

**Shakespeare and the Other Virgil:**  
**Pity and *Imperium* in *Titus Andronicus***

The influence of Virgil's *Aeneid* in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* is more extensive than has been recognized to date, largely because Shakespeare studies, surprisingly, still has not entirely acknowledged or addressed the more ambiguous reading of the *Aeneid* put forward in recent decades by the so-called 'Harvard School' of Virgil criticism. This interpretation of the *Aeneid* draws attention to Virgil's sympathy for human suffering; especially, his pity for the fallen enemies of Rome. Revisionary critics such as Adam Parry, Wendell Clausen, and Michael Putnam argue that the 'melancholy' tone of the poem, resigned, mournful, and at times, finely ironic, arises from a sense of sorrow at the human cost of establishing the Roman empire, undermining its ostensible purpose as Augustan propaganda. Virgil's 'private voice' of compassion undercuts his 'public voice' of praise for Augustus' *pax Romana*. Although associated today with criticism that emerged in America in the wake of the Vietnam War, as Craig Kallendorf has shown, this 'pessimistic' reading of the *Aeneid*, what he calls 'the other Virgil,' was available in England in the Renaissance, and arguably dates back to antiquity. As apparent from his allusions to Virgil in

*Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare's reading of the *Aeneid* is in keeping with this vision. Virgil's epic is the touchstone and the model for his own critique of *Romanitas*.

Writing in 1978, John Velz complains of 'the neglect of Virgil as an influence on Shakespeare's Rome,' and observes that 'there is much untouched ground.'<sup>1</sup> Writing a few years later, in 1986, Robert S. Miola also sees 'extant criticism on Vergil's presence in Shakespeare's art' as 'surprisingly slight and desultory.'<sup>2</sup> Since then the connection between Shakespeare and Virgil has attracted more attention; critics, however, have tended to focus either on *The Tempest* or on *Antony and Cleopatra*. Miola himself sees Virgil as a 'pervasive presence, a deep source,' in Shakespeare's plays, but only 'in Shakespeare's final phase, as in *Hamlet*.' Like Aeneas' ruthless, murderous rampage at the end of the *Aeneid*, Hamlet's 'final revenge' presents a 'paradox' which Miola sees as 'central' to Shakespearean tragedy, as well as Virgil's epic: 'the man of *pietas* and humanity acts in impious *furor*.' In *Titus Andronicus*, a much earlier play, 'allusions to Aeneas and Lavinia' are in contrast 'crudely and baldly inappropriate.' The *Aeneid* is 'stitched onto the play rather than woven into its fabric.'<sup>3</sup> Like Miola, Colin Burrow sees the *Aeneid* in *Titus Andronicus* as a 'counter-plot' to the 'main narratives.' The *Aeneid* 'represents an

alternative kind of Roman empire to the one presented on stage': a counterfactual, more optimistic vision of Rome. Virgil is 'a distant, strangled voice.'<sup>4</sup> Heather James argues that Shakespeare in *Titus Andronicus* displaces 'Virgilian authority'; the play 'performs an Ovidian critique of Rome,' replacing the 'imperial epic of Vergil' with the 'counter-epic of Ovid.'<sup>5</sup>

Not only in *Titus Andronicus*, but in general, critics tend to see Shakespeare as much more Ovidian than Virgilian. In his study of Shakespeare's sources, T. W. Baldwin casts Ovid as 'Shakespeare's master of poetry.'<sup>6</sup> For Burrow, Ovid is 'the Latin poet who had the greatest influence on Shakespeare.'<sup>7</sup> Writing in 1990, Charles and Michelle Martindale conclude, 'Shakespeare has little of the Virgilian sensibility and frequently Ovidianizes Virgilian matter.'<sup>8</sup> A decade later, Charles Martindale can see no reason to change his mind: 'Shakespeare is not usefully to be described as a Virgilian poet. By that I mean that his reading of Virgil did not result in a profound modification of his sensibility and imagination.'<sup>9</sup> Burrow, writing a decade later still, feels uneasy about this neat dismissal. 'There is perhaps something slightly nineteenth-century about Martindale's judgment ... Shakespeare was not an imperial and melancholy kind of guy, and so Virgil sat shallow in his mind.'

Nevertheless, even Burrow tends to cast Shakespeare's debt to Virgil in terms of 'allusion and stylistic echo' rather than 'sensitivity.'<sup>10</sup>

Politically, Heather James is reluctant to align Shakespeare with an author, Virgil, whom she believes he saw as an advocate of Roman imperialism. James acknowledges that 'Virgil himself formulated two distinct approaches to Augustan empire in the *Aeneid*, one panegyric and the other interrogative': 'Virgil chose to support Augustan ideology in the formal design of the *Aeneid* and test it through 'impertinent' questions dispersed throughout the poem.' James is not inclined to grant, however, that Shakespeare himself might have seen the 'interrogative' voice in the *Aeneid* as Virgil's own. 'Literary tradition is not always known for its justice, and so the panegyric tradition is, in the Renaissance, mostly known as Vergilian while the interrogative is more often associated with Ovid.'<sup>11</sup> Craig Kallendorf's study of 'the other Virgil' in the Renaissance, published a decade later, gives some reason to doubt this conclusion. James, however, associates Virgil almost exclusively with what she calls the 'panegyric' voice. Virgil is in practice, for Shakespeare, she suggests, a propagandist; an apologist on behalf of the Roman Empire. He is the 'authority' whom Ovid subverts, rather than himself a voice of subversion.<sup>12</sup>

In terms of temperament, Shakespeare also seems far-removed from the world-weary tone of the *Aeneid*: the sadness Aeneas himself describes simply, poignantly, as *lacrimae rerum* ('tears for [the way] things [are]') (1.462). Matthew Arnold observes, 'Over the whole of the great poem of Virgil, over the whole *Aeneid*, there rests an ineffable melancholy ... a sweet, a touching sadness.' He imagines Virgil as 'a man of the most delicate genius ... the most sensitive nature, in a great and overwhelming world.'<sup>13</sup> Shakespeare in contrast seems hearty, exuberant; unrestrained and cheerfully unrefined. As Dr. Johnson speculates, citing Thomas Rymer, 'his natural disposition ... led him to comedy.'<sup>14</sup> Looking deeper into Arnold's assessment, however, as well as more recent studies of the *Aeneid*, it may be possible to discern some common ground. As Michael Putnam explains, 'the past century has seen a revolution in the interpretation of Virgil.'<sup>15</sup>

The traditional or 'optimistic' interpretation of the *Aeneid* finds in Aeneas an ideal hero, and in the epic as a whole a celebration of the political achievement of Rome, especially, Virgil's patron, Augustus. Rome establishes civilization through self-discipline and the conquest of barbaric opposition. This sense of the *Aeneid* was set forth at the beginning of the twentieth century by two German scholars, Richard Heinze and Viktor Pöschl, and defended in English by T. S. Eliot.<sup>16</sup> After the Vietnam War,

however, a revisionist, 'pessimistic' school of interpretation began to emerge. 'We hear two distinct voices in the *Aeneid*,' Adam Parry argues, 'a public voice of triumph, and a private voice of regret.' Taking up Arnold's sense of Virgil's 'melancholy,' Parry presents 'the whole mood of the poem, the sadness, the loss, the frustration,' 'the sense of emptiness,' as 'produced by the personal accents of sorrow over human and heroic values lost.'

'Virgil continually insists on the public glory of the Roman achievement, the establishment of peace and order ... But he insists equally terribly on the terrible price one must pay for this glory ... human freedom, love, personal loyalty ... are lost in the service of what is grand, monumental, and impersonal: the Roman state.'<sup>17</sup>

Other critics central to this new school of thought include in America, Wendell Clausen and Michael Putnam, and in England, Deryck Williams and Oliver Lyne. 'How shall we define the private voice of the poet?' Williams asks. 'We associate it most strongly with Dido and the apparently senseless suffering of her tragedy; and with Turnus who does what he thinks right and loses his life; and with the old king Priam; with Pallas and Euryalus and Lausus and Camilla and the countless warriors who fall in battle ... It is the world of the individual not the state, a world of *lacrimae* not *imperium*.'<sup>18</sup> At the heart of this new strain of Virgilian

criticism is an emphasis on Virgil's surprising compassion for the victims of Aeneas' efforts to found Rome. The human cost of that political accomplishment undermines its putative value. According to Clausen, Aeneas' victory is 'Pyrrhic.' The *Aeneid* 'moves us' because it 'enlists our sympathies on the side of loneliness, suffering, defeat.'<sup>19</sup> Parry finds in the *Aeneid* a 'fine paradox': 'all the wonders of the most powerful institution the world has ever known are not necessarily of greater importance than the emptiness of human suffering.'<sup>20</sup>

Adumbrations of this reading of the *Aeneid* can be seen in earlier criticism, particularly in the tradition arising out of Richard Heinze's account of Virgil's distinctive *Empfindung der handelnden Personen*.<sup>21</sup> *Empfindung* is difficult to translate; essentially, Heinze observes that Virgil identifies with his characters (*der handelnden Personen*); his narration leads the reader to adopt their 'emotional point of view' (*Empfindung*). Brooks Otis, although for the most part opposed to the Harvard School, adopts and refines this concept as what he calls 'empathy,' and it looms large, as well, in the work of the influential Italian critics Gian Biagio Conte and Antonio La Penna.<sup>22</sup> As Conte explains, 'the poet's narrative voice lets itself be saturated by the subjectivity of the person within the narrative.'<sup>23</sup> These critics' sense of Virgil's emotional engagement with his characters,

especially, Rome's enemies, also informs Oliver Lyne's re-imagination of what Parry describes as Virgil's own 'private voice.' Wary of ascribing intention, rather than 'two voices,' both Virgil's own, Lyne prefers to speak of an 'epic voice' and 'further voices.' 'Further voices add to, comment upon, question, and occasionally subvert the implications of the epic voice.'<sup>24</sup> Drawing upon narratology, Don Fowler speaks in like vein of what he calls 'deviant focalization.'<sup>25</sup>

In his study of 'the other Virgil' in the Renaissance, Craig Kallendorf sets out 'to show in some detail that there is a continuous tradition of 'pessimistic' readings that extends through the early modern period in Europe.' As an opportunity to explore Lyne's concept of 'further voices,' and in keeping with the larger tradition of what Otis describes as Virgil's 'subjective style,' Kallendorf turns to Shakespeare's *Tempest*, alongside Ercilla's *La Araucana*, and asks how such a reading of the *Aeneid* might conceivably have influenced Shakespeare's understanding of colonization.<sup>26</sup> Citing Marilyn Desmond, he explains, 'classical studies has just recently begun to develop a postcolonial reading of Virgil,' one which emerges out of these critics' sense of Virgil's ambivalence.<sup>27</sup> Desmond writes, 'This strain of Virgil criticism, with its emphasis on the 'second voice' or the 'doubleness of vision' in the text, complements the focus of a



critical attempt to dismantle imperial or colonial discourses of the sort exemplified by the ‘imperial Virgil’.<sup>28</sup>

Kallendorf draws attention to Caliban, in particular, as an example of a Virgilian ‘further voice’: ‘Caliban occupies a space within the play that Prospero never succeeds in closing off.’ ‘Caliban’s claims to the island are never refuted; he is overpowered but on this point cannot be silenced.’ He has ‘an eloquence of his own’; his curses have ‘their own kind of power.’ ‘Thus,’ Kallendorf concludes, ‘while the main thrust of *The Tempest* is pro-imperial ... the ‘further voices’, especially Caliban’s, remind us of the cost of empire, just as in the *Aeneid*.’<sup>29</sup> In a recent essay on empathy and *The Tempest*, Leah Whittington presents a more developed version of this argument, comparing Shakespeare’s treatment of Caliban to Virgil’s surprisingly sympathetic account of the death of the arch-villain Mezentius. Shakespeare, she argues, imitates ‘the poetic strategy of *empathia* in Virgil’s *Aeneid*.’ ‘When Virgil allows the narrator’s voice to be fragmented and segregated, as different characters emerge to tell the story from their own unique perspectives, to represent the world *in persona* as they see it, the poem reaches out to the reader like an orator – or an actor – trying to engage the faculty of empathy.’<sup>30</sup>

One charge, nevertheless, which continues to be levelled against this kind of ‘pessimistic’ or ‘ambivalent’ reading of the *Aeneid* is that of anachronism, more specifically, ‘Christian anachronism.’<sup>31</sup> Are our soft hearts nowadays, reading Virgil’s epic, merely a projection of our own post-Christian prejudice towards pity? A symptom of what Nietzsche would call *décadence*? As A. D. Nuttall observes, ‘Christianity has happened; we are all now either Christian or post-Christian.’ Even when secularized, stripped of former Christian theological justification, our assumptions about ethics, as well as politics, have been indelibly shaped historically by ‘a transition from an ethical philosophy which essentially sets personal love and devotion to one side to a philosophy which makes personal love the centre of the ethical life.’<sup>32</sup> We are the legacy, in other words, of the latter-day ‘transvaluation of values’ which Nietzsche condemns as ‘the slave revolt in morals.’

One response to this charge is to argue that an ‘ambivalent’ reading of Virgil’s *Aeneid* has been in play since antiquity, independent of Christianity. In a book on what he calls the ‘Augustan reception’ of Virgil’s epic, Richard Thomas looks closely at one of the earliest pagan commentators on Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Servius, and re-constructs his opposition: other critics, lost to posterity, whom Servius refuses to name. Addressing

them simply as *alii* ('others'), or with various insults, Servius works throughout his commentary to debunk their misgivings in favour of his own more familiar, 'optimistic' take on the poem. In this fashion, Thomas argues, traditional 'Augustan' readers over the centuries have actively suppressed Virgil's own intentional subversion of his patron's politics. Thomas casts Virgil himself as a kind of Shostakovitch, working against the grain of his imperial commission. Ovid in particular, he maintains, who knew both Virgil and Augustus, understood his fellow poet's predicament; he is not a rival so much as a secret sympathizer.

Another response, however, to the charge of what Thomas calls 'Christian anachronism' is to argue that the *Aeneid* is proleptic. In the third century, Lactantius re-imagined Virgil's fourth eclogue as an unwitting prophesy of the coming Messiah, and the sense of Virgil as a pagan forerunner of Christianity has endured ever since. In the twentieth century, it was put forward most forcefully by Theodor Haecker in his book, *Virgil, the Father of the West*, and from there picked up and promulgated by T. S. Eliot in his influential essay, 'Vergil and the Christian World.'<sup>33</sup> Haecker appropriates Tertullian's concept of the *anima naturaliter Christiana* and applies it to Virgil, arguing that the poet had an 'adventist' presentiment of the coming of Christ.<sup>34</sup>

Virgil might also be considered ‘naturally Christian,’ however, in another, less mystical sense. In an essay on what he calls ‘the Stoic in love,’ A. D. Nuttall reconsiders Haecker’s appeal to Tertullian. Virgil, he suggests, anticipates Christianity, not as an inadvertent prophet, but as an ethical avant-garde. His compassion adumbrates the moral revolution, Christianity, which would follow soon thereafter. Christianity, in other words, emerges in response to the same kind of dissatisfaction with the prevailing Roman ethos which Virgil articulates in his epic. It is the public triumph of misgivings about Roman indifference to human suffering which can be discerned in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, but remain confined there to what Parry calls a ‘private voice,’ or Lyne, ‘further voices.’ Hence Virgil’s attractiveness, Pöschl argues, as ‘a mediator between the antique Roman world and medieval Christianity.’ He goes on, in somewhat purple prose: ‘In Vergil there is both the granite of ancient Roman grandeur and the delicate bloom of humanity opening upon a new dimension of the soul.’<sup>35</sup>

Seen in this light, J. L. Simmons’ argument that Shakespeare’s Rome resembles what St. Augustine calls ‘the City of Man’ becomes more plausible.<sup>36</sup> It is not necessary that Shakespeare himself read the *City of God* in order for his vision of Rome to resemble St. Augustine’s. Both authors are indebted to the same touchstone, Virgil’s *Aeneid*, for their sense of

Rome's characteristic flaws.<sup>37</sup> This 'earthly city,' St. Augustine writes, 'was itself ruled by its desire to rule' (*ipsa ei dominandi libido dominatur*) (1.1). 'Lust for power (*libido dominandi*) existed among the Romans with more unmitigated intensity than among any other people' (1.30). By way of explanation, St. Augustine cites Anchises' charge to Aeneas in the Underworld. 'Remember, Roman,' he says, 'to rule the nations by your command (*imperio*),' 'to impose the ways of peace, to spare the subjected (*parcere subiectis*), and to battle down the proud' (6.851-3). According to St. Augustine, as the Romans fought and conquered other nations, individual pursuit of political dominance was at first kept in check by a desire to be praised for temperance, as well as service to the Roman state. Once the Romans defeated Carthage, however, their most dangerous rival, this 'concern to preserve a reputation' (*cura existimationis*) began to seem old-fashioned and unnecessary, until finally it faded away altogether. Seeking only power, at whatever cost, the Romans began to turn on each other. 'First concord was weakened and destroyed by fierce and bloody seditions; then followed... civil wars ... massacres... proscription and plunder' (1.30). As St. Augustine sees it, desire for *imperium*, left unchecked, leads eventually, inevitably, to appalling internecine bloodshed. Rome's pitiless civil strife is

the polar opposite of the ideal City of God, unified in contrast by Christian *caritas*.

According to Michael Putnam, Aeneas himself undergoes a similar moral degeneration. ‘Jupiter early on predicts a time when *Furor impius*, Madness that lacks piety particularly because it is a source of war against internal, not external, enemies, will roar vainly from its prison (1.294-5). ... What we are witnessing, then, as the last half of the epic unfolds ... is a prototype of civil war, climaxing in Aeneas’ killing of Turnus.’ ‘In scorning his father’s command to spare a suppliant [*parcere subiectis*],’ Putnam argues, ‘Aeneas behaves impiously.’ He takes up, in effect, ‘the role of savage Juno and of Furor on the loose’ (12.946-7). ‘From the beginning of the epic,’ he explains, ‘*pietas* is antonymous to a series of negative abstractions including *ira*, *dolor*, *saevitia*, and ... *furor*.’<sup>38</sup> Yet all of these attributes are applied to Aeneas, in the end. In the closing lines of the epic, especially, as Aeneas decides to kill Turnus, Virgil describes him as *furiis accensus et ira / terribilis*: ‘inflamed with madness and terrible in his wrath.’ (12.946-7)

Within Virgil’s *Aeneid*, one of the clearest and most disturbing indications that Aeneas might not represent an ethical ideal is his decision, towards the end, to offer human sacrifice. He first takes eight captives to be

killed off-stage, so to speak, as a blood offering on Pallas's funeral pyre (10.517-20, 11.81-2). Then he kills Magus, a suppliant, despite his pleas for mercy, and immediately afterward Haemonides, a suppliant who is also a priest of Apollo. As he describes Aeneas' rampage, Virgil uses an unusual verb, *immolo*, a religious term for sacrifice, to describe not only what will happen to the captives (*immolet*, 10.519), but also Aeneas' killing Haemonides (*immolat* 10.541), as well as Turnus (*immolat*, 12.949). The choice of diction, Putnam maintains, is meant to be shocking. As Steven Farron explains, human sacrifice was seen within Rome, as well as ancient Greece, as inexcusably alien and abhorrent. Authors as various as Cicero, Ovid, and Lucretius all describe it as *impium*.<sup>39</sup> Livy calls it *foeditas* ('foulness, filthiness') (7.15.10). There is a precedent in Homer's *Iliad*: Achilles kills twelve captured Trojans at Patroclus' funeral pyre (18.336-7, 21.27-32, 23.22-3, 23.175-7). Homer's narrator condemns the deed, however, as does Zeus (23.176, 18.357-9). 'Why,' Putnam asks, 'does Virgil choose to end his poem with his precedent-setting hero offering human sacrifice, something no civilized Roman would have done? ... The answer must be that Virgil, too, would have us condemn his hero's final deed as the action of someone deranged, driven by fury to violate not only

his father's injunction to behave with *clementia* but also a basic tenet of civilized behaviour.'

It is very revealing, then, that *Titus Andronicus* begins with the same kind of human sacrifice that Aeneas offers at the end of the *Aeneid*.<sup>40</sup> As Danielle St. Hilaire points out, 'the problem is not, as Bate suggests, that Titus's behaviour is inconsistent with Rome's historical practices, but rather that Titus's sacrifice is entirely consistent with a similarly appalling scene in a Roman text.'<sup>41</sup> Lucius, Titus's eldest son, asks his father Titus for 'the proudest prisoner of the Goths, / That we may hew his limbs, and on a pile / *Ad manes fratrum* sacrifice his flesh' (1.1.96-9). Titus hands over Alarbus, Tamora's son, despite Tamora's pleas, and he is led away forthwith to be hacked apart and burnt. 'With what almost seems to be deliberate perverseness,' Andrew Ettin complains, 'Shakespeare has evoked from Vergil ... moments that display in the Latin poet's works whatever it is that lies on the side of the Roman soul opposite to forbearance and *pietas*.' Shakespeare's allusion to Virgil here is only 'perverse,' however, if one sees him, as Ettin does, as 'the celebrator ... of the Augustan virtues,' 'one of the writers responsible for our notion of Rome as civilized and virtuous.'<sup>42</sup> Only a few lines earlier, Titus is described as 'surnamed Pius,' an epithet that calls to mind Virgil's *pius* Aeneas. Almost immediately, however, the



concept itself of *pietas* is put to the question. ‘O cruel, irreligious piety!’ Tamora cries (1.1.130). Her outburst proves well-founded. ‘In this early, bloodthirsty play,’ Russell Hillier concludes, ‘Roman piety precludes and excludes pity.’ As a result, Shakespeare’s Romans, like Virgil’s, are ‘locked’ into an interminable ‘cycle of violent reprisal and counter-reprisal.’<sup>43</sup>

Heather James argues that ‘within the first three hundred lines of the play, the Vergilian virtues through which Titus understands himself emerge as bankrupt.’<sup>44</sup> The implicit claim here, however, that Titus’s ethos is ‘Vergilian’ is debatable. In keeping with the ‘Harvard School’ of Virgil criticism, it may be more accurate to say instead that in the opening scene of *Titus Andronicus*, the author shows, like Virgil himself, that what Romans such as Titus consider virtuous, the subordination of the individual to the state, is not necessarily a virtue at all, but instead compromised by its indifference to human suffering. As in the *Aeneid*, the moral value of traditional Roman *pietas* is undermined by a harrowing depiction of its human cost. As Miola observes, ‘Roman honour, with its subordination of private feeling to public responsibility, transforms the city into barbaric chaos. Titus’s vision of Rome and his place in it blinds him to Alarbus, just as it blinds him to his own son and daughter.’<sup>45</sup>

Despite all his plaudits, Titus, especially, the Roman war-hero, comes across as brutally cold and callous, even to his own family. He abruptly kills his own son, Mutius, for daring to try to prevent him from marrying off his daughter, Lavinia, without any thought of her consent, to the new emperor, Saturninus, rather than the man, Bassanius, whom she loves, and to whom she is already betrothed. When his brother, Marcus, accuses him of having ‘slain a virtuous son,’ Titus disavows Mutius, his brothers, and Marcus, as well (1.1.339). ‘No son of mine, / Nor thou, nor these, confederates in the deed / That hath dishonoured all our family.’ (1.1.340-2). When Lucius asks his father to let his brother, Mutius, be buried in the family tomb, Titus refuses. ‘Here none but soldiers and Rome’s servitors / Repose in fame.’ (1.1.349-50). ‘My lord, this is impiety in you,’ (1.1.352), Marcus protests. ‘Thou art a Roman, be not barbarous.’ (1.1.375) Titus reluctantly agrees, but shows no further sign of remorse.

Somewhat surprisingly, given her outrageous cruelty later in play, it is Tamora in contrast who outlines in this opening scene an alternative ethos, more akin to Christianity, and based like Christianity on a different understanding of the divine. ‘Wilt thou draw near the nature of the gods?’ she asks Titus. ‘Draw near them then in being merciful’ (1.1.117-8). After the death of her son Alarbus, however, Tamora becomes in contrast a

symbol of barbaric ruthlessness. She compares herself to Dido, but she can be understood as a representative of a more general pattern in the *Aeneid*. Women in Virgil's epic, starting with the goddess Juno, are symbols of unrestrained *furor*. When Latinus promises Lavinia to Aeneas, for example, Juno sends a fury, Alecto, to prompt his wife, Amata, to resist this decision. Robert Adger Law points out that the 'barren detested vale' where Shakespeare's Lavinia is raped, as well as what it contains, the 'abhorred pit' where Martius discovers the body of Bassanius, strongly resembles the Vale of Amsanctus in the *Aeneid*, where Alecto temporarily takes refuge.<sup>46</sup> When Martius falls into the pit, he describes it as a 'fell devouring receptacle, / As hateful as Cocytus' misty mouth' (2.3.235-6). Virgil describes Alecto's earthly hiding-place in like manner as a 'horrifying cave' (*specus horrendum*) containing the 'breathing-holes of hell' (*spiracula Ditis*). 'An enormous chasm, where Acheron bursts forth, opens wide its pestilent jaws' (*ruptoque ingens Acheronte vorago / pestiferas aperit fauces*) (7.568-70). Alecto aptly personifies the shared character of Aeneas' various female antagonists: her name in Greek means literally, 'the unceasing.' Even more so than the other Erinyes, she serves as a symbol of relentless, implacable anger: the *furor* that eventually overtakes Titus, as well as Aeneas, reducing him to acts of savage barbarism. Seeing his sons'

severed heads, Titus' tears abruptly cease: 'Which way,' he cries, 'shall I find Revenge's cave?' (3.1.269)

In *Titus Andronicus*, Lavinia finds herself prey to Tamora's sons, Chiron and Demetrius, while Tamora looks on. She pleads for 'pity,' but Tamora scoffs: her 'heart' is as impervious to Lavinia's tears as 'unrelenting flint to drops of rain' (2.3.140-1). The language here strongly echoes Virgil's. When Aeneas acknowledges he is planning to leave Carthage, Dido, weeping, accuses him of being born of the rocks of the Caucasus: *duris genuit te cautibus horrens / Caucasus* (4.366-7). Afterward, when Aeneas encounters her in the Underworld, the roles are reversed; Aeneas weeps, but Dido is unmoved. *Nec magis ... movetur / quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes* ('She was no more moved, than if she had been a hard stone ('flint'), or Parian marble' (6.470-1)).<sup>47</sup> As Lavinia pleads with Tamora, Demetrius urges his mother not to spare her, and Lavinia protests, again in language that recalls Virgil's. 'When did the tiger's young ones teach the dam?' she asks Demetrius. 'O, do not learn her wrath; she taught it thee. / The milk thou suckst from her did turn to marble.' (2.2.142-4). When Dido accuses Virgil of being a child of the craggy Caucasus, she also accuses him of having been nursed by Hyrcanian tigers: *Hyrcaenaeque*

*admorunt ubera tigres* (4.367). ‘Marble’ here, too, calls to mind *Marpesia cautes*, Virgil’s description of Dido, later on, as ‘Parian marble.’

Shakespeare seems to have been especially fascinated by Virgil’s conceit of the nursing female Hyrcanian tiger as a symbol of paradoxically pitiless femininity. At the end of *Titus Andronicus*, Lucius denounces Aaron as a ‘ravenous tiger’ (5.3.5) and Tamora, too, as a ‘ravenous tiger’ (5.3.194). ‘Her life was beastly,’ he explains, ‘and devoid of pity’ (5.3.198). The image of the tiger appears in several other plays, as well, and always in the same vein, as a symbol of frightening ruthlessness: ‘th’Hyrcan tiger’ in *Macbeth* (3.4.100); in *Hamlet*, ‘rugged Pyrrhus, like th’Hyrcanian beast’ (2.2.446). Urging his men ‘once more unto the breach,’ the tiger serves for Henry V as a symbol of ‘hard-favoured rage’ (3.1.1- 8). In 3 *Henry VI*, after she has killed his son, York describes Margaret of Anjou as ‘more human, more inexorable, / O ten times more than the tigers of Hyrcania’ (1.4.154-5). ‘O tiger’s heart,’ he calls her, ‘wrapped in a woman’s hide!’ (1.4.137). Later in the play, the tables are turned: Margaret becomes, as Henry VI says, ‘a woman to be pitied much’ (3.1.36). ‘Her tears will pierce into a marble heart,’ he claims; ‘the tiger will be mild whiles she doth mourn’ (3.1.38-39).

Turning to the other great villain of the piece, Aaron the Moor, it is tempting to surmise that his characterization, as well, may owe something to the influence of Virgil. Specifically, Aaron may be modelled on Virgil's Mezentius. In the *Aeneid*, Virgil describes Mezentius as a tyrant who had once ruled over the Etruscans, *superbo imperio et saevis... armis* ('with arrogant command and savage ... arms'), but whose reign had been overthrown by a popular uprising (8.481-2). Having fled Etruria, Mezentius took refuge with King Turnus, and he appears in the epic fighting at his side against Aeneas. Virgil attributes to this deposed tyrant a memorable form of executing his political enemies: chaining them to corpses, hand to hand and face to face, until the gruesome, bloody fluids of decomposition (*sanie taboque fluentis*) would extend from the dead to the living (8.485-9). Something akin to this peculiar form of torture can be seen in *Titus Andronicus*, when Aaron tricks Titus's sons, Quintus and Martius, into falling into a pit which contains the dead body of Bassanius. Shakespeare lingers over their horror at their proximity to the dead. 'I am surprised with an uncouth fear' (2.1.211) Quintus exclaims. 'A chilling sweat o'erruns my trembling joints.' (2.1.212). The pit is an 'unhallowed and bloodstained hole' (2.2.210), 'detested, dark, blood-drinking' (2.2.224): Martius describes the scene as a 'fearful sight of blood and death' (2.1.216).

Other similarities, as well, suggest a connection between Aaron and Mezentius. Both scoff at the gods. ‘Thou believest no god’ (5.1.71), Lucius says of Aaron. ‘Indeed I do not’ (5.1.73), Aaron retorts, unrepentant. As Aeneas and Mezentius begin to fight, Aeneas invites Jupiter and Apollo to strike the first blow. Mezentius, however, is undaunted. ‘I am not horrified by death,’ he boasts, ‘nor would I spare any of the gods’ (10.880). At another point, Mezentius declares his own right hand and spear his ‘god’ (*dextra mihi deus et telum*) (10.773). Aaron and Mezentius are also both in some measure redeemed by their heartfelt love for their own progeny. ‘This before all the world do I prefer’ (4.2.111), Aaron exclaims, holding tight to his newborn son. He vows to feed and raise the child himself and to bring him up ‘to be a warrior and command a camp’ (4.2.182). Mezentius’ love for his son, Lausus, can be seen in contrast in his reaction to his death. After Aeneas kills the young warrior, Mezentius is utterly distraught. He flings dust on his hair and clings to the corpse (*corpore inhaeret*), in an ironic recreation of his own former mode of execution (10.845). Only by killing his son, ‘only this way,’ (*haec via sola*), he tells Aeneas, ‘there was, by which you might destroy me.’ (10.879).

This peculiar weakness of Mezentius, as well as Aaron, is in keeping with another point of resonance between Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus*

and Virgil's *Aeneid*: an emphasis on the relationship between father and son. The word itself, 'son,' appears significantly more often in this play than in any other of Shakespeare's plays.<sup>48</sup> More specifically, both works emphasize a father's grief at the death of his son. Much of the action of the second half of the *Aeneid* revolves around the death of two young warriors: Pallas, son of Evander, killed by Turnus, and Lausus, son of Mezentius, killed by Aeneas. Titus' own case is more extreme: he begins the tragedy with most of his sons dead, kills one himself at the beginning, and loses two more over the course of the play. His chief antagonist, Tamora, loses her sons, as well; one at the beginning and two more at the end. Like Virgil, Shakespeare seems to say, *this*, this tragedy that you see before you, is the cost of *imperium*: the loss of young men's lives. Human sacrifice is a symbol of a more metaphorical sacrifice: the price of *Romanitas*, the blood offering it requires, is casualties in war.

By far the most disturbing aspect of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, however, is his recasting of Virgil's Lavinia as a kind of Philomela. Like her namesake, Shakespeare's Lavinia is the innocent subject of a bitter quarrel over marriage rights. In the *Aeneid*, Lavinia is initially betrothed to a local suitor, Prince Turnus, but then abruptly handed over to a stranger, Aeneas, prompting a pan-Italian war. In *Titus Andronicus*, Titus agrees to allow the



new emperor of Rome, Saturninus, to marry his daughter, even though she is already betrothed to Bassianus. Like Virgil's Turnus, Bassianus refuses to give up his claim. And, as in the *Aeneid*, the result is bloodshed, beginning with the death of Titus's own son. Later in the play, Tamora's sons, Chiron and Demetrius, rape Lavinia and mutilate her, with Tamora's approval, in reprisal for Titus's agreeing to sacrifice their brother, Alarbus. As in the story of Philomela, they cut out her tongue; in addition, however, they cut off her hands. Nonetheless, by indicating pages in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Lavinia is able to communicate her plight, prompting Titus to take revenge on Tamora and her sons, much as Philomela's sister, Procne, does to Tereus, by serving her her sons, Chiron and Demetrius, baked in a pie.

Miola argues that Shakespeare's Lavinia 'parodies' Virgil's; her rape is 'in direct contrast' to her namesake's wedding to Aeneas.<sup>49</sup> That sense of contrast, however, reflects his relatively 'optimistic' reading of the *Aeneid*. A more 'pessimistic' reading of the *Aeneid* would suggest that Shakespeare's Lavinia clarifies, by exaggeration, Virgil's own more subtly-rendered concerns about the human cost of *Romanitas*, for women as well as men. In *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora is not Lavinia's mother, and she does not carry off Lavinia herself, as Amata does in the *Aeneid*. Yet some analogy may be in play, nonetheless. In the *Aeneid*, Amata, associated with the

Bacchantes, vows that Bacchus alone is worthy of her daughter, and that he alone will have her (7.389-91). What would it mean, however, Shakespeare seems to ask, if Bacchus did indeed take possession of her daughter? Chiron and Demetrius dismember Shakespeare's Lavinia, much as the Bacchantes do Orpheus. When he finds Lavinia afterward, Marcus compares her explicitly to 'the Thracian poet,' Orpheus, and recalls her beautiful singing, as well as her 'lily hands ... upon a lute' (2.3.43-51). Voicelessness also signifies Lavinia's lack of agency. In the *Aeneid*, Amata speaks of her own 'maternal right' (*iuris materni*), but never of Lavinia's wishes or concerns (7.402). Shakespeare seems to have found this indifference, like Titus's, horrifying. Lavinia's enforced dumbness, her tongue literally cut out of her mouth, reflects the fact that in the *Aeneid*, she has no say in her own fate. Instead, she is shuffled back and forth as a bargaining chip: a voiceless object of political machination. The name of the son that Titus kills, Mutius, is perhaps, then, not coincidental. He, too, is rendered effectively 'mute.'

Heather James and Jonathan Bate see in *Titus Andronicus*

Shakespeare choosing Ovid over Virgil, not just in terms of style, but also in terms of what Martindale calls 'sensitivity.' 'Ovid dominates the central acts of the play,' James argues, 'at a direct cost to Vergil as a source of cultural decorum for Titus, Rome, and the play itself.'<sup>50</sup> Citing James, Bate agrees:

Ovid is used ‘to destabilize a Virgilian, imperial idiom.’<sup>51</sup> Lisa Starks-Estes, too, maintains that Shakespeare uses Ovid ‘to revise and, in part, to overturn Virgil, the epic tradition, and its values.’<sup>52</sup> James explains: ‘No sooner is Vergilian authority installed through the ritual events and ceremonious speeches of the first act than it is deposed by a specifically Ovidian insouciance, marked by the once humourless Titus’s laughter upon receiving his severed hand and his sons’ heads: ‘Ha, ha, ha!’ (3.1.265).’ Shakespeare ‘wrenches the play world from Vergilian to Ovidian coordinates’ and ‘unleashes the floodgates to the outrageous puns, violence, and schematic disjunctions that subsequently pervade the play.’<sup>53</sup>

To what end, however, does Shakespeare evoke Ovid as an alternative to Virgil? James and Bate seem not to notice Virgil’s celebrated ‘empathy,’ as well as his subversion of Roman ‘authority.’ They also overlook Ovid’s notorious cruelty: the gleeful, gloating sadism which pervades his representations of violence. Bate observes that ‘*Titus* reminds the audience of its own Ovidianism’ (102): a point hard to dispute, when Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* itself makes a cameo on-stage.<sup>54</sup> As A. D. Nuttall asks, however, ‘What then of the ethical question-mark which has hung over Ovid for so many centuries? ... There is so much pain and so many rapes in Ovid, and the poet seems in a way not to care.’<sup>55</sup> Shakespeare imitates what

James calls ‘Ovidian insouciance’ not out of affinity, but instead, to subject it to an ethical critique. As Valerie Traub writes, ‘any comprehensive account of the impulses and effects of Ovidianism needs to account for its fascination with the erotics of cruelty, including the amplification of such violence in such quintessentially Ovidian texts as *Titus Andronicus*.’<sup>56</sup> What Burrow identifies as the ‘Ovidian grotesquerie of *Titus*’ is meant to be horrifying, not appealing.<sup>57</sup>

Within classics, a sense of Ovid as witty but cold-hearted, even outright sadistic, is a critical commonplace, dating back to Ovid’s own contemporaries. ‘One of the oldest and most persistent charges which has been levelled against the Ovid of the *Metamorphoses*,’ David Hopkins explains, ‘is that the poet trivializes his depictions of pain, anxiety, and suffering by prolixity, by a callous impassivity, and by displays of tastelessly inappropriate wit.’<sup>58</sup> When a poet should ‘endeavour to raise Pity,’ Dryden observes, Ovid instead is ‘tickling you to laugh.’<sup>59</sup> If Shakespeare does intend to question Ovid’s amoral aestheticism, it makes sense, moreover, that he would turn to the *locus classicus* for this criticism of Ovid’s style, his description of Tereus’ rape and mutilation of Philomela (6.550-62). Karl Galinsky cites this scene, in particular, for its ‘loving depiction even of the smallest sadistic detail,’ including especially ‘the

detail of the cutting out of the tongue and its twitching on the ground.’<sup>60</sup>

Shakespeare omits this detail; Marcus’s long speech, after he finds Lavinia mutilated, has come in for criticism as over-elaborate, but it is much more sympathetic than Ovid’s description of Philomela. As Martindale writes, ‘here there is none of the disconcerting precision and coolness of Ovid,’ ‘no tone of detachment.’ ‘The effect ... is not flippant or disorienting, but rather one of pathos and sorrow.’<sup>61</sup> In other words, Marcus describes Lavinia, not in the style of Ovid, but instead, as Virgil might – with pronounced compassion. His is a eulogy, not a mockery.

Just before he cuts Chiron and Demetrius’s throats, Titus vows to make the “banquet” he will prepare for their mother, Tamora, “more stern and bloody than the Centaurs’ feast’ (5.3.201-2). Although brief, the allusion to Ovid here is again revealing. Galinsky cites the battle of the Lapiths against the centaurs as an especially egregious instance of the poet’s tendency toward Grand Guignol. ‘Ovid revels in ever new ways of imagining how bodies can be mangled, maimed, or disintegrated.’ One centaur is killed, for instance, by having his eyes gouged out by antlers a Lapith finds hanging on a tree; Ovid lingers over the image of his eyeball rolling down his beard (12.265-70). ‘Death becomes a ludicrous and sensational event, which the poet views without any empathy for its

victims.<sup>62</sup> Recounting a host of malevolent, murderous pranks,

Shakespeare's Aaron boasts:

I have done a thousand dreadful things,  
 As willingly as one would kill a fly,  
 And nothing grieves me heartily indeed  
 But that I cannot do ten thousand more. (5.1.141-4)

It is Ovid, not Virgil, whom Shakespeare 'parodies' in this play:

Shakespeare imitates, even exaggerates, Ovidianism, to the point that it becomes both absurd and revolting. Ovid's style is that of the villains, the barbarians, Tamora, Aaron, Chiron, and Demetrius, and it is part of the tragedy that Titus degenerates morally by the end of the play to the point that he takes on this attitude himself. At the beginning of the play, he is callous, indifferent to suffering. By the end, however, Titus is somehow worse: he takes pleasure, like his enemies, in inflicting pain. Ovidianism serves as an index of this moral decline. Like Traub, as well as Starks-Estes, Galinsky sees in Ovid a disturbing 'erotics of cruelty.' Citing Otto Kiefer's study of Roman sexuality, Galinsky argues that that this 'cruel and sadistic

streak in the Roman character' was 'endemic and never far from the surface.'<sup>63</sup>

Towards the middle of *Titus Andronicus*, in one especially heart-breaking scene, Lucius finds his father wandering the streets of Rome, pleading to the cobblestones for the life of his sons. 'No man is by' (3.1.28), Lucius protests. 'You recount your sorrows to a stone' (3.1.28-9). 'They are better than the Tribunes' (3.1.38), Titus replies. 'When I do weep, they humbly at my feet / Receive my tears and seem to weep with me' (3.1.40-1). Roman authority is in contrast 'more hard than stones' (3.1.44). The contrast between 'tears' and 'stones' recalls not only Dido's response to Aeneas's tears, itself a response to his earlier indifference to hers, but also Tamora's rejection of Lavinia's, 'as unrelenting flint to drops of rain' (2.3.141), which she casts explicitly as a response to Titus's indifference to her tears for Alarbus. 'Be not obdurate,' Lavinia begs (2.3.160). But Tamora professes herself 'pitiless' (2.3.162). 'Remember, boys,' she tells her sons, 'I poured forth tears in vain / To save your brother from the sacrifice, / But fierce Andronicus would not relent' (2.3.163-5).

'Foolish Lucius,' Titus explains to his son, 'dost thou not perceive / That Rome is but a wilderness of tigers?' (3.1.52-3) Rome seems to be a city, the centre of civilization. But it is little different from the 'wilderness'

that surrounds it. In Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, as in Virgil's *Aeneid*, *Romanitas* seems at first to be the opposite of barbarism, but by the end it turns out to be infected with the same savage spirit. 'I am Revenge,' says Tamora, visiting Titus in disguise (5.2.30). But the line could equally well apply to Titus himself. Like Aeneas at the end of the *Aeneid*, the 'Roman' has become 'barbarous.' In a sense, though, he always was. As Shakespeare shows, from a Christian perspective, the common thread connecting Roman subordination of the individual to the glory of the state, as well as of the child to the honour of the *paterfamilias* – Roman *pietas* – and barbaric sadism such as that of Shakespeare's Aaron is a desire for command, control, dominance: the craving for power over others that St. Augustine calls *libido dominandi*. And the missing element, the cost of that *imperium*, is pity: a Virgilian sense of compassion for human suffering.

*Patrick Gray*

*Durham University*

---

<sup>1</sup> John W. Velz, 'The ancient world in Shakespeare: authenticity or anachronism? A retrospect,' *Shakespeare Survey* 31 (1978), 1-12; p. 12 n. 5.



---

<sup>2</sup> Robert S. Miola, 'Vergil in Shakespeare: From Allusion to Imitation,' 241-58, in *Vergil at 2000: Commemorative Essays on the Poet and His Influence*, ed. John D. Bernard (New York, 1986), p. 241.

<sup>3</sup> Miola, 'Vergil in Shakespeare,' pp. 251, 250, 242.

<sup>4</sup> Colin Burrow, *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity* (Oxford, 2013), p. 75.

<sup>5</sup> Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols. (Urbana, 1944), vol. 2, p. 418.

<sup>7</sup> Burrow, *Classical Antiquity*, p. 92.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Martindale and Michelle Martindale, *Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity* (London and New York, 1994), p. 43.

<sup>9</sup> Charles Martindale, 'Shakespeare and Virgil,' 89-106, in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, ed. Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 89-90.

<sup>10</sup> Burrow, *Classical Antiquity*, p. 51.

<sup>11</sup> James, *Shakespeare's Troy*, pp. 24, 27, 43.

<sup>12</sup> Martindale and Martindale, *Uses of Antiquity*, p. 43.

---

<sup>13</sup> Matthew Arnold, 'On the Modern Element in Literature,' 18-38, in Matthew Arnold, *On the Classical Tradition*, ed. R. H. Super (Ann Arbor, 1960), p. 35.

<sup>14</sup> Samuel Johnson, 'Preface to Shakespeare,' in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Arthur Sherbo (New Haven and London, 1968), p. 69; cp. Thomas Rymer, 'A Short View of Tragedy,' in *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, ed. Curt Zimansky (New Haven, 1956), p. 169.

<sup>15</sup> Michael C. J. Putnam, *Virgil's 'Aeneid': Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill and London, 1995), p. 22.

<sup>16</sup> Richard Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig, 1903), transl. *Virgil's Epic Technique*, transl. Hazel Harvey, David Harvey, and Fred Robertson (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1993); T. S. Eliot, *What is a Classic?* (London, 1945); Viktor Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Vergils: Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis* (Innsbruck, 1950), transl. *The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the 'Aeneid'*, transl. Gerda Seligson (Ann Arbor, 1962).

<sup>17</sup> Adam Parry, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*,' *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 2 (1963), 66-80; pp. 71, 69, 78.

<sup>18</sup> R. D. Williams, 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*,' 21-36, in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's 'Aeneid'*, ed. S. J. Harrison (Oxford, 1990), p. 26.

- 
- <sup>19</sup> Wendell Clausen, 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*,' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964), 139-147; pp. 146, 144.
- <sup>20</sup> Parry, 'Two Voices,' p. 80.
- <sup>21</sup> Heinze, *epische Technik*, p. 362.
- <sup>22</sup> Brooks Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964). For Otis's influence on Virgil studies in Italy, see Don Fowler, 'Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*,' *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 36 (1990), 42-63; pp. 54-8.
- <sup>23</sup> Gian Biago Conte, *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*, ed. S. J. Harrison (Oxford, 2007), p. 30.
- <sup>24</sup> R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil's 'Aeneid'* (Oxford, 1987), p. 2.
- <sup>25</sup> Fowler, 'Deviant Focalisation.'
- <sup>26</sup> For Virgil's 'subjective style,' see Otis, *Civilized Poetry*, pp. 41-96.
- <sup>27</sup> Craig Kallendorf, *The Other Virgil: 'Pessimistic' Readings of the 'Aeneid' in Early Modern Culture* (Oxford, 2007), pp. viii, 73.
- <sup>28</sup> Marilyn Desmond, *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality, and the Medieval Mind* (Minneapolis, 1994), p. 7.
- <sup>29</sup> Kallendorf, *Other Virgil*, p. 124.

---

<sup>30</sup> Leah Whittington, 'Shakespeare's Virgil: Empathy and *The Tempest*,' 98-120, in *Shakespeare and Renaissance Ethics*, ed. Patrick Gray and John D. Cox (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 99, 105.

<sup>31</sup> Richard F. Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge, 2001), p. xii n. 4.

<sup>32</sup> A. D. Nuttall, 'The Stoic in Love,' 56-67, in A. D. Nuttall, *The Stoic in Love: Selected Essays on Literature and Ideas* (London, 1989), p. 61.

<sup>33</sup> T. S. Eliot, 'Vergil and the Christian World,' *Sewanee Review*, 61 (1953), 1-14; cp. Theodor Haecker, *Virgil, Father of the West*, trans. Arther Wesley Wheen (London, 1934).

<sup>34</sup> For the concept of *anima naturaliter Christiana*, see Tertullian, *Apology*, 17.6, and *Patrologia Latina*, 1:377.

<sup>35</sup> Pöschl, *Art of Vergil*, pp. 54, 58.

<sup>36</sup> J. L. Simmons, *Shakespeare's Pagan World: The Roman Tragedies* (Charlottesville, 1973).

<sup>37</sup> For a more comprehensive account of Virgil's influence on St. Augustine, see Sabine MacCormack, *The Shadows of Poetry: Vergil in the Mind of Augustine* (Berkeley, 1998).

<sup>38</sup> Putnam, 'Virgil's *Aeneid*,' p. 202.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ronald Broude claims “Elizabethans do not seem to have been aware” that “human sacrifice was rarely if ever practiced during the Empire”; see Broude, “Roman and Goth in *Titus Andronicus* [*sic*],” 30, *Shakespeare Studies* 6 (1970): 27-34. Given widespread condemnation of the practice, however, by other classical authors such as Cicero, this assumption seems debatable. See S. Farron, ‘Aeneas’ Human Sacrifice,’ *Acta Classica*, 28 (1985), 21-33.

<sup>40</sup> Some critics assign this and other sections of *Titus Andronicus* to a collaborator, George Peele, rather than Shakespeare himself. See esp. Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 148-243. For a recent overview of ongoing debate about the authorship of various sections of *Titus Andronicus*, see William W. Weber, ‘Shakespeare After All? The Authorship of *Titus Andronicus* 4.1 Reconsidered,’ *Shakespeare Survey* 67 (2014), 69-84.

<sup>41</sup> Danielle A. St. Hilaire, “Allusion and Sacrifice in *Titus Andronicus*,” 314, *SEL*, 49 (2009), 311-331. Cp. Bate 135 n. 127. St. Hilaire goes on to describe in some detail how “the language of the exchange between Aeneas and his pleading victim closely resembles Titus’s dialogue with Tamora.”

<sup>42</sup> Andrew Ettin, ‘Shakespeare’s First Roman Tragedy,’ *ELH*, 37 (1970), 325-41; pp. 326-8.

---

<sup>43</sup> Russell M. Hillier, “Valour Will Weep’: The Ethics of Valor, Anger, and Pity in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*,” *Studies in Philology*, in press.

<sup>44</sup> James, *Shakespeare’s Troy*, p. 54.

<sup>45</sup> Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare’s Rome* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 49.

<sup>46</sup> Robert Adger Law, ‘The Roman Background of *Titus Andronicus*,’ *Studies in Philology*, 40 (1943), 145-53; p. 149.

<sup>47</sup> ‘Flint’ is the usual sixteenth-century translation of *silex*.

<sup>48</sup> Along with related words such as ‘sons’ and ‘son’s,’ 73 times; the closest points of comparison are *3 Henry VI* (54) and *King John* (36).

<sup>49</sup> Miola, *Shakespeare’s Rome*, 54-55; cp. Miola, ‘Vergil in Shakespeare,’ pp. 242-3. See also James, *Shakespeare’s Troy*, p. 55, on Shakespeare’s Lavinia as a ‘warping’ of Virgil’s.

<sup>50</sup> James, *Shakespeare’s Troy*, p. 43.

<sup>51</sup> Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, 1993), p. 103 n. 33.

<sup>52</sup> Lisa S. Starks-Estes, *Violence, Trauma, and ‘Virtus’ in Shakespeare’s Roman Poems and Plays* (London and New York, 2014), p. 11.

<sup>53</sup> James, *Shakespeare’s Troy*, p. 43-4.

<sup>54</sup> Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid*, p. 102.

<sup>55</sup> A. D. Nuttall, ‘A Kind of Scandal,’ *London Review of Books*, 15 (1993), 15-16; p. 16. Review of Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid*.

---

<sup>56</sup> Valerie Traub, 'Afterword,' 260-9, in *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*, ed. Goran V. Stanivukovic (Toronto, 2001), p. 266.

<sup>57</sup> Burrow, *Classical Antiquity*, p. 106.

<sup>58</sup> David Hopkins, 'Dryden and Ovid's 'Wit out of Season',' 167-90, in *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, ed. Charles Martindale (Cambridge, 1988), p. 167.

<sup>59</sup> John Dryden, 'Preface to *Fables Ancient and Modern*,' 552-71, in John Dryden, *Major Works*, ed. Keith Walker (Oxford, 1987), p. 559.

<sup>60</sup> Karl Galinsky, 'Ovid's Humanity: Death and Suffering in the Metamorphoses,' 110-57, in Karl Galinsky, *Ovid's 'Metamorphoses': An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1975), p. 130.

<sup>61</sup> Martindale and Martindale, *Uses of Antiquity*, p. 51. See also Burrow, *Classical Antiquity*, pp. 110-2.

<sup>62</sup> Galinsky, 'Ovid's Humanity,' pp. 126-7.

<sup>63</sup> Galinsky, 'Ovid's Humanity,' p. 138; cp. Otto Kiefer, *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome* (London, 1934).