is Merlin's prophecy to Britomart of her 'famous Progenee' (III iii 22) by the man with whom she is desperately in love but whom she has never seen in the flesh, Artegall. Both are in part modelled on the Virgilian Parade of Heroes. The *Briton Moniments* narrates history as a succession of rulers who preside over an alternation of kingdom building and civil discord, down to the time of the birth of the reader, Arthur. Taking up the thread, Merlin prophesies to Britomart that (III iii 23) 'Renowmed kings, and sacred Emperours, | Thy fruitfull Ofspring, shall from thee descend … The Feeble Britons, broken with long warre, | They shall vpreare, and mightily defend | Against their forrein foe, that commes from farre, | Till vniuersall peace compound all ciuill iarre.' That conclusion is reached with the coming of the Tudors, 49 'Thenceforth eternall union shall be made | Betweene the nations different afore, | And sacred Peace shall lovingly persuade | The warlike minds to learne her goodly lore, | And civile armes to exercise no more'.

Restoration. Spenser's story is also one of 'former rule restor'd' (III iii 44), the restoration of British kings in the Welsh Tudor dynasty after a long period

of Saxon, Danish, and Norman rule. Restoration, with its easy contrast of a before and after, is one of the most common topics of praise; this is Norden's *merses profundo, pulchrior euenit* (Hor. *C.* 4,4,65) principle. Restoration of good government after a bad or defective predecessor, 'restoration panegyric'[30], is a standard ancient Roman strategy of praise, seen already in Velleius Paterculus' panegyric of Tiberius in contrast to his predecessor Augustus[31], and practised at great length by Pliny in his *Panegyricus*. 'Restoration panegyric' is implicit in *Aeneid* 6 in the contrast between the civil war that Anchises cannot prevent between Caesar and Pompey and Augustus' unified Rome, and explicit in Anchises' praise of Augustus for his refounding of the Golden Age. After Virgil the restoration of the Golden Age becomes the commonest and tritest of panegyrical topics. But the millennium and a half that separates the *Aeneid* from Renaissance epics does allow for a more interesting narrative of decline and restoration. In his poem 'Secondary epic' W.H. Auden takes Virgil to task for the dishonesty of telling history as prophecy. Why doesn't Aeneas ask 'What next?' after Augustus' triumph. Auden then imagines 'a continuation | To your Eighth Book', in which a barbarian 'refugee rhetorician' tells of Alaric's Sack of Rome. Auden was anticipated by a Supplement to *Aeneid* 6 by L.B. Neander published at Vienna in 1768, which takes the story down to the Hapsburg Empire and the Golden Age restored by Maria Theresa. In Neander's version Aeneas does persuade a reluctant Anchises to continue, and is shown the destruction of Rome by the Vandals and Goths, in a repetition of the Sack of Troy. But what has fallen will rise again, through the rise and civilization of the Germans and the foundation of a new Rome, Vienna. The Dark Ages are also put to the service of panegyric of the Medici family by Girolamo Vida in his *De Arte Poetica*, in a history of letters that tells of the restoration of the Muses to Italy by the Medici after the long process of decline from the time of 'golden Virgil' (1,172 *aureus*) firstly through literary degeneration and then through barbarian invasions.

Continuation, as well as restoration may be listed under the strategies of praise, when a poet continues the Virgilian Parade of Heroes down to a later subject of praise, so enlisting the authority and greatness of Virgil in support of the modern hero's claim to fame. An earlier example is the mid-fifteenth century *Hesperis* by Basinio da Parma (d. 1457), which tells of the exploits of Sigismondo Malatesta. In Books 8 and 9 Sigismondo visits the Temple of Fame, which is also the entrance to the Underworld, where the line of warrior-

---

[30]   Cf. GARRISON 1975 on 'limitation and restoration'.
[31]   See RAMAGE 1982.

heroes viewed by Sigismondo in the Elysian fields (9,216-244) largely overlaps with the Virgilian Parade of Heroes, but concludes with *Malatesta propago*.

Desire and praise. Panegyric always runs the risk that it may alienate rather than enlist its audience, that it may elicit disbelief or cold indifference. The panegyrist has a better chance of success if he can engage the affections of his audience, in the form of love or desire[32]. Virgil, we have seen, frames the Parade of Heroes with emotions of parental and filial love, made the more intense by grief. Part of the intended effect, I think, is that these emotions should spill over into Aeneas' response to the long line of his descendants, and, further, that the Roman reader should share this affective response to the great Roman heroes who process before him. There is an almost comic moment in Neander's Supplement to *Aeneid* 6 when Aeneas catches sight of the Venus-like Maria Theresa, and he rushes forward to embrace, as he thinks, his mother. An even more intense, erotic, desire energizes Merlin's 'parade' of British heroes presented in prophecy to Britomart. She has come to Merlin to learn where she might find the man with whose image in a magic mirror she has fallen in love. Merlin tells her that he is Arthegall, and then prophesies the line that will issue from the couple. The ultimately glorious line of British monarchs is thus the product and in some sense the object of Britomart's sexual desire, and, to the extent that the reader may empathize with Spenser's character, of our desire[33].

Praise and critique. My focus on the panegyrical elements in Renaissance imitations of the Parade of Heroes has shown, unsurprisingly, that pre-twentieth century readers of Virgil were less embarrassed about praise poetry than are many moderns. But it should not be assumed that these reworkings are simplistic versions of the subtleties of Virgilian panegyric. In any case, the most successful panegyric, in the sense of that which best wins the assent of its audience(s), is likely to be that which admits to limitations and qualifications of success, and to an awareness of the transience and fragility of human achievement. I end with a couple of examples from my Renaissance corpus. Ronsard's parade of French kings in the *Franciade* ends with the glorious figures of Charles Martel and Pépin, after which there are eight lines on the mutability of all worldly things; princes and kings and their lines come and

---

[32]   Cf. Hor. *C.* 4,5,9-15 *ut mater iuuenem … sic desideriis icta fidelibus | quaerit patria Caesarem.*
[33]   See HARDIE 2004.

go, nothing lasts for ever, and only virtue is assured[34]. The relativization, but not the negation, of the pursuit of fame for virtuous achievement is already built into the Virgilian Parade through allusion to the Ciceronian *Somnium Scipionis*.

For my last example I return to Spenser and the books in the chamber of Eumnestes. While Prince Arthur is reading the *Briton Moniments*, his companion, the Faery knight Guyon, reads another chronicle, the *Antiquitee of Faery lond* (III x 70-76). This parallel history reaches in one sweep from the beginning to the present day. Prometheus creates the first man, called Elfe, and from him and a fairy are descended a mighty people, ruled by an unbroken line of renowned and mighty kings called Elfin, Elfinan, Elfiline, and so on, down to Elficleos, who stands for Henry VIII, and his daughter Tanaquill whom for her great qualities they call 'Glorian', the figure of Elizabeth. These two chronicles, in Harold Berger's words, describe 'two different worlds, two utterly irreconcilable views of life, two opposed modes of memory, perception, and consciousness' – historical realism contrasted with the unreality of 'seven stanzas of excellence, peace and power, undisturbed succession and order'[35]. In the world of Faeryland such a chronicle of unqualified achievement and renown *may* be a true account of reality; in the ordinary human world of Britain panegyric must accommodate itself to the actuality of 'history as a series of beginnings, of backslidings and renewals'[36].

***

Some reworkings of the Virgilian Parade of Heroes[37]

[Virgil] *Culex* 358-372.

Manilius *Astronomica* 1,758-804 souls of great men in Milky Way.

Lucan *Bellum Ciuile* 6,784-820.

Silius *Punica* 13,615-895 Scipio's necromancy.

Dante *Inferno* 4,106-151 castello of fame.

---

[34]   The mortality of kings had a more immediate effect on the composition of the *Franciade*, which Ronsard abandoned after the death of Charles IX in 1574. In the 1578 reissue of the poem the following quatrain serves as an epilogue to the incomplete epic: 'Si le Roy Charles eust vescu, | J'eusse achevé ce long ouvrage: | Si tost que la mort l'eut veincu, | Sa mort me veinquist le courage.'

[35]   Berger 1957, 104.

[36]   Berger 1957, 113-114.

[37]   Compiled in part from Heyne 1832, Excursus XIV to *Aeneid* 6, 'Futurarum rerum praedictiones in epico carmine'; Borzsák 1968.

Petrarch *Africa* 1,160-2,557 Scipio's dream-interview with his father, including 1,501-546 parade of six Roman kings; 1,549-574 Horatii; Book 2 contains a prophetic survey of future Roman history, down to Petrarch.

Basinio di Parma *Hesperis* 8 Sigismondo Malatesta's visit to Fortunata Insula, and to Temple of Fama and visit to Underworld.

Boiardo *Orlando Innamorato* II xxi 53-61 Atlante's prophecy to Agramante of Ruggiero's defeat of Charlemagne, his conversion to Christianity, early death, descendants in House of Este.

Ariosto *Orlando* 3,1-62 Bradamante's vision of her descendants, the House of Este; 13,56-73 Melissa's prophecy to Bradamante of the great women of her house.

Trissino *L'Italia liberata dai Goti* 9 Belisario in cave on Monte Casino, visions of past and future, ending with glorification of Charles V, and golden-age empire.

Tasso *Gerusalemme Liberata*. Book 10,73-78 Hermit's vision of glories of House of Este; Book 17,66 ff. Shield of Rinaldo with scenes of House of Este.

Ronsard *Franciade* 1,165-276 Jupiter's prophecy to Juno of future of Francus and his race, down to Charles IX; 3,269 ff. Leucothoe's prophecy of line of French kings to Francus; 4,963 ff. Hyante's magic and Heldenschau.

Spenser *The Faerie Queene* (1590). II x Arthur and Guyon read (respectively) *Briton Moniments* and *Antiquitie of Faerie Londe* in chamber of Memory in House of Alma; III ii Britomart shown future history of her race in cave of Merlin; III ix Paridell tells Britomart history of Trojan descendants from fall of Troy to Brutus' building of Troynovant (London).

Milton *Paradise Lost*. Books 11-12 Adam shown future history of mankind by Michael.

Voltaire *La Henriade* (1728). Book 7 Henri IV shown his descendants in palace of Destiny by St Louis.

Neander, L. B. (Vienna 1768) *Supplementum ad Lib. VI Aeneid de Festis Imperii RomanoGermanici et Aug. Gente Austriaca.*

Bibliography

AGUZZI, D.L. 1959, *Allegory in the Heroic Poetry of the Renaissance*, PhD Columbia.

BARTSCH, S. 1994, *Actors in the Text. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge, Mass. - London.

BASINIO DA PARMA 1794, *Opera praestantiora, nunc primum edita et opportunis commentariis inlustrata*, Rimini.

BERGER, H. 1957, *The Allegorical Temper. Vision and Reality in Book II of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, New Haven - London.

BETTINI, M. 1991, *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, Baltimore.

BORZSÁK, S. 1968, *Zum Fortleben von Vergils Heldenschau (Aen. B. VI)*, "ACD" 4, 93-100.

BRAUND, S. 1998, *Praise and protreptic in early imperial panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny*, in M. WHITBY (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Leiden - Boston - Köln, 53-76.

BRAUND, S. 2009, *Seneca. De Clementia. Edited with Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.

BURKE, P.F. 1979, *Roman Rites for the Dead and* Aeneid *6*, "CJ" 74, 220-228.

BURROW, J.A. 2008, *The Poetry of Praise*, Cambridge.

CAIN, T.H. 1978, *Praise in the Faerie Queene*, Lincoln, Nebraska - London.

CAIRNS, F. 1972, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh.

DOBLHOFER, E. 1966, *Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht*, Heidelberg.

DUFALLO, B. 2007, *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, The Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*, Columbus, Ohio.

ERASMUS, Desiderius 1997, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, ed. L. JARDINE, Cambridge.

FEENEY, D.C. 1986, *History and revelation in Vergil's Underworld*, "PCPhS" 32, 1-24 [= P. HARDIE (ed.), *Virgil. Critical Assessments*, London 1999, 221-243].

FLOWER, H. 1996, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford.

GARRISON, J.D. 1975, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, Berkeley.

GRAZIOSI, B. - HAUBOLD, J. 2005, *Homer. The Resonance of Epic*, London.

GREBE, S. 1989, *Die vergilische Heldenschau. Tradition und Fortwirken*, Frankfurt - Bern - New York - Paris.

HADOT, P. 1972, *Fürstenspiegel*, in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, VIII, 555-632.

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

HARDIE, P. 2004, *In the Steps of the Sibyl: Tradition and Desire in the Epic Underworld*, "MD" 52, 143-156.

HARDISON, O.B. 1962, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory*, Chapel Hill.

HEYNE, C.G. 1832, *Publius Vergilius Maro, varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus*, 4th ed. rev. by G.P.E. WAGNER, II, Leipzig.

HOLLIS, A.S. 2007, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC - AD 20*, Oxford.

HORSFALL, N.M. 1982, *The structure and purpose of Vergil's Parade of Heroes*, "Anc. Soc. (Macquarie)" 10, 12-18.

KALLENDORF, C. 1989, *In Praise of Aeneas. Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance*, Hanover, NH - London.

KEITH, A. 2000, *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*, Cambridge.

KURKE, L. 1991, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca - London.

LEACH, E. 1989, *The Implied Reader and the Political Argument in Seneca's* Apocolocyntosis *and* De clementia, "Arethusa" 22, 197-230.

NAGY, G. 1999, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, rev. edn., Baltimore.

NEANDER, L.B. 1768, *Lapsus Protoparentum ex Poemate Miltoni Cantus VI; accedit Supplementum ad Lib. VI Aeneid. De Fatis Imperii RomanoGermanici et Aug. Gente Austriaca*, Vienna.

NORDEN, E. 1957[4], *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, Darmstadt.

PEACOCK, J. 2006, *The image of Charles I as a Roman emperor*, in I. ATHERTON - J. SANDERS (edd.), *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Eras*, Manchester.

RAMAGE, E. 1982, *Velleius Paterculus 2.126.2-3 and the panegyric tradition*, "ClAnt" 1, 266-271.

RONSARD, Pierre de 1983, *La Franciade*, ed. P. LAUMONIER, Paris.

SHARPE, K. 1987, *Criticism and Compliment. The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I*, Cambridge.

SKARD, O. 1965, *Die Heldenschau in Vergils Aeneis*, "SO" 40, 53-65.

VEGIO, Maffeo 2004, *Short Epics*, edd. M.C.J. PUTNAM - J. HANKINS, Cambridge, Mass. - London.

VICKERS, B. 1982-1983, *Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance*, "New Lit. Hist." 14, 497-537.

VOLTAIRE 2005, *La Henriade*, ed. O.R. TAYLOR, Oxford[2].

VON ALBRECHT, M. 1967, *Vergils Geschichtsauffassung in der Heldenschau*, "WS" 80, 156-182.

WEST, D. 1993, *The Pageant of Heroes as Panegyric (Vergil,* Aeneid *6.750-886)*, in H.D. JOCELYN (ed.), *Tria lustra*, Liverpool, 283-296.