

CULTURAL MEMORY AND CONSTRUCTED ETHNICITY IN VERGIL'S *AENEID*

Tedd A. Wimperis

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics.

Chapel Hill
2017

Approved by:

James J. O'Hara

Robert G. Babcock

William H. Race

James B. Rives

C. Sydnor Roy

© 2017
Tedd A. Wimperis
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

TEDD A. WIMPERIS: Cultural Memory and Constructed Ethnicity in Vergil's *Aeneid*
(Under the direction of James J. O'Hara.)

This dissertation examines the ways in which the *Aeneid*'s fictionalized ethnic communities—principally the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians—construct and promote their collective identities, and how members of these groups employ memory and identity in political rhetoric. Building on theoretical and comparative sources on ethnicity, national identity, and cultural memory, this study shows that the depiction of ethnic identity and communal politics within the world of the poem corresponds closely with real practices among ancient Mediterranean communities, most pertinently Augustan Rome. Like their historical counterparts, the epic's fictive communities employ cultural memory and identity in several political activities, including diplomacy, elite self-representation, and public displays. Vergil's characters also appeal to shared identity and values to mobilize collective action, reinforce group solidarity, and legitimize political decisions or leadership. The dissertation applies this evidence to a broad literary analysis of the *Aeneid* and a re-evaluation of its engagement with contemporary Augustan ideology.

Chapter 1 introduces the dissertation's thesis and place in current scholarship on Vergil, and examines the Aeneas myth in the Republican and Augustan periods as a case study of cultural memory's role in politics and propaganda. Turning to the epic itself, Chapter 2 elaborates the evidence for cultural memory and identity among the *Aeneid*'s four major ethnic groups (the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians), and analyzes the ways in which cultural memory and ethnicity are expressed and employed in their political activity. Chapter 3 reads the Trojans' journey to Italy as a narrative of exile and collective trauma, and

argues that the most intimate concern of Aeneas and his refugee people in founding a new community is securing the continuity of their Trojan identity in the wake of Troy's collapse. Chapter 4 addresses the poem's depiction of Italian identity in Books 7-12, interpreting the rhetoric of Italian solidarity and anti-Trojan polemic voiced by Turnus and his allies as an effort to construct a new sense of unity and collective identity among the diverse peoples opposing Aeneas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this dissertation was only possible through the encouragement and expertise of generous advisors, friends, and family. First and greatest thanks go to Jim O'Hara, who guided me in shaping this project from its initial fits and starts to its finishing touches; I could not have hoped for a more attentive, knowledgeable, and supportive mentor. I thank also the remaining members of my committee, Bob Babcock, Bill Race, James Rives, and Sydnor Roy, who have greatly enriched this study with their care and insight, and have helped make the last two years of writing a smooth, constructive, and altogether pleasant experience.

Many friends at UNC-Chapel Hill have contributed to the progress of this dissertation, and to my own wellbeing as I was writing it. A few words among these acknowledgments cannot begin to express my gratitude for their daily reassurance, cheerfulness, inspiration, and kindness, now and during all of my years at the university. Special thanks go to Kim Miles, who at every step provided crucial research incentive in the form of donuts, cookies, cakes, pies, and brownies. In addition to the constant support I have received from the Department of Classics throughout my graduate career, a year-long fellowship from the Graduate School has allowed me the time and resources needed to complete the dissertation, for which I am grateful.

Lastly, I thank my parents, Bruce and Debbie Wimperis, who have supported me in countless ways ever since I first decided to learn a bit of Latin in high school, and embarked on the adventure that has led all the way here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| CHAPTER 1: THE POLITICS OF THE PAST IN THE <i>AENEID</i> AND AUGUSTAN ROME..... | 1 |
| Memory and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean..... | 4 |
| <i>Genus unde Latinum</i> : The Aeneas Myth in Roman Politics..... | 20 |
| The Memory of Aeneas in Public Discourse: Three Aspects | 37 |
| Conclusion and Prospectus | 48 |
| CHAPTER 2: CULTURAL MEMORY IN THE WORLD OF THE <i>AENEID</i> | 53 |
| Cultural Memory and Identity in Vergil's Ethnic Communities | 57 |
| The Trojans | 57 |
| The Carthaginians | 69 |
| The Latins | 78 |
| The Arcadians | 87 |
| Memory and Identity in State Diplomacy..... | 107 |
| Conclusion | 116 |
| CHAPTER 3: VERGIL'S TROJANS: CRISIS, IDENTITY, AND CONTINUITY | 125 |
| The Trojan Experience of Exile..... | 130 |
| Visions of Troy: <i>domus</i> or <i>imperium</i> ? | 159 |
| Conclusion | 181 |
| CHAPTER 4: RHETORIC AND RESISTANCE: CONSTRUCTED ETHNICITY IN VERGIL'S ITALY | 183 |
| Italian Identity in the Late Republic: <i>Tota Italia</i> and Its Complications | 186 |
| Identity and (Dis-)Unity in Vergil's Italy | 194 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Trojan Resistance and Italian Solidarity | 214 |
| Conclusion | 237 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 241 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 245 |

CHAPTER 1: The Politics of the Past in the *Aeneid* and Augustan Rome

Vergil's *Aeneid* recounts the birth of a civilization, narrating through the deeds of "father Aeneas" and the Trojan settlers of Lavinium the earliest origins of the Roman people. The story of the Trojan migration to Italy was one of many cultural narratives about the past that underpinned the Roman sense of self, situating the origin of the community in mythic time, identifying its genealogy through a line of communal ancestors, and defining its core values through the deeds of its early heroes. The Aeneas myth constitutes an ancient example of what modern scholarship now recognizes as "cultural memory," the repository of myths, symbols, traditions, institutions, and historical experiences through which the members of a community construct their collective identity. Growing to special prominence in the Age of Augustus, the Aeneas myth was widely celebrated in civic monuments, literature, and public displays. Its protagonist, the alleged ancestor of Augustus himself, was regarded as the progenitor of the Roman people and a model of the Roman character, and the story of his foundation became enshrined as a premier myth of the empire.

The members of the *gens Iulia* who derived prestige and legitimacy from their Trojan pedigree were not the first Romans to invoke the memory of Aeneas for political purposes. The studied promotion of the myth under the principate was preceded by at least two centuries of its circulation in public discourse at home and abroad, where the Trojan foundation story was pragmatically deployed in a variety of ways. It was used as a tool in diplomatic relations, serving to connect the Roman historical identity with the mythic pasts of other nations, and to ground

alliances, hostilities, and territorial claims. It informed political decision-making and discourse on cultural values by providing, in the form of ancestral heroes, exemplary ideals of character. It conferred legitimacy on contemporary authorities and their policies through their perceived alignment with the imperatives of the communal past. Vergil's epic, a rendition of the traditional myth that achieved the status of canon, played an essential role in both the reception and transmission of this narrative of Rome's collective past, a narrative which, under the reign of Augustus, buttressed a political and cultural program that advanced the restoration of Romans' native values, the solidarity of the Roman people through shared heritage, and their unique identity and destiny among peoples.

The cultivation of the Aeneas myth among Romans and its pragmatic functions in their political activity exemplify the use of cultural memory in constructing communal identity, promoting solidarity, and motivating collective action and belief. The social dynamics and political efficacy of memory and identity, demonstrated here in the example of a prominent Roman myth, are the themes that guide this study of the *Aeneid*. In this dissertation I aim to show how the roles of cultural memory and identity attested in Vergil's first-century milieu are equally at work within the fictive landscape of his poem, reproduced, as if in miniature, among the communities of Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians that inhabit its mythic world.

The subjects of memory and identity in the *Aeneid* have long been studied in connection with Vergil's Roman audience. My approach, by contrast, turns from the contemporary world outside of the poem to the world inside of it, to the poet's creative rendering of a mythic past populated by the Trojan exiles and the several peoples they encounter in the narrative. Like their real-life counterparts, the *Aeneid*'s ethnic groups preserve the memory of their own communal pasts and employ it in several political activities, including diplomacy, elite self-representation,

and public displays, and rhetorically appeal to their collective identities to mobilize action, encourage conduct faithful to ancestral *exempla*, and legitimize political authority.

Among Vergil's Trojans, memory of the founders Teucer and (especially) Dardanus guides their effort to found a new settlement. Through Dardanus' origins in Italy, the refugees are able to recognize Latium as an authentic *patria*, a land connected with their Trojan identity as the birthplace of their communal founder. Dido and her Carthaginian settlers, themselves refugees, commemorate the recent founding of their new state in North Africa, as well as their ethnic origin from Tyre. At the state banquet held for the Trojans, the narrator describes a silver dish that depicts the exploits of Dido's father Belus and the founding fathers of the Phoenician race, and the queen pours a libation with a chalice passed down through this long line of ancestors.

In Italy, Latinus traces his illustrious lineage through the divinized Faunus, the civic founder Picus, and ultimately Saturn, regarded as the father of the Latin people. The palace of Picus, wherein are performed the major duties of state, is a storehouse of symbols evoking the community's heritage of martial exploits and the divine origins of their kings. When Aeneas meets Evander and the Arcadians, they are performing the annual honors at the Ara Maxima that form an integral part of their civic identity. Celebrated with sacrifice and song, Hercules serves not only as a patron god, to whom the community both corporately and individually renders prayer, but also a savior and founder whose slaying of Cacus represents a defining moment in communal memory. Throughout Books 7-12, Turnus, Numanus Remulus, and others mobilize resistance against Aeneas by casting the war in Italy as a "national defense," and appeal to an Italian solidarity that did not previously exist among the region's diverse communities, but is rhetorically constructed through the polemical contrast of native and foreign identities.

Beginning with this and other evidence, this dissertation examines the influence of a community's collective past, preserved in its cultural memories and other markers of identity, on the actions, motivations, and emotions of Vergil's characters within the *Aeneid*. Applying to the poem a new interpretive focus and critical framework, I argue that cultural memories function among the *Aeneid*'s fictionalized ethnic groups in much the same ways as they do among real-life ancient communities. Like the Aeneas myth among Vergil's contemporary Romans, these memories shape collective identity, guide political decisions, legitimize power, motivate action, and inspire solidarity. Through analysis of cultural memory and identity within the *Aeneid*'s poetic microcosm and in the historical Greco-Roman world it reflects, this study defines a further way in which the epic creatively engages with contemporary political and cultural discourse.

This introductory chapter will, in its first half, lay the methodological groundwork for the dissertation, surveying its foundations in cultural theory and situating its place in current scholarship on Vergil. In the chapter's second half, I initiate my analysis of the poem by exploring in greater detail the major point of contact I will draw between the discourses of identity in the *Aeneid* and those in the Roman world outside of the poem, namely the Aeneas myth. Study of that myth's political uses in the Roman world before and during Vergil's time will develop an interpretive framework for examining cultural memory within the poem in subsequent chapters, and further elaborate this dissertation's two main subjects of inquiry: first, how communities construct their identities through cultural memory, and, second, how they make strategic use of memory and identity in their public life.

Memory and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean

Scholarship on collective memory and its role in political communities has proliferated over the past half-century, and now encompasses a wide range of disciplines and methodologies.

Writing in the first half of the twentieth century, Maurice Halbwachs laid much of the groundwork for the study of memory as a collective, socially-constructed phenomenon. His three works on memory, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (1925), *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte* (1941), and, published posthumously, *Étude de mémoire collective* (1950), located individual memory within a social framework that, through constant communication with the individual's acts of remembrance, actively conditions one's own perceptions of the past. In Halbwachs' scheme, individual recollection "depend[s] on intercourse, within the context of an existing social frame of reference and value. There is no memory without perception that is already conditioned by social frames of attention and interpretation."¹ The notion that memory is conditioned in a social context entails its subjectivity, and highlights its liability to be constantly readapted and reinterpreted. Recollections of the past are always rooted in the present, the locus of construction and reconstruction: "even at the moment of reproducing the past our imagination remains under the influence of the present social milieu."²

Since the publication of Halbwachs' work, the concept of collective memory has been the subject of much further refinement, expansion, and application in diverse fields of study. His initial observations on memory as a facet of social psychology laid the groundwork for others to develop a cohesive theory of culture, which over the past several decades, including the "memory boom" of the 1970's, has further expanded in the scope and depth of its extent.³

¹ Assmann (2011), 22.

² Halbwachs (1992), 49, excerpted and translated by Coser from *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*; see 46-51 on "The Reconstruction of the Past."

³ Assmann (2011), 21-33 summarizes Halbwachs' main contributions; for the development of memory studies since Halbwachs, see Coser's survey in Halbwachs (1992), 21-34, and Olick & Robbins (1998). Important recent studies on collective memory include Assmann & Czaplicka (1995), Erll & Rigney (2006), Assmann (2011), and Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, & Levy (2011). The term "cultural memory," first introduced by Assmann, has come into common use alongside Halbwachs' original "collective memory," reflecting the trajectory of the study toward cultural theory; I have generally opted for the terminology of "cultural memory" in this dissertation. For the

The study of collective identity, especially as concerns political communities, has been a particularly important locus of interaction with Halbwachs' model of memory. The intersection of collective memory and collective identity has borne fruit in work on the sociocultural dimensions of contemporary and pre-modern nationalism, among whose chief interpreters are John Armstrong and Anthony D. Smith. Both are exponents of the ethnosymbolist approach to nationalism, which locates the basis of nation-states and national identity in the myths, memories, symbols, cultural practices, and perceived kinship relations shared among members of a particular ethnic community. While some scholars of nationalism—the “modernist” school, which includes Eric Hobsbawm and Benedict Anderson—see the phenomenon of national identity as dependent on strictly modern factors, and therefore uniquely modern, ethnosymbolists see the components of national consciousness active also among ethnic communities in the Middle Ages and antiquity.⁴

Armstrong's 1982 *Nations Before Nationalism* explores the components of national consciousness among individuals, the “cement that has maintained group identity over very long periods of time.”⁵ A foundational process in defining the identity of specific groups, according to his schema, is the demarcation of ethnic boundaries: perceived similarities and distinctions among peoples underpin a sense of solidarity among group members who claim a common

relationship between collective memory and myth production, see Bell (2003). On the study of memory applied to the *Aeneid*, see below, 16-17.

⁴ For a summary of the debate on the origins of nationalism and its different factions, see the first chapter of Smith (1999), 3-27. Representative works of modernists include Anderson (1983) and Hobsbawm (1992). Smith (1986), 21-125 and (2004) assess the presence of “national” sentiments in pre-modern times. Though Smith is clear that ancient Greece and Rome did not constitute “nations” as we mean the term today (Smith 2004, 131-32), his observations on ethnicity have proven applicable to studies of Greco-Roman identity, as well as studies of Latin literature, such as Shumate (2006). Garman (2007), contributing to an edited volume on ethnosymbolism, focuses specifically on the relevance of the theory to the ancient Mediterranean. Smith's ideas have been especially influential on Jonathan Hall's writings about ethnicity in the Greek world (see below); cf. Farney (2007), 26-34, discussing both Smith and Hall in the context of ethnic identity among Roman Republican elites.

⁵ Armstrong (1982), 3.

cultural or biological character.⁶ Armstrong stresses that ethnic identity is supported, in the long term, by nonmaterial factors: “The primary characteristic of ethnic boundaries is attitudinal. In their origins and in their most fundamental effects, ethnic boundary mechanisms exist in the minds of their subjects rather than as lines on a map or norms in a rule book.”⁷ This “attitudinal” conception of group identity relies on a communicative network of shared symbols—ranging from words to images and music—to express boundaries between one’s own group and others. Networks of symbols integral to the self-conceptualization of the group crystalize into myths, whose recital “arouse[s] an intense awareness among the group members of their ‘common fate.’”⁸ The myths told and retold by a people, which enshrine in narrative form the symbols that define their ethnic identity, both create solidarity and reinforce the boundary between Self and Other.

Approaching these same questions, Antony D. Smith has written most influentially on the role of communal myths and memories in shaping collective identity and influencing political activity.⁹ According to Smith, the narratives of the cultural past perform a vital role in defining the group’s sense of self and others. They are social symbols “which endow popular perceptions of ethnic boundaries and identities with meaning and sentiments, and which mediate changes in

⁶ *Ibid.*, 4-6. Armstrong builds on the work of the anthropologist Fredrik Barth, who emphasized the role of boundaries in constructing ethnic identity; see Barth (1969). The concept of boundaries between Self and Other in the ancient world is pervasive, but perhaps best expressed in the concept of the barbarian, for which see esp. Hall (1989). I remark more on the concept of boundaries in ethnic identity in the fourth chapter of this dissertation.

⁷ Armstrong (1982), 7-8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 9. Armstrong further discusses myths in connection with imperial ideology in 129-67; see also Smith (2015) for Armstrong’s views on myth and identity.

⁹ “Myths of common ancestry” are one of six features identified by Smith as essential to ethnic identity; another is “shared history.” See Smith (1986), 22-31 for the six features.

those identities set in motion by external forces.”¹⁰ Stories about the past also anchor the values and worldview of communities:

In the shape of the ancient heroes, they give us our standards of collective morality; in the promise of new modes of solidarity and fraternity, they provide cures for our homelessness and alienation; in the return to primordial origins of kinship, they seem to minister to our need for security.”¹¹

In the sphere of political belief, argumentation, and action, the collective past can thus be an active and productive force in human societies:

The past is not some neutral terrain to be explored and dissected; it is the locus of *exempla virtutis*, of the sacred, of the ancestral homeland, of the golden age, and of communal authenticity and identity. The past embodies the peculiar values and traditions of the community, without which there could be no nation and no national destiny.¹²

Recent work by classicists and historians on ethnic and political identity in the ancient world has further elucidated the singular importance of perceived kinship among group members in generating identity and solidarity. Narratives about the past mediated how members of ancient communities understood their relation to one another. Chief among such narratives were myths of foundation, which commemorated the group’s inception by a founder who was revered as the common ancestor of his people.¹³ Such “descent myths,” or “myths of common ancestry” were

¹⁰ Smith (1999), 57.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹² Smith (1998), 115. On contemporary examples of myth and memory in the promotion of national consciousness and political directives, see Hosking & Schöpflin (1997), Stråth (2000), Leoussi & Grosby (2007), Langenbacher & Shain (2010), and Bouchard (2013); these works are representative of a growing bibliography. Paralleling the work of the ethnosymbolists, comparative mythologists and political philosophers have also identified the unique importance of narratives about a community’s shared past in public discourse, terming these narratives “political myths.” Henry Tudor (1972), Christopher Flood (1996), and Chiara Bottici (2007) have produced major accounts of the subject, each treatment bringing its own observations and philosophical apparatuses to bear in defining and explaining political myths.

¹³ On foundation myths in antiquity, see most recently Mac Sweeney (2015) and Angelova (2015); also Gruen (2011), 223-52 and Hall (2006).

pervasive among ancient societies, and, as Emma Dench describes, were the substance of defined ethnicities in antiquity:

Mythological genealogies were the broad common ‘language’ of ethnic identity in the ancient Mediterranean world. Notions of shared origins and of descent from gods and heroes delineated human groups of all kinds, including families, clans, tribes, and urban communities. Mythological genealogies were the ‘language’ in which kinship, distinction, differentiation, and ethnic plurality were regularly articulated, in which the world was mapped and selves were located throughout the Mediterranean world. This ‘language’ was intensely discursive, lending itself well to the creation of alternative versions, to change, invention, and reinvention, and to multiple means of cultural expression, from cult to painting, to sculptural reliefs, poetry and prose.¹⁴

The construction of ethnicity among ancient peoples has been the subject of several important studies.¹⁵ Jonathan Hall’s work on ethnic identity in Greece especially emphasizes the role of communal myth in the definition of distinct groups. Hall largely agrees with Smith’s account of ethnic identity, and gives pride of place to the myths that reinforce ties of kinship between members of the group: “it must be the myth of shared descent that ranks paramount among the features that distinguish ethnic from other social groups, and, more often than not, proof of descent will act as a defining criterion of ethnicity.”¹⁶ Among the ancient Greeks, “the primary constitutive elements in the construction of ethnic consciousness were not behavioral but discursive, articulated through myths of ethnic origins which spoke not only of ethnic ancestors but also of primordial territories.”¹⁷ Hall stresses that this idea of kinship was putative and, from

¹⁴ Dench (2005), 12.

¹⁵ There is now a substantial bibliography on ethnicity and identity in the ancient world; scholarship most valuable to this dissertation includes Hall (1997, 2002), Isaac (2004), Gruen (2011), and the edited volume of McInerney (2014). Ancient testimonia for ethnicity and ethnography is collected in the anthology of Kennedy, Roy, & Goldman (2013). Bickerman (1952) is a foundational study of ancient approaches to the origins of ethnic groups. Lindner (1994) explores the role of myth in ethnic identity in imperial Asia Minor, emphasizing evidence from material culture. On Roman and Italian ethnic identity, especially in the Republican era, see esp. Dench (2005), and Farney (2007), with additional bibliography in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

¹⁶ Hall (1997), 25; also (2002), 9, 15-16.

¹⁷ Hall (1997), 40.

a scientific standpoint, fictive; the community existed as a sentimental and cultural, not a biological, entity, and an individual's qualification as a member was judged by primarily nonmaterial factors.¹⁸ Above all it was the shared ancestry preserved in cultural memory that oriented the community's sense of self, acting as "the instrument by which whole social collectivities could situate themselves in space and time."¹⁹

Irad Malkin and Carol Dougherty have approached the relation between memory and identity by looking at specific kinds of ethnic narratives, those pertaining to travel, founding, and colonization. Malkin's 1998 *The Returns of Odysseus* addresses "how myths...were used to mediate encounters and conceptualize ethnicity and group identity in the Archaic and Classical periods," especially as this process involved narratives of the *nostoi* of Homeric heroes.²⁰ Dougherty examines colonization stories from an anthropological and narratological standpoint, evaluating the role that these stories played in cultural negotiation and the representation of identity. These narratives held ongoing relevance for the Greek societies who commemorated them, for whom the colonial past could guide, explain, and justify the present:

Although they describe the past, colonization tales must also respond to the needs of the present: the significance of the narrative depends less on an accurate reflection of facts than on internal coherence and continued cultural value. As a result, historical, literary, mythical, and legendary material are combined as needed to represent and legitimate action.²¹

Like the myths of common descent highlighted by Smith and Hall, these colonization tales, in Dougherty's reading, exerted significant influence in the political life of the Greek communities who preserved them in their collective past.

¹⁸ See esp. Hall (2002), 9-17.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁰ Malkin (1998), xi.

²¹ Dougherty (1993), 5.

Another branch of classical scholarship has focused on the specific use of cultural memory in diplomatic engagements in the Greco-Roman world, where myth often supplied a mediating device in encounters between peoples. The mythology shared by ancient communities allowed them to lay claim to territory through ancestral ties, form alliances based on mythical kinship or friendship, or call in favors through obligations owed from primeval times. Jones (1999) and Patterson (2010) have written the most detailed studies about “kinship diplomacy,” a concept now widely recognized in literature on ethnicity in the ancient world; the wealth of examples in Erich Gruen’s *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (2011) further illustrate the centrality of mythic genealogies to cultural negotiation and appropriation throughout the Mediterranean.²² It was through memories of founding, colonization, and descent from common ancestors that diverse cultures recognized both themselves and one another, and in this way the communal pasts of Mediterranean societies played a substantial role in the international politics of antiquity.

But it is not only the past that shapes the present; the opposite is equally true. The importance of a community’s shared history in cultural interaction and political activity endows the past with strategic value. By spinning narratives of the past in an advantageous way, emphasizing, suppressing, or outright inventing certain events or characters of communal history, whole communities could derive diplomatic benefit and enhance their prestige, while political leaders could win support for their policies or bolster their claim on power. The ability of the past to be readapted continually according to the exigencies of the present is a feature of collective memory recognized as early as Halbwachs, and, as much evidence from across the ancient world attests, such reconstruction lent itself easily to deliberate, even tendentious efforts

²² See esp. Gruen (2011), 223-307.

to satisfy pragmatic goals.²³ Terming the subjective accounts of a community's past constructed through its myths "intentional history," H.-J. Gehrke (2007) describes the capacity of individual communities to adapt creatively or fully invent aspects of their history in order to serve present political needs, using as a case study the Magnesians, who industriously wove their communal history into the narratives of other states in order to win favor among major powers in the Hellenistic world.²⁴ On a smaller scale, the same tendency motivated Roman elite families of the late Republic to begin tracing their history back to an eponymous Trojan ancestor, promoting the antiquity of their line as the Aeneas myth gained cultural capital in Roman society.²⁵

While the scholarship enumerated in this survey has dealt largely with memory and identity in the Greek world, the same patterns are also attested among the Romans. Rome's was a culture steeped in memory of the past, a past reverently maintained in sites, monuments, buildings, honorific devices, and traditions.²⁶ The widespread advertisement of ancestral *exempla* in the public and private spheres—in visual display, political rhetoric, and literature—epitomizes the Romans' deep investment in both the cultivation of memory and its practical use in

²³ On the strategic use of appeals to myth, cultural memory, and ethnic kinship in the Greco-Roman world, see Hall (1997, 2002, 2007); also Gruen (2011). Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983) has examined influentially how modern societies also employ the past in creative ways for political goals.

²⁴ On the Magnesians, see Gehrke (2007), 287-97. Hall (1997), 38 remarks on the importance of mythical genealogies and the demonstration of συγγένεια in diplomacy, and acknowledges that "appeals to kinship can always, of course, be a matter of pure invention." The most significant use of mythic genealogy among the Romans involved their Trojan ancestry, treated at length below. Curty (1995) compiles Greek epigraphic sources in which συγγένεια is invoked.

²⁵ See below, 31-32, on the "Trojan families."

²⁶ Studies of memory and identity in Rome constitute an abundant bibliography. The edited volumes of Citroni (2003), Ker & Pieper (2014), Galinsky (2014, 2016), and Galinsky & Lapatin (2015) encompass evidence from multiple media and time periods; on Republican and Augustan Rome, see Flower (1996), Walter (2004), Gowing (2005), Rea (2007), Rutledge (2012), Goldschmidt (2013), Labate & Rosati (2013), and Lamp (2013). On ethnicity among the Romans, see Dench (2005), Farney (2007), the relevant contributions to McInerney (2014), and, for ancient primary sources, Kennedy, Roy, & Goldman (2013). On the regal period in Roman memory, see esp. Fox (1996). See also Chapter 2, 60-61.

transmitting cultural identity and values.²⁷ As much as their Greek neighbors, Romans conceived of themselves and their world through narratives about the communal past, and the common store of these narratives provided the fund from which political elites often drew to win support and promote policies.

I have aimed to show with this limited review of scholarship the prominence of one feature of ethnic and political discourse among ancient societies: the fundamental importance of a community's shared past both in its conceptualization of self and others, and in its influence on political activity. Interest among classicists in the *Aeneid*'s engagement with Roman memory and identity has proliferated in recent decades, and has now been the topic of several books and articles, especially the work of Katharine Toll (1991, 1997), Clifford Ando (2002), Yasmin Syed (2005), Joseph Reed (2007), Aaron Seider (2013), and Kristopher Fletcher (2014). The contributions of Toll, Ando, and Fletcher share an emphasis on historical context in interpreting the epic, which they read in part as a discourse on Roman identity that responds to the momentous social and political changes of Vergil's era. Toll attempts to reconcile "light" and "dark" readings of the poem's ideological allegiances by shifting focus away from Vergil's presentation of Augustus to his vision of the Roman "nation" that Aeneas is building.²⁸ After the recent experience of the Social Wars, as the idea of Rome grew to encompass the Italian city states alongside the imperial center,

the common national identity of Romans and Italians together, if there was to be such a thing, would have to be created new... Vergil seized on the occasion to conceive of Roman Italians as a new entity, to frame for this new citizenry a new

²⁷ On exemplarity in the Roman world, see esp. Bell & Hansen (2008), Roller (2004, 2009), and, in Roman poetry, Seo (2013) and Goldschmidt (2013), esp. 149-54.

²⁸ Toll (1991), 3: "The *Aeneid* was not made to express any simple partisanship, but precisely to deter partisan splintering from hindering its dream of ideological unity and ethical endeavor for the whole of Roman Italy. The *Aeneid* is a poem of Italian national character, and examining it for any smaller or less difficult object can only do less than justice to its scope and yearning."

myth of nationhood, and, by means of his myth, to endow posterity with power to sponsor and guide and ameliorate yet further new conjunctions.²⁹

The ambiguities of Vergil's poem are thus, in Toll's view, deliberately calculated to accommodate multiple perspectives, and encourage shared participation in the project of building Rome's future. As a Mantuan who had not begun his life as a Roman citizen, Vergil was well poised to ask the question of what constituted Roman identity; in exploring the question, he crafted a response which "propounds no specific models," but "indicates that answers are continually to be supplied and revised, and the search is unremitting."³⁰

Ando's 2002 article "Vergil's Italy: Ethnography and Politics in First-Century Rome" also reads the *Aeneid* against the backdrop of the Social Wars. Perceiving, like Toll, that the assimilation of Italian communities into Rome's civic constitution occasioned a reevaluation of Roman identity, Ando develops two different ideas advanced by prominent Latin authors who both originated from outside Rome: Cicero and Vergil. In contrast to the Ciceronian formulation of Italian identity, advanced in *De Legibus* 2.2-5,³¹ that Roman Italians have two distinct *patriae*—the *patria naturae*, their place of origin, and the *patria civitatis*, meaning Rome—Ando explores an alternative formulation shared by Augustus and Vergil, "that Rome and Italy were an inseparable unity."³² Building on the work of both Toll and Ando, Fletcher too asserts that the *Aeneid* "responds to this...need for national self-definition through investigation of the nation's past" in light of changes in Roman and Italian identity.³³ Fletcher's study turns attention to the

²⁹ Toll (1997), 41.

³⁰ *Ibid.* (1991), 7.

³¹ Cf. Fletcher (2014), 4-7.

³² Ando (2002), 139; 134-42 addresses the *Res Gestae*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*.

³³ Fletcher (2014), 9.

Trojans' voyage from Troy to Italy, and highlights the transition of identity that accompanies their physical journey from one *patria* to another, "the process by which Aeneas falls in love with Italy before even arriving there and what this love means for both Aeneas and Vergil's audience."³⁴

The volumes of Syed (2005) and Reed (2007) also treat identity in Vergil's *Aeneid*, both engaging the literary-critical heuristic of the gaze. Syed is primarily concerned with how Vergil's text shaped Roman identity through its readership, on the levels of both "the self" and "the collective"—the latter term indicating the socially-conditioned categories of ethnicity and gender. As Vergil's readers identify with the gaze of the fictional characters within the *Aeneid*, and draw out similarities and distinctions between themselves and the characters, "the poem constructs its version of the reader's individual self...and further defines this individual self in terms of collective determinants such as gender and ethnicity."³⁵ Through the reader's interaction with the text on a subjective basis, Roman identity is delineated along boundaries of self and other, male and female.

Reed also investigates how the epic conceptualizes Roman identity, and sees the demarcation of ethnic boundaries as a key part of that process, but stresses the impasse that results from defining a national identity through contrast with other nationalities. Reed argues that Vergil's poem characterizes Roman identity as a fundamentally unstable construct, predicated on comparison with other national identities whose boundaries are constantly shifting

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

³⁵ Syed (2005), 3.

and ill-defined.³⁶ Because its formulation rests on such unstable ground, Reed suggests, Roman identity is merely “provisional and perspectival,”³⁷ lacking any real definition of its own:

Roman identity—always reducible to some other nationality, depending on where the poem draws the boundary between nations—emerges as a synthesis...of other national identities; ...there is no essence, no absolute center, no origin that exclusively authorizes Romanness.³⁸

While these scholars have provided much of the foundation on which this dissertation builds, points of departure between their work and my own lie in the identities to be elaborated, and the features of those identities to be explored. Focusing primarily on how Vergil’s epic conceptualizes what it means to be Roman, these studies read the poem in terms of its contribution to, or critique of, Roman and Italian identity. Owing to this focus, they address the transmission of the collective past largely with respect to the *Aeneid* itself, a literary monument of cultural memories integral to the formation of Roman identity. My own study, by contrast, asks how the *Aeneid*’s fictionalized communities understand and express their *own* collective identities, and how those identities influence their sentiments and actions as political bodies through the course of the text. I am most interested in the ways in which Vergil’s ethnic groups inside the world of the poem preserve and transmit their own communal memory, and put it to use in the service of present exigencies.

This dissertation has also benefitted from scholarship on other topics central to my thesis. Recent work on memory in the *Aeneid* has shown the complexity of the characters’ engagement

³⁶ Reed (2007), 1: “The present study, through close reading of the text, looks at the way the *Aeneid* offers the readerly subject a national identity—which the teleology of the poem invites us to read as Roman—through comparisons and contrasts between other nationalities (especially Trojan, Carthaginian, Italian, and Greek).” See also Reed (2012), which summarizes much of his 2007 book, and Bernstein (2008) 167-68, who makes similar remarks on the fluidity of ethnic identity in the poem.

³⁷ Reed (2007), 2.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

with the past, particularly in the case of the Trojans who must come to terms with the loss of their homeland. Among these works, Aaron Seider's *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid* (2013) has contributed most to my own reading of the poem, as I share Seider's methodological focus on the subjective construction and adaptation of memory among Vergil's characters.³⁹ Cultural memory in Republican Rome is a major focus of Nora Goldschmidt's volume on Ennius and Vergil, *Shaggy Crowns* (2013), which addresses the role of the two poets in shaping and transmitting core narratives of the Roman past. Research on genealogies and kinship in the *Aeneid* by Nakata, Hannah, and others account for the ways in which Vergil's characters construct individual and collective identity through personal lineage or myths of common descent, and also exploit or strategically "engineer" their genealogies for practical advantage.⁴⁰ Horsfall, Thomas, Syed, and Reed have richly contributed to the study of ethnography in the poem, both on Vergil's use of source material as well as his characters' application of recognizable ethnographic tropes to define Self and Other.⁴¹

Alongside secondary literature on the *Aeneid* itself, I have also had recourse to studies of Roman cultural memory in the material record of the Republican and Augustan eras, as part of this dissertation's aim to draw connections between the discourse of identity and memory within the poem and the world outside of it. Artistic and epigraphic evidence for the Aeneas myth is one primary focus of this research, as I use the dynamics of this myth, in the latter half of this

³⁹ Quint (1982, 1993), Henry (1989), Hardy (1991), Berlin (1998), Most (2001), Scarth (2008), and Meban (2009) also address aspects of memory in Vergil. The majority of these studies (Quint, Henry, Hardy, Most) deal primarily with the poem's acts of commemorating and forgetting in light of Augustan ideology and the history of the civil wars; they do not, however, address memory's political and cultural dimensions and their implications for the *Aeneid*'s fictive communities. Berlin (1998) links Aeneas' memory of Troy's fall with his attack on Latinus' capital in 12.554-60. Scarth (2008) focuses on mnemotechnics and the composition of memory in the *Aeneid*. Meban (2009) examines cultural memory in the *Eclogues*, a project with insights transferable to Vergil's later work.

⁴⁰ See, esp. Hannah (2004) on "genealogical engineering," and Nakata (2012) on "genealogical opportunism."

⁴¹ Horsfall (1990, 1991), Thomas (1982, 2004-2005), Syed (2005), Reed (2007).

chapter, as a case study of how the communal past shapes cultural and political discourse across generations. A second category of evidence pertains to Italy itself, as the fourth chapter of this dissertation deals with Vergil's depiction of Italy in *Aeneid* 7-12 and its connection to the rhetoric of *tota Italia* current in the first century BCE; this discussion builds principally on the work of Ando (2002), Dench (2005), and Bispham (2007).

As this dissertation engages, in some dimensions, with the poem's relation to Augustan ideology, it owes much to the foundational work of Otis, Parry, Putnam, and others who have set the field for discussion on both sides of the "light" and "dark," pro-Augustan and anti-Augustan sides of the debate.⁴² My own viewpoint has most in common with recent studies that see Vergil's text as "optimistic" and "pessimistic" simultaneously, as expressing not just Parry's two voices, but multiple voices operating in a tense unison.⁴³ But the argumentative thrust of this dissertation does not emphasize one ideological reading of Augustus over another. While I make the case that the *Aeneid* mirrors aspects of Augustan culture in how its fictive communities utilize their shared past, the attitudes of the poet toward the *princeps* himself are secondary considerations. My aim is rather to explore a previously unexplored locus of interaction between Vergil's literary world and the contemporary milieu that exists outside of the text, namely the discourses of cultural memory which actively influence the beliefs and activities of political communities.

⁴² On the debate between the "Harvard" and "European" schools of interpretation, see Johnson (1976), Harrison (1990), Schmidt (2001), and Conte (2007), 150-69; Toll (1991), 12 supplies a useful bibliography of major publications from critics on both sides.

⁴³ For this position, see esp. Conte (2007), 150-69: "Virgil's undertaking is configured as a system shot through with tensions, a system within which greater and lesser contradictions oppose each other and, through their development, dynamically determine the meaning of the whole" (169). Toll (1991) also aims to accommodate both the "optimistic" and "pessimistic" reading of the text, but does so by directing the interpretive focus away from the figure of Augustus and onto Vergil's construction of Roman and Italian identity. For a recent attempt to reclaim a purely "optimistic" reading of the poem, see Stahl (2015).

Although this study does not directly assess Vergil's presentation of Augustus, it also does not interpret his replication, within the poem, of real forms of ideological discourse—those on which Augustan ideology especially relied—as a neutral commentary on contemporary political rhetoric. The calculated interpretation of the community's past to suit the needs of political argumentation in the present—what Gehrke has termed “intentional history”—is at work in Vergil's Rome no less than in the ancient world as a whole, and this tendency in the promotion of cultural memory is not lacking among the characters of the *Aeneid*. At the same time as Vergil creates fictional communities that commemorate their past in ways analogous to those of real-world Mediterranean societies, he also shows that political elites can alter, suppress, and invent aspects of the past in order to achieve practical goals. Drawing attention to the instability of the communal past, the poem exhibits the ways in which leaders can invoke a people's shared identity and history in arguably contrived, even coercive ways, wielding them as ideological tools of persuasion and legitimation.

Vergil's “commentary” on the use of cultural memory and identity in political propaganda is rendered all the more complex by the fact that his very own poem, in which these tendencies toward manipulation of the past are exemplified, is itself engaged in crafting a vision of history that places the Augustan regime and its values at the center of Roman identity. In fact, hardly any cultural product of the principate so successfully popularized the Augustan interpretation of Rome's origins and identity as did the *Aeneid*, and, whatever the poet's private leanings might have been, he was arguably a chief contributor to the regime's ideologically-guided narrative of history. Through reproducing the use (and abuse) of cultural memory in political argumentation among its characters, the *Aeneid* reveals itself as a self-referential text,

dramatizing both the power of such rhetoric and the instabilities that inhere within it, even while participating in the very same type of discourse.

I conclude the review of this dissertation's place in scholarship with a summary of its main goals. What this study aims to contribute to *Aeneid* scholarship is a more comprehensive assessment of how the ethnic communities depicted by Vergil employ their shared past to address present political needs. This includes not only surveying the evidence for ethnic identity in the *Aeneid*, but also taking stock of how identity is preserved and transmitted by members of each community, what practical and sentimental functions it can serve, and how certain elements of a communal past can be deliberately emphasized, neglected, invented, or altered for pragmatic purposes. At the same time as it examines cultural memory within the poem, this study also aims to compare its expressions in the *Aeneid* with the real-life dynamics of memory and identity in the epic's contemporary context, exploring areas of correspondence that have gone largely unnoticed in previous scholarship. This study does not aim to offer a new perspective on the Roman identity of Vergil's audience, as other recent commentators on the *Aeneid*, cited above, have done, but rather to show how the transmission, expression, and political uses of identity at work in Roman public discourse are mirrored within the fictional world of the poem. The interpretive frames of cultural memory and ethnic identity provide new avenues for reading the motivations, goals, and rhetoric of Vergil's characters, and illuminate another dimension of the *Aeneid*'s engagement with political and cultural discourse in the ancient world.

Genus unde Latinum: The Aeneas Myth in Roman Politics

Before turning to the *Aeneid* itself in the next chapter, I present here an historical case study of cultural memory's tangible influence on political activity. The subject of this case study is the myth of Rome's Trojan origins, and its aim is to survey the efficacy of the myth in Roman

politics of the Republican and Augustan eras.⁴⁴ The survey has three purposes: first, to examine in closer detail the multiple roles that cultural memory can play in the real political sphere; second, to demonstrate the power of cultural memory to motivate action and belief among members of a community; and third, to show how not only the significance, but even the content of a specific memory can gradually shift over time, owing to its strategic deployment in political argument and the varied contexts of its implementation. In the chapters that follow, the framework developed here will guide an approach to the myths and memories shared among Vergil's fictionalized Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians.

From as early as the sixth century BCE, a number of traditions were in circulation among Greek, Sicilian, and, later, Roman intellectuals regarding the Trojan presence in Italy. The Sicilian poet Stesichorus may be the earliest literary source for Aeneas' arrival on Italian shores, though our only evidence that his lost *Ilioupersis* contained this tradition is a much later and contested witness, the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina.⁴⁵ In prose, Hellanicus of Rhodes is the earliest known historian to mention Aeneas in Italy, in a fragment preserved by Dionysius of

⁴⁴ Literary and material evidence for the Aeneas myth in Republican and Augustan Rome has attracted much scholarly comment over the past century. I have benefitted most from Galinsky (1969a), Horsfall (1987a), Gruen (1992), Erskine (2001), and Battistoni (2009, 2010). Gabba (1976) remains an important foundational treatment of the myth in the third and second centuries. Evans (1992), treating Roman political propaganda, devotes a chapter to the Julian appropriation of the myth. Wiseman (1974) and Rose (2008) discuss the display of Trojan ancestry among elite families under the Republic. Prag (2010) focuses on kinship diplomacy between Sicily and Rome, Russo (2014) on the myth's role in Roman intervention in Asia Minor. On the transmission of the myth in the early Republic, see Erskine (2001), 146 n. 71, who summarizes the positions of the main commentators on the issue.

⁴⁵ This marble tableau of scenes in relief from the fall of Troy was produced in Italy around 15 BCE, and cites with inscriptions the literary sources for its depictions, one of which is Stesichorus' poem (cited as Ἰλίου Πέρσις κατὰ Στησίχορον). Two of the scenes represent the flight of Aeneas with his father and son, one of which shows Aeneas, Ascanius, Anchises (who bears a chest titled τὰ ἱερὰ), and a figure identified as Misenus, boarding a ship whose destination is marked as Italy (εἰς τὴν Ἑσπερίαν). Owing to its late date and the presence of elements in the scenes that seem directly inspired by Vergil's work, just recently published by the time of the Tabula's manufacture, some commentators have cast doubt on the legitimacy of the sculpture as a reflection of Stesichorus' material. On the Tabula and its disputed validity as a reflection of Stesichorus' poem, see the discussions of Petrain (2014), 97-102, Gruen (1992) 13-14, Horsfall (1979), and Galinsky (1969a), 106-113.

Halicarnassus. If Dionysius' attribution is correct, Hellanicus has Aeneas found Rome after arriving in Latium together with Odysseus; Aeneas founds the city of Rome, naming it after a Trojan woman named Rhome.⁴⁶ The Sicilian Alcimus, writing perhaps in the late fourth century, has the union of Aeneas and a woman named Tyrhennia produce a daughter named Alba, who in turn gives birth to Rhomus, the eponymous founder of Rome.⁴⁷ The poet Lycophron also attests to the tradition that names Odysseus as Aeneas' companion, though in his account Aeneas founds Lavinium, not Rome.⁴⁸ Other variants support the Trojan identity of Rome, but exclude Aeneas from the happenings in Italy altogether: the Sicilian Callias, in the third century, attributed the city's founding to the triplets Rhomus, Romulus, and Telegonus, the offspring of a marriage between the Trojan woman Rhome and King Latinus.⁴⁹ These accounts are only a small portion of the wide array of variants acknowledged in the Greek and Sicilian traditions. Dionysius of Halicarnassus' account of Rome's founding and the beginning of Plutarch's *Life of Romulus* describe even more versions of the Trojan foundation narrative.⁵⁰

Material evidence for the Aeneas myth's presence in Italy in the early centuries of the Roman Republic centers on Etruria and Lavinium. In Etruria, several artistic depictions and epigraphic attestations of Aeneas have been found; while some of these artifacts have been

⁴⁶ Dionysius, *Ant. Rom.* 1.72.2. On this variant of the founding myth, see Gruen (1992), 17-18. On the grounds that Rome, still a small state in the fifth century, would probably not have attracted the attention of Hellanicus at such an early date, Gruen doubts the veracity of Dionysius' attribution of the story to this author, favoring a later attribution. A version of the story involving the woman Rhome who burns the ships appears in Plutarch's *Life of Romulus*, 1.2-4.

⁴⁷ Gruen (1992), 15; Erskine (2001), 151-52, with bibliography.

⁴⁸ *Alexandra* 1226-80; see McNelis & Sens (2016), 204-217 on Lycophron's Aeneas narrative and its relation to Vergil's later iteration.

⁴⁹ *Ant. Rom.* 1.72.5. Cf. Gruen (1992), 15-16 and Erskine (2001), 151-52.

⁵⁰ *Ant. Rom.* 1.72-73; Plutarch, *Romulus* 1-2. See also the surveys of Gruen (1992), 31-44 and (2011), 243-49 on the Aeneas myth in Greek and Roman historiography.

dated, not without dispute, to as early as the seventh century BCE, most come from the late sixth and fifth centuries.⁵¹ Etruscan black- and red-figure vases depicting the flight of Aeneas from Troy with Anchises are the most prevalent of these finds. Votive terracotta statuettes of this scene have also been found at Veii, dated to the fifth or fourth centuries.⁵² But while these artifacts show the prevalence of the Aeneas story in Etruria, they give us no real indication of how the myth was viewed among Romans in this period. Lavinium was a Latin city connected with Aeneas in the tradition as early as Lycophron's *Alexandra* and the Sicilian historian Timaeus, who reports that a Trojan earthenware vessel (κέραμος Τρωϊκόν) was kept by the locals among the city's sacred objects.⁵³ But excavations there have yielded little firm evidence as to the city's early association with the Aeneas myth.⁵⁴

From the third century forward the record becomes clearer, for in this century, with the growth of Rome's influence on the international stage, the Trojan foundation myth gained prominence in political and diplomatic affairs. It is worth noting, however, that the impetus for invoking the Aeneas myth comes largely from Greek and Sicilian communities, and not yet the Romans themselves. According to the literary record, the first of these communities was the court of Pyrrhus of Epirus, who in the late 280's was readying his offensive against Rome. In Pausanias' account of the Tarentine embassy to Epirus seeking war, Pyrrhus, whose line traced its descent back to the Aeacidae, imagines his military campaign as an encore of the Trojan War:

⁵¹ See Galinsky (1969a), 122-28; Horsfall (1987a), 18-19, who disputes the seventh century date of an Etruscan oenochoe depicting Aeneas; Gruen (1992), 21-22.

⁵² Galinsky (1969a), 133-34; Gruen (1992), 22.

⁵³ Timaeus' report is preserved by Dionysius, *Ant. Rom.* 1.67.4; see the discussions in Galinsky (1969a), 155-57 and Erskine (2001), 144. Dionysius seems to identify the κέραμος with the Penates that Aeneas brought from Troy, although, as Erskine notes, it is not clear that Timaeus had also made that identification.

⁵⁴ On the excavations in Lavinium and their findings, see Galinsky (1969a), 141-61; Horsfall (1987a), 15-17; Gruen (1992), 24-25.

When the envoys urged these considerations, Pyrrhus remembered the capture of Troy, which he took to be an omen of his success in the war, as he was a descendant of Achilles making war upon a colony of Trojans.⁵⁵

Better attested than any such propaganda from Pyrrhus is the role of the Trojan past in relations between Rome and the Sicilian town of Segesta. Both communities traced their foundation back to the Trojan refugees, and thus considered one another as kin through common ancestry.⁵⁶ Events precipitating the First Punic War occasion the earliest recorded expression of their mythic kinship, as it was allegedly on this basis that the people of Segesta, the Elymians, threw their allegiance to Rome after violently revolting against Carthaginian control:

...Segesta [the Romans] took without resistance; for its inhabitants because of their relationship with the Romans—they declare they are descended from Aeneas—slew the Carthaginians and joined the Roman alliance.⁵⁷

The perceived kinship relation between Romans and Elymians is widely acknowledged outside of this account. Already in the fifth century, Thucydides (6.2.3) records the Elymians' legendary Trojan origins, and the eponymous founders Elymos and Aigestes (Latinized as Acestes, as in the *Aeneid*) appear alongside Aeneas in various accounts of the founding of Segesta and Eryx, the two main settlements of the Elymian people.⁵⁸ Perhaps as early as the third century, coins

⁵⁵ Pausanias 1.12.2, trans. Jones (1918). Erskine (2001), 157-61 resists the idea that Pausanias' account reflects actual Pyrrhic propaganda, on the grounds that this passage represents the sole source for the idea that Pyrrhus ever invoked Troy in the war against Rome, and, in Erskine's view, the story is probably an embellishment, "the product of later literary imagination" (157). Battistoni (2010), 82-83 defends the validity of Pausanias' account.

⁵⁶ See Prag (2010) for an historical overview of the kinship claims between Sicily and Rome.

⁵⁷ Zonaras 8.9, trans. Cary (1914). The Byzantine chronicler Zonaras is our only source for the Elymian appeal to kinship in this event, and, although he is considered to be a reliable witness of lost material from Cassius Dio, his twelfth-century date and the lack of corroborating evidence for this motivation for the Elymians' actions have raised dispute over his testimony; cf. Erskine (2001), 181-82.

⁵⁸ Galinsky (1969a), 77 n. 39 enumerates further literary attestations of the Elymians' Trojan descent. On Aigestes and Elymos, see Erskine (2001), 182-83 and Battistoni (2010), 118-19.

were struck in Segesta advertising the image of Aeneas carrying Anchises on the reverse.⁵⁹ The importation of the cult of Venus Erycina into Rome in 217, discussed below, was likely based on the notion of kinship between the two peoples. Centuries later, in the trial of Gaius Verres in 70 BCE, the Trojan origin of the Elymians permitted Cicero to represent the governor's plundering of Segesta as an offense against not just innocent provincials, but kin of the Roman people.⁶⁰

Another account from the third century is illustrative of the range of forms that appeals to mythic kinship could take. In 237, the Greeks of Acarnania also invoked the Romans' Trojan past to strengthen a diplomatic bid. The Acarnanians apparently could not argue convincingly for Trojan kinship with the Romans, as the Elymians of Sicily might have done. Instead, they claimed that their ancestors had demonstrated goodwill toward the Trojans: they had been the only Greeks to not participate in the Trojan War.⁶¹

In the late third century, Rome imported two foreign cults that evoked Trojan ancestry: Venus Erycina from Sicily and the Magna Mater from Pergamum. Both events have been cited by scholars as reflective of Rome's growing interest in its Trojan past, as a turning-point at which Romans began to avow publicly their Trojan heritage on their own initiative.⁶² Venus' shrine in Eryx was kept by the Elymians, and the Magna Mater was especially associated with

⁵⁹ The third century date has support, but is disputed. Cf. Erskine (2001), 182, with bibliography on the debate; he favors a later date.

⁶⁰ Cicero, *In Verrem* 2.4.72, 2.5.83, 2.5.125; discussion in Erskine (2001), 178-80 and Battistoni (2010), 121-23.

⁶¹ The embassy is preserved in Strabo (10.2.25) and Justin (28.1-2). Strabo claims that the bid was for "autonomy;" Justin, that it was for protection from the Aetiolians. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.51.2) records that a group of Acarnanians led by Patron aided Aeneas on his journey; see also 40-41 below on the tradition of Acarnanian aid to Aeneas.

⁶² On the importation of Venus Erycina and the Magna Mater, see Galinsky (1969a), 174-77; Gruen (1992), 46-47; Erskine (2001), 198-224; Battistoni (2010), 87-88, 124-27. Battistoni (2009), 76 regards the decision to install Venus Erycina in Rome as the *terminus ante quem* for the Romans actively laying claim to a Trojan identity. On the introduction of these cults in historical context and as expressions of developing Roman identity, see Orlin (2010), 58-85. Russo (2014), 594-98 analyzes the transfer of the Magna Mater in the context of Roman intervention in Asia Minor.

the environs of Ilium on the Troad. The traditions of Trojan kinship between the Romans and Elymians most likely motivated the importation of Venus Erycina, whose temple was dedicated in 215 BCE; she received another temple near the Porta Collatina in 181. The installation of the Magna Mater in 204 also resonated with Rome's Trojan identity, but seems to have depended on other motivating factors. In negotiations between Rome and Attalus I of Pergamum to bring the goddess to the West, the Romans' mythic ancestry facilitated diplomatic exchange; but once the goddess was brought to Rome there is little to suggest that her cult was celebrated in the city as a symbol of Trojan identity at that time.⁶³

Outside the contexts of diplomacy and cult, Livy records a curious instance from the late third century that may also reflect the ascendancy of Trojan identity in Rome. In the year 212, hexameter verses composed by a certain *vates* named Marcius were discovered, one of which was revealed to have predicted the battle of Cannae before its occurrence, and opened with the admonition *amnem, Troiugeneae, fuge Cannam*.⁶⁴ With no corroborating evidence of this account, it is difficult to make much of Livy's report; the popularity of the Aeneas myth in his own lifetime could arguably have influenced his recording of the Marcian prophecies. If his report is to be trusted, however, the reference to *Troiugeneae* would accord with the demonstrably greater interest in Rome's Trojan identity both at home and abroad in the later third century.

As the second century sees ever greater interaction between Rome and the Greek East, our evidence for the political use of the Aeneas myth, especially in diplomatic exchanges, increases correspondingly. By this time, Romans are more proactive in advertising these mythic origins, a trend attested by two dedications made by Titus Flamininus at Delphi and Olympia

⁶³ Cf. Erskine (2001), 218, 223.

⁶⁴ Livy 25.12; see Galinsky (1969a), 177-78 and Erskine (2001), 39.

following the battle of Cynoscephalae in 197. The dedicatory inscriptions publicly assert the Roman people's descent from Aeneas and the Trojans.⁶⁵

A well-documented event from the beginning of the century provides an exemplary case of kinship diplomacy dependent on the Aeneas myth. In 197/6, a delegation from Lampsacus journeyed to Massalia and Rome to seek Roman friendship and protection, probably against the expansion of Antiochus III. The details of the embassy are recorded in an inscription of the 190's dedicated to the delegation's leader, Hegesias.⁶⁶ According to this document, the demonstration of ancient kinship with the Romans, whose Trojan ancestors would have neighbored Lampsacus in the Troad, was key to the embassy's diplomatic strategy. The ambassadors visited first with Lucius Flamininus, who was commanding the Roman fleet in Greece, before journeying to Massalia, where they sought an introduction to the Roman senate. Here, too, their argument was predicated on kinship, as Massalia and Lampsacus both had originated as Phocian colonies. As per the delegation's request, the Massalians formally introduced the Lampsacans to the senate in Rome and vouched for their cause. The ambassadors pled their case before the senate and secured the provisions hoped for; following this, they returned east and met with Titus Flamininus in Corinth to take care of all additional matters. On the basis of ancient kinship between the peoples of Lampsacus, Rome, and Massalia, the ambassadors could argue that the proper obligations of kin toward kin necessitated these communities' mutual support for one another. The drafters of the commemorative inscription for Hegesias made sure to record not only that the embassy had succeeded, but that the Romans had looked favorably on their claims of kinship.

⁶⁵ The inscriptions are cited by Plutarch, *Flamininus* 12.6-7; see also Erskine (2001), 41-42.

⁶⁶ *I.Lamp* 4; *SIG* 591. The inscription is reproduced in Curty (1995), 78-82, with French translation and discussion; see also Erskine (2001), 169-72, and Battistoni (2009), 83-86, both of whom provide additional bibliography.

An embassy of Delians to Rome in the 180's BCE bears mentioning as another variant of this form of diplomacy.⁶⁷ Where the Lampsacans had invoked συγγένεια with the Romans, a relationship of blood-ties through ancient kinship, the Delians invoked οἰκειότης between themselves and the Romans, implying an historical bond of hospitality and goodwill between the communities.⁶⁸ The inscription commemorating the Delian embassy is dated to the first half of the second century, with a *terminus ante quem* of 167 BCE. The inscription is fragmentary, and provides little detail about the aim and content of the mission, but does mention, crucially, that the delegation appealed to φιλία καὶ οἰκειότης that existed between the peoples of Rome and Delos.⁶⁹

Better known and of greater historical significance was the importance attached by Rome to the city of Ilium itself, which traced its history back to the original Homeric settlement. Especially during and after the Augustan age, the city enjoyed exceptional status among provincial cities, including tax exemption and frequent imperial benefaction.⁷⁰ It is difficult to tell when Rome's special regard for Ilium first developed, but evidence exists from as early as the late third and early second century, the time of Rome's increasing interaction with other cities of the Troad, including Lampsacus. Suetonius' life of Claudius records that the emperor, who promised the Ilrians tax immunity on the grounds that they were the "founders of the Roman

⁶⁷ The embassy is recorded in a damaged inscription, *IG* 11.4.76; see discussion in Erskine (1997) and (2001), 185-89, and Battistoni (2009), 90-92.

⁶⁸ On the terminology of kinship diplomacy, see the comprehensive treatment of Curty (1995), 215-41; Jones (1999), 6-16 provides an accessible summary. See also Battistoni (2009), 89-92 and Patterson (2010), 13-16.

⁶⁹ Another claim of mythic kinship, perhaps originating from the latter half of the second century, existed between the Romans and Samothracians, predicated on the identification of the Penates with the Samothracian Great Gods. Servius, commenting on *Aen.* 3.12, attests to this belief: *Dii Penates a Samothracia sublatis ab Aenea in Italiam advecti sunt, unde Samothracae cognati Romanorum esse dicuntur*. See Battistoni (2009), 92 (in English) and, more comprehensively, (2010), 128-37.

⁷⁰ For the relationship between Rome and Ilium from Republican through imperial times, see esp. Jones (1999), 94-105 and Erskine (2001), 252-80.

race,” once produced an old letter in Greek written by the senate to “King Seleucus” that guaranteed friendship between their states should the king leave the Romans’ kin, the Ilions, free from taxation.⁷¹ If this letter were genuine, and the identity of the “King Seleucus” in question was Seleucus II Callinicus, who ruled from 246-225 BCE (thus Battistoni) or even Antiochus III, from 222-187 BCE (thus Erskine), this gesture of συγγένεια between Rome and Ilium would be the earliest document of a relationship between the cities.⁷²

The visits of two Roman generals to Ilium, first Gaius Livius Salinator, then the consul Lucius Cornelius Scipio, are firmly dated to 190 BCE.⁷³ Both offered sacrifice to Athena Ilias during their visits before bringing their forces further eastward. Both Livy and Justin liken the ecstatic joy of the Romans and Ilions upon their meeting to the reunion of long-separated relatives.⁷⁴ The extent to which genuine Roman reverence for their mythic homeland motivated these events is subject to debate; there was sure strategic advantage in the display of kinship with the people of the Troad, especially in the context of military intervention in Asia Minor.⁷⁵ Whatever the reasons for its establishment, the Romans seem to have had, by this time, a standing relationship with the Ilions, for in 188 BCE, when the Lycians were fearing Roman

⁷¹ Suetonius, *Divus Claudius* 25.3.

⁷² See Erskine (2001), 172-75 and Battistoni (2009), 81-83, (2010), 86-87 on the reliability of the alleged letter and the identity of the king.

⁷³ The visits are reported by Livy (37.9.7, 37.37.1-3) and Justin (31.8.1-4).

⁷⁴ Justin’s account is illustrative: “Preparations for a contest were in consequence made on both sides; and when the Romans, having entered Asia, had reached Troy, mutual gratulations took place between the Trojans and the Romans; the Trojans observing that ‘Aeneias, and the other leaders that accompanied him, had gone forth from them;’ the Romans telling them that ‘they were their children;’ and such joy was among them all as is wont to be between parents and children met after a long separation. The Trojans were delighted that their descendants, after having conquered the west and Africa, were now laying claim to Asia as their hereditary domain, remarking that ‘the ruin of Troy had been an event to be desired, since it was so happily to revive again’” (trans. Watson 1853). Cf. Erskine (2001), 234-36, who suggests that Livy and Justin perhaps retrojected Augustan and imperial interest in the Aeneas myth onto this early event.

⁷⁵ See esp. Erskine (2001), 225-34, with further sources; also Horsfall (1987a), 21-22 and Gruen (1992), 48-51.

retribution for their support of Antiochus, they appealed to their neighbors the Ilians to intercede with Rome on their behalf. The effort at reconciliation met with success, at least in the short term.⁷⁶

Relations with Ilium again become prominent a century later, in 85 BCE, in a surprising turn of events. In the waning years of the First Mithridatic War the city was subject to aggression by the Roman army of Gaius Flavius Fimbria in Asia, perhaps because it had sympathized with Mithridates. The Ilians sent word to Sulla, who was operating in Greece, asking for his protection from Fimbria; Sulla replied that the city would be under his care, and that the Ilians should report this new arrangement to Fimbria. Fimbria, however, gained entry to the city and razed it, against Sulla's will. Later sources universally condemn the act as akin to parricide, but no contemporary accounts of the event survive, rendering it difficult to gauge how the sack of Ilium was received by most Romans at the time.⁷⁷

Sulla's opposition to Fimbria's advance against Ilium can be contextualized with evidence that may indicate his own promotion of the Trojan myth. During his campaigns in the East, his cultivation of Aphrodite, mother of Aeneas, as his patron deity—most visibly indicated by his epithet *Epaphroditos*, which he popularized in his dealings with Greeks, and which the senate formally awarded him in 87—may indicate that the memory of Troy played some role in his own self-representation.⁷⁸ The fact that Sulla staged the *Lusus Troiae* in Rome (the first

⁷⁶ For concise treatments of this affair, see Erskine (2001), 176-78, and Battistoni (2009), 87-89. Battistoni (2010), 166-86 assesses not only this event but Lycia's ties with Troy and Rome in greater detail.

⁷⁷ The sack of Ilium in 85 is recorded by several later writers, including Livy, Appian, Cassius Dio, and Augustine; for sources and analysis see Erskine (2001), 237-45, who questions the actual extent of the damage inflicted by Fimbria.

⁷⁸ See Balsdon (1951) on Sulla's association with Venus/Aphrodite.

recorded Roman to do so) would support this notion.⁷⁹ If the historian Appian were relying on Republican sources, perhaps even Sulla's own extensive *commentarii*, when he recounted the oracle that Sulla receives from Delphi upon his visit to the shrine, the following passage from his *Civil Wars* would offer even more compelling evidence:

πεῖθρό μοι, Ῥωμαῖε. κράτος μέγα Κύπρις ἔδωκεν
Αἰνείου γενεῇ μεμελημένη.

Hearken to me, O Roman. Great power on the race of Aeneas,
Cherishing them with her care, has Cypris conferred.⁸⁰

Sulla's self-promotion as the favorite of Venus, which may also have evoked Rome's origins from Aeneas and Troy, reflects a new trend in the Roman circulation of the Trojan foundation myth. Where the use of the myth appears in earlier centuries, it is only in the public contexts of statecraft, diplomacy, and cult; even when the myth was invoked by individuals, as Titus Flamininus did in making his dedications at Delphi, the individual spoke on behalf of the Roman people who corporately shared the heritage of Troy. In the first century, however, the myth gains wider currency in the personal propaganda of aristocratic families. By this time the story of the Trojan founding had already attained an important place in Roman cultural memory, at least among the political and intellectual elite. Citations of the Aeneas myth in the poetry of Naevius, Ennius, Accius, and Lucretius, and the prose of Fabius Pictor, the elder Cato, Varro, and Sallust, among several others, attest to its integration into high literary culture.⁸¹ In tandem with the proliferating interest in the Trojan past, certain families sought to trace their genealogies

⁷⁹ Plutarch, *Cato Minor* 3.1; cf. Horsfall (1987a), 23 and Erskine (2001), 244 n. 88.

⁸⁰ Appian, *Bella Civilia* 1.11.97, trans. Carter (1996); cf. Balsdon (1951), 8-9 for discussion.

⁸¹ Cf. Gruen (1992), 31-37, (2011), 243-49; Erskine (2001), 30-36.

back to the original settlers who had accompanied Aeneas in laying the foundations of the Roman state.⁸²

The *gens Iulia*, which claimed descent from Aeneas himself, is only the most famous of these families. Varro's lost work *De familiis Troianis*, apparently a compilation of these mythic genealogies, was at least two books in length, suggesting that several elite families were claiming Trojan descent in the first century BCE. Dionysius claims that there were fifty such families.⁸³ Among those "Trojan families" known to us from the second century onward, we can name the Aemilii, Atilii, Caecilii, Cloelii, Cluentii, Corneli, Geganii, Iunii, Memmii, Metilii, Nautii, and Sergii.⁸⁴ To what degree these traditions are truly ancient, or more recent contrivances as the Aeneas myth increased in cultural capital is difficult to tell. Some families, like the Caecilii and Memmii, evidently altered their mythic lineage from Greek to Trojan ancestry by the first century BCE.⁸⁵ Nakata's phrase "genealogical opportunism" aptly characterizes the motivations of elites to weave their history into a Trojan mythology, especially as the memory of Troy became ever more significant under Caesar and Augustus.⁸⁶ Some eponymous ancestors from these families were later incorporated into Vergil's epic, such as Mnestheus (Trojan ancestor of the Memmii), Sergestus (of the Sergii), and Cloanthus (of the Cluentii), who take part in the boat race in Sicily in *Aeneid* 5.⁸⁷

⁸² On the promotion of mythical genealogies by Roman families, see Wiseman (1974), Toohey (1984), Erskine (2001), 17-22, Bretin-Chabrol (2009), Nakata (2012).

⁸³ *Ant. Rom.* 1.85.3. Varro's lost work is cited by Servius (*ad* 5.704). Augustus' freedman Hyginus wrote a book about the Trojan families, also mentioned by Servius (*ad* 5.389), that may have been a revision of Varro's study. On these two works, see esp. Toohey (1984), 6-9.

⁸⁴ Wiseman (1974), 153-57; Erskine (2001), 21-22, esp. n. 35.

⁸⁵ Wiseman (1974), 157.

⁸⁶ Nakata (2012), Bretin-Chabrol (2009); also Toohey (1984), 7-9 and Erskine (2001), 21-22.

⁸⁷ *Aen.* 5.114-23; see O'Hara (2017), 160, and Fletcher (2014), 172-76.

In this context we turn to the Iulii themselves, whose alleged descent from Venus and Aeneas was to have profound consequences for Roman identity as a whole. Evidence for the Julian claim is already present in coinage from 129 and 103 produced by members of the family; in 77 BCE, a Caesar is also named among benefactors of Ilium on an inscription from the city.⁸⁸ A certain Lucius Julius Caesar, perhaps to be identified with the consul of the year 64, wrote an early history of Rome that included the Aeneas myth, and may have been the first writer to identify Iulus, the family's eponymous ancestor, with Aeneas' son Ascanius, an equation that Vergil was to adopt for his own purposes.⁸⁹

The most energetic proponent of the family's divine lineage and its antiquarian prestige was Gaius Julius Caesar. His descent from Venus predominated his self-representation, from coinage issued before and during his dictatorship bearing her image, to the construction of the temple of Venus Genetrix in Caesar's new forum. The eulogy he delivered for his aunt Julia in 68 BCE, in which he publicly praised her ancestry through the Alban kings and Venus, demonstrates an early interest in advertising his family's special pedigree. Nearly two decades later, when Marcus Caelius Rufus writes to Cicero in 49, it suffices for him to refer to Caesar as *Venere prognatus*, with no further identifier.⁹⁰ During the battle of Pharsalus, the watchword among Caesar's camp was "Venus Victrix," and, at Munda, simply "Venus."⁹¹ Alongside the goddess' patronage, he also actively promoted the memory of Troy and Aeneas. A coin issue

⁸⁸ Coins: Crawford (1974), nos. 258, 320; Erskine (2001), 21. See also Duncan (1948), who surveys the use of the Aeneas myth on coinage under Caesar, Augustus, and later emperors. Inscription: *I.Ilion* 10.

⁸⁹ On L. Julius Caesar's now-lost work, see Horsfall (1987a), 23, with bibliography, and Erskine (2001), 22-23. On the identification of Iulus and Ascanius, see also Weinstock (1971), 9-11.

⁹⁰ *Ad Familiares* 8.15; cf. Weinstock (1971), 83 and Erskine (2001), 19.

⁹¹ Appian, *Bella Civilia*, 2.76.319, 2.104.430; Cassius Dio 43.43 records the watchwords and other details of Caesar's personal cultivation of prestigious ancestry. Cf. Weinstock (1971), 83-84.

from 47/46 depicting Venus on the obverse bears, on the reverse, the image of Aeneas carrying Anchises and the Palladium.⁹² Strabo records Caesar's renewal of patronage for the city of Ilium, and he may have visited the city in the aftermath of Pharsalus.⁹³ The dedication of the temple of Venus Genetrix in 46 was celebrated with a staging of the *Lusus Troiae*.⁹⁴

When, after the death of his great-uncle and adoptive father, Octavian entered Roman politics, he had only to appropriate for his own uses the symbolism of Venus and Troy that Caesar had already popularized. In 42, coins were produced for the new triumvir whose obverse bore the images of Aeneas and Venus.⁹⁵ With the exile of Lepidus, the defeat of Antony, and Octavian's ascent to sole power as Augustus, his Trojan lineage would maintain a key position in his self-representation throughout his reign. Through his ancestor Aeneas and the myth of the Trojan founding, Augustus was able to juxtapose his restoration of the Roman state with its first establishment, to identify his values with the moral authority of the revered founder, and to promote an ideal of civic and religious identity rooted in the cultural memory of the Roman people. Prior to the ascendancy of Caesar and Augustus, the myth of the Trojan founding had been limited in its popular appeal within Roman society, remaining largely the province of elites and intellectuals conversant with Greek culture; the Italian myth of Romulus' founding continued to hold pride of place in the Roman origin story.⁹⁶ Only with its more expansive

⁹² Crawford (1974), no. 458; no. 468, from 46-45 BCE, also depicts Venus.

⁹³ The grant of patronage is recorded in Strabo 13.1.27. An inscription from Ilium (*IGR* 4.199) is thought to attest to the same act; cf. Horsfall (1987a), 24. Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 9.950-99 is the only source for Caesar's visit to the city; though it is plausible enough that this did take place, it could also be, as Erskine (2001), 248-50 suggests, a poetic fiction.

⁹⁴ Cassius Dio 43.23; Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 39.2.

⁹⁵ Crawford (1974), no. 494.3a, 6a; cf. Evans (1992), 41-42 and Erskine (2001), 18-19, with additional citations.

⁹⁶ See Erskine (2001), 30-36.

propagation in the official media and literary output of the late Republic and early Empire did the Aeneas myth achieve wide recognition as the first chapter of Roman history.

As Augustus' extensive use of Aeneas and Troy in his personal propaganda has been documented by numerous studies, it will suffice here to cover briefly the most important media for the promotion of the Trojan myth under the principate, to illustrate how the myth, now united with the emperor's cult of personality, was integrated into Roman culture at large and diffused through multiple strata of public and private society. Among these media, the written word has arguably proven the most enduring and influential. The poets and prose writers who lived and worked in the Augustan Age, especially those in the literary circle of Maecenas and the *princeps* himself, were chief propagators of the Aeneas myth and its significance for the new era. Vergil's *Aeneid* is only the most outstanding example of the literary contribution to this effort, but the verses of Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid also engage with the contemporary preoccupation with Aeneas and Troy.⁹⁷ In prose, historians both Latin and Greek—Livy, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius, Strabo—incorporated the Trojan founding into accounts of early Rome. Much of our testimonia for earlier literary treatments of the Aeneas myth have come down to us as citations by Augustan authors who reference the findings of their predecessors.⁹⁸

The importance of Aeneas in the new regime is equally attested in the visual arts. His image appears in relief on the upper front-right panel of the Ara Pacis Augustae, dedicated to Augustus by the senate in 9 BCE and publicly displayed in the Campus Martius. The panel

⁹⁷ See also Bell (1999), who assesses the effectiveness of the *Aeneid* in promoting Augustan ideology among the lower classes as well as the literate elite.

⁹⁸ See Erskine (2001), 23-30, who notes the evidence bias toward passages discussing Troy and Aeneas in our early sources resulting from Augustan and imperial enthusiasm for the myth.

depicts the founder bearded and with head covered, in the act of sacrifice.⁹⁹ Also in a religious context, Aeneas appears in one of the sculptures on the Belvedere Altar, set up to commemorate Augustus' reorganization of the cult of the Lares Compitales in 7 BCE, which shows Aeneas recognizing the prodigy of the sow that marks the future location of Lavinium.¹⁰⁰ A statue group of Aeneas with Anchises and Ascanius stood prominently in the northwestern exedra of the new Forum of Augustus, flanked on its left side by the likenesses of their Julian descendants.¹⁰¹ The symbolism of Aeneas circulated outside the imperial center, as well: the remains of fora modeled after the Forum of Augustus from Arezzo, Lavinium, Pompeii, and as far as Augusta Emerita in Spain represent the Trojan founder among the sculpted figures, and in the East, too, his image was frequently reproduced.¹⁰² Interest in the Trojan past outside of official monuments is further indicated by the proliferation of Tabulae Iliacae, artistic renderings of scenes from the Trojan War with literary citations, through the first century CE, of which the most famous is the Tabula Iliaca Capitolina (ca. 15 BCE) mentioned above, depicting Aeneas with Anchises and the sacred objects of Troy as he sets out for Hesperia.¹⁰³

Public performances and rituals, too, showcased the Trojan heritage of Rome and the lineage of the imperial house. Augustus put on the *Lusus Troiae* three times during his reign, on

⁹⁹ On the Ara Pacis and its place in Augustan imagery and ideology, see Zanker (1990), *passim*, Galinsky (1996), 141-55, and Lamp (2013), 38-57.

¹⁰⁰ For this altar, see the treatments of Evans (1992), 47-49, Galinsky (1996), 319-21, and Lamp (2013), 111-23.

¹⁰¹ On the Forum of Augustus, see Zanker (1990), *passim*; Luce (1990); Evans (1992), 109-18; Flower (1996), 224-36; Galinsky (1996), 197-213; Lamp (2013), 61-67; Pandey (2014), 92-106.

¹⁰² On the remains from outside Rome, see Evans (1992), 111 and Erskine (2001), 255. For the image of Aeneas in Asia Minor during the imperial period, see Lindner (1994).

¹⁰³ See above, n. 45, and esp. Petrain (2014) and Squire (2015) on Tabulae Iliacae.

which occasions the young men of his household rode among the participants.¹⁰⁴ The Secular Games of 17 BCE featured a hymn by Horace publicly performed on the Palatine and Capitoline hills by a chorus of twenty-seven girls and twenty-seven boys from patrician families. The verses of the *Carmen Saeculare* include, among the invocations of the major deities of the festival, a brief narration of the Trojan founding (37-48), and an allusion to the Trojan descendant who performs sacrifice on the city's behalf:¹⁰⁵

Quaeque vos bobus veneratur albis
Clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis,
Impetret... (CS 49-51)

What the glorious descendant of Anchises and Venus asks of you with white oxen,
may he obtain.¹⁰⁶

State funerals provided one more public venue for the display of ancestry: on the occasion of his death in 14 CE, Augustus' funeral train carried the *imagines* of his forebears, among whom was almost certainly Aeneas.¹⁰⁷

The Memory of Aeneas in Public Discourse: Three Aspects

The preceding historical survey has traced the influence of the Aeneas myth through centuries of Roman public life, and highlighted some of its main social and political roles.

Cultural memory, of which foundation myths are one prominent example, shapes a community's

¹⁰⁴ The games were staged in 29, at the dedication of the Temple of Divus Iulius; in 13, dedicating the Theater of Marcellus; and in 2 BCE, dedicating the Temple of Mars Ultor. On the *Lusus Troiae*, see the historical summary in Fratantuono & Smith (2015), 532-33; also Weinstock (1971), 88-90 and Erskine (2001), 19-20. For its Vergilian rendering in relation to Augustan athletic spectacles, see Theodorakopoulos (2004), Feldherr (1995), Heinze (1993), 128-29, and Briggs (1975). The *Lusus Troiae* of *Aeneid* 5 is further discussed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, 179-80, with additional bibliography.

¹⁰⁵ Thomas (2011) contains, in addition to commentary on Horace's poem, appendices reproducing the main ancient sources on the games of 17 BCE.

¹⁰⁶ Trans. Rudd (2004).

¹⁰⁷ Evans (1992), 43; Dio 56.34.2 is our source for the procession of masks. Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.9) reports that Aeneas' mask was present at Drusus' funeral in 23. See Flower (1996), 238-46 on the use of *imagines* in funerals for the imperial family, including Augustus' own.

historical identity and values, and asserts the unity of its members through common descent from ancient ancestors. Communities can employ cultural memory to root the assertion of present affinities and antagonisms with foreign peoples in the mythic past, to sanction moral, religious, or political directives through their perceived conformity with the *mores maiorum*, and to legitimize authority through the display of continuity—in blood or in spirit—between historical regimes, articulating a line of succession from the present time even to the very dawn of the state. The myth of Rome’s Trojan origins readily correlates with these roles of cultural memory. Before closing this chapter, I now explore in greater detail these three expressions of the myth’s demonstrable influence on Roman culture and politics: its functions in guiding diplomatic negotiation, promoting cultural identity, and legitimizing political power.

From the third century forward, Rome’s expanding political and military interests brought it into closer communication with the Greek states. In this period of heightened cross-cultural exchange among diverse communities, the myth of the Trojan War provided the common ground by which Romans and Greeks could situate each other in their own historical experience:

It was here that Aeneas and the Trojans were of value, because they rooted Rome in the mythical past, the age of the heroes of Homer. In this way Rome was linked to the world beyond Rome, in particular to the Greek world. ...it provided the Romans and the Greeks with a common past they could look back to and exploit in order to understand and validate their relationship in the present. It was a myth that worked in both directions, serving both the Romans looking at the Greek world beyond and Greeks looking in from the outside.¹⁰⁸

For the Greek communities, the Trojan War was a cornerstone of their cultural memory. It was a Panhellenic event that helped define not only the larger conceptualization of Greek identity, but also the identities of the numerous local communities that held their own traditions about the war

¹⁰⁸ Erskine (2001), 37-38.

and their ancestors' role in it.¹⁰⁹ The avowal of Trojan identity permitted the Romans to engage with Greeks as inheritors of the same store of traditions. The tale of Aeneas' settlement in the West opened a way for the two worlds to encounter each other on a shared cultural plane.

The solidarity affirmed by common mythic traditions could facilitate a variety of practical initiatives. Negotiations with Attalus I of Pergamum over the importation of the Magna Mater to Rome and the Lampsacan delegation of 197/6 both resulted in diplomatic settlements, the one permitting the transfer of a cult, the other guaranteeing consideration in a treaty. Trojan kinship between the Romans and Elymians, if Zonaras' account is to be believed, inspired the people of Segesta to revolt from Carthage and embrace Rome in the lead-up to the First Punic War, and justified them in seeking Roman protection; more than a century later, it likely motivated the transfer of Venus Erycina, and, even in 70 BCE, permitted Cicero to invoke the obligations of kinship in prosecuting Gaius Verres. Roman military activity in Asia coincides with our first evidence of special favor toward Ilium, and the words that the historian Justin puts in the mouths of the Ilians in 190 BCE, rejoicing upon Scipio's visit, may well correspond to a calculated argument for foreign intervention: the Romans have returned to rescue their ancestral land.¹¹⁰

In composing the first half of his epic, Vergil made studied use of Aeneas' voyage to derive mythical aetiologies for Roman foreign policy initiatives, especially those encounters involving perceived Trojan kin. His linking of the Punic Wars to Aeneas' courtship of Dido, made explicit in the queen's prophetic curse swearing Carthaginian vengeance on his descendants (4.622-29), is only the clearest example. Other events in Rome's diplomatic and

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Malkin (1998).

¹¹⁰ See above, 29.

colonial history are provided with similar origin stories. The landing of Aeneas and his crew at Actium (3.278-90) foreshadows Octavian's decisive victory there, and the city of Nicopolis he was to found at the site.¹¹¹ Their subsequent visit to Buthrotum in Epirus, where Helenus and Andromache have built a miniature Troy as their home, occasions a moving speech of Aeneas (3.500-505) foreseeing the day when the sundered Trojan communities led by Helenus and Aeneas will be joined as one community (*unam Troiam faciemus utramque / Troiam*, 504-505). Historically, Buthrotum had been under Roman control since 167 BCE, and was the site of an effort by Caesar in the 40's to establish a colony for his veterans, a project which Augustus carried forward.¹¹² The Trojan settlement of Acesta on Sicily acknowledged the famous traditions of Roman-Elymian kinship; in fact, Vergil expanded the chief role of Aeneas in his Sicilian narrative by making him the founder of not only Segesta, but also of the shrine of Eryx (*Aeneid* 5.759-60).¹¹³

Other, less well-documented examples of kinship diplomacy may also be reflected in the poem, like the cameo appearance of an Acarnanian named Patron at the games in 5.298, which may allude to a tradition, reported by Dionysius, that an Acarnanian contingent led by Patron aided the refugee Trojans in their westward voyage.¹¹⁴ The diplomatic appeal by the Delians to the Romans in the first half of the second century may have some bearing on Vergil's depiction of Aeneas' landing on Delos in 3.78-123, where the Trojans meet Anius, king of Delos and priest

¹¹¹ On the Trojans' stop at Actium in the *Aeneid*, cf. Gurval (1995), 81-82, Stahl (1998), and Miller (2009), 95-96.

¹¹² Williams (1962) and Horsfall (2006), *ad* 3.294 supply further ancient sources for the Trojan presence in Epirus; also Bettini (1997), 18.

¹¹³ Earlier accounts, including that of Diodorus (4.83) had named Eryx, another son of Venus, as the founder of the shrine, and Aeneas only a later visitor who further embellished it; see Erskine (2001), 220 and Orlin (2010), 73-74. On the founding of Segesta, see 24-25 above.

¹¹⁴ Dionysius 1.51.2; cf. Fratantuono & Smith (2015), *ad loc.*

of Apollo, a guest-friend of Anchises (3.80-83). The Delians' second-century claim to *φιλία καὶ οἰκειότης* between themselves and the Romans was perhaps informed by traditions in which the Lavinia whom Aeneas married was the daughter not of Latinus, but of the Delian Anius.¹¹⁵

The second function of the Aeneas myth I want to highlight moves us from the international to the domestic stage, where among the Romans themselves the memory of the Trojan founding contributed to the construction of Roman identity and values. It was Augustus who most energetically applied the myth to this purpose, principally as part of a program of social and religious renewal that emphasized, above all, the reinstitution of ancient cults and a return to traditional social morality. The six Roman Odes of the poet Horace (3.1-6) perhaps best articulate the ethos of this platform, but in the *Aeneid*, too, it informs Vergil's casting of the Trojan myth in fundamental ways.¹¹⁶ The cultivation of Roman identity also pervades numerous artistic monuments, coin issues, and even legislative initiatives produced under the principate, as well as public celebrations like the Secular Games.

Cultural memory was integral to both the formulation and promulgation of what it meant to be Roman, as the Augustan vision of Roman identity was intimately bound up with the veneration of Rome's cultural heroes, the exemplars of native virtue. I have already mentioned the sculptural program of the new Forum of Augustus, which proudly displayed the statues of Rome's great military and political heroes from the city's founding up to the present day, each effigy accompanied by an inscription recounting the name and deeds of the individual portrayed.

¹¹⁵ On diplomacy between Delos and Rome, see 28 above; cf. Erskine (1997). Anius also appears in Ovid's Aeneas narrative, *Metamorphoses* 13.632-704.

¹¹⁶ See esp. Shumate (2006), 55-80 on the Roman Odes.

The intent of this display, as Suetonius's account of Augustus' own declaration over the forum attests, was above all didactic and protreptic:¹¹⁷

Proximum a dis immortalibus honorem memoriae ducum praestitit, qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent. Itaque et opera cuiusque manentibus titulis restituit et statuas omnium triumphali effigie in utraque fori sui porticu dedicavit, professus et edicto: commentum id se, ut ad illorum vitam velut ad exemplar et ipse, dum viveret, et insequentium aetatum principes exigerentur a civibus. (*Divus Augustus*, 31.5)

Next to the immortal gods, Augustus most honoured the memory of those citizens who had raised the Roman people from small beginnings to their present glory; this was why he restored many public buildings erected by men of this calibre, complete with their original dedicatory inscriptions, and raised statues to them, wearing triumphal dress, in the twin colonnades of his Forum. Then he proclaimed, 'This has been done to make my fellow citizens insist that both I (while I live) and the leaders of following ages shall not fall below the standard set by those great men of old.'¹¹⁸

Vergil's retelling of the Aeneas myth participated in this didactic program, integrating the study of Roman identity into the very fiber of its narrative. The Parade of Heroes that concludes Book 6 accomplishes in literary form what the artistic program of the new forum advertised in sculpture, and Anchises' speech to Aeneas proclaims the common character and destiny of the Roman people:¹¹⁹

850 excudent alii spirantia mollius aera
 (credo equidem), vivos ducent de marmore vultus,
 orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
 describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent:
 tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
 (hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
 parcere subiectis et debellare superbos. (6.847-53)

¹¹⁷ See esp. Lamp (2013), 61-67 on the didactic and exemplary functions of the Forum of Augustus; on ancestral images in Roman culture, including under Augustus, see Flower (1996).

¹¹⁸ Trans. Graves, rev. Rives (2007).

¹¹⁹ See esp. Pandey (2014), 92-106 on correspondences between the Parade of Heroes and the Forum of Augustus. Zanker (1990), 212-13 sees the conclusion of Book 6 as the source of the "basic idea" for the new forum's gallery. Like the Forum, the Parade presents the Roman heroes as *exempla* for citizen behavior: Goldschmidt (2013), 166-79. See also Luce (1990), who explores connections between the Forum and another contemporary literary work, Livy's history of Rome.

Anchises' injunction is inseparable from the context in which he utters it, amid the celebration of Rome's great kings, magistrates, and commanders, a "genealogical protreptic" for both Aeneas and his distant descendants of the first century.¹²⁰ Here Roman identity derives its very definition from the examples of those champions who have won immortality in the memory of Romans.

The needs of Rome's present underpinned the cultivation of its past. In the wake of civil war and immense social upheaval, the promotion of *mores maiorum* helped reaffirm the validity of the Roman ethos and the vitality of the community, at the same time reasserting standards of civic conduct drawn from the deep well of cultural memory. In summoning forth the heroic past for these purposes, Augustan practice correlates with observations made by theorists of nationalism and collective memory. Anthony Smith's discussion of the "golden age" as a motif of nationalist discourse emphasizes the need for guidance and self-definition that motivate the veneration of cultural heroes:

[T]he vision of the desired future transmutes the meaning of memories of the golden age in each generation, adapting them to present conditions (though within strict limits), and thereby enabling them to galvanize the community for collective action to achieve a better future. Equally, the memories of a golden age hold the key to unlocking the secrets of a community's destiny, providing a rough-and-ready compass for the journey, as well as a 'map' and a 'morality' for the road, one which will enable the members to return to their core ethnic values and realize their 'inner beings.'¹²¹

At the same time as the great men and women of ancient Rome provided models of virtuous conduct, their examples also served a more precise purpose in the ideology of the principate, that of constructing Augustus' public image. Among the chief role models employed

¹²⁰ Cf. Horsfall (2013), *ad* 6.889.

¹²¹ Smith (2004), 224; cf. 211-35. See esp. Shumate (2006), 55-80 on the ideological construction of the past in Horace's Roman Odes; also Assmann (2011), 62-63, 247-51 and Garman (2007), 119.

in this effort was Aeneas, who embodied the “quintessentially Roman virtue” of *pietas*.¹²² More than any other, this virtue was to become most intimately associated with the *princeps* himself. The senate’s gift to Augustus of the golden shield emblazoned with the titles *virtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia*, and *pietas* (*Res Gestae* 6.20) occurred in 27 BCE, but the promotion of *pietas* as one of his characteristic virtues may have been in progress for some time already. As Octavian, he had appealed to *pietas* in urging war in 42 against his father’s murderers; the same year saw the issue of the coin type portraying Aeneas in his characteristic iconography, fleeing Troy with his father on his back, a display that evoked Aeneas’ loyalty to gods and family.¹²³ The same image was used for his statue-group in the Forum of Augustus, and, prior to the Forum’s construction, Vergil had solidified the connection by applying the epithet *pius* to Aeneas no fewer than 19 times throughout the *Aeneid*. Augustus’ own association with *pietas* proved enduring, for even in Tacitus’ much later account of Augustus’ funeral (*Annales* 1.9-10), as the onlookers debate the emperor’s merits, “the mention of Augustus’ *pietas* is the very first point made in the enumeration of the emperor’s praiseworthy deeds...as well as their rebuttal: some charged that Augustus assumed his *pietas erga patrem* merely as a mask.”¹²⁴

Commemoration of the Trojan myth, then, could actively influence interstate relations, as well as define a coherent vision of native identity and traditional values. We can identify, lastly, a third function of the myth in Roman political discourse, namely the reinforcement of Augustus’ legitimacy in power. We have already noted the early coin issues by which Octavian appropriated the images of Aeneas and Venus to link his public image with Caesar’s, an effective

¹²² Galinsky (1996), 86.

¹²³ Cf. Weinstock (1971) 253-54 and Zanker (1990), 201-10.

¹²⁴ Galinsky (1969a), 52; cf. Syme (1939), 157.

tactic for consolidating support among the late dictator's supporters and veterans. This granted him the initial legitimacy of kinship with Caesar, stressing his legal and moral standing as son and heir of his father. As Octavian became Augustus, the Julian cultivation of Trojan lineage grew, owing largely to the efforts of Vergil, into a mythology of national identity for the Roman people, and the veneration of Aeneas, founder of the Roman race, assumed a central place in Augustan ideology.

The assertion of ancestral legitimacy aims to achieve, above all, a sense of continuity with past authority, represented both by the claimant's relation to illustrious predecessors, and his conformity with the community's social values, traditions of government, and principles of succession. As the scion of the *gens Iulia*, Augustus was endowed with an impressive lineage that included not only the deified Caesar himself, but Aeneas and the goddess Venus, whom his family had claimed as ancestors. On the other hand, the regime's zealous promotion of native cultural values and traditions, especially as exemplified in the great heroes of the past, helped construct the image of the *princeps* as the chief preserver and representative of Roman identity. By both of these avenues, his conformity with tradition was solidified and the perception of continuity between Rome's past and present was achieved.

More than other narratives from Roman memory, the Aeneas myth encompassed the ancestry, the cultural symbols, and the virtues with which Augustus could assert the claim to legitimate authority. In this connection, it is vital to acknowledge the unparalleled contribution of the *Aeneid* in tailoring the Trojan foundation myth to the ideology of the Augustan Age. One way in which Vergil joined the Trojan past with the Augustan present was by incorporating the emperor, *in propria persona*, directly into his poetic narrative. Servius' famous claim that the

Aeneid was written “to imitate Homer and praise Augustus through his ancestors”¹²⁵ identifies the Vergilian effort to embed the current political order within his narrative of the mythic past. The events of the epic and the figure of its protagonist prefigure Augustus and the hegemony of the Julian house, and in the *princeps*’ three striking appearances in the poem, his reign is made to signify the culmination of Aeneas’ labors and the fruition of all intervening Latin and Roman history.

Two aspects of the link between Aeneas’ founding and Augustus’ rule gesture toward legitimacy. First, Augustus is represented as a continuation of Aeneas’ ancient line through descent, and thus sanctioned by blood to inherit the mantle of leadership. Jupiter’s prophecy to Venus in Book 1 lays special emphasis on this continuity, as the goddess fears for the future of her descendants during Aeneas’ trials at sea. When Jupiter describes the course of Rome’s history, he draws his narrative through the continuity of Aeneas’ line through Ascanius, the Alban kings, and Romulus, finally ending with the ascent of Julius Caesar and Augustus:¹²⁶

Nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo. (1.286-88)

Augustus succeeds Aeneas not only in his line of descent, but also in his extraordinary character and deeds. Carrying on the bloodline of the founder, he fulfills the work begun by his ancestor, and leads the Roman people to the zenith of global power. In this way, he wins legitimacy not only by blood, but in spirit as well, through the demonstration of his exceptional virtue and devotion to the Roman people. We have already seen, in Jupiter’s prophecy,

¹²⁵ Servius, *Aen.* 1 *pref.*

¹²⁶ I side with the view that the phrase *Caesar...Iulius* (1.286-88) simultaneously invokes both Caesar and Augustus, through deliberate ambiguity on the part of the poet. For this reading, see esp. O’Hara (1990), 155-63; for opposing interpretations, see Kraggerud (1992) and Dobbins (1995), who argue for exclusive identification with Augustus or Julius Caesar, respectively.

Augustus' destined restoration of order to the Roman state. His turn in the review of Rome's future heroes in Elysium looks forward to the period of worldwide conquest, civilization, and peace over which he will preside:

hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva
Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos
proferet imperium. (6.791-95)

What this speech of Anchises reveals in prophecy, the depiction of Actium and its aftermath on Aeneas' shield renders concrete. Augustus Caesar leads the western world against the motley, feminized hordes of the East (8.678-88); fighting under the auspices of the Olympian gods, he enters combat against the enemy's amorphous, raucous deities (696-706); having subdued Egypt, saved Rome, and pacified the East, Augustus in triumph receives the tribute of peoples throughout the world who willingly submit to Roman power (714-28), realizing at last the Jovian promise of *imperium sine fine* for the descendants of father Aeneas.

By integrating the figure of Augustus into his recasting of the Trojan myth, Vergil brings the memory of Aeneas' foundation and the present reality of the principate into a seamless unity. The Aeneas myth becomes the Augustus myth; Aeneas' foundation typifies Augustus' restoration. Augustus' appropriation of cultural memory served to strengthen his identification with illustrious ancestors, mortal and divine, as well as to display his possession of the virtues and cultural credentials requisite for leadership of the Roman state. In all of these ways, the myth bolstered the emperor's claim to legitimacy, and articulated a practical political argument for Roman consensus and solidarity under his reign.

Conclusion and Prospectus

This chapter's treatment of the Aeneas myth in Roman politics has aimed to show that a people's cultural memory, its repository of evocative symbols and narratives about the past, exercises an active and concrete influence on communal life. The mythic tale of Aeneas' flight from Troy and foundation in Italy, shared among Romans, Greeks, and Sicilians, opened up the pathways of diplomatic communication. Arguments predicated on the kinship of two peoples through the common ancestry of Aeneas helped craft treaties, inspire the transfer of cults, and motivate acts of civic benefaction. In the context of Augustus' call for a return to traditional morals and religious observances, Aeneas symbolized the virtues, especially *pietas*, that were the bedrock of the Roman identity. His image, advertised in art and literature and circulated in official media, represented the ancient ways, the *mores maiorum* that defined the Roman character and sense of self, and so bolstered the return to native values through example. Lastly, the Trojan foundation narrative, in the hands of the regime, lent Augustus legitimacy in power. Through assimilation of Augustus' own character with that of Aeneas, promoted especially through the narrative of Vergil's "national epic," his regime was formulated as a continuation of Rome's founding bloodline. Through this association, Augustus could assume not only divinity as *divi filius*—through Divus Julius and, further back, through Venus—and the political mantle of his adoptive father, who had similarly cultivated his family's Trojan origin, but also a direct relationship with Rome's earliest founder, a symbolic link that communicated Augustus' self-representation as restorer of the state and guardian of *mores maiorum*.

Diplomacy, identity, and legitimacy: these are three of the areas in which cultural memory guided Roman public life. The Romans were, of course, hardly unique among ancient civilizations both in preserving such memories and applying them pragmatically. Among the

Greeks alone, the Athenians, who promoted the synoecist Theseus as champion of the democratic ideal, and the Spartans, whose kings derived legitimacy from their perceived succession of the Heracleidae, exemplify the same tendency. States large and small across the landscape of the ancient world employed their cultural memory in the service of political belief, argumentation, and action.

I return here to the focus of this dissertation, and restate its main ideas in light of the preceding case study from Vergil's own time and place. Examining evidence for the cultivation and practical use of cultural memory and identity among the *Aeneid*'s ethnic groups, this study argues that Vergil has constructed his fictionalized communities with a keen awareness of the nature and functions of the past in communal life. Much as the Romans preserved the memory of the Aeneas myth and employed it in their political activity, the *Aeneid*'s four main ethnic groups—the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians—are shown by Vergil to possess their own cultural memories, which they publicly commemorate and pragmatically apply in ways that correspond with real Greco-Roman practices.

At the same time as Vergil replicates the social dynamics of memory and identity within the world of his poem, he also reproduces the tendency of elites to opportunistically adapt, alter, or invent aspects of the communal past for political advantage. The vigorous promotion of the Aeneas myth under the principate exemplifies such ideological shaping of memory, as the Augustan vision of history narrated in the *Aeneid* and advertised in all manner of public display endowed the Trojan foundation story with a popularity and significance greater than it had previously enjoyed in Roman society.¹²⁷ The characters within Vergil's epic selectively define their community's past and present according to political expedients, much as the dictates of

¹²⁷ See 34-35 above.

Augustan self-representation governed the installation of the Aeneas myth as a cornerstone of Roman identity.

I conclude with an outline of the dissertation's subsequent chapters, which advance new observations on the *Aeneid* through the interpretive lenses of memory and identity. Chapter 2 investigates the expression of cultural memory among Vergil's Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians, identifying previously unexplored correspondences between the content and social functions of collective memory within the world of the poem and in real-life Greek and Roman communities. Surveying each of *Aeneid*'s main ethnic groups in turn, this chapter explores the several media they employ to commemorate and transmit cultural memory and identity—including ethnonyms and toponyms, public monuments and exhibitions, elite self-representation, and civic rituals—and considers the many roles of the past in the community's political life. There follows a specific discussion of myth and memory in the poem's diplomatic encounters, before the chapter concludes with evidence of the strategic emphasis, suppression, or tailoring of communal memories by Vergil's characters to serve pragmatic goals.

Chapter 3 newly considers the importance of Trojan identity in the quest of Aeneas' refugee community to found a new settlement. This chapter reads the Trojans' journey to Italy as a narrative of exile, insecurity, and collective trauma, and argues that the most intimate concern of Aeneas' people in seeking a new home is to guarantee the continuity of their Trojan identity in the wake of Troy's destruction. In contrast to the divine revelation of Troy's resurgence in Italy and expansion into a global empire, the refugees' own imagined future emphasizes not *imperium* and *gloria*, but rather the stability of a permanent home where the Trojan people can peacefully reside. Throughout their migration, the exiles consistently conceive of a new city as the restoration of Troy, a notion expressed in the characters' speeches and demonstrated by the

choice of the names Pergamum, Ilium, and Troia for their attempted settlements (3.132, 5.755-56). The memory of the founders Teucer and Dardanus permits the exiles to regard their migration as a “return” to a legitimate Trojan *patria*, first identified as Crete, and then Italy. The urgent desire for a permanent settlement motivates their journey from their early visit to the Delian oracle, where Aeneas asks Apollo for *moenia*, *genus*, and *mansura urbs* (3.85-86), through the end of the games in Sicily, where the dread of endless exile drives the Trojan women to burn the ships. The hope of a new Troy combats the persistent fear of communal death for their people, a fear first expressed by the Trojan priest Panthus as the city is falling to the Greeks: *fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens / gloria Teucrorum* (2.325-26).

The fourth and final chapter focuses on the Italian coalition headed by Turnus in the *Aeneid*’s second half. Where Chapters 2 and 3 treat memory and identity among defined ethnic communities, this installment explores the construction of a new communal identity among previously independent peoples. Surveying the rhetoric deployed by Turnus and the other Italian chiefs to mobilize the peninsula’s autonomous and ethnically distinct communities, this chapter argues that the narrative of indigenous resistance to foreign (Trojan) aggression spun by Turnus appeals to a sense of common Italian identity among groups who had not shared such unity before. This reading of Books 7-12 diverges from current scholarly consensus that regards Vergil’s Italians as culturally unified at the time of Aeneas’ arrival; instead, I emphasize the role of Turnus’ bellicose rhetoric in inventing a new ideal of Italian unity. In the absence of pan-Italian traditions or cultural memories, solidarity among the diverse communities is achieved through a program of ethnic contrast that constructs native Italian identity through polemical comparison with the Trojan Other. This discussion of Italian identity and solidarity in the poem plays out against the backdrop of events in Vergil’s contemporary Italy, where, in the lead-up to

the war against Antony and Cleopatra, Octavian, too, had appealed to the collective will of *tota Italia* to defend the homeland from a perceived foreign threat.

CHAPTER 2: Cultural Memory in the World of the *Aeneid*

At the close of *Aeneid* 9, as Turnus has breached the gates of the Trojan camp, the narrative follows his bloody advance through the ranks of its defenders. Enumerating the Trojan dead, the poet pauses over a certain Cretheus:

et amicum Crethea Musis,
Crethea Musarum comitem, cui carmina semper
et citharae cordi numerosque intendere nervis,
semper equos atque arma virum pugnascue canebat. (9.774-77)

A devotee of the muses famed for heroic song, the doomed Cretheus has long been understood as a literary double of Vergil himself, especially in view of the phrase *arma virum pugnascue* (777) that evokes the *Aeneid*'s own incipit.¹²⁸

Cretheus is one of a number of singers who inhabit the epic's landscape; others include Iopas, the singer at Dido's court (1.740-47), Messapus' men who "sing their king" (*regemque canebant*) like swans (7.698-705), and the forlorn Cynus (10.189-93), whose son Cupavo marches with the Etruscans. Inserting these figures into his fictionalized world, Vergil follows the model of Homer, whose two epics, especially the *Odyssey*, incorporate bards, songs, and performative contexts, a meta-literary program exemplified particularly by the singers Phemius and Demodocus.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Bibliography on Vergil's Cretheus is modest. Fratantuono & Faxon (2013) is the most comprehensive treatment of his role in the poem, and reads Cretheus' death as a commentary on Vergil's adaptation of Homer; see also Hardie (1995), *ad* 9.774, and Desport (1952). Gale (2003), Malamud (1998), and Hardie (1986), 52-66 treat poets and poetry in the *Aeneid* more broadly.

¹²⁹ See esp. Segal (1994) and Ford (1992) on song and singers in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; also Scodel (1998) and Scully (1981).

Like the inclusion of various objects, armaments, and practices retrojected from Iron Age Greece into the Trojan War's Bronze Age landscape, bardic song represents an intersection of the Homeric poet's own milieu and the artificial world within his narrative. The representation of Phemius and Demodocus in the *Odyssey* creatively reproduces not only their craft and social station, but also the audience's reception of epic song, as Homer's characters are variously inspired, charmed, or upset by the bard's themes. Most importantly for our purposes, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* also attest to the social dynamics of the epic genre as an instrument for collective remembrance and the instilling of social values.¹³⁰ Within the world of Homer's characters, "[the singer] is transmitter, teacher, and constructor of the values in that society," furnishing through the recitation of heroes' deeds a store of *exempla* and a useful record of the communal past.¹³¹ The inspired bard is a repository of cultural memory, of a past remembered and interpreted under divine auspices. The roles of epic song within the Homeric microcosm are analogous to its functions in the real ancient Mediterranean, where oral and literary epic often promoted cultural values and identity through the celebration of key figures and events in collective memory.¹³²

Vergil's Cretheus, like his Homeric predecessors, attests to the tradition of epic song within the *Aeneid*'s literary microcosm. His presence further suggests that the social dynamics of epic in Homer's fictional world—to entertain and edify, but also to transmit values and preserve the past—are still in effect in Vergil's. Cretheus' brief but notable cameo thus calls attention to the poetic transmission of collective memory among the Trojan exiles, among whose ranks we see Cretheus fight and die. Like the peoples who occupy the communities of the *Iliad* and

¹³⁰ Segal (1994), 134-35; Scodel (1998), 183; Scully (1981), 75-79.

¹³¹ Scully (1981), 78.

¹³² Cf. Goldschmidt (2013), 9-10, 17-28 on Roman memory and identity in Ennius' *Annales*, ultimately succeeded as Rome's "national epic" by the *Aeneid*; Syed (2005), 13-19 treats the *Aeneid* and Roman identity during the imperial period. See also Keith (2000), 2-6 on the epic genre in Greece and Rome.

Odyssey, the Trojans in the *Aeneid* also have a bard who guards and hands on his audience's collective past through heroic song.

Cretheus' eulogy is one testimony to the cultivation of shared historical memory among Vergil's fictionalized ethnic communities, the subject to which the present chapter is devoted. Further evidence in the *Aeneid* attests to this cultivation not only among the Trojans, but the poem's other main communities, the Phoenician settlers of Carthage, the Latins, and Evander's immigrant Arcadians. These groups within Vergil's poetic landscape possess their own cultural traditions—narratives about the past, communal rituals and displays, places of memory, and other tokens—that define and reinforce the group's collective identity and values. Like cultural memory in real-life ancient and modern communities, these traditions profoundly influence their social and political life. Appeals to these ethnic traditions and symbols among Vergil's characters are capable of mobilizing action, legitimizing power structures, promoting ideologies, and guiding collective decision-making. Communal memory and identity constitute a palpable force in the political sphere, capable of firing the hearts and minds of group members and harnessing their will in solidarity.

Where the first chapter of this dissertation evaluated the nature and functions of cultural memory in the real milieu of Republican and Augustan Rome, here my aim is to apply the same frame of analysis to the fictionalized communities within the poem. The previous chapter illustrated how Roman cultural memory, particularly the Aeneas myth, was strategically employed for a variety of practical and ideological purposes. In this installment, I now turn to the artificial world within the *Aeneid*, to the ethnic groups that populate its narrative landscape. As this chapter aims to show, these "invented" peoples have usable pasts of their own, tales of foundations, wars, and heroes of deep significance to their communal values and sense of self.

This chapter thus picks up the same interpretive threads that underpinned discussion of the Aeneas myth, but alters the focus of inquiry from the Roman Republic to the fictional world within Vergil's poem.

Examining in turn the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians, this chapter assesses the evidence for the preservation and transmission of cultural memory among these groups.¹³³ Recurrent areas of analysis include: the names employed by communities for themselves and their lands, which often enshrine the memory of founders and heroes; evidence for unique cultural practices and rituals that unite the community in acts of commemoration or solidarity; the transmission of ethnic myths; the artistic representation of cultural memory and symbolism of the communal past in public display; the veneration of important sites and artifacts; and appeals to cultural memory or symbolism in political self-representation. After surveys of the individual groups, there follows a closer look at the several intergroup diplomatic encounters in the poem, important contexts for the exchange of identities through symbols, myths, and memories.

The chapter concludes with consideration of how Vergil's ethnic groups, much like their historical counterparts in the ancient Mediterranean, creatively adapt their construction of the past to satisfy present political needs. Much as the Aeneas myth in Rome was purposefully cultivated by the *gens Iulia* as a claim to antiquity, legitimacy, and, at last, hegemony, Vergil's fictionalized characters are seen to suppress, distort, or emphasize elements of their communal history as expediency demands. The tendency of societies to shape and interpret creatively their

¹³³ This dissertation's fourth chapter discusses the Italians as a broader ethnic community, beyond the Latins and Arcadians alone. The Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians have a relatively defined, specific, and stable ethnic identity; Italian identity proves to be a more nuanced concept. This chapter also does not include detailed discussion of the Etruscans; while this community is narratively significant in the war of Books 7-12 and in Roman collective memory, there is little testimony of their communal practices and beliefs in the text. Their Lydian identity, to which Vergil's narrator and characters allude in several instances (cf. 8.479, 8.499, 9.11, 10.155) is the only substantial indicator of Etruscan cultural memory within the *Aeneid*.

cultural memory to respond to present exigencies is evidenced no less among the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians than the real-life communities of the ancient world.

Cultural Memory and Identity in Vergil's Ethnic Communities

The Trojans

I begin this survey of cultural memory in the *Aeneid* with its most prominent and narratively significant community. Owing to the Trojans' leading role in Vergil's epic, their depiction exhibits a unique depth of characterization. Trojan identity is itself a major theme in the poem that demonstrably influences the course of the story and the motivations of the characters: the poem's basic premise, after all, is the Trojan exiles' quest to find a new home for their people. The third chapter of this dissertation explores the drama of Trojan cultural survival in greater detail. In this current section, I will describe the expressions of Trojan identity—their unique traditions, tokens, and myths—apparent in the poem's twelve books.

The names by which the Trojans refer to their community and their territory constitute basic expressions of their sense of self. According to Anthony Smith, the act of self-definition is essential to forming a cohesive group identity:

Only when a collective proper name is conferred on a population, highlighting the unity of its parts, and only when it becomes widely accepted by the members of the population, can a sense of distinctive ethnic identity begin to emerge.¹³⁴

In claiming a distinctive identity, peoples of the ancient Mediterranean regularly derived the names for their group and their homeland from eponymous founders, patrons, kings, symbols, or memories of special significance to the community; the traditional derivation of 'Rome' and

¹³⁴ Smith (2009), 46. Smith (1986), 22-24 treats the subject of ethnic names at greater length.

‘Roman’ from the founder and first king Romulus provides one example among countless others.¹³⁵

In this practice, the ethnic groups in the *Aeneid* act in the same way as their real-life counterparts, using signifiers that evoke their shared past, most often their founders, to define themselves and their environment. Even in the absence of a specific name, the persons and myths associated with different territories provide tokens of identification. When, in Book 1, Dido answers the shipwrecked Trojans’ plea for safe passage, she recognizes their destinations of Latium or Sicily through the founders associated with those regions:

seu vos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva
sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten,
auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo. (1.569-71)

The naming of locations after persons or events of communal importance occurs widely within the fictionalized communities studied in this chapter, but this form of discourse also works in ways that directly engage the contemporary Roman audience. When, for instance, Vergil traces the name of the Italian Capes Misenum (6.232-35) and Palinurus (6.378-83) to the lost comrades of Aeneas, the aetiologies link these known landmarks with the memory of the Trojan landing in Italy.¹³⁶ Both inside and outside of the text, the names attached to locations and groups join the act of self-definition with the commemoration of the past.

In the *Aeneid*, the Trojan people go by a variety of recurrent ethnonyms, and their city has two names in regular use. Vergil has inherited these terms from the rich mythical, literary, and historiographical traditions available to him, and they accord with the onomastic conventions described above. While the context and deployment of these terms varies according to stylistic,

¹³⁵ Cf. Malkin (1985), 116-17.

¹³⁶ Cf. O’Hara (2017), 73-75, and 108-109 on etymological aetiology in Vergil; also Seider (2013), 135-40 and Fletcher (2014), 200-206.

metrical, and rhetorical considerations, they share an origin in the names of Trojan founders and kings. The appellations *Teuceri*, *Dardanidae/Dardanii*, and *Troiani/Troes* all derive from the names of such figures, respectively Teucer, Dardanus, and Tros.¹³⁷ Three times the name of another Trojan king, Laomedon, the father of Priam, is used to refer to the Trojans collectively (*Laomedontae...gentis*, 3.248, 4.541-42; *Laomedontia pubes*, 7.105).¹³⁸ *Iliades* is used of Trojan women six times in the text (1.480, 2.580, 3.65, 5.644, 7.248, 11.35). The broader regional signifier *Phrygius* also appears with some frequency, especially in reference to Aeneas. When applied by such enemies as Iarbas, Amata, Turnus, Numanus Remulus, or Juno, it often has the force of an ethnic slur against the Trojans.¹³⁹ The toponyms *Troia*, *Ilium*, and *Dardania* respectively come from Tros, Ilus, the son and successor of Tros, and Dardanus. Through these names, we recognize the fundamental importance of the shared past in communal self-definition: the Trojans' status as "the people of Tros," "the people of Teucer," and "the people of Dardanus" informs their basic identity, and their common "descent" from these figures grounds their perceived kinship with one another.

Ethnic names can also assume a heightened ideological charge, as the case of *Dardanidae/Dardanii* in the poem best demonstrates. In the context of the Trojans' efforts at resettlement in Latium, their common descent from the founder Dardanus, whose birthplace was Italy, articulates an implicit territorial claim: as "the people of Dardanus," the exiles are justified

¹³⁷ Cf. *Iliad* 20.215-40 on the lineage of Troy's ruling house.

¹³⁸ Note also 8.18, where the narrator refers to Aeneas alone as *Laomedontius heros*. Mention of Laomedon sounds an ominous note in this text, evoking the king's swindling of Neptune, Apollo, and Hercules that resulted in Troy's ruin. Dido explicitly imputes Laomedon's bad faith to the whole Trojan people: *nescis, heu! perdita, necdum / Laomedontae sentis periuria gentis?* (4.541-42). See Wiesen (1973), 744-46, Cairns (1989), 127-28, and Petrini (1997), 53-55 on Laomedon in the *Aeneid*.

¹³⁹ See Chapter 4, 216 and 230-31, and O'Hara (2011), *ad* 4.215. In post-Homeric usage, the ethnonym *Phrygius* acquired the connotation of effeminacy, owing in large part to the self-castration practiced by priests of the Phrygian goddess Cybele.

in viewing Italy as a legitimate Trojan *patria*.¹⁴⁰ It is in connection with their destination that Apollo's oracle at Delos addresses the exiles as *Dardanidae* (3.94), a subtle clue overlooked by the Trojans as to the identity of the *antiqua mater* (3.96) to which the god directs them. Initiating the Sicilian funeral games for Anchises, Aeneas attempts to kindle the weary spirits of his people with a passionate invocation that alludes to their Italian claim: *Dardanidae magni, genus alto a sanguine divum* (5.45). After their arrival in Latium, the Trojans avow this ancestral bond with Italy before Latinus and Evander.¹⁴¹ As the subtext of the name *Dardanidae* indicates, ethnonyms can, through evoking the specific memories that underlie them, convey in themselves a valorized narrative of ethnic history.

The previous chapter's treatment of cultural memory in Republican and Augustan Rome demonstrated the ways in which the collective past can be visually advertised. Throughout the ancient world, sculptures, inscriptions, coinage, vase paintings, monumental architecture, and a broad range of other media were employed to promote the images of communal heroes and narratives of cultural history for a wide audience. Relics, symbols, and locations bound to important figures or events from the shared past—the cultural artifacts Pierre Nora has influentially studied as “sites of memory” (*lieux de mémoire*)—signified the community's existence across time and emblemized its unique identity and history.¹⁴² The public spaces where such media were displayed—temples, fora, tombs, and other settings—provided a special

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Chapter 3, 150-151.

¹⁴¹ On Dardanus' memory in the *Aeneid*'s diplomatic encounters, see 117-19 below.

¹⁴² See Nora (1989) for a concise introduction to “sites of memory.” The original seven-volume study directed by Nora, *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (1984-92), has been adapted into English in three volumes as *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past* (1996-98). See also Goldschmidt (2013), 69-100, who applies Nora's work to the presentation of Roman landmarks in Ennius and Vergil.

locus for the cultivation of memory and the transmission of group identity.¹⁴³ In ancient cities, these sites of display often existed within centers of power—in the Roman Forum, for example, or the Acropoleis of Athens and Pergamum—where they interpenetrated the structures of civic and religious life. In such centers, power and memory are advertised side-by-side in a program of mutual reinforcement: the community perceives the continuity of cultural history and identity in the modern-day transactions of the state, while the state’s administrators advertise their legitimacy and adherence to cultural values by appropriating the symbolism of the past.

The promotion of communal memory in the urban landscape also takes place in the fictionalized communities of Carthage, Latium, and Pallanteum, where special sites function as repositories of the group’s cultural heritage; these examples are further discussed in the following sections. As the Trojans have no fixed settlement in their exile, and their former city has only a minimal appearance in the poem, we find comparatively less evidence for the transmission of Trojan memory in the visual arts and public displays. The urban context which would have provided the venue for such displays appears only in Book 2, and the poet includes little ethnographical detail in the description of the city. Only in the settlement of Helenus and Andromache at Buthrotum do we see the expression of Trojan cultural memory, here inspiring the reproduction of some of the old city’s defining landmarks: the rivers Xanthus and Simois, the Scaean Gate, and the grave of Hector.¹⁴⁴

Nevertheless, there do appear some culturally important artifacts and artworks preserved by the exile community. In Book 1, after Dido’s reception of the Trojans, Aeneas instructs

¹⁴³ For modern criticism on “places of memory,” see Till (2003); for Greek and Roman contexts, see esp. Galinsky (2016), Galinsky & Lapatin (2015), Lamp (2013), Schmitt Pantel (2013), Seider (2013), 16-21, Price (2012), Rutledge (2012), Rea (2007), Gowing (2005), Ker & Peiper (2004), Roller (2004), and Walter (2004); further bibliography in Chapter 1, n. 26.

¹⁴⁴ I further discuss Buthrotum and Trojan identity in Chapter 3, 146-50.

Achates to bring precious heirlooms to the queen as gifts, two of which evoke particular events and persons from Troy's recent history:

munera praeterea Iliacis erepta ruinis
ferre iubet, pallam signis auroque rigentem
et circumtextum croceo velamen acantho,
650 ornatus Argivae Helenae, quos illa Mycenis,
Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos,
extulerat, matris Leda mirabile donum;
praeterea sceptrum, Ilione quod gesserat olim,
maxima natarum Priami, colloque monile
655 bacatum, et duplicem gemmis auroque coronam. (1.647-55)

During the games in Book 5, Cloanthus wins the boat race, and receives as his prize a finely-wrought cloak of purple and gold decorated with the story of Ganymede:

250 victori chlamydem auratam, quam plurima circum
purpura maeandro duplici Meliboea cucurrit,
intextusque puer frondosa regius Ida
velocis iaculo ceruos cursuque fatigat
acer, anhelanti similis, quem praepes ab Ida
255 sublimem pedibus rapuit Iovis armiger uncis;
longaevi palmas nequiquam ad sidera tendunt
custodes, saevitque canum latratus in auras. (5.250-57)

In Book 7, during the Trojans' diplomatic exchange with Latinus after arriving in Latium, Ilioneus concludes his address by pledging as gifts to the king the state regalia of Troy, once in the keeping of Anchises and Priam:

hoc pater Anchises auro libabat ad aras,
hoc Priami gestamen erat cum iura vocatis
more daret populis, sceptrumque sacerque tiaras
Iliadumque labor vestes. (7.245-48)

In Book 10, as the Trojans prepare to return to the encampment on the Tiber with their new Etruscan and Arcadian allies, the narrator describes the decoration of Aeneas' ship, whose figurehead sports the likeness of two Phrygian lions beneath the icon of Mount Ida:

Aeneia puppis
prima tenet rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones,

imminet Ida super, profugis gratissima Teucris. (10.156-58)

These artifacts and artworks attest in diverse ways to the veneration the Trojans attach to memory of their homeland.¹⁴⁵ In the diplomatic exchanges of Books 1 and 7, the regalia of their forefathers emblemize Troy's longstanding religious and political traditions; this is especially true of the objects offered to Latinus, all of which are connected with the main power structures of the former Trojan state.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, the pledge of these emblems by Aeneas' community to other state representatives articulates the legitimacy of the exiles, now the possessors of these objects, as the heirs and custodians of Troy. In the context of a formal political transaction, then, the artifacts of Troy's past carry symbolic significance: they are testimonia both of ancient religious and political traditions, and of the continuity of the Trojan state through those survivors who are now the stewards of Troy's legacy.

From the standpoint of Vergil's audience, the Ganymede cloak of Book 5 represents an allusion to Apollonius' cloak of Jason (*Arg.* 1.721-68), as well as a grim reminder of Juno's wrath toward the Trojans, as the narrator in the proem identifies *rapti Ganymedis honores* (1.28) as one source of her hatred. The violence of the image also exemplifies the theme of theodicy that runs throughout the epic.¹⁴⁷ But among Vergil's characters, who have evidently kept this

¹⁴⁵ In addition to these more specific allusions to Trojan memory and symbolism, the text also includes some items identified as specifically Trojan or "Phrygian" in style. As Aeneas' ships leave Buthrotum, Andromache gives Ascanius a "Phrygian cloak" (*Phrygiam Ascanio chlamydem*, 3.484) as a memento of his kin (*accipe et haec, manuum tibi quae monumenta meorum / sint... cape dona extrema tuorum*, 3.486-88). When Anchises, Aeneas, and the crew pray to Pallas and Juno after the appearance of the horses of Italy's coast, they veil themselves with "Phrygian coverings" (*capita ante aras Phrygio velamur amictu*, 3.545). On Sicily, the marooned Achaemenides easily recognizes Aeneas' men by their "Dardanian clothing and Trojan arms" (*Dardanios habitus et Troia vidit / arma procul*, 3.596-97). Chloereus, the priest of Cybele whom Camilla pursues on the battlefield is distinguished by his shining "Phrygian armor" (*insignis longe Phrygiis fulgebat in armis*, 11.769) and "Lycian" bow (11.773); the narrator calls them "Trojan arms" (*arma / Troia*, 11.778-79). These items further attest to the presence of recognizably Trojan cultural products within the world of the poem.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.245: "[T]he gifts represent continuity of cult and of power, *pietas* towards father, gods and country." On these two gift exchanges, see also Henry (1989), 32-35.

¹⁴⁷ See Fratantuono & Smith (2015), *ad loc.* for bibliography on the cloak and its significance in the poem.

exceptional garment since Troy's fall, and now stake it as a top prize in the funeral games for a beloved Trojan leader, the scene on the cloak represents an important witness to Jupiter's interactions with the Trojan people through history. The story of Ganymede constitutes a kind of ethnic myth, specifically Trojan in its setting and its main actor, the boy prince who was a member of Troy's ruling house.

The decorations of Aeneas' ship reproduce important ethnic symbols, the attributes of the goddess Cybele;¹⁴⁸ the Trojan response elicited from these cues (*profugis gratissima Teucris*, 10.158) testifies to their emotive power. The narrative behind the ship's construction further reinforces the association of these symbols with the Trojans' homeland and native traditions.¹⁴⁹ The ship which they board in Book 10 following the treaty with the Etruscans, the same in which Aeneas' crew had sailed up the Tiber to Pallanteum, is from the fleet first crafted by the survivors in the aftermath of Troy's destruction, as Aeneas recounts in Book 3 (*classemque sub ipsa / Antandro et Phrygiae molimur montibus Idae*, 3.5-6). These ships, after the fire in Sicily of 5.659-99 which claimed four of them (699), went on to Latium. Their majority, excepting the one helmed by Aeneas on his diplomatic mission, metamorphose into nymphs through Cybele's intervention early in Book 9. During this event, the narrator fully reveals the fleet's origins; the ships were crafted from wood hewn on Mount Ida from a grove sacred to the Magna Mater, as the goddess herself explains in her petition to Jupiter:

pineae silvae mihi multos dilecta per annos,
lucus in arce fuit summa, quo sacra ferebant,
nigra piceae trabibusque obscurus acernis.
has ego Dardanio iuveni, cum classis egeret,

¹⁴⁸ Cf. 10.252-53, where Aeneas names the Phrygian lions and Mount Ida in his prayer to the goddess: *alma parens Idaea deum, cui Dindyma cordi / turrigeraeque urbes biuigique ad frena leones*.

¹⁴⁹ On the ships and their history, see the overview of Smith (1946); Fletcher (2014), 236-43, Fantham (1990) and Hardie (1987) provide further interpretation of the fleet's narrative significance. Hardie (1987), 168-69 notes that the icons on the ship not only point back to the ethnic origins of the Trojans, but also look forward to Rome through Cybele's association in the text with the future city; cf. Harrison (1991), *ad* 10.158.

laeta dedi; nunc sollicitam timor anxius angit. (9.85-89)

The nymph Cymodocea confirms these origins in her speech to Aeneas in 10.230-31: *nos sumus, Idaeae sacro de vertice pinus, / nunc pelagi nymphae, classis tua.*

In light of this background, the sculptures on Aeneas' ship take on heightened significance. They are no idle decorations, but reverent acts of devotion and commemoration that memorialize the fleet's origins and, at the same time, pay homage to a goddess integral to their people's homeland and religious heritage. The figurehead of Ida and the lions is another document of the Trojans' cultural memory, an expression of native symbolism chiseled in pine and affixed to the ship that would bear them to a new land. The single phrase *profugis gratissima Teucris* (158), with the emphasis of a superlative adjective and the Trojans' meaningful description as *profugi*, speaks to the rich significance of these memories to the refugee nation.

Beside these material artifacts of their collective memory, we also see the Trojans preserve certain cultural institutions or practices. A brief example appears in Book 3, when, after landing at Actium, Aeneas' comrades take part in traditional Trojan sports:

ergo insperata tandem tellure potiti
lustramurque Iovi votisque incendimus aras,
Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis.
exercent patrias oleo labente palaestras
nudati socii. (3.278-82)

Participation in these "ancestral" matches expresses Trojan identity through physical performance. In this respect, the sports anticipate the *Lusus Troiae* of Book 5, another performance that reinforces communal solidarity, there through the enactment of a choreographed war-game acted out by the Trojan youth.¹⁵⁰

¹⁵⁰ See Chapter 3, 179-80 for further discussion of the *Lusus Troiae*.

Another traditional practice maintained by the exile community, one of major prominence, is the cult of the Penates, the gods of Troy. The Penates function as patron deities of the state, but their relation to Troy appears even more intimate. In Book 2, when Hector warns Aeneas of Troy's fall, he urges Aeneas to find these gods a new home, which Troy itself entrusts to him:

sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis;
hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
magna pererrato statuas quae denique ponto. (2.293-95)

Here the Penates seem to embody Troy in its essence, appearing as the symbolic expressions of an abstract cultural community. Where the Penates go, there Troy shall be; Aeneas' successful relocation of these gods directly entails the reestablishment of the Trojan state. Juno's early description of Aeneas' mission to Aeolus acknowledges this equation of the gods and the city:

gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat aequor,
Ilium in Italiam portans victosque Penates. (1.67-68)

In this connection it is significant that the Penates themselves, in a dream appearance to Aeneas, provide the first extensive explanation of the nation's destiny, and stress their abidance among the survivors from the time of Troy's demise, through the present moment, and into the future:

nos te Dardania incensa tuaque arma secuti,
nos tumidum sub te permensi classibus aequor,
idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes
imperiumque urbi dabimus. (3.156-59)

From their origins in Italy, in connection with the Trojan founder Dardanus, first springs the notion that Italy is a legitimate Trojan homeland: *hae nobis propriae sedes, hinc Dardanus ortus / Iasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum* (3.167-68).¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ See Casali (2009) on the Penates' origins with Iasius and Dardanus.

The intimate bond between the Penates and the community of Troy clarifies the real significance of the gods' arrival in Latium, an event first highlighted in the proem in tandem with Aeneas' founding of a city: *dum conderet urbem / inferretque deos Latio* (1.5-6). The equation of the Penates with a new Troy also underscores the weight of Aeneas' repeated assertion that he carries Troy's gods with him: *sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penates / classe veho mecum* (1.378-79); *feror exsul in altum / cum sociis natoque, Penatibus et magnis dis* (3.11-12). Once in Italy, the gods maintain a central place in the Trojan conception of their community, from Ilioneus' explanation to Latinus of his people's desire for a city (*dis sedem exiguum patriis...rogamus*, 7.229) to Aeneas' claim on religious authority in Latium should he win the duel with Turnus (*sacra deosque dabo*, 12.192). The Italians resisting Trojan settlement appear cognizant of the consequences of the Penates' importation, for Venulus is to name it among the threats posed by the "invaders" in his overture to Diomedes (*Aenean...victosque penatis / inferre*, 8.11-12). The arrival of Troy's gods with Aeneas correlates directly with the establishment of Troy in Italy, the very outcome that Turnus' forces are working to prevent.

Lastly, Vergil's Trojans also employ their people's memory and identity in direct rhetorical appeals. Though a minor character in the narrative, Mnestheus shows himself a keen practitioner of such rhetoric. During the ship race in Book 5, he galvanizes his men as *Hectorei socii* and *cives*, summoning forth the valor they showed in the war for Troy and their subsequent journeys.¹⁵²

at media socios incedens nave per ipsos
hortatur Mnestheus: "nunc, nunc insurgite remis,
190 Hectorei socii, Troiae quos sorte suprema
delegi comites; nunc illas promite viris,
nunc animos, quibus in Gaetulis Syrtibus usi

¹⁵² Fletcher (2014), 172 situates this speech within a political context: "With its focus on teamwork and leadership, the ship race taps into the 'ship of state' metaphor that was apparent in earlier books." Cf. Feldherr (1995), 253, and 260-61 on Mnestheus' speech; also Dunkle (2005), 162-63 and Glazewski (1972), 91-93.

195 Ionioque mari Maleaeque sequacibus undis.
 non iam prima peto Mnestheus neque vincere certo
 (quamquam o!—sed superent quibus hoc, Neptune, dedisti);
 extremos pudeat rediisse: hoc vincite, cives,
 et prohibete nefas.” (5.188-97)

In Book 9, now in the thick of battle against Turnus’ army, Mnestheus again rouses his fellow warriors to live up to the charge of their homeland, gods, and king:

785 et Mnestheus: “quo deinde fugam, quo tenditis?” inquit.
 “quos alios muros, quaeve ultra moenia habetis?
 unus homo et vestris, o cives, undique saeptus
 aggeribus tantas strages impune per urbem
 ediderit? iuvenum primos tot miserit Orco?
 non infelicis patriae veterumque deorum
 et magni Aeneae, segnes, miseretque pudetque?” (9.781-87)

Aeneas, too, appeals to Trojan identity in his last conversation with Ascanius in the poem. He admonishes him to recall his family as examples of conduct and sources of inspiration, especially his father and the hero Hector.¹⁵³

435 disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem,
 fortunam ex aliis. nunc te mea dextera bello
 defensum dabit et magna inter praemia ducet.
 tu facito, mox cum matura adoleverit aetas,
 sis memor et te animo repetentem exempla tuorum
 440 et pater Aeneas et avunculus excitet Hector. (12.435-40)

In all of these examples, the appeal to identity incites allegiance to the values and character perceived as native to the Trojan people. This type of rhetoric articulates verbally the same argument visually presented in the images of communal heroes or tokens of cultural achievements displayed in public sites, the mementos of *mores maiorum*. Such symbols assert a standard of conduct characteristic of the community at large, a nature exemplified in the deeds of the ancestors; the audience, as the “descendants” and heirs of those past heroes, are exhorted to

¹⁵³ Cf. Seider (2013), 161-67; also Goldschmidt (2013), 149-54.

do likewise.¹⁵⁴ The national heritage invoked in the marble statues of Augustus' Forum advances the same rhetoric here deployed by Mnesteus and Aeneas within the poet's fictional landscape.

The Carthaginians

The Phoenician settlers of North Africa, now erecting the city of Carthage under Dido's leadership, share a collective identity of their own, which they express and transmit through many of the devices described above: ethnonyms and toponyms, visual media, cultural artifacts, and places of memory. Like the Trojans under Aeneas, Dido's community is a nation divorced from its traditional land, the outcome of political violence in their native city of Tyre (1.338-68). Unlike the Trojans, however, Dido's people have already undertaken a new foundation, creating a new homeland in Africa separate from their Phoenician origin. The Carthaginian identity thus encompasses the settlers' new state in North Africa, the site of their communal activity and the focus of their civic allegiance, and the ancestral land of Tyre, the greater source of their cultural memories and ethnic identity.¹⁵⁵

The ethnonym *Poeni* and its related alternatives—*Punici*, *Phoenices* (1.344), and *Phoenissa*, used exclusively of Dido—are the most geographically comprehensive terms for this community, and also the Carthaginian ethnonyms most familiar to Roman readers. Like *Teucri* and *Dardanii*, *Poeni* and its relatives are derived from the name of a founding father, in this case

¹⁵⁴ See esp. Roller (2004) and Goldschmidt (2013), 149-92, with further bibliography on *exempla* in Roman culture; also Chapter 1, 12-13.

¹⁵⁵ Hexter's (1992) analysis of Vergil's Dido engages closely with the representation of Punic culture in the poem, emphasizing the "palpable absence" of authentic history among the Carthaginians; instead, Vergil's Carthage is constructed through the eyes of an imperial Rome that appropriates and conceals foreign culture. Thus, according to Hexter, an authentic "Sidonian Dido" never appears in the poem, and "from the perspective of the poem, there is no such thing as Tyrian history" (358-59). Where Hexter focuses on the absence of genuine Phoenician motifs and ethnographic elements in the *Aeneid*'s depiction of Dido and Carthage, the following survey examines how, where, and for what reasons Vergil's Carthaginians commemorate and appeal to their collective past as it is represented in the poem. On Roman stereotypes about Carthaginians in Vergil's characterization of Dido and her community, see esp. Syed (2005), 143-76 and Horsfall (1990a); Reed (2007), 73-100 gives a nuanced reading of orientalism and ethnic contrast in the depiction of the Carthaginians and Trojans.

Phoenix, the son of Agenor who founded Sidon and gave his name to the Phoenicians.¹⁵⁶ In frequency of usage, however, “Phoenician” is surpassed by “Tyrian” (*Tyrii*), the most common signifier of the Carthaginians, first employed by the narrator at the very start of the poem (*Tyrii coloni*, 1.12). This ethnonym points to a more specific site of origin for Dido’s people, in the city of Tyre from which they fled.¹⁵⁷ Also recurrent is *Sidonii*, a virtual synonym for *Tyrii* derived from neighboring Sidon.¹⁵⁸ In parley with Ilioneus, Dido verbalizes the semantic overlap between the broader ethnic category of “Phoenician” and the narrower civic identity of “Tyrian,” naming her people as Phoenician and their city as Tyrian: *non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora Poeni, / nec tam aversus equos Tyria Sol iungit ab urbe* (1.567-68). When Venus describes Carthage to Aeneas, she, too, identifies the settlement by means of its people’s ethnic and civic origins together, and names the progenitor of Dido’s line: *Punica regna vides, Tyrios et Agenoris urbem* (1.338). Much later, the narrator juxtaposes the Carthaginians’ current and former civic identity in the scene of Dido’s suicide: when rumor spreads of the queen’s mortal wound, her people raise lamentation as if Carthage or Tyre were falling to enemy attack:

non aliter, quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis
Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes
culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum. (4.669-71)

¹⁵⁶ See esp. Mackie (1993) and Hannah (2004), 144-48 on Dido’s ancestry and ancient sources for these figures; also Maltby (2006) s.v. “Punici.”

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Smith (1986), 83-84 on the dynamic between allegiance to city-state and identification with a broader ethnocultural community in ancient societies; also Konstan (2001), concerning Panhellenic and local identities among Greeks. The *Aeneid*’s more frequent usage of *Tyrii* over *Poeni* in referencing the Carthaginians corresponds with historical evidence suggesting that, among Phoenicians, civic identity rooted in autonomous city-states took priority over identification with the larger pan-Phoenician community; see Smith (2009), 46 and (1986), 99-100.

¹⁵⁸ Servius’ comment on 8.165 (on Evander’s origin from the Arcadian Pallantion or Pheneus) uses the example of Dido’s epithets to illustrate the poetic tendency to conflate neighboring cities: *nec nos debet movere quod, cum Evander de Pallanteo sit, dicit ‘Phenei sub moenia,’ cum sciamus poetas vicinas omnes pro uno habere civitates, sicut de Didone facit, quam nonnumquam Tyriam, aliquotiens Sidoniam vocat.*

The veneration of founders and heroes that underpinned the ethnonyms and toponyms of the Trojans does not apply to the Carthaginian settlers, with the exception of *Poeni*, *et al.* derived from Phoenix. The names of Tyre, Sidon, and Carthage, which entered Latin through Greek and the original Phoenician, do not reflect the names of founders or ancestors as do *Troia*, *Ilium*, and *Dardania*.¹⁵⁹ Among Vergil's Carthaginian characters, too, there is no hint that these names resonate with specific historical memories, in contrast to the clear significance of Teucer and Dardanus to the Trojan collective identity within the poem.

The text does, however, attest to an alternative name for Carthage, one attributed to the settlers themselves and linked with the memory of the city's founding. When the disguised Venus recounts to Aeneas the story of Dido's exile, she tells how the queen first acquired and increased the territory of Carthage through the ruse of the oxhide, an anecdote available to Vergil from ethnographic sources.¹⁶⁰ From this event the locals have derived the new city's name:

devenere locos ubi nunc ingentia cernes
moenia surgentemque novae Karthaginis arcem,
mercatique solum, facti de nomine Byrsam,
taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo. (1.365-68)

The name *Byrsa*, Punic for "oxhide," ties the city's identity to a seminal moment in its foundation story, and also to the person of Dido, the founder herself, who in this act set down the first beginnings of the state.¹⁶¹ In this brief anecdote, Vergil shows the Carthaginians already

¹⁵⁹ The name *Karthago*, a Hellenized form of the Phoenician *Qart Hadasht*, simply means "new city." Vergil's recurrent description of Carthage as "new" in *Aeneid* 1 and 4 suggests that he was aware of this etymology; cf. O'Hara (2017), 123-25 and Reed (2007), 129.

¹⁶⁰ See esp. Scheid & Svenbro (1985), 330-31 on pre- and post-Vergilian sources for this story, which include Timaeus, Pompeius Trogus, Livy, and Appian.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Austin (1971), *ad loc.* on the name's historical origin: "the Greek βύρσα means a bull's hide; the Greeks identified with it the Phoenician name for the citadel of Carthage, *Bosra*: and so the aetiological story arose that Virgil follows in 368." Scheid & Svenbro (1985) explore the name and its thematic associations in the text comprehensively; see also Syed (2005), 159-60 and O'Hara (2017), 125; further bibliography in Harrison (1984), 223 n. 131.

building a body of cultural memory around their community's foundation, here preserved in the city's name.

The city's major landmark, the temple of Juno, also engages the identity of the Carthaginian people. The temple's conspicuous size and rich endowments bespeak its prominent stature in the urban landscape:

hic templum Iunoni ingens Sidonia Dido
condebat, donis opulentum et numine divae,
aerea cui gradibus surgebant limina nexaeque
aere trabes, foribus cardo stridebat aënis. (1.446-49)

The temple's description suggests its correlation with the community as a whole: like Carthage itself, the temple is being "founded" under Dido's direction (*Dido* / *condebat*, 446-47), and its construction remains ongoing, as the verb implies. Its façade is further adorned with the murals of scenes from the Trojan War that seize Aeneas' attention (1.453-93).¹⁶² Juno's high prestige as Carthage's chief deity (1.12-18) explains the veneration attached to this site, but the narrator also reveals the temple's direct connection with the city's founding and divine charter. On the spot where the temple is being built, Juno had led the settlers to uncover the head of a horse, understood as a prophetic symbol of the new Carthaginian nation:

¹⁶² Scholarship on the temple murals produced during the last half-century has elaborated their connections with the plot of the *Aeneid* and the characterization of Aeneas; see esp. Putnam (1998), 23-54, and Ganniban (2008), 69 for further bibliography. From another interpretive standpoint, the artistic program invites speculation as to why Dido and her settlers should decorate the temple of Juno with scenes that reflect discernibly neither their own communal history nor their own worship of Juno. For Hexter (1992), 353-59, the incongruity of Trojan War scenes on a Phoenician temple exemplifies and exposes the Roman suppression of Carthaginian identity occurring within the poem. Barchiesi (1999), 336-38, on the other hand, has advanced an interpretation that links Juno with the Trojan War to account for the Carthaginians' choice of design: "The Carthaginians want to honour Juno, patron of the new city, persecutor of Troy. The pictures commemorate the victory of the Greeks—and of Juno—and it is a touching mistake by Aeneas...to see them as a tribute to the tragedy of Troy" (336). Barchiesi sees the conduit for the settlers' knowledge of the war as Teucer, brother of Ajax, who met Dido's father Belus (1.619-26), and speculates that their interest in Troy may stem from perceived similarities between their new city in North Africa and the Asian Troy: "A city which is powerful but isolated in a vast land ripe for colonisation has struggled to survive against the competition of Greek cities: exactly the fate that awaits Carthage. The violent end of Troy might be a warning, rather than a model for conquest. Isolated in Africa, as Troy was in Asia, the Carthaginians are predestined to compete with the Greeks... The failure of the Trojans is an important message for the new city which must escape future invasions" (338).

lucus in urbe fuit media, laetissimus umbrae,
quo primum iactati undis et turbine Poeni
effodere loco signum, quod regia Iuno
monstrarat, caput acris equi; sic nam fore bello
egregiam et facilem victu per saecula gentem. (1.441-45)

This story creatively engages with real Punic tradition, as the horse's head was an historically-attested political symbol of the Carthaginian state, appearing on official coinage.¹⁶³ For Vergil's characters, the temple built over the site of the head's discovery both signifies the active favor of their patron goddess over the settlement, and commemorates the moment when Juno revealed the community's destiny as a great nation. The temple is the heart of the city's religious life, but also a place of memory that marks a decisive event in its foundation narrative.

In tandem with its roles as a site of memory and a religious center, the temple also serves as a seat of government. It is here that Aeneas' men first catch sight of Dido holding court, transacting the business of state on the temple's steps:

tum foribus divae, media testudine templi,
saepa armis solioque alte subnixa resedit.
iura dabat legesque viris, operumque laborem
partibus aequabat iustis aut sorte trahebat. (1.505-508)

The connection between political and religious centers and the cultivation of the shared past, on which I commented in the previous section, is fully actualized in the institution of Juno's temple. In this public space, communal identity, political power, and religious devotion form a mutually-reinforcing program. The queen takes up her high seat at the doors of the temple, ruling under the goddess' sign in a show of authority and legitimacy.¹⁶⁴ The significance of the site to

¹⁶³ See Bayet (1941); also McCartney (1927).

¹⁶⁴ Ganniban (2008), *ad* 1.505 notes the echo of Roman senatorial practice in the image of Dido conducting political business at the foot of a temple; cf. also Augustus' triumphant appearance on Aeneas' shield, seated before the temple of Palatine Apollo (8.720-22). See Reed (2007), 142-43 on Roman elements in the characterization of Dido and Carthage.

communal identity contextualizes the political acts of the queen and her court within the ongoing narrative of the city's history, and commemorates its divine charter under Juno's auspices. Further, the prominence of the temple in civic life shows due devotion to the city's patron goddess, who is herself a focus of unity among the Carthaginian people.

Although Dido is the sole founder of this new community, and a cult of veneration has not yet developed around her memory, there is more to say about the presence of ancestors and heroic founders in the culture of the Tyrian settlers, through the memory of Dido's own descent from past Phoenician kings. Venus first refers to the city as *Agenoris urbs* (1.338) after Dido's distant ancestor Agenor, whose son Phoenix was the eponymous ancestor of the Phoenician race.¹⁶⁵ We hear nothing of Agenor or Phoenix from the Carthaginians themselves, but two notable passages in the text confirm the public display of Dido's elite ancestry. Both passages occur during the state banquet she holds for the Trojans, a fitting context for political self-representation. First, among the decorations set out for the feast, the narrator calls attention to an *ingens argentum*, presumably a silver plate, decorated with a pictorial narrative of the *res gestae* of Dido's ancestors, dating back to the earliest days of her people:¹⁶⁶

ingens argentum mensis, caelataque in auro
fortia facta patrum, series longissima rerum
per tot ducta viros antiqua ab origine gentis. (1.640-42)

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Mackie (1993).

¹⁶⁶ For an alternative approach to this artifact, see Hexter (1992), 358-59, who calls attention to the medium of the silver plate as an indicator of the poem's suppression of authentic Punic culture: "This is just enough for us to think of Tyrian history as a possible category, but we can hardly help noting that this is the vaguest and most generalized history possible...the events are neither presented as a moving pageant, cast in bronze nor embossed on arms but rather chased in dishes and platters (luxury goods)."

Second, Dido employs a chalice that once belonged to Belus and his forebears in a formal religious and diplomatic gesture:¹⁶⁷ taking this cup, she utters aloud a prayer invoking Jupiter Hospitalis, Bacchus, and Juno, and offers a libation for the feast:

730 hic regina gravem gemmis auroque poposcit
 implevitque mero pateram, quam Belus et omnes
 a Belo soliti; tum facta silentia tectis:
 “Iuppiter, hospitibus nam te dare iura loquuntur,
 hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis
 esse velis, nostrosque huius meminisse minores.
 adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator et bona Iuno;
 735 et vos o coetum, Tyrii, celebrate faventes.” (1.728-35)

Both visual artifacts in Dido’s keeping speak to the succession of the current sovereign from her predecessors in an unbroken line of descent, articulating a claim to legitimacy and an intimation of the queen’s own heroic character. In the ancestral cup, readers of epic are reminded of the scepter of Agamemnon, another symbol of authority and lineage passed down through a royal house (*Iliad* 2.100-108).¹⁶⁸ Like the scepter, Dido’s use of the ancestral chalice visually asserts a continuum between past Phoenician rulers and her present reign. The great silver dish, on the other hand, stands as a visual equivalent of an epic poem, a device that serves not only to delight its audience and display artistic prowess, but also to transmit social values and construct communal identity through collective memory. Taking this connection further, we are reminded of Servius’ judgment that the *Aeneid* was written in part to praise Augustus through narrating the valiant feats of his ancestors (*Augustum laudare a parentibus*, *Aen.* 1 *pref.*), a rhetorical goal analogous to that of Dido’s plate. In the context of this banquet, a diplomatic function between Phoenicians and Trojans, both plate and chalice articulate with special pointedness the illustrious

¹⁶⁷ According to Servius (*ad* 1.729), this Belus is not the father of Dido mentioned in 1.619-26, but a much earlier ancestor; see Mackie (1993), 231 and Hannah (2004), 145-46.

¹⁶⁸ Dido’s chalice also anticipates the libation vessel of Anchises later pledged to Latinus by the Trojans (*hoc pater Anchises auro libabat ad aras*, 7.245); both are formal ritual devices emblematic of the wielder’s authority.

antiquity of Dido's line, and the continuity of the refugee community's Phoenician traditions in their new country.

The cultivation of the past, then, is active in Dido's new city, though Carthage's identity remains as much Phoenician as properly Carthaginian; the city has not yet had time to develop a deep repository of unique traditions rooted in its North African homeland. An interesting epilogue to this discussion is found in Silius Italicus' later epic on the Second Punic War, *Punica*, a work steeped in the literary conventions and narrative world of the *Aeneid*. Situating his epic centuries after the events treated in *Aeneid*, at the time of Hannibal's childhood, Silius offers a glimpse into Carthage's future development that extrapolates the beginnings of Carthaginian memory drawn by Vergil. The young Hannibal takes the famous oath to exact vengeance on Rome in a temple evidently modeled after the palace of Picus in *Aeneid* 7, discussed below. This site is decorated with the images of Carthaginian ancestors, most prominently that of the founder Dido:

urbe fuit media sacrum genetricis Elissae
manibus et patria Tyriis formidine cultum,
quod taxi circum et piceae squalentibus umbris
abdiderant caelique arcebant lumine, templum.
85 hoc sese, ut perhibent, curis mortalibus olim
exuerat regina loco. stant marmore maesto
effigies, Belusque parens omnisque nepotum
a Belo series, stat gloria gentis Agenor
et qui longa dedit terris cognomina Phoenix.
90 ipsa sedet tandem aeternum coniuncta Sychaeo.
ante pedes ensis Phrygius iacet, ordine centum
stant arae caelique deis Ereboque potenti. (*Pun.* 1.81-92)

In the center of Carthage stood a temple, sacred to the spirit of Elissa, the foundress, and regarded with hereditary awe by the people. Round it stood yew-trees and pines with their melancholy shade, which hid it and kept away the light of heaven. Here, as it was reported, the queen had cast off long ago the ills that flesh is heir to. Statues of mournful marble stood there—Belus, the founder of the race, and all the line descended from Belus; Agenor also, the nation's boast, and Phoenix who gave a lasting name to his country. There Dido herself was seated, at last united for ever

to Sychaeus; and at her feet lay the Trojan sword. A hundred altars stood here in order, sacred to the gods of heaven and the lord of Erebus.¹⁶⁹

Dedicated to the veneration of Dido, now hailed as *genetrix* of her people, the temple stands in the very center of the city (81), and elicits the “ancestral reverence” of the Carthaginians (82). It is erected on the site where the queen had ended her life (85-86), a location that evokes collective mourning. The images of Phoenician ancestors in the temple—Belus and a series of unnamed descendants, Agenor, and Phoenix—rely on Vergilian precedent; all of these forefathers appear in the text of the *Aeneid*, in the dialogue of the characters or in connection with Dido’s plate and chalice. These figures are pointedly described as communal ancestors, of whom the Carthaginian people are the perceived descendants and heirs (*parens*, 87; *gloria gentis*, 88); the ethnonyms *Poenus* and *Punicus* are here explicitly traced to the name of Phoenix (89). Foremost among the statues is the image of Dido, eternally joined to her Phoenician husband Sychaeus, a scene that evokes for readers of Vergil the queen’s last appearance in *Aeneid* 6.450-76. Displayed at Dido’s feet is the “Phrygian sword” (91), a dark reminder of Aeneas’ ancient crime, the instrument of the founder’s death; Silius’ use of the Vergilian ethnic slur *Phrygius* captures the contempt of Carthaginian onlookers.

The temple’s significance, placement, and sculptural program all mark it as a site of memory, a place for the cultivation of Carthaginian identity through the celebration of founders and ancestors and the grim commemoration of the queen’s demise. Silius’ employment of this temple as the location of Hannibal’s oath to repay Roman injustices against his people (*Pun.* 1.113-19) further reinforces the cultural import of the site: Hannibal accepts the mantle of leadership under the gaze of the ancestors and the weight of his people’s long history, fulfilling the curse of Vergil’s Dido as the avenger of Carthage (4.625-27). Silius’ vision of a developed

¹⁶⁹ Trans. Duff (1934).

Carthage with a rich deposit of cultural memory relies upon Vergilian precedent (the palace of Picus) and the veneration of founders that is already evident, in embryonic form, in the Carthage of *Aeneid* 1.¹⁷⁰ As a careful reader and emulator of the *Aeneid*, Silius shows marked awareness of Vergil's programmatic expression of collective memory within his fictionalized communities, reproducing the form and features of its cultivation, as well as its capacity to inspire solidarity and action among members of those communities.

The Latins

In the poem's second half, the Trojans encounter more ethnic groups in Vergil's primeval Italy, first among them the Latins. These people, too, are seen to cultivate collective memories of their founding, their kings, and their communal achievements and character. The Latin state under King Latinus contains more evidence for these practices than the Trojan or Carthaginian communities, largely because this city, with its public spaces and civic institutions, is still standing (unlike Troy) and has endured through multiple generations (unlike Carthage), permitting an accumulation of cultural traditions and a fuller apparatus for their promotion.

The main ethnic names employed by the Latins for themselves and their territory—*Latini* and *Latium*—are rooted in the most prominent narrative in their cultural memory: Saturn's flight from heaven and habitation in Latium, where he presided over a Golden Age.¹⁷¹ Saturn's integral connection to Latium is widely known among the inhabitants of Vergil's epic world,

¹⁷⁰ More mementos of Carthaginian memory appear later in Silius' text (*Pun.* 2.406-52), outside of Carthage's urban landscape. During Hannibal's siege of Saguntum, he receives as gifts a breastplate and shield, both modeled after the Vergilian shield of Aeneas. The breastplate depicts Dido directing Carthage's construction, the discovery of the horse's head in the earth, and the queen's kind reception of the shipwrecked Aeneas; the shield presents a wider panorama of Carthaginian history, beginning with the affair of Dido and Aeneas and the queen's suicide, and closing with Hannibal himself at Saguntum.

¹⁷¹ Within the world of the poem, Latinus' own name also seems to be derived from this source. Outside of the *Aeneid*, however, it is Latinus who appears as the region's eponymous founder, from whom the names *Latini* and *Latium* are derived; cf. Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.45, and Latinus' earlier appearance in Hesiod, *Theogony* 1011-13.

acknowledged by the Italian immigrant Diomedes in his diplomatic dispatch to the Latins in Book 11 (*Saturnia regna*, 11.252), as well as the Tyrian Dido, who in Book 1 refers to the country as *Saturnia arva* (1.569). The fullest iteration of the story is provided not by the Latins but by Evander, another resident of Latium familiar with the tradition:

320 primus ab aetherio venit Saturnus Olympo
 arma Iovis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis.
 is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis
 composuit legesque dedit, Latiumque vocari
 maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris.
 aurea quae perhibent illo sub rege fuere
 325 saecula: sic placida populos in pace regebat.
 deterior donec paulatim ac decolor aetas
 et belli rabies et amor successit habendi. (8.319-27)

Evander's account etymologizes the region's name, revealing that the word *Latium* itself serves a commemorative function, recalling the god's hiding there (*latuisset*).¹⁷² Emphasizing even more the commemorative subtext of the name, Saturn is said to have imposed it on the land himself (*Latium vocari / maluit*, 322-23) as a memorial of his presence there. The acts of civilization attributed to Saturn by Evander place Saturn squarely in the role of a founder and lawgiver, making his period of "hiding" in Italy a founding event that represents, in the minds of Latium's inhabitants, the genesis of their community as it now exists.

Commentators have noted some discrepancy between Evander's and Latinus' accounts of Saturn's reign. Where Evander attributes to the god the activities of synoicism and lawgiving (*is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis / composuit legesque dedit*, 321-22), and shows that the Golden Age has decisively ended (326-27), Latinus' version, narrated to the Trojan embassy in Book 7, focuses on the present state of affairs in Latium, stressing the natural virtue of the people Saturn created, free from the force of law:

ne fugite hospitium, neve ignorete Latinos

¹⁷² Cf. O'Hara (2017), 207-208; also Lee-Stecum (2008), 71-72.

Saturni gentem haud vinclo nec legibus aequam,
sponte sua veterisque dei se more tenentem. (7.202-204)

Latinus' omission of Saturn's lawgiving can be explained, at least in part, as a reflection of Latin self-representation. In the context of the diplomatic exchange, Latinus articulates a collective identity for the Latins based on the premier tradition of their past, projecting an image of a people still living in the Saturnian Golden Age.¹⁷³ The "Golden Age ideology" Latinus constructs here corresponds with a larger program of cultural identity among the Latins. The palace of Picus houses a visual narrative of Latin history that idealizes rusticity and native virtue, filled with the *imagines* of ancient kings carved from old cedar (*antiqua e cedro*, 7.178), whose ranks include the vinedresser Sabinus, armed with a pruning hook, alongside Saturn. Through verbal artistry, the poet reinforces the equation of Saturn's reign of agrarian peace with Latinus' through the nearly exact repetition of a phrase describing their tenures: *urbes...placidas in pace regebat* (7.46) of Latinus, *placida populos in pace regebat* (8.325) of Saturn.¹⁷⁴ The Saturnian narrative that Latinus expresses to the Trojan embassy emphasizes the continuity of the Golden Age into the present time, a notion that resonates with the core themes of Latin cultural identity.¹⁷⁵ The name *Latini*, evoking memory of the god and his Golden Age in the very act of self-definition, is part and parcel of this same claim to a rustically pure and innately virtuous ethnic character.

¹⁷³ Cf. Bleisch (2003), 101-102, Thomas (1982), 101, and Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.203 ("It is unhelpful to think in terms of a Latium that has somehow maintained the justice inculcated by its divine benefactor...though Saturn's Golden Age is in other aspects over; rather, Latinus speaks with a ruler's national pride in his people, whom he claims are just without the necessity of obedience to laws."). On the contradictory evidence for war, laws, and authority in Vergil's Latium, see 121-22 below.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.46 for a nuanced view of this equation.

¹⁷⁵ See also 121 below on the discrepant accounts of Saturn's activity, and 109-11 on Saturn in Latinus' diplomatic rhetoric. Through the mythic paradigm of Saturn's overthrow by Jupiter, the respective alignments of Latinus and Aeneas with these gods foreshadow violence between their peoples; see Thomas (2004-2005).

Latini is not the only ethnonym by which the region's inhabitants understand themselves, nor is Saturn the only founder to bestow upon them a new name. The second ethnonym of the Latin people, *Laurentes*, is similarly charged with the themes of founding, memory, and divine favor, and also imposed by the community's leader, this time Latinus himself. Vergil traces the name's origin to a sacred laurel tree discovered by the king on the site of his new palace:¹⁷⁶

laurus erat tecti medio in penetralibus altis
sacra comam multosque metu servata per annos,
quam pater inventam, primas cum conderet arces,
ipse ferebatur Phoebos sacrasse Latinus,
Laurentisque ab ea nomen posuisse colonis. (7.59-63)

The religious, cultural, and political importance of this laurel contextualizes its role as the site of the first omen Latinus receives that portends the Trojans' arrival, in which bees swarm the tree (7.64-70, cited in part below). The tree's dedication to Apollo witnesses not only to the god's association with laurel, but also the prophetic arts which Latinus' father Faunus, now divinized (*Laurenti divo*, 12.769), practices through his own oracular cult (7.81-91). Apollo's attribute as a patron of civic foundation, for which he is widely famous inside and outside of the poem, applies here as well, for Latinus discovered the tree while establishing his citadel (*primas cum conderet arces*, 61).¹⁷⁷ The location of the laurel's preserve, now in the inner sanctum of the palace (*in penetralibus altis*, 59), attests to its symbolic importance in the Latin community. The omen of the bees further demonstrates its value as a Latin symbol, as the meaning divined from the portent suggests. As the bees swarm the tree's top, the seer links the physical form of the laurel with the structure of the Latin state, reading the tree as a metaphorical double of the community:

continuo vates "externum cernimus" inquit

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Rosivach (1980), 146-47 on the ambiguity of this building's identity relative to the palace of Picus described in 7.170-91. On the sacred laurel, see Boas (1938), 96-134, who treats its appearance in the *Aeneid* and the general associations of laurel trees in Italian culture; also Horsfall (2000), *ad loc.*

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Angelova (2015), 39-40.

“adventare virum et partis petere agmen easdem
partibus ex isdem et summa dominarier arce.” (7.68-70)

The laurel thus has multiple dimensions of significance in Vergil’s Latium: it is an artifact of cultural memory, an emblem of Latin identity, a memorial to the citadel’s founding by Latinus, and a witness to Apollo’s patronage of the state. The Latins’ self-definition as *Laurentes*, “the people of the laurel,” becomes, in the poet’s rendering, a rich expression of local memory and identity.

Latinus himself embodies an important link to Latium’s cultural memory, for he claims direct descent from the founder and patron god Saturn, the figure who is paramount in the memory of the Latin people.¹⁷⁸ Saturn is remembered as both the founder of the race and progenitor of Latium’s ruling line (*ultimus auctor*, 7.49), and is Latinus’ paternal great-grandfather (7.47-49). While Saturnian ancestry alone grants Latinus semi-divine stature, his father Faunus also became a *divus* (7.81-91, 12.769).

Latinus’ pedigree gains further luster from the line of his apparent grandmother, the witch Circe, named as Picus’ *coniunx* (7.189-91).¹⁷⁹ Through Circe’ parentage, Latinus can also claim semi-divinity in his direct descent from the Sun. Although Saturn remains the more prominent of his two forefathers owing to that god’s importance in the memory of his people, Latinus advertises his descent from the Sun at two junctures, both in politically significant contexts. The first occurs in Book 7. In exchange for the Trojan regalia promised by Ilioneus during the

¹⁷⁸ On Latinus’ genealogy, see esp. Rosivach (1980), Moorton (1988), and Bleisch (2003).

¹⁷⁹ It is disputed among critics whether Circe is to be interpreted as a part of Latinus’ ancestry. Horsfall and others argue against her identification as Latinus’ grandmother; cf. Horsfall (2000), *ad loc.* See esp. Moorton (1988), 253-54 on this dispute, with whom I agree in understanding Latinus to be Circe’s descendant. Bleisch (2003), 105-108 discusses Latinus’ Circean genealogy from a literary-critical standpoint. Note also the alternative account of Hesiod, who names Latinus as the child of Odysseus and Circe (*Theogony* 1011-1013).

diplomatic audience, Latinus gifts the embassy with fine steeds bred, through Circe's intervention, from the horses of the Sun:

omnibus extemplo Teucris iubet ordine duci
instratos ostro alipedes pictisque tapetis
(aurea pectoribus demissa monilia pendent,
tecti auro fulvum mandunt sub dentibus aurum),
280 absenti Aeneae currum geminosque iugalis
 semine ab aetherio spirantis naribus ignem,
 illorum de gente patri quos daedala Circe
 supposita de matre nothos furata creavit. (7.276-83)

The horses represent a family heirloom, signifying Latinus' descent through Circe and Picus, and ultimately, from the Sun, from whose stable they originate.¹⁸⁰ Latinus' gift is therefore a fitting answer to the Trojan pledge of treasures from Troy, discussed above: where the political and religious regalia of Anchises and Priam speak to the heritage of the Trojan people, Latinus' gift stands for the illustrious pedigree of his own house.

Latinus' solar ancestry comes to the fore a second time in the poem's final book, at the sealing of the truce between the Italian and Trojan armies. Latinus takes the field alongside Turnus wearing a golden helmet emblematic of the sun:¹⁸¹

interea reges ingenti mole Latinus
quadriiugo vehitur curru (cui tempora circum
aurati bis sex radii fulgentia cingunt,
Solis avi specimen), bigis it Turnus in albis,
bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro. (12.161-65)

The helmet's description as a *specimen* stresses the visual dimension of the display, whereby Latinus shows himself as the visible double of his divine ancestor, as if appearing *in persona*.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Bleich (2003), 106; Moorton (1988), 253-54.

¹⁸¹ On the controversy over Latinus' solar lineage in this passage, particularly concerning the word *avus*, see Moorton (1988), 256-59, with whom I agree in taking *avus* to mean here not strictly 'grandfather,' but 'ancestor.'

¹⁸² He also wields the scepter of the "Latin fathers" (12.206-211), another token of civic authority. Cf. Tarrant (2012), *ad loc.* on this passage's close engagement with Achilles' oath in *Il.* 1.234-39.

The choice of emphasizing his solar ancestry is fitting in the context of a truce, where, in literary convention, speakers frequently invoke the sun as an all-seeing witness.¹⁸³ Suggestive of this connection, Aeneas then opens his speech with an appeal to the sun (*esto nunc Sol testis et haec mihi terra vocanti*, 12.176).¹⁸⁴ In this case, Vergil's creative choice to have Latinus stress this ancestry at the truce pertains to the setting of the scene. The solar helmet promotes Latinus' authority and prestige as a demigod, but also, more pointedly, aligns his person with a divine guarantor of battlefield truces.

The epicenter for the commemoration of Latium's cultural memory is the palace of Picus, the site where Latinus initially receives the Trojan embassy. While the building is shown to serve the functions typical of a civic space, its communal importance surpasses that of an ordinary public building: it is, as Bleisch terms it, "a sacred political space."¹⁸⁵ Like the context of the temple of Juno and the banquet hall in Carthage, so in Latium the palace of Picus is the location of the main political and religious organs of the state, as well as the storehouse of the Latins' ethnic history. I quote its description in full:

170 Tectum augustum, ingens, centum sublime columnis
 urbe fuit summa, Laurentis regia Pici,
 horrendum silvis et religione parentum.
 hic sceptrā accipere et primos attollere fascis
 regibus omen erat; hoc illis curia templum,
 175 hae sacris sedes epulis; hic ariete caeso
 perpetuis soliti patres considerare mensis.
 quin etiam veterum effigies ex ordine avorum
 antiqua e cedro, Italusque paterque Sabinus
 vitisator curvam servans sub imagine falcem,
 180 Saturnusque senex Ianique bifrontis imago

¹⁸³ Cf. the opening of Agamemnon's speech at the truce in *Il.* 3.276-80 (Ἡελίος θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις, 277); see also Tarrant (2012), *ad* 12.176, Galinsky (1969b), Fontenrose (1968), and Zeitlin (1965) on the oaths of Latinus and Aeneas.

¹⁸⁴ Galinsky (1969b), 458 further reads Aeneas' invocation as a *captatio benevolentiae* directed at Latinus, the Sun's own descendant.

¹⁸⁵ Bleisch (2003), 97; also Rosivach (1980), 147-48 on the building's identification as a *regia*.

vestibulo astabant, aliique ab origine reges,
 Martiaque ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi.
 multaque praeterea sacris in postibus arma,
 captivi pendent currus curvaeque secures
 185 et cristae capitum et portarum ingentia claustra
 spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis.
 ipse Quirinali lituo parvaque sedebat
 succinctus trabea laevaue ancile gerebat
 Picus, equum domitor, quem capta cupidine coniunx
 190 aurea percussum virga versumque venenis
 fecit avem Circe sparsitque coloribus alas. (7.170-91)

In this presentation of Picus' palace, the construction of the city's founder,¹⁸⁶ the elements of authority, memory, and identity exist in close communication. The portraits of royal ancestors adorning the space simultaneously promote the lineage of the ruling house through its representatives, as well as provide a narrative of Latium's people through its heroic exemplars reaching back to the time before Saturn's age. The practice of ancestral *imagines* in the homes of Roman elites, or the statues and inscriptions decorating the Forum of Augustus are analogous, both in form and function, to these decorations in the fictive state of ancient Latium.¹⁸⁷ The memorials of war heroes and spoils visually assert the identity of the Latin people, articulating their valor and exemplifying their communal values. In these roles, the display corresponds with Anthony Smith's characterization of war memorials in ethnic states:

The mobilisation of armies, the ravages of war on the countryside, the heroic feats of battle, the sacrifice of kinsmen and the myths and memories of ethnic resistance and expansion all help to define and crystallise ethnic communities. Sacrifice and myths of war are particularly effective in creating the consciousness and sentiments of mutual dependence and exclusiveness, which reinforce the shared culture, memories, and myths of common ancestry that together define a sense of ethnic community.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Rosivach (1980), 146-47.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Chapter 1, 41-43; Flower (1996).

¹⁸⁸ Smith (2009), 27-28.

Vergil's text underscores Latinus' own participation in this program by bookending the ecphrasis with virtually the same two images of the king seated on the throne of his ancestors: (*solio medius consedit avito*, 7.169; *patriaue Latinus / sede sedens*, 7.192-93). The living display of Latinus himself, the current chief of Latium who rules in continuation of his heroic lineage, becomes a focal point of the narrative history elaborated through the palace's decoration, joining past with present.¹⁸⁹ Thus Rosivach describes the argumentative quality of the whole scene:

...as we pass from the ancestors to those 'Martia...ob patriam pugnando vulnera passi' (182) we meet what should be purely civic monuments, but in the context created by the portraits of Latinus' ancestors we in some way sense that Latinus and the Latins are similarly related to these heroes as well, that the same spirit which dwelt in the heroes now dwells in them, and that the trophies of the heroes' triumphs affixed to the *regia* (183ff.) are not simply symbols of past grandeur but also an index of the present capacities of Latinus and his people.¹⁹⁰

All of these objects and images are emblems of ethnic pride, instantiations of cultural myth, evidence of political legitimacy, and visual *exempla* for the actions of current kings, magistrates, and citizens who participate in the life of the community.

The Latin palace of Picus and the Carthaginian temple of Juno share strong similarities. Both sites are constructions of the city's founders (Picus and Dido), serve both religious and political functions, and play a communal role as a locus of cultural memory—the palace through the displays inside it, and the temple of Juno through its location at the place where the horse's head, the new symbol of Carthage, was discovered. Vergil's depictions of these public buildings as focal points for the cultivation of memory fully accord with real commemorative practices in ancient societies. We have already noted the Roman Forum as an urban space where cultural

¹⁸⁹ In connection with Latinus' example of self-representation through display of lineage in public spaces, we might also read the Libyan king Iarbas as undertaking a similar project. The Libyan capital is distinguished by the countless shrines to Jupiter erected there by Iarbas, and the immense scale of its worship (4.199-202); while an exhibition of the king's piety, this is also, arguably, a display of his power and legitimacy, as Iarbas is Jupiter's own son (*Hammone satus*, 4.198).

¹⁹⁰ Rosivach (1980), 150.

memory and the political order were jointly promoted. For the palace of Picus, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline has been suggested as an immediate analogue, another public space where religious reverence, state authority, and core social traditions were concentrated.¹⁹¹

The palace of Picus, then, is the combined political, religious, and cultural epicenter of the Latin people, the place where the deeds and virtues of generations past are commemorated and continued in the present business of state. Advertising the divine descent of the king and the heroic character of the Latins, this building is a museum of the cultural memories, values, traditions, symbols, and examples that comprise the Latin ethnic identity. The display of these elements contextualizes the public assemblies, rituals of authority, religious practices, and diplomatic engagements said to take place there (7.173-76), informing and orienting the communal activity of the Latin state.

The Arcadians

In Book 8, Aeneas is introduced to the Arcadians, the people who, under Evander's leadership, fled their native land to found a new city on the future site of Rome. Evander's own status, phrased in his provocative epithet *Romanae conditor arcis* (8.313), reflects the double perspective at work in this context, as Evander is founder of both his own Arcadian community and, proleptically, of the future home of the Roman people. The perspectival layering of these two communities—the present Pallanteum and the future Rome—deepens the analysis of cultural memory among the Arcadians.

The exploration of an early Rome in this book provides arguably the clearest expression of a phenomenon with which this dissertation is primarily concerned: how the discourses of

¹⁹¹ Cf. Rosivach (1980), 148-49, with references.

cultural memory outside of the poem, especially in the milieu of Augustan Rome, are mirrored inside of the poem in the actions and beliefs of the ethnic communities that populate the *Aeneid*'s poetic microcosm and preserve their own collective pasts. Two levels of interpretation exist side-by-side in the description of Pallanteum: one focalized through Vergil's contemporary Roman readership, the other through Vergil's characters within the dramatic narrative. In the poem's presentation of a primeval forerunner to the modern city, the cultural perspectives of Roman readers and the epic's fictional characters merge into closest alignment, for in this setting their perspectives pertain to the same landscape and monuments, sometimes even to the same significance behind them. In presenting the site of early Rome, Vergil taps into the memories of contemporary Romans, but also contextualizes the traditions of Pallanteum within the cultural memory of the fictionalized Arcadians themselves.¹⁹² The presentation thus engages both groups, those outside of the poem and those within it, the real and the literary, on parallel planes, mirroring their responses to the same cultural monuments along a shared axis.

We can begin once more with the names by which the Arcadians define themselves. The precise circumstances of the Arcadians' migration from Greece remains shadowy in Vergil's account: Evander merely says that he was "driven from his homeland" (*me pulsum patria*, 8.333).¹⁹³ Whatever the cause of that expulsion, the immigrants' shared geographic origin constitutes the primary tool of self-definition at their disposal: *Arcades* is virtually the only ethnic signifier used of their people. Evander himself is once referred to as "Parrhasian," (*Parrhasio Euandro*, 11.31) a term derived from the Arcadian region of Parrhasia and employed

¹⁹² Cf. Papaioannou (2003), 688-89, who remarks on Vergil's depiction of Pallanteum as a community with a history of its own, independent of its Roman future: "Proto-Rome is a historical landmark; it has a past that can actually be traced, and a future that will be fulfilled" (688).

¹⁹³ See Papaioannou (2003), 691-94 and Lee-Stecum (2008), 72-74 on ancient sources for Evander's emigration.

as a virtual synonym for Arcadia itself, much like *Sidonii* of Dido's Tyrian Phoenicians; it is also applied, in its only other attestation in the poem, to a native epithet for the Arcadian Pan (*Lupercal / Parrhasio dictum Panos de more Lycae*, 8.343-44). When Evander wakes on the morning after Aeneas' arrival in Pallanteum, he girds himself with a "Tegean sword" (*Tegeaeum subligat ensem*, 8.459) that bespeaks his Arcadian origin. Most broadly, the Arcadians are Greeks: the Sibyl foretells to Aeneas that aid in Italy will come "from a Greek city" (*Graia pandetur ab urbe*, 6.96-97) in reference to the Arcadian settlement; Aeneas himself, in high style, greets Evander as *optime Graiugenum* (8.127), and recognizes his relation, as a Greek, to the Atreidae (*non equidem extimui Danaum quod ductor et Arcas / quodque a stirpe fores geminis coniunctus Atridis*, 8.129-30). But this identifier is limited in application to the Arcadians, occurring only in these two instances. As with the Carthaginians, whose particular origin from Tyre is invoked more frequently than their general Phoenician ethnicity, the more precise identity of "Arcadian" prevails over the wider ethnic category of "Greek." Lastly, Evander himself is unique in self-identifying not only as an Arcadian (*Arcadii...regis*, 8.573), but also as an "Italian" in one instance (*Itali...diximus*, 8.331-32), making him the only character in the poem to espouse with explicit force an identity as an *Italus*; this detail is further explored in the dissertation's fourth chapter.¹⁹⁴

While the ethnonyms in use among the settlers only signify geographic origins, the name of their new city, Pallanteum, has special resonance with their communal past. The city's name works on the two levels of interpretation outlined at the beginning of this section: for Roman readers, it represents an etymological aetiology for the Roman Palatine Hill;¹⁹⁵ for the

¹⁹⁴ On Evander as an Italian and the use of *Italus* as an ethnic signifier, see Chapter 4, 198-200, 223.

¹⁹⁵ See esp. O'Hara (2017), 202, with further references.

fictionalized Arcadians, the name Pallanteum, and the figure behind it, reveal multiple points of contact between the current settlement on the Tiber and the Arcadians' memory of their origins.

The city's name derives from an eponymous founder, Pallas, as Tiberinus informs Aeneas:

Arcades his oris, genus a Pallante profectum,
qui regem Euandrum comites, qui signa secuti,
delegere locum et posuere in montibus urbem
Pallantis proavi de nomine Pallanteum. (8.51-54)

The fact that Evander's own son Pallas was evidently named in honor of this founding ancestor attests to a deep significance attached to his memory.¹⁹⁶

Servius (*ad* 8.51, 54) further clarifies the identity of this ancestor in Vergil's account, in contrast to competing traditions about Evander from Varro and others. According to Servius, the Vergilian Pallas, from whom the Arcadian immigrants derive their community's name, is Evander's grandfather. Moreover, ancient tradition identified the Arcadian town from which Evander and his people first emigrated to Italy as another "Pallanteum" (Gr. Pallantion), the original foundation of the eponymous ancestor Pallas.¹⁹⁷ The naming of the Italian Pallanteum in the *Aeneid*, newly planted on the banks of the Tiber by the exile community, therefore has dual meaning for Vergil's Arcadian community: it invokes the memory of their revered ancestor and communal founder, and also directly reproduces the name of their original Greek homeland, symbolically transferring identity from their former city to their current one.¹⁹⁸ Evander rules in

¹⁹⁶ The association of Pallas' name with an ancestor and founder parallels the case of Ascanius' alternative name, Iulus: Vergil's Jupiter mentions that Ascanius' name had been "Ilus" prior to Troy's fall (1.267-68), surely after the Trojan king Ilus, the namesake of "Ilium." On this etymology, cf. O'Hara (2017), 90, 121. The names of Ilioneus and the princess Ilione (whose scepter is presented to Dido in 1.653-54) also appear to be derived from Ilus and Ilium.

¹⁹⁷ Livy (1.5.1), Dionysius (*Rom. Ant.* 1.31.1), and Pausanias (8.43.1-2, 44.5) attest to this identification, and Servius endorses it (*ad* 8.165). See O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*) and Gransden (1976), *ad* 8.51. In *Aen.* 8.165, Evander refers to his boyhood home as Pheneus, a town neighboring the Arcadian Pallantion; Servius regards this as a typical poetic conflation of neighboring cities (see n. 158 above).

¹⁹⁸ In renewing the name Pallanteum in their Italian city, the Arcadians mirror the behavior of the exiled Trojans: in Book 3, Aeneas and his people name their attempted settlements *Ilium*, *Troia*, and *Pergamum*, and Helenus and

succession of his community's original founder, whose name he has also preserved in the person of his son, another Pallas. The king's descent from the founder of the Arcadian Pallanteum bases his authority in much the same way as we have seen with Latinus and Saturn, Dido and her Phoenician ancestors, and, outside of the poem, the *gens Iulia* and Aeneas.

Evander's prestige among his people and the Arcadians' own sense of identity underpins the young Pallas' peroration to the troops in Book 10. He relies on precisely these elements to stir their courage:

quo fugitis, socii? per vos et fortia facta,
per ducis Euandri nomen devictaque bella
spemque meam, patriae quae nunc subit aemula laudi,
fidite ne pedibus. ferro rumpenda per hostis
est via. qua globus ille virum densissimus urget,
hac vos et Pallanta ducem patria alta reposcit. (10.369-74)

Pallas invokes the Arcadians' king (*per ducis Euandri nomen*, 370), their "noble" homeland (*patria alta reposcit*, 374), his own leadership, emphasized with his own culturally significant name (*Pallanta ducem*, 374), his desire to win for himself his father's glory (*patriae...laudi*, 371), and the Arcadians' history of battlefield valor (*fortia facta* 369; *devictaque bella*, 370): all of these appeals to action derive their emotive force from communal memory and identity. In highlighting these elements, this speech verbally embodies the visual rhetoric of the palace of Picus in Latium, which also emphasized the lineage and leadership of the king, the storied history of their people and native land, and their demonstrated prowess in previous wars. It also corresponds with the appeals of the Trojan Mnestheus to his comrades, that they live up to the character of their people, follow the example of Hector, and honor their gods, country, and king (5.188-97, 9.781-87). Pallas' rhetorical strategy rouses their valor (*nunc prece, nunc dictis*

Andromache go so far as to construct a scale model of old Troy. On the naming of these sites in connection with Trojan identity, see Chapter 3, 144-46.

virtutem accendit amaris, 8.368), displaying the feelings such cultural symbols can elicit, here employed not in the silent media of ancestral *imagines* or war trophies, but in the thick of a war waged on the community's behalf.

Neither the founding ancestor Pallas nor the king Evander, however, holds primacy of place in the communal life of this people; that distinction belongs to Hercules, Pallanteum's patron deity and preeminent cultural hero. The Arcadians' commemoration of Hercules centers on the rituals performed annually at the Ara Maxima, erected by Hercules and maintained by Arcadian stewards. The poet's inclusion of the Ara Maxima in Book 8 represents another aetiology that, like the etymology of the Palatine Hill from Pallanteum, locates the origins of a contemporary Roman landmark in the heroic past. Also like the aetiology of the name "Palatine," the worship of Hercules at the Ara Maxima is constructed by Vergil in such a way that it simultaneously engages the cultural traditions of the poem's fictional actors, and the Roman readers familiar with contemporary stories and practices associated with the altar.¹⁹⁹

Aeneas arrives at Pallanteum on the day of the annual rites at the Ara Maxima, to which he is invited by Evander. A sacrifice opens the proceedings (8.102-106), after which the flesh is devoured in a rich feast (8.179-83). After this first feast, Evander narrates the event that inspired these acts of worship, Hercules' defeat of the monster Cacus (8.184-275), and the king leads the pouring of libations in honor of the hero (8.276-79). There follows a second feast (8.283-84). Salian priests, the imagined forerunners of the later Roman priesthood, perform their traditional dance and sing a hymn to Hercules that enumerates his heroic deeds on earth and final apotheosis

¹⁹⁹ Particularly important in this connection is the role of Hercules in Augustan ideology, reflected in the poem's general alignment (though not without complications) of Hercules, Augustus, and Aeneas; see esp. Galinsky (1990) and Morgan (1998, 2005) on this issue, and Feeney (1991), 161 on some parallels between Hercules and Aeneas within the poem.

(8.285-302). The priests save for the last, most emphatic position in the hymn his victory over Cacus, the act of greatest importance to the celebrants (8.303-304).²⁰⁰

The rites are elaborate, involving ritualized feasting, prayer, dress, performance, and song. Evander's relation of the combat with Cacus, too, is no impromptu story, but a solemn commemoration of the deed that engendered the cult. Unlike other contexts of cultural memory observed so far, the setting of Pallanteum evinces no visual depictions of Hercules or his *res gestae* at the altar or in the city, although some visible token of Hercules appear during the festival: a lion skin covers the seat that Aeneas takes at the feast (8.177); Evander wears a wreath of poplar (8.276), the tree sacred to Hercules, as do the Salian priests (8.286); and Evander uses a *scyphus* (8.278), the cup associated with the hero in literary tradition.²⁰¹

Like the sites of Juno's temple and the palace of Picus, the celebration of Hercules at the Ara Maxima engages both the religious and political structures of the city. We witness Evander himself, *rex Arcas* (8.102), taking an active part in the rituals, together with his son, civic elites, and his "senate:"

Pallas huic filius una,
una omnes iuuenum primi pauperque senatus
tura dabant, tepidusque cruor fumabat ad aras. (8.104-106)

The direct participation of the city's king and chief men in the activities of civic religion reflects the duties typical of magistrates in the ancient world, including first-century Rome. In accordance with Roman tradition that Hercules, after setting up the Ara Maxima in his own

²⁰⁰ Cf. Miller (2014), 447: "After the exploits of Hercules in the Greek world, which range from his throttling of serpents as a baby through the conquest of various other monsters, the Salian singers value above all else...his decisive defeat of the local pest Cacus near where the rite is taking place, in what will one day be central Rome. For Evander's people, Hercules' salvific exploit in their neighborhood surpasses in importance his feats elsewhere, which, however, they continue to celebrate in their ceremonial song."

²⁰¹ Another visual reminder of Hercules appears in 8.552-53, as Aeneas rides from Pallanteum on a horse adorned with a lion skin; see 102 below.

honor, placed the care of the cult in the hands of two elite families, the Potitii and Pinarii, Vergil has a Potitius acting as the chief of the cult, alongside the Pinarii (*primusque Potitius auctor / et domus Herculei custos Pinaria sacri / hanc aram luco statuit*, 8.269-71; *iamque sacerdotes primusque Potitius ibant*, 8.281).²⁰²

The yearly ceremonies at the Ara Maxima honor Hercules with the veneration due to a patron deity, including prayer, sacrifice, and the reciting of an aretology. At the same time, the rites also represent an expression of Arcadian cultural identity that commemorates a signal event in their collective memory, Hercules' rescue of Pallanteum from Cacus. In the connection between identity and civic ritual, the Arcadian worship of Hercules accords with religious practice among ancient Mediterranean communities, where the localized worship of a patron god or goddess solemnly reaffirmed the community's divine charter and relationship with the deity.²⁰³

Hercules' slaying of Cacus is revered as a signal event in Pallanteum's history. In Evander's recitation of the story, the hero visited the community as a savior: the Arcadians were "saved from dreadful peril" (*saevis...periclis / servati*, 8.188-89) by a "supreme avenger" (*maximus ultor*, 8.201). Evander's narrative keeps in perspective the people whom Hercules saved, who remain on the margins of the action as Cacus flees from the hero (*tum primum nostrum Cacum videre timentem / turbatumque oculis*, 8.222-23), and finally reenter the scene to rejoice over the monster's corpse:

nequeunt expleri corda tuendo
terribilis oculos, vultum villosaque saetis
pectora semiferi atque extinctos faucibus ignis. (8.265-67)

²⁰² See Mueller (2002).

²⁰³ Cf. Stratton (2013) and Schmitt Pantel (2013), with further bibliography; also Malkin (1987), 244-45, on cults of founding heroes.

The observances that now commemorate their salvation engage all of the Arcadians together, a point reinforced by Evander's consistent use of plural language (*nobis*, 8.185, 200; *facimus meritosque novamus honores*, 8.189). According to the king, Hercules' original institution of the rites has been faithfully preserved across generations of Arcadians, and shall be kept by their people for all time:

ex illo celebratus honos laetique minores
servavere diem, primusque Potitius auctor
et domus Herculei custos Pinaria sacri
hanc aram luco statuit, quae maxima semper
dicetur nobis et erit quae maxima semper. (8.268-72)

The event of Pallanteum's salvation at the hands of a god has become a cornerstone of its cultural memory, a triumph of good over evil ritually commemorated by the whole community. The supreme importance of Hercules to the Arcadian people is expressed also in private devotion, inspiring Pallas' prayer to the hero when he enters single combat with Turnus:

per patris hospitium et mensas, quas advena adisti,
te precor, Alcide, coeptis ingentibus adsis.
cernat semineci sibi me rapere arma cruenta
victoremque ferant morientia lumina Turni. (10.460-63)

Hercules is a champion, a patron god, and a savior; but in his act of communal salvation he also represents, in many ways, a founder, a role he often assumes in mythic tradition. In the most immediate sense, he is the founder of his own cult, having instituted the Ara Maxima himself and appointed the Potitii and Pinarii as its guardians (8.269-71), but in view of Pallanteum as whole, too, Hercules cuts the figure of a civic founder. He intervened decisively in the affairs of that community to set it upon a new course of freedom and security, and created a new institution (the Ara Maxima) for his own commemoration that was to be, over decades, a focal point of the Arcadians' religion and culture. Cacus' defeat and death further evokes mythic

paradigms of violence initiating a new order, a recurrent motif of founding narratives familiar from such stories as the Gigantomachy or Apollo's slaying of Python.²⁰⁴

In her examination of founders and foundation in ancient political discourse, Diliانا Angelova elaborates the connection between the rhetoric of communal salvation and that of foundation:

Greeks believed that exceptional mortals, saviors, benefactors, and founders of cities deserved divine honors. The Hellenistic monarchs...promoted the idea that the king was *sōtēr* (savior), *euergetēs* (benefactor), and *ktistēs* (creator/founder) of his people. ...the origination of cities was closely linked to the concepts of paternity and deliverance, the utmost benefaction. Founding, an act tantamount to engendering a city and a nation, thus became notionally connected to saving the polity from extreme danger. A savior would be hailed as a new founder and worshipped as a god.²⁰⁵

Among the Romans, too, deliverers of the state had long been honored as founders in the Republican period:

Because Romans honored the saviors of the state as founders, a city such as Rome could have more than one father and more than one savior. Camillus, who saved Rome from the Gauls, was hailed as "Romulus," "parent of the fatherland," and a "second founder of the city." The Roman general Marius was called "the third founder of Rome" for his victories over Germanic tribes. In the late republic a few Roman citizens, including Augustus's adoptive father, Julius Caesar, received the honorifics *pater patriae*, epithets that also have religious significance in that apotheosis was an expected award for saviors and for founders.²⁰⁶

This tradition was alive in Vergil's own age, and continued through Augustus' principate, which saw the elaboration of "his own self-fashioning as Rome's new founder, scion of a divine line of founders, himself the progenitor of a new generation/age who deserved divine honors for his accomplishments."²⁰⁷

²⁰⁴ Cf. Hardie (1986), 110-18, who reads the story of Hercules and Cacus against the model of the Gigantomachy.

²⁰⁵ Angelova (2015), 15.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 21; also 57-65 on Augustus and later emperors as saviors and founders.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

In the rites performed for Hercules and his preeminent role in the city's cultural memory, the ceremonies at the Ara Maxima also evoke ancient models of founder cult. In their standard procedures, annual commemorations for Greek founders agree in several aspects with the activities of Evander and his people: such commemorations were treated as state festivals and engaged the whole community; they occurred on an appointed day, annually observed; and all forms of celebration, which included ritual feasting, focused on the founder.²⁰⁸ Founder cults provided a locus for communal solidarity and identity within colonies, a role filled by Hercules for Vergil's Arcadians.²⁰⁹

From these historical comparanda and a bedrock of mythological, political, and religious traditions, Hercules' identity in Pallanteum accords not only with that of a savior and patron divinity, but also that of a founder. In this respect, the civic cult of Hercules corresponds with the veneration of founders we have seen elsewhere in the *Aeneid*. In diverse ways, the Trojans, Carthaginians, and Latins all publicly commemorate their founders and organize, to some extent, their cultural landscape around the memory of foundation.

Like communal heroes in other societies—such as we have seen in the commemoration of Rome's great generals and statesmen in Augustan monuments—Hercules also represents an exemplar of values. Following the tour of the city, Evander admonishes Aeneas not to scorn the poverty of his lodgings on the Palatine, invoking Hercules as a model of humility:

“haec” inquit “limina victor
Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.
aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
finge deo, rebusque veni non asper egenis.” (8.362-65)

²⁰⁸ Malkin (1987), 195-200. Eden (1975), *ad* 8.275 raises the possibility that Evander's injunction to the cult officiants to “call upon” Hercules (*communemque vocare deum*) reflects the ancient belief that divine recipients of honors were present at their celebration; the summoning of Hercules would agree with common procedure in founder cults, where the founder was ritually invited to the annual feast (Malkin 1987, 198).

²⁰⁹ Malkin (1987), 200-203, 244-45, 260.

In Evander's memory, Hercules shows himself to be the ideal guest, generously accepting the rustic poverty that characterizes his society.²¹⁰ In his prayer to Hercules in Book 10, Pallas seeks the god's favor by expressly reminding him of his obligation as guest-friend of his people (*per patris hospitium et mensas, quas advena adisti, / te precor, Alcide*, 10.460-61).

But the contribution of the Herculean paradigm to the Arcadians' moral sensibilities goes much deeper than the show of proper guest-host relations. Scholarship on Evander's adoption of a broader "Herculean ethos" has considered the influence of Pallanteum's cultural hero on the king's entire worldview.²¹¹ Hercules was, besides a model guest, a peerless warrior. The motif of his indomitable power links together the many labors and battles recounted in the hymn of the Salii (8.285-305), which begins with his strangling of the twin snakes in his crib and ends with the fall of Cacus. Hercules' resourcefulness receives just one remark (*non te rationis egentem*, 8.299) amid this longer narration of his extraordinary physical prowess, which, in the culmination of the song, constitutes the definitive proof for his descent from Jupiter (*vera Iovis proles*, 8.301).²¹²

In combination with this tremendous power, Hercules' role as a savior, defender, and monster-slayer for the Arcadians yields a conceptualization of the hero that renders him a deliverer of justice, a force for good over evil, a righteous and merciless punisher of foes. In both the hymn of the Salian priests, and Evander's longer narrative prior to it, the speakers' accounts

²¹⁰ As the Trojans first enter the city, the accommodations they receive at the Ara Maxima are heaps of turf (8.176) and a seat hewn from maple (8.178); Papaioannou (2003), 700 supplies further evidence of Pallanteum's poverty.

²¹¹ See esp. O'Hara (forthcoming *Evander*) and (forthcoming *Aeneid*), ad 8.184; Petrini (1997), 50-51, 62-65.

²¹² Miller (2014), 441-47 provides a close reading of the hymn and examines the characterization of Hercules that emerges from it; Heiden (1987) sees Vergil constructing the hymn as a demonstrably unsuccessful attempt to "suppress" the truly chaotic force that Hercules represents through an encomiastic program that constantly undermines itself.

express a black-and-white moral perspective and a predilection for violence that ranges to the extreme.²¹³ The gruesome description of Cacus' strangulation exemplifies this taste for blood (*angit inhaerens / elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur*, 8.260-61). The Arcadian stories of Hercules' other exploits, those known from other mythographical sources, evince a degree of violence attested nowhere else: Hercules kills the centaurs Hylaeus and Pholus with his bare hands, along with the Cretan bull, which in all other accounts he delivers alive to Eurystheus.²¹⁴

tu nubigenas, invicte, bimembris
Hylaeumque Pholumque manu, tu Cresia mactas
prodigia et vastum Nemeae sub rupe leonem. (8.293-95)

O'Hara and Petrini have further illustrated how these facets of Hercules' characterization, apparently springing from the imagination of Evander, fit a larger pattern in the Arcadian king's worldview. Evander's tendency toward clear-cut moral narratives is predicated on a Herculean paradigm of good versus evil. The influence of that paradigm reaches far beyond his understanding of Hercules' own deeds; through it, Evander seems to construct his own universe, recreating the hero's mythos in his own conception of past and present realities. This is seen, for instance, in the thematic and verbal paralleling of the hellish Cacus with Evander's own arch-nemesis, Mezentius, as Evander elaborates the monstrous cruelties of the Etruscan king:

quid memorem infandas caedes, quid facta tyranni
effera? di capiti ipsius generique reservent!
485 mortua quin etiam iungebat corpora vivis
componens manibusque manus atque oribus ora,
tormenti genus, et sanie taboque fluentis
complexu in misero longa sic morte necabat. (8.483-88)

²¹³ The very names of the story's narrator (Evander, "good-man") and its villain (Cacus, "bad-man") underscore this basic morality; cf. O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), ad 8.184.

²¹⁴ O'Hara (forthcoming *Evander*).

Like Cacus, Mezentius has brought righteous vengeance down upon himself. Even after his overthrow and exile the Etruscans are still intent on delivering justice:

ergo omnis furiis surrexit Etruria iustis,
regem ad supplicium praesenti Marte reposcunt. (8.495-96)

The hideous decay of Mezentius' victims (*taboque*, 487) recalls the rotting heads that adorned Cacus' lair (*ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo*, 197); Evander's stress on the Etruscans' righteous *furor* (495) recalls the rage of Hercules in pursuit of Cacus: *furiis exarserat...dolor* (219-20), *furens* (228), *fervidus ira* (230).²¹⁵

The Herculean subtext that shapes Evander's conception of his world also accords with an intriguing segment of his speech of farewell to Pallas. There he reminisces about his victory over the three-lived warrior Erulus, a figure otherwise unattested in ancient literature, and a feat which critics as early as Servius (*ad* 8.564) have identified as Evander's own perceived reenactment of Hercules' combat with the three-bodied Geryon.²¹⁶

560 o mihi praeteritos referat si Iuppiter annos,
qualis eram cum primam aciem Praeneste sub ipsa
stravi scutorumque incendi victor acervos
et regem hac Erulum dextra sub Tartara misi,
nascenti cui tris animas Feronia mater
565 (horrendum dictu) dederat, terna arma movenda—
ter leto sternendus erat; cui tunc tamen omnis
abstulit haec animas dextra et totidem exuit armis... (8.560-67)

Following upon this Herculean feat, Evander yearns that he himself could have put an end to Mezentius' evil, sparing the need for Pallas' departure, were he but a younger man:

²¹⁵ O'Hara (forthcoming *Evander*) notes that the words Evander puts in the mouth of the Etruscan soothsayer describing Mezentius' overthrow (*quos iustus in hostem / fert dolor et merita accendit Mezentius ira*, 8.500-501) correspond with Evander's own characterization of the uprising in 8.495-96 (above). The description also, by extension, evokes the raging, vengeful Hercules of Evander's earlier story.

²¹⁶ Cf. Petrini (1997), 50-51: "The resemblances are obvious, and Geryon is in our mind throughout the episode: Heracles is driving Geryon's cattle at the time of Cacus' theft: Erulus is thrice-lived...and Geryon is triple-bodied." See also Secci (2013), 214-15, who reads Evander as purposely embellishing the event to provoke his own comparison with Hercules.

Non ego nunc dulci amplexu divellerer usquam
 nate, tuo, neque finitimo Mezentius umquam
 huic capiti insultans tot ferro saeva dedisset
 funera, tam multis viduasset civibus urbem. (8.569-71)

Evander again becomes a would-be Hercules, a savior of Pallanteum from an oppressive evil, this time in opposition to a Mezentius already fashioned after Cacus' likeness.

What Petrini calls the "cultural innocence" of Evander and his people transforms their world into a heroic landscape, "a mythical realm of monstrous creatures, heroic labors, and clear moral choices."²¹⁷ The young Pallas, raised in this cultural milieu, shows himself an heir to the martial ideology that Evander's worldview entails. His prayer to Hercules concludes with a graphic vision of Turnus' death that would be at home in a speech of his father (*cernat semineci sibi me rapere arma cruenta / victoremque ferant morientia lumina Turni*, 10.462-63). Indeed, the figure of Evander looms large in Pallas' own dreams of heroism. In his battlefield peroration, he shows himself eager to win his father's glory (*spemque meam, patriae quae nunc subit aemula laudi*, 10.371), and does so again in his bold challenge to Turnus: *aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis / aut leto insigni: sorti pater aequus utrique est* (10.449-51).

When, in Book 11, Evander receives Pallas' funeral procession at Pallanteum, he remains true to his martial worldview, extolling his son's valor and imagining the enemy carnage he left behind:

quod si immatura manebat
 mors gnatum, caesis Volscorum milibus ante
 ducentem in Latium Teucros cecidisse iuvabit.
 quin ego non alio digner te funere, Palla,
 170 quam pius Aeneas et quam magni Phryges et quam
 Tyrrhenique duces, Tyrrhenum exercitus omnis.
 magna tropaea ferunt quos dat tua dextera leto;
 tu quoque nunc stares immanis truncus in arvis,
 esset par aetas et idem si robur ab annis,
 175 Turne. (11.166-75)

²¹⁷ Petrini (1997), 51.

Living out the Herculean paradigm of crime and retribution, he expresses only the wish for swift vengeance against Turnus, the perpetrator, using the language of moral obligation to articulate Aeneas' duty as avenger of father and son:

quod vitam moror invisam Pallante perempto
dextera causa tua est, Turnum gnatoque patrique
quam debere vides. (11.177-79)

If we grant, with O'Hara and Petrini, that the Hercules myth fundamentally influences the ideology of Evander and the Arcadians, we might also ask whether their assimilation of reality to the Herculean paradigm applies equally to Evander's new heroic guest, Aeneas. The verbal, visual, and thematic association of Aeneas with Hercules constitutes a major theme in the *Aeneid* as a whole, but, in the context of Evander's interaction with his Trojan guest, a number of elements speak to Evander's deliberate linking of Aeneas with Herculean symbolism. Upon Aeneas' arrival, Evander personally (emphasized with *ipse*, 8.176) invites Aeneas to the seat covered with the lion skin emblematic of the city's patron deity. After their tour of the city, the king enjoins Aeneas to assume Hercules' model generosity—literally, to “fashion himself” after the god's example—and not spurn the humble accommodations of his home (*te quoque dignum / finge deo*, 8.365). The phrase immediately following this speech, *ingentem Aenean duxit* (8.367), focalized through the subject Evander, further suggests his identification of the “giant” Aeneas with Hercules. Later, when the war pact has been made, Evander sends forth the Arcadian cavalry on campaign against the Latins, Aeneas leading them on a steed clad in a lion skin with gilded claws (8.551-53), a mount which Evander and his people specially prepared for him (*ducunt exsortem Aeneae*, 8.552).

It is Evander's tendency to view the world through the lens of the Herculean mythos, and to cast individuals in the roles of the hero and the monster: he himself acted as Hercules in

slaying Erulus, and Mezentius becomes a double of Cacus. Is Aeneas, in the mind of Evander, a new Hercules for Pallanteum? Structural similarities between the circumstances of Hercules' arrival and Aeneas' suggest this possibility. Both have come as strangers from afar, and enjoy the city's hospitality. Hercules' advent saved the community from an existential threat; Aeneas, who has arrived on the day sacred to the hero and god, has come pledging war against the Latins, whom, according to Tiberinus, Evander has been battling in a protracted war (8.55), one in which his resources are scarce and his foes have the upper hand (8.472-74). Given these narrative parallels, the recurrent linking of Aeneas with Hercules through Evander's design, and Evander's broader "Herculean worldview," it is possible to read these cues as a deliberate effort to fashion Aeneas in the guise of a new Hercules, a new savior of the city.

All of this evidence contributes to a more comprehensive appraisal of Hercules' role in the Arcadians' communal consciousness. As the quintessential fighter of evil, the community's savior and virtual founder, and an exemplar of heroic virtue, Hercules models the Arcadians' civic values, informs their martial ideology, and even, for Evander, frames his construction of political events. The cultural memory of this god, champion, and founder thus directs, in very real ways, both the cultural life and the political initiatives of the Arcadian people.²¹⁸

Here we leave discussion of Hercules, and turn to further instantiations of cultural memory attested in the urban landscape of Pallanteum.²¹⁹ Evander's tour with Aeneas through the *virum monumenta priorum* (8.312) aligns the fictional characters of Vergil's poem and its

²¹⁸ On the influence of Hercules in Pallanteum, see also Secci (2013), who has raised the issue of Evander's own agency in promoting the cult that binds his community together. According to his view, Evander is deliberately embellishing the Hercules and Cacus story to engineer an effective political myth for his people.

²¹⁹ This episode is crucial to study of Roman memory and identity in the *Aeneid* and Augustan ideology; in what follows I focus on the Vergilian construction of Pallanteum's sites of memory among the Arcadians themselves, rather than among contemporary Romans. O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), ad 8.337 supplies further bibliography on the tour; see also Seider (2013), 52-55, Papaioannou (2003), 688-91, 696-700, and Rea (2007), 89-95.

real-life Roman audience, for both groups possess cultural awareness of the monuments described, excepting those whose future fame Evander's Arcadians cannot know. The social dynamics of commemoration that shape Vergil's crafting of this set-piece for his Roman audience are thus reproduced among his imaginary Arcadians.

Evander and Aeneas approach first the altar and gate built, according to the narrator, in honor of Evander's prophetess mother, the nymph Carmentis:

vix ea dicta, dehinc progressus monstrat et aram
et Carmentalem Romani nomine portam
quam memorant, nymphae priscum Carmentis honorem,
vatis fatidicae, cecinit quae prima futuros
Aeneadas magnos et nobile Pallanteum. (8.337-41)

The setting of the Roman Carmental Gate in Evander's time represents Vergil's only demonstrable anachronism in the survey of Pallanteum, as the historical gate was only built with the Servian Wall traditionally dated to the reign of Rome's sixth king. The anachronism aside, the Roman structure and its poetic replica share the same object of commemoration; both the gate, and the altar on the south side of the Capitoline, were linked with the figure of Carmentis (or Carmenta) in Roman tradition.²²⁰ The monument honors the same figure, in the perspective of both Vergil's Roman audience and his Arcadian characters.

Within the fictive Pallanteum, the reasons for the characters' own cultivation of Carmentis' memory resonates with many of the themes we have been tracing so far. Having merited the dedication of these prominent installments, Carmentis appears prominent in the cultural memory of the Arcadians; she is the recipient of unique public tribute. As a member of the ruling house of the founders Pallas and Evander, her status as "queen mother" would have

²²⁰ See Gransden (1976) and Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.*

made her a figure of prestige. Her divinity as a nymph, too, might mark her out for special reverence, as the presence of the altar suggests.

Two details about Carmentis mentioned in the text clarify the terms of her veneration. First, as attested in the lines above, she foretold the glory of the new settlement of Pallanteum and its eventual inhabitants (340-41): the attachment of this relative clause to the monument's description constitutes a virtual *elogium* of Carmentis, and suggests this prophecy as the primary reason for her important place in collective memory. Amid their first beginnings in a distant land, the nymph's oracle of the settlers' future prosperity has become an object of collective remembrance and pride. Second, Evander relates that it was Carmentis' prophetic admonitions, along with Apollo's auspices, that led him to the shores of Italy in the first place: *matrisque egere tremenda / Carmentis nymphae monita et deus auctor Apollo* (8.335-36). The "fearsome" bidding of his mother compelled his action; that Evander credits her role in influencing his travel alongside Apollo, the god associated with city founding, highlights her crucial role in inspiring and guiding the endeavor. Carmentis holds a place in the community's founding narrative, together with Apollo as the "guarantor" (*auctor*) of the new settlement, and Evander himself as founder and king. The monuments to Carmentis, then, celebrate not only a queen and a divine prophetess, but also a founder of Pallanteum.²²¹

Evander points out the future site of Romulus' asylum, then the Lupercal. The narrator, tapping into an ancient etymology of the latter name, connects the Lupercal with *Lycaeus*, an Arcadian epithet of Pan: *et gelida monstrat sub rupe Lupercal / Parrhasio dictum Panos de more Lycae* (8.343-44). Connecting the site with the Arcadian cult, Vergil's etymology of the Lupercal's name is contextualized in the memory of his fictional characters and explained as an

²²¹ Cf. Angelova (2015), 10-22 on queens and empresses as founders in Greco-Roman practice; also 66-107 for the depiction of Livia and later imperial women as founders.

expression of ethnic identity. The veneration of Pan in his Arcadian aspect narrates the cultural attachment of Evander's people to this native cult, which they have borne with them to Italian shores and enshrined in the cave.²²²

The name of the Argiletum receives an etymological aetiology of its own, as *letum Argi*, "Argus' demise," after a guest whom Evander once hosted: *nec non et sacri monstrat nemus Argileti / testaturque locum et letum docet hospitis Argi* (8.345-46). Servius and Servius Auctus (*ad loc.*) report that this Argus attempted to murder Evander in a bid for power, and was slain after the discovery of his plot, either by the king himself or his guards.²²³ The name of this Roman street, in the poetic universe of the poem, is thus devised by Vergil to commemorate the suppression of what the tradition characterizes as a political conspiracy. In the naming of sites after events of treachery and communal peril, contemporary Rome also had notable examples, like the Tarpeian Rock, a site which, perhaps in suggestive juxtaposition, the narrator mentions immediately following Evander's explanation of the Argiletum (*hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem*, 8.347).²²⁴ In Pallanteum, the name *Argiletum* conveys a narrative of a grave danger to the state and its swift suppression. It may stand as a warning to other would-be abusers of Evander's hospitality (as Servius proposes), but also as a public display of Arcadian valor. In view of the heroic ideology in Pallanteum explored above, this Argus may appear in Arcadian memory as one more Cacus threatening communal destruction, a villain dispatched by Evander with stern justice.

²²² Cf. Fordyce (1976) and O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), *ad loc.* on the antiquarian tradition linking Arcadian Pan to the Lupercal; also O'Hara (2017), 209-210 on the etymology underlying the tradition.

²²³ See O'Hara (2017), 210-11.

²²⁴ Cf. Papaioannou (2003), 698-99.

A trio of monuments linked to major gods closes the tour of Pallanteum. The first, the Capitolium, is a site of mysterious religious power as yet unconnected with a specific deity (8.347-54); it is only from the viewpoint of Vergil's Roman readers that Evander's description foreshadows the supreme religious site in the city, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Where the developed Capitolium will only exist in the future, the settlements called Janiculum and Saturnia, to which Evander turns next, only existed in the past:

haec duo praeterea disiectis oppida muris,
 reliquias veterumque vides monumenta virorum.
 hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem;
 Ianiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen. (8.355-58)

The ruined towns founded by Janus and Saturn memorialize gods who ruled their own earthly kingdoms in the region's primeval times. The ethnographic traditions from which Vergil derives this antiquarian story relate that Janus and Saturn ruled as contemporaries, each in his own domain.²²⁵ Saturn's Golden Age may receive the most emphasis in the regional histories of Latinus and Evander, but the reign of Janus is also commemorated in the Latin palace of Picus, where his portrait appears with Saturn's (7.180-81), and in the ritual opening and closing of the Gates of War (7.610). The succession of kingdoms represented by the ancestral *imagines* in Latium is concretized in these physical remains that bear their founder's names, witnesses to a mythic past preserved and handed down by Vergil's Latin and Arcadian communities.

Memory and Identity in State Diplomacy

We can build on the evidence gathered up to now for cultural memory and identity within the poem's communities by exploring one more crucial venue for their expression, namely diplomacy. In this focus, we shift attention from the cultivation of communal identity among the

²²⁵ Cf. O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*) and Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.*

members of one ethnic group to the articulation of that identity to outsiders, who not only do not share membership of the group, but have distinct traditions and identities of their own. We have seen in the previous chapter how shared myths could provide common ground in diplomatic interactions in the ancient world, a forum where cultural memory, assertions of kinship, and political rhetoric intersected. In Anthony Smith's framework, ethnic cultures "can act as models for locating human populations in the world in relation to each other;" they can "be regarded as means for framing and interpreting the world of human beings, and in particular as a means of classifying and situating unknown others."²²⁶ In Vergil's narrative microcosm, too, we see myth and memory deployed in interstate dialogue among his characters, who use ethnic culture to mediate engagements in ways familiar from the poet's contemporary world.

In the first diplomatic exchange between Dido and the Trojans, it is not shared culture that bridges the divide between peoples, but another kind of negotiation: Dido's personal familiarity with Troy and its history.²²⁷ The illustrations of stories from the Trojan War on Juno's temple (1.453-93) corroborate the knowledge that Dido claims before Ilioneus:

quis genus Aeneadam, quis Troiae nesciat urbem,
virtutesque virosque aut tanti incendia belli?
non obtunsa adeo gestamus pectora Poeni,
nec tam aversus equos Tyria Sol iungit ab urbe. (1.565-58)

Dido later reveals to Aeneas that her impressions of the Trojans have been shaped by her father Belus' encounter in Cyprus with the warrior Teucer, former adversary of the Trojans and himself half-Trojan:

atque equidem Teucrum memini Sidona venire
620 finibus expulsum patriis, nova regna petentem
auxilio Beli; genitor tum Belus opimam
vastabat Cyprum et victor dicione tenebat.

²²⁶ Smith (2009), 29.

²²⁷ Cf. Seider (2013), 98-99 and Nakata (2004), 106-110.

tempore iam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis
Troianae nomenque tuum regesque Pelasgi.
625 ipse hostis Teucros insigni laude ferebat
seque ortum antiqua Teucrorum a stirpe volebat. (1.619-26)

Dido's respect for the Trojan people, affirmed by her personal memories of Belus and Teucer, influence her decision to lend aid to Aeneas' men. But it is another kind of memory, the memory of her own exile, that receives emphasis in the close of her first speech to Aeneas: *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco* (1.630).

In Book 7, the interview between King Latinus and the Trojan delegation relies more extensively on cultural memory as a means of diplomatic mediation. Latinus' opening statement bears quoting in full:

195 dicite, Dardanidae (neque enim nescimus et urbem
et genus, auditique advertitis aequore cursum),
quid petitis? quae causa rates aut cuius egentis
litus ad Ausonium tot per vada caerula vexit?
sive errore viae seu tempestatibus acti,
200 qualia multa mari nautae patiuntur in alto,
fluminis intrastis ripas portuque sedetis,
ne fugite hospitium, neve ignorete Latinos
Saturni gentem haud vinclo nec legibus aequam,
sponte sua veterisque dei se more tenentem.
205 atque equidem memini (fama est obscurior annis)
Auruncos ita ferre senes, his ortus ut agris
Dardanus Idaeas Phrygiae penetrarit ad urbes
Threiciamque Samum, quae nunc Samothracia fertur.
hinc illum Corythi Tyrrhena ab sede profectum
210 aurea nunc solio stellantis regia caeli
accipit et numerum divorum altaribus auget. (7.195-211)

The meeting takes place inside the palace of Picus, which itself constitutes a grandiloquent showcase of the Latin people and their storied past. Latinus devotes only a small portion of his opening speech to defining his own community, which he characterizes as Saturn's people, virtuous not by imposed law but their inherent nature (202-204). With great economy, this short description highlights two elements that define the Latin character and facilitate the diplomatic

exchange. First is the figure of Saturn (*neve ignore Latinos / Saturni gentem*, 202-203), who merits special mention as the patron deity of Latium, the founder who established the Latins' cultural norms (*veterisque dei se more tenentem*, 204), and the divine ancestor of Latinus himself, from whose lineage he derives prestige and legitimacy. The second element is the characterization of the Latins as a righteous people (*gentem...aequam / sponte sua*, 204-205). This self description, in the context of the exchange, underscores a diplomatic posture of welcoming generosity, to be read in tandem with Latinus' admonition *ne fugite hospitium* (202), and the gentle disposition with which he first receives them (*placido...ore*, 7.194). These three lines thus express, in brief, the Latins' ethnic character and history, and reassure the Trojans of the king's good intentions in the dialogue.

Latinus shows greater interest in relating to the identity of the foreign party than in introducing his own, and finds common ground in the figure of Dardanus, with whom he begins and ends his overture. From the first words of his speech, Latinus asserts his knowledge of the Trojans, their homeland, and their migration (*neque enim nescimus et urbem / et genus, et auditque advertitis aequare cursum*, 195-96), and locates his guests within the local history of his native Italy by addressing the embassy as *Dardanidae* (195). Asking the reason for their arrival, he extends his hospitality (197-202), then proceeds with the brief excursus on Saturn and the Latins (202-204) before returning again to the theme of Dardanus, this time with greater elaboration, recounting the tale heard from "Auruncean elders" of Dardanus' eastward journey and ultimate apotheosis (205-211). Dardanus' major role in the speech reflects his usefulness as a device in cultural negotiation. In dialogue between two diverse and distinct peoples, Dardanus represents, in a looser sense, a "common ancestor," a point of contact to which the Trojans and Latins can both relate, by which they can situate one another in their world.

Ilioneus' response is well tailored to the prompts issued by Latinus. He answers the king's introduction of his Saturnian race with a Jovian reply, affirming at the same time the Trojans' descent from Dardanus:

ab Iove principium generis, Iove Dardana pubes
gaudet avo, rex ipse Iovis de gente suprema:
Troius Aeneas tua nos ad limina misit. (7.219-21)

Three times invoking Jupiter, Ilioneus affiliates the Trojan people, their founder Dardanus, and their current king Aeneas with the god in answer to Latinus' description of the Latins' Saturnian identity; the assertion of patron deities constitutes an exchange of cultural tokens.²²⁸ Ilioneus again refers to Dardanus toward the close of his speech, representing the Trojans' arrival in Latium as a "return:" *hinc Dardanus ortus, / huc repetit* (7.240-41).

Even as the ambassador foregrounds his people's Trojan identity, he follows Latinus' cues in using Dardanus' memory as a basis for cultural mediation. As Nakata observes, in Ilioneus' speech the delegation's dominant identity as Trojan immigrants outweighs any avowal of native Italian roots; his address invokes the illustrious past of the Trojans' city, the valor of their people, and their current misfortune, and even alleges, in apparent exaggeration, that other nations are begging for their alliance.²²⁹ But amid these arguments predicated on their more immediate "foreign" identity as Trojans, the ambassador does not suppress the figure of Dardanus or the "native" identity that his ancestry also entails. Before Ilioneus even speaks, Latinus himself has already asserted the value of Dardanian ancestry in the process of cross-cultural negotiation.

²²⁸ Cf. Thomas (1982), 101-102.

²²⁹ Nakata (2012), 345-48. I disagree, though, with Nakata's claim that the Trojans are downplaying their Dardanian descent here as a rhetorical calculation (344).

Where Latinus and Ilioneus exchange native traditions as a means of coming to terms, Aeneas' overture to Evander in 8.127-51 does not rely on cultural commonality, but rather direct kinship:

135 Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor,
Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus,
advehitur Teucros; Electram maximus Atlas
edidit, aetherios umero qui sustinet orbis.
vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia
Cyllenae gelido conceptum vertice fudit;
140 at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas,
idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit.
sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno. (8.134-42)

Aeneas takes care to stress the claim of Atlantean kinship, repeating the name of Atlas four times (135, 136, 140, 141), in the last instance strengthened with *idem*. His language, too, aims to fortify his appeal with the authority of known traditions, particularly those of Evander's people, the Greeks (*ut Grai perhibent*, 135; *auditis si quicquam credimus*, 140). So confident is Aeneas in the force of this appeal that he alleges to have prepared no other arguments for an alliance (*his fretus non legatos neque prima per artem / temptamenta tui pepigi*, 143-44). For all of his efforts, though, the real effect of Aeneas' rhetorical strategy cannot be measured; Evander acknowledges none of Aeneas' arguments in his reply. Instead, it is a closer familial link that stirs his feelings, the intimacy he enjoyed with Anchises as a young man.

In its aim of securing a political goal through appeal to kinship, Aeneas' speech to Evander is a specimen of kinship diplomacy, a form of engagement predicated on presumed ancestral ties between peoples, and the consequent affinities or obligations owed by the parties to one another as kin. The many ancient communities—in Sicily, Asia Minor, and elsewhere—that claimed kinship with the Romans through shared Trojan heritage exemplify this type of rhetoric, which flourished in the Hellenistic world and transferred into Roman usage. Vergil has replicated

this widely attested form of diplomatic rhetoric in the overture of Aeneas to Evander, which Bernstein aptly labels a “paradigmatic example” of the practice.²³⁰

The claims made in the speech have received further scrutiny at the hands of critics, who have revealed flaws in Aeneas’ alleged genealogy: the ancestral link through “the same Atlas” is actually based on the conflation of three distinct figures named Atlas.²³¹ In replicating this common diplomatic practice within his epic, Vergil also reproduces, through Aeneas’ flawed but expedient use of mythic genealogy, the tendentiousness of this type of rhetoric. Many attempts at claiming kinship in the ancient world were based on specious evidence, invented traditions, and forced interpretations of myth, resulting in alleged genealogies concocted expressly for political advantage.²³² With this historical reality in mind, we should not be surprised to read, in Aeneas’ overture, a supposed genealogical link between himself and Evander based on an erroneous equation of three mythical figures named Atlas, one the Italian parent of Dardanus’ mother Electra, another the Arcadian parent of Mercury’s mother Maia, and yet another the North African Atlas who sustains the heavens on his shoulders.²³³ Even if we take Aeneas’ mistake as innocent and not deliberate, the error still highlights the liability for expedient invention in mythical genealogies. Vergil’s replication of kinship diplomacy in the world of his epic accounts for both its use and abuse in political negotiation.

²³⁰ Bernstein (2007), 183.

²³¹ The North African Atlas appears in the *Aeneid* in 4.246-51, and is mentioned in 4.481-82 and 6.796-97. Servius (*ad* 8.134) identifies the three Atlases in mythographical tradition and calls their conflation in Aeneas’ speech an error. I agree with Nakata (2012), 353-54 in reading this “error” as a deliberate mistake on the part of Aeneas, and therefore intentionally committed by Vergil in crafting Aeneas’ overture: “The crucial point for Aeneas in the genealogy he presents here is that the Trojans’ and Evander’s origins lie in a common ancestor ‘engineered,’ so to speak, in order to support an alliance between the two sides” (354).

²³² Cf. Chapter 1, 11-12.

²³³ Cf. Nakata (2012), 353-54.

Aeneas seeks to persuade Evander to ally with him based on the (specious) pretext of shared lineage. Why does he deploy this rhetorical strategy, which appears nowhere else in the poem? At the close of his speech to Evander, Aeneas relies upon a more conventional argument for alliance, elaborating the threat posed by the Latins, to whom he attributes, in what Fordyce labels a “total misrepresentation,” lust for dominion over all Italy:²³⁴

gens eadem, quae te, crudeli Daunia bello
insequitur; nos si pellant nihil afore credunt
quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant,
et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra. (8.146-49)

Aeneas’ exaggeration of the Latin threat plays to the Arcadians’ immediate concerns; he had already learned from Tiberinus that Evander has been waging a protracted war with the Latins (8.55). Aeneas also argues from military objectives in his two other diplomatic speeches as well. Earlier, when his men first approach Pallanteum, he responds to Pallas’ demand for their identity and purpose by requesting alliance to counter the Latin threat:

Troiugenas ac tela vides inimica Latinis,
quos illi bello profugos egere superbo.
Euandrum petimus. ferte haec et dicite lectos
Dardaniae venisse duces socia arma rogantis. (8.117-20)

In Book 10, when he meets with the Etruscan leader Tarchon, the reported exchange suggests Aeneas’s approach was similarly straightforward:

150 namque ut ab Euandro castris ingressus Etruscis
 regem adit et regi memorat nomenque genusque
 quidve petat quidve ipse ferat, Mezentius arma
 quae sibi conciliet, violentaque pectora Turni
 edocet, humanis quae sit fiducia rebus
 admonet immiscetque preces, haud fit mora, Tarchon
 iungit opes foedusque ferit. (10.148-54)

²³⁴ Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.*

Aeneas foregrounds their common enemies Mezentius, the Etruscans' former tyrant, and Turnus, the man who sheltered Mezentius after his overthrow (*ille inter caedem Rutulorum elapsus in agros / confugere et Turni defendier hospitis armis*, 8.492-93).

The contrast between these pragmatic arguments and the extravagant genealogical appeal to Evander raises the question of why Aeneas employs such inflated rhetoric in that one instance. I agree with Nakata in locating the answer in the very concern that Aeneas expressly dismisses at the beginning of his speech: *non equidem extimui Danaum quod ductor et Arcas / quodque a stirpe fores geminis coniunctus Atridis* (8.129-30). Following the sack of their city, the Trojans are left with an abiding distrust of Greeks, an attitude expressed by both Aeneas (*evasisse tot urbes / Argolicas mediosque fugam tenuisse per hostis*, 3.282-83) and Helenus (*cuncta malis habitantur moenia Graiis*, 3.398). Even before his personal appearance in the text, Evander's role is foreshadowed by the Sibyl in a way that calls attention to the irony of a Greek settlement offering aid to Trojans (*via prima salutis / (quod minime reris) Graia pandetur ab urbe*, 6.96-97). Aeneas thus opens his speech to Evander with the vocative *optime Graiugenum* (8.127), and forthrightly acknowledges the Hellenic ethnicity the king shares with the Atreidae, the devastators of Troy. The elevated diction and ingratiating tone reflect the unease of a situation in which a Trojan survivor of a bloody Greek conquest seeks aid from a Greek king; in spite of the promises of the Sibyl and Tiberinus, the outcome of the encounter is surely a source of tension for Aeneas.²³⁵ The need to overcome this perceived ethnic divide, deeply rooted in recent trauma and violence, motivates Aeneas' attempts to ground the alliance not merely in political and

²³⁵ Cf. Nakata (2012), 356: "Despite the Tiber's assurances regarding Evander, Aeneas could not therefore precisely gauge the outcome of a meeting with unknown Greeks. Kinship ties might mitigate potential tensions that could arise, and so Aeneas, by creatively manipulating his and Evander's genealogies, constructs plausible kinship ties that are central to his overtures to Evander."

military advantage, but in the more profound reassurance of an ancestral bond. Like Ilioneus and Latinus before him, Aeneas mines the mythic past to find common ground with a foreign interlocutor, here to surmount possible animosity through recourse to an ancient kinship rooted in shared traditions. The result is an impressive, but fundamentally specious, rhetorical specimen, an appropriate analogue to the kinship diplomacy of Vergil's own time.

Conclusion

Aeneas' inventive use of the past to seal a military alliance showcases the perceived force of such narratives in Vergil's epic world, and in the real world of antiquity that it reflects. This type of "genealogical engineering" (Hannah) or "genealogical opportunism" (Nakata) has many referents in Augustan Rome, not the least of which is the tracing of the *gens Iulia* back to Aeneas' son Ascanius, identified with Iulus perhaps only as late as the first century BCE.²³⁶ Aeneas' appeal illustrates with special clarity the usefulness of the past in political discourse, as well as its liability to manipulation that serves the demands of the present.

These two themes—first, the influence of the collective past on political activity, and, second, the deliberate editing and shaping of the past for political goals—return us to the larger scope of this dissertation, for they are precisely the cultural phenomena with which this study of the *Aeneid* is primarily concerned. Beginning from the first theme—the crucial role of the shared past in communal politics—this chapter has surveyed several expressions of cultural memory among Vergil's fictionalized communities, and assessed the variety of ways in which the poem's major ethnic groups employ memory in the construction of identity, values, and political authority. In concluding this chapter, I close with further reflections on the second theme: how

²³⁶ Hannah (2004), Nakata (2012); see also Bretin-Chabrol (2009), Toohey (1984), and Wiseman (1974). On the Iulus-Ascanius identification, see Chapter 1, n. 89.

Vergil's communities, like their real-life counterparts, use their past histories to suit political expedients, and in the process subject cultural memory to deliberate alteration, emphasis, or suppression. Like Aeneas' tendentious genealogy, these instances show the poet replicating among his characters not just the use of cultural memory in political rhetoric, but also the instabilities inherent in that use.

The Trojans' descent from Dardanus, which has major implications in the narrative of the exiles' westward migration, is itself the subject of a selective reading of the past based on practical goals. Early in their journey, the oracle at Delos urges the Trojans to seek their "ancient mother:"

antiquam exquirite matrem
hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris
et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis. (3.94-98)

The ambiguity of the *antiqua mater*'s identity exposes the complex, even contradictory nature of the Trojans' own foundation myths.²³⁷ Believing that the oracle indicates the homeland of Teucer, the Trojans sail to Crete, only to discover later, with the Penates' clarification (3.154-71), that the correct location was the birthplace of Troy's other founder, the Italian Dardanus.

Prior to the Penates' correction, the Trojans embrace Crete as their new home with high spirits. The sailors cheer *Cretam proavosque petamus* as they voyage (3.129), a rallying cry that bespeaks the Trojans' deep veneration for Teucer's memory. But the initial excitement is not to last: following the Penates' revelation that Dardanus' land is their true *patria*, Teucer fades into utter obscurity. It is instead their lineage from Dardanus that becomes most prominent in the Trojans' narrative of their origins.

²³⁷ See Nakata (2012), 336-43, Bretin-Chabrol (2009), 308-12; also Hardy (1996), Armstrong (2002), 322-24, and Seider (2013), 56-59.

The reason for this new emphasis on Dardanus is manifestly pragmatic. On his ancestry, not Teucer's, rests the promise of a legitimate *patria* in Italy, a strong emotional motivation for the refugees who aim to rebuild Troy, but also, more practically, a title deed to the new land. In ancient practice, cultural memory was often employed to validate territorial claims, and so it works within Vergil's epic universe.²³⁸ The displacement of Teucer and elevation of Dardanus thus exemplifies an accentuated reading of the Trojans' ethnic history, promoting one branch of their founding tradition and marginalizing others. What necessitates this choice is the divine identification of Italy as the site of their national restoration; present circumstances dictate how the Trojans interpret and project their people's past. In accordance with this Italian narrative, they present themselves as descendants of Dardanus before the Latins and Arcadians, having left Teucer's memory with the failed settlement on Crete.

When the Trojans arrive in Italy, even Dardanus is subject to strategic emphasis and neglect in diplomatic rhetoric. Aeneas explicitly claims Dardanian ancestry in his opening to Pallas cited above (*Dardaniae...duces*, 8.120) and his address to Evander (*Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor*, 8.134); we have already seen Ilioneus avow Dardanian descent before Latinus (7.219-20, 240-41). But Aeneas does not mention this genealogy to the Etruscans, a striking omission in light of Dardanus' mention in every other diplomatic exchange in Italy. This is perhaps because, according to the Etruscan soothsayer whom Evander cites, their people can only be led by a foreigner (*nulli fas Italo tantam subiungere gentem: / externos optate duces*, 8.502-503). The narrator presently reminds us of this condition immediately after the reported exchange between Aeneas and Tarchon, when the treaty is struck: *tum libera fati / classem conscendit iussis gens Lydia divum / externo commissa duci* (10.154-56). For Aeneas to call

²³⁸ Cf. Malkin (1994), Jones (1999), and Patterson (2010), esp. 69-82.

attention to his Dardanian, and thereby native Italian, descent in this context would be disadvantageous to his diplomatic aim. Moreover, Dardanus' precise origin from the Etrurian city of Corythus (*Corythi Tyrrhena ab sede*, 7.209) makes him not just Italian, but properly Etruscan, further necessitating the suppression of a fact that would weaken Aeneas' credentials as a *dux externus*.²³⁹

As Richard Thomas has observed, Jupiter becomes another neglected ancestor in Aeneas' genealogical appeal to Evander. We have already seen the lengths to which Aeneas goes to establish an Atlantean lineage that proves erroneous. But Thomas raises the point that Aeneas and Evander do, in fact, share a common ancestor in Jupiter, a link even more distinguished and temporally immediate than Atlas: Jupiter was the father of both Dardanus and Mercury through Electra and Maia, respectively. Thomas asks why Aeneas puts forth Atlas instead of Jupiter, eliding Jupiter from the genealogy entirely. Looking to the exaggerations Aeneas makes about the Italians' aggression right after the genealogy, he suggests a solution in political expediency:

...quite possibly [Aeneas] omits this element in order to depict himself (and Evander) as the aggrieved against rather than the aggressors... Any objective judgment of the realities of invader and invaded in this poem, must surely find that the reverse obtains: it is the Trojans who appear to be usurpers of Latin territory. These realities belie the claim of Aeneas that he is not acting with craft (*neque...per artem*); that is precisely what he does here, and in that quality we perhaps see why he suppresses his own and Evander's Jovian connections.²⁴⁰

Political advantage may also require "forgetting" not just certain ancestors, but substantial events in ethnic history. Aeneas' visit to Pallanteum coincides with the annual celebration of Hercules, which includes a hymn to the god that recalls, among his heroic feats, his razing of Troy: *bello egregias idem disiecerit urbes, / Troiamque Oechaliamque* (8.290-91).

²³⁹ Cf. Nakata (2012), 358. On Dardanus' Etruscan birth, see Reed (2007), 11-13 and Horsfall (1987b).

²⁴⁰ Thomas (2004-2005), 135-36.

The text provides no indication of the Trojans' response to this part of the hymn; they appear to receive it in silence.²⁴¹ Given their experience as firsthand witnesses to their city's recent destruction, an event which, in the court of Dido, Aeneas has narrated as an *infandus dolor* (2.3), their silence invites speculation. Reading Hercules' sack of Troy in tandem with Evander's recent encouragement to all present, following the story of Cacus, to partake of the rites to their "shared god" (*communemque vocate deum et date vina volentes*, 8.275) only adds to the uneasiness of this scenario.²⁴² Most striking of all, though little mentioned in scholarship, is Aeneas' enthusiastic participation in the cult following the omen of the arms. He concludes the diplomatic mission to Pallanteum by initiating his own sacrifice to Hercules, joined by Evander and the other Trojans who pay homage to the god with equal zeal:

solio se tollit ab alto
et primum Herculeis sopitas ignibus aras
excitat, hesternumque larem parvosque penatis
laetus adit; mactat lectas de more bidentis
Euandrus pariter, pariter Troiana iuventus. (8.541-45)

Eden notes that the invocation of *di communes* underscores the forging of alliance, as an appeal to religious traditions shared by both parties; the phrase also occurs in 12.118, as the Italians set up altars to *di communes* before the swearing of the truce between Latins and Trojans.²⁴³ The Trojans' apparent acceptance of Hercules as *communis deus* is best understood in this diplomatic context. Hercules has two dramatically different identities for the Trojans and Arcadians: for the former he is a destroyer, for the latter a savior and founder. The profound

²⁴¹ Cf. O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), *ad loc.*: "Somewhat embarrassingly, Aeneas is listening to a hymn praising Hercules for sacking his city." Fordyce (1977, *ad loc.*) calls the reference "somewhat tactless in the presence of a Trojan guest." Servius attests to early critical scrutiny of the passage: *sane critici frustra culpant Vergilium, quod praesentibus Troianis Troiae laudari introduxit excidium*. On the literary sources for Hercules' sack of Troy, and the Trojans' silence in this scene, see esp. Heiden (1987), 666-70.

²⁴² On this phrase, see Eden (1975) and O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), *ad loc.*; also Morgan (2005), 199.

²⁴³ Eden (1975), *ad* 8.275.

devotion of the Arcadians to this figure threatens a cultural rift that could undermine the cooperation of both parties. The necessity of alliance therefore compels the Trojans to “forget” the brutality of the Arcadians’ patron god against their nation in past times. Grim memories of Hercules pose the danger of irreconcilable differences; Aeneas suppresses these memories first with silence, then with an enthusiastic sacrifice, and succeeds in winning the Arcadians’ support.

The vulnerability of the past to creative emphasis and suppression leads us to consider the constant mutability of historical interpretation.²⁴⁴ Groups or individuals may invoke the same past in support of diverse ideological programs, rendering the past’s “real” significance something that exists only in the eye of the beholder. When Saturn presided over Latium, did he raise up a people of innate justice, or impose laws upon the sundry tribes? Latinus and Evander recall Saturn’s reign in two distinct ways that seem to reflect the ideologies of their nations: the Latins are a people still cultivating the rusticity and lawless virtue of the Golden Age, while Evander’s Arcadians, devotees of the Herculean ethos, would favor the imposition of order over chaos as a dominant moral paradigm.

Moreover, the ethnic history of the Latins visually narrated in the palace of Picus attests to two different cultural identities that exist in contradiction: while they claim to enjoy a Saturnian state of peace and freedom from authority, the several relics of land and sea battles and memorials to war heroes that adorn the palace reveal a society that also promotes military valor.²⁴⁵ To these warlike displays we might add the appearance of Latin youth in combat training outside the city walls (7.162-65), as well as the fact that a longstanding public ritual for

²⁴⁴ Cf. Chapter 1, 11-12; see also Seider (2013) on the subjective recollection of past events by individuals in the poem.

²⁴⁵ On this contradictory portrayal, see esp. O’Hara (2007), 96-98, Bleisch (2003), 101-104, and Rosivach (1980). Moorton (1989) addresses more broadly the evidence for war and violence in Vergil’s Italy.

initiating and concluding wars exists in the Latin tradition, centered on the Gates of Janus (7.601-22). The alleged “lawlessness” of the Latins is even more directly complicated by the oaths of office said to be taken in the palace of Picus (*hic sceptrum accipere et primos attollere fascis / regibus omen erat*, 7.173-74), to which Fordyce draws special attention:

Latinus means that the way of life of the *Saturnia regna*, the Golden Age of primitive innocence, still has force in his kingdom; but the picture of a society in which law is unnecessary hardly fits with the conception of the *fascis*, a symbol of the enforcement of law, in line 173.²⁴⁶

The multivalence of meaning in past events opens the possibility of subtexts or unintentional implications to arise when appeals to cultural memories allow for more interpretations than the one intended. For instance, the comparison of patron gods by Latinus and Ilioneus in Book 7 is evidently intended by the characters as an innocent exchange of their equivalent religious and cultural traditions, a move toward common ground and mutual respect. But the strife between these gods in mythic history, recalled by Evander in 8.319-20 (*Saturnus / arma Iovis fugiens*), ironically undercuts the characters’ efforts at diplomacy, opening up a subtext of the violent overthrow of Saturnian antiquity by Jovian modernity that persists throughout the poem’s second half.²⁴⁷

This hermeneutic instability is perhaps most volatile in the case of artistic or literary expressions of the past, where artifacts of memory may assume interpretations divergent from the intended effect of their display.²⁴⁸ The shield that Turnus carries in the catalogue of Book 7, bearing as its device the image of Io, exemplifies this ambiguity. The sign that appears to represent, at first, an emblem of Turnus’ illustrious Argive ancestry, an *argumentum ingens*

²⁴⁶ Fordyce (1977), *ad* 7.203.

²⁴⁷ Thomas (2004-2005), 131-32.

²⁴⁸ Cf. Seider (2013), 202-204.

(7.791) asserting his quality and capabilities, ends up becoming, as Hannah, Gale, and O'Hara have cogently shown, a symbol of his own doom: through an alternative reading of the device, Io's image instead narrates the divine wrath and ancient curse hanging over the Inachid clan to which Turnus belongs.²⁴⁹ I would argue, as many critics have, that this type of ambiguity is equally at work in the famously multivalent shield of Turnus' foe, Aeneas.²⁵⁰

From these considerations, we arrive at the artistic artifact most relevant to this whole discussion, an artifact that presents an ideologically-guided narrative of a people's ethnic history, encompassing themes of communal values and political legitimacy, engaging the beliefs and activities of an audience in the present through the commemoration of cultural memory, yet also containing within itself the seeds of divergent interpretations of that same past. This is, of course, the *Aeneid* itself. Like the instantiations of cultural memory within the world of the poem, Vergil's narrative of Roman history enshrines the founding of the Roman people with a recasting of the Aeneas myth thoroughly invested in contemporary concerns, and shot through with the ideological context of the Augustan Age that saw its production.

Returning to Vergil's poetic doppelgänger, the ill-starred epic poet Cretheus of *Aeneid* 9, we end where we began. As the "friend of the muses" Cretheus once did for his imagined audience within the epic world, Vergil sings of the kings and battles of ages past for the delight and edification of his hearers. As I hope to have demonstrated here, Cretheus' presence in the world of the text is but one aspect of a much larger and more pervasive program. In depicting the transmission of cultural memory among the epic's fictionalized communities, its use in political discourse, and its liability to pragmatic revision, Vergil is replicating the social and political

²⁴⁹ Hannah (2004), 149-61; Gale (1997); O'Hara (1990), 78-80.

²⁵⁰ On the shield of Aeneas in scholarship, see O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), ad 8.626.

dynamics of the collective past at work within the verses of his own epic song, an artistic monument of Roman cultural memory. Like the Romans of the first century BCE, Vergil's characters live and move in landscapes shaped by their own memories, traditions, myths, symbols, and sacred sites, espousing cultural identities defined, reinforced, and reinterpreted through the commemoration of the common past.

CHAPTER 3: Vergil's Trojans: Crisis, Identity, and Continuity

The *Aeneid* famously defines its narrative as the deeds of a “man” (*virumque*) in its opening verse, but the epic is properly the story of a people, not of one man only. Throughout the poem’s twelve books, Aeneas’ actions are linked inseparably with the community he represents. Virtually every challenge encountered, every decision made, every prophetic utterance heard involves not just Aeneas, but also the Trojan refugees—the incipient *populus Romanus*—whom he leads on a quest fraught with risk, opposition, despair, and death. Corresponding with this double focus on the man and the people together, the narrative climaxes in two coordinated events: Aeneas defeats Turnus on the heels of the divine pact that determines the destiny of the Trojan community. While Aeneas’ triumph assures a place in Italy for his exile nation, Jupiter’s settlement with Juno dooms to oblivion the Trojan identity, granting the goddess’ wish for Troy’s decisive “death:” *occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia* (12.828).²⁵¹

The guarantee of Troy’s death—as a civic community and a cultural identity—at the very end of the poem echoes a moment at the chronological beginning of Aeneas’ story, when, in Book 2, Troy has fallen to the invading Greeks. Aware of the attack and rushing to defend the city, Aeneas first encounters the priest Panthus, who opens with these words:

venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus
Dardaniae. fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens
gloria Teucrorum. (2.324-26)

²⁵¹ Cf. Bettini (1997), 30: “At the behest of Juno, and to some extent also of Jupiter, [Aeneas] will become an exile who disappears, who dissolves, who forsakes not only the reconstruction of his own city but even the preservation of his own national identity; abandoning his own language, his own customs, the very name and even the physical traits of his people. Far from rebuilding Troy in Italy, the Trojans will lose their very selves there; they will agree to be called Latins.”

Panthus' premonition of Trojan annihilation and the provisions of Jupiter and Juno that ultimately fulfill it bookend the whole narrative arc of the Trojans' quest for resettlement. Brought side-by-side, the two passages throw into relief a fundamental conceptual link between Trojan identity and a Trojan homeland. In Panthus' words, the city's physical destruction entails the loss of "Trojanness," expressed in terms of the ethnic signifier *Troes*; Juno, too, recognizes that Troy will truly die only when the distinct cultural markers that define its people lose all significance. As this chapter will show, throughout the *Aeneid*'s twelve books the threats to the founding of a new city are understood as endangering, by the same token, the survival of the "Trojan race." Successful resettlement in a new "Troy" provides for the community's preservation, just as its failure entails communal death for the Trojan people as Trojans.

The close connection between the survivors' effort to re-establish a permanent city and the preservation of Trojan identity opens another locus for exploring the dynamics of ethnic identity in Vergil's poem. This chapter builds from the broader analyses of cultural memory and identity in Augustan Rome (Chapter 1) and among the major ethnic communities within the epic (Chapter 2), and proceeds now with a deeper study of a single group, the Trojans. Here I examine not cultural memory and commemorative practices among these characters, but rather the marked influence of ethnic identity on the refugees' quest for a new city, both in their sensitive awareness of their Trojan identity and their fervent efforts to preserve their community.

My analysis in this chapter focuses on the experience of exile, above all on the place of Trojan identity—as a source of grief and hope, and as a motivator of action—in the traumatic aftermath of Troy's fall and the hardship of the survivors' journey. The sundered connection between homeland and identity represents, as Edward Said writes in his influential *Reflections on*

Exile, “a perilous state of not-belonging.”²⁵² Said contrasts this dislocated condition with ‘nationalism,’ “an assertion of belonging in and to a place, a people, a heritage. It affirms the home created by a community of language, culture, and customs; and, by so doing, it fends off exile, fights to prevent its ravages.”²⁵³ Displaced from the familiar land and community that orients their sense of self, exiles are victims of a denial of identity and stability, a state in which “*nothing* is secure” (Said’s emphasis).²⁵⁴ Against these immense physical and psychological pressures, they seek “reconstitution,” to reacquire the security of a permanent community:

Exiles are cut off from their roots, their land, their past. They generally do not have armies or states, although they are often in search of them. Exiles feel therefore, an urgent need to reconstitute their broken lives, usually by choosing to see themselves as part of a triumphant ideology or a restored people.²⁵⁵

The hope of “reconstitution,” here expressed as an ultimate recovery of what had been before, bespeaks a profound desire for continuity in the wake of traumatic rupture. The violent changes wrought by exile are countered by the vision of a restoration that will realign present and past identities, and relocate the displaced in a renewed state of belonging.

Said’s portrayal of the experience of exile provides readers of the *Aeneid* with a valuable framework through which to interpret the actions, motivations, and emotions of Vergil’s Trojan characters, who find themselves in precisely this “perilous state of not-belonging” after Troy’s brutal demise. As they suffer the alienation and insecurity of homelessness, Aeneas and his exiles, aided by divine revelation of future glory, respond to the pressures of displacement with

²⁵² Said (2000), 140. Silvia Montiglio’s 2005 study of wandering and exile in ancient Greek culture intersects with much of Said’s account; see esp. her second chapter, “Pains and Privations of Wandering” (24-41).

²⁵³ Said (2000), 140.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 139, 141. Cf. the characterizations of exile cited by Doblhofer (1987, 59-60): “eine Ex-Existenz;” “die Negation der Kommunikation;” “die Summe von lauter Verlusten.” See 59-72 for Doblhofer’s discussion of the experience of exile.

²⁵⁵ Said (2000), 140-41.

belief in their community's divinely-ordained restoration in a land embraced as an alternative Trojan *patria*. Their recourse to this future underscores the refugees' basic need for reassurance against the threat to their national survival. It provides comfort, hope, and pride in a condition of fundamental isolation, trauma, and insecurity.

Interest in the study of exile among Classicists has produced a sizable bibliography on its place in Greek and Roman culture, most prominently the volumes of Doblhofer (1987), Claassen (1999), Montiglio (2005), and Gaerten (2007).²⁵⁶ Among Roman authors, Cicero, Ovid, and the younger Seneca, who suffered personal exile and dealt with the experience in their writing, occupy most research in this area, but the *Aeneid* has also attracted a share of attention.

Doblhofer's treatment of the *Aeneid* assesses the theme of exile in the first and second halves of the poem, drawing attention to the Trojans' experience of exile, the parallel narratives of other prominent exiles in the epic, such as Dido and Evander, and the dual characterization of the Trojans as simultaneously *exules* (from Troy) and *reduces* (to Italy).²⁵⁷ Claassen's contribution, focusing primarily on Cicero and Ovid, touches on the *Aeneid* only briefly, contextualizing Vergil's study of exile within traditions inherited from mythological and Homeric models.²⁵⁸

Bettini treats the *parva Troia* of Helenus and Andromache in response to the emotional pressures of loss and exile.²⁵⁹ Stephen Harrison's chapter in Gaertner (2007) surveys the theme of exile in Latin epic, including the *Aeneid*, situating Vergil's depiction of the Trojans' exile in the tradition

²⁵⁶ See esp. the comprehensive bibliography of Gaerten (2007), which covers scholarship up to the year of its publication. Montiglio's study treats the theme of exile in Greek literature, and does not touch on the *Aeneid*. I note also Olshausen & Sonnabend (2002), whose edited volume on migration in antiquity, "*Troianer sind wir gewesen*"—*Migrationen in der antiken Welt*, is titled after Panthus' pronouncement in *Aeneid* 2.325; but the collection otherwise contains little material on Vergil.

²⁵⁷ Doblhofer (1987), 179-201.

²⁵⁸ Claassen (1999), 37-40.

²⁵⁹ Bettini (1997).

of ancient foundation myths.²⁶⁰ Lee-Stecum includes the *Aeneid* in a broader treatment of refugee narratives in Augustan literature, evaluating their role in crafting an imperial ideology that sees constituent identities of foreign peoples subsumed into—and thus effaced by— participation in the all-encompassing “refuge” of Rome.²⁶¹ Putnam’s chapter on “the poetry of exile” in *A Companion to Vergil’s Aeneid and its Tradition* studies the representation of exile in Vergil’s *Eclogues* and *Aeneid* in dialogue with Ovid’s *Tristia*.²⁶²

Reading the Trojans’ journey as a refugee narrative, I aim to analyze Vergil’s depiction of their exile as part of the poem’s larger reflections on ethnic identity. The first chapter of this dissertation elaborated the Aeneas myth as a study in how cultural memory was put to deliberate political purposes in the Republican and Augustan periods; the second chapter surveyed the pervasive presence of cultural memory among the poem’s fictionalized ethnic communities, analyzed its social roles, and evaluated its rhetorical construction. This installment now takes a more intimate approach, focusing on the emotional and psychological dimensions of identity in the life of a people, in this case the Trojan refugees whose communal identity is profoundly endangered by the destruction of their native land.

This chapter, like the previous two, falls roughly into two halves. The first half examines the Trojans’ journey as a refugee narrative, reading their struggle against the “ravages” of exile in light of the hope for an ultimate “reconstitution.” Building from the trauma that pervades the survivors’ memory of Troy’s destruction and the threat of communal death that looms over their frustrated attempts at resettlement, this discussion brings new attention to the fundamental

²⁶⁰ Harrison (2007).

²⁶¹ Lee-Stecum (2008).

²⁶² Putnam (2010).

importance of Trojan identity in the refugees' experience of exile. Much scholarship on the poem's first half has concentrated on Aeneas' challenge of leaving behind the memory of old Troy to embrace a Roman destiny; I emphasize instead the profound need of Vergil's characters to preserve their native identity amid exile and isolation, and interpret their core motivation in seeking a new city as the assurance of their people's continuation as Trojans in the wake of Troy's physical collapse. My approach here is particularly indebted to the insights of Seider (2013) and Fletcher (2014) into the development of Trojan identity and memory over the course of the epic, but builds upon their discussions with an alternative focus on the refugees' response to the condition of exile.

The chapter's second half turns from the Trojans' past and present to the vision of their future. I argue that the poem contains two distinct but interwoven narratives of Troy's resurgence in Italy. One is the vision of the future revealed by Jupiter and other divine agents, a prophecy, as Hejduk has cogently demonstrated, concerned especially with power and glory.²⁶³ The other is the Trojan refugees' own conception of their future, which speaks to their most immediate needs: security, stability, and, above all, the survival of their Trojan identity. The marked discrepancy between these two narratives has never been addressed in prior scholarship on the Trojans, and further identifies the refugees' main motivation as the preservation of their ethnic community, this time by contrast with the divine promises of future imperial glory.

The Trojan Experience of Exile

The razing of Troy and the ten-year war that preceded it represent a profound collective trauma for the Trojans, a trauma rendered by the poet with grim realism. His Trojan characters, now homeless, exposed to danger, and haunted by the violent demise of their country, carry their

²⁶³ Hejduk (2009).

grief into a struggle for survival whose main objective is the securing of a new home. The survivors' hopes in Troy's restoration develop in painful tension with their past and present experience.

The opening of Aeneas' narration in the court of Dido reveals the lasting sorrow of Troy's memory, an agony made fresh again (*renovare*) in the telling:²⁶⁴

infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem,
Troianas ut opes et lamentabile regnum
5 eruerint Danai, quaeque ipse miserrima vidi
et quorum pars magna fui.
...
10 sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem,
quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
incipiam. (2.3-6, 10-13)

Aeneas' *infandus dolor* is given voice not only by the language of grief that pervades this preamble (underlined above), but his emphasis on autopsy, underscoring his personal participation in the events (*ipse...vidi* / *et quorum pars magna fui*, 5-6). At the same time, however, he initiates what becomes a recurrent theme in his narrative of Troy's sack, the collective doom for the Trojan people inflicted by the attack on the physical city. While Aeneas, as speaker and firsthand witness of the events, is to be the center of his story, the destruction of Troy is not merely expressed as *casus*, but *casus nostros* (10), a personal trauma suffered by all Trojans.

Throughout the narrative of Book 2, Aeneas repeatedly breaks off the story under the weight of his grief, as if palpably reliving and reacting to the memories that led to the catastrophe. He first breaks into the scene of Laocoon casting the spear into the Trojan Horse:

et, si fata deum, si mens non laeva fuisset,
impulerat ferro Argolicas foedare latebras,

²⁶⁴ On Aeneas' grief and its shaping of his narrative, see esp. Seider's (2013) commentary 101-107; also Johnson (1999).

Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres. (2.54-56)

This flight of imagination in hindsight reveals Aeneas' emotional investment in the story, as well as his critical reflection on events even as he relates them. He locates this moment as a potential turning point in the sad history of Troy's fall, and then, initiating a theme that will become recurrent throughout Aeneas' recollection, he names a hostile but divinely-ensured fate as the instrument preventing an alternative course of events.²⁶⁵ He again reflects, bitterly, on the irony of the celebrations that followed the acceptance of the horse. The Trojans who had unwittingly sealed their doom piously wreath the shrines of the gods on the eve of destruction, in vain thanksgiving: *nos delubra deum miseri, quibus ultimus esset / ille dies, festa velamus fronde per urbem* (2.248-49).

Narrating Troy's fall, just as Aeneas cautioned Dido at the outset, means "renewing" the trauma (2.2). The outbursts of Aeneas throughout his story reveal not only a deep emotional investment in the tale, but also a certain psychological tension, as he recognizes how the story could have ended differently, had events taken another course (as in Laocoon's spear-cast, above) or the gods been more favorable. Bowie's observation that Aeneas' apostrophes and "frequent editorializing" reveal him to be "a skilled presenter" acknowledges the artful composition of Books 2 and 3, but risks taking for granted that Aeneas' account is guided solely by rhetorical calculation and technique, and not the emotional duress he claims to feel.²⁶⁶ Although Aeneas' skill in engaging his audience cannot be denied, this does not preclude the reality of his grief; we can understand him both as an eloquent storyteller who "paints himself as

²⁶⁵ It is disputed as to whether the *mens* of 2.54 (*si mens non laeva fuisset*) represents the minds of the Trojans or of the gods just named (*fata deum*). I agree with Horsfall (2008), *ad loc.* in understanding the phrase to refer to the gods, but my reading of the passage here accommodates either interpretation.

²⁶⁶ Bowie (2008), 43-44; cf. 41-42.

a man of sorrows,” and as a genuine man of sorrows, whose speech is sensitively composed by the poet to capture the haunting experience of a survivor of trauma.²⁶⁷ Aeneas’ assertion that his suffering will be renewed in its telling and the surges of emotion that periodically rupture his narrative are consonant with Dominick LaCapra’s characterization of traumatic memory as “a past that intrusively invades the present,” that “carries the experience into the present and future in that the events are compulsively relived or reexperienced as if there were no distance between past and present.”²⁶⁸

As a *magna pars* of his own story, Aeneas also reflects on his own performance during Troy’s last night. When he recounts the death of his comrades in a skirmish, Aeneas breaks out in an anguished address to city and people:

Iliaci cineres et flamma extrema meorum,
testor, in occasu vestro nec tela nec ullas
vitavisse vices, Danaum et, si fata fuissent
ut caderem, meruisse manu. (2.431-34)

Testifying before city and countrymen, Aeneas forswears the possibility that Troy could have been saved, an insistence perhaps rooted in his obvious failure to save the city. His narrative of events simultaneously reinforces the inevitability of Troy’s fall, and acknowledges his own dedicated but futile attempt to prevent an unstoppable outcome.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁷ Bowie (2008), 44. Cf. Aaron Seider’s balanced treatment of Aeneas’ narration (2013, 101-107), which accounts for both the engaging style of Aeneas’ story and the real traumatic memories that shape it.

²⁶⁸ LaCapra (2004), 55-56. On traumatic memory in the *Aeneid*, see esp. David Quint (1993), 50-96, who reads the Trojans’ post-war trauma through Freud’s principle of “repetition compulsion,” a condition whereby “the victim of an earlier trauma may neurotically reenact his victimization over and over again” (51). Quint applies this principle to the Trojans’ attempts to set up new communities imagined as a second Troy, a tendency exemplified in the extreme by Helenus’ and Andromache’s model Troy at Buthrotum; this evidence is discussed below, 146-50.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Sanderlin (1972), who sees Vergil arranging the narrative of Book 2 so as to protect Aeneas’ heroism in spite of his failure to save Troy. Grillo (2010) takes up the question of Aeneas’ characterization in his loss of Creusa toward the end of the book; for Grillo, Aeneas comes off less favorably.

Though this commentary may reveal Aeneas coming to terms with his inability to save his homeland, his narration as a whole betrays an effort to lessen Troy's own role in its demise. Two recurrent themes pervade Aeneas' story: first, that Troy's fall was inevitable; second, that Troy was blameless and undeserving of its doom. The former notion, already voiced above by Aeneas, is corroborated first by the dead Hector, who assures Aeneas that Troy cannot be saved: *sat patriae Priamoque datum: si Pergama dextra / defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent* (2.291-92). After Aeneas has awoken to the Greek assault, Panthus, too, characterizes Troy's sack as the *ineluctabile tempus* (2.324).

The theme of inevitability is expressed most frequently in Aeneas' emphasis on the decision of Fate and the gods against Troy's survival.²⁷⁰ His people would never have taken in the Trojan Horse, had the gods not wished it to happen (2.54-56, cited above). Fate and the gods were protecting Sinon as he freed the Greeks from the horse's belly: *fatisque deum defensus iniquis* (2.257). The Trojans had no recourse to the gods, even as Cassandra was impiously dragged from Minerva's shrine (*heu nihil invitis fas quemquam fidere divis*, 2.402). Venus confirms Aeneas' intimations that the gods' hostility has enabled the attack, and magnifies their active role in ravaging the city:

non tibi Tyndaridis facies invisa Lacaenae
culpatusve Paris, divum inclementia, divum
has evertit opes sternitque a culmine Troiam. (2.601-603)

The Olympians participate energetically in Troy's ruin (2.604-620), a scene Venus renders terrifyingly real before Aeneas' eyes by revealing to him the forms of the gods: *apparent dirae*

²⁷⁰ On the motif of divine hostility to Troy in Book 2, cf. Bowie (2008), 43-44, Johnson (1999), Berlin (1998), and Farron (1993), 140-45.

facies inimicaque Troiae / numina magna deum, 2.622-23).²⁷¹ Even Aeneas' loss of Creusa transpired according to the gods' will, as her ghost attests (*non haec sine numine divum / eveniunt*, 2.777-78), in apparent affirmation of Aeneas' blaming the gods for her disappearance (*quem non incusavi amens hominumque deorumque*, 2.745). But while the divine plan has necessitated the city's destruction and the deaths of many, the omens of the fire and comet witnessed by Aeneas' family also assure Anchises of the gods' ongoing provision for the remnants of Troy: *vestrum hoc augurium, vestroque in numine Troia est* (2.703).

Complementing the belief that Troy's fall was inevitable, Aeneas's narration emphasizes that it was also unmerited. Venus confirms Troy's innocence when she appears to Aeneas, absolving the city of responsibility for its own destruction and pointedly dismissing the act most plausibly linked to the catastrophe, the *casus belli* of Helen's abduction (2.601-602, above).²⁷² In the aftermath of Troy's destruction, when Aeneas sets sail from the Troad, he again recalls the divine opposition to Troy and its innocence, with an emphatic enjambment: *postquam res Asiae Priamique evertere gentem / immeritam visum superis* (3.1-2).²⁷³

The hero's trauma reaches beyond his narrative of Troy's fall. Before Dido's banquet, when he sees the episodes from the Trojan War represented on the Carthaginian temple of Juno, he stands transfixed, tears flowing: *animum pictura pascit inani / multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine vultum* (1.464-65); *haec dum Dardanio Aeneae miranda videntur, / dum stupet*

²⁷¹ That it was indeed the gods' plan that Troy should fall is further confirmed by Vulcan in Book 8: *nec pater omnipotens Troiam nec fata vetabant / stare decemque alios Priamum superesse per annos* (8.398-99). On Venus' revelation, see also Heinze (1993), 30-31; Horsfall (2008), 428 provides much additional bibliography on this scene.

²⁷² On the guilt of Helen here and in ancient tradition, see Heinze (1993), 29-30; Garstang (1962) examines Vergil's subordination of the "crime of Helen" to the greater designs of fate that necessitate Troy's fall.

²⁷³ The notion of Troy's innocence is complicated throughout the text by the memory of Laomedon, whose treachery against Apollo, Neptune, and Hercules brought ruin on Troy in the previous generation; Anchises alludes to this earlier destruction of Troy as he refuses to escape with Aeneas (2.642-43, cited below). On Laomedon in the *Aeneid*, see Wiesen (1973), 744-46, Cairns (1989), 127-28, and Petrini (1997), 53-55.

obtutuque haeret defixus in uno (1.494-95). Aeneas' remarks to Achates characterize the illustrations as objects of sorrow: the consolation derived from them depends upon the perceived attitude of the Carthaginians to the Trojans' plight, a response to bare human suffering (*sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*, 1.462).²⁷⁴

The fall of Troy represents a lasting source of grief for the survivors, but it is only the preamble to their consequent exile, which constitutes a daily renewal of their suffering.²⁷⁵ So great is the pain of exile that Aeneas prefers to have died on his native shore than endure the fraught life of a refugee on a deadly sea: *o terque quaterque beati, / quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis / contigit oppetere* (1.94-96). In Aeneas' narrative in Book 2, Anchises is faced with the dilemma of survival in exile and certain death in Troy, and he, too, initially opts for the latter: *abnegat excisa vitam producere Troia / exiliumque pati* (2.637-38). The ablative absolute *excisa...Troia* brackets the option for survival (*vitam producere*), an enclosing structure that suggests the price of a life after Troy: survival entails a life drawn out within the shadow of trauma, a passage into Said's "perilous territory of not-belonging." Anchises has already seen his homeland ruined once before, and prefers death to enduring the experience a second time (*satis una superque / vidimus excidia et captae superavimus urbi*, 2.642-43).

After the Trojans wash up on the shores of Carthage, Aeneas attempts to console their sorrow (*dictis maerentia pectora mulcet*, 1.197):

²⁷⁴ See esp. the remarks of Seider (2013), 82-86, with further bibliography on the murals and Aeneas' response to them. Other critics have argued that Aeneas is mistaken to perceive sympathy in the murals; see, e.g., Barchiesi (1999), 335-41, who adduces several alternative readings of the murals that suggest darker undertones.

²⁷⁵ Khan (2001), 911-12 notes that, from the standpoint of Vergil's Trojans, their years of wandering after Troy's fall continue the lasting trauma of the war. Commenting on 3.1-8, where Aeneas reflects on the destruction of Troy before describing the beginning of their exilic journey (*diversa exsilia et desertas quaerere terras / ...agimur*, 4-5), Khan emphasizes, "It is clear from Aeneas' words that he considers the ill luck of the Trojans to have lasted from the days of the Trojan War right up to the present moment. His wanderings after the fall of Troy are, in other words, a *continuation* of the trials and tribulations undergone during the Trojan War" (911, author's emphasis). Cf. Quint (1993), 50-65 on the Trojans' search for a second Troy as a continual repetition of the traumatic past.

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

To assuage their *maestus timor* (202)—surely the grief for comrades lost in the storm, but also the despair of continuing homelessness and frustration at failed attempts to resettle—Aeneas acknowledges their common toils (198), affirms their ability to overcome trial, and, most emphatically, draws up a vision of what most responds to their yearning: a permanent home, a new Troy, where their current period of dislocation and danger will be at an end. The narrator does not reveal the effect of this speech on its hearers, with the exception of Aeneas’ own reaction; for all of his external optimism, he receives little comfort from his own words (*taliam voce refert, curisque ingentibus aeger / spem vultu simulat*, 1.208-209).²⁷⁶

Both the fall of Troy and the subsequent journey of its survivors are a standard element of the story the Trojans tell others outside their group. When Aeneas is met by the disguised Venus outside of Carthage, his speech is characterized as *questus* and *dolor* (*nec plura querentem / passa Venus medio sic interfata dolore est*, 1.385-86). His speech’s opening is representative of how Trojans conceive of their recent history:

o dea, si prima repetens ab origine pergam
 et vacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum,
 ante diem clauso componet Vesper Olympo. (1.372-74)

²⁷⁶ See below, 136-37 and 168-70, for further discussion of this speech.

Similarly, Ilioneus first pleads the Trojans' case before Dido with reference to their suffering (*Troes te miseri, ventis maria omnia vecti, oramus*, 1.524-25). After Ilioneus, Aeneas follows suit:

o sola infandos Troiae miserata labores,
quae nos, reliquias Danaum, terraeque marisque
omnibus exhaustos iam casibus, omnium egenos... (1.597-99)

Their dwindled numbers, their misfortune, and their lack of any recourse are the consequences of Troy's destruction. Aeneas notably defines the trials of the Trojan survivors with the same word he will use to define the city's destruction in beginning his story to Dido: *infandus* (1.597; *infandum...dolorem*, 2.3).²⁷⁷ The studies by Allen and Dunkle of *Aeneid* 3, a segment of the poem fully taken up with the Trojans' long succession of voyages, landfalls, and fruitless attempts at settlement, illustrate the pervasiveness of "weariness" as a verbal and thematic leitmotif throughout the book.²⁷⁸

One statement in Aeneas' introduction to the "Libyan huntress" speaks with special pointedness to another important consequence of the Trojans' plight:

ipse ignotus, egens, Libyae deserta peragro,
Europa atque Asia pulsus (1.384-85)

Aeneas claims that he is impoverished (*egens*), a complaint we have seen before in evidence above, but in the same breath he describes himself as *ignotus*: he is anonymous, stripped of prestige, of agency, and, most basically, of identity. His present condition bitterly contrasts with the renown attached to his name: *sum pius Aeneas...fama super aethera notus* (1.378-79).²⁷⁹

²⁷⁷ See also Seider's discussion of *infandum* (2013, 102-103).

²⁷⁸ Allen (1951); Dunkle (1969).

²⁷⁹ Cf. Vergil's model for *Aen.* 1.378-79, the introduction of the shipwrecked and destitute Odysseus to Alcinous: εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν / ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει (*Od.* 9.19-21).

Aeneas suffers anonymity and powerlessness as he draws out a life in exile, “wandering” (*peragro*) through the wilderness of Libya, denied resettlement throughout the known world (*Europa atque Asia pulsus*). The fall of Troy and the resultant exile have invited, alongside the straits of poverty, a loss of identity for Aeneas and his people. The real threat posed by their loss of a home and continued wandering is communal annihilation, in both a literal sense—as they face hazards of the sea, the aggression of enemies, and resourcelessness—and a metaphorical sense, in the annihilation of the Trojan cultural identity, the demise of the Trojans as a living ethnic community.

Both of these dimensions of Troy’s destruction—as a physical urban center and as a living community of people—are borne out in the text. Though he did not live to take part in the *labores* of Aeneas and his crew, Panthus concisely formulates this danger in the words *fuimus Troes* (2.325), as noted at the beginning of this chapter. When, in Book 5, the aggrieved Trojan women set fire to the fleet—a scene to which I turn later in more depth—Iris, in the guise of Beroe, attempts to persuade them by playing upon this very fear of communal destruction: *o gens / infelix, cui te exitio Fortuna reservat* (5.624-25). In response, Aeneas’ prayer to Jupiter to save the ships regards the burning of the ships as the realization of that very fear:

Iuppiter omnipotens, si nondum exosus ad unum
Troianos, si quid pietas antiqua labores
respicit humanos, da flammam evadere classi
690 nunc, pater, et tenuis Teucrum res eripe leto.
vel tu, quod superest, infesto fulmine morti,
si mereor, demitte tuaque hic obrue dextra. (5.687-92)

In the following book, as he seeks entry to the underworld, Aeneas petitions the gods who once opposed Troy in terms that equate the granting of passage with the salvation of the Trojan race:

vos quoque Pergameae iam fas est parcere genti
dique deaeque omnes, quibus obstitit Ilium et ingens
gloria Dardaniae. (6.63-65)

Even after the Trojans have safely reached Italy, their small number still faces the threat of extinction. During Turnus' encirclement of the Trojans in Book 9, Aletes gives his blessing to the night mission of Nisus and Euryalus with the recognition that the camp's rescue means the deliverance of their whole community:

di patrii, quorum semper sub numine Troia est,
non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis,
cum talis animos iuvenum et tam certa tulistis
pectora. (9.247-50)

Communal extinction seems nigh at the conclusion of the same book, when Turnus breaches the walls of the camp and its defenders scatter. The narrator describes the scene through the Trojans' eyes:

diffugiunt versi trepida formidine Troes,
et si continuo victorem ea cura subisset,
rumpere claustra manu sociosque immittere portis,
ultimus ille dies bello gentique fuisset. (9.756-59)

Hardie has called attention to verbal cues in these lines that link the scene with memories of Troy's fall in Book 2: like the Greek storming of Troy, Turnus' massacre inside the camp poses an existential threat.²⁸⁰

The high stakes of the survivors' success, and the loss of identity and agency that Troy's fall has meant for the refugees, together inform the Trojans' deep desire to found a new city, a sentiment repeatedly expressed by the exiles throughout their story. A city represents a return to stability, the satisfaction of their basic needs, the reassurance of permanence, and, perhaps most importantly, the continuity of "Troy" as an ethnic community. Aeneas' elation at seeing the construction around Carthage speaks to his own yearning to found a home, as he "marvels" (a

²⁸⁰ Hardie (1994), *ad loc.*

point doubly emphasized) at the settlers' achievement, reviewing their various efforts with studied interest:

miratur molem Aeneas, magalia quondam,
miratur portas strepitumque et strata viarum.
instant ardentes Tyrii: pars ducere muros
molirique arcem et manibus subvolvere saxa,
425 pars optare locum tecto et concludere sulco;
iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum.
hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris
fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora apta futuris. (1.421-29)

Absorbing this scene as he passes through the city, he exclaims *o fortunati quorum iam moenia surgunt* (1.437), the word *iam* implicitly contrasting the Carthaginians' present success with his own dream for the future.

His attachment to this dream supersedes all other desires, including, most consequentially, a life with Dido.²⁸¹ After Aeneas makes preparation to leave Carthage, the passion with which he speaks of his mission to Italy before Dido must give little comfort to his lover, but exemplifies his profound devotion to Troy and the cause of its restoration.²⁸²

340 me si fata meis paterentur ducere vitam
auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas,
urbem Troianam primum dulcisque meorum
reliquias colerem, Priami tecta alta manerent,
et recidiva manu posuissem Pergama victis.
345 sed nunc Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo,
Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortes;
hic amor, haec patria est. (4.340-47)

²⁸¹ Cf. Skulsky (1985), 453-54, who reads Aeneas' departure from Dido as indicative of "the change in the nature of Aeneas' expression of love" as his "personal ties are replaced by the abstract love of Rome."

²⁸² See esp. the Fletcher's discussion (2014, 148-56) of the phrase *hic amor, haec patria est* and its context. Reed (2007), 108 notes that Aeneas, even as he anticipates his new home in Italy, continues to invoke Apollonian epithets derived from his native country in naming "Grynean Apollo and Lycian oracles" as the sources of his charter (4.345-46).

Aeneas' comrades show the same enthusiasm for founding a new home. We have already noted, in the last chapter, their exultant cry *Cretam proavosque petamus* (3.129) as they push toward Crete, assured by the memory of Teucer that they are returning to a true Trojan homeland.²⁸³ When they arrive at the island, they eagerly cultivate the land and lay the foundations of the city (3.132-37), believing they are fulfilling the divine promise of Apollo by returning to their *antiqua mater*. After the failure of that settlement, the Trojans receive a new direction from the Penates' vision, which they also receive enthusiastically: *cuncti dicto paremus ovantes* (3.189). The same excitement is later felt when the crew catches sight of Italy, with an ecstatic triple repetition of its name:²⁸⁴

iamque rubescebat stellis Aurora fugatis
cum procul obscuros collis humilemque videmus
Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant. (3.521-24)

In Italy, the Trojans at last receive the sign marking the site of their new home in the fulfillment of Celaeno's—or, as Aeneas remembers, Anchises'—prophecy that the eating of tables would mark their new home.²⁸⁵ Aeneas greets the token joyfully, as the reclamation of a home and a homeland—expressed with a near doublet of his words to Dido (cf. 3.347, above)—and a welcome end to the threat of death that had loomed over their long exile:

salve fatis mihi debita tellus
vosque, ait, o fidi Troiae salvete penates:

²⁸³ Cf. Fletcher (2014), 105: "...what the sailors shout is most striking: the junctura *Cretam proavosque* exemplifies the interconnection of place, people, and history that dominates Book 3 and the entire poem, rephrasing the same notion as Apollo's reference to the land they should be seeking as their *antiqua mater*. Place and people are inseparable in the poem, and the Trojans' zeal for a new place is connected with their own identity."

²⁸⁴ See the close analysis of these lines by Nethercut (1992), who emphasizes the elation conveyed by the triple repetition of *Italiam*, and expands on its resonance in light of other references to Italy in *Aeneid* 1-4.

²⁸⁵ Seider (2013), 28-31 reads Aeneas' faulty recollection of the prophecy's source as a deliberate manipulation of history, and links this event with a larger pattern of Aeneas' mnemonic reconstruction of the Trojans' past into a positive and useful narrative; he explores alternative explanations of the inconsistency in 41-44. The first chapter of Seider's study, 28-65, advances the cogent thesis that Aeneas creatively and pragmatically engages with Troy's memory.

hic domus, haec patria est.

...

haec erat illa fames, haec nos suprema manebat
exitiiis positura modum. (7.120-22, 128-29)

The Trojans, too, eagerly participate in the rite, celebrating the joyous occasion:

diditur hic subito Troiana per agmina rumor
advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant.
certatim instaurant epulas atque omine magno
crateras laeti statuunt et vina coronant. (7.144-47)

When Aeneas bids them, the following day, to forge ties with the people of Latium, the delegation wastes no time in setting out: *haud mora, festinant iussi rapidisque feruntur / passibus* (7.156-57).

The preceding discussion of the Trojans' collective trauma, the threat of communal extinction, and their anticipation of a new city urges consideration of what a restored home represents to Troy's survivors, sentimentally and pragmatically. Evidence is supplied by one of the earliest episodes in their Mediterranean voyage, the landing at Delos during which Aeneas prays to Apollo for protection and guidance. Aeneas' petitions, concisely articulated, attest to the most vital needs of the community on whose behalf he speaks:

da propriam, Thymbraee, domum, da moenia fessis
et genus et mansuram urbem; serva altera Troiae
Pergama, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli. (3.85-87)

Aeneas' address to Apollo *Thymbraeus*, the cult identity of the god linked to the Troad, initiates the series of prayers that seek the welfare of his Trojan community.²⁸⁶ Within these three lines, he makes five requests, as underlined. First, and most fundamentally, the refugees desire a "home of their own" (*propriam...domum*, 85) a new, autonomous community that will belong to their people. Notably, they do not seek a temporary settlement, or integration into another

²⁸⁶ Cf. Horsfall (2006) and Williams (1962), *ad loc.*, and Reed (2007), 108.

preexisting state; in light of this petition we may read the refugees' timely departure from the Trojan city of Helenus and Andromache, and later, in Book 4, their cheerful response to Aeneas' order to leave Carthage (*ocius omnes / imperio laeti parent et iussa facessunt*, 4.294-95). Settlement in either place would have compromised the hope of a *propria domus*. Second, Aeneas asks for walls (*moenia*, 85), evoking a fixed and organized settlement that spells an end to defenseless wandering, to the weariness of exile that afflicts the Trojans (*fessis*). Third is the request for a "race" (*genus*, 86) turning the focus of the prayer from the urban space to the people who will inhabit it. The grant of a "race" suggests the continuity of the Trojan community through future generations, guaranteed by the security of a stable settlement. Fourth, he asks for a city "that will last," the participle highlighting, once again, the desire of the Trojans for stability and continuity. These first four petitions center upon the community, elaborating in the extended periphrasis of home, walls, race, and city their essential needs as a nation in exile. All four answer directly the major threat of communal death posed by the fall of Troy and their condition of displacement.

The ideas of continuity and identity also underpin the fifth and final petition, as Aeneas appeals to the god to preserve "a second Trojan Pergama," a new iteration of their lost city.²⁸⁷ The understanding of their future home as a restored Troy reflects the intimate bond between the physical site of Troy, now just a memory, and the identity of the Trojan community. The conceptual link between city and identity is attested as early as Aeneas' speech of consolation to his men, where he promises his comrades a new Troy in Latium (*illic fas regna resurgere*

²⁸⁷ On the theme of Aeneas' founding a "second Troy," see also the comprehensive discussion of Henry (1989), 43-65, who traces a development in the Trojans' goal of rebuilding their community away from the "Homeric" image of old Troy to a concept less dependent on the material city of the past. On this development in the Trojan mission, see also Fletcher (2014), 125-34, Reed (2007), 107-109, and Cairns (1989), 114-18, and the discussion of Buthrotum below.

Troiae, 1.206), and recurs thematically throughout the early books of the poem, where, over the course of their voyages, the Trojans regularly name attempted settlements after their old home on the Troad.²⁸⁸ The abortive city on Crete is called Pergamum, a name that delights the refugees:

ergo avidus muros optatae molior urbis
Pergameamque voco, et laetam cognomine gentem
hortor amare focos arcemque attollere tectis. (3.132-34)

After partitioning the crew at the end of Book 5, Aeneas lays the foundations of another city on Sicily, the center named Ilium and its environs Troy, over which a Trojan governor happily presides:

interea Aeneas urbem designat aratro
sortiturque domos; hoc Ilium et haec loca Troiam
esse iubet. gaudet regno Troianus Acestes
indicitque forum et patribus dat iura vocatis. (5.755-58)

The naming of new cities after the traditional names of Troy is a deeply evocative act in the context of the refugees' exile, isolation, and threatened anonymity, signifying an attempt at continuity between the old and new Trojan communities. Their enthusiastic response to the name of Pergamum on Crete (*laetam cognomine gentem*, 3.133) witnesses the emotions stirred by the

²⁸⁸ The one exception to this pattern is Aeneas' first settlement in Thrace, which he names Aeneadae (3.16-18). Fletcher (2014), 105-107 discusses the emotional import of place names in connection with the settlement in Crete (3.132-34), and reads the Trojans' practice in light of attested conventions of colonization: "This kind of naming impulse appears frequently in colonization narratives, both ancient and modern, and reveals a desire to establish a link with one's past and fear of losing one's identity when surrounded by new peoples as well as a reluctance to break with the past and fear of having made the wrong choice in leaving" (107). Cf. Hammer (2014), 216-27, who also stresses the urge for continuity that underpins this repetition of Trojan names for new settlements.

Bettini (1997), 18-19 notes Servius' comment (*ad* 10.60) that it was not uncommon for exiled peoples to set up new cities based more or less directly on their previous ones. Horsfall (2006), *ad* 3.133 comments on the name of Pergama selected for the Trojans' Cretan settlement, "It is altogether normal, and blameless, for Greek colonists, mythical (and above all Virgilian) or historical, to name their city-foundations after their mother-city." A comparandum for this practice within the *Aeneid* is found in Diomedes' new Italian city of Argyripa, which, as the speaker Venulus remarks, the founder called "after the name of his ancestral race" (*ille urbem Argyripam patriae cognomine gentis*, 11.246); according to Servius (*ad loc.*), this city's name originated as Argos Hippiion, after Diomedes' Greek homeland of Argos.

Most commentators identify the Trojans' naming of their new settlements after old Troy as symptomatic of the refugees' unhealthy attachment to the past, a tendency exemplified in the extreme by Helenus' and Andromache's replica Troy at Buthrotum; see below for discussion of the Buthrotum episode.

perception of that continuity. The symbolic reinstatement of their native land under ancient titles offers the comfort of familiarity and the reassurance that the community they left behind has been preserved, at least in spirit: they are still Trojans, and their land is still “Troy,” if only in its name.

This tendency toward the nominal “resurrection” of old Troy in new colonies reaches its apogee in the *parva Troia* of Buthrotum, where the hope for continuity with the past has inspired two other Trojan refugees, Helenus and Andromache, to build a scale model of the former city:

morte Neoptolemi regnorum reddita cessit
pars Heleno, qui Chaonios cognomine campos
Chaoniamque omnem Troiano a Chaone dixit,
Pergamaque Iliacamque iugis hanc addidit arcem. (3.333-36)

Approaching this city, Aeneas first encounters Andromache near the “Simois” (*in luco falsi Simoentis*, 3.302), one of many replica Trojan landmarks at the site noticed by Aeneas as he advances to the palace:

procedo et parvam Troiam simulataque magnis
Pergama et arentem Xanthi cognomine rivum
agnosco, Scaaeaeque amplector limina portae. (3.349-51)

Critics have often interpreted Buthrotum in a negative light, reading this replica Troy as the expression of a regressive attachment to the past that stifles the progress of the survivors toward a new life.²⁸⁹ Drawing parallels between Aeneas’ visit to Buthrotum and *Odyssey* 11, Quint has influentially characterized the episode as a kind of *nekyia* in which the living Aeneas crosses into a realm morbidly suffused with the memories of a dead city and fallen kinsmen.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁹ See esp. Saylor (1970); Holt (1979-80), 114-15; Quint (1982), (1993), 53-65; Henry (1989), 52-53; Bettini (1997); Hexter (1999), 73-77; Reed (2007), 119-20; Seider (2013), 86-92; Fletcher (2014), 125-34; also, briefly, Nugent (1992), 280. The commentaries of Perkell (2010), *ad* 3.294 and Horsfall (2006), 236-37 provide a fuller bibliography on the episode.

²⁹⁰ Quint (1993), 57-60; (1982), 32-34.

In a similar vein, Bettini highlights the tendency of Andromache to view the living Trojans who appear to her as “doubles” of dead predecessors like Hector and Astyanax, a perception that underscores her habitation of a city that is itself a “ghost” of the past.²⁹¹ Buthrotum is largely understood as a foil for the new community in Italy that Aeneas is destined to found, a city oriented toward the desolate memory of the Troad rather than the future glory of Rome. The contrast, for Bettini, emphasizes “the two opposite extremes of possible responses to exile: nostalgic obsession with one’s own identity or, alternatively, detachment, amnesia, forced assimilation.”²⁹² Instead of choosing the former path, Aeneas sails on to Italy, where through the designs of Juno and Jupiter his people’s Trojan identity, blended with Italian stock, will indeed be consigned to oblivion.

These same commentators mark the visit to Buthrotum as an important juncture in Aeneas’ transition from “nostalgic obsession” with the old land of Troy to a positive embrace of his promised home in Latium. It is regarded as one of a series of episodes in Book 3, beginning with the elaborate funeral for Polydorus in Thrace and concluding with Anchises’ death at Drepanum, that show Aeneas beginning to “forget” Troy, to escape the traumatic shackles of the past and make progress toward future success.²⁹³ While I agree with these critics that the episode develops Aeneas’ sense of mission and his relationship with the past, I resist the notion that Aeneas abandons his love for and identification with Troy in the process; this view draws too sharp a dichotomy between the Trojan past and the Roman future. I share the reading articulated

²⁹¹ Bettini (1997), esp. 11-16.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, 31.

²⁹³ On Polydorus’ funeral and Anchises’ passing as markers of transition away from the Trojan past, see Allen (1951), 121-23, Holt (1979-1980), 114-16, and Fletcher (2014), 93, 140-41.

by Aaron Seider that Aeneas does not simply “forget” Troy, but instead comes to terms with the past in new and productive ways as he settles his people in Latium.²⁹⁴

The exiles remain attached to their Trojan identity from the beginning to the end of Vergil’s narrative. If they ever “become less Trojan,” as Fletcher claims, it is only in the sense that their identity gradually transcends its dependence on the physical urban community of old Troy, now lost beyond recovery; in their Penates, traditions, ethnic pride, and sense of self, the refugees remain entirely Trojan.²⁹⁵ During the Italian assault on the Trojans’ camp in Book 9, Ascanius responds to Numanus’ denouncement of the “twice-captured Phrygians” with a well-aimed arrow through Numanus’ head and a biting rebuke that reasserts Trojan valor: *i, verbis virtutem include superbis! / bis capti Phryges haec Rutulis responsa remittunt* (9.634-35). Even in Book 12, Aeneas speaks of a future order in Latium where Trojans and Italians co-exist as distinct but politically equal peoples (*nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo*, 12.189), where he will install his own gods (surely including the Penates, the symbolic embodiments of Troy) and administer his own religious traditions (*sacra deosque dabo*, 12.192). His is a city that “the Trojans will build” (*mihi moenia Teucris / constituent*, 12.193-94), though it will derive its name not from the old city of Troy, but from Aeneas’ new bride (*urbique dabit Lavinia nomen*, 12.194). The non-Trojan characters whom the exiles meet in Italy also regard Aeneas’ community as representatives of their former capital, and their planned settlement as a restoration of Troy. In Book 8, Evander names Aeneas as the hope of Troy’s resurgence (*maxime*

²⁹⁴ Seider (2013), 28-65; also Reed (2007), 170.

²⁹⁵ Fletcher (2014), 133; also 131, discussing Helenus’ prophecy: “...the presence of Greeks in Italy means that they have left part of their Greekness behind, as Aeneas is slowly losing some of his Trojanness.” But Fletcher clarifies that the shift in identity he describes takes place primarily in a move away from the “geographical reality” of Troy as the source of that identity (133). His reading agrees with that of Cairns (1989), 114-18, who also remarks on “the de-trojanising of the Trojans” (117) in the Buthrotum episode. I rather share the opinion of Syed (2005), 176 on Aeneas’ Trojan identity relative to that of his kinsmen in Buthrotum: “Although Aeneas is still a Trojan, he leaves behind him Andromache’s overdetermined Trojanness.”

Teucrorum ductor, quo sospite numquam / res equidem Troiae victas aut regna fatebor, 8.470-71). In the Etruscan catalogue of Book 10, the fleet allied with Aeneas sails “in support of Troy” (*navibus ibant / subsidio Troiae*, 10.213-14). In Book 11, Drances pledges to Aeneas the Latins’ willingness to help shoulder the burden of building a new Troy (*quin et fatalis murorum attollere moles / saxaque subvectare umeris Troiana iuvabit*, 11.130-31).²⁹⁶

The notion that preserving the old Troy and founding the new Rome are mutually exclusive goals for Aeneas’ people has arguably informed some of Buthrotum’s negative appraisal. In the designs of the poet, Buthrotum may well function as a negative example or a *reductio ad absurdum* of excessive attachment to the past. But Vergil’s Trojan characters, unlike many of the poem’s external critics, do not appear to take such a dim view of the settlement.²⁹⁷ In the estimation of Aeneas and his crew, *parva Troia* seems to meet with measured approval. Aeneas recognizes the landmarks and embraces the Scaean Gate (3.349-51, above), and his crew enjoys the hospitality of their kin (*nec non et Teucri socia simul urbe fruuntur*, 3.352). Even if Aeneas recognizes the discrepancy between this model Troy, with its “pretend Simois” and “dry Xanthus,” and its more impressive predecessor (as Bettini understands *agnosco* of 3.351), there is little in the text to suggest, as Saylor has, that “Aeneas is dispirited seeing the replica of his

²⁹⁶ Among the gods, too, there seems no doubt, until the very end of the poem, that the refugees will found their city as a new Troy. In the divine council of Book 10, both Venus and Juno characterize their early settlement in Latium as such: *recidivaque Pergama* (Venus, 10.58); *Troiam...nascentem* (Juno, 10.74-75).

²⁹⁷ Again I am in agreement with Seider (2013), 86-92 who takes a more nuanced and moderate view of Buthrotum and its relation to Trojan identity: “[Aeneas’] negative observations do not constitute the sum of his portrayal of that city. Attention to the entirety of Aeneas’ narrative uncovers the complexity of his reaction to Buthrotum; he does not leave the past behind here, just a certain mode of interacting with it” (87). Cf. Syed (2005), 175-76. Horsfall (2006), *ad* 3.302 goes further in arguing against negative readings of Buthrotum, asserting that the naming of new sites after old ones in this city is an unproblematic reflection of “evocative nomenclature” that was common in ancient practice; see also *ibid.*, 235-36 and *ad* 3.133.

past home,” that he finds “desolation” there, or that the “emotional experience” of the visit “is devastating.”²⁹⁸

Before departing, Aeneas bids a gracious farewell to his hosts and their city:

vivite felices, quibus est fortuna peracta
iam sua: nos alia ex aliis in fata vocamur.
495 vobis parta quies: nullum maris aequor arandum,
arva neque Ausoniae semper cedentia retro
quaerenda. effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis
quam vestrae fecere manus, melioribus, opto,
auspiciis, et quae fuerit minus obvia Graiis. (3.493-99)

Aeneas voices no disapproval of the replica Troy, but rather commends Helenus and Andromache on achieving the same goal toward which he and his crew are striving, and must still endeavor. Bettini rightly points out that *felix* (493) does not initially seem an apt description for a figure like Andromache, overcome by grief for the past and still beholden to the dead Hector; the word is expressed through Aeneas’ point of view, whose own “Troy” remains to be realized, and who hopes to achieve the rest (*quies*, 495) that the “fortunate” Helenus and Andromache have already found.²⁹⁹ Both groups of survivors desire a secure home and the preservation of the Trojan community. His kinsmen’s literal recreation of the old city seems only a more extreme realization of Aeneas’ own hopes for an *altera Troiae Pergama* (3.86-87), elsewhere manifested in the traditional names Pergamum, Ilium, and Troia bestowed on his new foundations. Like Helenus and Andromache, Aeneas’ people also yearn for continuity with the Trojan past embodied in their former home, though his exile community must realize that continuity in an alternative way, one that will take them far from Buthrotum’s shores.

²⁹⁸ Bettini (1997), 17; Saylor (1970), 26-27.

²⁹⁹ Bettini (1997), 26-27. Cf. Syed (2005), 175-76, for whom this speech “shows that [Aeneas] envies them their ability to indulge their nostalgic attachment to Troy,” though he himself must pursue a new identity that, unlike Andromache’s, does not reside “within the matrix of the Trojan past.” Just as Aeneas refers to Andromache and Helenus, who have attained *quies* in a new home, as *felices*, Aeneas also calls *fortunati* the settlers of Carthage who are energetically building their new city: *o fortunati quorum iam moenia surgunt* (1.437).

That sense of continuity also imbues the refugees' identification of Italy as a Trojan *patria*, a territory integrally tied to their people's ethnic heritage through the memory of the founder Dardanus. Aeneas recounts the grief of leaving their initial *patria* on the Troad (*litorea...patriae lacrimans portusque relinquo / et campos ubi Troia fuit*, 3.10-11), but in time the Penates' reveal their true land of origin in Italy (*hae nobis propriae sedes*, 3.167); Italy thus assumes, through the Penates and Dardanus, the status of the Trojan homeland, a *patria* as authentic as the environs of Troy and Ida.³⁰⁰ The Trojans readily espouse this identification, which Aeneas invokes as early as his encounter with the "huntress" on Carthage's shore (*Italiam quaero patriam*, 1.380), through his memorial for fallen comrades in Latium, following Mezentius' defeat:

ite, ait, egregias animas, quae sanguine nobis
hanc patriam peperere suo, decorate supremis
 muneribus. (11.24-26)

The identification of Italy as a Trojan *patria* casts their voyage not as a departure, but rather as a "return" (*reduces*, 3.95; *reverti*, 3.101; *repetit*, 7.241). Like their naming of new colonies with the titles of old Troy, the rendering of Italy as a Trojan land lessens the sense of rupture with the past, preserving the endangered bond that exists, in Edward Said's words, "between a human being and a native place, between the true self and its true home."³⁰¹ Anchises' immediate association of the Cretan *mons Idaeus* with the Asian Mt. Ida (3.105, 112) in response to the Delian oracle had expressed the same urge to recognize continuity between old and new.³⁰² In the case of Italy, the memory of Dardanus authorizes the refugees to conceive of

³⁰⁰ Fletcher (2014), 181 observes that, after the events the Books 2 and 3 and the identification of Italy as the Trojans' destination, the term *patria* is used exclusively of Italy, and no longer of Troy. On Italy as *patria*, see also Cairns (1989), 114-18.

³⁰¹ Said (2000), 137.

³⁰² Cf. Fletcher (2014), 106-107; Quint (1993), 57-58; (1982), 31-32.

their journey as a transfer of habitation from one Trojan *patria* to another, rather than a grim expulsion from an irrecoverable home, a permanent state of dislocation in which every place is foreign.

To conclude this discussion of trauma, crisis, and the hope for continuity in the Trojans' experience of exile, I return to the episode where all the pressures of exile converge, the landing at Sicily in *Aeneid* 5. The events of this book unfold at a time when Trojan morale is perilously low. The refugees arrive at Sicily troubled by the outcome of their sojourn at Carthage:

duri magno sed amore dolores
polluto, notumque furens quid femina possit,
triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt. (5.5-7)

When their kinsman Acestes greets them, he does his best to console their weariness (*fessos opibus solatur amicis*, 5.41). It is also the anniversary of Anchises' passing, an occasion for communal grief for a prominent countryman and respected leader of the exile nation. Aeneas' speech opening the games makes public his own sorrow on this anniversary (*maestasque sacravimus aras*, 5.48; *dies...quem semper acerbum / ...habebo*, 5.49-50). The Trojan women whom we later find on the seashore share Aeneas' grief (*amissum Anchisen flebant*, 5.614). As if recognizing the dire situation of Trojan morale, Aeneas' address in 5.45-71 takes care to remind his people of their mission and the divine promises that sustain them. He greets the community solemnly as the descendants of Dardanus (*Dardanidae magni, genus alto a sanguine divum*, 5.45), asserts the governing will of the gods (*sic di voluistis*, 5.50; *haud equidem sine mente, reor, sine numine divum*, 5.56), and looks forward confidently to their future city, where he will establish annual rites for his father (*haec me sacra quotannis / urbe velit posita templis sibi ferre dicatis*, 5.59-60). Aeneas' community has been pushed to the brink, their hopes for a new state repeatedly tested and foiled. Amid these pressures, Aeneas inaugurates the funeral games that

celebrate Anchises' memory, rejuvenate the weary hearts of his men, and reaffirm the bonds of the male community through displays of competitive valor.³⁰³ The games culminate in the *Lusus Troiae*, an elaborate pageant that showcases "the bright promise of the future represented by the Trojan *pueri*" who take part in a ritual that "accentuates not only the survival, but also the unity of the Trojan people."³⁰⁴

The very anxieties that the funeral games are meant to counteract—fear, grief, and despair for their community's revival, or even its survival—lead directly to the events that culminate in the firing of the Trojan ships. Vergil's abrupt transition between scenes juxtaposes public spectacle with private sorrow, meeting the joyous applause and adulation surrounding the *Lusus Troiae* with the Trojan women's abject isolation.³⁰⁵ The causes of their grief, described by the narrator and voiced by the women themselves, sound every keynote of the refugees' trauma explored in the previous survey: mourning for human loss, the endless toil of their voyage, and the persistent frustration of attempts at resettlement:³⁰⁶

at procul in sola secretae Troades acta
amissum Anchisen flebant, cunctaeque profundum
pontum aspectabant flentes. heu tot vada fessis
et tantum superesse maris, vox omnibus una;
urbem orant, taedet pelagi perferre laborem. (5.613-17)

³⁰³ On the social functions of the funeral games, see the analyses of Fletcher (2014), 169-76; Hammer (2014), 221-22; Feldherr (1995); Nugent (1992), 260-67; Holt (1979-1980), 116-17; Pavlovskis (1976); Glazewski (1972).

³⁰⁴ Dunkle (2005), 177-78. The *Lusus Troiae* is discussed further below, 179-80.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Nugent (1992), 267.

³⁰⁶ The abhorrence of wandering on the sea expressed in Greek culture, especially in the *Odyssey*, resonates with the attitude of Vergil's Trojan women in this scene and in "Beroe's" speech that follows; cf. Montiglio (2005), 24-25.

Iris spies them on the shore and perceives their despair; to effect Juno's will she assumes the appearance of the Trojan matron Beroe.³⁰⁷ The appearance is apt for the situation, for the narrator's description reveals Beroe to be an exemplary case of the suffering familiar to the Trojans at large: *cui genus et quondam nomen natiue fuissent* (5.621). Her loss has encompassed not just her loved ones, but her social standing, too (*nomen*), evoking Aeneas' own complaint that he wanders *ignotus* (1.384). Bereaved of family, reputation, and children, "Beroe" is well suited to play upon the emotional trauma common to her audience, the other Trojan mothers into whose midst she enters (*Dardanidum mediam se matribus infert*, 5.622).³⁰⁸

The speech that follows is precisely tailored to that task, and falls into two halves that align with major themes surveyed in the preceding discussion. The first half addresses the trauma of exile; the second, their shared yearning for a stable home, a new Troy where the refugees' lives as Trojans can continue. The first half proceeds as follows:

o miserae, quas non manus, inquit, Achaica bello
traxerit ad letum patriae sub moenibus! o gens
625 infelix, cui te exitio Fortuna reservat?
septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas,
cum freta, cum terras omnis, tot inhospita saxa
sideraque emensae ferimur, dum per mare magnum
Italiam sequimur fugientem et volumur undis. (5.623-29)

Iris opens by pressing on the women's nostalgia for old Troy, evoking the same anxiety felt in Aeneas' first speech that saw him wish for death with his comrades beneath Troy's walls (*Troiae*

³⁰⁷ On Beroe's speech, see esp. the commentaries of Fratantuono & Smith (2015) and Williams (1965), Fletcher (2014), 176-81, Nugent (1992), 279-81, and Zarker (1978), 16-18; also Reed (2007), 121 on Beroe herself.

³⁰⁸ Cf. Williams (1965), *ad* 5.621, explaining the subjunctive *fuissent* in Beroe's description: "The line describes Beroe's high status in the days when Troy still stood; *fuissent* is subjunctive because it expresses the thought in Iris' mind, the reason why she chose the form of Beroe." Fratantuono & Smith (2015), *ad* 5.622 also note the poet's pointed use of *Dardanidae* in describing the Trojan women: while the ethnonym surely "carries a strong resonance of the spirit of old Troy," as they suggest, it also evokes the Delian oracle of a Apollo (*Dardanidae duri*, 3.94) and brings to mind, rather ironically in the context of "Beroe's" argument for immediate settlement in Sicily, the destined *patria* of Italy, Dardanus' land of origin.

sub moenibus altis, 1.95). She immediately links that displacement with the fear of communal death for the Trojans (*o gens infelix...exitio*, 624-25), removing any comfort in their predicament by naming unstable Fortune—not the sure fates often evoked by Aeneas—as arbiter of their future (625). Iris recounts in miniature the length of the Trojans’ trials (*septima post Troiae excidium...aestas*, 626), the distance covered (*cum freta, cum terras omnis*, 627), the constant hardships (*tot...ferimur*, 627-28), and the interminable frustration that keeps them from their destination (*Italiam sequimur fugientem*, 629).

In the second half of the speech, “Beroe” pivots to the suitability of a home in Sicily, answering the need for stable settlement:

630 hic Erycis fines fraterni atque hospes Acestes:
 quis prohibet muros iacere et dare civibus urbem?
 o patria et rapti nequiquam ex hoste Penates,
 nullane iam Troiae dicentur moenia? nusquam
 Hectoreos amnis, Xanthum et Simoenta, videbo?
 635 quin agite et mecum infaustas exurite puppis.
 nam mihi Cassandrae per somnum vatis imago
 ardentis dare visa faces: “hic quaerite Troiam;
 hic domus est” inquit, “vobis.” iam tempus agi res,
 nec tantis mora prodigiis. en quattuor arae
 640 Neptuno; deus ipse faces animumque ministrat. (5.630-40)

In focusing on Sicily, she makes a proposal sure to appeal to an audience defeated by endless voyaging, stoking resentment of the “accursed ships” (*infaustas...puppis*, 635). Cassandra’s alleged appearance and prophecy (636-38) bolsters Iris’ argument with oracular authority, and co-opts Anchises’ own reliance on Cassandra’s prophecy (3.182-85) to verify Italy as their promised land.³⁰⁹

Most abundantly of all, however, Iris exploits the women’s attachment to the memory of Troy. She identifies Sicily as a land already united with Troy through Eryx and Acestes (630).

³⁰⁹ Cf. Fletcher (2014), 179; see Fratantuono & Smith (2015), *ad loc.* for further bibliography on Cassandra’s appearance in this speech.

She calls the *patria* and the Penates to witness on her behalf (632); she invokes the rivers of Troy and the memory of Hector (633-34). These references to the past are ammunition for bitter reflection on the present: Eryx and Acestes, *patria* and Penates, Hector, Xanthus, and Simois evoke cultural memory to rouse the passions of an audience yearning for Troy.³¹⁰ Even after Iris' ruse is exposed by the nurse Pyrgo, her argument still engages the women, now torn between their deep longing for immediate settlement and the realm promised by Fate (*miserum inter amorem / praesentis terrae fatisque vocantia regna*, 7.655-56).

After the ships are fired, Aeneas' prayer and Jupiter's swift intervention save most of the fleet, but the event damages the exile community beyond repair. Affirmed by the guidance of Nautes and his father's ghost, Aeneas decides to leave in Sicily the Trojan women, the old, and those unwilling to continue the journey. Deliberating under heavy grief, Aeneas himself is emotionally "torn" in terms that verbally evoke the sundering of his people: *nunc huc ingentis, nunc illuc pectore curas / mutabat versans* (5.701-702); *tum vero in curas animo diducitur omnis* (5.720).

Aeneas' heartache is best understood in light of the main themes explored in this section: the refugees' hope for their nation's continuing integrity, and their simultaneous fear of its dissolution. Troy's fall resulted in fragmentation and diaspora: the once singular Trojan people scattered into multiple units of survivors, whether free refugees (like Antenor and his followers, 1.242-49) or ex-slaves (like Helenus and Andromache). Twice in the poem Aeneas expresses an ideal of Trojan solidarity that transcends this fragmentation, looking toward the imagined unity

³¹⁰ Cf. Frantantuono & Smith (2015), *ad* 5.634: "First we heard of *patria* and Penates; then a heavy emphasis on the negative and that which no longer was; now we are reminded of the rivers that are described as belonging to Hector, the greatest hero of the lost city, who died in its defense." Nugent (1992), 280 reads these reminders of the Trojan past as suggestive of Buthrotum's "pseudo-Troy," allusion to which undermines "Beroe's" own argument for settling Troy in Sicily by evoking Helenus' and Andromache's "self-delusion" that was "clearly exposed as inadequate, pathetic, empty as Hector's cenotaph." See also Fletcher (2014), 179-81 and Reed (2007), 121 on the resonances between this speech and the Buthrotum episode.

of Troy that still exists in the survivors who identify as Troy's people. Before Dido in Book 1, he includes the whole community of Trojans in giving thanks to the queen for welcoming his crew:

grates persolvere dignas
non opis est nostrae, Dido, nec quidquid ubique est
gentis Dardaniae, magnum quae sparsa per orbem. (1.600-602)

Even more strongly stated is Aeneas' envoi to Helenus and Andromache, where he dreams of a day when the Trojans of Italy and Buthrotum, now geographically separate, will again recognize themselves as "one Troy" in spirit:

500 si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva
 intraro gentique meae data moenia cernam,
 cognatas urbes olim populosque propinquos,
 Epiro Hesperiam (quibus idem Dardanus auctor
 atque idem casus), unam faciemus utramque
505 Troiam animis: maneat nostros ea cura nepotes. (3.500-505)

The dividing of Aeneas' people in Sicily cripples this ideal of unity, and opens the deep wounds of a community still reeling from a violent diaspora. If the goal of their journey had been to found a new Troy, to secure *domus*, *genus*, and *mansura urbs*, and to restore as much as possible of their broken ethnic community, the partitioning of Aeneas' own followers, however necessary it was deemed, represents a resounding defeat. On the Sicilian shore, "Troy" is again broken apart, fulfilling, in a small measure, the fear of communal dissolution that had haunted the exiles since the collapse of Troy.

And yet, at the very moment when the Trojan unity seems defeated, it again stirs the hearts of Aeneas' people. As the two groups, those bound for Italy and those staying in Sicily, exchange their last greetings on the shore, the Trojan women and men to be left behind undergo an immediate change of heart:

ipsae iam matres, ipsi, quibus aspera quondam
visa maris facies et non tolerabile numen,
ire volunt omnemque fugae perferre laborem. (5.767-69)

In this final reversal, the bonds of community transcend even the dread of continued exile. There is no evidence here of a studied reevaluation of the women's earlier choice, under Iris' influence, between *praesentis terrae amor* and *fatis vocantia regna* (5.656); rather, what transpires is an intimate outpouring of communal spirit among Trojan kin who have endured the same long grief of war and exile.

With his closing words, Aeneas kindly entrusts these people to the care of Acestes, bidding them a tearful farewell:

quos bonus Aeneas dictis solatur amicis
et consanguineo lacrimans commendat Acestae. (5.770-71)

Acestes' identification as *consanguineo* is particularly significant here, correspondent with Aeneas' effort to console (*solatur*, 770) those who must forfeit their place in the refugee community and their share in Troy's restoration in Italy. With this modifier, Aeneas' reassures them of this settlement's Trojan identity: Acestes is a Trojan kinsman, and the colony of Acesta, with its districts named Ilium and Troia (5.756), is a Trojan state.³¹¹ This attempt at consolation bears out, once more, the main contention of this chapter: that the preservation and continuity of their Trojan identity are of paramount concern to Aeneas and his fellow refugees. The hope of resettlement in a home identifiable, in some sense, as "Trojan" guides their journey, from their departure from the Troad through the final victory in Latium. Like Helenus and Andromache, who found their new Troy in Buthrotum, the new citizens of Acesta have won *quies* in the familiar comfort of Troia and Ilium.

³¹¹ Cf. Fratantuono & Smith (2015), *ad loc.* When he appears in the poem, Acestes' Trojan identity is often markedly reinforced: *Troianoque a sanguine...Acestes* (1.550), *Dardanium...Acasten* (5.30), *Troia generatus Acestes* (5.61), *Dardanius...Acestes* (5.711), *Troianus Acestes* (5.757). This point of emphasis gestures toward the ties of mythic kinship between Rome and Segesta; see Goldschmidt (2013), 116-19 and Chapter 1 of this dissertation, 24-25.

Visions of Troy: *domus* or *imperium*?

In the *Aeneid*'s wider scope, the Trojans' own hopes and fears represent only half the story, for they are not the only party invested in Troy's revival. Vergil's non-mortal actors—the gods, their attendants, and ghosts like Hector, Creusa, and Anchises—have their own vision of the Trojan destiny that guides the refugees' mission. In this half of the chapter, I turn to the interaction between what I shall distinguish as two “parallel narratives” about Troy's future: on the one hand, the narrative imagined by the exiles themselves, who seek the reconstitution of Troy as a stable, secure community in a new *patria*; on the other, the narrative revealed by the gods and their agents, for whom the new Trojan foundation represents the birth of a global empire. Comparison of these two visions of Trojan restoration highlights again the exiles' profound desire for cultural continuity, this time by contrast with a divine agenda defined above all by its imperial ambition. In what follows I survey first the divinely-revealed conception of the new Troy, then the exiles' own discourse about their future. Juxtaposition of these two narratives shows that, in contrast to the marked emphasis on empire and glory in the gods' revelations about Rome, the Trojans themselves demonstrate little regard for their future military and political power; instead, the stability of their new city, its Trojan identity, and the success of their descendants are the divine guarantees most resonant with their community.

Jupiter's vision of Troy's future is elaborated most fully in his first appearance near the beginning of the poem. Commentators have recognized the rhetorical underpinnings of Jupiter's vision of the future; it is a speech of consolation to Venus, and thus engineered to answer her fears for the perpetuation of Aeneas' line.³¹² This purpose may account, as others have

³¹² For this interpretation, see esp. the analysis of O'Hara (1990), 132-63.

suggested, for Jupiter’s emphatically “Trojan” reading of Roman history, which his final pact with Juno in Book 12 seriously problematizes.³¹³ The king of the gods has evidently made known this plan to the other Olympians, for Venus can name the major points of his prophecy even before he speaks, and is concerned only that he has deviated from the course to which he has already committed.³¹⁴

certe hinc Romanos olim volventibus annis,
hinc fore ductores, revocato a sanguine Teucri,
qui mare, qui terras omnis dicione tenerent,
pollicitus—quae te, genitor, sententia vertit? (1.234-37)

Turning to the prophecy itself, I quote in full the passages that define the main features of Jupiter’s narrative of Trojan restoration:

cernes urbem et promissa Lavini
moenia, sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli
260 magnanimum Aenean; neque me sententia vertit.
hic tibi (fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet,
longius et volvens fatorum arcana movebo)
bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis
contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet.
...
at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo
additur (Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno),
triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbis
270 imperio explebit, regnumque ab sede Lavini
transferet, et Longam multa vi muniet Albam.
hic iam ter centum totos regnabitur annos
gente sub Hectorea, donec regina sacerdos
Marte gravis geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem.
275 inde lupae fulvo nutricis tegmine laetus
Romulus excipiet gentem et Mavortia condet
moenia Romanosque suo de nomine dicet.

³¹³ O’Hara (1990), 144-47; on Jupiter’s omission, in his prophecy to Venus, of his ultimate assent to Juno’s wish that the Trojan race be dissolved through intermarriage, cf. O’Hara (2007), 79-81.

³¹⁴ Juno, too, has “heard” of this plan, and for this reason fears for Carthage in the poem’s earliest scene:

progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat, Tyrias olim quae verteret arces;
hunc populum late regem belloque superbum
venturum excidio Libyae: sic volvere Parcas. (1.19-22)

his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:
imperium sine fine dedi.

...

veniet lustris labentibus aetas
cum domus Assaraci Pthiam clarasque Mycenae
285 servitio premet ac victis dominabitur Argis.
nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
hunc tu olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum
290 accipies secura; vocabitur hic quoque votis.
aspera tum positis mitescant saecula bellis. (1.258-64, 267-79, 283-91)

Jupiter highlights the continuity of Aeneas' lineage, and, indeed, of all "Hector's race"

(*gente...Hectorea*, 273), the entire Trojan people. They will preside over the founding of new cities and the subjugation of foreign powers, not least the nations of Achilles, Agamemnon, and Diomedes (284-85) whose defeat, in Jupiter's telling, equates to their enslavement (*servitio premet...victis dominabitur*, 285), a satisfying revenge for captured Troy. The "Trojan Caesar," extraordinary in glory (287) and destined to join the gods (289-90) will rule a global empire (287) that brings an end to wars and ushers in a new order of peace on earth (291), the climax of a thousand years of military conquest.

Jupiter's prophecy revolves around the keynotes of future glory and power for the Trojans; to borrow the language of Julia Hejduk's insightful reading of Jupiter in the *Aeneid*, his vision of Trojan restoration is concerned above all with *fama* and *imperium*.³¹⁵ I want to draw attention to two specific motifs, corresponding with Hejduk's formulation, that are present in this prophecy, and will recur throughout the unfolding of the "divine narrative" in the poem. First is the military and political hegemony for which the new Troy is destined. Under the auspices of Fate and the favor of the gods, the city will be the capital of a worldwide empire and a divinely-appointed agent for advancing Jupiter's order on earth. This Trojan empire will be forged in the

³¹⁵ Hejduk (2009); 283-92 treat these themes in the prophecy to Venus.

crucible of war, and will impose law upon foreign peoples subject to its power. The Trojans, eventually called Romans, will be the masters of the whole world (*rerum dominos*, 282).

The second motif is the primacy of Aeneas' line, and, more broadly, of the Trojan race in constructing this global empire. The principal actors in Jupiter's prophecy are Aeneas (258-66), Ascanius (267-71), the "race of Hector," (272-74), its scion Romulus (275-77), the "house of Assaracus" (283-85), and the "Trojan Caesar" (286-90), all figures drawn into alignment as the perpetuation of the nation currently in exile. The future empire is explicitly a Trojan empire, its champions the sons of Aeneas. The achievements of this line will be bookended by the preeminent heroes Aeneas and "Caesar"—the latter representing Julius, Augustus, or an ambiguous conflation of the two—who will sit among the gods after death (259-60; 290).³¹⁶

These two components of Jupiter's plan for Trojan restoration—Troy's future empire and the exaltation of Aeneas' descendants—recur in the prophecies of other divine agents, whose ranks include gods and goddesses, the Penates, the divinized human Faunus, and spirits like Hector, Creusa and Anchises, who after death gain privileged knowledge of the future. A brief survey of the major prophecies throughout the epic illustrates the prevalence of the two motifs in the revelation of Troy's revival.

In the narrative chronology, Hector and Creusa are the earliest sources of the prophecies concerning Troy's future. Hector first reveals the long journey that awaits Aeneas before he will found a new home for Trojans:

sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penates;
hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto. (2.293-95)

³¹⁶ See. Chapter 1, n. 126 and O'Hara (1990), 155-61 on the question of this Caesar's identity.

Where Hector offers no further details about the Trojans' future, Creusa reveals more about Aeneas' destination and future life, promising him "a flourishing realm and a bride of royal blood:"

longa tibi exsilia et vastum maris aequor arandum,
et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris.
illic res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx
parta tibi; lacrimas dilectae pelle Creusae. (2.780-84)

It is left to Apollo, speaking through the Delian oracle in Book 3, to explain the hegemony in store for Aeneas' descendants in the land that will be theirs:

hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris
et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis. (3.97-98)

The motifs of global power and the glory of Aeneas' line are again on display in this prophecy, which evokes Jupiter's earlier prophecy in language as well as content.³¹⁷ The Trojan identity of the new settlement is emphasized by Apollo's earlier articulation of their new land as a return to their "ancient mother" (*antiquam exquirite matrem*, 3.96).

After the Trojans erroneously interpret their destination as Crete, the Penates step in to reorient them. Their prophecy to Aeneas again expounds the main themes of the "divine narrative:"

160 nos te Dardania incensa tuaque arma secuti,
 nos tumidum sub te permensi classibus aequor,
 idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes
 imperiumque urbi dabimus. tu moenia magnis
 magna para longumque fugae ne linque laborem.
 mutandae sedes. non haec tibi litora suasit
 Delius aut Cretae iussit considerare Apollo.
 est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,
 terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glabrae;

³¹⁷ *domus Aeneae...cunctis dominabitur oris* (3.97); *domus Assaraci...victis dominabitur Argis* (1.284-85). These verses of Apollo's oracle are also modeled after Poseidon's prophecy in *Iliad* 20.307-308: νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείας βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

165 Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
 Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.
 hae nobis propriae sedes, hinc Dardanus ortus
 Iasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum.
 surge age et haec laetus longaevo dicta parenti
 170 haud dubitanda refer: Corythum terrasque requirat
 Ausonias; Dictaea negat tibi Iuppiter arva. (3.156-71)

The Penates set the highlights of Jupiter's plan in a fuller narrative context comprehensible to the Trojans. Aeneas and his crew must sail for Italy, Dardanus' ancient home; hardships await them on the way. And the final rewards are, once again, articulated in terms of *fama* and *imperium*: the glory of Aeneas' descendants and the divine grant of empire to the new city.

In Book 4, Jupiter returns to the scene. Dismayed with Aeneas' idling in Carthage, he dictates his wishes to Mercury for direct report to the hero. Jupiter's command stresses the destiny of empire and Trojan glory in Italy, a destiny that also belongs to Ascanius:

non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem
 promisit Graiumque ideo bis vindicat armis;
 sed fore qui gravidam imperiis belloque frementem
 230 Italiam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucri
 proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem.
 si nulla accendit tantarum gloria rerum
 nec super ipse sua molitur laude laborem,
 Ascanione pater Romanas invidet arces?
 235 quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur
 nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia respicit arva? (4.227-36)

Hejduk's characterization of Jupiter's interests in Aeneas' future applies to this speech as much as it did to the major prophecy of Book 1. His vision of the Trojan restoration still entails the imposition of order through conquest (229), political sovereignty (231), and the acquisition of *gloria* and *laus* (232-33).³¹⁸ Even Ascanius' birthright is defined in terms of the Roman political and military establishment (*Romanas...arces*, 234). Mercury's message preserves much of Jupiter's language, but, even where it differs, it shares the Jovian vision of the Trojan future. He

³¹⁸ Hejduk (2009), 293-95.

scolds Aeneas as a man negligent of his political destiny (*heu! regni rerumque oblite tuarum*, 4.267), and defines Ascanius' due in terms of kingship and the future territory of Rome (*cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus / debentur*, 4.275-76).

In Book 6, Aeneas journeys through the underworld and into Elysium, where he receives the poem's second major prophecy. Anchises' narration of Roman history through the biographies of her heroes resumes in full measure the themes of empire and lineage. In language and scenes evocative of Jupiter's Book 1 prophecy, the future Troy is characterized here as a military superpower. The motif of *imperium* is ubiquitous in the Parade of Heroes, from Romulus' first settlement of Rome, whose destiny is a vast empire (*Roma / imperium terris...aequabit*, 6.782), the vision of Augustus' expansion of power to the ends of the earth (*super et Garamantas et Indos / proferet imperium*, 6.794-95), and Anchises' mandate that his Roman descendants should govern the world (*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento*, 6.851). Anchises also emphasizes the Trojan character of Aeneas' Italian-born stock. Procas is the "glory of the Trojan race" (*Troianae gloria gentis*, 6.767). Romulus' nascent city of Rome is likened, by way of simile, to the goddess Cybele (6.781-87). The *gens Iulia* is connected directly to Iulus (*hic Caesar et omnis Iuli / progenies*, 6.789-90). Lucius Aemilius Paullus is credited not simply with conquering Greece, but with avenging Troy's defeat through the conquest:³¹⁹

eruet ille Argos Agamemnoniasque Mycenae
ipsumque Aeaciden, genus armipotentis Achilli,
ultus avos Troiae templa et temerata Minervae. (6.838-40)

The younger Marcellus, doomed to an untimely death, will surpass any Trojan or Italian child:

nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
in tantum spe tollet avos, nec Romula quondam
ullo se tantum tellus iactabit alumno. (6.875-77)

³¹⁹ In another gesture that brings Anchises' prophecy into alignment with the prophecy of Jupiter in Book 1, Anchises' names the same three targets of Paullus' conquest in Greece, but in the reverse order: *Argos...Mycenas...genus armipotens Achilli* (6.838-39); *Pthiam...Mycenas...Argis* (1.284-85).

In Book 7, on Italian shores, the deified Faunus speaks to Latinus through his woodland oracle, relaying to a third party the revelations that until now had been shared only among the gods, the Trojans, and their go-betweens:

externi venient generi, qui sanguine nostrum
nomen in astra ferant, quorumque a stirpe nepotes
omnia sub pedibus, qua sol utrumque recurrens
aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt. (7.98-101)

The themes of descent and empire are transmitted clearly to Latinus, who soon after, in private reflection after the diplomatic overture of Ilioneus, recognizes the Trojans as the foretold *externi*:

hunc illum fatis externa ab sede profectum
portendi generum paribusque in regna vocari
auspiciis, huic progeniem virtute futuram
egregiam et totum quae viribus occupet orbem. (7.255-58)

Faunus and Latinus are not the only Italians made privy to the destiny attached to Aeneas' line; in Book 8, the brief allusion during Evander's tour of Pallanteum to the legacy of the prophetess Carmentis attests to her awareness of Troy's future glory, again in the familiar terms of power and lineage: *cecinit quae prima futuros / Aeneadas magnos et nobile Pallanteum* (8.340-41).

The eighth book of the epic ends with the last of the three great prophecies. The speaker here is the narrator, but the prophecy itself belongs to Vulcan, described as *haud vatum ignarus venturique inscius aevi* (8.627), who has reproduced visually what we have explored so far as the "divine narrative" of Troy restored. In the transition from verbal prophecy to visual depiction, the two major themes of the narrative have remained consistent. Like the Parade of Heroes, the scenes on the shield are underscored by a narrative of imperial expansion, advancing civilization, and the divine favor that empowers Aeneas' Roman descendants.

The new world order is brought to life in the central image of Augustus' conquest at Actium and triumph in Rome: fulfilling the Romans' civilizing mandate, the assembled forces of Italy suppress the wild barbarism of the East in a scene evocative of the gigantomachy, the archetypal contest of order against chaos.³²⁰ The victory at Actium actualizes the prophecy of universal peace under the imperial order of Augustus, Rome, and the divine powers whom Rome represents. Aeneas' descendant sits before the doors of Apollo's temple, presiding in triumph over a procession of lands, rivers, and peoples from across the globe that signifies the universality of Roman power:³²¹

720 ipse sedens niveo candentis limine Phoebi
dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis
postibus; incedunt victae longo ordine gentes,
quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis.
hic Nomadum genus et discinctos Mulciber Afros
725 hic Lelegas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos
finxerat; Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis,
extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis,
indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes. (8.720-28)

The last revelation of Troy's imperial future is delivered in Book 9 by Apollo to Ascanius, who has just brought down Numanus Remulus with his bow. Congratulating Ascanius on this rite of passage into manhood, Apollo foretells the lineage of "gods" that will issue from him, and the age of peace to be attained by that lineage:

macte nova virtute, puer, sic itur ad astra
dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella
gente sub Assaraci fato ventura resident,
nec te Troia capit. (9.641-44)

³²⁰ On this theme, see esp. the discussion of Hardie (1986), 97-110.

³²¹ The temple doors in this passage are linked intratextually with those of Priam's palace in Troy in Book 2. Both are decorated "proudly" with the spoils of empire: *barbarico postes auro spoliisque superbi* (2.504); *aptatque superbis / postibus* (8.721-22). While the verbal link may suggest the restitution of Troy's ancient hegemony in Rome, Putnam (1998), 161 notes the "disquieting" implications of the parallel between Priam's Troy and Augustus' Rome.

The preceding scenes and speeches are the major expressions of the “divine narrative” of Troy’s future. Envisioning Troy’s resurgence in Italy and future power, the gods and their agents repeatedly emphasize the vast *imperium* of the new community and the glory of Aeneas’ descendants as soldiers and statesmen. I turn now from this prophetic vision of the poem’s divine exponents to the rather different hopes of the Trojans themselves, to explore, by comparison, how the refugees think and talk about their future among one another. The points of contrast between their more intimate ideal of Troy’s restoration and the divine prophecy revealed to them have gone unnoticed in earlier scholarship, and lend further insight into the core motivations of the Trojans in exile.

The Penates’ revelation to Aeneas, as the first full explanation to the Trojans of their destiny and destination, is at first the main source of the exiles’ own understanding of their future. We see, for instance, Ilioneus quoting verbatim part of the Penates’ speech, reported in Book 3, to Dido in Book 1 (3.163-66 = 1.530-33), signaling the repetition of received information. What Aeneas and the Trojans know about their nation’s revival comes originally from the Penates; with the visitation of Mercury in Book 4, Anchises’ dream appearance in Book 5, the Sibyl’s prophecy and the Parade of Heroes in Book 6, and in Book 8, Tiberinus’ dream appearance and the visual transcript on Vulcan’s shield, the vision is further embellished.

For a “standard version” of the Trojans’ own vision of the future, we may return to Aeneas’ speech of consolation to his men as they sit in despair on the North African shore. There is some overlap with divinely-revealed details about their fate, but Aeneas’ speech also adds and subtracts from the regular patterns of the “divine narrative” considered so far. He is relaying to his shipwrecked, frustrated, and dispirited comrades not necessarily what the gods have reported,

but what he believes will most resonate with their personal hopes for the future.³²² I again quote Aeneas' words in full:

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

There are three main features of Aeneas' narrative: the promise of stability, peace, and an end to exile; the favor of the gods and the plan of Fate that guarantee their success; and the land already promised for the rise of a new Troy. We can note the similarities and differences between Aeneas' conception of Troy's future and that expressed by Jupiter in the great prophecy that falls immediately after this scene. Rather than empire and glory, we might characterize Aeneas' speech as invested in home and stability. Acknowledging the trials his people have endured, he steadies them with divine guarantees: the gods' providence will end their suffering (199); Fate has promised them a home (205-206); the appointed place for the new Troy, the place where its revival is *fas*, is Latium (206). In spite of their deep despair, his comrades have only to persevere (*durate...servate*, 207), for the way has already been made for them. There is no talk of an illustrious lineage through the ages, nor of the empire that the new Troy shall win, the two key features of all divine revelations of the future, which have already been relayed to Aeneas by the Penates by this time in the story (*idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes / imperiumque urbi dabimus*, 3.158-59). A new sovereign state of Troy shall rise, that much is certain (206;

³²² On the consolatory rhetoric of Aeneas' speech, see esp. Seider (2013), 79-82; also Fletcher (2014), 46-47 and O'Hara (1990), 8-9. Feldherr (1995), 260-61 and Glazewski (1972), 92-93 connect this speech with Mnesteus' later exhortation to his crew during the ship race in Sicily (5.189-97).

characterized not as *imperium*, but *regna*); but the significance of that new Troy to the exiles is not empire, but rather “a peaceful home” (*sedes quietas*, 205).

The discrepancies between the grander “divine narrative” of Troy’s restoration, a prophecy of conquest, power, and glory, and the humbler parallel of the Trojans’ own vision speak to the real needs of a refugee people. The Trojans have already received the divine monitions of the glory awaiting their race, but, instead of this prophecy, what Aeneas deems most salutary to his community is their trust in the peace and stability their promised city will provide. Like Jupiter’s speech to Venus, Aeneas’ encouragement to his shipwrecked crew is shaped by rhetorical calculation, and recognizes, with acute empathy, the hopes and fears of his fellow exiles. The moment of despair on the shore of North Africa is one among many for the refugees, like the failure of the colony on Crete, or the isolation of the Trojan women on the shore of Sicily. The needs to which Aeneas appeals in this consolation—stability, security, peace—are felt not only here, but everywhere. The guarantee of Fate that the Trojans’ hopes will be realized, an aspect of the divine narrative that provides the refugees with comforting assurance of success, recurs twice more in Aeneas’ discourse in Italy: first, when Ascanius’ jest about the group eating their tables reveals the location of their new city (*salve fatis mihi debita tellus*, 7.120), and again before the attempted single combat with Turnus, as Aeneas reassures Ascanius and his comrades (*tum socios maestique metum solatur Iuli / fata docens*, 12.110-111).

When they explain their hopes for the future to those outside their group, the Trojans’ wishes are consistent with the clues in Aeneas’ speech: they claim to want peace after long toil, the security of a home promised by Fate and the gods, and the integrity of their community. To the disguised Venus outside Carthage, Aeneas names the objectives of his quest as *patria* and *genus* (*Italiam quaero patriam et genus ab Iove summo*, 1.380), according to the guidance of his

divine mother and the pledge of Fate (*matre dea monstrante viam, data fata secutus*, 1.382).

Speaking for his shipwrecked crew, Ilioneus petitions Dido for conveyance to Sicily to join their countryman Acestes (1.549-550), and fears the loss of Aeneas and Ascanius. Ilioneus' introduction to Latinus is also notably humble. He claims for the Trojans nothing besides a "tiny home" for their community to worship its traditional gods, and the resources to support themselves: *dis sedem exiguam patriis litusque rogamus / innocuum et cunctis undamque auramque patentem* (7.229-30). Ilioneus is scrupulously modest in his demands: note *exiguam*, and *innocuum*, the latter emphasized with enjambment.

Although the ambassador's modesty in this case is surely, at least in part, a diplomatic calculation, nowhere else in Books 7-12 do we see the refugees make demands for anything more than the land in which to dwell, even in the presence of characters who already know and have embraced the prophecy of a Trojan empire. In fact, these characters show themselves more eager to avow Troy's imperial destiny than the Trojans themselves. Before Ilioneus, Latinus is the one who lays claim to their descendants' future power, and allies with them on that basis:

270 est mihi nata, viro gentis quam iungere nostrae
 non patrio ex adyto sortes, non plurima caelo
 monstra sinunt; generos externis adfore ab oris,
 hoc Latio restare canunt, qui sanguine nostrum
 nomen in astra ferant. hunc illum poscere fata
 et reor et, si quid veri mens augurat, opto. (7.268-73)

Aeneas and the Trojans remain silent on these revelations, but, with the advent of war, Turnus and his allies soon accuse the refugees of harboring an imperial agenda. Venulus' message to Diomedes twists the oracle that Latinus had happily embraced into an urgent appeal for resistance: *Aenean...fatis regem se dicere posci / edoceat* (8.11-13). When Drances' embassy meets with Aeneas in 11.100-31, Aeneas acknowledges only the promises of Fate for his land in Italy and denies unwarranted aggression against the Latins (*nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque*

dedissent, / nec bellum cum gente gero, 11.112-13). Drances, on the other hand, readily speaks of Aeneas' foundation as *fatalis murorum...moles* (11.130), echoing the narrator's own description of the undertaking in the *Aeneid's* proem (*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33). Aeneas' speech at the sealing of the truce in Book 12 is similarly modest in its view of the future, even as he foresees himself as the victor (12.187-88). He publicly foreswears military and political power, promising equal rights to victor and vanquished (*paribus se legibus ambae / invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant*, 12.190-91) and leaves *regna*, *arma*, and *imperium* to Latinus (*nec mihi regna peto...socer arma Latinus habeto, / imperium sollemne socer*, 12.190, 192-93). For himself he claims only what needs to rebuild his Trojan community: cultural and religious authority, a city, and a wife: *sacra deosque dabo...mihi moenia Teucri / constituent urbiq[ue] dabit Lavinia nomen*, 12.192, 193-94)

The absence of any mention of Trojan empire and glory in the presence of foreign parties may be viewed, like Ilioneus' unassuming presentation to Latinus, simply as diplomatic propriety. But even in the privacy of their own community, the Trojans' focus remains consistently on peace, stability, and communal continuity, the standard elements of Aeneas' consolation speech in Book 1. In Buthrotum, Aeneas' last words to Helenus and Andromache look forward not to the glory of a Trojan empire—a future known to the prophet Helenus (3.374-79)—but to the spiritual unity of the fragmented Trojan nation (*unam faciemus utramque / Troiam animis*, 3.504-505). Helenus' own envoi to Aeneas, notably more invested in Trojan glory than Aeneas', highlights a contrast in perspective: *vade age et ingentem factis fer ad aethera Troiam* (3.462). Aeneas retains the view of a refugee, who faces the daily trauma of exile; he remains circumspect even of his chances of landing in Italy (*si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva / intraro gentique meae data moenia cernam*, 3.500-501), let alone

dreams of glory and empire. While Helenus and Andromache have already won an end to their toil (3.493-94) and, like the gods who devise Troy's restoration in power, are at leisure to entertain such dreams, Aeneas and his crew are fixed instead on the essential and immediate necessities of communal survival.

Two prayers Aeneas renders to Apollo on the Trojans' behalf demonstrate the consistency of their goals throughout Books 1-6. First is the prayer to Delian Apollo in Book 3, which takes place after the more shadowy premonitions of Hector and Creusa, but before the Penates have fully revealed the designs of Fate. As we have seen above, the refugees' prayer speaks to the basic needs of their community: they ask for *domus*, *moenia*, *genus*, *mansura urbs*, and the preservation of a second Troy (3.85-87). The second prayer takes place in Book 6, well after Aeneas has learned of Troy's imperial destiny and the glory of his line. Yet his requests in the Sibyl's cave remain fully consistent with those he put forward on Delos:

tuque, o sanctissima vates,
praescia venturi, da (non indebita posco
regna meis fati) Latio considerare Teucros
errantisque deos agitataque numina Troiae. (6.65-68)

The guarantee of Fate; the stability of a settlement (*considerare*, 67); the restoration of their community and their country's gods: these elements comprise the vision of the future most resonant with the Trojan exiles, even after their destiny of *fama* and *imperium* has been revealed.

At this point we have identified the basic discrepancies between the Trojan future foretold by the gods, a vision of imperial glory and global conquest, and the one imagined by the exiles, for whom the new Troy promises security and the preservation of their Trojan identity. To assess this contrast in greater detail, I will consider now the Trojan responses to the two specific motifs of the "divine narrative," namely worldwide *imperium* and the glory of Aeneas' line. While the Trojans demonstrate little interest in the first motif, they show much more in the

second, further evidence that their deepest motivation remains the continuation of their community, here represented by the achievements of Aeneas' descendants.

The discussion so far has highlighted the apparent lack of imperial ambition among the refugees, but this does not mean that they do not conceive of the new Troy as a strong and prosperous state. A closer study of the political terminology used to describe the new Troy—particularly the terms *imperium* and *regna*—offer another perspective on the exiles' conception of their future vis-à-vis divine prophecy. The term *imperium* in the *Aeneid* has three important shades of meaning. First is its sense of widespread political control, something akin to its English cognate “empire,” the sense in which Jupiter and others describe the global sway the Romans will exercise.³²³ In another usage, it indicates a “command” issued by a wielder of authority; this term is very often applied in the poem to Jupiter himself, who holds supreme rank in the hierarchy of gods and men, but also to other authority figures, like Aeneas.³²⁴ The third meaning indicates the defined authority through which commands are issued, close to the sense of an “office,” but denoting supreme power in that sphere; it is used in this sense in Anchises' prophecy of the first consul, Brutus (*consulis imperium hic primus... / accipiet*, 6.819-20), as well as of Dido, Mezentius, and Latinus, the highest authorities in their respective domains.³²⁵ While the latter two definitions are relevant to the discussion, it is the first sense of *imperium*, the one most pertinent to the gods' designs for a Trojan empire, that most interests us here.

³²³ OLD s.v. “imperium” 5, 6.

³²⁴ OLD s.v. “imperium” 8.

³²⁵ OLD s.v. “imperium” 1, 2, 3. Dido: *imperium Dido Tyria regit urbe profecta* (Venus to Aeneas, 1.340); Mezentius: *superbo / imperio...tenuit Mezentius* (Evander to Aeneas, 8.482); Latinus: *decus imperiumque Latini / te penes* (Amata to Turnus, 12.58-59) and *socer arma Latinus habeto, / imperium sollemne socer* (Aeneas at the swearing of the truce, 12.192-93).

The gods and their representatives regularly employ the term *imperium* to describe the political order that Aeneas' community in Italy will command. In his major prophecy to Venus, Jupiter refers to this order as *imperium* three times (1.270, 279, 287); so do the Penates in Aeneas' dream (3.159), and Anchises in narrating the Parade of Heroes (6.782, 795, 812, 851). It may be to this sense of *imperium* that Venus appeals when, in bitter dispute with Juno in the council of the gods, she alleges to abandon hope of *imperium* for Aeneas' line, asking merely for Ascanius' survival instead: *nil super imperio moveor. speravimus ista / dum fortuna fuit* (10.42-43).

In contrast to this widespread usage of the term among exponents of the "divine narrative," Aeneas and the Trojan refugees, with only one possible exception, never describe their future state as *imperium*. They do not imagine their new community in terms of vast hegemony, but rather, as we have seen, in terms that respond to their needs: *domus, moenia, genus*. In Book 2, as Aeneas rallies a resistance to the Greeks, he does describe the former state of Troy as *hoc imperium*, evidently in the sense of political supremacy: *excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis / di, quibus imperium hoc steterat* (2.351-52).³²⁶ But this usage of the term by Aeneas, arguably justified in application to the preeminent state of the Troad, lies outside the norm. Elsewhere in the epic, when Aeneas employs this word it has either the clear sense of a political office—as in his truce speech of Book 12, assuring Italians that Latinus will maintain *imperium sollemne* (12.193)—or the sense of a command, typically from Jupiter (e.g. *sequimur te, sancte deorum, /...imperioque...paremus*, 4.576-77).

³²⁶ Horsfall (2008), *ad loc.* cites Aeneas' language here as "hallowed, familiar phrasing," with comparanda from speeches of Cicero and Livy's history; from this perspective, Vergil's stylistic choice of an elevated phrase with overtones of political rhetoric may govern the wording of Aeneas' phrase *hoc imperium steterat*.

The single exception to this rule occurs in Book 11, where Aeneas uses *imperium* in possible reference to future Trojan power. Following the first major battle against the Italian coalition, Aeneas mourns for Pallas and summons the memory of Evander:

non haec Evandro de te promissa parenti
discedens dederam, cum me complexus euntem
mitteret in magnum imperium metuensque moneret
acris esse viros, cum dura proelia gente. (11.45-48)

Elsewhere in the entire poem, Aeneas never expresses or conceives of his future in terms of *imperium*, let alone *magnum imperium*. The exceptional nature of this remark cautions against taking it at face value, as evidence of a sudden enthusiasm for empire. I suggest two possible explanations. First is to understand the sense of *imperium* here not as “empire,” but its alternate sense of “office,” in the same way he later describes Latinus’ kingship as *imperium sollemne* (12.193). But I consider the second interpretation the more plausible choice: that Aeneas is indeed referring to his future community as an “empire,” but the usage is nuanced by focalization through Evander, a figure more likely to describe Aeneas’ efforts in such terms. From this perspective, Aeneas is recalling, with bitter irony, the high ambitions that Evander attributed to Aeneas’ mission as he sent him forth with Pallas at his side; the extravagant phrase *magnum imperium*, reflecting the ambitious optimism of the old king, is set in brutal contrast to the cold reality of Pallas’ corpse. That Evander, in Aeneas’ imagination or his actual memory, should express such ambition is in keeping with his characterization; we have already explored Evander’s martial ideology at some length in the last chapter, and, in Book 8, the king applies the word to his own station when he cites old age as an impediment to his claiming *imperium* (*sed mihi tarda gelu saeculisque effeta senectus / invidet imperium seraeque ad fortia vires*, 8.508-509).

The few times when Aeneas and the Trojans, or the narrator in reference to them, do describe Troy's future in terms of political power, they use the term *regna*. Aeneas employs the word twice to describe the institution of the new, Italian Troy, first, as we have seen, in the consolation speech (*regna...Troiae*, 206), and again to Dido in pleading his case for leaving Carthage: *et nos fas exera quaerere regna* (4.350). Furthermore, we have already cited the terms in which the aggrieved Trojan women are torn between a home in Sicily and the promised land of Italy, the latter of which is referred to as *fatis vocantia regna* (5.656). In two related cases, Aeneas uses the singular *regnum* to describe Ascanius' due in the new community, of which the messenger Mercury reminds him (*cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus / debentur*, 4.275-76), and which Aeneas himself uses as an explanation of his departure to Dido (*puer Ascanius...quem regno Hesperiae fraudo*, 4.354-55). Jupiter, too, is seen to employ the singular *regnum* in his prophecy, though again in terms of the singular states of Troy and Ascanius' court (*dum res stetit Ilia regno*, 1.268; *regnumque ab sede Lavini / transferet*, 1.270-71).

In general, the plural *regna* occurs frequently in the text. Venus describes Dido's realm in North Africa as *Punica regna* (1.338) and her land of origin as *regna Tyri* (1.346). When Dido explains how Belus encountered Teucer, she says her father met him in the course of the hero's search for *nova regna* (1.620). Crete is referenced periphrastically as *Cnosia regna* (3.115) or *Minoia regna* (6.14); Ithaca is called *Laertia regna* (3.272). Latinus refers to the territory governed by Turnus' home of Ardea as *regna patris Dauni* (12.22), and Latinus' own capital in Latium is invoked by Aeneas, as he directs an attack on the city walls, as *regna ipsa Latini* (12.567).

In these many examples the sense of *regna* is consistently narrower than that of *imperium*, ranging in connotation from "kingship" to the territory or community over which a

king or queen presides, all standard definitions of the word.³²⁷ In discussing their new community in terms of *regnum* and *regna*, the exiles envision a robust monarchy worthy of old Troy, the capital of a strong and prosperous realm. But the Trojans' vision of restored *regnum/-a* does not equate, on the verbal level, to the global Trojan *imperium* repeatedly and specifically invoked by Jupiter and his agents.

With the second major motif of the "divine narrative," the flourishing of Aeneas' descendants and the Trojan race through time, we find considerably more agreement between the gods' designs and the hopes of the refugees, whose deepest yearning is the survival of their nation. Aeneas' early prayer to Apollo for a race (3.86) and avowal to the disguised Venus of his mission to secure a "race descended from supreme Jupiter" (1.380) already confirm Aeneas' own sensitivity to the continuation of the Trojan race. His regard throughout the poem for his most immediate descendant, Ascanius, speaks to the same sensitivity, as Aeneas shows himself attentive to his son's future leadership.³²⁸ We have already seen Aeneas' concern for Ascanius' kingship as he prepares to leave Carthage (5.354-55, cited above), and, even in the last meeting in the poem between father and son, we see Aeneas inculcating the values of leadership into his heir, using as role models himself and the hero of their people, his kinsman Hector (12.435-40, cited below). The greater exile community, too, shows a special reverence for Ascanius. In Carthage, Ilioneus mourns the probable loss of Aeneas and Ascanius in the same breath, the latter described periphrastically as the Trojans' "hope" (*spes...Iuli*, 1.556). At the very beginning

³²⁷ OLD s.v. "regnum;" Austin (1971), *ad* 1.206.

³²⁸ On Ascanius' relationship with Aeneas and his importance in the future restoration of Troy, see Eidinow (2003), esp. 263-64, Skulsky (1985), 454, and Glazewski (1972), 88-89; Petrini's chapter on Ascanius (1997, 87-110) is most comprehensive, and includes discussion of his complex "initiation" into war and political responsibility as Aeneas' heir (101-110).

of the Trojans' exile, it was the omen of the flames around Ascanius' head that assured Anchises of the gods' continuing protection of Troy:

sequor et qua ducitis adsum.
di patrii, servate domum, servate nepotem.
vestrum hoc augurium, vestroque in numine Troia est. (2.701-703)

Ascanius' importance as a symbol of Troy's future, and, more generally, of the exiles' hopes in the next generation, is integral to the communal spectacle of the *Lusus Troiae*. The male descendants of prominent Trojans parade "before their parents' eyes" (*ante ora parentum*, 5.553) in military regalia, showcasing in high style the vibrancy of the Trojan youth who will oversee the nation's resurgence.³²⁹ The display moves the crowd of spectators, who marvel and murmur as the spectacle begins (*omnis euntis / Trinacriae mirata fremit Troiaeque iuventus*, 5.554-55). The theme of generational continuity is felt throughout the set-piece. As a participant in these games, Ascanius rides, according to Aeneas, "for his grandfather" (*avo*, 5.550; *sancto certamina patri*, 5.603). Appearing alongside Ascanius and Atys, ancestor of the Atii (5.568), is a young Priam, the son of Polites, whose name commemorates his famous grandfather, and whose line is destined to contribute to the new nation in Italy:

una acies iuvenum, ducit quam parvus ovanem
nomen avi referens Priamus, tua clara, Polite,
progenies, auctura Italos. (5.563-65)

The viewers rejoice in the youth, and through them remember their own ancestors: *excipiunt plausu pavidos gaudentque tuentes / Dardanidae, veterumque agnoscunt ora parentum* (5.575-

³²⁹ On the theme of generational continuity and Trojan identity in the *Lusus Troiae*, see Fletcher (2014), 176; Hammer (2014), 216; Seider (2013), 136-37; Dunkle (2005), 176-78; Smith (2005), 179-80; Theodorakopoulos (2004), 66-70; Nugent (1992), 66-67; Henry (1989), 43; Holt (1979-1980), 119-21; Pavlovskis (1976), 202-203; Glazewski (1972), 88-91. Fratantuono & Smith (2015), 531-32 provide a general bibliography on Vergil's *Lusus Troiae* and its stagings in the late Republic and empire. The phrase *ante ora parentum* (or *ante ora patrum* in Aeneas' first speech, 1.95) recurs throughout the *Aeneid*; as it occurs most often to describe where parents are present for the deaths or funerals of their children, its usage here has invited comment; see esp. Dunkle (2005), 177, Smith (2005), 179-80, and Glazewski (1972), 90-91.

76). Applying the phrase *ora parentum* to both the current and previous adult generations, Vergil signals the alignment of Troy's past, present, and future leaders in the spectacle of the game. With the poet's closing allusion to the latter-day practice of the *Lusus Troiae* and its transmission across centuries (596-602), the vision of continuity expands to encompass even the Trojans' distant Roman descendants.

The *Lusus Troiae* that ends Book 5 prefigures another trans-generational spectacle, the Parade of Heroes of the following book, where again an older generation of Trojans, Anchises and Aeneas, stands riveted at the display of their successors. Aeneas first greets Anchises as he reckons up his "dear descendants" and studies with interest the details of their future lives:

omnemque suorum
forte recensebat numerum, carosque nepotes
fataque fortunasque virum moresque manusque. (6.681-83)

Embarking on the catalogue, Anchises invites Aeneas to share his joy in their descendants' destined glory, and rouses him to embrace the new Trojan homeland of Italy:

has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram
iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum,
quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta. (6.716-18)

The Dardanian and Italian heroes of later generations shall continue the fame of their Trojan ancestors as fitting heirs, winning glory according to the dictates of Fate:

nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur
gloria, qui maneant Itala de gente nepotes,
inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras,
expediam dictis, et te tua fata docebo. (6.756-59)

Aeneas and Anchises are rapt at the display (*haec mirantibus*, 6.854), and, after the spectacle ends, the narrator describes Anchises' commentary on the review as "firing the soul" of Aeneas "with passion for the glory to come" (*quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit / incenditque animum famae venientis amore*, 6.888-89). Two books later, following the third

great revelation of the future on Vulcan's shield, Aeneas again "wonders" and "rejoices," though without an interpreting Anchises to explain the events and characters: *miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet / attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum*, 8.730-31).

Joy, pride, and inspiration characterize Aeneas' response to this motif of the "divine narrative," and, to judge by the thrill of the older generation of Trojans who watch the Lusus Troiae, Aeneas' enthusiasm for the achievements of Troy's children is shared by his fellow exiles. The abundant evidence for Trojan excitement at their people's future success contrasts starkly with their consistent silence on the other major promise from the gods, the overwhelming military and political power that the new Troy will attain. In the context of this chapter's broader discussion of the refugees' desire to preserve and maintain their community, the contrast further testifies to the core importance of Troy's ongoing vitality in the hearts of the survivors. It is owing to this fervent hope in their nation's future that the vision of *fama veniens* for their children's children carries immediate emotional power; it resists the looming fear of communal oblivion, and answers their deep-seated and persistent concern for the continuity of Troy.

Conclusion

This chapter's new reading of the Trojan refugees' experience of exile has aimed to show the crucial role of ethnic identity as a source of their hopes, fears, frustrations, and motivations. The exiles' yearning for continuity in their Trojan identity underlies their recurrent fear of communal death, a death imagined both literally, through the perils of homelessness, and metaphorically, through the dissolution of their collective identity. It is felt throughout the Trojans' journey in the apprehension of their future settlement as a second Troy, their bestowal of traditional names—Troia, Ilium, and Pergamum—on their new sites, and the enthusiasm with which they recognize Crete and Italy as Trojan *patriae*. The children of Troy, those now in their

youth and those yet to be born, assume a new significance for the beleaguered Trojans as symbols of their nation's vitality and ultimate restitution.

The Trojans are refugees, victims of a trauma inflicted by the ruin of their land and the pain of displacement. But for their occasional allies and the promises of the gods, they exist without defense or recourse in a hostile world, wandering, as Aeneas acknowledges of himself, "anonymous, resourceless, rejected by Europe and Asia" (1.384-85). They are threatened with the prospect of Troy's ultimate annihilation, not only as an urban center, but as a community, a culture, and a distinct ethnic identity—the very harm Juno seeks to inflict, and finally succeeds in exacting at the close of the poem. The Trojans' deep longing for a new home exists in counterpoint to this danger. For a refugee nation, the founding of a new city represents security, stability, the propagation of their people, and the preservation of their ethnic community. The grief of exile and the dream of restoration fundamentally shape the Trojans' journey, from Troy's fall to the death of Turnus. As a dramatic rendering of the refugee experience, their story reveals in its fashioning the *Aeneid*'s keen sensitivity to the bonds, memories, ideals, and sentiments that anchor a people's communal life.

CHAPTER 4: Rhetoric and Resistance: Constructed Ethnicity in Vergil's Italy

The previous two chapters of this dissertation have investigated the influence of cultural memory and identity among four distinct ethnic communities in the *Aeneid*: the refugee Trojans, the Phoenician settlers of Carthage, the Latins, and Evander's immigrant Arcadians who reside in Latium. These groups share a number of common features that mark them off as distinctive ethnic units. They all possess names for their group that define them as a distinct community and often evoke the memory of their origins or founders. The members of these groups commemorate and transmit their shared history and values in public media, including the display of family heirlooms and the construction of civic monuments. The community's myths and memories engage the emotions of its members, and play a key role in motivating collective action. In the previous chapter we have seen the power of cultural identity in shaping the Trojans' conception of their communal past, present, and future, and its demonstrable influence on their beliefs and actions. This final chapter, too, will examine the role of communal identity in mobilizing political action, but in a more nuanced context, and with, I suggest, a more specific engagement with social developments in the first century BCE.

The group under examination in this chapter, the Italians, presents some new conceptual challenges. The four ethnic groups mentioned above—Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, Arcadians—all share a collective identity that is recognizably distinct and meaningful both to outsiders and to members of the group. Identifying oneself as a "Trojan," for instance, carries with it certain definable features that comprise the content of the Trojan identity. Anthony Smith,

followed by Jonathan Hall, delineated six major features of ethnic identity: a collective name for the group; a shared myth of descent from one or more founders; shared historical memory; a distinctive culture; a connection with a particular land; and a sense of group solidarity.³³⁰ Studied according to these criteria, the *Aeneid*'s four main communities, as they are portrayed in the epic narrative, qualify as distinct ethnic communities. The labels of "Trojan," "Tyrian," "Latin," or "Arcadian" signify a specific set of cultural traits defined among themselves and others by name, territory, and traditions.

The collectivity known as "Italians," as Vergil constructs it in the poem, does not fit these parameters so neatly. The members of this collectivity, who populate *Italia* and are distinguished by the ethnonyms *Itali*, *Ausonii*, and others, present further complications as carriers of cultural identity. The Italians are not so much an ethnic "group" as they are a "supergroup:" Italian identity does not belong to one specific community, but to the members of each of the various groups that inhabit the Italian peninsula. These circumstances open the possibility of one individual claiming multiple cultural identities, and raise questions of priority and distinctness. If, for instance, all Latins are Italians, which identity takes precedence, and where does the content of each identity begin and end? We have already surveyed the Latin identity in some depth, and seen the robust fund of cultural memory, traditions, and shared values that exist in their society. If a participant in this robust cultural program also claims an identity as Italian, what does that claim entail? This question, in turn, depends on the nature of "Italy" itself: is the Italian community a distinct and defined cultural community, along the lines of Smith's and Hall's criteria and the other communities of the poem?

³³⁰ Smith (1986), 22-30; cf. Hall (1997), 25.

These complications form the basis of my approach to Italian identity in *Aeneid* 7-12. Close reading of these books reveals Italian identity and the idea of an Italian “nation” to be problematic concepts, and these problems bear substantially upon interpretation of the Italian coalition’s war effort against the Trojans. This chapter focuses on the content of such words as *Italus* and *Italia*, as well as how the Italian leaders deploy language of Italian solidarity for political ends. I argue that both “Italian” identity and “Italy” are largely rhetorical constructions that, at least initially, have little actual content as cultural signifiers.

Italy is populated by a wide array of distinct ethnic groups that inhabit politically autonomous cities, and, prior to Turnus’ mobilization of resistance to the Trojans, there appears to have been little sense of unity and solidarity as “Italians” between the individual ethnic communities. In other words, the ethnic designation *Itali* had little force beyond the merely geographic, and the kinship of “Italians”—versus that of Latins, Rutulians, Volscians, and the like—held little significance compared with those more local civic and tribal associations. However, in the course of Turnus’ war effort, he and the other Italian chiefs amplify the idea of Italian solidarity, invoking a united resistance deeply invested in the ethnic contrast between “Italian” and Trojan. Through the rhetoric of war and racial polemic, Italian ethnicity is endowed with profound significance for a major military movement among the individual communities in and around Latium. By means of this rhetoric, Italian identity is placed at the core of a struggle between native and foreign, Self and Other, and fashioned into a vehicle for solidarity among the diverse members of the coalition.

In relation to the previous chapters of this dissertation, this chapter aims to elaborate another way in which appeals to cultural identity can tangibly impact political affairs, even when such appeals are manifestly tendentious. It also highlights an aspect of ethnogenesis widely noted

in scholarship on ethnicity and nationalism, the tendency of ethnic groups to define themselves in contradistinction to an Other. The Italian leaders' violent polemics against their Trojan adversaries dramatize this process of identity construction, for the definition of the Italian character rests largely upon an aggressive rhetorical contrast between the two groups that pervades Books 7-12. Lastly, the case of the Italians provides a negative example of the force of cultural memory in forging communal solidarity. As an ethnic conglomeration of disunited communities, they do not have a fund of shared historical memory from which to derive an identity, unlike Vergil's Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians, who define themselves largely through their communal pasts. From this perspective, the rhetoric of contrast that underpins the new Italian solidarity can be explained in terms of the absence of a usable collective past.

Adding nuance to this discussion of Italian identity in the poem is the background of social and political transformations in Italy that were unfolding throughout most of the first century BCE, to which Vergil himself was a sensitive witness. Before turning to the poetic rendering of war-torn Latium in the *Aeneid*, I will first frame the events in Vergil's created world against its historical context.

Italian Identity in the Late Republic: *Tota Italia* and Its Complications

The Mantuan author of the *Aeneid* did not begin his life as an Italian or a Roman, but died as both.³³¹ Coming of age in the aftermath of the Social War, Vergil witnessed the enfranchisement of Italian communities and redrawing of territorial borders that took place as

³³¹ Toll (1997), 34-36; cf. Ando (2002), 136.

part of Rome's "unification" of Italy.³³² Consequent to its legal and political dimensions, integration of the Italian periphery into the Roman center also occasioned a re-evaluation of the identities of "Roman" and "Italian" that had prevailed among Italy's many communities. These cultural changes drew responses from prominent authors of the first century, many of whom—Vergil, for one—were members of the newly enfranchised communities and took part in a reassessment of what membership of one's home city, of Rome, and of a new community of "Roman Italy" now entailed.³³³ Connections between these developments in Roman Italy and Vergil's poetic setting of Latium in the *Aeneid* have been explored fruitfully since the last century, and more recent scholarship has turned increasingly to the questions of nation, ethnicity, and identity that the epic poses against the backdrop of momentous cultural change in the Roman homeland. One connection to which earlier commentators have drawn attention is the mobilization of Italy by Octavian to combat Antony and Cleopatra; here too I begin my own analysis, as the basis of a new perspective on the war in *Aeneid* 7-12.

When ties between Antony and Octavian finally disintegrated in the year 32, each of them raced to secure the support of allies in the senate and abroad in preparation for the coming showdown. Antony, based in Egypt with Cleopatra, joined his Roman troops and followers with a coalition of Egyptian allies.³³⁴ Octavian, on the other hand, mobilized the support of the West,

³³² Dench (2005), 152 notes the nationalist charge of the language of a first-century "unification" in light of the 19th-century unification of modern Italy: "the continued and largely unquestioned use of the term 'unification' to describe Roman Italy after the Social War tends to encourage the equation between ancient ideology and the ideology of the modern nation-state." Mouritsen (1998) examines in further depth the influence of the modern unification on interpretations of first-century Italy.

³³³ Among these were Catullus and Nepos from Cisalpine Gaul, and, later, the historian Livy, whose home city of Padua received citizenship in 49. On Catullus and Nepos, see Ando (2002), 130-31; on Livy, Feldherr (1997).

³³⁴ On the lead-up to Actium, see esp. Pelling (1996); also Scott (1933) and Syme (1939), 276-93.

especially of Italy, for his cause.³³⁵ Both men had their allies swear an oath of allegiance to their leadership, an act which the princeps Augustus, in his *Res Gestae* composed some time later, commemorates as the moment of unity among Italians: *Iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua, et me belli quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit* (RG 25). Later historians took their cue from Augustus in highlighting the consensus of Italy beneath his banner. Suetonius even employs the slogan *tota Italia* in describing the event, likely a direct borrowing from RG 25; Dio also emphasizes Italian solidarity behind Octavian's cause.³³⁶ In Augustus' own version of history and into posterity, Italian unanimity in the lead-up to Actium was a focal point of the standard narrative.

Modern commentators, as early as Ronald Syme, have approached Octavian's appeal to *tota Italia* with greater skepticism. "The immediate purpose of the oath was to intimidate opposition and to stampede the neutrals," Syme writes in *The Roman Revolution*; it was also "a plea of a 'higher legality'" to help bolster Octavian's shaky constitutional standing as commander-in-chief.³³⁷ As a political gesture, appealing to the favor of all Italians had substantial precedent in earlier politics, and the slogan *tota Italia* had enjoyed a long currency before its turn in the *Res Gestae*. It was a repeated device of Cicero, who, much like Octavian, used it as a byword for the unanimous support of Italy's civic leaders, and evoked it especially in times of crisis to represent the unanimous will of all right-thinking citizens to defend the republic.³³⁸ As a *novus homo* himself, Cicero was well positioned to speak to the solidarity of newly enfranchised Italians when circumstances called for it. Especially thick with the language

³³⁵ Cf. Dio 6.2-6.

³³⁶ Suetonius *Divus Augustus* 17.2 (*cum tota Italia*); Dio 6.3.

³³⁷ Syme (1939), 285.

³³⁸ On Cicero and Italian unity, see Dench (2013), 126-29 and Ando (2002), 131-34.

of Italian solidarity are the speeches of 57 delivered to the senate and the people after his return from exile, in which he recognized Italian support for his recall.³³⁹ More vigorously, he appealed again in 43 to Italian unity against Antony in the *Philippics*, a gesture that foreshadows Octavian's oath of allegiance roughly a decade later.³⁴⁰

The rhetoric of *tota Italia*, in light of the real situation of Italy in the first century, invites deeper scrutiny. In the year 32, following decades of legal, political, and social transformation in Italy, to what did extent did a *tota Italia*, joined in patriotic solidarity, truly exist for Octavian to invoke? Syme was surely correct when he asserted that the political spectacle of the sworn oath helped stymie opposition on the peninsula. But the appeal to *tota Italia* glossed over more than factional divisions, and the ideal of a unified *Italia* disguised a more nuanced state of affairs among the Italian communities. The grant of citizenship following the Social War was the first time that Italy had shared in real political unity with Rome. While centuries of interaction had brought the multiple Italian polities into close contact with Rome, most of them had never before been integrated, in any official capacity, into the fabric of the Roman state, let alone with full civic participation. Integration of the Italian municipalities led to the induction of increasing numbers of *novi homines* into the halls of power, and local elites played a more engaged role in decision-making at Rome. Political assimilation had taken root. But what of the shift in identity and loyalties, now that the local community was no longer the sole unit of social agency?

The transformations of the first century presented not only a practical challenge, but also a conceptual one. The Mediterranean world had long regarded the city as the standard measure of political collectivity; what sort of thing was the new community of a unified Italy, and what

³³⁹ Cf. *Post Reditum in Quirites* 4, 18; *Post Reditum in Senatu* 25, 39; *De Domo Sua* 26, 82, 90.

³⁴⁰ See esp. *Philippics* 10 (e.g. *tota Italia desiderio libertatis exarsit*, 10.19). Dench (2005), 184-87 and (2013), 128 provide further citations from the speeches and commentary.

values and hierarchies did it entail for members? What, if not local attachment and ethnic heritage, was to be the basis of the Italian sense of self? Emma Dench has pointed out how, even among Hellenistic Greek historians and ethnographers, Italy had already presented such a conceptual problem, as home to a patchwork of ethnically variegated and politically autonomous states.³⁴¹ Clifford Ando (2002) approaches the conceptual problem of patriotic loyalty in the first century through the works of prominent Italian authors, principally Cicero and Vergil. Cicero's solution, expounded in his *De Legibus*, formulates one's place of birth and place of citizen participation (Rome) as two distinct *patriae*, a scheme in which loyalty to the greater *res publica* centered on Rome takes precedence.³⁴² Ando reads Vergil as offering an alternative perspective, one in which local and Roman identities are not held separate, but joined in unison, just as the communities of "Italy" and "Rome" form an integral whole.³⁴³

Ando's study is one contribution to a larger scholarly discussion of Vergil's engagement with Italian and Roman identity; beginning with Katherine Toll (1991, 1997), the last few decades have seen increasing interest in this issue.³⁴⁴ Toll interprets the *Aeneid* as a work profoundly—indeed, primarily—engaged with the emergence of the new "Italian nation," reading the epic as part of an effort to build an inclusive community in the aftermath of crisis and change. Zetzel (1997) sees the poem's war in Italy as "an analogy to and an anticipation of the

³⁴¹ Dench (2005), 158-63. See also Bispham (2007), 53-73 on the conceptual evolution of Italy as a territory during the Roman Republic, and Ando (2002), 124-26.

³⁴² *De Legibus* 2.2-5; Ando (2002), 131-34. On Cicero's formulation of Italian identity, see also Feldherr (1997), 139-41.

³⁴³ Ando (2002), 136-42.

³⁴⁴ Antecedents to these recent trends are McKay (1970), who is most interested in the poem's Italian landscape and its antiquarian sources, but whose conclusion (311-16) addresses Vergil's engagement with Italian identity and patriotism; and Bonjour (1975), who takes a panoramic view of Roman patriotism in the works of several Latin authors, and devotes a portion of her volume to Vergil and the *Aeneid*.

historical war fought between Roman and Italian at the beginning of the first century,” both wars fought “between peoples soon to become a single nation.”³⁴⁵ Vergil’s presentation of the war promotes unity by deconstructing the “simple polarities” that divide the warring sides: “there is, from the point of view of the Augustan present, no more difference between Roman and Italian than between Trojan and Italian.”³⁴⁶ Like Toll, Pogorzelski (2009, 2016) has explored Vergil’s Italy as a model of achieving national unity through inclusiveness. From his perspective, Vergil represents an Italy already unified in the primeval past, thus reinforcing a sense of natural unity between Italians and Romans in the present day; the depiction of the war in Books 7-12 as a civil war identifies both sides as members of the same community, and “the deaths of heroes on both sides of the war become keystones for Roman collective identification.”³⁴⁷ Fletcher (2014) has also read the poem as a response to change in first-century Italy, and, like Toll, Ando, and Pogorzelski, sees Vergil’s narrative as a meditation on the new “nation” of unified Italians and Romans.³⁴⁸

³⁴⁵ Zetzel (1997), 193.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.* See also Marincola (2010), 186-93 on the Social War as a subtext of *Aeneid* 7-12, and Johnson (2001) on the attitudes of Vergil, Propertius, and the *Aeneid*’s first Italian audience toward the new nation of “Roman Italy.” Like Zetzel, Reed (2007) also interprets Vergil’s deconstruction of Roman/Italian and Trojan /Italian categories as contributing to an inclusive Roman identity, but expands the process of identity formation beyond these binaries: “The war, characterized as a proleptic civil war between peoples meant to become one, dramatizes our sense of the Roman not just as the combination of Trojan and Latin, but as forged out of cross-cultural exchanges from many sides” (5).

³⁴⁷ Pogorzelski (2016), 71-72. Pogorzelski’s 2009 article on Italy in the *Aeneid* was excerpted from a larger study of Vergil and Joyce now published in monograph form in 2016. The two publications differ only in structure and in the latter’s inclusion of some material on Joyce: (2009) 261-89 = (2016) 5-8, 68-90. In citing Pogorzelski’s work I refer consistently to the more recent publication of 2016.

³⁴⁸ Fletcher (2014), 1-11. Other commentators on Italian identity in the *Aeneid* have focused specifically on the place of Vergil’s Italians—Roman ancestors on one hand, but Aeneas’ foes on the other—in relation to Roman identity. Bourdin’s 2005 study of the Rutulians in Roman history and ethnography reads their portrayal in the epic as supporting an ideology of Italian unity. For Barchiesi (2008), Vergil’s primeval Italians offer valuable cultural contributions to the future Rome, but at the same time threaten the new civilization Aeneas is bringing. According to Ames & De Santis (2011), Vergil’s depiction of the Italians is participating in the work of constructing the new Roman nation; the Italian characters model both “negative” and “positive” ethnographic traits which are subject to selection and rejection in the process of defining Roman identity. Syed (2005) and Reed (2007) also investigate

The preoccupation of Vergil, Cicero, and their contemporaries with Italian identity is not our only indication that the relationship between Italy and Rome remained indefinite. Syme's characterization of Italy after the Social War as "united, but only in name, not in sentiment," and as a place where "loyalties were still personal, local and regional," has held true in light of continuing work on both literary sources and material evidence, which suggests that the officially "unified" Italy was still considerably variegated and culturally autonomous.³⁴⁹ Rome and the Italian communities surrounding it had been interacting for centuries, but neither side had viewed themselves as part of an integrated whole. Even as legal and political infrastructure developed that brought Italy into closer alignment with Rome, there was scant basis for feelings of broad solidarity:

This population of the newly enfranchised had, historically, little or no reason to think of themselves and each other as a single people. There had been no long-established tradition of Italian nationalism. If anything, the opposite: Rome had built separate bridges between herself and the various Italian peoples and had discouraged them from forming links among one another... Although the immense populations of new Romans had long traditions of affiliation with Rome's military enterprises, they had no traditions of connection to the rest of the Roman project, no history, in particular, of partnership in Roman political or administrative affairs... The newly enfranchised had little reason to feel that they had become full members of the Roman state.³⁵⁰

Italian and Roman identity in the *Aeneid*, but without emphasizing the context of Italian unification. On Italian unity in Horace's *Ode* 3.14, composed contemporaneously with the *Aeneid*, see Morgan (2005).

³⁴⁹ Syme (1939), 88. The survival of local Italian cultures amid the transformations of the first century has generated substantial scholarly interest, producing a wide bibliography that cuts across several fields of Roman study. See esp. Bispham (2007), 405-46; Bradley (2007); Dench (2005), 152-221; Horsfall (1997, 2001); Mouritsen (1998); and Gabba (1994); Crawford (1996) provides a concise treatment of some evidence. Marincola (2010), 191-92 cites the persistence of local cultures as evidence of the Social War's continuing relevance for the *Aeneid*'s original Roman audience. For broader historical and methodological views of Italian integration with Rome during the Republic, see Cooley (2016), Roselaar (2012), Wallace-Hadrill (2008), 73-143, Jehne & Pfeilschifter (2006), Keay & Terrenato (2001), Torelli (1995, 1999), David (1997), Giardana (1997), and Dyson (1992). Keaveney (2005) focuses on the Social War, but also addresses the ambiguity of Octavian's appeals to Italian unity in the late 30's. Brunt (1988) assesses the attitudes toward Roman citizenship and integration of the Italians who undertook the war with Rome. Bradley (2000) focuses on Umbria as a locus of change; 190-269 address the period after the Social War. On Italian ethnicities in Roman politics and elite self-representation during the first century, see Farney (2007).

³⁵⁰ Toll (1997), 37-38. Cf. Farney (2007), 8-9 on aristocratic scorn for newly enfranchised Italians, including the *novus homo* Cicero.

This is not to deny the reality of concrete change in Italian communities, from new elements of urban planning imported from Rome to the adoption of the Latin language and the convention of dating years after sitting consuls.³⁵¹ But amid these new developments, local affinities retained their power, and institutional centralization remained relatively limited. The dynamic of negotiation between local identity and wider political participation had the effect not of reducing, but rather of amplifying local identities: “It is in fact possible to argue that the institutions of ‘Roman Italy’ enhance rather than diminish a sense of local, and sometimes even ‘tribal’ identity that we might be tempted to treat as romantic antiquarianism were we to find it in literature alone.”³⁵²

The picture of Italian solidarity in the years prior to Actium, then, is a good deal more complicated than Octavian’s rhetoric of *tota Italia* and oath of allegiance would convey. In the late 30’s, “Italian unification,” inasmuch as the grant of citizenship and the municipalization of cities represented such a thing, was still, in Syme’s phrase, a reality in name only, not yet in sentiment. I draw this section to a close with the apt summation of Emma Dench:

...the continued importance—in an undoubtedly changed universe—of a sense of variegation, regionality, and the specifics of local identities, should make us hesitate before reading as simply descriptive the monolithic concepts we find in literature, such as the highly emotive, and sometimes politically effective *tota Italia*. We should, instead, read such expressions as efforts to create a shape for new realities, perceived or desired.³⁵³

³⁵¹ Cf. Crawford (1996) and Dench (2005), 173-78.

³⁵² Dench (2005), 176. Cf. Bispham (2007), esp. 436-40, on the legal and political flexibility that allowed for both centralization and local autonomy.

³⁵³ Dench (2005), 178. Cf. Horsfall (1997), 75: “*tota Italia* was a slogan...if not invalidated, then at least weakened and impugned by numerous inconvenient exceptions and anomalies.”

Identity and (Dis-)Unity in Vergil's Italy

The previous discussion has focused on an historical moment that occurred in the years just prior to Vergil's composition of his epic, and drawn attention to its complications: Octavian, as he consolidated support in the West for war against Egypt, strategically invoked a sense of Italian solidarity that was, in reality, only tenuous and emergent. With an eye to this historical context, I turn now to the representation of primeval Italy in the second half of the *Aeneid*, and pose the following question: to what extent does Turnus' mobilization of Italy in the poem reflect that of Octavian in the late 30's, particularly in their shared appeals to Italian solidarity? To lay the groundwork for the promotion of Italian identity that develops throughout Books 7-12, I first investigate the state of affairs in Italy prior to Aeneas' arrival, to assess, as much as possible, the extent to which the ethnic and political groups populating the land demonstrate any real sense of solidarity prior to the war.

Pogorzelski and Fletcher have taken the position that Vergil's Italy is essentially unified as it is depicted.³⁵⁴ Their interpretations are grounded in an attempt to discern Vergil's relationship with the development of Italian and Roman identity in the decades leading up to the composition of his epic, especially the rhetoric of *tota Italia* echoed in *Res Gestae* 25. Pogorzelski sees the poet buttressing the ideology of a unified Italy by projecting the contemporary solidarity achieved under Octavian/Augustus onto the peninsula's mythic past. Crafting an image of Italy as a "natural whole" with a defined character, "the poem represents the already established, pre-Trojan, Italian communities as sharing a homogeneous culture."³⁵⁵ Fletcher has followed Pogorzelski's lead, arguing that the unity of Vergil's Italy represents

³⁵⁴ Pogorzelski (2009, 2016); Fletcher (2014).

³⁵⁵ Pogorzelski (2016), 72, 73.

“proleptic unity” that prefigures the political status achieved in the first century BCE.³⁵⁶ These two studies further develop the ideas posed in Ando’s 2002 article, which detects in the verses of the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* an attempt to reconcile Italian and Roman identity by bringing the two into unison, and Toll’s reading of the *Aeneid* as an effort to forge an inclusive identity for a new Roman Italy.³⁵⁷

In what follows, I challenge the interpretation that Vergil’s Italy represents a politically *or* culturally unified entity. In so doing, I aim to suggest an alternative relation of *Aeneid* 7-12 to the ideology of Italian unity in the first century. Through careful reading of the epic’s latter half, I will suggest that Vergil’s Italy is, in fact, fundamentally disunited at the time of Aeneas’ landing, and that any ethnic, political, or cultural ties among the different communities are few and rudimentary. Against this backdrop, as Turnus, Numanus Remulus, and others mount a resistance to the foreign invasion represented by the Trojans, the Italian leaders amplify the idea of Italian solidarity through rhetoric that evokes Italy as a unified whole and defines a comprehensive “Italian” identity in contrast to the Trojan Other. When Turnus raises his banner against Aeneas and leads the defense of *Italia* (7.469), Italian solidarity is not a reflection of social reality within the world of the poem, but rather, like the ideal of *tota Italia* in contemporary Roman politics, a useful rhetorical invention.

While the interpretations of Pogorzelski and Fletcher render Turnus’ invocation of Italian solidarity unproblematic, textual evidence that Vergil’s Italians lack a sense of shared identity calls that view into question. Instead of seeing Italy as a “natural and permanent entity”³⁵⁸ or

³⁵⁶ Fletcher (2014), 112 n. 87, 224 n. 16, 236 n. 30, 243-51.

³⁵⁷ Ando (2002) argues that Vergil represents Rome and Italy as an ethnic unity through underscoring the Italian roots of the Romans from primeval times. He does not, however, read the Italian communities in the poem as sharing cultural unity among one another, as do Pogorzelski and Fletcher.

³⁵⁸ Pogorzelski (2016), 72.

proleptically unified, the diverse and disunited Italian communities instead bear out a narrative of the power of rhetoric and militant resistance to amplify a sense of common identity, even where such solidarity did not exist before. In relation to the rhetoric of the late 30's BCE, then, this reading of a fragmented Italy in *Aeneid* 7-12 conveys a parallel narrative: a narrative of how leaders of native resistance to foreign aggression can, through appeals to national solidarity and the polemical contrast of Self and Other, endow an inert, undeveloped, or inefficacious ethnic identity with powerful significance. The rhetoric of Turnus, like that of Octavian, results in an invigorated sense of shared Italian identity, a conception of a unified *Italia* whose members are bound in a single community.

Close reading of the poet's narrative and the speeches of characters residing in Italy suggest that the peninsula is not characterized by a single "national" identity to which the many different communities primarily subscribe. Although the adjective *Italus* is well-attested in the text as an ethnonym, the notion of being "Italian" takes a back seat to the more localized associations of tribe or city. The heterogeneity, independence, and fractiousness of the individual communities gives little indication that the idea of "Italy" holds as much weight in the hearts and minds of Italians as do their more immediate ethnic and political allegiances. Much as the terms "Italy" and "Italian" were used in the centuries leading up to Vergil's lifetime, they appear in the poem as signifiers of geographic situation rather than a distinct cultural program.³⁵⁹ The various peoples named throughout the poem's latter half as inhabiting the land of Italy—Latins, Rutulians, Arcadians, and Etruscans, to name but a few—are shown to be singular, autonomous, conscious of their ethnic distinctness from neighboring groups, and even hostile toward one another.

³⁵⁹ Cf. Syme (1939), 286: "The name of Italy long remained as it had begun, a geographical expression only."

I begin this survey of Vergil's Italy with its tremendous diversity. The multiple different groups that appear in the poem's second half are distinguished by a wide range of ethnic and civic associations. Besides the major communities with important roles in the narrative (Rutulians, Latins, Etruscans, Volscians, etc.), several more populations are enumerated in the catalogue of Italian allies that concludes Book 7. These groups are tied to particular cities or regions of Italy, and originate from across the land. Ocnus, who marches with Aeneas, represents a city as far north as Vergil's own Mantua, a community whose composition speaks to the array of discrete ethnicities, distinguished by language and lineage, that can exist in even a single polity:

Mantua dives avis, sed non genus omnibus unum:
gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni,
ipsa caput populis, Tusco de sanguine vires. (10.201-203)

More races are enumerated from previous settlements on the peninsula, as reported in Evander's account of Italy's ancient past, an account to which we will return again:

tum manus Ausonia et gentes venere Sicanae
saepius et nomen posuit Saturnia tellus;
tum reges asperque immani corpore Thybris,
a quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim
diximus; amisit verum vetus Albula nomen. (8.328-32)

The pattern of migration, assimilation, and change that characterized the peninsula's primeval history connects with the current reality we find in Books 7-12, where Italy is peopled with an array of discrete ethnic communities living side-by-side. The continual adoption and divestment of names for its topographical features corresponds with the fluctuating identity of Italy itself, which bears the imprint of the many races and cultures that have altered its complexion. All of these groups have imposed, and continue to impose, their own identities and traditions—their

own “names”—onto the land they inhabit, rendering the very idea of “Italy” a malleable construct.

In denoting Italy’s different tribes and political groups, the poet employs a variety of ethnonyms. Most are specific to region or ethnicity, such as *Rutulius*, *Latinus*, or *Volscius*. Some races or places are distinguished by more than one name, like the Etruscans, who are variously labelled *Tyrrheni*, *Tusci*, and *Etrusci*, or multiple terms that share some overlap, like *Latinus* and *Laurens*.³⁶⁰ Where there are several terms denoting one location or ethnic group, they are largely synonymous, except in register of diction. The most inclusive and wide-ranging terms for the peninsula’s inhabitants, *Italus* and *Ausonius*, are similarly distinguished by level of diction:³⁶¹ *Ausonius* and its related noun, *Ausonia*, typically represent a higher elevation of poetic language.³⁶² As the poem’s second half proceeds, the diverse composition of Turnus’ army sometimes blurs strict differentiation between groups. In Book 12, for instance, the bystanders watching the duel between Turnus and Aeneas are variously called Rutulians and Latins (e.g. 12.704, 730, 928); these two groups are both present as spectators, but no hard distinction between them is being signified.

³⁶⁰ On the cultural content of the ethnonyms *Latinus* and *Laurens* in Vergil’s Latium, see Chapter 2, 78-82. The adjective *Laurens* more specifically refers to the territory of the *ager Laurens* in northern Latium, but Vergil does not use the term so strictly; Fordyce (1977), *ad* 7.47; Harrison (1997), *ad* 10.635.

³⁶¹ We might add to this group the adjective *Hesperius*, but in its three appearances in the poem it refers only to the peninsula, never its people: *Hesperium...latus* (3.418); *litus in Hesperium* (6.6); *Hesperio in Latio* (7.601). The name *Italides* is also used once by the narrator to refer to Camilla’s lieutenants (11.657).

³⁶² Tarrant (2012) calls *Ausonius* a “grander synonym” for *Italus* (*ad* 12.834). As further testament to the term’s “elevated” connotation, three of its four usages by human characters occur in the context of formal diplomacy. Ilioneus employs it during the diplomatic interview with Latinus (*Ausonios*, 7.233); Diomedes uses it to address the gathered Italians in his dispatch (*Ausonii*, 11.253, cited below); and Aeneas describes Turnus as “Ausonian” during his formal speech at the truce in Book 12 (*Ausonio...Turno*, 12.183). The one usage outside of diplomacy comes from Turnus, as he begs Aeneas for his life at the very end of the poem (*vicisti et victum tendere palmas / Ausonii videre*, 12.936-37); but here, too, the appeal is formal, even “diplomatic,” and the elevated language is arguably appropriate for the situation. Jupiter, the king of the gods, uses the term *Ausonius* most frequently of all the characters in the poem (10.105, 12.834, 12.838).

The names *Italus* and *Ausonius* deserve further comment.³⁶³ As terms that encompass the whole breadth of Italy, they represent evidence that “Italian” does exist as a classification, albeit one very broadly and rudimentarily defined. When the Etruscan prophet, whose words are reported by Evander to Aeneas, tells his people that their leader cannot be an *Italus* (*nulli fas Italo tantam subiungere gentem*, 8.502), this seems only to mean that their leader must arrive from elsewhere other than the peninsula they inhabit. It does not indicate anything as geographically or culturally specific as other ethnonyms.

Perhaps owing to this looseness of meaning, and, I suggest, the lack of a unified ethnic identity to which all residents of Italy subscribe, the terms *Italus* and *Ausonius* do not appear to be endowed with the same significance as markers of individual and collective identity that the more specific ethnonyms are. In other words, “Italian” identity is not a meaningful concept to the peninsula’s inhabitants in the way that Latin, Rutulian, or Etruscan identity are. Vergil’s Trojan and Italian characters only rarely identify others as “Italian” or “Ausonian,” preferring to use more specific ethnic or regional appellations.³⁶⁴ Rather than as “Italians,” the Rutulians and Latins are addressed corporately by the names *Rutuli* and *Latini* several times, as when, for one example, Turnus stays his troops in preparation for single combat with Aeneas: *parcite iam, Rutuli, et vos tela inhibete Latini* (12.693).³⁶⁵ By contrast, however, *Itali* never appears in the

³⁶³ See 223-27 below on the toponyms *Italia*, *Ausonia*, and *Hesperia*. On *Italus*, cf. Tarrant (2012), *ad* 12.202, who connects the usage of *Italus* in the poem’s most Augustan passages, such as the description of Aeneas’ shield, with the slogan *tota Italia*.

³⁶⁴ For example, combined usages of *Italus* and *Ausonius* by Trojan or Italian characters to designate self or others number only 15, against 32 total usages of *Latinus* and *Rutulius* alone.

³⁶⁵ Other examples include 7.400 (*matres...Latinae*), 9.428 (*o Rutuli*), 9.494 (*o Rutuli*), 11.108 (*Latini*), 11.302 (*Latini*), 12.229 (*o Rutuli*).

vocative case, and *Ausonii* does only once, when the Greek émigré Diomedes (in Venulus' report) addresses the whole coalition with diplomatic formality (*antiqui Ausonii*, 11.253).³⁶⁶

Though every Italian character is aligned with at least one ethnicity and location—for example, Turnus is Rutulian, and other characters identify him as such—only one individual ever self-identifies as *Italus*. This is the immigrant Evander, who includes himself among the *Itali* who refer to the river as “Tiber” after the eponymous Thybris: *Thybris, / a quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim / diximus* (8.330-32). The fact that this single example comes from Evander, whose foreign (Greek) origin the text repeatedly brings to our attention,³⁶⁷ is especially illustrative of the force of the appellation “Italian.” For a character whose foreign ethnicity is so rigorously emphasized to lay unique claim to status as an *Italus* demonstrates the basic flexibility of this term. An Arcadian Greek by geographic origin—an identity he also avows³⁶⁸—Evander makes a conscious choice in linking himself with the *Itali* in this way, even though his connection with this homeland is more tenuous than others may boast. If a recently-immigrated Arcadian is *Italus* as much as Turnus or Latinus, the term seems little more than geographic in significance, with little ethnic or cultural import attached. This state of affairs further explains the name's spare use among even Italian characters, in contrast to the highly frequent *Rutulius* or *Latinus*, which denote more precise and meaningful ethnic, cultural, and political alignments.

I return to the ethnic composition of Vergil's Italy. Among the ethnicities resident on the peninsula there are also several recent immigrants from abroad, particularly from Greece. The Arcadian émigré Evander is only the most prominent of these; to his Arcadians we might also

³⁶⁶ Turnus' greeting to Camilla, *o decus Italiae virgo* (11.508), comes closest to a vocative *Italus*. While Camilla's connection to Italy receives some emphasis here, the sense of the phrase is arguably different from addressing an individual or a body as “Italian(s).”

³⁶⁷ E.g. *Graia...ab urbe* (6.97), *rex Arcas* (8.102), *optime Graiugenum* (8.127).

³⁶⁸ Cf. 8.573, where Evander refers to himself as the “Arcadian king” (*Arcadii...regis*).

add the Argive Diomedes, the famed champion of the Greek side in the Trojan War, and two other Greeks who fall to Mezentius' spear in Book 10, the exile Acron, described as a *Graius homo* (10.719), and Antores, who had joined with Evander:

at illa volans clipeo est excussa proculque
egregium Antoren latus inter et ilia figit,
Herculis Antoren comitem, qui missus ab Argis
780 haeserat Evandro atque Itala consederat urbe.
sternitur infelix alieno vulnere, caelumque
aspicit et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos. (10.777-82)

The catalogue of Turnus' allies in Book 7, comprising the kings who pledge assistance to the defense of Italy, attests to considerable variation in the coalition leaders' ties with the land they have sworn to protect. Catillus and Coras, as well as their brother Tiburtus, the founders of Tibur, hail from Argos (7.670-72); Halaesus is a son of Agamemnon (7.723-25); Oebalus, the son of Telon, migrated to the region with some of his Teloboan countrymen from Aetolia (7.733-38); more Argives march in Turnus' own retinue (*Argiva pubes*, 7.794). Turnus himself, whose family boasts a longer-established residency on the peninsula, bears a shield emblazoned with the likeness of Io, an image which advertises his connection with the Inachid clan of Argive origin.³⁶⁹ The varied ethnicity of these and other figures who appear in Vergil's Italy, many of whom, as recent immigrants, might only with some qualification be called "Italian," complicates the supposition of a defined Italian identity. The Arcadian Evander's self-identification as *Italus* highlights the same complication.

As readers, we are not alone in recognizing these ethnic divisions; to the residents of Italy, too, they represent meaningful distinctions between people. Groups and individuals display a strong consciousness of their own foreign origins and those of others. Turnus' shield, whose

³⁶⁹ On the shield and its implications for Turnus' ancestry see Mackie (1991, 1993), Gale (1997), Hannah (2004), and Reed (2007), 69-70.

image draws attention to his non-native lineage, demonstrates an awareness of foreign ethnic identity even on the part of the king leading the coalition to defend Italy, whose ancestors had settled in Italy some generations before.³⁷⁰ The Etruscans, too, are repeatedly characterized by their Lydian ethnicity; both Evander (8.479-80) and the narrator (10.155) refer to them as *gens Lydia*, and the Etruscans' own prophet, whose words are reported by Evander, addresses their assembled host as *Maeoniae delecta iuventus* (8.499), invoking their Lydian homeland with its archaic toponym.³⁷¹ The Rutulian Turnus can claim Greek identity as much as he can Italian, and whether Aeneas' allies are called Etruscans or Lydians depends only on the desired emphasis.

Because so many of Italy's inhabitants qualify as simultaneously native and foreign, Italian identity is capable of being willfully emphasized or suppressed. In Book 7, Faunus' oracle directs Latinus to seek a foreign marriage for Lavinia:

ne pete conubiis natam sociare Latinis,
o mea progenies, thalamis neu crede paratis;
externi venient generi, qui sanguine nostrum
nomen in astra ferant... (7.96-99)

Still favoring her daughter's betrothal to Turnus, the Latin queen Amata attempts to dissuade Latinus from giving Lavinia in marriage to Aeneas, and poses the argument that Turnus is just as much an *externus* as Aeneas is, by virtue of his Argive ancestry:

et Turno, si prima domus repetatur origo,
Inachus Acrisiusque patres mediaeque Mycenae. (7.371-72)

Amata's argument is clearly motivated by her desire to marry Lavinia to Turnus, but she makes the point to Latinus in all seriousness. After all, Turnus himself promotes his own Greek origin

³⁷⁰ Mackie (1991), 264 notes the ambiguity of Pilumnus' relation to Turnus' father Daunus; Turnus is either the grandson or great-grandson of the Argive Danae, who married Pilumnus in Italy and founded the city of Ardea.

³⁷¹ The term appears as a name for Lydia as early as Homer, and thereafter becomes standard in poetic usage; see Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.* and 8.479 on testimony from antiquity about the Etruscans' Lydian origin.

with the device on his shield; the Etruscans are Italian by habitation, but Lydian by ethnicity; Evander speaks as an Italian, but originated in Greece. One is seemingly *Italus* or *externus* only in the eye of the beholder.³⁷² If the ethnic identity of Italy's inhabitants is so recognizably varied, and Italian ethnicity is so fluid a construct, the idea of a unified Italian identity appears increasingly unstable, not to mention the notion of solidarity among peoples who self-identify, in any meaningful way, as Italian.

The marked ethnic diversity of Italy's inhabitants, and the consciousness of that diversity among the groups themselves, are not the only complicating factors for a defined Italian identity. *Aeneid* 7-12 is replete with politically autonomous communities, each of which has its own civic and military leadership. Besides Latinus, Evander, and Turnus, the catalogue in Book 7 includes numerous other kings from throughout the region, each of whom presides over a politically independent state. The members of these communities are shown to be loyal to their own leaders. The Rutulians eagerly arm for war, moved by the summons of Turnus:

certatim sese Rutuli exhortantur in arma.
hunc decus egregium formae movet atque iuventae,
hunc atavi reges, hunc claris dextera factis. (7.472-74)

In the catalogue of Italian allies, Messapus' troops hail their king in song as they march (*ibant aequati numero regemque canebant*, 7.698). In Book 11, as the Volscians watch the fatal spear hurtle toward Camilla, all eyes are on their queen: *convertere animos acris oculosque tulere / cuncti ad reginam Volsci* (11.800-801).

Although the individual states are distinct and autonomous, they do demonstrate a degree of interaction with one another. The narrator recounts that princes from across the land had come to Laurentum to seek Lavinia's hand in marriage (*multi illam magno e Latio totaque petebant /*

³⁷² Cf. Chapter 2, 117-19 on the Trojans' promotion or suppression of descent from Dardanus among themselves and in diplomatic interviews, so as to identify alternately as *externi* or *Itali*.

Ausonia, 7.54-55). Latinus and Turnus have a history of cooperation (*quid cura antiqua tuorum / et consanguineo totiens data dextera Turno*, 7.365-66);³⁷³ the phrase *polluta pace* attached to the Rutulians' march against Latinus corroborates the notion of a pre-existing diplomatic arrangement between their states (*ergo iter ad regem polluta pace Latinum / indicit primis iuvenum*, 7.467-68). Turnus' alliance with the Etruscan Mezentius is based on a guest-friendship that brought the king under Turnus' care following his overthrow and exile from Agylla (*ille inter caedem Rutulorum elapsus in agros / confugere et Turni defendier hospitibus armis*, 8.492-93). But, for all of this interaction between individual elites and groups, nowhere is it suggested that Italy is characterized by any sort of broad political solidarity.

The largest body of unified Italians in Books 7-12 is Turnus' coalition, but this joining of forces is not indicative of a formal unity that existed prior to the war against Aeneas. The catalogue of Book 7 shows countless small and large communities joining the Rutulians not as a unified political body, but as an alliance of independent states pledging their service to a common military effort. When the narrator, invoking Erato and formally embarking upon the poem's Iliadic half, characterizes the war as *totamque sub arma coactam / Hesperiam* (7.43-44), the language reflects this very state of affairs. The adjective *totam* and the participle *coactam* signify that a unity of effort has been achieved at the present time; but this unity is specifically predicated on the war (*sub arma*).³⁷⁴ A mobilization of Italians on this scale has never before occurred, as line 7.623 leads us to believe: *ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante*.

The Latin queen Amata offers one more example that speaks to Italy's political division. We have already called attention to her labelling of Turnus as an *externus* owing to his Argive

³⁷³ As *consanguineo* suggests, Turnus is also related by blood to Latinus' household, as nephew of Amata and cousin of Lavinia; Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.*, reporting Servius.

³⁷⁴ I disagree here with Fletcher (2014), 243-44, who reads this phrase as suggesting a pre-existing Italian unity.

origin. The preceding segment of her argument that Turnus qualifies as a foreigner targets not his ethnic identity, but his city's political autonomy. Because Ardea does not fall under Latinus' jurisdiction, Turnus is, we might say, "politically foreign:"

si gener externa petitur de gente Latinis,
idque sedet, Faunique premunt te iussa parentis,
omnem equidem sceptris terram quae libera nostris
dissidet, externam reor et sic dicere divos. (7. 367-70)

Though tendentiously defined, the concept of foreignness the queen advances here is predicated on the real political divisions that exist in Italy, where each state is a free agent; it reflects, too, the panoply of ethnicities that further demarcate the identities of Italy's tribes and cities. Even Pogorzelski, who argues that Vergil's Italy is unified, admits that Amata's arguments about Turnus represent real fissures between the Italian communities.³⁷⁵

More than just politically autonomous, however, the nations of Italy are also prone to warfare against one another. The palace of Picus in Laurentum, the storehouse of the Latins' cultural memory, displays several relics of wars fought against other states:³⁷⁶

multaque praeterea sacris in postibus arma,
captivi pendent currus curvaeque secures
et cristae capitum et portarum ingentia claustra
spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis. (7.183-86)

Tiberinus reveals to Aeneas that Evander has been engaged in a long-fought war against the Latins (*hi bellum adsidue ducunt cum gente Latina*, 8.55), and Evander himself confirms the

³⁷⁵ Pogorzelski (2016), 74: "The facts are on Amata's side. The political reality of ancient Italy is one of many distinct states, only much later to be unified by Rome." Pogorzelski accepts that Vergil's Italy is not politically unified, but maintains that it is culturally unified: "Amata's arguments, however, do not ultimately undermine Italian unity. The poem does take her reasoning seriously, but does not allow her argument to deny the natural homogeneity of Italy... The *Aeneid* responds to Amata's position by positing a preexisting cultural unity that will only find political expression through Italy's Roman future" (74).

³⁷⁶ The display of arms in the palace of Picus represents the Latins as formidable warriors, in contrast to an earlier description of Latinus and his realm: *rex arva Latinus et urbes / iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat*, 7.45-46. On the apparent contradiction and possibilities for interpretation, see Gransden (1976), *ad* 8.55; Rosivach (1980); Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.46; Bleisch (2003); O'Hara (2007), 96-98, with further evidence and references.

hostility of Latium at his borders, naming the Rutulians as foes (*hinc Tusco claudimur amni, / hinc Rutulus premit et murum circumsonat armis*, 8.473-74).³⁷⁷ The speech of Numanus Remulus, which receives further comment below, paints Italian society as highly bellicose, where young and old alike thrive on warfare and plunder.³⁷⁸ In Book 12, when Latinus attempts to persuade Turnus to abandon the war, he argues that Turnus still possesses his ancestral realm of Ardea, and other, unnamed towns he has already taken by military force (*sunt tibi regna patris Dauni, sunt oppida capta / multa manu*, 12.22-23). The peninsula's autonomous states do not belong to a peaceful, cohesive whole, but, on the contrary, are seen to employ military force to attack, resist, and annex one another.³⁷⁹

When we turn from politics to culture, the diverse populations of Italy are shown to have individual cultural traditions and institutions all their own. As we have seen in Chapter 2, the Latins and Arcadians are shown to have unique cultures of only local significance. The narrator's look inside the palace of Picus in Book 7 attests to various political, religious, and familial traditions of the Latins, to which we might add the custom of opening the gates of war described in 7.601-22. For the Arcadians, the cult of Hercules and its related rituals constitute a centerpiece of their civic and religious life. From the standpoint of Vergil's effort to compose a Roman "national epic," the depiction of these cultural elements serves an etiological purpose, whereby the poet grounds the customs of present-day Rome in primeval institutions. But in the

³⁷⁷ The discrepancy between Tiberinus' account of the war, which makes the *gens Latina* the enemy of Evander, and the account of Evander, who names the Rutulians instead, may reflect the alliance between Latinus and Turnus to which the *data dextera* of 7.366 alludes.

³⁷⁸ *At patiens operum parvoque adsueta iuventus / aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello* (9.607-608); *canitiem galea premimus, semperque recentis / comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto* (9.612-13).

³⁷⁹ See Moorton (1989) for further evidence and commentary.

fictionalized world of the poem, these cultural traditions belong locally to the Latins and Arcadians, and are nowhere suggested to be universal, or “pan-Italian.”³⁸⁰

Two elements of culture are, however, discernibly shared among more than one community. First is the story of Saturn’s habitation in the land in mythic times. Evander recounts to Aeneas that the land of Italy remained uncivilized until the fugitive Saturn settled in Italy for many generations (8.319-23). Saturn’s special connection to Latium is also mentioned by Latinus (7.202-204), the god’s own descendant.³⁸¹ The story of Saturn varies in its particulars between Latinus and Evander—the latter characterizes the Saturn as a lawgiver and civilizer, while Latinus claims that the god imposed no laws on the Latins—but does appear to reflect a shared tradition about Italy’s past.³⁸²

The second “pan-Italian” cultural institution is the oracle of Faunus.³⁸³ When Latinus visits the oracle to learn about Lavinia’s marriage, the poet describes the site as respected and visited by all the neighboring peoples together: *hinc Italiae gentes omnisque Oenotria tellus / in dubiis responsa petunt* (7.85-86). A passage late in Book 12 confirms the prevalence of Faunus’ cult, where Turnus, during his duel with Aeneas, invokes Faunus with a vow that reminds the god of Turnus’ past acts of veneration:

“Faune, precor, miserere” inquit, “tuque optima ferrum
terra tene, colui vestros si semper honores,
quos contra Aeneadae bello fecere profanos.” (12.777-79)

³⁸⁰ In Vergil’s depiction, the Latins and the Arcadians are singled out as the primary contributors to future Roman culture; for the poem’s consideration of the broader Italian contribution to Rome, see esp. Toll (1991, 1997) and Barchiesi (2008).

³⁸¹ Rosivach (1980) and Bleisch (2003) provide thorough treatments of Latinus’ genealogy and analyses of Saturn’s role in the poem’s presentation of Latium. Cf. Thomas (2004-2005) on the subtext of the rivalry of Saturn and Jupiter in the encounter between the Latins and Trojans.

³⁸² On this discrepancy, cf. Chapter 2, 79-80, 121.

³⁸³ I agree here with Fletcher (2014), 244.

The Rutulian Turnus' devotion to this "Laurentian god" (12.769) further suggests that Faunus' cult was an institution widely revered by Italians.

Besides these two elements, the text does not offer evidence of specific cultural customs shared throughout different communities; yet when Pogorzelski asserts that Vergil's Italy is a unified entity, he stresses that this unity exists in the shared culture of Italians.³⁸⁴ The main examples on which his argument rests are the speech of Numanus Remulus (9.598-620) and the dialogue of Jupiter and Juno near the conclusion of the poem (12.819-40). To conclude this survey of Italian disunity, I will pause over these two scenes to engage more closely with Pogorzelski's interpretations, beginning with the speech of Numanus Remulus, which runs as follows:

non pudet obsidione iterum valloque teneri,
bis capti Phryges, et morti praetendere muros?
600 en qui nostra sibi bello conubia poscunt!
quis deus Italiam, quae vos dementia adegit?
non hic Atridae nec fandi fictor Vlixes:
durum a stirpe genus natos ad flumina primum
deferimus saevoque gelu duramus et undis;
605 venatu invigilant pueri silvasque fatigant,
flectere ludus equos et spicula tendere cornu.
at patiens operum parvoque adsueta iuventus
aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello.
omne aevum ferro teritur, versaque iuencum
610 terga fatigamus hasta, nec tarda senectus
debilitat viris animi mutatque vigorem:
canitiem galea premimus, semperque recentis
comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto.
vobis picta croco et fulgenti murice vestis,
615 desidiaae cordi, iuvat indulgere choreis,
et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitrae.
o vere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta
Dindyma, ubi adsuetis biformem dat tibia cantum.
tympana vos buxusque vocat Berecynthia Matris
620 Idaeae; sinite arma viris et cedite ferro. (9.598-620)

³⁸⁴ Pogorzelski (2016), 72-79.

When Numanus Remulus addresses the “twice captured Phrygians” (599), he embarks upon a rhetorical contrast between the Italian and Trojan character that simultaneously elevates his own side and demeans his foes.³⁸⁵ Italian identity, then, is central to the speech’s program; the assertion of “Italianness” as a defined concept is necessary in order to contrast it with its inferior alternative. To this end, he first names his homeland with the all-encompassing term *Italia* at the beginning of his speech (601) and proceeds to describe the primitively virtuous character of all Italians with a series of vignettes recounted with first-person plural verbs (*deferimus, duramus, fatigamus, premimus*) that render him the representative of a homogenous population. It is for this representation of homogeneity that Pogorzelski singles out the speech as illustrative of a culturally unified Italian identity.³⁸⁶

But the highly rhetorical nature of this speech cautions against taking Numanus’ depiction of Italy at face value. To read it as an accurate representation of Italian culture is to neglect its rhetorical intent. Predicated on a polemically-charged contrast of Self with Other, the speech reveals its program of comparison in its very structure: Numanus treats first the Italians, and then, at 614, with the emphatic *vobis* beginning the line, he shifts his attention to the Trojans.³⁸⁷ The portraits of Italian character produced by Numanus in the first half all contribute

³⁸⁵ Hardie (1994), 188 calls Numanus’ speech a “powerful piece of epideictic rhetoric, using the techniques of praise and invective in order to elaborate contrasting racial stereotypes of the Italians and the Trojans.” On the ethnic rhetoric in Numanus’ speech, see esp. Nelsestuen (2016), 85-95; Nakata (2004), 177-85; Keith (2000), 19-22; Hardie (1994), 17-18, 185-98; Horsfall (1990b); Cairns (1989), 125-28; and Dickie (1985); also Seo (2013), 54-56, Thomas (1982), 98-100, and Winnington-Ingram (1971-72), 63-66.

³⁸⁶ Pogorzelski (2016), 74-75, 78. Pogorzelski acknowledges that Numanus defines Italian unity in contrast to the Trojan enemy: “Juno and Numanus Remulus, in subscribing to the idea that the Trojans are foreign to Italy, define Italian culture as a cohesive whole against a non-Italian other” (77). But he does not question Numanus’ characterization of Italy, or the rhetorical underpinnings of that characterization.

³⁸⁷ From a literary standpoint, Vergil has relied upon a wealth of Greco-Roman ethnographic tropes to compose Numanus’ representations of both the Trojans and the Italians; Horsfall’s 1990 account of the speech’s ethnographic influences is authoritatively thorough. Nelsestuen (2016) identifies Cato’s *Origines* as the speech’s most important single source.

to the depiction of their race as physically and mentally tough: Horsfall identifies Italian *duritia* as a “dominating theme” of the speech.³⁸⁸ When he turns to the Trojans, Numanus simply reverses his formula, answering his sketches of Italian *duritia* with examples of Trojan *mollitia*. Where Italians are men, the Trojans are women; where the Italians gird themselves with iron, the Trojans wear colorful garb; where the Italians are farmers and warriors, the Trojans amuse themselves with song, dance, and bizarre oriental rituals. Numanus’ invective in these lines recalls the African king Iarbas’ prayer in Book 4, which pointedly defamed Aeneas’ effeminacy in similar terms (4.215-17); Numanus’ fellow Italians, particularly Amata and Turnus, engage in the same type of anti-eastern polemic.³⁸⁹ According to Numanus’ rhetorical and ideological goals, the speech fashions the Trojan character into an effective foil for his own people, whose masculinity and fortitude are thrown into relief by the contrast.

So clearly constructed for this purpose, and so polemical in its characterization of Self and Other, this speech should not be mistaken for genuine evidence as to the nature of Italian society. Numanus’ entire description of Italian *mores* is constructed for an audience of Trojans, and delivered as a challenge. Asserting a distinct, comprehensive, and unified ethnic category for Italians is part of his rhetorical program, and such a scheme does not allow for the variety and multiplicity of identities in Italy that we have been observing throughout this survey. The dichotomy underpinning the speech, between Italian/native and Trojan/foreign, inevitably depicts Italians as an ethnic unity possessed of a shared character. In the process, this speech erases the distinctions between separate communities in favor of a show of strength and solidarity.

³⁸⁸ Horsfall (1990b), 306.

³⁸⁹ The features of this polemic are further analyzed below, 223-37.

What of the actual content of his depiction? The characterization of Italians as a *durum genus* is not found only in Numanus' speech. Evander, relating to Aeneas the origins of the Italian peoples (8.314-27), recounts that the original, indigenous race was born from "tree trunks and tough oak" (*gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata*, 8.315). Earlier on, when the shade of Anchises appears to Aeneas in the dream in Book 5, he warns his son about the labors awaiting him in Latium: *gens dura atque aspera cultu / debellanda tibi Latio est* (5.730-31). Vergil's Italians may well be characteristically rugged and bellicose, but this still does not entail cultural homogeneity among the sundry communities. If these textual clues do point us in the direction of taking *duritia* as an ethnic trait which residents of Italy embrace as uniquely theirs, it still does not indicate a shared cultural program, nor does it validate Numanus' rhetorical sleight of hand in casting "Italian" as a homogenous category. Given our survey of Italy's ethnic and political constitution so far, its peoples are far from claiming any degree of solidarity as "Italians." A number of discrete groups residing in a single land may all claim physical and mental toughness as a trait of the people sharing that land, but it does not entail that they are culturally unified, or unified in any other substantive way.

The other major evidence for cultural unity put forward by both Pogorzelski and Fletcher is the settlement of Jupiter and Juno, which guarantees the survival of the indigenous *mores* at the expense of the Trojans' ethnic identity (12.819-840). Juno implores Jupiter to permit the survival of native culture, including language and dress, following Trojan victory, but it is worth paying attention to the specifics of her request:

820 pro Latia obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:
 cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)
 component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,
 ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
 neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari
 825 aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem.

sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
sit Romana potens *Itala virtute* propago:
occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia. (12.820-28)

As the triple invocation of Latium and the Latins suggests, Juno is addressing the culture of one ethnic group in particular, not of all the Italian communities together. Since this is the region in which Lavinium, then Alba Longa, and finally Rome shall rise, it is not surprising that the poet has Juno single out Latium for cultural survival. Though she names specific aspects of the Latin cultural identity, including dress and language, there is no indication here, nor elsewhere in Books 7-12, that the *mores* peculiar to the Latins represent those of Italy as a whole. The phrase *Itala virtus* (827), much like Numanus Remulus' insistence on Italian *duritia* as an ethnic trait, similarly does not indicate any sort of shared cultural program; it is merely a putative quality of the people inhabiting the peninsula.³⁹⁰ Pogorzelski claims this passage shows that Juno “considers the Italians as one unified army fighting against the Trojans” and “treats the Italian part of Roman heritage as a single homogenous culture.”³⁹¹ But Juno's own words do not support such an interpretation.

Where Juno's proposition covers only the Latins, Jupiter's response assumes a larger scale, guaranteeing the preservation not just of Latin customs, but the traditions of all the peninsula's inhabitants:

do quod vis, et me victusque volensque remitto.
sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
835 utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum
subsident Teucri. morem ritusque sacrorum
adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.
hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,
840 nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores. (12.833-40)

³⁹⁰ Pogorzelski (2016), 73 emphasizes the phrase *Itala virtus* as reflecting Italian cultural homogeneity.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*

Like Juno, Jupiter also specifies that the settlement pertains to the Latins (836-37), but he twice employs the ethnonym *Ausonius* as well (834 and 838). Although Jupiter invokes the *Ausonii* all together in this passage, referencing the Italians as a defined collective, his words still do not entail a culturally unified Italy.³⁹² Jupiter's provision for the survival of local cultures does not require that all Ausonians—here meaning the collective body of Italy's individual states and tribes—share the same *sanguis* or *mores*, an idea markedly incompatible with the ethnic diversity and political autonomy of Vergil's fictional communities. The context of the speech is not about defining what constitutes "Italian," but contrasting indigenous customs with foreign customs, and ensuring the endurance of the former. From the point of view of the epic's historical narrative, the settlement of Jupiter and Juno signifies the Romans' partial descent, ethnically and culturally, from the ancient Italians; it does not indicate a specific state of affairs between the Italian communities in the poem's primeval setting. Jupiter's real distinction is between the groups already present on the peninsula and the new Trojan arrivals. The Ausonians do not need to be unified in order for the god's vow to hold true.

The picture of Italy upon Aeneas' arrival, then, is one of ethnic variety, political autonomy, internal hostility, and only a basic degree of shared culture. The idea of *Italia* as a geographic concept, and of *Italus* as the ethnic category encompassing those who reside on the peninsula, exist in the world of the text, but evidence for the disunity among the multiple distinct peoples living in this land argues against the presence of a unified, defined, and meaningful Italian identity. More significant are the localized ethnic and political identities that prevail in individual states, peoples, and regions. It is by these identities primarily that the Italian

³⁹² *Contra* Fletcher (2014), 251: "...[Jupiter's] repetition of the archaic, poetic term *Ausonia* also emphasizes the long-term unification of Italy, stretching it back into the legendary past as well as ahead into the future."

communities recognize themselves and their neighbors, rather than the more inclusive, more abstract construct of an “Italian” nation.

Trojan Resistance and Italian Solidarity

Bearing in mind this state of affairs in Italy, we now turn to the emergence of a unified conception of the land and its sundry peoples over the course of *Aeneid* 7-12. As a military resistance is mounted against the “foreign invasion” of Aeneas and the Trojans, we observe a new movement among the Italian communities who band together under Turnus’ leadership. The resistance fuels the amplification of a unified Italian identity, a spirit of “pan-Italianism” that promotes an ideal of solidarity between the region’s disparate peoples, and is defined in opposition to the Trojan Other through ethnic polemic. In what follows I will trace the narrative of the poem’s latter half, taking stock of the moments in the text where we see the emergent ideology of Italian unity taking shape, then analyze its constituent elements more closely.

The proem of *Aeneid* 7 heralds a clash of nations, setting the stage for the discourse of solidarity and resistance that will unfold in the poem’s second half. The arriving Trojans are called an *advena...exercitus* (7.38-39), a gesture toward both their “outsider” status and the imminent war they are bringing.³⁹³ The response of Italy, in turn, is articulated as *totamque sub armis coactam / Hesperiam* (7.43-44), an equally martial image that looks ahead to the mobilization of Italy in a collective resistance. From these initial characterizations of the two sides, already the narrator is laying out two major themes of the impending conflict: the struggle between foreign and native forces, and the uniting of Italy’s tribes under a single banner.

³⁹³ See Nethercut (1968) on the Trojans’ arrival as a “foreign invasion.” Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.38-39 notes that the semantic range of *advena* can include the idea of “aggressor” or “invader,” but does not see that as the operative meaning in these lines.

After Juno has sent Allecto to sow discord between the Trojans and Italians, Turnus comes to the fore as the leader of the military resistance to Aeneas. Rallying the various Italian communities, he shows himself a vocal exponent of a united Italy. As I have argued, Italy possesses little in the way of a unified political and cultural character; rather, it is a heterogeneous assortment of individual communities and diverse races that interact with one another as independent groups. But, contrary to this state of affairs, Turnus' rhetoric fashions Italy into a singular entity, with territorial borders and an "Italian" race residing within them. His appeal to Italian solidarity first resounds as he leads forth his army from Ardea towards Latium, summoning the support of allies in a "national" defense:

ergo iter ad regem polluta pace Latinum
indicit primis iuvenum et iubet arma parari,
tutari Italiam, detrudere finibus hostem;
se satis ambobus Teucrisque venire Latinisque. (7.467-70)

Two key features of Turnus' rhetorical program appear in line 469. First, he names *Italia* as the object of defense, an appeal that looks beyond the narrower focus of any one state or region; this is not, according to his vision, a struggle for Latium only, but the entire peninsula. Second, he speaks to the *fines* of the land, reinforcing a conception of Italy as a single, comprehensive, and cohesive unit defined by geographical borders.³⁹⁴ Turnus' call to arms transcends local communities, looking toward a grander conception of an Italian nation that encompasses all the numerous groups within its confines. It is a gesture toward a unity of identity, a shared territory and cultural claim.

Turnus' appearance at the court of Latinus later in book 7, amid the carnage following the shepherds' battle against the Trojans, shows him again promoting the ideology of a single Italy:

³⁹⁴ Cf. Juno's language in 7.333-34: *neu conubiis ambire Latinum / Aeneadae possint Italosue obsidere finis*.

Turnus adest medioque in crimine caedis et igni
terrorem ingeminat: Teucros in regna vocari,
stirpem admisceri Phrygiam, se limine pelli. (7.577-79)

The consequences of unchecked Trojan ambitions are not only political dominance (*regna*), but the adulteration of an Italian race. The ethnonym “Phrygians”, already deployed in Book 7 as a slur against the Trojans by Amata (7.363) and Allecto as Calybe (7.430), receives studied use in the rhetoric of Turnus and other Italian leaders.³⁹⁵ Here, as elsewhere, the term is employed to accentuate the foreign character of the Trojan foe, to draw a sharpened contrast between the indigenous resistance and the invading Other, already laying out the ethnic polemic most rigorously proclaimed in the speech of Numanus Remulus. Warning of the corruption of an extant “native” stock with Trojan blood, Turnus now casts the heterogenous melting pot of Italy as a racially unified entity.

The coalition of allies takes shape under Turnus’ leadership. The Rutulians, at the summons of their king, are the first to take up arms, and do so eagerly (7.472). At Turnus’ arrival in Latium, the once-peaceful peninsula is brimming with preparations: *ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante* (7.623). In the beginning of book 8, all Latium too has pledged its support: *simul omne tumultu / coniurat trepido Latium* (8.4-5).³⁹⁶ Together with the rest of the troops gathered by the several chiefs named in the catalogue, Turnus’ forces army now comprises a fair share of *tota Italia*.

An embassy is sent to Diomedes, who has established his new city of Arpi to the south, to enlist his aid against Aeneas. Venulus’ intended request to Diomedes begins as follows:

mittitur et magni Venulus Diomedis ad urbem

³⁹⁵ On *Phrygius*, see Chapter 2, n. 139 and O’Hara (2011), *ad* 4.215.

³⁹⁶ The language of *omne...coniurat...Latium* evokes the slogan *tota Italia* and the oath sworn by Italians in 32 BCE; cf. O’Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), *ad loc.*

10 qui petat auxilium, et Latio consistere Teucros,
 advectum Aenean classi victosque penatis
 inferre et fatis regem se dicere posci
 edoceat, multasque viro se adiungere gentis
 Dardanio et late Latio increbrescere nomen. (8.9-14)

The ambassador's account of current events displays a similar concern for the cultural integrity of Italy as we have seen in Turnus' rhetoric. The foreigners have come intending to make a settlement in the land (*consistere*, 10), to set up a permanent community of Trojans in the heart of Italy. Aeneas has come with not just a small band of exiles, but a fleet under his command (*classi*, 11). As we learn in Book 11, Venulus' embassy identifies the Trojans to Diomedes as bellicose "invaders" (*qui bellum intulerint*, 11.250). The mention of Aeneas' importation of Trojan gods (8.11-12) suggests a further cultural dimension to his threat, the implication that his foreign religious institutions will supplant those which have hitherto prevailed in Italy.³⁹⁷ These points emphasize Aeneas' ability to displace the existing culture of Italy by the permanent immigration of a foreign group. The allegations that Aeneas claims for himself the backing of the fates and gathers great numbers to his cause (12-14) stress the imminence of the danger.³⁹⁸ The ambassadorial dispatch echoes Turnus' rhetoric from Book 7 in its emphasis not just on the Trojans' military threat, but, pointedly, on the cultural influences they bear with them. In the reckoning of the coalition's leaders, their war is a struggle for Italian identity, not merely political hegemony; they promote the war primarily as the preservation of the native status quo.

At the outset of the battle against the Trojan camp, Turnus delivers a vigorous address to his troops that again evokes the ideal of a unified Italian resistance. After the Trojan ships morph

³⁹⁷ On the Penates as symbols of Trojan identity, see Chapter 2, 66-67.

³⁹⁸ Fordyce (1977), *ad loc.* rightly calls these lines a "total misrepresentation" on Venulus' part, as Aeneas has not yet secured any support among the Italians; also O'Hara (forthcoming *Aeneid*), *ad loc.* Later in the same book, Aeneas similarly exaggerates when he tells Evander that Turnus and his allies threaten to subjugate all the land and sea (8.147-49).

into sea nymphs through Cybele's intervention, Turnus boasts, in a convenient interpretation of the prodigy, that the Trojans have lost their only means of escape from the assembled might of Italy:

ergo maria invia Teucris,
nec spes ulla fugae: rerum pars altera adempta est,
terra autem in nostris manibus, tot milia gentes
arma ferunt Italae. (9.130-33)

Backed by Italy's *milia gentes* standing together, and goaded by the theft of his bride, he again mingles this appeal to Italian solidarity with racial polemic, targeting the "criminal race" that stole his bride:

sunt et mea contra
fata mihi, ferro sceleratam excindere gentem
coniuge praerepta. (9.136-38)

Both of these themes—the unity of Italians and the racial corruption of the Trojans—return stridently later in Book 9 in the speech of Numanus Remulus. As discussed above, Numanus' diatribe throws into sharpest relief the ethnic polemic of the Italians against the emasculated "Phrygian" invaders, deploying a program of contradistinction that simultaneously promotes the solidarity of Italians, defines for them a common character and ethos, and asserts their natural superiority over the enemy.

After the Trojans, now joined by Aeneas and the Etruscans, repel the Italian assault on the camp in Book 10, dissension among the Latins occasions a public assembly in Book 11. There Turnus, stung by defeat and disgraced by his desertion through Juno's contrivance, must defend the war and his leadership against Drances. Diomedes has refused to send aid, and a major battle has been lost. Public opinion is shifting, and the crowd in Latinus' court calls for Turnus himself to decide in single combat who shall win hegemony over Italy: *ipsum armis ipsumque iubent decernere ferro, / qui regnum Italiae et primos sibi poscat honores* (11.219).

Recalling earlier invocations of *Italia* by the war's leaders, the crowd affirms that the rule of all Italy is at stake.³⁹⁹ Their perspective is now universal, not local.

In response to Drances' opposition to furthering the war, Turnus responds first with a ringing invective against Drances and a spirited defense of his own valor. He then attempts to reignite the Latins' hopes for victory in the war by appealing again to the armed might at their disposal, pledged by the many communities of Italy for the common cause:

420 sin et opes nobis et adhuc intacta iuventus
 auxilioque urbes Italae populi que supersunt,
 sin et Troianis cum multo gloria venit
 sanguine (sunt illis sua funera, parque per omnis
 tempestas), cur indecores in limine primo
 deficimus? cur ante tubam tremor occupat artus?
425 multa dies varique labor mutabilis aevi
 rettulit in melius, multos alterna revisens
 lusit et in solido rursus Fortuna locavit.
 non erit auxilio nobis Aetolus et Arpi:
 at Messapus erit felixque Tolumnius et quos
430 tot populi misere duces, nec parva sequetur
 gloria delectos Latio et Laurentibus agris.
 est et Volscorum egregia de gente Camilla
 agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas. (11.419-33)

In this impressive catalogue of the coalition's major contributors, Turnus envisions a unified front, as all of the various *urbes Italae populi que* (420) stand together in support of the war. Numerous chiefs, sent by numerous individual states (*quos / tot populi misere duces*, 429-30) have taken the field. Combatting Latin desperation, Turnus showcases the tremendous power at their disposal, a vision of strength and solidarity that relies upon the unity of the Italian people. As when in Book 9, following the omen of the ships, he bolstered his men with a show of Italian

³⁹⁹ Cf. Horsfall (2003), *ad* 11.219, who connects the phrase *regnum Italiae* with Turnus' first call to arms in 7.469, *tutari Italiam*.

unanimity, Turnus' defense of the war is delivered with a specific rhetorical aim, here again of repairing the hopes of his followers.

The council is stopped short by sudden news of Aeneas' advance. After Camilla's death and the rout of her troops derail an attempted ambush of the Trojans, Turnus arrives back in Latium. Book 12 opens as Latinus checks Turnus' impulse to reenter battle. Beseeching him to end the war and retire to his own land, Latinus defines the state of the war in terms that echo Turnus' language of a united Italy. His city, now hardly defensible, is the bastion of the Italians' hopes for victory: *bis magna victi pugna vix urbe tuemur / spes Italas* (12.34-35). Unwilling to send Turnus to an inevitable death, Latinus considers not only the Rutulians' reaction, but that of all Italy:

quid consanguinei Rutuli, quid cetera dicet
Italia, ad mortem si te (fors dicta refutet!)
prodiderim, natam et conubia nostra petentem? (12.40-42)

Latinus' words, and those of Amata that follow, fail to change Turnus' mind; he arms for battle, uttering a violent slur against the "Phrygian" Aeneas:

da sternere corpus
loricamque manu valida lacerare revulsam
semiviri Phrygis et foedare in pulvere crinis
vibratos calido ferro murraque madentis. (12.97-100)

From Numanus' speech and other passages, the rhetoric here is familiar: the feminizing of the Trojans goes hand-in-hand with the assertion of Italian masculinity, in this case Turnus' own.

In the swearing of the truce that follows soon after, Latinus addresses the assembled hosts, sanctioning with these words a lasting peace "for Italians:" *nulla dies pacem hanc Italis nec foedera rumpet* (12.202). But his oath is soon voided when war again breaks out between the two sides. The battle culminates in the single combat of Aeneas and Turnus, a struggle Turnus must ultimately lose. As the struggle unfolds, Jupiter and Juno come to terms with the settlement

that charts the future of Italy (12.821-40): the language and customs of the Latins will prevail, while the Trojan ethnic identity will pass away. Italy will subsume yet another racially distinct community into its highly diverse constitution. The rhetoric of unity and solidarity that has underpinned the Italian resistance to the Trojans will culminate, at last, in a union of indigenous and foreign.

At the end of the narrative, what has become of Turnus' rhetoric of solidarity? Does it succeed in producing a comprehensive Italian identity? Even though the coalition threatens to break down in Book 11, it persists, as we are left to imagine, until the victory of Aeneas at the close of the poem. Though Turnus himself may have lost some stature in the eyes of his troops—the debate in Latinus' court in Book 11 and Turnus' feeble appearance to onlookers at the swearing of the truce (12.216-21) suggest as much—he nevertheless commands their allegiance until the end. Attempting to break the truce, the disguised Juturna is able to rally the Rutulians while invoking the valor of Turnus, the *ille* of the following speech:

ille quidem ad superos, quorum se devovet aris,
succedet fama vivusque per ora feretur;
nos patria amissa dominis parere superbis
cogemur, qui nunc lenti consedimus arvis. (12.234-37)

The Rutulians and Latins alike are charged by Juturna's appeal, and take up Turnus' cause:

qui sibi iam requiem pugnae rebusque salutem
sperabant, nunc arma volunt foedusque precantur
infectum et Turni sortem miserantur iniquam. (12.241-43)

Immediately after, there appears in the sky the omen of the eagle pursuing the geese, and, in response, the augur Tolumnius calls on his Rutulian countrymen to take up arms in defense of their king:

vos unanimi densete catervas
et regem vobis pugna defendite raptum. (12.264-65)

Later in the battle, as Aeneas lays siege to the city, Saces finds Turnus on the battlefield and beseeches him, as their “last hope,” to save Italy from destruction:

Turne, in te suprema salus, miserere tuorum.
fulminat Aeneas armis summasque minatur
deiecturum arces Italum excidio daturum,
iamque faces ad tecta volant. in te ora Latini,
in te oculos referunt. (12.653-57)

Although Turnus’ resistance against the Trojans ultimately fails, the fostering of Italian solidarity seems, by the end of the poem, to have gained some traction. When Juturna rallies the Italians in the passage cited just above (12.234-37), it is noteworthy that she refers to the Rutulians’ *patria* and autonomy as the stakes of victory or defeat (*nos patria amissa dominis parere superbis / cogemur*, 12.236-37), and the appeal wins over the “Laurentes and Latins” as well (*ipsi Laurentes mutati ipsique Latini*, 12.240). To this ideal of the *patria* as object of defense we may add those words of Latinus to Turnus, on the eve of the last battle, that express acknowledgment of all Italy’s investment in the effort (*spes Italas*, 12.35; *cetera / Italia*, 12.40-41), and Saces’ fear for the *arces Italum* (12.655). The Trojan opposition, too, seems to recognize the corporate identity of the Italians mustered against them. When Aeneas delivers his speech at the truce, he promises equal rights for both peoples, Trojan and “Italian” (*nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo*, 12.189). Later in the book, when he lays siege to Latinus’ city, Aeneas names not Turnus, Latinus, or the Latins, but the “Italians” altogether as his foes, now the violators of two agreements:

ipse inter primos dextram sub moenia tendit
Aeneas, magnaue incusat voce Latinum
testaturque deos iterum se ad proelia cogi,
bis iam Italos hostis, haec altera foedera rumpi. (12.579-82)

The frequency of the ethnonyms *Italus* and *Ausonius* in Book 12 may also signal a growing consciousness of Italian collective identity: used in reference to persons, these ethnonyms appear 17 times in Book 12, representing more usages by far than any previous book of the poem.⁴⁰⁰

Now that we have surveyed the ideology of Italian solidarity in Books 7-12, I want to explore two major features of the Italian leaders' rhetoric in further detail and with additional evidence: first, the ideological significance of the name *Italia*; second, the pattern of ethnic contradistinction exemplified by the anti-Trojan polemic.

Names associated with ethnicities and the lands they claim are often laden with profound cultural meaning. We have seen, in the case of ethnonyms, the frequent derivation of such names from memories central to the identity of the ethnic community.⁴⁰¹ Anthony Smith includes ethnic signifiers as one of six defining characteristics of ethnic groups.⁴⁰² This chapter has already addressed the ambiguous status of *Italus* as an ethnic and cultural signifier, but the territorial moniker *Italia*, and other names for the land, also demand treatment, for the contrast of these larger term with smaller regional markers like *Latium* urges consideration of their significance. Invocation of *Italia* helps elevate Turnus' private dispute with Aeneas over Lavinia into a crisis of national proportions; from the earliest rumblings of war, when the narrator reports Turnus' rallying cry as he marches on Latinus, his mission is to save not just *Latium*, but *Italia* (7.469).

Chronologically, the first mention of the name *Italia* in the poem comes from the Penates, who use it to define the new Trojan homeland (3.166); the Trojans understand the land by this

⁴⁰⁰ This count includes its usages by the narrator and the gods. By contrast, *Italus* and/or *Ausonius* appear a total of three times in Book 7, four times in Book 8, three times in Book 9, four times in Book 10, and five times in Book 11. There is no commensurate rise in the frequency of other, more local ethnonyms in Book 12.

⁴⁰¹ See Chapter 2 on ethnonyms among the Trojans (57-60), Carthaginians (69-71), Latins (78-82), and Arcadians (88-89).

⁴⁰² Smith (1986), 22-24.

name owing to that revelation. The Penates are joined by the other gods and goddesses in calling the territory predominately by the name *Italia*. The frequency of the term in the text noticeably shifts between the first and second halves of the poem: in Books 1-6 the word appears 34 times; once the Trojans reach Latin shores, however, it only occurs 10 times in Books 7-12.⁴⁰³ Complementing this decline in frequency is the fact that the term *Italia* is not used by Italians nearly to the degree that it is used among the non-Italians of Books 1-6. In the poem's first half, the primary characters are the Trojans, the gods, and the various peoples they meet in their journey; here the name of Italy typically appears in the context of the divinely-presaged future, and, by virtue of the characters in play, in the mouths of non-Italians. In Books 7-12 the term *Italia* is used twice by Turnus (7.469, in indirect discourse, and 11.503), once by Ascanius (9.267), once by Numanus Remulus (9.601), three times by the gods in council (10.8, 32, 67), once in the reported speech of the crowd in Latinus' court (11.219), once by Latinus (12.41), and once by the narrator (7.563). To isolate the relevant fact, only five of the 44 usages of the term *Italia* in the entire *Aeneid* come from the speeches of Italians.

As an indicator of the significance of the name *Italia* to the characters on the peninsula, these data cannot be pressed too hard. The many discussions in Book 1-6 of Italy as the Trojans' destination surely accounts for higher usage of the name, and other reasons for the discrepant frequencies of its use between the epic's two halves may be posited. But the relative scarcity of the name *Italia* in the speech of Italian characters does reinforce a point made in the previous section about the ethnonym *Italus*: it is not used with anywhere near the frequency that more local territorial markers appear in speech. While references to *Italia* remain few and exceptional, characters regularly identify themselves as belonging to territorially-based communities like

⁴⁰³ Cf. Tarrant (2012), *ad* 12.41.

Latium, Pallanteum, Etruria, or Ardea through corresponding ethnonyms. The prevailing geographical, ethnic, and cultural units among Vergil's Italians are local; they conceive of the landscape not in terms of *Italia*, but of the territorial units inhabited by smaller civic and ethnic communities. Contrasted with this tendency toward local affiliations, Turnus' pledge to defend the whole of Italy in 7.469 appears all the more exceptional.

Italia is not the only name Vergil's characters use for the land. Evander's account of the peninsula's early history draws special attention to the constant mutation of its name, an emblem of Italy's ethnic diversity (*saepius et nomen posuit Saturnia tellus*, 8.329). In the *Aeneid*, the terms *Ausonia* and *Hesperia* are the most frequent alternatives to *Italia* throughout the poem.⁴⁰⁴ *Hesperia* deserves further comment here, for its usage relates to cultural perspectives in the poem in interesting ways. The origin of the name *Hesperia*, like *Ausonia*, is Greek; while no mention is made of *Ausonia*'s derivation, the Greek origin of *Hesperia* is recognized within the world of the poem: *est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt* (1.530 = 3.163). The name's very etymology bespeaks an oriental perspective, as Italy is thus identified as the "evening land"—that is, the land belonging to the West. In relation to the name *Italia*, *Hesperia*'s Greek origin, eastern perspective, and usage among non-native speakers renders it the foreign equivalent of the "indigenous" *Italia*, which, by contrast, is said to be more recent and derived from the native king Italus: *nunc fama minores / Italiam duxisse ducis de nomine gentem* (1.532-33 = 3.165-66).⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰⁴ In Vergil's usage, *Ausonia*, like its derived ethnonym *Ausonius*, seems to differ from *Italia/Italus* only in register of diction; cf. n. 362 above. The term was originally associated with a specific Italian tribe, and denoted the southern-central portion of Italy, but it came into use by the Hellenistic poets as a learned toponym for the land as a whole; Vergil uses the name in this later tradition. See Fordyce (1977), *ad* 7.39; Harrison (1997), *ad* 10.54; Horsfall (2000), *ad* 7.62; also Johnson (2001), 14 n. 11, and Maltby (2006), s.v. "Ausonia."

⁴⁰⁵ See Maltby (2006), s.vv. "Italia," "Hesperia," and "Ausonia" on ancient etymologies of these names; also Hahn (1920) and Fletcher (2014), 111.

It is also telling of the foreign connotation of the term *Hesperia* that it is used, with only one exception, among non-Italians. In the chronology of the story, the Trojan Creusa is the first to use it, in a description of Aeneas' destination couched in imagery of the Lydian East:⁴⁰⁶

et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris. (2.781-82)

In his overture to Evander in Book 8, Aeneas also employs this name, one of only two mentions of *Hesperia* in the poem's second half not made by the narrator (*quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant*, 8.148). This example, too, fits the idea of *Hesperia* as the foreigner's name for Italy, uttered by a recent Trojan arrival to a fellow immigrant.

Most interesting for our purposes here is the one exception to this pattern. Turnus himself uses the term *Hesperia* in Book 12 in a scene that, in light of the connection of this Greek term with non-Italians, further attests to Turnus' aggressive promotion of native identity. After slaying the Trojan Eumedes on the battlefield, Turnus vaunts over him:

en agros et, quam bello, Troiane, petisti,
Hesperiam metire iacens: haec praemia, qui me
ferro ausi temptare, ferunt, sic moenia condunt. (12.359-61)

Turnus' mockery is deeply sarcastic. Pointedly labeling Eumedes as a foreigner (*Troiane*), he chastises him for taking part in the alleged intentions of Aeneas' crew to seize Italian territory for "building their walls" (361).⁴⁰⁷ Turnus defies the dead man to "measure out" the land, as if setting the boundaries of the property he sought to claim for himself.⁴⁰⁸ The name *Hesperia*'s non-native connotation in the text reveals Turnus' bitter irony; appropriating the language of the

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. Fletcher's discussion of these lines (2014, 70-73).

⁴⁰⁷ Tarrant (2012), *ad* 12.359-61 notes the sarcasm of the *en* that initiates the speech, and Turnus' "mocking use" of the vocative *Troiane*.

⁴⁰⁸ *OLD* s.v. "metior" 2; cf. Tarrant (2012), *ad loc.*

foreigner, he mocks Eumedes as a would-be colonizer whose very conception of Italy, defined by the Greek name *Hesperia*, marks him as an outsider. Turnus' single, ironic use of *Hesperia* illustrates the significance of the name *Italia* in the rhetoric of his coalition: the very term becomes an ideological tool that separates native from foreign, "us" from "them."

The same aggressive dichotomy of native and foreign identities undergirds the construction of the war as a struggle between races. We have seen the Trojans referred to in terms that collectivize them as a racial category, as in 7.579 (*stirpem...Phrygiam*) and 9.137 (*sceleratam...gentem*). The racial component of the Italian rhetoric casts the war not only as a territorial defense, but a defense against miscegenation, the dilution of "native" Italian stock.⁴⁰⁹ Evidence for broad heterogeneity among Italians reveals the notion of an "Italian race" to be a construct of the imagination only; even the champions of Italian nativism, like Turnus, come from immigrant stock, and Evander's historical digression shows that, throughout Italy's history, migration and assimilation have been the rule, not the exception (8.328-32). The formulation of the war as a defense of a defined racial community from foreign pollution eschews reality in favor of rhetoric, but it is a powerful device indeed, one with a long pedigree in discourse both ancient and modern, and which, in the context of *Aeneid* 7-12, helps construct *Italia* as a singular and racially homogenous entity.

The threat of miscegenation is also the point where Turnus' private feud with Aeneas over Lavinia meets the public cause of Italy's defense. Turnus proclaims the threat of Trojan pollution and the charge of bride-theft in the same breath: *stirpem admisceri Phrygiam, se limine pelli*, 7.579; *ferro sceleratam excindere gentem / coniuge praerepta*, 9.137-38. The parallel of Aeneas with Paris that complements this charge recurs throughout the poem, voiced by Aeneas'

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. Isaac (2004), 109-48 on ancient notions of racial purity and impurity.

enemies, like Juno and Amata, and frustrated suitors of women “stolen” by Aeneas (Iarbas and Turnus).⁴¹⁰ In his exhortation in Book 9, Turnus extends the crimes of Paris, and now Aeneas, to the Trojan people as a whole, who have come to Italy no wiser than when the theft of Helen left their country in ruins:

- 140 ‘sed periisse semel satis est.’ peccare fuisset
 ante satis, penitus modo non genus omne perosos
 femineum. quibus haec medii fiducia valli
 fossarumque morae, leti discrimina parva,
 dant animos; at non viderunt moenia Troiae
 145 Neptuni fabricata manu considerare in ignis? (9.140-45)

In the same book, Numanus Remulus follows Turnus’ lead in characterizing the Trojans as a nation of bride-thieves: *en qui nostra sibi bello conubia poscunt* (9.600).⁴¹¹ The imputation of Aeneas’ guilt onto the whole Trojan race joins Turnus’ cause to the Italian cause, rendering himself, in effect, the first victim of Trojan miscegenation and a cautionary example for the rest of his countrymen. Trojan rapaciousness for the women of Italy may lurk behind Turnus’ exhortation to his men to consider their homes and wives: *nunc coniugis esto / quisque suae tectique memor* (10.280-81).

The warnings of bride-theft and foreign intermarriage—to which we may join, in a similar category, the cultural imperialism threatened by Aeneas’ importation of Trojan gods (8.11-12)—represent the Italian war effort as protection of the status quo against foreign influence. Much as the terms *Italia* and *Italus* constructed a sense of geographic wholeness that encompassed all Italians, the rhetoric of ethnic inclusion and exclusion develops a comprehensive ideal of “the Italian race” through contrast with its foreign adversary. This contrast brings us to the last topic of analysis, the pervasive contradistinction between Italian and

⁴¹⁰ See the treatment of Seo (2013), 32-65 for evidence and analysis of this parallel.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Seo (2013) on Numanus (54-56) and Turnus (59-60).

Trojan identities, the most basic vehicle for the construction of Italy in *Aeneid* 7-12, and the real cornerstone of the Italian war rhetoric.

In the past half-century, theorists of ethnicity and nationalism have elaborated the fundamental role of contradistinction in the formation of group identity, as “groups tend to define themselves not by reference to their own characteristics, but by exclusion, that is, by comparison to ‘strangers.’”⁴¹² Even more basic than the various elements of language, dress, tradition, and collective memory that define an ethnic community is the recognition that the one community is unlike any number of others: “stable, persisting, and often vitally important social relations...are frequently based precisely on the dichotomized ethnic statuses.”⁴¹³ As groups encounter one another, their differences may assume greater ideological import, especially in times of tension or open conflict. One or both sides of an “ethnic dichotomy” may define their distinctions not just in terms of cultural or political attributes, but moral ones, as one asserts superiority over the other in their character or way of life; such rhetoric has long characterized imperial and colonial discourse.⁴¹⁴ The polemical contrast of Self with Other also serves to reinforce cohesion within one’s own group, a process enhanced by the perception of a danger from outside: exterior threat encourages interior solidarity.⁴¹⁵

The observations of these theorists apply precisely to the ethnic rhetoric of *Aeneid* 7-12. Vergil’s Italians assert their superiority in valor, moral virtue, and tenacity, drawing these

⁴¹² Armstrong (1982), 4. See Barth (1969), esp. 9-10; Armstrong (1982), 4-6; Hall (1997), 26-33. On the definition by contrast of Roman identity in the *Aeneid*, see Syed (2005), 194-223 and Reed (2007), 1-7.

⁴¹³ Barth (1969), 10.

⁴¹⁴ Edward Said’s seminal *Orientalism* (1978) is a seminal case study; Boehmer (2005) offers a broader perspective of colonial discourse in literature.

⁴¹⁵ This concept approaches Sallust’s *metus hostilis*, the fear of external enemies that maintained social balance and cohesion among Romans, most thoroughly expounded in *Bellum Jugurthinum* 41. See esp. the analysis of Kapust (2011), 27-52.

aggressive contrasts primarily along the lines of gender, culture, and geography. As we have seen in the prime example of this rhetorical contrast, Numanus Remulus' speech, the Trojan foil facilitates the definition of a singular Italian character through the distinguishing virtues they hold in common. The patterns of comparison deployed in the Italians' rhetoric correspond with discourses of race, gender, and ethnicity widely attested in antiquity.⁴¹⁶ The Greek construction of the barbarian, in its various manifestations in politics, literature, and art during and after the Persian Wars, provides an example especially close in spirit to the attitude of characters like Turnus and Numanus Remulus.⁴¹⁷

One recurrent feature of this rhetoric, the conflation of easternness and effeminacy in describing oriental peoples, received studied use among Greeks, especially in the stereotype of the barbarian, as well as among Romans.⁴¹⁸ Within the *Aeneid*, its use as an ideological weapon against the Trojans is manifested throughout the text, from the polemic of the Libyan Iarbas in Book 4 through the end of the poem, as Turnus refers to Aeneas as a Phrygian *semivir* and sneers at his (imagined?) eastern hairstyle (12.97-100). The ethnonym *Phrygius*, which often has the force of an ethnic slur in the poem, connotes not just easternness, but also, in most contexts, effeminacy.⁴¹⁹

Strongly resonant with this type of discourse are the orientalizing caricatures of Cleopatra and the Egyptians found in Roman poetry after Actium, including the *Aeneid* itself. Here we are

⁴¹⁶ See esp. Gruen (2011), Shumate (2006), and Isaac (2004) for evidence and commentary, with additional sources.

⁴¹⁷ On the construction of the barbarian, see the classic treatment of Edith Hall (1989) and Hall (2002), 175-89. On Panhellenism and ethnic identity, see Hall (2002), 125-171. See also Erskine (2001), esp. 6-12, on the ambiguously barbarian status of the Trojans in Greek thought.

⁴¹⁸ For this representation among Romans, see esp. Lomas (2014), and Shumate (2006), 99-104, who further discusses the figure of the "feminized colonial Other" in modern criticism.

⁴¹⁹ Cf. O'Hara (2011), *ad* 4.215; Syed (2005), 194-99 discusses the eastern stereotypes used against the Trojans.

brought again to the war between a unified *tota Italia* and the eastern armies of Antony and Cleopatra, the point of comparison from which we began. In the propaganda of the late 30's, emphasis on western (especially Italian) solidarity is complemented by the identification of Rome's primary enemy not as Antony, but the foreign queen Cleopatra, rendering the conflict a foreign war, rather than a civil one.⁴²⁰ Antony's treason against Rome was said to be the work of Cleopatra, who had bewitched and enslaved him; the revelation of his will, in which he pledged substantial assets to his children with Cleopatra and expressed his wish to be buried with her in Egypt, bolstered the allegation of the queen's malign control over him.⁴²¹ The playing down, or even outright elision, of Antony as an antagonist in later poetic accounts continued to shift hostility and blame for the war onto Cleopatra. The construction of the Egyptian Cleopatra as Rome's chief nemesis, understood in tandem with Octavian's public swearing of *tota Italia* to unanimous support against her, reveal a familiar narrative: the conflict of West vs. East, of native resistance to a foreign menace.

Not only in this paradigm, but also in the tropes of gender and ethnicity attached to easterners, the rhetoric of Vergil's Italian chiefs corresponds with Roman memory of the war against Cleopatra.⁴²² The earliest account of Actium, Horace's *Epode* 9, sees Antony the servant of a woman and her train of eunuchs:

Romanus, eheu,—posteri negabitis—
emancipatus feminae
fert vallum et arma miles et spadonibus

⁴²⁰ Bispham (2007), 444: "The unity drummed up before Actium was essentially and consciously defined as unity against an external enemy." See esp. Reinhold (1981-82); also Scott (1933), 43-44, and Gurval (1995), 137-57, on this theme in Horace's ninth *Epode* (excerpted below), and 234-35, in *Aeneid* 8.

⁴²¹ On the charges against Antony, see Pelling (1996), 41-42, 52; Reinhold (1981-82), 101-102; Syme (1939), 282-83; Scott (1933), 43-44.

⁴²² On Cleopatra's image in Roman poetry, see Wyke (2009), Syed (2005), 177-93, and Keith (2000), 118-22. On Actium, see Gurval (1995) and Miller (2009), 66-94. On Cleopatra, Egypt, and Egyptians in orientalist discourse, see Wyke (2009), 345-48 and Shumate (2006), 129-55.

To be sure, the harlot queen of licentious Canopus, the one disgrace branded on Philip's line, dared to pit barking Anubis against our Jupiter and to force the Tiber to endure the threats of the Nile, to drive out the Roman trumpet with the rattling sistrum and with the poles of her barge pursue the beaks of our galleys, to stretch effeminate mosquito-nets on the Tarpeian rock and give judgment amid the arms and statues of Marius.⁴²⁵

The *Aeneid*'s own vision of Actium endows the conflict between West and East with profound ideological significance; Syed identifies the account as "a founding text for the Western discourse of orientalism."⁴²⁶ As Cleopatra rallies her forces with her "native sistrum" (*regina in mediis patrio vocat agmina sistro*, 8.696), the eastern gods, wild, monstrous, and animalistic, rage against the Olympians (*omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis*, 8.698). Unlike the unified Italians whom Augustus leads to war (*Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar*, 8.678), Antony's army comprises a haphazard crew of foreigners (*ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis*, 8.685) who turn tail *en masse* when Actian Apollo levels his bow: *omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi, / omnis Arabs, omnes vertebant terga Sabaei* (8.705-706). Fearing death, the Egyptian queen makes her own escape (*illam inter caedes pallentem morte futura, / fecerat ignipotens undis et Iapyge ferri*, 8.709-10). Wyke's summation of these portrayals captures the complex of geography, ethnicity, and gender that underlies the ideological construction of the Egyptian enemy:

This persistent equation of the relation of west to east with the relation of male to female provides, within the logic of ancient orientalism and gender, the necessary authority for domination and conquest. The womanish easterners enthralled by their Egyptian queen need imposed upon them the masculine order of the west, embodied in the figure of Octavian/Augustus. A sense of urgency then attends the whole process for, following the orientalist pattern that calls for the west's control of the east in order to stop the east's designs on the west, the Capitol is depicted as

⁴²⁵ Trans. Goold (1990).

⁴²⁶ Syed (2005), 178. On the dichotomies of ethnicity, gender, and geography underpinning Vergil's depiction of Actium, see Miller (2009), 67-71; Syed (2005), 178-81; Gurval (1995), 237-39; Quint (1993), 21-31; Hardie (1986), 97-110.

compelled to conquer Cleopatra in order to prevent Cleopatra's plans for subjecting it.⁴²⁷

Wyke's observations provoke rich comparisons between the Augustan image of orientalized, feminized Egyptians menacing the Capitol with the anti-Trojan polemic of Turnus and Numanus borne out within the fictional world of Vergil's Italy.

Another charge regularly leveled against the Trojans by the Italians relates to both the orientalist discourse described above and the *Aeneid*'s Homeric models: the allegation of Trojan cowardice. In the beginning of Book 12, for instance, we see Turnus imagining Aeneas' intimidation at the challenge of single combat. Alluding to events from *Iliad* 5, Turnus denies Aeneas the chance to escape in a "womanly cloud" under his mother's protection: *longe illi dea mater erit, quae nube fugacem / feminea tegat et vanis sese occulat umbris* (12.52-53).⁴²⁸ The "Phrygian tyrant" will not receive the news of the challenge happily (*nuntius haec, Idmon, Phrygio mea dicta tyranno / haud placitura refer*, 12.75-76).

The first example above, in which Turnus calls back to *Iliad* 5, is part of another theme in the Italian characterization of Trojans, one that complements Vergil's pervasive intertextuality: the use of the Trojan War as a device for collectively shaming their enemies.⁴²⁹ In the imagination of Turnus and Numanus Remulus, the Trojan War helps construct the image of Trojan cowardice—in Numanus' formulation, also linked to their alleged effeminacy—that strengthens the assertion of Italian superiority. While in Vergil's artistic program the Trojan War is key to his poem's engagement with Homeric models, in the rhetoric of his Italian characters

⁴²⁷ Wyke (2009), 349-50.

⁴²⁸ See esp. Fletcher (2006) on the parallels between Aeneas' performance in *Iliad* 5 and in the *Aeneid*.

⁴²⁹ Cf. Seider (2013), 36-40.

the Homeric exemplum becomes a tool that furthers the Italians' program of ethnic contradistinction. Memory of Troy's fall proves the cowardice of the Trojans.

Book 9 is especially rich with examples of this trope, as the Trojans' defensive situation, hemmed up in their camp while the Italians assault them from outside, aligns that past history with the present. Describing the Trojans taking cover behind their walls, the narrator is careful to stress that Aeneas' order enjoined them to do so (9.40-43); the Trojans themselves, perhaps cognizant of repeated history, feel "shame" as they shelter, in spite of their will to fight (*etsi conferre manum pudor iraque monstrat*, 9.44). When the Italian host has mustered outside the fort, Turnus himself does not fail to recognize the parallel, and mockingly juxtaposes his Italians with the victorious Greeks:

150 tenebras et inertia furta
 Palladii caesis late custodibus arcis
 ne timeant, nec equi caeca condemur in alvo:
 luce palam certum est igni circumdare muros.
 haud sibi cum Danais rem faxo et pube Pelasga
155 esse ferant, decimum quos distulit Hector in annum. (9.150-55)

Here he alludes to the similarity between his Italians and the Greeks, while at the same time asserting Italian uniqueness as Trojan antagonists. Toward the end of the book, however, he directly parallels himself with the deadliest of the Greek champions:

 incipe, si qua animo virtus, et consere dextram,
 hic etiam inventum Priamo narrabis Achillem. (9.741-42)

Between these two examples from Turnus falls the speech of Numanus, which contains all the keynotes of the anti-Trojan polemic: where the native Italians represent masculinity, valor, and virtue, the Trojans are effeminate foreigners, cowards, and bride-thieves. The Trojan War motif leads his harangue against the fortified Trojans: *non pudet obsidione iterum valloque teneri, / bis capti Phryges, et morti praetendere muros?* (9.599-600). Like Turnus, he juxtaposes his team

with the Greek besiegers of Troy in a scheme that both assimilates and distinguishes: *non hic Atridae nec fandi fictor Ulixes* (9.602).⁴³⁰ Turnus relies on the same memory of Trojan defeat when he mocks Aeneas as *desertor Asiae* (12.15) before the finale battle.

The marked importance of ethnic contradistinction in defining the Italian identity invites comparison with the means of ethnic definition among Vergil's Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians. These four groups all share a set of unique cultural memories, myths, and customs. Names of the group or of their territory evoke lands of origin, communal founders, or key events in their shared history. Visual arts, significant sites or objects, and poetry facilitate the transmission of cultural memory from one generation to the next. Among these communities within Vergil's imagined world, as it was among those in the real world of the ancient Mediterranean, shared traditions, values, memories, and symbols are the ingredients of ethnic identity.

These examples exist in stark contrast to the situation of the Italians, whose only device in asserting a cohesive identity is the most basic form of collective self-definition, the construction of the Self in opposition to the Other. No Italian leader invokes cultural memories or traditions involving all Italians to stir "Pan-Italian" sentiment; their solidarity is predicated on contrast rather than content. The sheer diversity of Vergil's Italy would frustrate attempts to find such common ground. Not only is the current Italy where Aeneas lands a patchwork of different immigrant communities, but the land throughout time has been a locus of migration, intergroup tension, and ethnic variety, as Evander's story of early Italy attests. The story he tells is the only

⁴³⁰ Cf. the vaunt of Liger to Aeneas in Book 10, which draws a similar contrast between the Trojans' former and current foes: *non Diomedis equos nec currum cernis Achilli / aut Phrygiae campos: nunc belli finis et aevi / his dabitur terris* (10.581-83).

ethnic myth in *Aeneid* 7-12 that qualifies as “pan-Italian,” in that its subject is Italy as a whole; but this heritage would be little help in promoting an ideology of Italian unity.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to reassess the connection between the *Aeneid*’s fictionalized ancient Italy and its real-world analogue of the first century BCE, specifically in respect to the issues of Italian identity, unity, and solidarity. The current scholarly consensus sees these two “Italies,” the fictional and the real, conveying a parallel unity among Italians, whereby Vergil’s poetic depiction buttresses the ideology of *tota Italia* and supports the integration of Italy and Rome into a unified whole. My own interpretation, on the other hand, has also read the two Italies as parallel, but in their show of disunity, not unity. Just as the rhetorical appeal to *tota Italia* disguised a still emergent “Roman Italy” whose member communities retained their local identities, traditions, and autonomy, the diverse Italians of the *Aeneid* appear discrete, independent, and local in their affiliations, and the ethnonym *Italus* has, at least initially, only a geographical significance. I suggest that the political narrative of *Aeneid* 7-12 is structurally analogous to that of the late 30’s BCE: subjected to perceived foreign aggression, diverse communities join forces in solidarity through the rhetoric of a charismatic leader and the demands of a “national” resistance. In both cases, Italian solidarity is activated in response to an external threat; the allied communities, prior to uniting against a common foe, shared only a basic sense of broad affinity with one another. Octavian did not wholesale invent the idea of Italian identity in 32; neither does Turnus in *Aeneid* 7. Their invention lay in the endowment of an otherwise weakly-defined or ambiguous identity with clear moral value and cultural significance, and in promoting that identity for political ends.

The complexity typical of Vergil's engagement with Roman history contextualizes the resulting alignment of Octavian, leader of a mobilized Italy, with the narrative's antagonist, and the eastern aggressor Cleopatra with the Trojan "invader" Aeneas. But these alignments are themselves immediately complicated. The characterization of the Italian war as a civil war played out between two groups of Roman ancestors, indigenous and Trojan, provides space for Turnus to be both proto-Roman and, as an agent of Juno and foe of Rome's founding father, anti-Roman.⁴³¹ In the case of aligning Turnus and Aeneas with Rome and Augustus, many configurations and viewpoints are possible, but the same is true of the relation of Vergil's characters to Homer's. As much as Turnus and Numanus relish their role as the destined victors in a new Trojan War, the text constantly undermines easy correlation of either the Italians or the Trojans to the combatants of the *Iliad*, as armies or as individuals. When Turnus bills himself as the new Achilles in 9.741-42, the claim is solely based on his own construction of events, an act of willful interpretation of a subjective narrative. Turnus may indeed be Achilles, but he is Hector, too; and Aeneas also plays both roles.⁴³²

On the scale of larger national and ethnic identities, Vergil consistently blurs categories like "Roman" and "Foreign," a tendency pervasive in the epic.⁴³³ Here we approach something of a "Vergilian critique" of the Italian rhetoric in Books 7-12, for Vergil's problematization of categories unmask the fundamental instability of Turnus' rigid dichotomy of native and foreign. Reed and other commentators in the last few decades have traced the shifting boundaries of ethnic identity in Vergil's Italy, especially in the case of Aeneas, who is simultaneously *externus*,

⁴³¹ On Turnus' characterization as a Roman, see Goldschmidt (2013), 179-91; Thomas (1998), 283-85; Hardie (1995), 249-49.

⁴³² Cf. Quint (2011); also (1989), 65-75.

⁴³³ Reed (2007), esp. 1-13, 101-28, 143, 155-65; Nelsestuen (2016), 91-95.

through Trojan origin, and *Italus*, through Dardanian ancestry. Turnus' ethnicity is subject to the same ambiguity: as leader of the "indigenous" coalition, he promotes his Italian identity, a claim which Juno herself avows in the divine council:

indignum est Italos Troiam circumdare flammis
nascentem et patria Turnum consistere terra,
cui Pylum avus, cui diva Venilia mater. (10.74-76)

But at the same time, Amata can claim, with justification, that he is an Argive, and Book 7 closes with Turnus' appearance in the catalogue carrying a shield emblazoned with his Argive ancestress Io.⁴³⁴ Vergil's use of similes effect the same shifts in perspective, as when the "native" Turnus in 9.29-32 is compared to the river Ganges, while in 12.701-703 the "foreign" Aeneas is assimilated to series of mountains—Athos, Eryx, and the Apennines—that moves ever further west, climaxing in Italy itself, his legitimate *patria*.⁴³⁵

Through these devices, Vergil's text undermines Turnus' strident contradistinction of ethnic categories. The matter becomes even clearer in light of the inherent vagueness of *Italus* as a signifier, as Italy's long tradition of immigration and assimilation resists the imposition of a single homogenous identity. Foreignness and "Italianness" alike are constructed ethnicities. They are the products not of reality, but of rhetorical manipulation, and their definition is always subject to creative interpretation. The second half of the poem adduces several examples of the basic subjectivity in assigning and embracing an ethnic identity: Amata's construction of Turnus as foreign; Juno's construction of Turnus as native; Latinus' identification of Aeneas as *externus* in fulfillment of Faunus' oracle, even though he is aware of the Italian Dardanus;⁴³⁶ Aeneas'

⁴³⁴ Cf. Bernstein (2008), 167-68; Syed (2005), 208-209.

⁴³⁵ See esp. Pogorzelski (2016), 75-78, Reed (2007), 57-58 (on Turnus), and Cairns (1989), 109-28.

⁴³⁶ Cf. Nakata (2012), 343-51.

suppression of Dardanus in diplomacy with the Etruscans, who require a foreign leader;⁴³⁷

Evander's self-identification as both Italian and Arcadian.

For all of the obvious flaws in the dichotomy of “us” and “them,” Vergil’s narrative fully accounts for the real effectiveness of such rhetoric, whether in the mythic landscape of the *Aeneid*, in the late Republic, or in modern times. Just as the invocation of shared memory and the emotive power of cultural identity have the power to unite, mobilize, and inspire communities, rhetoric of ethnic unity and contrast can rally collective action to much the same effect. It is in this connection that Turnus’ characterization of the war—as Italian integrity threatened by foreign pollution—should be understood. In the poem’s second half, through the words and actions of Turnus and his chiefs, Vergil dramatizes the power of ethnic rhetoric, and, in so doing, reveals its strength as well as its instability.

⁴³⁷ Cf. Chapter 2, 118-19.

CONCLUSION

Applying to the *Aeneid* a cross-disciplinary approach engaging ethnicity, memory, and collective identity, this dissertation has advanced a new reading of the poem through the combined interpretive lenses of cultural memory and ethnic identity. Observing the ways in which the poem's fictionalized ethnic communities understand, express, and act upon their collective identities, this study has afforded new insights into the epic's characters and narrative, as well as its interaction with real cultural and political discourse in Vergil's first-century milieu. The preceding four chapters have addressed these issues in a variety of contexts outside and within the poem. Chapter 1, after introducing the dissertation's thesis and its place in current scholarship on Vergil, has examined the Aeneas myth in the Roman Republic as a case study of cultural memory's role in politics and propaganda among historical ancient communities. Turning to the epic itself, Chapter 2 has elaborated the rhetoric of memory and identity among the *Aeneid*'s four major ethnic groups (the Trojans, Carthaginians, Latins, and Arcadians), and analyzed the ways in which memory is expressed and employed in their political activity. Chapter 3 has approached the Trojans' journey to Italy as a narrative of exile and collective trauma, and shown that the most intimate concern of Aeneas and his refugee people in founding a new community is the continuity of their Trojan identity in the wake of Troy's collapse, rather than achieving the imperial power and glory emphasized in divine prophecies about their future. Chapter 4 has addressed the poem's depiction of Italian identity in Books 7-12, interpreting the rhetoric of Italian solidarity and anti-Trojan polemic voiced by Turnus and his allies as an effort

to construct a new sense of unity and collective identity among the diverse peoples opposing Aeneas. These treatments have aimed to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of Vergil's depiction of communities in the *Aeneid*, particularly the construction and transmission of communal identity, and the influence of that identity on the beliefs and actions of individuals who subscribe to it.

My methodology has relied primarily on evidence from within Vergil's created world, placing greatest emphasis on the speeches, thoughts, actions, and elements of setting that attest to collective memories and identities inside the poem's literary microcosm. At the same time, however, I have also kept in view the external world of the Roman audience, drawing connections between the forms of communal discourse within the poem and those current in the first century BCE. In virtually every respect, Vergil's depiction of ethnic identity corresponds with attested beliefs and practices among Greek and Roman communities. Like their real-life counterparts in the ancient Mediterranean, the *Aeneid*'s ethnic groups understand themselves as descended from founding ancestors, preserve unique cultural traditions, and celebrate their cultural memory in myths, rituals, public spaces, and the visual arts. They employ the rhetoric of memory and identity in many political activities, including diplomacy, self-representation, and public displays, and appeal to communal identity to mobilize collective action among their members, reinforce group solidarity, and legitimize decisions or leadership. I see the implications of these connections as widely applicable to future work not only on Vergil and the *Aeneid*, but on Roman narrative poetry more broadly. The discussion of Vergil's Carthaginians in Chapter 2 has already adduced evidence of replicated cultural memory in the Flavian epic *Punica* that closely corresponds with the Vergilian examples studied in this dissertation. The methodology applied here to the world of the *Aeneid* may also be applied fruitfully to the fictive

landscapes of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* or Statius' *Thebaid*, other post-Vergilian epics similarly occupied with the dynamics of political communities.

While this dissertation has not dealt directly with the question of Vergil's pro- or anti-Augustan sympathies, its findings on memory and identity within the poem has highlighted a new approach to considering the *Aeneid*'s relationship with Augustan ideology. In the cultural revival of the age, the principate made dedicated use of Roman myth and history to promote its ideals. The main social roles of cultural memory attested in the *Aeneid*—its uses in promoting group identity, fostering unity and solidarity, legitimizing authority, and reinforcing communal values through ancestral *exempla*—are equally at work in the ideologically-guided narrative of Roman history advertised by the new regime. Vergil's epic played a key role in developing and popularizing this narrative. But the findings of this dissertation also reveal that the *Aeneid* is a highly self-aware, even self-referential text. At the same time as the poem acts in concert with Augustan ideology, it replicates, within its fictional universe, its own political functions as a national epic.

Recognition of the *Aeneid*'s self-referentiality reveals a new mode of interpreting its engagement with the contemporary ideology, one which sees Vergil commenting not directly on the characteristic images, narratives, or ideals of the principate, but rather on the rhetorical program that underlay the regime's appropriation of Roman memory and identity. The commentary borne out in the microcosm of the *Aeneid* offers a candid view of such a program. Just as the poet inscribes into his fictional universe the real political efficacy of arguments predicated on identity and memory, he exposes the rhetorical manipulations on which such arguments often rely. We have seen, after all, the rhetoric of identity strategically deployed by Turnus, who galvanizes a disunited and ethnically diverse coalition of Italian states to stage a

“native” national resistance to foreign invaders, as well as by Aeneas, who advances a specious argument for mythic kinship with Evander to secure an alliance. Vergil’s characters invoke myth, memory, and identity for demonstrably tendentious or expedient political purposes. Through such examples, the *Aeneid* frankly displays the instabilities inherent in the very forms of rhetoric that buttressed Augustan ideology.

In reproducing real types of cultural and political discourse inside the world of his epic, Vergil shows himself to be a sensitive observer of public life. His rendering of the Aeneas myth commemorates the origins and destiny of the Roman people through a narrative that dramatizes, among its fictional actors, the importance of the past in constructing the present, the sentiments that anchor communal pride and solidarity, the constituents of collective identity, and the ways in which individuals act and deliberate within and between communities. Because his art so closely imitates life, the study of cultural memory and ethnic identity in the *Aeneid* yields new insights not only into the characters and settings of the poem, but also the living communities of ancient Greece and Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, A. W. 1951. "The Dullest Book of the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 47:119-23.
- Ames, C. & De Santis, G. 2011. "Die Konstruktion ethnischer Identitäten in augusteischer Zeit: Vergils *Aeneis*," *Gymnasium* 118:7-28.
- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, M. J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ando, C. 2002. "Vergil's Italy: Ethnography and Politics in First-Century Rome," in D. S. Levene & D. P. Nelis 2002: 123-42.
- Angelova, D. N. 2015. *Sacred Founders: Women, Men, and Gods in the Discourse of Imperial Founding, Rome through Early Byzantium*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Armstrong, J. 1982. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Armstrong, R. 2002. "Crete in the *Aeneid*: Recurring Trauma and Alternative Fate," *CQ* 52:321-40.
- Assmann, J. 2011. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, J. & Czaplicka, J. 1995. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity," *New German Critique* 65:125-33.
- Austin, R. G. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1951. "Sulla Felix," *JRS* 41:1-10.
- Barchiesi, A. 1999. "Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*," in P. Hardie (ed.) *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, vol. 3, 324-44. London: Routledge.
- . 2008. "*Bellum Italicum*: Unificazione dell'Italia nell'Eneide," in G. Urso (ed.) *Patria diversis gentibus una? Unità politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica*. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli 20-22 settembre 2007, 243-60. Pisa: ETS.
- Barth, F. 1969. "Introduction," in F. Barth (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, 9-37. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

- Battistoni, F. 2009. "Rome, Kinship and Diplomacy," in C. Eilers (ed.) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, 73-97. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. *Parenti dei Romani: Mito Troiano e Diplomazia*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Bayet, J. 1941. "L'Omen du Cheval à Carthage: Timée, Virgile, et le Monnayage Punique," *REL* 19:166-90.
- Bell, A. J. E. 1999. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the *Aeneid*," *TAPA* 129:263-79.
- Bell, D. S. A. 2003. "Mythsapes: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity," *British Journal of Sociology* 54:63-81.
- Bell, S. & Hansen, I. L. (eds.) 2008. *Role Models in the Roman World: Identity and Assimilation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Berlin, N. 1998. "War and Remembrance: *Aeneid* 12.554-60 and Aeneas' Memory of Troy," *AJP* 119:11-41.
- Bernstein, N. W. 2007. *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bettini, M. 1991. *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, trans. Sickel. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1997. "Ghosts of Exile: Doubles and Nostalgia in Vergil's *parva Troia* (*Aeneid* 3.29ff.)," *ClAnt* 16:8-33.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1952. "*Origines Gentium*," *CPh* 47:65-81.
- Bispham, E. 2007. *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bleisch, P. "The *Regia* of Picus: Ekphrasis, Italian Identity, and Artistic Definition in *Aeneid* 7.152-93," in P. Thibodeau & H. Haskell (eds.) *Being there together: essays in honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, 88-109. Afton: Afton Historical Society Press.
- Boehmer, E. 2005. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bonjour, M. 1975. *Terre Natale: Études sur une composante affective du patriotisme romain*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Bottici, C. 2007. *A Philosophy of Political Myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bouchard, G. (ed.) 2013. *National Myths: Constructed Pasts, Contested Presents*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdin, S. 2005. "Ardée et les Rutules: Réflexions sur l'émergence et le maintien des identités ethniques des populations du Latium préromain," *MEFRA* 117:585-631.
- Bowie, A. M. 2008. "Aeneas Narrator," *PVS* 26:41-51.
- Bradley, G. 2000. *Ancient Umbria: State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005. "Aspects of the cult of Hercules in Central Italy," in H. Bowden & L. Rawlings (eds.) *Herakles and Hercules: Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*, 129-51. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Bremmer, J. N. & Horsfall, N. M. 1987. *Roman Myth and Mythography*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Bretin-Chabrol, M. 2009. "Les généalogies d'Enée chez Homère et Virgile: aspects de la mémoire sélective des Romains," *Latomus* 69:295-318.
- Briggs, W. 1975. "Augustan Athletics and the Games of *Aeneid* V," *Stadion* 1, 267-83.
- Brunt, P. A. 1988. "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War," in P. A. Brunt (ed.) *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, 93-143. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cairns, F. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Casali, S. 2009. "*Iasius pater*: Iasius e i Penati in *Aen.* 3, 167-168," in C. Braidotti, E. Dettori, & E. Lanzillotta (eds.) *οὐ πᾶν ἐφήμερον: Scritti in memoria di Roberto Pretagostini*, 77-91. Rome: Università di Roma Tor Vergata.
- Citroni, M. (ed.) 2003. *Memoria e Identità: la Cultura Romana Costruisce la Sua Immagine*. Florence: Università degli studi di Firenze.
- Claassen, J.-M. 1999. *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. London: Duckworth.
- Conte, G. B. 2007. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*, ed. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooley, A. E. (ed.) 2016. *A Companion to Roman Italy*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London: Routledge.

- Cornell, T. J. & Lomas, K. (eds.) 1997. *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*. London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 vols. London: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. "Italy and Rome from Sulla to Augustus," in A. Bowman, E. Champlin, & A. Lintott (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History* 10, 414-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curty, O. 1995. *Les Parentés Légendaires entre Cités Grecques: Catalogue Raisonné des Inscriptions Contenant le Terme ΣΥΓΓΕΝΕΙΑ et Analyse Critique*. Geneva: Droz.
- David, J.-M. 1997. *The Roman Conquest of Italy*, trans. Nevill. Malden: Blackwell.
- Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2013. "Cicero and Roman Identity," in C. Steel (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, 122-137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Desport, M. 1952. *L'incantation virgilienne: Virgile et Orphée*. Bordeaux: Imprimeries Delmas.
- Dickie, M. 1985. "The Speech of Numanus Remulus (*Aeneid* 9,598-620)," *PLLS* 5:165-221.
- Dobbin, R. F. 1995. "Julius Caesar in Jupiter's Prophecy, *Aeneid*, Book 1," *ClAnt* 14:5-40.
- Doblhofer, E. 1987. *Exil und Emigration: Zum Erlebnis der Heimatferne in der römischen Literatur*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duncan, T. S. 1948. "The Aeneas Legend on Coins," *CJ* 44:15-29.
- Dunkle, J. R. 1969. "Some Historical Symbolism in Book Three of the *Aeneid*," *CW* 62:165-66.
- . 2005. "Games and Transition: *Aeneid* 3 and 5," *CW* 98:153-78.
- Dyson, S. L. 1992. *Community and Society in Roman Italy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eden, P. T. 1975. *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*. Leiden: Brill.
- Eidinow, J. S. C. 2003. "Dido, Aeneas, and Iulus: Heirship and Obligation in *Aeneid* 4," *CQ* 53:260-67.

- Erll, A. & Rigney, A. 2006. "Literature and the Production of Cultural Memory: Introduction," *European Journal of English Studies* 10:111-15.
- Erskine, A. 1997. "Delos, Aeneas and IG XI.4.756," *ZPE* 117:133-37.
- . 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, J. D. 1992. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fantham, E. 1990. "Nymphas...e navibus esse: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in *Aeneid* 9.77-122 and 10.215-59," *CPh* 85:102-19.
- Farney, G. D. 2007. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, J. & Putnam, M. C. J. (eds.) 2010. *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Farron, S. 1993. *Vergil's Aeneid: A Poem of Grief and Love*. Leiden: Brill.
- Feldherr, A. 1995. "Ships of State: *Aeneid* 5 and Augustan Circus Spectacle," *ClAnt* 14:245-65.
- . 1997. "Livius's Revolution: Civic Identity and the Creation of the *Res Publica*," in T. Habinek & A. Schiesaro (eds.) *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, 136-57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finley, M. I. 1983. *Politics in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fletcher, K. F. B. 2006. "Vergil's Italian Diomedes," *AJP* 127:219-59.
- . 2014. *Finding Italy: Travel, Nation and Colonization in Vergil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Flood, C. 1996. *Political Myth: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Flower, H. I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fontenrose, J. E. 1968. "The Gods Invoked in Epic Oaths: *Aeneid*, XII, 175-215," *AJP* 89:20-38.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Fordyce, C. J. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII-VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, M. 1996. *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fratantuono, L. & Faxon, C. 2013. "Atque arma uirum: Turnus' Killing of Virgil in *Aeneid* IX," *Latomus* 72:400-411.
- Fratantuono, L. & Smith, R. A. 2015. *Virgil, Aeneid 5: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gabba, E. 1976. "Sulla Valorizzazione Politica della Leggenda delle Origini Troiane di Roma fra III e II Secolo a.C.," in M. Sordi (ed.) *I Canali della Propaganda nel Mondo Antico*, 84-101. Milan: Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore.
- . 1994. "Il Problema dell' "unità" dell'Italia romana," in E. Gabba (ed.) *Italia romana*, 17-31. Como: New Press.
- Gaertner, J. F. 2007. *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gale, M. R. 1997. "The Shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7.783-92)," *G&R* 44:176-96.
- . 2003. "Poetry and the Backward Glance in Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*," *TAPA* 133:323-52.
- Galinsky, G. K. 1969a. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1969b. "Aeneas' Invocation of Sol (*Aeneid*, XII, 176)," *AJP* 90:453-58.
- . 1990. "Hercules in the *Aeneid*," in S.J. Harrison 1990: 277-94.
- . 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . (ed.) 2014. *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . (ed.) 2016. *Memory in Rome and Early Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Galinsky, G. K. & Lapatin, K. (eds.) 2015. *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire*. Los Angeles: Getty Museum Publications.
- Ganniban, R. T. 2008. *Vergil: Aeneid Book I*. Newburyport: Focus Publishing.

- Garman, S. 2007. "Ethnosymbolism in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in A. Leoussi & S. Grosby (eds.) *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture, and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*, 113-25. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Garstang, J. B. 1962. "The Crime of Helen and the Concept of *Fatum* in the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 57: 337-45.
- Gehrke, H.-J. 2007. "Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond," in N. Luraghi (ed.) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, 286-313. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giardana, A. 1997. *L'Italia romana: Storie di un'identità incompiuta*. Bari: Editori Laterza.
- Glazewski, J. 1972. "The Function of Vergil's Funeral Games," *CW* 66:85-96.
- Goldschmidt, N. 2013. *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gowing, A. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gransden, K. W. 1976. *Virgil: Aeneid, Book VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grillo, L. 2010. "Leaving Troy and Creusa: Reflections on Aeneas' Flight," *CJ* 106:43-68.
- Gruen, E. S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gurval, R. A. 1995. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hahn, E. A. 1920. "On an Alleged Inconsistency in the *Aeneid* (Between 2.781 and Book 3)," *Classical Weekly* 13:209-12.
- Halbwachs, M. 1992. *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hall, J. M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- . 2006. "Foundation Stories," in G. Tsetschladze (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, 2:389-426. Leiden: Brill.

- . 2007. "Politics and Greek Myth," in R. Woodard (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*, 337-354. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammer, D. 2014. *Roman Political Thought: From Cicero to Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hannah, B. 2004. "Manufacturing Descent: Virgil's Genealogical Engineering," *Arethusa* 37:141-64.
- Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1987. "Ships and Ship-Names in the *Aeneid*," in M. Whitby, P. Hardie, & M. Whitby (eds.) *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, 163-71. Oak Park: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- . 1994. *Virgil: Aeneid, Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardy, C. S. 1996. "Antiqua Mater: Misreading Gender in *Aeneid* 3.84-191," *CJ* 92:1-8.
- Hardy, R. B. 1991. "The Uses of Memory in the Poetry of Vergil," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University.
- Harrison, E. L. 1984. "The *Aeneid* and Carthage," in A. J. Woodman & D. West (eds.) *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, 95-115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.) 1990. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1990. "Some Views of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century," in S. J. Harrison 1990: 1-20.
- . 1997. *Vergil: Aeneid 10*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2007. "Exile in Latin Epic," in J.F. Gaertner: 129-54.
- Heiden, B. 1987. *Laudes Herculeae: Suppressed Savagery in the Hymn to Hercules*, Verg. A. 8.285-305," *AJP* 108:661-71.
- Heinze, R. 1993. *Vergil's Epic Technique*, trans. Harvey, Harvey, and Robertson. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hejduk, J. 2009. "Jupiter's *Aeneid: Fama and Imperium*," *ClAnt* 28:279-327.
- Henry, E. 1989. *The Vigour of Prophecy: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Hexter, R. 1992. "Sidonian Dido," in R. Hexter & D. Selden (eds.) *Innovations of Antiquity*, 332-84. New York: Routledge.
- . 1999. "Imitating Troy: A Reading of *Aeneid* 3," in C. Perkell 1999: 64-79.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1992. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. & Ranger, T. O. (eds.). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, P. 1979-1980. "*Aeneid* V: Past and Future," *CJ* 75:110-21.
- Horsfall, N. M. 1979. "Stesichorus at Bovillae?" *JHS* 99:26-48.
- . 1987a. "The Aeneas Legend from Homer to Virgil," in J. N. Bremmer & N. M. Horsfall 1987: 12-24.
- . 1987b. "Corythus Re-examined," in J. N. Bremmer & N. M. Horsfall 1987: 89-104.
- . 1990a. "Dido in the Light of History," in S. J. Harrison 1990: 127-44.
- . 1990b. "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff," in S. J. Harrison 1990: 305-15.
- . 1991. "*Externi Duces*," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 119:188-92.
- . 1997. "The Unity of Roman Italy: Some Anomalies," *SCI* 16:71-76.
- . 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2001. "The Unity of Roman Italy: Anomalies in Context," *SCI* 20:39-50.
- . 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hosking, G. & Schöpfung, G. (eds.) 1997. *Myths and Nationhood*. New York: Routledge.
- Isaac, B. H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jehne, M. & Pfeilschifter, R. (eds.) 2006. *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in Republikanischer Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike.

- Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1999. “*Dis Aliter Visum*: Self-Telling and Theodicy in *Aeneid* 2,” in C. Perkell 1999: 50-63.
- . 2001. “Imaginary Romans: Vergil and the Illusion of National Identity,” in S. Spence (ed.) *Poets and Critics Read Vergil*, 3-16. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jones, C. P. 1995. “*Graia Pandetur ab Urbe*,” *HSCP* 97:233-41.
- . 1999. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kapust, D. J. 2011. *Republicanism, Rhetoric, and Roman Political Thought: Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keaveney, A. 2005. *Rome and the Unification of Italy*. Bristol: Bristol Phoenix.
- Keay, S. & Terrenato, N. (eds.) 2001. *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Keith, A. M. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, R. F., Roy, C. S., & Goldman, M. L. (eds.) 2013. *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Ker, J. & Pieper, C. (eds.) 2014. *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World: Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII*. Leiden: Brill.
- Khan, H. A. 2001. “Exile and the Kingdom: Creusa’s Revelations and Aeneas’ Departure from Troy,” *Latomus* 60:906-915.
- Koortbojian, M. 2013. *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Konstan, D. 2001. “*To Hellenikon ethnos*: Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity,” in I. Malkin (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, 29-50. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kraggerud, E. 1992. “Which Julius Caesar?” *SO* 67:103-12.
- Labate, M. & Rosati, G. (eds.) 2013. *La costruzione del mito augusteo*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

- LaCapra, D. 2004. *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lamp, K. S. 2013. *A City of Marble: The Rhetoric of Augustan Rome*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Langenbacher, E. & Shain, Y. (eds.) 2010. *Power and the Past: Collective Memory and International Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lee-Stecum, P. 2008. "Roman *Refugium*: Refugee Narratives in Augustan Versions of Roman Pre-History," *Hermathena* 184:69-91.
- Levene, D. S. & Nelis, D. P. (eds.) 2002. *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lindner, R. 1994. *Mythos und Identität: Studien zur Selbstdarstellung Kleinasiatischer Städte in der Römischen Kaiserzeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Lloyd, R. B. 1957. "Aeneid III and the Aeneas Legend," *AJP* 78:382-400.
- Lomas, K. 2014. "Ethnicity and Gender," in J. McInerney 2014: 483-96.
- Luce, T. J. 1990. "Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum," in K. Raaflaub & M. Toher (eds.) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, 123-38. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mac Sweeney, N. (ed.) 2015. *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mackie, C. J. 1991. "Turnus and His Ancestors," *CQ* 41:261-65.
- . 1993. "A Note on Dido's Ancestry in the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 88:231-33.
- Malamud, M. 1998. "Gnawing at the End of the Rope: Poets on the Field in Two Vergilian Catalogues," *Ramus* 27:95-126.
- Malkin, I. 1985. "What's in a Name? The Eponymous Founders of Greek Colonies," *Athenaeum* 63:114-30.
- . 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1994. *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- . 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Maltby, R. 2006. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.
- Marincola, J. 2010. “Eros and Empire: Virgil and the Historians on Civil War,” in C. Kraus, J. Marincola, & C. Pelling (eds.) *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, 183-204. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCartney, E. S. 1927. “The Omen of the Buried Horse’s Head in Vergil’s *Aeneid*,” *CJ* 22:674-76.
- McGlew, J. F. 1996. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- McInerney, J. (ed.) 2014. *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McKay, A. G. 1970. *Vergil’s Italy*. Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society.
- McNelis, C. & Sens, A. 2016. *The Alexandra of Lycophron: A Literary Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meban, D. 2009. “Virgil’s *Eclogues* and Social Memory,” *AJP* 130:99-130.
- Miller, J. F. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2014. “Virgil’s Salian Hymn to Hercules,” *CJ* 109:439-63.
- Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moorton, R. F. 1988. “The Genealogy of Latinus in Vergil’s *Aeneid*,” *TAPA* 118:253-59.
- . 1989. “The Innocence of Italy in Vergil’s *Aeneid*,” *AJP* 110:105-30.
- Morgan, L. 1998. “Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus. *Aeneid* 8,” in H.-P. Stahl 1998: 175-97.
- . 2005. “A Yoke Connecting Baskets: *Odes* 3.14, Hercules, and Italian Unity,” *CQ* 55:190-203.
- Most, G. W. 2001. “Memory and Forgetting in the *Aeneid*,” *Vergilius* 47:148-70.
- Mouritsen, H. 1998. *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. London: BICS Supplement 70.

- Mueller, H.-F. 2002. "The Extinction of the Potitii and the Sacred History of Augustan Rome," in D.S. Levene & D.P. Nelis: 313-29.
- Nakata, S. 2004. "*Dum Conderet Urbem*: Colonization in the *Aeneid*," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- . 2012. "*Egredere O Quicumque Es*: Genealogical Opportunism and Trojan Identity in the *Aeneid*," *Phoenix* 66:335-63.
- Nelsestuen, G. A. 2016. "Numanus Remulus, Ascanius, and Cato's *Origines*: The Rhetoric of Ethnicity in *Aeneid* 9," *Vergilius* 62:79-97.
- Nethercut, W. R. 1968. "Invasion in the *Aeneid*," *G&R* 15:82-95.
- . 1992. "Gilbert Highet's Raising of Italy: *Aeneid* 3.523-524," in R. M. Wilhelm & H. Jones 1992: 229-36.
- Nora, P. 1989. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*," *Representations* 26:7-24.
- Nugent, S. G. 1992. "Vergil's 'Voice of the Women' in *Aeneid* V," *Arethusa* 25:255-92.
- O'Hara, J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011. *Vergil: Aeneid Book 4*. Newburyport: Focus Publishing.
- . 2017. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . Forthcoming. *Vergil: Aeneid Book 8*. Indianapolis: Hackett Press.
- . Forthcoming. "Evander's Love of Gore and Bloodshed in *Aeneid* 8."
- Olick, J. K. & Robbins, J. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:105-40.
- Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (eds.) 2011. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olshausen, E. & Sonnabend, H. (eds.) 2002. "*Troianer sind wir gewesen*"—*Migrationen in der antiken Welt*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- Orlin, E. M. 2010. *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pandey, N. 2014. "Reading Rome from the Farther Shore: *Aeneid* 6 in the Augustan Urban Landscape," *Vergilius* 60:85-116.
- Papaioannou, S. 2003. "Founder, Civilizer and Leader: Vergil's Evander and His Role in the Origins of Rome," *Mnemosyne* 56:680-702.
- Patterson, L. E. 2010. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pavlovskis, Z. 1976. "*Aeneid* V: The Old and the Young," *CJ* 71:193-205.
- Pelling, C. 1996. "The Triumviral Period," in A. Bowman, E. Champlin, & A. Lintott (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History* 10, 1-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perkell, C. (ed.) 1999. *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- . 2010. *Vergil: Aeneid Book 3*. Newburyport: Focus Publishing.
- Petrain, D. 2014. *Homer in Stone: The Tabulae Iliacae in their Roman Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Petrini, M. 1997. *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pogorzelski, R. J. 2009. "The 'Reassurance of Fratricide' in the *Aeneid*," *AJP* 130:261-89.
- . 2016. *Virgil and Joyce: Nationalism and Imperialism in the Aeneid and Ulysses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Prag, J. 2010. "Kinship Diplomacy between Sicily and Rome," in D. Bonanno, C. Bonnet, N. Cusumano, & S. Péré-Noguès (eds.) *Alleanze e Parentele: Le 'Affinità Elettive' nella Storiografia sulla Sicilia Antica*, 179-206. Caltanissetta: Salvatore Sciascia Editore.
- Price, S. 2012. "Memory and Ancient Greece," in B. Dignas & R. R. R. Smith (eds.) *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, 15-36. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, M. C. J. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2010. "Vergil, Ovid, and the Poetry of Exile," in J. Farrell & M. C. J. Putnam 2010: 80-95.
- Quint, D. 1982. "Painful Memories: *Aeneid* 3 and the Problem of the Past," *CJ* 78:30-38.

- . 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2010. "Aeacidae Pyrrhi: Patterns of Myth and History in *Aeneid* 1-6," in B. Breed, C. Damon, & A. Rossi (eds.) *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*, 133-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. "Virgil's Double Cross: Chiasmus and the *Aeneid*," *AJP* 132:273-300.
- Rea, J. A. 2007. *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London: Duckworth.
- Reed, J. D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2010. "Vergil's Roman," in J. Farrell & M. C. J. Putnam 2010: 66-79.
- Reinhold, M. 1981-82. "The Declaration of War against Cleopatra," *CJ* 77:97-103.
- Roller, M. 2004. "Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia," *CPh* 99:1-56.
- . "The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture," in A. Feldherr (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, 214-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, C. B. 2008. "Forging Identity in the Roman Republic: Trojan Ancestry and Veristic Portraiture," in S. Bell & I. L. Hansen 2008: 97-131.
- Roselaar, S. T. (ed.) 2012. *Process of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rosivach, V. J. 1980. "Latinus' Genealogy and the Palace of Picus (*Aeneid* 7.45-9,170-91)," *CQ* 30:140-52.
- Russo, F. 2014. "The Function of the Trojan Myth in Early Roman Expansionism in Greece and Asia Minor," in V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, & M. Dana (eds.) *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic Worlds during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, 581-604. Cluj-Napoca: Mega Publishing House.
- Rutledge, S. 2012. *Ancient Rome as a Museum: Power, Identity, and the Culture of Collecting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Press.

- . 2000. "Reflections on Exile," in E.W. Said (ed.) *Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays*, 137-49. London: Granta Books.
- Sanderlin, G. 1972. "Vergil's Protection of Aeneas in *Aeneid* II," *CW* 66:82-84.
- Saylor, C. F. 1970. "Toy Troy: The New Perspective of the Backward Glance," *Vergilius* 16:26-28.
- Scarth, E.-A. 2008. *Mnemotechnics and Virgil: The Art of Memory and Remembering*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag.
- Scheid, J. & Svenbro, J. 1985. "Byrsa: La ruse d'Élissa et la fondation de Carthage," *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 40:328-42.
- Schmidt, E. 2001. "The Meaning of Vergil's *Aeneid*: American and German Approaches," *CW* 94:145-72.
- Schmitt Pantel, P. 2013. "State Festivals and Celebrations," in H. Beck (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, 432-47. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Scodel, R. 1998. "Bardic Performance and Oral Tradition in Homer," *AJP* 119:171-94.
- Scott, K. 1933. "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 BC," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 11:7-49.
- Scully, S. P. 1981. "The Bard as the Custodian of Homeric Society: *Odyssey* 3.263-72," *QUCC* 8:67-83.
- Secci, D. A. 2013. "Hercules, Cacus, and Evander's Myth-Making in *Aeneid* 8," *HSCP* 107:195-227.
- Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Seider, A. 2013. *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seo, M. 2013. *Exemplary Traits: Reading Characterization in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shumate, N. 2006. *Nation, Empire, Decline: Studies in Rhetorical Continuity from the Romans to the Modern Era*. London: Duckworth.
- Skulsky, S. 1985. "Inuitus, Regina...: Aeneas and the Love of Rome," *AJP* 106:447-55.
- Smith, A. D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1998. *Nationalism and Modernism*. New York: Routledge.

- . 1999. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004. *The Antiquity of Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2008. *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, Republic*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- . 2009. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, L. F. 1946. "Aeneas' Fleet," *CJ* 41:328-31.
- Smith, R. A. 2005. *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sorel, G. 1961. *Reflections on Violence*, trans. Hulme & Roth. New York: Collier Books.
- Squire, M. 2015. "Figuring Rome's Foundation on the Iliac Tablets," in N. Mac Sweeney 2015, 151-89.
- Stahl, H.-P. (ed.) 1998. *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. London: Duckworth.
- . 1998. "Political Stop-Overs on a Mythological Travel Route: from Battling Harpies to the Battle of Actium (*Aen.* 3.268-93)," in H.-P. Stahl 1998: 37-84.
- . 2015. *Poetry Underpinning Power: Vergil's Aeneid: The Epic for Emperor Augustus: A Recovery Study*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Stråth, B. (ed.) 2000. *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community: Historical Patterns in Europe and Beyond*. Brussels: P. I. E.-Peter Lang.
- Stratton, K.B. 2013. "Identity," in B.S. Spaeth (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Mediterranean Religions*, 220-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Syed, Y. 2005. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarrant, R. 2012. *Virgil: Aeneid, Book XII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Theodorakopoulos, E. 2004. "The Name of the Game: The *Troia*, and History and Spectacle in *Aeneid* 5," *PVS* 25:63-72.
- Thomas, R. F. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

- . 1998. "The Isolation of Turnus: *Aeneid*, Book 12," in H.-P. Stahl 1998: 271-302.
- . 2004-2005. "Torn between Jupiter and Saturn: Ideology, Rhetoric and Culture Wars in the *Aeneid*," *CJ* 100: 40-54.
- . 2011. *Horace: Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Till, K. E. 2003. "Places of Memory," in J. Agnew, K. Mitchell, & G. Toal (eds.) *A Companion to Political Geography*, 289-301. Malden: Blackwell.
- Toll, K. 1989. "What's Love Got to Do with It? The Invocation to Erato, and Patriotism in the *Aeneid*," *QUCC* 33:107-118.
- . 1991. "The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*," *Helios* 18:3-14.
- . 1997. "Making Roman-ness in the *Aeneid*," *ClAnt* 16:34-56.
- Toohey, P. 1984. "Politics, Prejudice, and Trojan Genealogies: Varro, Hyginus, and Horace," *Arethusa* 17:5-28.
- Torelli, M. 1995. *Studies in the Romanization of Italy*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- . 1999. *Tota Italia: Essays in the Cultural Formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tudor, H. 1972. *Political Myth*. London: Praeger Publishers.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walter, U. 2004. *Memoria und res publica: zur Geschichtskultur im Republikanischen Rom*. Munich: Verlag Antike.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wiesen, D. S. 1973. "The Pessimism of the Eighth *Aeneid*," *Latomus* 32:737-65.
- Wilhelm, R. M. 1992. "Dardanus, Aeneas, Augustus and the Etruscans," in R. M. Wilhelm & H. Jones 1992: 129-45.
- Wilhelm, R. M. & Jones, H. (eds.) 1992. *The Two Worlds of the Poet: New Perspectives on Vergil*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Williams, R. D. 1965. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- . 1967. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1971-72. “*Digna atque indigna relatu*: Observations on *Aeneid* IX,” *PVS* 11:61-73.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1974. “Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome,” *G&R* 21:153-64
- Wyke, M. 2009. “*Meretrix regina*: Augustan Cleopatras,” in J. Edmondson (ed.) *Augustus*, 334-80. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Zanker, P. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zarker, J. W. 1978. “Vergil’s Trojan and Italian *matres*,” *Vergilius* 24:15-24.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1965. “An Analysis of *Aeneid*, XII, 176-211: The Differences between the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus,” *AJP* 86:337-62.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. 1997. “Rome and Its Traditions,” in C. Martindale (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 188-203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.