

PERSUASION IN THE *AENEID*

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Michael Esposito

December 2017

© 2017 Michael Esposito

PERSUASION IN THE *AENEID*
Michael Esposito, Ph.D.
Cornell University 2017

This dissertation is an analysis of how characters in the *Aeneid* acquire and use knowledge to manipulate their addressees, and of how the Vergilian narrator employs similar strategies to manipulate his reader. The first three chapters are readings of speeches and scenes informed by a focus on each character's rhetorical goals and persuasive strategies. I concentrate particularly on passages in which characters invent, distort, and speak tendentiously in other ways. The final two chapters argue that the Vergilian narrator is misdirecting, because he uses untrue character speech to raise unfulfilled expectations, and that he is suppressive, because he leaves out much, and displaces the telling of much onto unreliable characters' claims.

In the first chapter I examine how the reader perceives what characters in the *Aeneid* know, how the characters come to know, and how they use what they know. In the second chapter I interpret the diplomatic exchanges between Ilioneus and Latinus and between Aeneas and Evander as rhetorical contests for advantage, informed by the chaotic military and political world that is Vergil's Italy. In the third chapter I argue that the speech in the last four books shifts to disputing the responsibility for the outbreak of the war and the question of over what the war is being fought. In the fourth chapter I argue that the rhetorical strategies used by characters in the *Aeneid* to manipulate and persuade other characters are closely intertwined with the narrative strategies used by Vergil to misdirect the expectations of his readers. In the fifth chapter I suggest

some broader effects on our understanding of the *Aeneid* that may follow from my readings of character speech and narrative technique in the first four chapters.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Michael Esposito was born in the Bronx, New York in 1986. He attended Fordham University, where he completed his B.A. in Classics and History in May 2008. In August 2009 he entered the Ph.D. program in Classics at Cornell University. In July 2017 he defended his doctoral dissertation at Cornell University.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mike Fontaine guided my work with the greatest patience. Without him I would never have finished. Hayden Pelliccia read my work with the greatest care. Without him my writing would be looser and my thought poorer. Fred Ahl changed the way I think about ancient literature and Latin poetry. To him I owe the inspiration for more of my thoughts than I can adequately record. I thank them all. I owe thanks to my other teachers too, especially Bruce McMenemy, for teaching me to love Latin, Pietro Pucci, for giving me some idea of how to read Homer, and Charles Brittain, for helping me think clearly and read carefully.

To my parents I owe, in addition to everything else, what ability I have to think and write. To my wife I am indebted for years of patience. Finally I thank David, my son, who provided immeasurable inspiration to finish this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v-vi
GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: TRACKING AND USING KNOWLEDGE IN THE <i>AENEID</i>	36
Introduction.....	36
1.1 An Asymmetry of Knowledge: Ilioneus and Dido.....	37
1.2 Reading the Balance of Knowledge: A Messenger Scene.....	43
1.3 How Accounts are Spread: Vergil’s Tripartite Solution.....	49
1.4 Prior Knowledge.....	72
1.5 Conclusion.....	85
CHAPTER 2: DIPLOMATIC USE OF KNOWLEDGE IN ITALY.....	89
Introduction.....	89
2.1 Wartime Diplomacy.....	89
2.2 <i>Status Italiae</i>	96
2.3 First Model of Diplomatic Speech in Italy: Latinus and Ilioneus.....	106
2.4 Second Model of Diplomatic Speech in Italy: Aeneas and Evander.....	131
2.5 Conclusion.....	147
CHAPTER 3: RECAPITULATION AND THE UNRELIABLE SPEAKER.....	149
Introduction.....	149
3.1 Latinus to Turnus.....	149
3.2 “Recapitulation” Defined.....	154
3.3 Aeneas Recapitulates.....	157
3.4 Recapitulation in Councils: The Council on Olympus.....	160
3.5 Recapitulation in Councils: The Latin Council.....	185
3.6 Conclusion.....	188
CHAPTER 4: MANIPULATING THE READER’S KNOWLEDGE.....	191
Introduction.....	191
4.1 Misdirection through Character Speech.....	192
4.2 Short-Term Misdirection.....	197
4.3 Large-Scale Misdirection.....	201
4.4 Invitation to Retrospective Reevaluation.....	213
4.5 Unauthorized Speech Muddies Waters.....	219
4.6 Pluperfect Storytelling.....	225
4.7 Prophecy Recalled and Recounted.....	234
4.8 Conclusion.....	240
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	242
5.1 The Suppressive Narrator.....	242
5.2 Inviting and Resisting Response.....	255

5.3 Interpenetration of Narrator, Reader, and Character.....	257
5.4 Characters Read Art: Other Misdirections in Carthage	263
5.5 Aeneas Narrates.....	267
5.6 Characters Generate the Tradition's Variants.....	268
5.7 Characters Read Tradition.....	269
5.8 Characters Play Poet.....	273
5.9 Narrator Plays Character.....	275
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	277

Persuasion in the *Aeneid*: General Introduction

This dissertation is an analysis of how characters in the *Aeneid* acquire and use knowledge to manipulate their addressees, and of how the Vergilian narrator employs similar strategies to manipulate his reader. The first three chapters are readings of speeches and scenes informed by a focus on each character's rhetorical goals and persuasive strategies. I concentrate particularly on passages in which characters invent, distort, and speak tendentiously in other ways. The final two chapters argue that the Vergilian narrator is misdirecting, because he uses untrue character speech to raise unfulfilled expectations, and that he is suppressive, because he leaves out much, and displaces the telling of much onto unreliable characters' claims.

I. Preliminary Questions

In this introduction I consider three preliminary questions. (1) How does ancient epic treat the question of how characters acquire the knowledge they evince in speeches? (2) What is "authorized" narrative? (3) How are we to understand a contradiction between a character's speech and authorized narrative? I conclude with an outline of this thesis and a brief framing of the place of each chapter's arguments in scholarship.

I.1 The Plausibility of Character Knowledge

My argument that Vergil takes great care over the question of how characters acquire the knowledge evinced in their speeches invites an assessment of the Homeric and epic convention for dealing with such questions.¹ Bassett lists passages in the *Iliad* in which the knowledge

¹ For my use of "knowledge" see below (II.1.2).

displayed by a character in speech is not, and should not be, “rationally” explained.² How, for example, does Diomedes know Dolon’s name (*Il.*10.447)?³ How does Achilles know not only Iphition’s father’s name, but even the landscape of his homeland (*Il.*20.389-92)?⁴ Bassett concludes that “[i]n matters of slight importance what the listener knows, because the poet has told him in the preceding narrative, the character may be assumed to know.”⁵ We readers know who Dolon is; Diomedes therefore knows. We have just been told about Iphition’s heritage and homeland (12.382-5); Achilles therefore knows about them too.

Although this convention allowed the poet a great deal of leeway to create interesting battle taunts, knowledge that lacked plausible explanation was not a matter of complete unconcern to the ancient reader.⁶ Odysseus has to supply an awkward prop to explain how he knows of Hyperion’s colloquy with Zeus on Olympus: Calypso told him that Mercury had told her.⁷ In less strikingly problematic situations, when the anomalous knowledge does not concern events on Olympus, Homeric scholiasts do not fail to take note of many of the same verses listed by Bassett, and to provide an explanation based on rational or “realistic” principles (e.g.,

² Bassett 1938, 130-140. His examples are from the *Iliad*: 5.246 (how does Sthenelus know Pandarus?); 10.447 (how does Diomedes know Dolon’s name?); 11.450 (how does Odysseus know Socus?); 14.482 (how does Acamas know Promachus?); 14.472 (how does Ajax know Archelochus?); 17.23-8 (how does Menelaus know Euphorbus?); 13.374-6 (how does Idomeneus know Othryoneus?); 20.389-92 (how does Achilles know Iphition?); 1.380 (how does Achilles know that Chryses has prayed to Apollo?); 16.558 (how does Patroclus know that Sarpedon made the first successful attack on the Greek wall?); 16.543 (how does Hector know that this is Patroclus?); 22.46 (why does Priam mention only Lycaeon and Polydorus out of the many sons who have been killed by Achilles?). He rejects the argument of that the *Odyssey* is more careful about these problems.

³ Scholion *ad Il.*10.447: ὅτι ζητεῖται, πῶς τὸ ὄνομα ἔγνω... εἰκὸς δὲ τινῶν γινώσκεισθαι ὀνόματα ὡς ἂν δεκαετοῦς γεγονότος χρόνου, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ Δόλωνος· ἦν γὰρ κήρυκος υἱὸς “πολύχρυσος πολύχαλκος” (10.315). bT scholion *ad loc*: καὶ πῶς ἤδεισαν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα; ἢ εἰκὸς ὡς κήρυκος υἱὸν πολλάκις συμπαρεῖναι τῷ πατρὶ. The text for scholia to the *Iliad* is taken from Erbse 1971-1977.

⁴ Scholion *ad Il.*20.389-92: ὅτι ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς γινώσκων αὐτὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος καλεῖ.

⁵ Bassett 1938, 130. For the principle in literature he refers to Fraccaroli 1903, 397-401. The modern narratological term is “paralepsis” or “transference”; see de Jong 1987, 108-9.

⁶ I use “plausibility” as the criterion for a narrative to meet in this context, but see Meijering 1987 for the range of ancient critical views on what was poetically acceptable and appropriate, and for the vocabulary of desideranda in poetry that includes much besides πιθανότης.

⁷ Bassett 1938, 138 calls these lines “the greatest blemish in the whole narrative art of Homer.”

warriors must have known each other's names and places of birth from prisoners or deserters; or, they came to know each other during temporary truces).⁸ Schlunk and Schmit-Neuerburg have argued convincingly that Vergil was influenced both by the critical principles undergirding ancient Homeric criticism and by some of the scholia that have come down to us.⁹ Schlunk gives an example of Vergil responding to the above-noted example of critical discomfort with implausible knowledge: when Turnus kills a certain Aeolus, that Trojan's epitaph, modeled on Achilles' taunt of Iphition (*Il.*20.389-392), is transposed into the narrator's voice (12.542-7), where it is more plausible as well as more affecting.¹⁰ The argument in my Chapter 1 that Vergil seems to take the problem of how characters acquire knowledge seriously follows not from an *a priori* assumption that he would have done so, but from close reading of the passages in the *Aeneid* that show him carefully tracking this problem. Here, however, I also offer the Homeric scholiasts' concern over the plausibility of characters' knowledge, along with Vergil's response to

⁸ Bassett (*ibid.*, 130) notes that scholiasts were "often troubled to explain how one of Homer's characters could know this or that." Of the passages he lists (see n.2 above) scholiasts are concerned about the speaker's source of knowledge *ad* 10.447; 14.472; 13.374; 20.389. For examples of similar concerns in other passages see scholia *ad Il.* 1.213; *Il.*5.265 (πόθεν δὲ οἶδεν; ἐξ αἰχμαλώτων δηλον ὅτι, ὅθεν καὶ Ἰδομενεὺς ἔμαθε τὰ περὶ Ὀθρυονέως [cf. 13.374–82]); *Il.*5.181-2 (καὶ πῶς γινώσκει πολέμιον ὄντα); *Il.*10.437 (πῶς δὲ ἐδόκει εἰδέναι ὅτι ταχεῖς εἰσιν, εἰ γε νεήλυδες ἦσαν;); *Il.*10.493 (ἀήθεσσον γὰρ ἔτ' αὐτῶν: πόθεν οἶδεν ὅτι ἀήθεις εἰσὶ νεκρῶν; ὅτι ἀκήκοε Δόλωνος λέγοντος „Θρήϊκες οἶδ' ἀπάνευθε νεήλυδες [cf.10.434]); *Il.*16.854 (πόθεν ὁ Πάτροκλος οἶδεν ὅτι Ἀχιλλεὺς κτενεῖ τὸν Ἔκτορα; ὡσπερ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀκούσας παρὰ Θέτιδος, ἢ ἐπεὶ κατ' Ἀρτέμωνα τὸν Μιλήσιον ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὄνειρων, ὅταν ἀθροισθῇ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος πρὸς τὸ ἐκκριθῆναι, μαντικωτάτη γίνεται); *Od.*8.489; *Od.* 11.564 (πόθεν τοῦτο οἶδεν; καὶ γὰρ ὁ Αἴας ἀπιῶν ὄχετο); 11.568 (πῶς οἶδε τοῦτους ἢ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἔσω τῶν Ἰδίου πύλων ὄντας καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν;). Scholia to the *Odyssey* are taken from Dindorf 1855. Other scholia wonder how a character can do or say something considering what he knows (e.g. *ad Od.*4.185: πῶς ὁ Μενέλαος γινώσκων ζῶντα τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα [ἔμαθε γὰρ αὐτὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πρωτέως] εἰς θρήϊνους κατάγεται;).

⁹ See Schlunk 1974; Schmit-Neuerburg 1999. Hexter 2010 considers the methodological issues, and argues that Vergil's engagement with the scholiasts' treatment of *crucis*, and their habit of athetizing to avoid difficulties, contributes to the "aporetic" quality of the *Aeneid*.

¹⁰ Schlunk 1974, 21-2; Schmit-Neuerburg 1999, 314-5. Another example (Schlunk 1974, 59-60): the scholiasts *ad Il.* 10.11 and 12 are worried about how Agamemnon can look out from the Greek camp and see the whole Trojan camp on the plain. Vergil tells that the Trojans look out from a raised palisade (*haec super e vallo prospectant Troes*, 9.168-9).

scholiasts' criticism of Homer elsewhere, as support for the idea that the plausibility of characters' knowledge was a problem he would have considered.¹¹

I.2 Narrative Authority

I.2.1 Narrative Authority: First Principles

I take accounts by the diegetic narrative to be authoritative within the fictive world of the *Aeneid*. I modify Dolezel's "authentic" and call the the accounts delivered by this narrative "authorized,"¹² and propose that when a character's account differs from the authorized version, we should understand that the character is speaking falsely or tendentiously. I refer to authorized "accounts" because it is the telling of events that that is to be accepted as true within the fictive world of the *Aeneid*, while the narrator's characterizations, interjections, foreshadowing, and other interventions may be misdirecting, and may seem to contradict or be in strong tension with the narrator elsewhere. A good example of the narrator's unstable words can be found in his treatment of Italy. Although the narrator characterizes Italy, with its men preparing to attack the new outsiders, as *inexcita....atque immobilis ante* (7.623), later references to many wars in Italy make it difficult to understand what it can have meant to call it "un-roused and undisturbed

¹¹ A resource available to Vergil but not to Homer was the Augustan poets' habit of putting in their characters' mouths markers of memory of the literary tradition. For this "Alexandrian footnote" see Ross 1975, expanded by Hinds 1998. See Knox 1995, 19 for the idea of characters as readers of the literary tradition without such a marker: Ovid's Briseis refers to Athena's interference to restrain Achilles' attack on Agamemnon, an intervention unperceived by any character and known only to reader of the *Iliad*. Vergil usually does not mark characters' recollections of the tradition with memory words (for an exception see Latinus' misremembering of the tradition [below 5.7]), but his Italians seem to have encyclopedic knowledge of the *Iliad* (discussed below at 1.4.4).

¹² For the clearest statement see Dolezel 1980, 12ff, esp. "A sentence statement of a narrative agent is true if it agrees with the narrative facts and it is false if it contradicts the narrative facts." (14) This is true in his first system, the "binary model," in which all utterances in a text can be separated sorted into either the authenticated words of the narrator or the non-authenticated words of characters. The words of the "Er-narrator" "construct" the narrated world. This terminology is to be distinguished from earlier analyses — Dolezel singles out Martinez-Bonati 1973 — in which the narrator's words "refer" to a world, can be treated as truth-claims, and are assigned "truth-values." Later in the article, and in another way in Dolezel 1998, he considers "non-binary models," in which authentication is "graded." Here I propose a criterion for sorting out those of the narrator's statements that are, in my term, "authorized."

beforehand.” The narrator’s *inexcita ante* is a piece of characterization used to misdirect the reader. The same instability cannot be read into events told by the narrator. The immediate cause of the clash that leads to the conflict comes when Ascanius shoots a deer; the deer returns to Sylvia to die; the natives, infuriated, gather weapons, and fighting breaks out (7.475-539). To be sure the account moves quickly and omits details in which we might be interested — who struck the first blow? — and to be sure there are many other causes, human and divine, that inspire Turnus with his men and Amata with her women to push for war in the scenes that follow. Nevertheless we can say without equivocation that, in the *Aeneid*, the immediate cause of the first skirmish between the Italians and the new arrivals is Ascanius’ killing of a semi-tame pet deer of the local herdsman’s daughter. We can further say that, although the narrator and characters use words that suggest the historians’ variant, in which Aeneas and his men raid the local herds, this version is not the version true in the *Aeneid*.¹³

Narratological theory distinguishes between the “*sujet*” (or “text”), the events in the order in which they are presented to the reader, and the “*fabula*” (or “story”), all the events which are recounted “abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order.”¹⁴ In the *Aeneid* such an abstraction of events — that is, the writing of an authorized *fabula* — would perforce omit much that is essential to our understanding,

¹³ For this historians’ version see below n.653.

¹⁴ This is now commonly cited as the definition of “*fabula*” (e.g., de Jong 2001, xiv), although it is originally the definition of the related term “story” in Rimmon-Kenan 1983, 3. For the early bibliography of “*fabula*” and “*sujet*” see Sternberg 1978, 8-14 (with n.15); see also Bal 1997. For newer discussion of these terms and a consideration of the effects of suppressive narrative, see Kafalenos 1997.

interpretation, and reaction.¹⁵ This is so not only because so much of the past, from the point of view of the poem, is alluded to but not recounted, but also because so much of past, present, and future is told only through the claims of characters. Vergil severely restricts authorized narration, and leaves a remarkable amount to characters' telling, or to silence. Ahl describes this dividing up of the narrative as an example of what Demetrius calls *δεινότης*: "Vergil rarely eradicates conflicting elements in the Aeneas tradition. Rather, he places them 'formidably,' and thus without explicit comment, in some 'internal' narrative."¹⁶ We readers can see that characters are unreliable tellers when they contradict authorized narrative; we should suspect they are unreliable when they are the sole authorities for a claim. Vergil is, in narratological terms, a "deliberately suppressive" narrator.¹⁷

I.2.2 Narrative Authority: Narrator's Self-Presentation

The *Aeneid's* narrator begins by making himself responsible for his own song (*arma virumque cano*, 1.1), needing the aid of the Muses only for insight into Olympian minds (*Musa mihi causas memora*, 1.8-11). Feeney sees here a movement back from the self-conscious and self-undermining Apollonian narrator to a confident and assertive narrator, closer to the Homeric

¹⁵ I do not mean to imply that such an abstraction is possible in e.g. *Odyssey* either. de Jong's "In general, the rule of thumb in Homer is that stories are true as long as they are not labelled as untrue by the narrator" (2001: 32) refers to Richardson 1996 as authority; Richardson does not say this, but argues that, when dealing with "characters' stories whose truth-value cannot be precisely determined" (401), we readers can be so absorbed that we adopt the posture of the "ideal narrative audience who believes every word of it"; and that "perhaps the 'actual' truth-value of a narrative is not so meaningful. The significant 'truth' in fiction lies in the interplay between the various audiences that comprise the making of a narrative." (402).

¹⁶ Ahl 1989, 22. For *δεινότης* and *ἐμφοσις* see further Ahl 1984.

¹⁷ For this term see Sternberg 1978, 260-82. Olsen 1997 prefers the adjective "reticent." For a newer discussion and an objection to this terminology, see Culler 2007, 183-201.

model, but “unsubordinated” and able to “vouch for his narration.”¹⁸ But this opening claim is methodically undermined throughout the poem, and is finally reversed.

At first, in the invocation that marks both the beginning of the poem’s second half and the poet’s *maius opus*, the narrator is still the subject of the verbs of telling what is deep in the past (*expediam...revocabo; dicam...dicam*). Although as the Muse’s *vates* he requires her guidance (*mone*), yet he is still the motive agent (*moveo*; 7.36-45).¹⁹ The invocation to begin the catalogue of Italian kings, however, is a close imitation of the self-presentation of the Homeric narrator.²⁰ For Vergil the self-limitation is all the stronger because of the contrast with his previous invocations — now the Muses are the motive force (*cantusque movete*) — and his addition of a complaint against the attenuated nature of the tradition on which he relies (*et meministis enim, divae, et memorare potestis; ad nos vix tenuis famae perlabitur aura*, 7.645-6). The tale of the Olympian exchange that provides the cause for the fabulous transformation of ships requires

¹⁸ Feeney 1991 (quotations from 186 and 184). See also 184: “If we turn to consider the stance of the poet, especially with the Apollonian model in mind, the reassertion of the poet’s command is very striking. Where there are gaps for the reader to fill, Vergil creates the impression that it is not that he cannot tell, but that he need not tell all he knows.” Feeney traces some of the progression I outline below, but he concludes that the “partnership” proposed at 9.528 is markedly a more balanced relationship between poet and Muse than that proposed by the Ennian lines upon which Vergil’s are modeled. Nelis 2001, 386-9 asserts more cautiously that Vergil is “drawing back towards a position somewhat closer to Homeric practice” (386). Hunter 1993, 172-89 concludes that Vergil “placed near the centre of his work a nuanced and ironised poem which invited readings which could threaten to disturb, if not in fact subvert, the nationalist project upon which he was engaged” (189), but on the subject of poetics he agrees that “[w]hereas the opening of Virgil’s poem announces a ‘Roman Homer,’ the opening of the *Argonautica* announces that ‘this is not Homer.’” (172)

¹⁹ In Book 6 the narrator requires the permission of the gods of the underworld to recount a tradition, to disclose what is not accessible or visible (*di, quibus imperium est animarum, umbraeque silentes, et Chaos et Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late, sit mihi fas audita loqui, sit numine vestro, pandere res alta terra et caligine mersas*, 6.264-7).

²⁰ Compare 7.641-6 (*pandite nunc Heliconae deae cantusque movete / qui bello exciti reges, quae quemque secutae / complerint campos acies, quibus Itala iam tum / floruerit terra alma viris, quibus arserit armis; / et meministis enim, divae, et memorare potestis; / ad nos vix tenuis famae perlabitur aura*) and *Il.* 2.484-93 (ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσαι: / ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαὶ ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα, / ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν: / οἳ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν: / πληθὺν δ’ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ’ ὀνομήνω, / οὐδ’ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ’ εἶεν, / φωνὴ δ’ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἐνεῖη, / εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο / θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ’ ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον: / ἀρχοὺς (αὐτῶν νηῶν ἐρέω νηῆς τε προπάσας). Like Homer, Vergil repeats the same form of invocation for a second catalogue (*Aen.* 10.163-5 and *Il.* 16.112; [followed by a catalogue not immediately but at 168ff]).

direct questions to the Muses, and complete reliance upon them, for the first time.²¹ The invocation of Calliope for Turnus' *aristeia* (9.525-8) seems to offer a compromise teamwork model, in which the poet relies on the Muse for inspiration (*aspirate canenti*), while the Muse expounds events in tandem with the poet (*mecum ingentis oras evolvite belli*). This model fails in the climactic book, when the narrator finds himself inadequate to tell either what happened²² or why it happened, despite direct questions charged no longer to the Muses but to Jupiter:

*quis mihi nunc tot acerba deus, quis carmine caedes
diversas obitumque ducum, quos aequore toto
inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros,
expediat? tanton placuit concurrere motu,
Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?* (12.500-4)

I.2.3 Narrative Authority: Problems

I.2.3.1 Undermining of Narrative Authority

The narrator's questioning of his own adequacy invites us to further questioning. Hardie wonders whether another common trope, the "obsessive and tendentious re-presenting of parts of the narrative within the narrative," can "still leave intact the authority of the primary narrator," and concludes largely in favor of "thoroughgoing relativization of epic authority."²³ In response to this argument I propose to take the narration of events, rather than evaluative statements, as authorized and true within the fictive world. Hardie makes his argument after tracking the reports of *fama* in Book 4 as evaluations of Dido's and Aeneas' actions. In this case the narrator's

²¹ *quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris / avertit? tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis? / dicite: prisca fides facta, sed fama perennis*, 9.77-9. Contrast the indirect questions at 1.8-11; 7.37-40; 7.642-4; 10.163-5.

²² Earlier the narrator adapted historiographical language to ground his narrative in received tradition (see, after the invocation of Erato, *accipimus* 7.48; *refert* 49; *ferebatur* 62). In Book 12 he extends this generic intrusion by admitting uncertainty over the events in his own narrative: *incertum est* who threw the dart that strikes Aeneas, and whether chance or a god drove it (12.319-22).

²³ Hardie 1998, 262-3.

evaluations should, I agree, be interrogated just as are the characters'.²⁴ Concerning the relationship between Aeneas and Dido the assignation and weighting of blame by characters (Iarbas, Jupiter, Mercury, Dido, and Aeneas) may undermine the authority of the narrator, for example, to call Dido's action blameworthy (*hoc praetexit nomine culpam*, 172); or perhaps we are to understand that the "*culpa*" of v.72 is focalized, either through the the judgment of those who disapprove of Dido's actions, or through Dido's guilty conscience.²⁵ No matter how we choose to interpret evaluations, from any voice in the text, there remain the underlying events subject to evaluation. That Dido and Aeneas during a storm came to the same cave is beyond question, because the narrator tells us that Dido and Aeneas during a storm came to the same cave (4.160-6). That Aeneas prepared in secret to leave Carthage is beyond question for the same reason. During the time between these two events may other events are left untold by authorized narrative.²⁶ That the telling of these events is omitted, that their interpretation is displaced onto characters, is not a relativization of the narrator's authority, but a severe limitation of its scope, and a corresponding widening of permanent gaps that invite the reader to fill them in. We can apply this principle to events in the second half of the poem. Juno may say that Aeneas' race is trying to outmaneuver Latinus by means of marriage (*neu conubiis ambire Latinum / Aeneadae*

²⁴ I read the passages Hardie discusses less as an reduction of narrative authority to only one of many sources of authority, and more as an exploitation of the interpenetration of narrator and character points of view, of the ambiguity of through whose point of view evaluative statements in the narrative voice are focalized. For "focalization" see Genette 1980, 189-94 and 1988, 72-8; Bal 1997, 142-60; Broman 2004 for distinctions and a critical survey. For focalization of narrative in the *Aeneid* see Reed 2007; also Conte 2007, 50-57, esp. 50: "[T]he narrative appears to be saturated with the sentiments of individual characters in action; there is fusion rather than distance between the representation of characters and their own perception of the events in which they are involved."

²⁵ Reed 2007, 26-31 considers the problem of to what degree we can isolate and filter out focalization in the *Aeneid*. He argues against the search for a "definite focalizer," which "presupposes a definitively recoverable authorial voice in control of its different possible perspectives and distributing them neatly among his characters." (p.29) If in principle such a search cannot end in certainty, yet in practice the moments of marked focalization are remarkable and important (e.g. *ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras* [1.281]; *dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos* [10.782]).

²⁶ See the discussion below (5.1.1).

possint, 7.333-4), but authorized narrative reports to us that Latinus was the one to think of and offer marriage (7.249-73). No matter how Juno characterizes the origin and purpose of the prospective marriage alliance in Latium, and no matter what we think of Aeneas in general, concerning this particular issue we readers know that it was Latinus who thought of the marriage, and that he was prompted by the bee omen and Faunus prophecy. We conclude that Juno is saying what is not so in the world of the *Aeneid*, and that she is employing distortion in persuasive speech.

I do not, then, understand the narrator's escalating self-effacement, which I trace above and to which I return to at the end of this thesis, to be an abnegation of the narrator's authority over what he does narrate. I do not think that for Vergil and his contemporaries there could be any question of a bardic narrator making truth-claims that could apply, as history and fact, outside the world of the poem. In this sense the rhetoric of the Vergilian narrator often, as Bal puts it in his typology of narrators, "points to the presence of invention."²⁷ The narrator's authority outside the fictive world of the poem does not need to be questioned, relativized, or undermined, because no such authority was ever imagined to be available for the claiming. Nevertheless the events that are narrated remain authorized within the fictive world of the *Aeneid*, and thereby allow us to build an interpretation of the world dwelt and acted in by the *Aeneid*'s characters. I understand the narrator's problematization of his own authority outlined above to have two other effects. First, at its culmination in Book 12, it is Vergil's confession that he is unable — perhaps that poetry is unable (*quis...carmine...expediat?*) — to adequately tell of the butchery of what he has depicted as a civil war, and especially to tell what purpose civil

²⁷ Bal 1997, 25. He is distinguishing between an "external narrator" — the term is a contrast to a "character-bound narrator" — who presents a story as true, and one whose rhetoric "points to the presence of invention."

slaughter could have.²⁸ Second, the gradual change of the narrator's claims about himself are the means by which Vergil thematizes his pervasive narrative strategy of severely limiting what he tells.

I.2.3.2 The Gods

Vergil reduces direct commerce between gods and men to a minimum, and responds to the puzzle of what we call "double motivation"²⁹ by giving his characters stronger natural reason than does Homer to do what they do when they are inspired by gods. This has led some to consider the gods literary "tropes," not relevant except allegorically to interpreting human action. On this topic useful is the discussion of Feeney, who argues at length against Gordon Williams' division of the *Aeneid*'s action into a divine world of "unreality" and a human world to be read naturalistically.³⁰ Because almost all the persuasive speeches I discuss are spoken by gods to gods or by mortals to mortals, my arguments do not rest upon any single conception of the relationship between the divine and the mortal. Nevertheless I believe that any divine action that affects the characters' world outside any individual's mind and body is to be accepted as having

²⁸ Juno's use of *socer* and *gener* calls to mind Caesar and Pompey (7.317). What Allecto calls her own work, *discordia* (7.545), is a buzzword for civil strife in contemporary discourse (see Hellegouarc'h 1963, 134) and in Vergil (*Ecl.* 1.71; *Geo.* 2.496; 8.702 [on the shield at Actium]; 12.313). In Aeneas' attempt to quell the last outbreak of war Vergil alludes to Horace on the civil wars (cf. *quo ruitis? quaeve ista repens discordia surgit?* [12.313] and *Hor. Epode.* 7.1 *quo, quo scelesti ruitis?*).

²⁹ For the term see Pelliccia 2011. The interpretation of the Vergilian gods is inevitably tied up with the same question in Homer; on this question useful are Kirk 1974 (divine interventions are "little more than façon de parler" [292]); Dietrich 1979 (real gods are believed in naively, in literature and in life); Redfield 1975 (the gods have no *numen* and are a source of comedy, with no real effect on the *Iliad*'s anthropological examination of value conflicts); Griffin 1980, esp. 144-204 (explicitly *contra* Kirk 1974; the gods drive the plot); Kullmann 1985 (the gods in the *Iliad* and the gods in the *Odyssey* represent two fundamentally and persistently different conceptions of the divine); Erbse 1986 ("Die Götter sind die Herren dieser Welt [57], necessary to tell mortals, who lack a will, what to do); Emlin-Jones 1992 (the dualistic framing of the question is a product of the disjunction between the modern mind, with its "polarities," and the Greek mind, with its "'poetically mediated" [135] conception of the gods).

³⁰ Feeney 1990, 129-87 argues against G. Williams 1983, esp. 24-35. Others more or less on the latter's side include Coleman 1982, who acknowledges that the gods carry a "burden of causation" but sees in divine exchanges "frivolous anthropomorphism" (p.163); Quinn 1968, 316-20, for whom "parallel divine and human motivation" is a sufficient analysis.

happened within the world of the *Aeneid*: however much, for example, Vergil’s narrator unmistakably “points to the presence of invention”³¹ when telling the miraculous transformation of the Trojan ships into nymphs (9.77-9), the transformation is observed by the Rutulians as a miracle (123-4), and addressed by Turnus as a miracle (128-9).

I.3 Interpreting Speech That Contradicts Narrative

In *Odyssey* 13.330-8 Athena compliments Odysseus for the shrewdness and prudence he has shown by not joyfully rushing to greet his wife, as any other man would have. The scholia say that the verses were athetized by some because Odysseus has given no sign to this stranger that he does not intend to rush and greet Penelope.³² Our scholiast disagrees and proposes an explanation: Athena is covertly warning Odysseus that he needs to hide his arrival. In this comment we see two common responses to character speech inconsistent with narrative. The first is to cut out or ignore anything that is not obviously coordinated with or fully explained by previous narrative. The second is to search for motivation that the speaker might have for saying what she says. I take the latter approach, and attempt to read speakers’ inconsistencies with authorized narrative as distortions that contribute to the persuasive strategy of the speaker. Essential to this endeavor is the distinction between a character’s motivation for his speech and the narrator’s motivation for putting it in his mouth. The principle remains the same whether we call these elements “narratorial motivation” and “actorial motivation”³³ — for the latter I will simply use “character motivation” — or speak first of communication between the poet and the

³¹ See above n.27.

³² Scholion *ad* 13.333-8: ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴληφε παρ’ αὐτοῦ σημεῖον τοῦ μήπω βούλεσθαι τὴν γαμετὴν ἰδεῖν. τὸνναντίον γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῷ ἐπιφαίνεται, ἵνα κρύψη αὐτοῦ τὴν εἴσοδον. διὸ καὶ φησὶν “ἢ μάλα δὴ Ἀγαμέμνωνος Ἀτρεΐδαο φθίσεσθαι κακὸν οἶτον ἐπὶ μεγάροισιν ἔμελλον, εἰ μὴ μοι σὺ ἕκαστα θεὰ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες” (12.383-5). οὕτως οὖν αὐτὸς ἠπειγέτο ἰδεῖν τὴν γαμετὴν.

³³ For this terminology see de Jong 2001, xi-xix with bibliography.

reader, then of communication between one character and another.³⁴ Analysis of Homer much more than criticism of Vergil has respected the distinction between narrator speech and character speech, as well as that between the reason the narrator says something (or has a character say something) and the reason a character has for saying something.³⁵ De Jong's application of narratological theory to Homer offers an inspiration for a comprehensive reading of ancient epic informed by distinguishing the two types of motivation in each speech.³⁶ The same distinction underlies the ancient critical principle of *λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου*, upon which O'Hara relies to explain scenes that have been read as inconsistencies or mistakes, and to argue that in the *Aeneid* prophecy is possessed of neither unerring accuracy nor the unifying authority that stabilizes the poem's vision.³⁷

The *Aeneid* poses special problems for the reader eager to read the character motivation in speeches. The supposedly incomplete state of the poem has offered critics a methodological justification for ignoring or chalking up to error speech uncoordinated with narrative. Vergil, this view supposes, would have repaired such inconsistency if he had lived. Adherents of this approach use it to work out the order in which different books or passages were written.³⁸ More recently the "current hypothesis that internal contradiction, deemed broadly characteristic of

³⁴ For this terminology (and the maker and recipient of "implicature"), see Wharton 2008.

³⁵ See Richardson 2006, 201 on the Homeric scholia: "Speeches of persuasion are often interpreted as highly artificial and sophisticated, suggesting something covertly (*λεληθότως*), in contrast to their surface meaning."

³⁶ de Jong 1987 and 2001. She says (2001, viii) that Heinze inspired her to apply this approach to Homer. Vergilian use of this branch of theory (e.g. Fowler 1990 and subsequent essays gathered in Fowler 2000) concentrate on focalization as a means to introduce competing ideologies; in substance this resembles Lyne 1987, although he uses his own terminology.

³⁷ See O'Hara 1990; for *λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου* see also Dachs 1913. Highet 1972, 285-9 already pondered this solution to alleged "inconsistencies" in the *Aeneid*.

³⁸ Representative examples: Conrads 1863; Noack 1892; Gercke 1913; Henselmans 1914; Hirst 1916; Crump 1920; more recently D'Anna 1957; Berres 1982. For use of the assumption that the *Aeneid* was unfinished as an "escape hatch" for the interpretation of difficult or "contradictory" passages, see Ahl and Roisman 1996, 16.

literary texts, characterizes the *Aeneid* as well”³⁹ has led critics to recognize that, for example, the narrator’s advertisement of a peaceful Italy is intimately connected with, not mistakenly contradictory to, the narrator’s later revelations of its warlike state. O’Hara emphasizes the *Aeneid*’s resistance to harmonization, how it undercuts any unifying authoritative voice guiding the whole.⁴⁰ Horsfall prefers to lend more weight to the allusive, *ad hoc*, local effects of each learned reference than to their inconcinnity when brought across many lines into juxtaposition.⁴¹ In this thesis I concentrate not on inconsistencies in authorized narrative, but on inconsistencies between character speech and authorized narrative. These I read as distortions, like Athena’s in the *Odyssey*, that invite us to perceive both the speaker’s intention to persuade and the strategies by which he persuades.

Ahl points out the slippage critics allow when they isolate verses and claim that “Vergil takes a position” on myths with variants, e.g. Horsfall’s claim *ad* 1.599 that “Vergil describes the Trojans as *omnium egenos*,” and so rejects the variant in which Vergil escapes after having been given by the Greeks a choice of treasures to take from Troy.⁴² Vergil makes no such description; Aeneas does.⁴³ Not only is Aeneas’ claim in this verse unauthorized by the narrator, it is undermined, even contradicted by a careful reading of what the narrator and the same character tell us elsewhere, both before and after the speech.⁴⁴ When we perceive that the poet draws attention to the way in which his own manipulative narrative works like his manipulative

³⁹ Perkell 1999, 21.

⁴⁰ See O’Hara 2007, 77-103.

⁴¹ See Horsfall 1999, 91-102.

⁴² See Ahl 1989, esp. 25, where he quotes Horsfall 1991, 64-5: “Virgilio descrive i troiani come *omnium egenos* (1.599) in contrasto ovvio e polemico con Didone, anche lei profuga di Sidone, e con le versioni nelle quali Enea tratta con i Greci ed ottiene il privilegio di lasciare Troia con un ampio tesoro.”

⁴³ The lines are from Aeneas’ speech of appeal and thanks to Dido (1.595-610).

⁴⁴ See Ahl 1989, 24-30.

characters, we cannot collapse the narrator's authority entirely. The only way we are able to detect the characters in manipulation is to mark when and how their words differ from those of the narrator, whose account of events remains authoritative in the fictive world of the *Aeneid*.

In identifying the distortions of speakers I wish to avoid assigning blame to any speaker. Heinze offers taxonomy of deceptive speech in the *Aeneid* — the omission, distortion, and invention of facts—⁴⁵ but he understands Vergil to be inviting the reader to pass moral judgment on distorting speech. Under this view distortion is characteristic of Juno and the Trojans' enemies,⁴⁶ not plain and direct speakers like Aeneas.⁴⁷ Hightet, on the other hand, recognizes that “It would be feasible to maintain that, in every important speech in the *Aeneid* which is intended to persuade, there is at least one lie,” and points out when Aeneas too is responsible for “deliberate misstatement of fact.”⁴⁸ Yet he frames his discussion of this point as an opposition between readings of Vergil as a poet and Vergil as an orator, and he takes distorting speech to be a sign that “Vergil distrusted oratory.”⁴⁹ Hardie attempts to “resituate the place of rhetoric”⁵⁰ in the *Aeneid*, arguing against the idea that “rhetoric” is the object of Vergil's disapproval or opprobrium. In the scenes I examine, especially in Chapters 1-3, Aeneas speaks tendentiously as frequently as his enemies, and employs the same rhetorical techniques as they. I do not point this out to criticize Aeneas, as if he who does not speak with honesty or objectivity should be

⁴⁵ Heinze 1993, 325: “...Tatsachen zu verschweigen, zu entstellen oder zu erfinden...” With his observations on the directedness of each speech toward accomplishing a goal, and the adaptation of each speech to his addressee (pp. 324-326), compare Mack 1978, 63 (followed and expanded upon greatly by O'Hara 1990) on prophecies “shaped by the speaker to suit the needs of recipients.”

⁴⁶ Heinze 1993, 325: “Virgil's speakers are good at such sly insinuations; naturally they are most used by advocates of a poor cause, i.e. in this case by the enemies of the Trojans.”

⁴⁷ See Feeney 1993, esp. 217: “Aeneas does not lie...often he speaks with great emotion, but he does not use words to win his way by overpowering one emotion with another.”

⁴⁸ Hightet 1972, 277-290 (quotations from 284 and 289).

⁴⁹ *ibid*, 285.

⁵⁰ Hardie 1998, 243. Beginning from the Latin Council in Book 11, he attempts a short assessment of internal narrations in the epic tradition and discusses examples in the *Aeneid*.

considered “not an honourable or pleasant character.”⁵¹ As careful a commentator as Eden can point out how Aeneas’ misrepresentations are like those of his enemies,⁵² yet immediately afterward claim, when Aeneas describes himself to Evander as *volens* when driven by fates after he had told Dido that he was traveling *invitus*, that Aeneas is “equally sincere in two totally different contexts.”⁵³ To call him “equally insincere” in both contexts would be closer to the truth, but the more productive approach is to realize that “sincerity” is not a quality to be looked for in speech in the *Aeneid*, if by that word we mean full, honest, transparent, objective, disinterested proclamations of truth.

I.4 Other Terminology

I use “the reader” or “we readers” indiscriminately to indicate the idealized narratee experiencing the *Aeneid* in order for the first time. I am concerned mainly with what is told and what is omitted by the narrator, and in what order; that is, I track what the reader has been told or not told at any given time in the poem. If the text under analysis were Forster’s “The King died and then the Queen died,”⁵⁴ I might say that after the first three words we readers have no way of knowing that the queen too will die. When I consider the technique of misdirection, I am concerned only with the structuring and ordering of narrative that conceals and misleads, not with the question of whether any particular reader was or is misled.⁵⁵ In reading the *Aeneid*, a poem written to multiple audiences, so soon canonical, and possessed of readers of such a range

⁵¹ Lyne 1989, 48-9 says this of Mercury in Book 4, because “592ff give the lie to 563ff.”

⁵² Eden 1975, 61: “Aeneas exaggerates to gain his point (esp.[8].147ff) as much as his enemies ([8].13ff).”

⁵³ *ibid.*, 62.

⁵⁴ Forster 1958, 82-3.

⁵⁵ For the way in which the “order of presentation” conditions the “exposition,” see Sternberg 1978.

of status, education, and sophistication, it is not a profitable pursuit to claim to know what any particular reader will have thought or understood at any particular point.⁵⁶

Throughout the thesis I call Aeneas and his people “Trojans.” The identity of the hero and his people is the locus of a great deal of tension, conflict, and development in the poem, and the poet evidently takes great care in choosing each time between the names “Dardanian,” “Teucrian,” “Trojan,” “Phrygian,” and “Laomedontian,” among others. I find myself in need of a neutral alternative, however, when I am not discussing the significance of whichever epithet is found in a particular passage, and I have not found it possible always to use a circumlocution (e.g. “Aeneas and his people”). In the same way I call Dido’s people “Carthaginian,” although the narrator and characters use the names “Phoenician,” “Punic,” and “Tyrian.”

OUTLINE

II.1 Chapter 1: Tracking and Using Knowledge in the *Aeneid*

II.1.1 Chapter 1: Outline

In the first chapter I examine how the reader perceives what characters in the *Aeneid* know, how the characters come to know, and how they use what they know. I open with the observation that every people the Trojans encounter knows much about them before they arrive or speak. In the first section I discuss how the reader is able to detect what knowledge the speaker employs in a struggle for advantage with an interlocutor. I begin with a reading of the exchange between Dido and Ilioneus in Book 1. In the second section I apply the same analysis to the changes Mercury makes to Jupiter’s *mandata* when he delivers them to Aeneas in Book 4.

⁵⁶ That is, I will not attempt conclusions like those made by Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.29: “Venus, *like the reader*, expects the embassy recently sent to Diomedes by the Latins to bring back this formidable warrior to aid the Latin war-effort, and his eventual refusal to come is both a surprise and an indication of the inevitable result of the war.” (emphasis mine)

In each case a speaker's partial, modified quotation of another character shows that the speaker's method of persuasion is informed by a calculation of what his interlocutor knows.

In the third section I consider the means by which stories are spread in the world of the *Aeneid*. Characters hear about events through divinely inspired speech, through the reports of *fama*, and through direct inquiry; I concentrate on the last two. Notwithstanding the narrator's misdirecting characterization of it as a liar, *fama*'s reports throughout the poem are accurate, though freighted with moral assessment of interested parties. Inquiry is the way in which the Trojans discover where they are and to whom they are speaking, in order that they might not be at too much of a disadvantage when they speak to their knowing hosts.

The fourth section discusses instances in which characters who are told new information respond by claiming, to the surprise of both the speaker and the reader, that they already know what they have been told. These scenes leave the impression that the narrator selectively grants insight into an ongoing story, and neglects or obscures other parts. The poet has established that characters learn by the three means outlined above, and so when a character claims knowledge we have not seen him acquire, we can either accept this as plausible or think that he is speaking unreliably. Finally, I document the encyclopedic knowledge of the Trojan past that shapes the attitude of the natives of Italy toward those new arrivals. I conclude that Vergil takes care to make it plausible that the characters acquire the knowledge that informs their speech, and that characters know so much about each other because their world is closely bound by connections both mythical and historical.

II.1.2 Chapter 1: Place in Scholarship

In this chapter I argue that speech exchanges are conditioned by an “asymmetry of knowledge” between interlocutors. This terminology I adapt by analogy from the anthropological study of “asymmetries of knowledge” and the way in which they condition and hamper communication. A seminal article by Schuetz considered the difficulties faced by a stranger attempting to map his half-conscious “systems” and “recipes” onto those of the new group with whom he must live.⁵⁷ Recent studies focus on overlap, tension, and hierarchy in communicating agents’ “communicative knowledge.”⁵⁸ Goody considers the limited degree to which “goal-oriented strategies” can be termed “consciously calculated.”⁵⁹ In an analogous fashion we should ponder the degree to which the rhetorical strategies embedded in an epic code should be analyzed as calculated by any particular character. I choose to refer to the calculation of characters, but it is true that one can understand a rhetorical strategy to be directed toward a persuasive goal without using language that frames one’s analysis as insight into the deliberation of a literary character. It should be noted that for these authors “knowledge” indicates loose and semi-conscious linguistic strategies and codes of behavior, whereas in my analysis “knowledge” indicates a character’s conscious conception of a person or event based on a report he has heard.

I do not argue in this chapter that Vergil never assigns to characters knowledge difficult to explain only by events in the fictive world. The narrative resource, discussed above, that characters are granted some knowledge that the narrator has given the reader is occasionally exploited. It is otherwise puzzling that, for example, Andromache knows that Creusa died at

⁵⁷ See Schuetz 1944; the quoted terms are introduced on p.500.

⁵⁸ See Marková and Foppa 1991; Pallotti 2001; Günther and Luckmann 2001.

⁵⁹ See Goody 1978, esp. 8-16.

Troy,⁶⁰ or that the first time we hear Aeneas speaking to his men of their destination he speaks of *Latium* (1.205), although we never hear how he learned this name.⁶¹ He could easily have heard “off-stage” the name associated with the Tiber, but the Trojans’ acquisition of other important names drawn from Italy is so carefully accumulated that this exception does surprise.⁶²

I argue that it is not enough to attribute any example of unexplained character knowledge to “convention.”⁶³ Undoubtedly the poet can write more entertaining taunts when each side in a fight knows enough to taunt the other with choice reminders of the past.⁶⁴ Undoubtedly there is some sense in which the characters act as readers of the tradition established by Vergil’s literary predecessor: Vergil’s Italians are readers of the *Iliad*, not the first six books of the *Aeneid*.⁶⁵ The question I address, however, is whether the poet implicitly assumes that knowledge can be justified by “convention” alone, against plausibility or with disregard for it, or devotes narrative time and energy to making knowledge plausible.⁶⁶ I argue that the passages assembled in this chapter show that Vergil does devote effort and attention to telling how characters acquire knowledge.

⁶⁰ 3.341.

⁶¹ Kvicala 1881, 76ff. For a clearer error see below (2.4.1). At 8.548-50 Aeneas sends a ship or ships down the Tiber as messenger to Ascanius, but we never hear of these men again.

⁶² Allowance must be made that both of these exceptions involve scenes narrated by Aeneas.

⁶³ For examples of this attitude see Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.581-2 (“[S]uch dramatically convenient knowledge is common in epic.”); Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.167 (“I hope never to have to read an epic in which all such questions are answered”); Horsfall 2006 *ad* 3.341 (“V. does not explain how Andr. knows of Creusa’s d. [and we do best not to ask.]”); Conington 1876 *ad* 1.553 (“Virg.’s love of variety leads him to neglect these minutiae.”)

⁶⁴ The Trojans also learn quickly about the Latins. Pandarus early on knows about Turnus’ hopes for marriage, and about his father and city: *non haec dotalis regia Amatae, / nec muris cohibet patriis media Ardea Turnum. / castra inimica vides, nulla hinc exire potestas* (9.737-739).

⁶⁵ See n.11 above. Barchiesi 1999, 334 reads *orbis* (1.457) as a footnote referring to the Epic Cycle. Hardie 1998, 257 adds Diomedes on the fame of Greeks’ homecoming (*infanda per orbem / supplicia* [11.257-258]) as a reference to the *Nostoi*.

⁶⁶ The task of making sure the listener can follow how characters know what they know is the object of considerable narrative effort in the *Odyssey*; see Olson 1995.

II.2 Chapter 2: Diplomatic Use of Knowledge in Italy

II.2.1 Chapter 2: Outline

In the second chapter I interpret the diplomatic exchanges between Ilioneus and Latinus and between Aeneas and Evander as rhetorical contests for advantage, informed by the chaotic military and political world that is Vergil's Italy. I begin with Venulus' embassy to Diomedes, and compare the way it exploits its audience's ignorance to tactics used by the Trojans elsewhere in Italy. My third section is a consideration of the situations in which Latinus and Evander find themselves, and of what they might wish to obtain from the Trojans. Completion of this task requires the preliminary work of the second section, an assessment of Italy as it was when the Trojans arrived. This task is made difficult by the limited scope of the summary of Latinus' domestic affairs that follows the narrator's promise of a *status rerum* of this new land. The impression he leaves, that Italy is peaceful, is misdirecting. The true picture — that it is a land of colonists, warriors, and raiders, riven by war, and used to dealing with threatening outsiders — can only be pieced together from a gradual accumulation of details throughout the final six books.

In the third section I argue that in the speech exchange between Latinus and Ilioneus each sides matches god against god, interest against interest. Latinus claims that his people follow Saturn, offers *hospitium*, and suggests that the Trojans might be distant relatives. Ilioneus says that his people require land, are descended from Jove, and follow the commands of the gods. Latinus' solution, to propose that Aeneas marry his daughter, offers an advantageous model for assimilating these outsiders.

In the fourth section I argue that Aeneas attempts to base an alliance with Evander on genealogical connection and the temporary shared interest of a common enemy. Evander replaces this with what he frames as a recognition of a much closer connection, the continuation or renewal of a years-old relationship with Anchises. He promises Aeneas help. The next day, after an interlude in which Aeneas sleeps under his roof and becomes his pupil in the history of Italy, Evander reveals that the only help he can provide is information: where and how Aeneas can get troops from the Etruscans. He then puts his son Pallas in his guest's charge. I conclude that in both diplomatic exchanges the Trojans and their interlocutors speak with the goal of moulding an alliance on terms to their respective people's best advantage.

II.2.2 Chapter 2: Place in Scholarship

These scenes take inspiration from multiple Homeric and Apollonian sources. For the poet they are necessary to motivate actions in the second half of the poem. From the point of view of the characters these scenes have been understood as displays of harmony and generosity, leading to action that is joyfully performed and mutually beneficial, fated to be overturned only by divinely-plotted chaos. This reading leaves the Latin and the Pallantean king nothing but archetypes of the good king: in the former case, a king "willing to submit to fate and divine will,"⁶⁷ "self-possessed,"⁶⁸ "unmistakably characterized as a good king,"⁶⁹ "generous,"⁷⁰ and marked by such "overwhelming benevolence"⁷¹ that he offers the Trojans "far more than they

⁶⁷ Moskalew 1982, 163.

⁶⁸ Papaioannou 2000, 209.

⁶⁹ Cairns 1989, 64-5.

⁷⁰ Horsfall 2000, 161; Highet 1972, 316 n.45; Cairns 1989, 65.

⁷¹ Horsfall 1995, 155.

hoped or dreamed.”⁷² in the latter case, a king who rules a “quasi-idyllic”⁷³ people, who is endowed with so much “genuine warmth,” “real affection” and “love” for Aeneas that he “does not even think of discussing terms and balancing the contributions of the two peoples,”⁷⁴ and “will even sacrifice his only son in an effort to establish the Roman nation.”⁷⁵ I read the arguments of both the resident kings in these diplomatic exchanges as directed to the practical goal of averting the dangers the Trojans represent and achieving a favorable alliance. I do so for three reasons: (1) It is difficult to find epic speakers in the pre-Vergilian tradition speaking only in order to spout virtue. Self-interested speech is what we should expect. (2) When we understand from later passages the chaotic and warlike state of Italy, we should expect the kings to respond, responsibly and in accordance with their duties as rulers, to the considerable pressures on them. (3) A reading that understands the scenes to be competitions for advantage better explains verbal details that are otherwise puzzling or otiose.

Understanding the political calculation and rhetorical manipulation in these speeches follows from and reinforces an understanding that the Italy of the *Aeneid* is not a fairy-tale land of prophesied princesses. It is a world whose patchwork organization is grounded in concerns more familiar to the ancient historian than the mythographer: colonists, immigrants, networks of alliance. Its inhabitants are at war, or jockeying for advantage in prospective wars. Reckford argues well for the anticipations of tragedy throughout the book, for the inevitable opposition between the Trojans’ claims and the interests of those who receive them, and for the disjunction

⁷² Horsfall 2000 *ad* 39; taken to its extreme this view ends with “kind, bumbling Latinus” (Nisbet 1990, 262).

⁷³ Wigodsky 1972, 213.

⁷⁴ Highet 1972, 140.

⁷⁵ Papaioannou 2003, 690. A worse misreading is Newman 2005, 257: “From narrating Evander, Aeneas will recruit Pallas to his cause.”

between what Ilioneus claims the Trojans need and what they will eventually require.⁷⁶ Moorton points out the selectivity of the once-popular reading that took Italy to be a Golden Age land of “pristine purity,”⁷⁷ and shows that it is “a postlapsarian land inhabited by a complex, non-uniform human population in which mortality and violence were indigenous if not predominant,” demonstrably “not a peaceable kingdom, but a land sliding into burgeoning war.”⁷⁸ Adler juxtaposes the assurance in the narrator’s *status rerum* that Latium is at peace with Tiberinus’ claim to Aeneas that the (a?) *gens Latina* have been waging war with Evander, and concludes that either Tiberinus is exaggerating or that the *gens Latina* refers only to the Rutulians.⁷⁹ She documents the conquests of Turnus and sees him as a danger both to Latinus and to all Etruria. Finally, she traces the network of alliances, active wars, and smoldering hostilities between Rutulians, Latins, Etruscans, and Pallanteans. Following her example I try to assemble a fuller picture of Vergil’s Italy just before the Trojans land, and I disagree with her on details that are noted as they arise.

III.3 Chapter 3: Recapitulation and the Unreliable Speaker

III.3.1 Chapter 3: Outline

In the third chapter I argue that the speech in the last four books shifts to disputing the responsibility for the outbreak of the war and the question of over what the war is being fought. I begin again with a paradigmatic example: Latinus’ speech to Turnus (12.19-45), in which his claim that he was responsible for the outbreak of the war is false in every detail.

⁷⁶ Reckford 1961.

⁷⁷ Parry 1963, 68; Nethercut 1971-2, 123 speaks of “natively tranquil peoples.”

⁷⁸ Moorton 1989, 118 and 112.

⁷⁹ Adler 2003, esp. 67-71; I discuss this below (2.4.1).

In the second section I define “recapitulation” as the telling by a character of events that have already been told by authorized narrative. I argue that attribution of responsibility is the principal subject about which speakers speak falsely when they recapitulate. The third section uncovers in Aeneas’ speech to the Latin embassy after the death of Mezentius (11.108-119) these habits of propagandistic speech. The fourth section is an analysis of the council on Olympus (10.1-117) and the rhetorical techniques employed by Venus (σχῆμα κατὰ πλάγιον) and Juno (*remotio criminis*). By her speech Juno gains not only a short-term victory at the end of the council, when Jupiter declares his own abstention from interference and implicitly allows the other gods to act, but later a long-term victory, when she obtains the erasure of the name “Troy” and “Trojan” (12.793-842).

The fifth section concerns the council of Latins (11.225-443), which, like the council on Olympus, breaks up without resolving on decisive action. This does not happen before Drances, like Juno, is able to redirect talk of negotiating peace with the Trojans to a peace that depends on marrying Lavinia to them, and which depends on the object of his hatred, Turnus, fighting a single combat with Aeneas. After a brief discussion of Diomedes’ speech excusing himself from combat with Aeneas (11.252-293), which departs in tone and detail from the events of the Trojan War reported in the extant tradition, I conclude with an assessment of the attempts of speakers in the last three books to control interpretation of events and attribution of blame.

III.3.2 Chapter 3: Place in Scholarship

In Chapter 3 I consider the passages during the war in Italy in which characters retell narrated events in a manner that does not accord with the narrative. The goal common to these characters is the shifting of responsibility for controversial actions. Critics have sometimes

strained to find any explanation for an inaccuracy in a character's speech to avoid the conclusion that it is an attempt to manipulate the speaker's addressee. The Book 12 speech of Latinus, in which he falsely makes himself the doer of a series of deeds at the outbreak of the war, has inspired a representative range of reactions:⁸⁰ it has been adduced as evidence of the lack of coordination between books in an unfinished or carelessly completed work⁸¹; it has been called a "reasonable, compassionate appeal"⁸² without any mention of its inaccuracies; it has been defended as "constitutionally correct"⁸³; it has been interpreted as a product of a guilty conscience⁸⁴ or of mental breakdown.⁸⁵ The consistency with which characters demonstrably speak falsely suggests that the simpler and more productive solution is that characters speak falsely in order to persuade, to control perceptions of their deeds, and to extract advantage from the negotiations in which they are entangled.

Especially useful for contextualizing Jupiter's self-contradiction in the council on Olympus is Hejduk's survey of Jupiter's speeches in the epic, in which she finds him not a disinterested arbiter of fate but a vividly drawn character, "magisterial and ferocious, consolatory and mocking."⁸⁶ A series of earlier studies already undermined what had been the common view

⁸⁰ Reaction to 10.83 (Juno's claim that Venus transformed Aeneas' ships into nymphs) provides a similar range of reactions: Conington 1876 *ad* 10.83: "The commentators notice that it was Cybele, not Venus, who performed the miracle: a remarkable inadvertence on Virg.'s part." Hight 1972, 183, disagreeing with Kivcala, who athetizes 4.656 on the grounds that Dido claims to have gotten vengeance on her brother when all she did was run off with his money, calls Dido's words "unconscious exaggeration on the part of a speaker emotionally moved." Because Amata's argument that Turnus can still be accepted as a husband who fits the dictates of Faunus' oracle requires her to ignore part of the oracle's terminology, Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.368 concludes that the text is "meant to imply an increasing weakness in her stability of mind."

⁸¹ See Gercke 1913.

⁸² Clausen 1992, 194.

⁸³ Heinze 1993, 144: "constitutionally correct, in so far as he did not persist in exercising his veto to the very end but allowed the war." This view is only defensible if we consider the general sense of the words Heinze quotes (*arma impia sumpsit*, 31), and not the other specific and false claims Latinus makes in adjacent lines.

⁸⁴ Balk 1968, 90: "Latinus kann nur so sprechen, wenn er von seiner Schuld überzeugt ist."

⁸⁵ See Warde Fowler 1927, 45-6.

⁸⁶ Hejduk 2009 (quotation is from 282; for the council on Olympus see 296-7).

of Jupiter as arbiter of cosmic order, Providence with a capital P, in this scene.⁸⁷ I consider Jupiter's decision as a reaction to the persuasive strategies in the speeches of Juno and Venus, and in analyzing their rhetoric I expand on brief treatments by Highet and Harrison.⁸⁸ Suerbaum sees the language of Trojan rebirth, which I consider as part of the conflict between Juno and Venus, as a temptation to Phrygian degeneracy from which Aeneas must turn.⁸⁹ Quint understands the act of forgetting Troy to be therapeutic for Aeneas and his people. Feeney, Seider, and especially Rodman speak of the erasure of Troy in the final colloquy between Jupiter and Juno as the latter's victory.⁹⁰ The close reading in Fantham's article on the Latin council, published after a period in which the long scene was ignored or dismissed, provides an important overall assessment of the dynamics and structural function of a scene I mine only for a few instances of covert rhetoric.⁹¹

III.4 Chapter 4: Manipulating the Reader's Knowledge

III.4.1 Chapter 4: Outline

In the fourth chapter I argue that the rhetorical strategies used by characters in the *Aeneid* to manipulate and persuade other characters are closely intertwined with the narrative strategies used by Vergil to misdirect the expectations of his readers. I begin with two claims made by Venus (her complaint that Aeneas has lost "ships" [1.251]; her complaint that Diomedes is

⁸⁷ E.L. Harrison 1980; Block 1981, 86-92; Lyne 1987, 88-90; for the earlier view see Klingner 1967.

⁸⁸ See Highet 1972, 65-72 on both speeches speech; Harrison 2002 *ad* 67 for Juno's speech. The idea that the exchange between the two goddesses is to be understood as part of a continuous exchange over whether and how the Trojan War will be repeated I can find touched upon briefly in works concerned with wholly different subjects: Bösing 1968 and Hanford 2014, 30-31.

⁸⁹ Suerbaum 1967.

⁹⁰ Quint 1982 and 1989; Feeney 1984, 182; Seider 2013; Rodman 2013.

⁹¹ See Fantham 1999 and her bibliography. I disagree with her assessment of Hardie 1998, which she understands to be hostile to "rhetoric."

attacking “Troy” again [10.26-28]) and show that they dispose the reader to believe something that is not revealed to be false until a later passage of authorized narrative.

In the second and third section I examine some examples of short-term misdirection, in which expectation is raised and reversed within a line or two, and long-term misdirection, in which expectations about the direction of the poem are raised and cultivated across thousands of lines, only to be frustrated in the end. The proem sets up the expectation that the Trojans will found a city at the end of their wandering (1.5); at the end, the reader abruptly understands that the only scene of founding was a line and a half of Aeneas marking out a provisional camp-*cum*-city at the site of his landfall (7.157-8). In a similar way, the mental wandering that accompanies the physical travails of the first six books seems to be externalize the Trojans’ escape from the memory of their tragic past; yet in the last six books we never see the expected orientation to the future in the Trojan mind, either in Aeneas or in his people.

The fourth section considers speeches in which the speaker cannot be thinking of deceiving his audience, but his exact choice of words nevertheless misdirects the reader to form an either incorrect expectation or an understanding of the denotation of the words that will be corrected later (e.g., Aeneas’ reference to Scylla and Charybdis [1.200-]1; the Sibyl foretells a new Achilles [6.89-90]). In the fifth section I consider scenes in which a speaker makes a claim that, although not irreconcilable with authorized narrative, appears with no preparation, and muddies the reader’s previously untroubled interpretation of an earlier passage. Prominent among these are Aeolus’ praise of Juno as the obtainer and maintainer of his authority (1.78-80), and Dido’s advertisement of an ongoing intimacy between Aeneas and her sister (4.421-3).

The sixth section catalogues instances of what I call “pluperfect storytelling,” in which a character (or occasionally the narrator) tells an important event that occurred (or is claimed to have occurred) during a sequence that was narrated without any mention of it. The revelations that Aeneas he promised to watch over Pallas (11.45-58), and that Turnus has known for two hundred lines that his sister has been driving his chariot away from Aeneas (12.632-4), make each character’s past conduct more blameworthy, and his now-current guilt sharper. In the seventh section I consider the trickier topos of prophecy suddenly “recalled” and recounted, often in a manner suited to the speaker’s goals (Anchises recounts Cassandra [3.182-188]; “Beroe” recounts Cassandra [5.632-40]; Aeneas recounts Celaeno [3.122-9]; Aeneas recounts Anchises [7.256-76]). I conclude that Vergil uses these sudden unauthorized claims by characters to open up possibilities that are never fully rejected, only proffered and left to the reader’s judgment.

III.4.2 Chapter 4: Place in Criticism

Critics have noted in a piecemeal fashion a few of the Vergilian narrative strategies I characterize broadly as “misdirection,” especially when they exploit the tension between a first and second reading.⁹² Lyne, discussing the promises Evander reveals Pallas gave him before leaving (11.152-3), says without elaboration that it is a “frequent Vergilian practice” to tell later what occurred earlier in the narrative.⁹³ Although he does not comment on it as a general narrative strategy, Putnam usefully comments that when Icarus is left unmentioned in the first

⁹² Quinn 1968, 84ff and *passim* uses the term “suspended narrative” to refer to the leaving off of one thread at a critical juncture, e.g.: the narrator tells of Arruns stalking Camilla (759b-67); then breaks off to hear of Chloereus and Camilla (767-783a); then, mid-sentence, goes back to Arruns (784bff). This technique may work hand in hand with misdirection, but it need not. For brief remarks see Fowler 1997, 264-7.

⁹³ Lyne 1987, 160.

fifteen verses about the Daedalan relief (6.14-29), “both Daedalus within this initial segment of the narrative and the narrator expounding his tale, *seem* in different senses careless — and the reader thus far unaware — that more than one person was involved in this strange itinerary.”⁹⁴ Williams uses the term “enforced retrospective judgment” for the reaction required of readers when passages prompt them to go back and reconsider earlier words. He analyzes this into words formally ironic only upon a second reading⁹⁵ and whole scenes with gaps filled by later words. He takes Jupiter’s words to Cybele about the uncertainty of Aeneas’ journey (*certusque incerta pericula lustret / Aeneas?*, 96-97) as an invitation to understand that Aeneas was not helped on his journey by the gods,⁹⁶ and Jupiter’s pledge to Venus as a sign that Aeneas throughout the poem has not been representative of Trojans but has alone been a proto-Roman, unique in his *pietas* and his pursuit of duty-bound goal.⁹⁷

Williams seems to understand the second passage always to be conclusive, and to provide resolution. When Aeneas tells Dido that he has been receiving visits from Anchises every night, the narrator is telling the reader, through a character’s speech, what was happening, entirely un-narrated, between the cave and the arrival of Mercury: Aeneas was “suppressing guilt.”⁹⁸ Difficulties in such an approach can be reconciled by the usual assumption that one passage is a relic of an older version: so when Aeneas says in one place that Celaeno gave him a dire prophecy about eating tables, and in another place that Anchises gave him a hopeful one, the

⁹⁴ Putnam 1987, 177 (emphasis mine).

⁹⁵ Williams 1983, esp. 30-33 and 40-85. He lists Aeneas’ praise of Dido (1.607-10), Latinus’ praise of his people’s lack of restraint by law (7.202-4), and the narrator’s statement that Latinus had been ruling in peace (7.45-6).

⁹⁶ *ibid.*, 131.

⁹⁷ *ibid.*, 141-3. His other example is the narrator’s undercutting of his own authority concerning the Underworld (47-58).

⁹⁸ *ibid.*, 43-6.

former is the poet's "original conception,"⁹⁹ and the latter the newer design imperfectly incorporated. I argue against this position. Analysis of speeches throughout the first three chapters demonstrates that a character's claim about what happened is very far from establishing with certainty that the thing occurred, especially when the speaker has the motive and opportunity to invent or distort.

It is important to emphasize this interpretative principle because references in the *Aeneid* to events that are claimed to have occurred earlier in the narrative have been understood through the lens of Homeric narrative and Homeric criticism. In his analysis of the narrative economy of the *Aeneid*, Heinze remarks on the methods by which bygone events (*Vergangenes*) are inserted into the narrative, listing on the one hand examples of explanatory digressions, and on the other hand ancillary and unimportant events not narrated at the time of their occurrence but introduced later.¹⁰⁰ This filling-in of past events is in the service of avoiding retelling (*Rekapitulieren*). It is essential that we understand this economy taken by the narrator through the examples in which the statements are uncontroversially true, Heinze says, because they account for the other times events are brought up by characters long after they are supposed to have occurred, and assure us that we must believe these statements, and not consider them lapses that would have been repaired by the editing process. So, for example, when Aeneas tells Dido about Anchises' nightly visits in his dreams to urge him to leave Carthage, we readers have not heard about this because there was no opportunity (*keine Gelegenheit*, 309) to tell of them before Mercury's visit. Possibly

⁹⁹ *ibid.*, 272.

¹⁰⁰ Heinze 1993, 307-9. For ancient critical conceptions of *oikonomia* ("organization"), which includes what we might call arrangement, economy, and foreshadowing, see Meijering 1987, 134-223.

influenced by the Servian commentary, he ends by comparing Vergil's habit to the Homeric technique detected by ancient critics and named by them narrative κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον.¹⁰¹

This term, developed early in the criticism of Homer and examined most recently by Nünlist, was applied to passages that require the reader to understand that an event has occurred earlier and been passed over in silence.¹⁰² Sometimes it refers to the donning of armor or weapons, e.g. Achilles switches from spear to sword on the banks of the Xanthus (*Il.*21.17-20), but a few lines later he is using his spear again (67-9); therefore, at some time between vv. 20 and 67, without an indication in the narrative, he took up his spear again.¹⁰³ Sometimes it refers to the appearance or movement of characters, e.g. when heralds appear (*Il.*7.276), we are to assume they were sent by their respective leaders;¹⁰⁴ when Patroclus, last seen on his chariot, brains an enemy with a stone (16.411), how can he have picked up the stone unless he dismounted his chariot first?¹⁰⁵ These, as well as the similar events understood to have occurred

¹⁰¹ Servius frequently applies the same term to two phenomena. The first is an unauthorized claim by a character, or a reference in a passage representing a character's thoughts, to past events that were not narrated. These events may fall before or during narrated time: *ad* 1.407; 3.82; 4.227; 6.346; 6.456; 6.696; 8.531; 8.612; 9.200; 11.45; 11.55; 11.152; at 1.234 *per silentium*. The second is a narrated occurrence that requires the reader to infer some prior occurrence in the narrative. *ad* 2.532; 2.552; 2.558; 5.61; 5.282; 6.34; 7.195; 10.238; 10.543; 10.655; 11.91; 12.236; 12.11; 12.638; 12.784; at 1.188 *per silentium*. The latter are uncomplicated instances of narrative economy, e.g. when Achates returns to interrupt Aeneas' reading of the Daedalan relief, *praemissus* (6.34) tells us that he had been sent ahead, and we accept this without pondering why we did not hear Aeneas send him ahead.

¹⁰² Nünlist 2009, 157-617 discusses the terminology methodically, and assembles comparative material from scholia of other authors and from later Homeric commentary. For the early appearance of the term see *ibid.*, 157-8. For an older but thorough and useful catalogue see Meinel 1915. See also Richardson 2006 for the similar term κατὰ συμπέρασμα.

¹⁰³ *ad* 21.17: δόρυ μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ὄχθη: ὅτι ἀποτίθεται μὲν τὸ δόρυ ῥητῶς, ἀναλαμβάνει δὲ οὐ κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν, ἀλλ' ὕστερον αὐτῷ φαίνεται χρώμενος. ἢ δὲ ἀναφορά πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον, ἀγνοοῦντα ὅτι πολλὰ δεῖ προσδέχσθαι κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον ἐνεργούμενα; *ad* 21.67 ὅτι κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον ἀνέλαβε τὸ δόρυ. For other comments on weaponry see scholia *ad* 5.279; 5.297; 13.177; 13.605; 14.509; 22.293.

¹⁰⁴ Scholion *ad* 7.276: κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον οἱ ἡγεμόνες αὐτοὺς πέμπουσιν.

¹⁰⁵ Scholion *ad* 16.411: κατῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ δίφρου κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον· πῶς γὰρ ἂν εἶλε τὸν πέτρον; For other comments on characters' movement and appearance see scholia *ad* 5.231; 16.427; the movement of the gods and the place of their colloquies seems to have attracted particular attention (*ad* 16.432; 16.666; 18.356).

unmentioned, are uncontroversial.¹⁰⁶ Almost without exception the gap between the moment at which the originally unmentioned event must have occurred and the point at which it is mentioned is short. The actions we readers are required to understand are trivial, and the gaps we are required to fill do not affect our interpretation of earlier scenes.

Both Heinze and Servius, presumably thinking on the analogy of Homeric narration κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον, seem to begin from the premise that we are to accept as true all references by the *Aeneid*'s character to un-narrated events. This attitude is sensible when we need to supply a mechanism to understand an event that has undoubtedly occurred but has been not entirely explained; for example, when Latinus greets the Dardanians by name, Servius speculates that *fama* is responsible for his prior knowledge, and connects this to the king's following explanation (*auditique advertitis aequore cursum*, 7.196).¹⁰⁷ But neither critic distinguishes between the economical late introduction of an authorized detail and a story that a character has every motive and opportunity either to fabricate or to tell so tendentiously as to distort it beyond all recognition. When Achilles uses his spear, we must conclude that he picked it up; but when Aeneas makes his father's oneiric exhortations authorize his departure, or when Dido says she knows there is an ongoing intimacy between her sister Anna and Aeneas, we need not, and should not, conclude that we are receiving unvarnished reports of uncomplicated truth.¹⁰⁸

Chapter 3 lists instances in which the reader, knowing the authorized narrative, can detect that a

¹⁰⁶ Other examples: to motivate a speech (scholia *ad* 6.114; 6.337; 9.698; 9.709; 21.290); to explain why Patroclus has with him the healing root he applies to Eurypylos (*ad* 11.846); to speculate that a gesture may have occurred during direct speech (*ad* 4.159; 8.221; 9.224; 13.125). Meinel 1915, 16-20 and Nünlist 2009, 164-7 discuss examples in which the beginning of an action is indicated and the end must be filled in by the reader.

¹⁰⁷ *ad* 7.195: "dicite Dardanidae" aut ex veste eos Troianos esse cognoscit, quae erat propria gentium singularum; aut κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον intellegimus famam, quae eos venire nuntiaverat, eandem etiam Troianos esse dixisse: unde infert 'auditique advertitis aequore cursum'. 'Dardanidae' autem, ac si diceret 'o cognati'.

¹⁰⁸ Heinze 1993, 309 uses these two passages (4.351 and 4.421) as examples of events that are to be accepted and not put down to the lack of a finishing edit (but see p.114 n.38, where he is more cautious in accepting Dido's representation of the situation at 4.421).

recapitulating character is speaking unreliably. Chapter 4 lists passages in which characters must be understood in hindsight to have been speaking falsely. Therefore, when later in Chapter 4 a pattern emerges of characters making convenient claims about the past unauthorized by the narrative, we are not obliged to understand them to be the narrator's proxies filling in gaps. On the contrary, when we consider both the frequency with which speakers make demonstrably false statements and the brazenness with which they do so, we should recognize that we cannot make conclusions about the past from a character's claim, and should further suspect that the speaker is suppressing or exaggerating for his own advantage. If there is to be any default assumption about an unauthorized claim, it should be that a character is at least choosing words so advantageous to him as to distort beyond recognition any event that might underly the claim, and at most may be speaking flat falsehood.

What I call "pluperfect storytelling" differs in important respects from "paralipsis," which Genette defines as an "omission of one of the constituent elements of a situation in a period that the narrative does generally cover."¹⁰⁹ I use my own term because in what is called paralipsis the later telling of the omitted earlier events is most often in the voice of the narrator, and, even if it is not, is conceived of by critics who use this term as reliable and authoritative. Richardson calls the technique in Homer "not a sophisticated narrative device," because it proceeds according to an easily apprehended principle: the Homeric narrator "customarily passes over actions at the time they occur if we do not need to know about them until later."¹¹⁰ Nünlist includes Homeric characters' filling in of gaps left by the narrator, and finds sophistication in the

¹⁰⁹ Genette 1980, 51-3.

¹¹⁰ Richardson 1990: 99-100. See also Meinel 1915:11-21, who seems to have renewed the term (found in the scholia in e.g. *ad II.17.247*) for modern criticism, and who distinguishes it from his catalogue of events to be understood *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον*.

poet's "distribution of material over several characters,"¹¹¹ but all of it he still conceives of as part of the narrative to be accepted by the reader. I argue that in the *Aeneid* the most important examples in which information is presented about already narrated scenes are unverifiable claims of clever speakers who are as little motivated to present disinterested accounts, uncomplicatedly true within the fictive world, as those discussed above.

III.5 Chapter 5: Conclusion

The fifth chapter suggests some broader effects on our understanding of the *Aeneid* that may follow from my readings of character speech and narrative technique in the first four chapters. My principal argument is that Vergil is a suppressive narrator who leaves permanent gaps in his narrative. I consider two constellations of related gaps: first, the passage of time in Carthage and the passage of time in Italy; then, Aeneas' treatment of the body of Mezentius, the city of Latinus, and the body of Turnus. Next I argue that variant accounts of the mythical past are active within the fictive world of the *Aeneid*. In Italy characters offer competing accounts of the Golden Age, while in Carthage competitive accounts of the Trojan War are detectable. I conclude by arguing for an analogy between characters' assumption of the role of a narrator, when they attempt to read a tradition or to form a tradition from conflicting variants, and the Vergilian narrator's assumption of the limited perspective of a character. This Vergil accomplishes not only implicitly, by leaving so much in the mouths of characters alone, but by the development of his own narrator's claims of authority, which devolve from the confidence of the opening *cano* to an unanswered plea to the heavens for answers (12.500-504).

¹¹¹ Nünlist 2009, 172; his chapter on "gaps and omissions" (157-73) offers other helpful comparanda for Vergilian technique.

CHAPTER 1: Tracking and Using Knowledge in the *Aeneid*

Introduction

In the *Aeneid* Aeneas and his people meet the inhabitants of a new land, by my count, nine times. Each time the inhabitants recognize the Trojans at first sight, know who they are, and know much of what has happened to them.¹¹² Every encounter and speech exchange, and therefore every decision made during or influenced by these exchanges, is guided by the resident peoples' knowledge of the Trojans prior to their arrival. The Trojans' perception that their interlocutors already know of them determines the limits, methods, and goals of their efforts at self-presentation. The question of how this knowledge of the Trojans spread is intertwined with the question of how the Trojans acquire knowledge about the peoples they encounter and the places they find themselves. Because the Vergilian narrator rarely intervenes to say what speakers know, think, or intend, characters' knowledge and the goals they pursue through speech are detectable only through their own words. To understand the dynamics of the encounters between Trojans and other peoples the reader must be able to understand what each character does and does not know and what each is claiming to know or not know. In this chapter I will examine how the reader perceives what characters in the *Aeneid* know, how the characters come to know, and how characters use what they know.

¹¹² Chronologically: Thrace (Polydorus); Delos (Anius); Crete is empty; Strophades (Celaeno); Buthrotum (Andromache and Helenus); land of the Cyclopes (Achaemenides); Sicily (Acestes); Carthage (Dido); Cumae (Sibyl); Latium (Latinus [for other Italians see below 1.4.4]); Pallanteum (Evander). At Actium the Trojans arrive at a small city (3.276), but Aeneas tells nothing of the natives. The narrative of the encounter with Etruscans (10.148-154) tells nothing about what they know.

1.1 An Asymmetry of Knowledge: Ilioneus and Dido

1.1.1 Ilioneus and Dido: Thrust and Parry

*si datur Italiam sociis et rege recepto,
tendere, ut Italiam laeti Latiumque petamus;
sin absumpta salus, et te, pater optime Teucrum,
pontus habet Libyae nec spes iam restat Iuli,
at freta Sicaniae saltem sedesque paratas,
unde huc advecti, **regemque petamus Acesten.*** (Ilioneus to Dido; 1.553-558)

...
*seu vos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva
sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten,
auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo...* (Dido to Ilioneus; 1.569-571)

Cloud-wrapped Aeneas witnesses in Carthage the poem's first encounter between Trojan and stranger. Ilioneus, leader and legate of the Trojans separated from Aeneas by the Juno-inspired storm, asks the Carthaginian queen first for relief from her hostile subjects, then for the time to search for lost companions, to repair, and to leave. Dido promises help. The names and epithets of persons and places she uses — Hesperia, Saturnian fields, Eryx, Acestes — are not only euphonious line-fillers meant to be savored by Vergil's reader; they are the means by which the queen responds to the ambassador's insinuations. When he first arrives, Ilioneus begins his opening speech by adopting the tone of one instructing an isolated and ignorant audience. He informs the Carthaginians that nearby is the island of Sicily and its inhabitants of Trojan descent (*sunt et Siculis regionibus urbes / armaque, Troianoque a sanguine clarus Acestes*, 1.549-550). In his closing he returns to Acestes and names him the ruler to which the Trojans will return if Aeneas is dead (558, *regemque petamus Acesten*). In her response Dido repeats Ilioneus' words in the same metrical *sedes*, changing only the intervening verb, and thereby seems to signal her agreement to his plea (570 *regemque optatis Acestes*). The rare absence of variation in a name

and epithet calls for an explanation. At first it seems a plausible hypothesis that Dido repeats so closely because she does know enough to vary what Ilioneus has just said (“go back to this ‘Acestes’ of whom you speak!”). At no other time in the *Aeneid*, however, does a responding speaker repeat the initial speaker’s words without variation to indicate that she has learned from the initial speaker and knows no more than what he originally said. Dido repeats not because of her ignorance, but because she knows precisely of what she speaks, and wishes to signal to her interlocutor that she knows.

This opening exchange begins with conflict. Ilioneus claims that the storm-ravaged Trojans have been denied the shore and threatened with assault and fire (1.525-6). He uses his best expository manner to pose as an instructor of the Carthaginians, isolated and barbarous, either ignorant or contemptuous of common human rules to such a degree that they stand outside the human race and despise its mores:

*quod genus hoc hominum? quaeve hunc tam barbara morem
permittit patria? hospitio prohibemur harenae;
bella cient primaque vetant consistere terra.
si genus humanum et mortalia temnitis arma,
at sperate deos memores fandi atque nefandi.* (1.539-43)

In professing not to know what *genus* he confronts or what *patria* could be so *barbara* as to produce such savagery, the Trojan also belittles the Punic as unworthy of the fame his own people possess.¹¹³ Although Dido does plead necessity as an excuse for her people’s hostility (563-4), she responds to the imputation of ignorance of the stories told by civilized men more than to the charge of barbaric behavior. To structure her response and to mark the points to which

¹¹³ Earlier Ilioneus mentioned *Libycos...Penatis*, but the adjective — like at 1.527 and unlike at 1.339 — is geographical and not ethnic. There is no sign that he knows who the Carthaginians are; unlike Aeneas, he has not received a précis of their history.

she is responding, Dido echoes Ilioneus' words in sound and structure. To the Trojan's indignant *quod genus hoc hominum? quaeve hunc tam barbara morem* (4.540) the queen replies *quis genus Aeneadum, quis Troiae nesciat urbem?* (1.565) Proof that she and her people know about the Trojan War serves as proof that she and they are civilized members of the Mediterranean community, conversant in the culture and history of their neighbors to the east. To prove that the Trojans had not approached with hostile intent, Ilioneus has just previously named their true goal (Italy) and given, in a similarly didactic style, its name, characteristics, inhabitants, and some of its history (1.530-33). He has not mentioned Troy or the Trojan War, only that the Trojans are wretched seafarers unable to determine to where they travel (*Troes...miseri, ventis maria omnia vecti...524*). Now Dido reassures Ilioneus that she knows exactly who the Trojans are, and has heard in detail about the fall of their city (565-6).¹¹⁴ She shows the Trojan that she knows more than he had said about his people.

After showing that she knows more about Ilioneus' people than he thought, Dido shows that she knows more than he about the geography and political landscape of her sphere of the Mediterranean: *seu vos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva / sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten* (569-70). Ilioneus has lingered over the name of his destination, beginning with Hesperia (*est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt*, 530) and explaining that the land was later named Italy (533), and returning to the subject using the names "Italy" and "Latium" (554). He uses the common and neutral name for where the Trojans are heading, and although he pretends to some knowledge of the history of its naming, he does not seem to — and, as later

¹¹⁴ Aeneas has just responded to the scenes on the temple of Juno with some surprise that the Trojan story is known everywhere, even a place so remote and so unknown to him (*'quis iam locus, 'inquit 'Achate, / quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* 1.459-60). By the time the Trojans reach Italy, Ilioneus can claim to Latinus that everyone knows much about the Trojan War (7.222-7).

narration will show, does not — know much more about it. Dido never uses the word “Italy,” the name on which Ilioneus laid such emphasis. In her theme and variation she calls the land “Hesperia” and its fields “Saturnian.”¹¹⁵ By defining *arva* with the epithet *Saturnia*, she signals to the Trojans that she knows more about this land than the difference between the Greek and the indigenous name for it; that she knows enough of its history to know that by tradition it belongs to Saturn. She applies the same method to Ilioneus’ reference to a Sicilian king. He says that there was an Acestes of Trojan blood; she quotes his words, but adds the name “Eryx” to signal that she knew before Ilioneus’ instruction who this Acestes is and where he reigns.¹¹⁶

1.1.2 Covert Rhetoric

It matters a great deal to Dido that she knows the past of a far-off people,¹¹⁷ and it is plausible that, to an exile and city-founder, such knowledge and the ability to display it are psychologically comforting. Prestige may follow from such superiority in knowledge, but practical benefits accrue as well. Prior knowledge is immediately helpful for outarguing or

¹¹⁵ Conington objects (*ad* 1.554) to Ilioneus’ use of “Latium”: “See v. 3. Ilioneus has not previously mentioned Latium, while he has spoken of Italy vv. 530 foll. as an unknown country; but Virg.’s love of variety leads him to neglect these minutiae. So Dido talks of ‘Saturnia arva’ below v. 569.” By “these minutiae” Conington must mean either that Ilioneus should not know about Latium, or that in introducing it as a toponym he should think that he has to explain it to Dido. Aeneas has mentioned it (*tendimus in Latium*, 1.205), so we can be sure that it is known to his men as the goal of all their efforts. Here, by pairing *Latium* with *Italiam* in a typical theme and variation (*si datur Italiam sociis et rege recepto / tendere, ut Italiam laeti Latiumque petamus*, 553-4), Ilioneus makes clear to his addressee that he is referring to the same place with both names.

¹¹⁶ Only with the insight that Dido is anxious to disprove Ilioneus’ accusation of ignorance and to display how much more she knows than her visitors can we make sense of the structure of her speech. The opening lines of her response contain a harsh and puzzling transition: *solvite corde metum, Teuceri, secludite curas. / res dura et regni novitas me talia cogunt / moliri et late finis custode tueri. / quis genus Aeneadum, quis Troiae nesciat urbem, / virtutesque virosque aut tanti incendia belli? / non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora Poeni, / nec tam aversus equos Tyria Sol iungit ab urbe. / seu vos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva / sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten, / auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo.* (1.562-71) The first three lines are devoted to reassuring the Trojans that they will no longer be attacked and to excusing the Carthaginian coastal guards. The next seven lines end with Dido’s commitment to help (571), but it is not obvious how the first six of these seven (565-70) lead into the culminating promise; they do not give reasons why the Trojans deserve help, or arguments that they are natural allies of the Carthaginians. The solution to the puzzling transition is that in vv. 565-70 Dido is not telling why she does what she does, but is displaying what she knows, and suggesting that she knows more than she says.

¹¹⁷ The source and extent of Dido’s prior knowledge of the Trojans is discussed below (5.3).

outwitting an interlocutor. The ability to show strangers that you know their identity and history is a means of handling and controlling them. Here, for the first time and not the last, one character's knowledge about another, acquired before their initial meeting, gives the knowing character an advantage in self-presentation, persuasion, and negotiation.

Dido and Ilioneus, seeming to compete for the title of greater cartographer or ethnographer of the Western Mediterranean, are engaging less in epideictic than in diplomacy. Ilioneus obliquely introduces military considerations twice earlier in the speech, first in describing his men (*mortalia temnitis arma*, 542), then in characterizing Aeneas himself (*bello maior*, 545).¹¹⁸ The discussion of Sicily caps his representation of the Trojans as a formidable people by the assertion that they have permanent allies spread across the Mediterranean.¹¹⁹ This the envoy supports by telling of Acestes, an ally bound to the Trojans by blood, equipped with urban strongholds and military resources on an island only a short sail away: *sunt et Siculis regionibus urbes / armaque, Troianoque a sanguine clarus Acestes* (1.549-50). Not only ancient commentary has detected a hint of what might loosely be called a "threat,"¹²⁰ and would more precisely be described as a reminder that continuing to attack the Trojans might bring consequences. By adopting a didactic pose Ilioneus is able to make this hint without rising to an explicit threat. Dido's answer works on the same covert level. She is willing to excuse her

¹¹⁸ Aeneas' location and resources are unknown to both speakers, so the argument need not be a bluff. Even without his king Ilioneus can call on twelve ships' worth of forces. It is easy to suppose from the first few lines of recognition (510-514) that the men Aeneas sees have come as suppliants *en masse*, but we soon learn that Ilioneus and his companions are only picked representatives (*cunctis nam lecti navibus ibant*, 518).

¹¹⁹ Aeneas returns to this point in his own opening speech to Dido, describing his Dardanian *gens* as *magnum... sparsa per orbem* (1.602).

¹²⁰ See Servius *ad* 1.549 (*arma latenter minatur*) and Donatus *ad* 1.549ff (*intelligitur etiam illud adserere, posse et nocere, si res exegerit...proponit spem et inicit metum*). Gibson 1999, 188 notes in passing that an "implied threat" is an important (if, to his understanding, secondary) element in Ilioneus' rhetorical strategy. Monti 1981, 10 dismisses the phrasing as "surely" not a threat and emphasizes the cultural and moral values in the appeal; but an appeal to mores and an appeal to practical concerns may both be found in a skillful speaker's discourse.

people's belligerence, but she must not allow Ilioneus' framing of her people as ignorant and marginal to stand, and she must not arrive her culminating counter-proposal of permanent alliance (572-4) in a position of weakness. Her signal that she knows perfectly well about the Trojans' allies and their destination is a signal that she has already taken into account the Trojans' allies and connections, and that she has made her decision independent of external pressures.

1.1.3 Using Knowledge on Both Levels of Speech

The speeches of the diplomatic exchange between Ilioneus and Dido work on two rhetorical levels, and the speakers incorporate the names "Acestes" and "Eryx" into both. On the first and open level Ilioneus refers to Acestes' land as a plausible destination to which the Trojans, once allowed to repair their ships, will quickly head, while Dido mentions Acestes in order to mark her assent to Ilioneus' appeal. On the second and covert level, Ilioneus smuggles in Acestes' proximity and power as a deterrent against further attack, while Dido demonstrates that she has already considered this by giving a detail, "Eryx," that Ilioneus never did. Acestes stakes out a claim that he knows enough to instruct Dido in the possible consequences of her actions, and Dido counters by revealing her mastery of the relevant political factors. Both sides use information they have acquired as the material from which to construct an argument, but also as the means by which they contend for the distinction of knowing more and better than the other. For this sort of exchange on two levels to take effect, characters in a first encounter must know a great deal about each other before they first meet in person and exchange words. In the *Aeneid* the characters who inhabit the lands at which the Trojans arrive know more about the arrivals than the Trojans know about the people and places to which they have arrived. At the end of this thesis I will return to Dido's knowledge of the Trojan past, which includes far more than their

relation to settlers in Sicily; but even her knowledge of this relatively minor issue plays a critical role in her method of dealing with the intriguing but threatening strangers.

In Chapters 2 and 3 I will apply the sort of analysis I have attempted here, considering characters' use of prior knowledge, to the encounters between Trojans and the residents of Italy in the second half of the poem (Books 7-12). Before we can understand how prior knowledge and balance of knowledge inform any given speech exchanges, however, we must understand how it is that Vergil allows us to understand who knows what, and how he encourages us to read his characters as they covertly employ this knowledge.

1.2 Reading the Balance of Knowledge: A Messenger Scene

In exchanges like that between Ilioneus and Dido, the reader must understand the asymmetry in the balance of knowledge — in other words, the fact that one speaker knows more than the other — from the words of the speeches alone. In the *Aeneid* the narrator as a rule does not intervene to tell what a character knows, how he has learned it, what he is thinking, or what he desires his interlocutor to think.¹²¹ I begin by attempting to puzzle out from speech alone what each speaker knows, what he understands of what his addressee knows, and how he attempts to exploit the imbalance between his knowledge and that of his addressee.

¹²¹ Three times the narrator intervenes to tell that a character is thinking something undetectable in his speech. (1) Aeneas hides the pain he feels at what he thinks is the loss of comrades (note 1.220-222) in order to encourage his men (*talia voce refert curisque ingentibus aeger / spem voltu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem* [1.208-9]). (2) Neptune knows who is behind the disturbance on the sea, although his knowledge is not obvious from his speech to the winds (*nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae* [1.130]). (3) Venus can tell that Juno is speaking deceptively (*sensit enim simulata mente locutam, / quo regnum Italiae Libycas averteret oras* [4.105-6] and *adnuat atque dolis risit Cytherea repertis* [4.128]).

1.2.1 Balance of Knowledge: Messenger Scene

The gap between the knowledge of one interlocutor and another opens widest in exchanges between gods and men. When Jupiter hears the angry prayer of Iarbas, a local royal suitor rejected by Dido, and turns his attention to Libya, he sends his messenger Mercury to exhort Aeneas to leave for Italy. We hear the message twice: first, when Jupiter tells Mercury what to say (227-37); then, when Mercury relays the message to Aeneas (265-76):

*uade age, nate, uoca Zephyros et labere pennis
Dardaniumque ducem, Tyria Karthagine qui nunc
exspectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes,
adloquere et celeris defer mea dicta per auras.
non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem
promisit Graiumque ideo bis uindicat armis;
sed fore qui grauidam imperiis belloque frementem
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 inuidet arces?
quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur
nec prolem Ausoniam et Lauinia respicit arua?
nauiget! haec summa est, hic nostri nuntius esto.*

(Jupiter to Mercury, 4.223-37)

This is the only time in the *Aeneid* that we hear an original instruction to a messenger and then the message as it is relayed by the messenger. The significant changes in the messenger's partial quotation of the original speech are due to the different levels of knowledge, and therefore different degrees of understanding, between two and perhaps three of the parties involved: Jupiter as commander, Mercury as messenger, Aeneas as addressee.

Austin, summarizing Mercury's speech, asks us to "[n]ote the skillful echoes of Jupiter's own words (in a different order of lines), and the changes to adapt them to direct address."¹²² But the changes are more substantive than a switch from third- to second-person, a rearrangement,

¹²² Austin 1955 *ad* 4.70ff.

and a substitution of synonyms.¹²³ Jupiter's original accuses Aeneas on three counts: Aeneas is not the sort of ruler of Italy and the world that Venus promised (4.227-31); even if glory does not move him, why is he depriving Ascanius of his due? (232-34); what is he thinking of, delaying among an enemy people? (235-7). The last argument only makes sense to someone who knows that the Trojans and Carthaginians will be enemies; that the Carthaginians will be a *gens inimica* (225) in wars that are, from the point of view of the events of the poem, far in the future.¹²⁴ The antithesis of *Dardaniumque ducem, Tyria Karthagine* (4.224),¹²⁵ the absurdity of a Dardanian commander dallying in Tyrian Carthage, may be obvious to Jupiter and to the reader, but it would be lost on Aeneas.

When Mercury delivers the message, his three questions are not Jupiter's. He says instead: why are you building the foundations of Carthage, forgetful of your own affairs? (265-7); what are you expecting to come of wasting time in Libya (271)?; even if glory does not move you, think of Ascanius and what is owed him (272-6). At first glance this may appear to be only changing the order of thoughts; the messenger god quotes more or less precisely (232-3 vs. 272-3). But here, as in the exchange between Dido and Ilioneus, a character introduces a significant change by partial quotation:

quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur
(Jupiter, 4.235)

quid struis? aut qua spe Libycis teris otia terris?
(Mercury, 4.271)

¹²³ In making the messenger-speech so different from the original message Vergil differs from Homeric practice, in which exact repetition is the norm (see de Jong 1987, 180-185 and Appendix V A. She notes that even in Homer changes are more frequent and interesting than usually recognized [185]. In the Homeric model of the *Aeneid* 4 scene, Hermes's relay of Zeus' orders to Calypso, there is verbatim repetition [*Od.5.41-2=114-5*] but also omission and rephrasing to soften the speech unpleasant import.)

¹²⁴ More precisely, the two peoples will become enemies in accordance with the curse Dido hurls at Aeneas when he undertakes the very action that Jupiter's message here commands.

¹²⁵ The antithesis is noted by Austin 1955 *ad* 4.224.

Jupiter cares only that the people about whom he speaks are, or will be, enemies to Aeneas, and he does not name them.¹²⁶ Mercury's calling the land "Libyan" preserves for the reader the irony of an ancestor of Rome dallying with an ancestor of Carthaginians, but it has the added advantage that, unlike the original, it is comprehensible to Aeneas.¹²⁷ Libya belongs to the large class of places that are not Italy, and that are therefore places he is not supposed to spend his time. To him Mercury's naming of Libya means nothing more than that he is not in Italy, and it cannot be heard by him as portentous in any specific way.¹²⁸ On the basis of this passage alone we might conclude that Mercury is ignorant of what Jupiter knows, and omits reference to the Punic Wars because it makes no sense to him;¹²⁹ or we might conclude that Mercury is conscious of mortal ignorance, and is adeptly editing immortal discourse for their consumption. In either case he removes the crushing irony that is beyond Aeneas' comprehension and bases the rebuke on more universal ideals: the shame of dereliction of duty; the embarrassment of subjugation to a woman;¹³⁰ a father's duty to his heir.¹³¹ The terminology with which he rebukes Aeneas and the

¹²⁶ Austin 1955 *ad loc* interprets the hiatus in *spe inimica* as a sign of Jupiter's hesitation in choosing the right words.

¹²⁷ See Ahl 2001 *ad* 4.271: "Mercury substitutes a wordplay on *terra*, 'land,' and *teris*, 'wear down,' for Jupiter's words about Carthage as an enemy, which would make no sense to Aeneas."

¹²⁸ Mercury's change was noted first by Servius *ad* 271; see also e.g. Muecke 1983, 153; Rudd 1976, 37, n.9; Williams 1996 *ad* 4.271. That Carthaginians will be hostile to Romans may be incomprehensible to Aeneas, but calling the Carthaginians he sees "unfriendly" perhaps need not have been. Muse 2005, 648-9 n.15 remembers that Carthaginian coastal guards have been unfriendly to the men separated from Aeneas in Book 1. He wrongly claims that Aeneas would have no way of knowing this; but Aeneas has heard Ilioneus' speech to Dido, with its complaints about this mistreatment.

¹²⁹ Highet 1972, 123-4: "Mercury knows less, and substitutes a phrase containing a contemptuous little echo... Mercury makes Aeneas' dereliction of duty toward his own son more urgent as a command."

¹³⁰ Mercury shifts the locus of rebuke to Aeneas' submission to a woman and indulgence in unmanly luxury (*uxorius; pulchra; otia...teris*): he is his wife's property, building her not just a city but a pretty city. At 1.191 and 4.60 Dido is *pulcherrima* (at 4.192 *pulchra* in the indirect statement of *fama*'s report; presumably the adjective reflects what is said by rumor). Just before the fateful hunt in Carthage Aeneas is *pulcherrimus* (1.141; the adjective seems to reflect Dido's perceptions). Lyne 1989, 43-48 discusses "prosaic" *uxor* and its derivatives and proposes that Mercury frames Aeneas as an elegiac lover; even worse than the lover of a courtesan, as a proper elegist would be, he is a lover of a woman he has allowed to believe is his wife.

¹³¹ See Eidinow 2003.

implicit standards underlying his appeal are as much human and social as they are based on the specific divine instruction Aeneas has received.

Mercury's omission, and the reordering of argument elsewhere in the speech, suggest that he is probably not unaware of the gap between gods' knowledge and men's.¹³² Jupiter spends the first half of his message recounting the promise Venus made him, in order to draw a contrast between the sort of man she promised Aeneas would be and what he is now proving himself to be:

*non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem
promisit Graiumque ideo bis uindicat armis;
sed fore qui grauidam imperiis belloque frementem
Italiam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucri
proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem.* (4.227-31)

Jupiter tells two things about the past: Venus promised Jupiter that Aeneas would be a certain type of man (*nobis...promisit*), and Venus saved Aeneas from the Greeks twice (*Graium...armis*). Neither reference is entirely understandable to us, and neither could be understood by Aeneas. It seems reasonably clear that by *bis* Jupiter means to refer to the occasion on which Venus saved Aeneas from Diomedes before Troy, after he had been crushed by the latter's stone-throw (*Il.* 5.297ff), and the occasion on which she parted the flames and warded off darts from her son's back as he left Troy.¹³³ It is hard to see how Aeneas would immediately think of these, however. We assign the divine intercession in the departure from Troy that he mentions in his narrative

¹³² Jupiter is not the only god who knows something of this future. Juno had heard (*audierat*) that the fates had decreed that the destroyers of Carthage would come from Trojan stock (1.19-22).

¹³³ The other possibilities Servius *ad loc* discusses are worthy of attention: *alii dicunt propter Diomedis et Achillis certamina singularia. sed quando cum Achille dimicavit, a Neptuno liberatus est: potest tamen hoc pro Venere factum videri: sic enim Iuno imputat Veneri quod pro ea factum est dicens "et potes in totidem classes convertere nymphas". potest etiam et alter sensus esse: nam Troia antea ab Hercule, qui et ipse Graecus fuit, capta est: ut intellegamus iam tunc Aeneam natum fuisse: nec enim multum tempus interfuit, cum constet Priamo tunc ab Hercule imperium traditum.*

(2.630-633) to Venus because we have heard her promise help (2.620), but with his *ducente deo* he, who we know is frustrated by her lack of open dealing (see 407-9), seems reluctant to give her credit for aiding him. In the *Iliad* he is unconscious (*Il.5.310*) when his mother picks him up and, after she is stabbed by Diomedes, Apollo has to take her place and spirit him to safety (344-346).

The promise of Venus to which Jupiter refers is difficult to place, even for the learned reader. We have heard of such a promise neither from the *Aeneid* nor from any other source or tradition.¹³⁴ The terms in which Jupiter goes on to describe Aeneas' prospective greatness recall instead his own earlier promise, or explication of what the fates had decreed, to Venus (1.263-266). If this reference is murky to the learned reader, it is opaque to a mortal not privy to exchanges between divinities on Olympus. Mercury acts as an editor and removes all trace of Venus' promise and of her interventions. Aeneas does not need mysterious references to divine dealings, or grandiose predictions of the future; a simple mention of kingdom, land, Italy, and son is sufficient to remind Aeneas of the obligations he has forgotten.

The attempt to puzzle out what Mercury knows is incomplete if we do not understand that he acquires new knowledge, after he receives his instructions from Jupiter, at the moment he alights in Carthage. Jupiter, while making so much of the identity of the people with which Aeneas is spending time, makes no mention of the physical structure of Carthage; the *urbes* and *arces* of which he spoke were the future Italian cities Aeneas was neglecting. As soon as Mercury lands he finds Aeneas building Troy (*Aenean fundantem* [cf. Mercury's *fundamenta*, 266] *arces*

¹³⁴ This sort of abrupt reference to a detail in the past that we have not heard of Servius explains *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον intellegimus*; for more see above (Introduction) and below (Chapter 4). For the “not thus” trope Pease 1935 *ad loc* cites Cat. 64.139-140 and Ovid *Met.*3.652.

ac tecta nouantem), clad with a luxurious sword and cloak given him by Dido. What Mercury sees is the fodder for the change of accusations to luxuriousness and uxoriousness.¹³⁵ They also allow the change in signification of Jupiter's *quid struit?*, which at the time the reader can only understand to mean "what is he planning?," to Mercury's *quid struis?*, which can now mean "what are you building?" The last we readers heard of the construction of Carthage, it had halted because of Dido's infatuation (4.86-89). Since then we have heard nothing from the narrator, only the report of *fama* that the lovers are spending all their time and attention on each other and none on their kingdoms (193-194).¹³⁶ The god Mercury and we the reader see at the same time that Aeneas is not only dallying with Carthaginians; he is building Carthage (*Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta novantem / conspicit*, 260-1). The process by which a character acquires new information — Mercury learns that Aeneas is building Carthage, and that he is indulging Eastern luxury — is the process by which we readers learn the same.¹³⁷ The gap between human and divine knowledge allows Vergil to create an interesting exchange that requires the reader's engagement and speculation, and to surprise the reader by reversing the expectation — that Carthage is not being built at all — that he has carefully prepared.

1.3 How Accounts are Spread: Vergil's Tripartite Solution

In order for exchanges in which the balance of knowledge plays such such a central role to make sense, characters must have a plausible way of acquiring some knowledge of each other, and the reader must have some idea of how the character acquired this knowledge. This task

¹³⁵ That Mercury bursts into speech in the middle of a line and takes as his first topic the construction of Carthage (*continuo inuadit*, "tu nunc Karthaginis altae... 265) perhaps suggests he is extemporizing based on what he sees.

¹³⁶ We know that Jupiter twisted his gaze toward Carthage and the lovers therein (*oculosque ad moenia torsit / regia et oblitos famae melioris amantis* [4.220-221]), but we cannot tell whether he saw Aeneas at work. What is essential is that the first-time reader does not know what Aeneas is doing when he reads Jupiter's speech.

¹³⁷ We were not told of Aeneas' activities at the point at which we might have expected to be told of them: when Jupiter looks at Carthage.

Vergil accomplishes in three ways: (a) the narrator tells of the propagation of news, so that when a character begins to speak we already know what this speaker knows; (b) a character explains how he acquired the knowledge of the specific detail, a name or event *vel sim*, that he mentions; (c) a character refers to something without an explanation of how he acquired knowledge of it.

A character's unexplained reference makes better sense if we have some idea of how the knowledge underlying the reference might have been acquired. From the instances in which Vergil explicitly tells the means by which speakers acquire their knowledge, the reader is able to understand the mechanisms by which information is disseminated in the fictive world of the *Aeneid*. Both the narrator's and the characters' citation of sources tells us what are the frequent sources of knowledge and what sources characters consider reliable. The three most important are divine speech, *fama*, and direct inquiry.

1.3.1 Divine Speech

Here I am concerned not with the authority of prophecy of the future, which has been shown to be far from absolute,¹³⁸ but with the role of divine utterance in spreading knowledge of event previous to or concurrent with the moment of utterance. When divine speech does fulfill this function it more often informs a character's speech than it motivates his action. Venus means to encourage Aeneas when she announces that his fleet has been saved (1.407-409), but Aeneas reacts in near-despair to what he feels as separation from his mother (407-409); it is her pointing him down the road to Carthage rather than her encouraging claims about his lost men that has an immediate effect on this actions. Allecto thinks that she will inflame Turnus by telling him about the theft his bride by foreigners, but he reassures her that he knew about this before she spoke

¹³⁸ See O'Hara 1990.

(7.421-444). Later he cannot have had any premonition of Iris' exhortation to attack, based on Aeneas' acquisition of the Pallanteans and Etruscans as allies (9.6-13), but a man so *audax* (9.3) will have had little reason to delay the assault. Knowing that these two peoples are allies does, however, allow Turnus to spit taunts that mention the Etruscans (*addant se protinus omnes / Etrusci socios*, 9.149-150) and revile the Arcadians for their extension of hospitality to the Trojans (10.491-495). Aeneas does need to hear from Tiberinus where he must go, but he also needs to know the Pallanteans' bloodline and history to build the argument for alliance he will use of Evander. Cymodocea's warning to Aeneas that the ships he left behind have been lost and that his cavalry are in position is of some help (10.228-245), but it is the miraculous push of her fellow novice nymphs, not anything that Aeneas can do, that impels the fleet with enough swiftness that it can relieve the camp at dawn.

1.3.2 Fama

The primary means of disseminating information about events during or just before the timeframe of the narrative is the report of *fama*. *Fama* sometimes can be translated as "fame," and carry with it no specific information but the quality of being well-known.¹³⁹ At other times it means "reputation," which depends on "fame" and is vulnerable to "rumor."¹⁴⁰ In either of these two cases it is found in the mouths of characters who worry about being known to many now, or are concerned with how they will be known in the future. In these closely related senses *fama* is a sort of possession of a person (whether neutral "fame," or a "reputation" either positive or negative), but it has its origins in talk — "rumor" — and can always be changed by talk. In its

¹³⁹ 1.379; 1.457; 2.21; 2.82; 5.302; 7.2; 7.79; 7.564; 7.745; 8.731; 9.79; 9.195; 10.679; 12.235.

¹⁴⁰ 1.287; 4.91; 4.170; 4.221; 4.323; 5.392; 6.527; 6.889; 7.232; 7.333; 8.133; 8.731; 10.468; 10.679; 11.124; 11.224; 11.368; 11.847.

third sense the word is the “tradition”¹⁴¹ of *ut fama est* that carries down a version of a long-past event through the generations. This and related formulae may be an acknowledgment that the narrator is dealing with a varied or confused tradition¹⁴² or, paradoxically, a signal that the poet is about to tell a tale of his own invention.¹⁴³

It is with the final sense of *fama* that we are now concerned: an agent disseminating knowledge of a specific, recent event; that is, the “report” that spreads news. Occasionally *rumor* or *nuntius* appears instead of *fama* but indicates the same oral relay of news.¹⁴⁴ An examination of what information it disseminates shows that *fama* is a reliable source of news that is true within the world of the *Aeneid*, and that this reliability is indispensable to narrative economy and to the construction a plot with motivated characters. Characters rely on what they hear from *fama* even more than on what they are told in directly reported conversations by other characters, whether human or divine. They are right to do so.

1.3.2.1 Fama as Report: Reliable

Fama as report grants characters knowledge that motivates action. The events concerning which *fama* spreads its reports may have been previously narrated in full, or they may be known to the reader only through the passage describing the substance of *fama*'s report. The much-examined characterization of *fama* in Book 4 has directed attention away from the other times we see it at work, and the report carried by *fama* immediately after its first appearance is exceptional in its ambiguity. Before examining this unique case I will track every other example

¹⁴¹ 1.379; 1.457; 2.21; 2.82; 3.551; 3.578; 3.694; 4.218; 5.302; 6.14; 7.564; 7.646; 7.745; 7.765; 8.600; 9.79; 10.641; 12.735.

¹⁴² See Norden 1970 *ad* 6.14.

¹⁴³ See Horsfall 1991, 117-133 for a catalogue; see Townshend 2015 for a study of two times such a formula marks Vergil's deviation from the tradition (*Aen.*2.81-93 and *Ecl.*6.74-7).

¹⁴⁴ *rumor*: 4.203; 7.144; occasionally (7.549; 9.464 12.228) it seems to refer to looser talk or speculation. *nuntius*: 6.456; 7.167; 7.437; 8.582; 9.692; 11.447; 11.897.

of *fama* in action. The second time we see *fama* at work, the first time we see it without the weight of a lengthy evaluation by the narrator, is paradigmatic. When Aeneas is ordered to leave Carthage, his orders are narrated:

*Mnesthea Sergestumque vocat fortemque Serestum,
classem aptent taciti sociosque ad litora cogant,
arma parent et quae rebus sit causa novandis
dissimulent; sese interea, quando optima Dido
nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores,
temptaturum aditus et quae mollissima fandi
tempora, quis rebus dexter modus....* (4.288-94)

Fama accurately reports to Dido the arming of the fleet and preparations for departure that follow these orders:

*at regina dolos (quis fallere possit amantem?)
praesensit, motusque excepit prima futuros
omnia tuta timens. eadem impia Fama furenti
detulit armari classem cursumque parari.* (4.296-9)

When Dido confronts Aeneas, her words, based on what she has learned from the rumor, correspond to Aeneas' instructions to keep his intentions and preparations secret:

*dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum
posse nefas tacitusque mea decedere terra?* (4.305-6)

Dido has heard from *fama* nothing but an accurate report. *Fama* cannot be blamed for lying or even taking an active part in twisting the truth. A reader sanguine about Aeneas' sincerity might complain that the report was incomplete, because Dido did not hear Aeneas saying that he intended to tell her at the proper or easier time (291-294);¹⁴⁵ but rumor can hardly be blamed for missing his secret self-exculpations.¹⁴⁶ The adjective here characterizing *fama* must be

¹⁴⁵ For this point see further below (n.626).

¹⁴⁶ Austin 1955 notes *ad loc* that "Virgil is careful not to make it plain whether her knowledge came from *Fama* alone"; that is, it is not clear whether Dido derives her words about the secrecy with which the Trojans proceed from the rumor, or from her ability to put two and two together, or from a suspicion that proves justified.

considered with care: *fama* could be *impia* because it is “lacking all respect for ordinary human relationships”;¹⁴⁷ it could be so because it is detrimental to the interests of Aeneas who is called, and who presents himself as, *pius*; it could be that the epithet is transferred and *fama* is reporting actions — an abandonment that at a minimum seem stealthy or secret— that are *impia*.¹⁴⁸ No matter how wicked is the *fama*, and no matter in what exact sense it is wicked, its accuracy is not impeached.

With the exception of the two examples addressed below (1.3.2.3), *fama*’s report of what has just been narrated to the reader is always truthful: from the news of the death of Dido (4.666ff), to the spread of Faunus’ prophecy (7.104ff), to the imminent departure of Pallas from Pallanteum (8.554), to the return of Pallas’ corpse (11.139ff). These are all examples of “news” of a recent event that been the object of an authorized narrative rather than a tale of the remote past whose fulness or veracity can be doubted. Making *fama* the agent that makes news known allows each characters’ reaction to be understood in the social context of people who have all heard the same report. The recipient of these reports, with the exception of Dido in the example above, is a people or city as a whole.¹⁴⁹ The arrival of news is followed by a mass reaction or an individual reaction in sympathy with, and representative of, the population. The public quality of the rumor is always emphasized; we learn first which area or population are recipients before the

¹⁴⁷ Austin 1955 *ad loc.*

¹⁴⁸ Ahl 2001 *ad* 4.195 parses a similar dilemma, where it is not clear what *foeda* modifies: “[F]oul could, in Latin, refer to the goddess, her talk, or both. I link it to the goddess, since, despite the seventeen-line preamble, the four-line summary is concise and, essentially, true.”

¹⁴⁹ 4.666 *per urbem* (news of Dido’s death spreads through Carthage); *per urbes* (news of Faunus’ prophecy spreads through Ausonian cities); 392 (news of Amata’s wandering spreads through the women of Latinus’ city); 8.554 *per urbem* (news of the expedition to the Etruscans spreads through Pallanteum); 9.474 *per urbem* (news of Euryalus’ death spreads through camp, the Trojans’ first settlement in Italy); 11.139 *Fama...domos et moenia replet* (news of Pallas’ return as a corpse spreads to Pallanteum); 12.608 *per urbem* (news of Amata’s suicide spreads through Latinus’ city). Compare ἦλθεσ, δῖ’ Εὐμαιε. τί δὴ κλέος ἔστ’ ἀνὰ ἄστυ; (*Od.* 16.461); Ὅσσα δ’ ἄρ’ ἄγγελος ὄκα κατὰ πτόλιυ ὄχετο πάντα (24.413); Ὡς φάσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κατὰ πτόλιυ (*Ap. Rhod.* 1.247).

focus narrows to the reacting individual.¹⁵⁰ *Volare* or a similarly vigorous verb brings out the swiftness of rumor's dissemination.¹⁵¹ The public audience, the zoom in to the individual, and the swiftness of the whole process are essential to the working of the narrative: Carthage must know of Dido's suicide instantly, so that Anna can sprint to her sister's side for a threnody; Faunus' prophecy must be known in detail throughout Italy, so that its terminology can be debated and exploited when the Trojans arrive;¹⁵² the dread and the grief of the mothers and the torchlit crowd streaming into Pallanteum are the proper context for Evander's rush through restraints to cast himself on the body of his son, and to cry out his last words in the poem.

Similar rules apply in the two instances in which *fama* tells events that are not otherwise narrated, and thereby presents information to the reader for the first time. To Dido Aeneas introduces *fama* as the authority on which he bases his decisions to go to Crete and then to Buthrotum.¹⁵³ Aeneas as internal narrator is a storyteller just as concerned as Vergil with limiting the completeness of information he dispenses, but he must give enough to lend his tale credibility. In order for it to be believable that he decides to stop off in Crete and Epirus, he must learn that Idomeneus and Neoptolemus no longer rule in their native kingdoms, and it is convenient that he do so from vague sources.¹⁵⁴ Clearly he means it to be plausible that *fama*

¹⁵⁰ First the women of Carthage react, then Anna speaks (4.665ff.); first the mothers of Pallanteum pray, then Evander speaks (8.554); Euryalus' mother mourns, and this shatters the spirit of even the men in camp (9.474ff); first the women react to Amata's suicide; then Lavinia does so; then the whole city and its defenders; then Latinus (12.604ff).

¹⁵¹ *volare* or *volitans* 7.104; 7.392; 8.554; 9.473; 10.510; 11.139; *ruere* 9.474; *bacchari* 4.666. The report of Pallas' death is so swift that it follow on the heels of reports of his successes earlier in the day (*et iam Fama volans, tanti praenuntia luctus, / Evandrum Evandrique domos et moenia replet, / quae modo victorem Latio Pallanta ferebat*; 8.139-141).

¹⁵² See below (Chapter 2, esp. 2.1.2).

¹⁵³ 3.121-2: *Fama uolat pulsum regnis cecis paternis / Idomeneia ducem*. Note 3.128-9 (*nauticus exoritur uario certamine clamor: hortantur socii Cretam proauosque petamus*) for the effect of *fama* on group decision-making. 294-5: *Hic incredibilis rerum fama occupat auris, Priamiden Helenum Graias regnare per urbis*.

¹⁵⁴ The disasters of the two are later referred to by Diomedes (*regna Neoptolemi referam versosque penatis / Idomeni?* [11.264-265]).

reaches a fleet wandering in the Mediterranean with information useful for directing its course and choosing its landfall.

A few times *fama* is said to introduce an event that occurred within the experience of the characters but was not previously narrated.¹⁵⁵ Aeneas cites *fama* as the reason he believes that Deiphobus died a heroic death on a heap of dead Greeks. This allows him to introduce his own pious erection of a funerary mound, and to explain his surprise at the gruesome and shameful wounds he sees on the other Trojan's shade (6.500ff). This sort of unanticipated claim of previously unmentioned knowledge is several times important (see Chapter 4 below), but only one other time depends on the authority of an anonymous report: Aeneas, just before his talk with Deiphobus, claims he that he has heard some report of Dido's death -- nowhere mentioned in Books 5 or 6 -- but could not believe it. He refers to a *nuntius*, but the sudden reference to a un-narrated report is the same (456-7).

Turnus is the only other character to introduce previously knowledge based on *fama* of events not previously narrated, but this time it is demonstrably accurate and paired with another source. This extended sequence requires us readers to track carefully who knows what and when, and a later revelation requires us to go back and reassess an earlier part of the scene. It begins in Book 11, when Aeneas marches on Latinus' city. We learn of Aeneas' approach from the narrator in the vaguest terms: *castra Aeneas aciemque mouebat* (11.446). The internal audience, the people of Latinus' city, learn from a *nuntius*¹⁵⁶ that Teucrians and Etruscans are filling the plains: *instructos acie Tiberino a flumine Teucros / Tyrrhenamque manum totis descendere campis*

¹⁵⁵ Dido claims that the *fama* of a specific event, Aeneas' punishment, will reach her even in the underworld (4.387).

¹⁵⁶ Note that *nuntius* is here paired with the same words with which *fama* as "report" is paired: *ecce ruit magnisque urbem terroribus implet* (11.448).

(449-50). Then Turnus divides his army in three (463-7), ordering one force (cavalry) to the fields, one to remain behind in the city, one to follow him. Camilla offers to confront Aeneas' cavalry in the fields alone, leaving Turnus and his force to stay on foot and defend the city (502-6). Only Turnus' response (507-19) reveals the full situation, as it already stood at the beginning of Aeneas' movement and the subsequent spread of the report of it (starting at 448). The Rutulian says that from both *fama* and *exploratores* he knows that Aeneas has divided his forces, sending cavalry via the flatlands and taking infantry through a mountain pass to surprise the city. Turnus' own plan has been to send a cavalry force of Camilla, Messapus, Latins, and Tiburtines to counter the enemy horse, while he waylays Aeneas and the enemy foot. Only now does the reader, at the same time as the internal audience (here Camilla), receive a wealth of information: the details of Aeneas' previously unspecific order of march (this fills out 446); that the rumor of Aeneas' order of march (449-50) was incomplete and inaccurate;¹⁵⁷ that Turnus had a fully-formed, intricate, and formidable plan when he first ordered the division of forces (463-7).

The full account of what each characters knows and thinks at any point is fragmented and delivered piecemeal. This forces the reader to read later details backwards in order to fully understand earlier verses. The narrator must distribute knowledge between characters, but also allow the reader to form, eventually at least, a complete picture of the balance of knowledge. Each character acts based on what he thinks another character knows and intends. Turnus does not just say that Aeneas has divided his forces and sent them different ways; he also interprets his

¹⁵⁷ The first report (449-50) makes no mention of a division of forces and says that Trojans and Etruscans together are coming down from the mountains into the plain. As far as we can tell this general report is that of the *nuntius*, accepted by the people as a whole (*vulgus*, 451), and Turnus obtains more precise information about Aeneas' order of march by sending scouts.

enemy's intent: Aeneas, he says, is making a feint with his cavalry to mask his surprise attack through the mountains (512-3). Turnus' plan to trap Aeneas depends on Aeneas' not knowing that Turnus knows Aeneas' plan. On the Latin side different levels of knowledge are carefully stratified across different individuals and groups (the Latin populace; the first Italian leaders named; Camilla; Turnus) at different times. The difference between what the group of Volusus, Messapus, Coras, and the other cavalry commanders know as a result of their orders and what Camilla knows as a result of her conversation with Turnus is critical to the plot. While the precipitousness of the former group's flight (868ff) allows them no time to communicate with their high commander, Camilla with her dying words commands her companion Acca to tell Turnus of the rout so that he will abandon the mountain ambush and, as she thinks, save the city (823-7).¹⁵⁸ He abandons the pass; at the moment he disappears from sight, Aeneas marches through (903ff).

1.3.2.2 *Fama* Characterized

Into the mind of any Vergilian reader confronted with a claim that *fama* reports events accurately will immediately spring the description of *fama* in Book 4 (173-95). *Fama*, paired with "appearances" (*species*), is introduced as the concern by which Dido is not moved when she flaunts her relationship with Aeneas:

¹⁵⁸ It is not only a vague *saevissimus nuntius* — it is likely that this is "theme and variation," and that there is no other source of information — but Acca herself who convinces Turnus to leave the hills (11.895-900). Here again the reported, indirect speech is selective (*deletas Volscorum acies, cecidisse Camillam, / ingruere infensos hostis et Marte secundo / omnia corripuisse, metum iam ad moenia ferri*, 888-900). It contains only the facts of the rout, and not Camilla's *mandata nouissima* to draw back and rescue the city (*succedat pugnae Troianosque arceat urbe*, [825-7]). The reader must remember what Camilla said and conclude that Acca is not just giving news of the route but is also — although this is not reported — urging Turnus to leave immediately. Turnus' *furor* and Jove's *numina* (901) further conspire to push the the Rutulians to abandon the pass.

*neque enim specie famave¹⁵⁹ movetur
nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem:
coniugium vocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam* (4.170-2)

The attitude described in the first line leads to, or is evidenced by, the actions described by the two lines following: because Dido does not care for *species* or *fama*, she carries on her liaison openly. She no longer keeps her love secret, but covers her fault (*culpa*)¹⁶⁰ with the name of a legitimate marriage (*coniugium*). But how can it make sense to say that Dido did not care for either appearances or reputation, and then to say that she went out of her way to call her affair a marriage? After vv.170-71 we expect something like “she carried on her shameless affair openly and without excuse,” not “she carried on her affair openly, but cloaked her fault with the name of a legitimate marriage.” She uses a false name to designate her action, as one excusing a legal *culpa* would allege a false pretext.¹⁶¹ [*N*]eque *fama movetur* cannot, then, mean that she did not care at all about her reputation (*fama*), but rather that she is not disturbed by what her activities will look like (*species*) or by the reports of her behavior that rumor will inevitably spread (*fama*), because she can excuse it by naming it and thereby controlling the interpretation of it.

Fama will do its work despite Dido’s effort to apply a guiltless label -- and a tendentious one, according to the narrator -- to her own actions. It is to be feared because it disseminates information about actions (Dido is having a sexual liaison with Aeneas) and resists the name and evaluation put upon them by the actor (Dido is not at fault because she is “married” to Aeneas).

The narrator’s characterization of *fama*, immediately following these lines, designates it a

¹⁵⁹ Dido’s loss of concern for her own reputation springs to Juno’s mind (*persensit...nec famam obstare furori*, 4.91) as soon as she perceives that Dido has ignored *pudor* and given in to her infatuation, but especially when the queen has ignored her public duty and the construction of Carthage has ground to a halt (54-89).

¹⁶⁰ Whether we understand it to be “immoral act” or “failure to fulfill duty” (see Pease 1935 *ad loc*) or even “offense against marriage” (Austin 1955 *ad loc*, following Donatus) does not change that it is something that, if understood by others to be a *culpa*, will harm her reputation; or even, as she later claims, destroy it.

¹⁶¹ See e.g. Cic.*Pis.*24.56; Pease 1935 *ad loc* gives later parallels.

malum, monstrum horrendum ingens, and links its fearsome manner of action (*stridens; territat*) to the awful results it stirs up (*metus; ira*). All this concerns the unpleasant effects of how it goes about its work, and obscures what what information *fama* relays and how she does so. The only lines that tell what *fama* says, instead of how she says it, come near the end of the description:

*tam ficti praviq̄ue tenax quam nuntia veri.
haec tum multiplici populos sermone replebat
gaudens, et pariter facta atq̄ue infecta canebat.* (4.188-190)

Fama, apparently, deals in *ficta* and *prava* equally as it does in *vera*;¹⁶² and since she sings, not generally but at this moment (*tum*), both what has been done (*facta*) and what has not been done (*infecta*), it seems that the report spreading through the Libyan cities will be a mix of truth and lies.¹⁶³ We catch a glimpse in indirect statement of this report:

*venisse Aenean Troiano sanguine cretum,
cui se pulchra viro dignetur iungere Dido;
nunc hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fovere
regnorum immemores turpique cupidine captos.* (4.191-194)

Prepared to be shocked by *fama*'s pack of lies, we find instead a report that is accurate in each fact it alleges: Aeneas is a Trojan who has arrived (191); Dido has joined herself to him, sexually and by publicizing their relationship (192); the lovers are passing the winter together (193).¹⁶⁴ Even when we pass beyond the facts and include the judgment passed upon actions, the imputation of *luxus* and the accusation that the two are *immemores regnorum* and *cupidine capti* are, at the very least, defensible. Aeneas' dress upon Mercury's arrival, which provokes a charge

¹⁶² Hardie 2012, 107-108 compares the Hesiodic Muses (*Theog.* 27-28) and Horace's poet (*AP* 151-152).

¹⁶³ In light of later truth-telling (see below), it seems possible to understand the activation of a pun, and to take *infecta* to mean "stained, infected," either with immorality or with spin.

¹⁶⁴ Pease 1935 *ad* 190 rightly distinguishes the true factual claims from the moral judgments (*luxus* and *cupido turpis*).

of uxoriousness, can support a charge of *luxuria* (4.261-4).¹⁶⁵ By ceasing to oversee the construction of Carthage, Dido has neglected her communal obligations as ruler.¹⁶⁶ It is true that Aeneas is discovered by Mercury building Carthage, but the argument that this means that he cannot be accused of being *immemor regni* does not hold: Carthage is not his kingdom, and at just the moment that we see him busily at work, Mercury calls him to account with words almost identical to those of *fama's report* (4.267 *regni rerumque oblite tuarum*). If, then, we take *regnorum immemores* as “each forgetful of his or her respective kingdom” instead of “both neglecting all exercise of public authority,” it is closely supported by the text. Just so the final accusation (*cupidine captos*) is supported by the narrative in its general sense of the situation (cf. 1.715-722; the first hundred lines of Book 4) and by verbal echo (1.84-85).¹⁶⁷ Even the much more severe judgment that the *cupido* of the pair is *turpis* can look for support to the narrator, whose just-preceding use of “*culpa*” was a negative evaluation.

The next iteration of *fama* is the invective the neighboring king Iarbas directs to the heavens:

*Iuppiter omnipotens, cui nunc Maurusia pictis
gens epulata toris Lenaeum libat honorem,
aspicis haec? an te, genitor, cum fulmina torques
nequiquam horremus, caecique in nubibus ignes
terrificant animos et inania murmura miscent?* 210
*femina, quae nostris errans in finibus urbem
exiguam pretio posuit, cui litus arandum
cuique loci leges dedimus, conubia nostra*

¹⁶⁵ See Stark 1999, 273-4.

¹⁶⁶ See 4.86-89 (*non coeptae adsurgunt turres, non arma iuventus / exercet portusve aut propugnacula bello tuta parant: pendent opera interrupta minaeque / murorum ingentes aequataque machina caelo*). Earlier she presses on the work eagerly (*instans operi regnisque futuris*, 1.504). The public effect of Dido's dereliction of duty is hinted at when she later complains that, thanks to Aeneas, she is the object of her own people's hostility (*infensi Tyrii*, 4.321).

¹⁶⁷ *Cupido* is not elsewhere used of Dido's desire (in the *Aeneid* it is used of sexual desire only at 7.189), but was last used twice of Cupid himself (1.658; 695).

reppulit ac dominum Aenean in regna recepit.
et nunc ille Paris cum semiviro comitatu, 215
Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem
subnexus, raptu potitur: nos munera templis
quippe tuis ferimus famamque fovemus inanem. (4.206-18)

His diction reinforces the distinction between moral judgments, no matter how contentious or exaggerated, and inaccuracies of fact. He broadens and complicates the thematic issues when he tops his questioning of Jupiter's existence (4.208-10) by naming Jupiter himself an *inanis fama* (217-8). But if we limit our focus to the veracity of what has been carried from mouth to mouth to his ears, it appears that Iarbas has heard a substantively accurate report. He claims that Dido has received Aeneas as a *dominus* (214) and that the Trojan is enjoying his spoils. *Rapto* (217) is not a literal claim of rape — which would make nonsense of the complaint against Dido's choice of an interloper — but a furious¹⁶⁸ and tendentious characterization, in line with the naming of Aeneas as the second Paris, and him and his comrades as sartorial and olfactory effeminates (215-217). The only portion of Iarbas' speech factually suspect are the words with which he describes the terms under which Dido supposedly holds her lands (211-213): he conceals the manner in which he was outwitted¹⁶⁹ in the deal that gave the Carthaginians what they could cover with a hide, and he makes a claim to vestigial power over Dido's land¹⁷⁰ that is supported nowhere else in the text, and makes little intuitive sense.

Vergil sets up an expectation that *fama* will carry false rumors, or at least that it carries truth and falsehood indiscriminately; yet in *fama's* paradigmatic dissemination of news, it relays accurate information about Aeneas and Dido and what they have done. *Fama* is an efficient agent

¹⁶⁸ Iarbas is *amens animi et rumore accensus amaro* (4.203).

¹⁶⁹ See 1.368 for the reference to the story of the Byrsa; Iarbas mentions only a *pretium*.

¹⁷⁰ See *ad loc* Servius; Pease 1935; Austin 1955 on *loci leges*; Donatus: *haec non sunt omnia pro vero accipienda*.

of publishing what has actually been done (*facta*), with negative evaluations¹⁷¹ but no factual fabrications (*infecta*; *fictum*) in evidence.¹⁷² We are surprised and forced to return to the description of *fama* and reassess it, either to find a way to narrow its meaning and reconcile it with later passages, or to accept the tension between the narrator's characterization and the action he tells.¹⁷³

The sequence — the narrator's report of the unfavorable report of *fama*; Iarbas' reaction based on this or a similar report — is the pattern for the action of *fama* in the rest of the poem. Although *fama* may give an incomplete picture, it does not ruin reputation or motivate action by reporting events that did not happen. When *fama* disseminates information, what is unstable and disputed is not competing true and false claims of fact, but the question of who will pass what

¹⁷¹ Perhaps, therefore, this is how we should take *tenax pravi* (188): *fama* is not “clinging to reports of crooked deeds,” but “clinging to the reports that put forward the worst possible interpretation of deeds.” This sense of *pravus* — Vergil uses the word nowhere else — is a favorite of Tacitus' (De.Or.3.2: *an ideo labrum istum adprehendisti, ut diligentius retractares, et sublatis si qua pravae interpretationi materiam dederunt, emitteres Catonem non quidem meliorem, sed tamen securiorem?*; Hist.2.23: *suspectum id Othonianis fuit, omnia ducum facta prave aestimantibus*; Ann.6.5: *ne verba prave detorta neu convivalium fabularum simplicitas in crimen duceretur postulavit*; Ann.14.22: *consuleret quieti urbis seque prava diffamantibus subtraheret.*)

¹⁷² Critical assessments of *fama*'s reports: Keith 1921, 300: “What false slander does she spread abroad? She may cling to the false and the base, but is she not here the messenger of truth? Aeneas and Dido have done all that she claims they have, and according to the ordinary standards of Vergil and his readers they deserve scant sympathy.” Pease 1935: “true but indefinite”; whether we agree with its assessment is essential to our judgment of the lovers' morality. Austin 1955 ad 4.260: “*regnorum immemores* (194) is a patent lie.”; *luxu* and *cupidine capti* a “malicious twist on the truth.” Monti 1981, 45: “half-truths.” Hardie 1986, 274: “[*fama*] represents the power of the spoken word to exceed the truth while yet remaining anchored to it.” Cairns 1989, 49: “only partly accurate.” Laird 1999, 273: “In fact, everything she reports is just as it has already been narrated. Within the world of the story, then, *Fama* is peddling only facts...It can only be that if one considers *Fama*'s report on a pragmatic level then it can be no more true than the *Aeneid* itself is true. In this respect, poetry is very much like rumour...So *Fama* may have a reflexive significance for the *Aeneid*.” Hardie 2012, 1989: *fama*'s report (191-4) is “an (arguably) distorted description of the couple's behavior.” Iarbas' speech is “an increasingly fictitious and slanderous version of events.”

¹⁷³ In the *Metamorphoses*, *fama* — the narrator says — rejoices in adding falsehood to truth and grows through its lies, then tells Deianira that Hercules is having an affair with Iole. He is. (*cum Fama loquax praecessit ad aures, / Deianira, tuas, quae veris addere falsa gaudet, et e minimo sua per mendacia crescit, / Amphitryoniaden Ioles ardore teneri. / credit amans*, Met.9.137-141). Later the poet devotes twenty-five lines to the mechanics by which rumors are falsified, then has it tell the Trojans that the Greek army is coming. It is. (12.39-67, esp. 54ff: *veniunt, leve vulgus, euntque / mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur / milia rumorum confusaque verba volutant; / e quibus hi vacuas implent sermonibus aures, / hi narrata ferunt alio, mensuraque ficti / crescit, et auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor. / illic Credulitas, illic temerarius Error / vanaque Laetitia est consternatique Timores / Seditioque repens dubioque auctore Susurri; / ipsa, quid in caelo rerum pelagoque geratur / et tellure, videt totumque inquirat in orbem. / Fecerat haec notum, Graias cum milite forti / adventare rates, neque inexpectatus in armis / hostis adest: prohibent aditus litusque tuentur / Troes*). On this Ovidian reading of Vergil see Due 1974, 148-9 n.2.

judgments on the information relayed.¹⁷⁴ Dido will later (4.321-323) blame Aeneas for the loss not only of her *pudor* (the loss of which is the intrinsic result of her actions) but of her *prior fama* (the loss of which is the result of her actions becoming known), and she makes the latter the more important by its absence (*qua sola sidera adibam*, 4.322).¹⁷⁵ *Fama* frees information about a deed from the rhetorical control of its doer, who has the greatest stake in controlling its reception and interpretation, and allows others to “spin” it.¹⁷⁶ In Book 10 Turnus, so distraught at merely appearing to flee that he begs to die in shame, knows that the plea that he was bravely chasing what turned out to be an *imago* will not save him from opprobrium, just as he knows that the only limit of *fama* is the end of human society or of life: *in rupes, in saxa...ferte ratem saevisque vadis immittite syrtis / quo nec me Rutuli nec conscia fama sequatur* (10.677-679). Characters do not worry about a false *fama*, but about what will happen when *fama* broadcasts what they have actually done.

1.3.2.3 Is *Fama* Ever Wrong?

The accuracy of a report carried by *fama* is questionable only twice. When Aeneas, speaking to Deiphobus, claims that *fama* told him that Deiphobus’ death was glorious (6.502), we have no idea from where he heard this report, and no confirmation that he has heard it and is not flattering his dead compatriot. The only time *fama* is demonstrably wrong is in Aeneas’ account of the fall of his city: a rumor is promulgated that that the horse is a sacrifice by the

¹⁷⁴ Juno fears that the defeat of her plans will harm her reputation (*ne noster honos infractave cedat fama loco* [7.333]). Drances exhorts Turnus to greater forwardness in battle by citing that hero’s previous reputation and the thought of what knowledge of his supposed cowardice will do (*si fama movet* [11.368]). Ilioneus assures Latinus that his reputation will not suffer as a result of allowing the Trojans to settle in his land (*nec vestra feretur / fama levis* [7.231-232]). See further 4.91; 4.221; 4.323; 6.527; 10.679; 11.368; 11.847.

¹⁷⁵ Tatum 1984 traces all *fama*’s appearances in connection with Dido and argues that the single word takes the place of both τῆμη and φῶτις in Sophocles’ *Ajax*, whose hero he reads as an important model for Dido.

¹⁷⁶ For the term as used by analysts of modern political discourse see Lakoff 2004, 100: “the manipulative use of a frame...an attempt to put an innocent frame on an embarrassing occurrence.”

Greeks for a favorable return home.¹⁷⁷ In every other case it is reliable when reporting to characters events in the present or the near past. When a character has a false conception of the facts, when a character thinks something that is not so and acts upon this misconception, *fama* is never to blame. When the Trojans approach Latinus' walls and there is no sign of the Rutulians or Turnus, Amata thinks that Turnus is dead, blames herself, and hangs herself. The queen's private judgment based on what she sees, not a false report, leads her to the false conclusion that leads her into madness.¹⁷⁸ Trustworthy *fama* immediately spreads the accurate report of her suicide that breaks the spirit of the city and the king (607-11).

1.3.2.4 *Fama* conclusion

Fama in the *Aeneid* need not have been a truth-teller. It is not always so in Vergil.¹⁷⁹ In the historians its tendency to dangerously exaggerate is its proverbial feature.¹⁸⁰ Outside of literature it will say anything¹⁸¹ and is not, until supported by authority, understood by those citing it to be a sound basis for action.¹⁸² Nevertheless Vergil uses it in the *Aeneid* as the tool by which he can explain and control how information travels within the characters' world during

¹⁷⁷ 2.17 *votum pro reditu simulant; ea fama vagatur.*

¹⁷⁸ *regina ut tectis venientem prospicit hostem, / incessi muros, ignis ad tecta uolare, / nusquam acies contra Rutulas, nulla agmina Turni, / infelix pugnae iuvenem in certamine credit / extinctum* (12.595-9).

¹⁷⁹ *Ecl.*9.11: *audieras, et fama fuit; sed...*

¹⁸⁰ *Sall.fr.*2.58: *haec postquam Varro in maius more rumorum audivit*; *Livy* 21.32: *quamquam fama prius, qua incerta in maius uero ferri solent, praecepta res erat*; *Tac. Ann.*3.44: *cuncta, ut mos famae, in maius credit.*

¹⁸¹ *Cic. ProCaelio* 38 *At fuit fama. Quotus quisque istam effugere potest in tam maledicta civitate?*; *Rhet.ad.Herr.* 2.12: *Contra rumores dicemus: primum, si docebimus multos esse falsos rumores, et exemplis utemur, de quibus falsa fama fuerit; et aut iniquos nostros aut homines natura malivolos et maledicos confinxisse dicemus; et aliquam aut fictam fabulam in adversarios adferemus, quam dicamus omnibus in ore esse, aut verum rumorem proferemus, qui illis aliquid turpitudinis adferat, neque tamen ei rumori nos fidem habere dicemus, ideo quod quivis unus homo possit quamvis turpem de quolibet rumorem proferre et confictam fabulam dissipare.*

¹⁸² *Cic.Verr.*2.3.49: *Haec vos antea, iudices, audistis, verum fortasse ita audistis ut auctorem rumorem haberetis sermonemque omnium*; *ad Fam* 10.20: *modo enim quae vellemus de Lepido, modo contra nuntiabantur. de te tamen fama constans, nec decipi posse nec vinci.*; *ad Fam* 12.4: *fama nuntiabat te esse in Syria; auctor erat nemo; ad Fam* 12.10: *Nos de Dolabella cottidie quae volumus audimus, sed adhuc sine capite, sine auctore, rumore nuntio.* Aeschines' defense of the reliability of φήμη — not news of a specific event, but local reputation shaped over time by many deeds — is an entertaining contrast (*Contra Tim.* 125-131).

narrated time. Attribution of agency to *fama* allows the narrator to tell that knowledge spreads, while avoiding graceless, obtrusive precision (e.g., “the scout heard from the slave heard from the shepherd heard from...”).¹⁸³ Much information is floating around in the world of the *Aeneid*, and it has more ways of traveling than we readers know. When a speaker shows that he knows something we had no idea he knew, *fama*’s ubiquity and accuracy must be recalled.

1.3.3 Direct Inquiry

1.3.3.1 Acquiring and Using Knowledge

Vergil does not, however, resort to allowing his characters to hear fortuitous reports of everything they need to hear in order for his plot to progress. When his characters land in a new place and are not likely to be part of the chain of information relays that allow them to be passive recipients of *fama*’s reports, they search for what they need to know. Before the Trojans land in Italy in Book 7, they know only names and vague prophecies of Italy. When Ilioneus speaks to Latinus, his ability to name features of the local countryside bolsters his advancement of Trojan claims in Italy (see Chapter 2 below). Latinus, who spoke first, mentions only the *litus Ausonium* and the name of his own people, the *Latini* (7.198 and 202). Ilioneus packs his answers with geographical detail:

nec Troiam Ausonios gremio excepisse pigebit.
...
... hinc Dardanus ortus,
huc repetit iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo
Tyrrhenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici. (7.233; 240-2)

¹⁸³ Occasionally an individual messenger is named (e.g. Eumelus reports that the ships are burning [5.664]; Acca reports that the Trojans are headed for Latinus’ city [11.897]; Saces reports that Aeneas is triumphant and that Amata has committed suicide [12.71]).

Vergil has told us enough that we can tell exactly how Ilioneus knows these names. “Tiber”¹⁸⁴ and “Ausonia” have long been watchwords to the Trojans for their destination.¹⁸⁵ The Numicus, however, was not mentioned in any earlier passages describing the Trojans’ knowledge about their destination. The explanation for its presence is the speed with which the Trojans use the information they acquire. A little earlier, when Aeneas seizes upon his son’s joke and announces to his fellow leaders that it has fulfilled the table-eating prophecy, he ends his speech by announcing to his men that they will go scouting:

*quare agite et primo laeti cum lumine solis
quae loca, quive habeant homines, ubi moenia gentis,
vestigemus et a portu diversa petamus.* (7.130-2)

The narrator tells the fulfillment of the character’s intention by repeating almost exactly the character’s speech (7.148ff):

*postera cum prima lustrabat lampade terras
orta dies, urbem et finis et litora gentis
diversi explorant...* (7.148-50)

The report of the *exploratores* follows:

*...haec fontis stagna Numici,
hunc Thybrim fluvium, hic fortis habitare Latinos.*¹⁸⁶ (7.150-1)

Ilioneus immediately uses this freshly-acquired information, the name of the Numicus and the pairing of it with the Tiber, as rhetorical ammunition in his exchange with Latinus (7.242).

¹⁸⁴ 2.781-2: *et terram Hesperiam uenies, ubi Lydius arua / inter opima uirum leni fluit agmine Thybris* (Creusa, prophetically and vaguely); 3.500-1: *si quando Thybrim uicinaque Thybridis arua / intraro* (Aeneas, vague and exasperated); 5.82-3: *non licuit finis Italos fataliaque arua / nec tecum Ausonium, quicumque est, quaerere Thybrim* (Aeneas, more exasperated); 6.87 *et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno* (the Sibyl, prophesying war); to this perhaps add, if the alternate name is intelligible to Aeneas, *Tiberine* at 6.873.

¹⁸⁵ “Ausonia” (or its derivatives) is first mention by the Penates (3.171) and is subsequently common (3.378; 3.477 and 9; 3.496; 4.349; 5.83; 6.346; 6.807).

¹⁸⁶ As *comparanda* add to Aeneas’ similar resolve Book 1 (discussed below) the compressed example after the Trojans arrive in Cumae (*quaerit pars semina flammae / abstrusa in venis silicis, pars densa ferarum / tecta rapit silvas inventaque flumina monstrat*, 6.6-8).

D'Anna uses this sequence to argue for the priority of the composition of the second half of the poem, and for the lack of coordination between the two halves: Ilioneus says that Apollo pressed the Trojans to go to the land of the Numicus, but he has learned the name of the river a hundred lines ago, and Apollo never mentioned it.¹⁸⁷ But characters arriving in a new and unfamiliar situation often speedily and seamlessly incorporate into their speech the knowledge they seek and acquire. When the Trojans are blown by a storm to Africa, they have no idea where they are. Aeneas and Achates set out on a scouting expedition:

*ut primum lux alma data est, exire locosque
 explorare novos, quas vento accesserit oras,
 qui teneant, nam inculta videt, hominesne feraene,
 quaerere [Aeneas] constituit, sociisque exacta referre.* (1.306-9)

Aeneas is desperate to find out where the wind has driven him and who rules here; the locality is so deserted that he does not know whether there is any chance of human help. The Trojans are in desperate need of supplies, as the deer hunt (1.180ff) shows, and in need of repair, as Ilioneus' later plea to Dido makes clear (1.551-552). Aeneas' plea to disguised Venus, who he suspects is a goddess, shows how critical it is to him simply to know where he is:

*sis felix nostrumque leves, quaecumque, laborem,
 et, quo sub caelo tandem, quibus orbis in oris
 iactemur doceas: ignari hominumque locorumque
 erramus vento huc vastis et fluctibus acti:
 multa tibi ante aras nostra cadet hostia dextra.* (1.330-4)

Aeneas does not ask for, and promise ample sacrifice in exchange for, aid by divine intervention; what he needs is information, an accurate scouting report. Venus tells Aeneas a great deal about

¹⁸⁷ See D'Anna 1957, 24. Actually he seems to think that the scouting report (130-2) must mean that the Trojans are hearing "Tiber" for the first time, but there is no marker in the text to suggest that they do not hear "Tiber" and "Latins" as confirmation that they are at last where they were told to go (see 184 above for the Tiber; Anchises spoke to Aeneas of the *Latini* [6.875; also perhaps 890]).

the land, the local city, its current inhabitants, their threatening neighbors, and the history of the its people's arrival (335-370). We can tell how carefully he has been listening from his response to the queries about his identity with which Venus ends her speech:

*nos Troia antiqua, si vestras forte per auris
Troiae nomen iit, diversa per aequora vectos
forte sua Libycis tempestas adpulit oris.* (1.375-7)

...
*ipse ignotus, egens, Libyae deserta peragro,
Europa atque Asia pulsus* (1.384-385)

Aeneas names "Libyan" first the shores to which he has been driven (377), then the deserted lands in which he wanders (385). He knows enough only to repeat what he learned from Venus' speech, in which she named the natives (*finis Libyci*, 339). He does not adorn the toponym with synonymous epithets beyond what he should plausibly know; he can only use the name he has just now learned from his interlocutor.¹⁸⁸

1.3.3.2 Frustrated Inquiry

Characters try to acquire information in order to form a plan or to employ it in their rhetoric, but they also act on a compulsion, a lust to hear stories, and not only those that impart immediately useful information. Dido's ravenous curiosity, hinted at by the narrator at the end of Book 1 (*multa...rogitans*, 1.750)¹⁸⁹ is rightly characterized by Aeneas as an *amor cognoscere* (2.10). The Trojan sets up a parallel with his own desire during his wandering, when *fama* has been accurate but incomplete, to learn how a Trojan could be ruling in Epirus:

¹⁸⁸ Aeneas uses the same information when his protective cloud is dissipated and he makes his critical first address to Dido (*Libycis ereptus ab undis*, 596).

¹⁸⁹ Before any god interferes she regrets Aeneas' absence and sends scouts to find him (1.575-578 *equidem per litora certos / dimittam*).

*Hic incredibilis rerum fama occupat auris,
Priamiden Helenum Graias regnare per urbis
coniugio Aeacidae Pyrrhi sceptrisque potitum,
et patrio Andromachen iterum cecissee marito.
obstipui, miroque incensum pectus amore
compellare uirum et casus cognoscere tantos* (3.294-9)

One hearing of Aeneas' narrative does not satisfy Dido. Her thirst to hear his story again and again is a sign of her love-madness, and she hangs from his lips as a lover hangs from her man's neck.¹⁹⁰

Several times such a desire to know is frustrated, at least for the moment.¹⁹¹ The Trojans driven to Libya do not, on their first night ashore, know if their friends are alive or dead, and try to seek them in conversation. Aeneas suspects the worst.¹⁹² On the slopes of Aetna the Trojans' fear is the greater in proportion to their ignorance of the cause of the fearsome sound in the dark.¹⁹³ The Trojans at the open of Book 5, sailing away but still within sight of Carthage, cannot know the reason for the flames they see back in Carthage, but they suspect the worst.¹⁹⁴ Neither the exchange of news nor the compulsion to know and communicate end with death. The spirits in the underworld cannot ask for help, but above all they desire news; not so much talk as reports of events.¹⁹⁵ Because the *fama* bearing a single report affects or determines the *fama* of

¹⁹⁰ With *Iliacosque iterum demens audire labores / exposcit pendetque iterum narrantis ab ore.* (4.78-9) compare Prop.3.12.22 (*pendebit collo Galla pudica tuo*); Ov.Fas.2.760 (*deque viri collo dulce pependit onus*).

¹⁹¹ Aeneas and Acestes in Cumae do not know who the lost comrade spoken of by the Sibyl is (6.149-55), and they speculate (156-61); their curiosity is immediately satisfied (161ff).

¹⁹² *amissos longo socios sermone requirunt, / spemque metumque inter dubii, seu vivere credant, / sive extrema pati nec iam exaudire vocatos* (1.217-9).

¹⁹³ *nec quae sonitum det causa videmus* (3.584).

¹⁹⁴ *quae tantum accenderit ignem / causa latet; duri magno sed amore dolores / polluto, notumque furens quid femina possit, / triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt* (5.4-7).

¹⁹⁵ *circumstant animae dextra laeuaque frequentes, / nec uidisse semel satis est; iuuat usque morari / et conferre gradum et ueniendi discere causas* (6.486-8). Deiphobus asks Aeneas whether wandering on the sea has brought him to this meeting, as if they were still in the upper world (*sed te qui vivum casus, age fare vicissim, / attulerint. pelagine venis erroribus actus / an monitu divum? an quae te fortuna fatigat, / ut tristis sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires?* [6.531-534]). Knowledge of future honor is true consolation, says the Sibyl, for Palinurus (*sed cape dicta memor; duri solacia casus*, 6.377).

reputation, the obsession with controlling and acquiring knowledge cannot end with death. The living worry about what those in the underworld know, or what they themselves will know when they reach the underworld.¹⁹⁶

1.3.3.3 Incomplete Knowledge

Book 8 ends with two meditations on the three-fold division between an event, a report or representation of an event, and a character's knowledge and understanding of an event. As Aeneas and his new charge Pallas mass their men to set out from Pallanteum for war, Evander begs the gods to protect his son:

*at uos, o superi, et diuum tu maxime rector
Iuppiter, Arcadii, quaeso, miserescite regis
et patrias audite preces. si numina uestra
incolumem Pallanta mihi, si fata reseruant,
si uisurus eum uiuo et uenturus in unum,
uitam oro, patior quemuis durare laborem.
sin aliquem infandum casum, Fortuna, minaris,
nunc, nunc o liceat crudelem abrumpere uitam,
dum curae ambiguae, dum spes incerta futuri,
dum te, care puer, mea sola et sera uoluptas,
complexu teneo, grauior neu nuntius auris
uulneret.*

(8.572-83)

The appeal is not for a desired future outcome — Pallas' safety — but for a desired state of knowledge in Evander himself. The good appealed for by Evander is that he never know, that he not ever hear the news of Pallas' death. The beloved son's death is not present for the father if the father is dead before he can hear of it. The deprecated and worst possible outcome is not Pallas'

¹⁹⁶ Neoptolemus sends a message to his father through Priam (2.547-9; *referes...nuntius*). Dido longs to hear of Aeneas' suffering and death even after she is dead (4.387; *audiam et haec Manis ueniet mihi fama sub imos*). Evander wants to bring to Pallas in the underworld the news that he has been avenged (11.180-1: *non vitae gaudia quaero, / nec fas, sed gnato manis perferre sub imos*).

death, but Evander's survival to learn of Pallas' death.¹⁹⁷ After the Trojans and Pallas march for a day, Venus comes down and presents Aeneas with his new suit of arms and a shield on which is represented the history of his descendants. Aeneas receives from the shield information, in the form of an incomprehensible mass of representations of fact, but he derives from it no knowledge: *rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet*.¹⁹⁸

Vergil uses the scope offered by a non-verbal revelation of divine and prophetic foreknowledge to artificially separate information, a report or representation of events, and the understanding that makes it a possession of a character that can motivate action. The effect of this separation is to draw attention to the divide between Aeneas, who cannot connect the visuals his senses take in to any referent, and Vergil's contemporary reader, who can read the shield with understanding through he is only hearing an ephrastic narrative inadequate to the reality it tries to report (*non enarrabile textum*, 625).¹⁹⁹ In several passages already we have seen Vergil employ Aeneas and the Trojans as his point-of-view characters, so that the reader learns at the same moment they acquire knowledge or experience; but at this moment the immeasurable chasm between the two opens.

1.4 Prior Knowledge

1.4.1 Prior Knowledge Claims

We turn now to the passages in which the reports that float so freely around the *Aeneid's* Mediterranean appear unexpectedly. An addressee of a speech that delivers information often, in

¹⁹⁷ For the opposite sentiment, cf. Telemachus (*Od.*3.79-101), who asks for accurate news of his father, no matter how bad.

¹⁹⁸ Contrast Vulcan at 627-8: *haud vatum ignarus venturique inscius aevi / fecerat ignipotens*. That the genitive should be construed with *ignarus* is clear (see Gransden 1976 *ad loc*). Putnam 1998, 153-4 has Aeneas "rejoice, though he is ignorant," (emphasis mine) but there is no adversative in the Latin. For Aeneas as a reader of images see below (5.4).

¹⁹⁹ Harrison 2001, 85ff terms this making the Roman reader the "focalizer."

his response, claims that he already knew a story or detail that the initial speaker told. Turnus replies to Allecto, who, disguised as Calybe, has announced to him that the Trojans have docked and are about to be offered his rightful bride, that this is no news to him: *classis inuectas Thybridis undam non, ut rere, meas effugit nuntius auris* (7.436-437). Before she began speaking, he says, he knew all about the landing of the Trojans in the Tiber. The responding speaker seems to gain some advantage if he can dismiss the original speaker's arguments by saying, in effect, "You haven't told me anything I didn't know."²⁰⁰

It is Aeneas who most often resorts to the claim that he already had detailed prior knowledge of what a speaker has just told him.²⁰¹ In Cumae, Aeneas asks the Sibyl, not yet fully under the Apollo's rein and spur, to prophesy (6.66-68).²⁰² The Sibyl falls fully under the god's control and tells him: worse dangers than those he has encountered at sea await him on land (83-84); he will enter the kingdom of Lavinium, but will find only war and a Tiber reddened by

²⁰⁰ Walcot 1992 compares the attitude to lying documented in modern Greek villages by sociolinguists with that found in the *Odyssey*. Especially interesting for my argument is the following passage (pp.53-4): "The agonistic quality of life affects conversation: one person will try to secure information from another, and that other villager will attempt to reveal as little as possible in his reply, and the questioner, having established what he wishes to learn, will claim a prior knowledge of the fact."

²⁰¹ In addition to the examples discussed below see his reply to Palinurus' exhortation that he take shelter from an impending storm in Sicily (*equidem sic poscere ventos / iam dudum et frustra cerno te tendere contra*, 26-7).

²⁰² It is not clear what Aeneas asks for. Helenus told him that the Sibyl would give him actionable intelligence on what he would find in Italy when he arrived, and how to deal with it (*illa tibi Italiae populos uenturaque bella / et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem / expedit, cursusque dabit uenerata secundos*, 3.458-460). Anchises, appearing to him in a dream, told him to ask for escort from the Sibyl, not prophecy; the information he promises will be given in the underworld, and will concern the future Roman race (*Ditis tamen ante / infernas accede domos et Auerna per alta / congressus pete, nate, meos...huc [Elysium] casta Sibylla / nigrarum multo pecudum te sanguine ducet / tum genus omne tuum et quae dentur moenia disces*, 5.731-737). Aeneas, perhaps confused as well, asks for rest in Italy (*tuque, o sanctissima uates, / praescia uenturi, da (non indebita posco / regna meis fati) Latio considerare Teucros / errantisque deos agitataque numina Troiae*, 6.65-68), and then for sung instead of written commands (*foliis tantum ne carmina manda, / ne turbata uolent rapidis ludibria uentis; / ipsa canas oro*, 74-76). He seems to be asking for whatever commands might be relevant without knowing quite what they may be; but all this confusion makes his dismissive response more puzzling -- what was it that he was expecting, but did not hear? Anchises is the one who does what Helenus said the Sibyl would do (*quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit / incenditque animum famae uenientis amore, / exim bella uiro memorat quae deinde gerenda, / Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini, / et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem*, 888-892), but the reader does not hear any details that Anchises discloses. The crowning oddity is that Aeneas does not seem to benefit from whatever Anchises says: in no passage in Books 7-12 does he recall, or act as if he were recalling, anything he heard from Anchises here or from the Sibyl a little earlier.

blood (84-86); the war will be a reenactment of the battles on the Trojan plain, and Juno will again lead the way against him (88-90); he will be forced into the role of suppliant (91-92); a woman and a marriage will again be the cause (93-94); the way to safety runs through a Greek city (96-97).²⁰³ Aeneas replies:

*non ulla laborum
o uirgo, noua mi facies inopinaue surgit;
omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi* (6.103-105)

He follows this with a request:

*unum oro: quando hic inferni ianua regis
dicitur et tenebrosa palus Acheronte refuso,
ire ad conspectum cari genitoris et ora
contingat; doceas iter et sacra ostia pandas.
...
quin, ut te supplex peterem et tua limina adirem,
idem orans mandata dabat.* (6.106-109; 115-116)

In other words, he says that that what the Sibyl has just foretold is all very well, but none of it is new to him; he understood it thoroughly beforehand, and what he really needs is for her to escort him to his father in the Underworld.²⁰⁴ It is hard to explain why he is so dismissive of what should be valuable foreknowledge, and a review of the information we have seen him acquire, or claim he acquired, before this point does not lessen the mystery. According to his account Creusa told him about the Tiber and a new *coniunx* (2.783), but not that she would be the cause of war; Anchises interpreted the sight of the four white horses as a portent of war (539); Anchises' shade (*facies*) referred to war in Latium (5.730-731). Aeneas knew, therefore, that a war, perhaps over a

²⁰³ On the difficulties of the speech, and what he takes to be its inaccuracies as a prophecy, see Horsfall 1991, 82-84.

²⁰⁴ Lloyd 1957, 53-54 describes Aeneas as "almost impatient with the practical information which the Sibyl has to offer him regarding the wars immediately to be faced in Italy" and "almost brusque with the Sibyl and anxious to get on with the more important business of the day."

woman, would greet him; he did not know about a uniquely formidable enemy, or about the necessity of becoming a *supplex*, or about a Greek city that would be his rescuer. These details seem like they should be interesting to one about to face unspecified hostilities in a new land. The Sibyl responds tartly, not only with her famous *hoc opus, hic labor est* (6.128-129), and not only with her initial riposte to Aeneas' argument from precedent that as a descendent of Jove he should be allowed to tread where other descendants of Jove have tread,²⁰⁵ but even in the words with which she grants Aeneas' request:

*quod si tantus amor menti, si tanta cupido est
bis Stygios innare lacus, bis nigra uidere
Tartara, et insano iuuat indulgere labori,
accipe quae **peragenda** prius* (6.133-136)

With her quotation of the key words (*peragenda prius*) the Sibyl returns with interest Aeneas' unimpressed reception of her prophecy (*ante peregi*)²⁰⁶ and suggests that his claim to prior knowledge, to having already gone through the future in his mind, must be matched by a willingness to undergo physical hardship.

Prior knowledge claims are one of the means by which Vergil gives the reader the impression that the narrator selectively grants insight into an ongoing story and neglects or obscures other parts. They also raise the question of whether speakers with prior knowledge are only claiming prior knowledge: the reader is given no authoritative narration to corroborate the speaker, and the speaker in each instance cited above might have reasons to invent or exaggerate his previous comprehension. When Aeneas sees Dido's shade approach, we might expect him to

²⁰⁵ *pauci, quos aequus amaui / Iuppiter aut ardens euexit ad aethera uirtus, / dis geniti potuere* (129-131) answers his *si potuit manis accersere coniugis Orpheus / Threicia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris, / si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit / itque reditque uiam totiens. quid Thesea, magnum / quid memorem Alciden? et mi genus ab Ioue summo* (119-123).

²⁰⁶ Her *labori* (135) also echoes his *laborum* (103).

express shock or disbelief; but we cannot expect him to say that he has already heard of her death: *infelix Dido, uerus mihi nuntius ergo / uenerat extinctam ferroque extrema secutam? / funeris heu tibi causa fui?* (7.456-458). We have not seen any messenger or message deliver news of Dido's suicide to Aeneas. We have been assured that he was not able, upon departure from Carthage, to do more than suspect the worst.²⁰⁷ On the one hand, the many precedents of *fama* relaying information lend credence to Aeneas' claim of a *nuntius* (6.456). On the other hand, we consider that the Trojans saw the fire of Dido's pyre from afar, although they were ignorant of its cause at the time; that Aeneas is in a realm of women who died due to love, several of them suicides;²⁰⁸ that he is probably able to see Dido's wounds (450 *recens a vulnere*); that he can put two and two together. His claim of a definite report makes his protestations more believable: if he heard that she had killed herself over him, but could not believe it, he really must not have thought that his leaving was so important to her, or that she loved him enough to react in such a way.

1.4.2 Unexplained Knowledge

The cumulative effect of prophecy, inquiry, and *fama* informing characters of so much frees the narrator from the obligation of laboriously explaining every piece of knowledge a character exhibits. When in Carthage we see with Aeneas that Ilioneus is escorted into Dido's presence, we hear that he too knows about Dido and her people, but we do not know how he came to know. He uses the region's name (*Libycos...penatis* [1.527]²⁰⁹ and *pontus...Libyae*

²⁰⁷ 5.1-7 *Aeneas iam classe tenebat / certus iter fluctusque atros Aquilone secabat / moenia respiciens, quae iam infelicis Elissae / conlucent flammis. quae tantum accenderit ignem / causa latet; duri magno sed amore dolores / polluto, notumque furens quid femina possit, / triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt.*

²⁰⁸ For a consideration of the other female shades (Phaedra, Eriphyle, Pasiphae, Evadne, Procris, Laodamia, Caeneus), see Tatum 1984, 436-8 with bibliography.

²⁰⁹ *Libycus* as an ethnonym properly belongs to the natives hostile to the Carthaginians (see *finis Libyci*, 1.339 and 4.320), but as a toponym it can refer to something in or associated with the area [see 4.106; 4.271; 4.348].

[556]), says that Dido is a queen, and says that she has been responsible for founding Carthage (*O regina, novam cui condere Iuppiter urbem / iustitiaque dedit gentis frenare superbas* [1.522-23]). One response might be to fault the narrator for not having told us how Ilioneus came to know any of this, even to attribute such a “mistake” or “inconsistency” to the uncompleted state of the poem.²¹⁰ Another is to shrug off these sorts of questions as irrelevant, not the concern of an epic poet, “trivia.”²¹¹ We might, however, consider that we have already seen one character acquire basic knowledge about Libya and Dido, and have no need to observe Ilioneus send out scouts or exchange challenges with Carthaginian coastal guards to guess how he might have done so as well. We might also consider that a man speaking to a woman seated on a throne and giving orders (506-508) in a city being busily constructed (421-440) need not be endowed with extraordinary perspicuity to conclude that this woman is the queen of a new city. We might finally consider that Ilioneus exploits his ignorance of anything beyond these obvious details to frame a question the incredulity of which is meant as a rebuke to his interlocutor: *quod genus hoc hominum? quaeve hunc tam barbara morem / permittit patria?* (1.539-540).

In the exchange in Book 7 that structurally corresponds to this scene, Latinus tells the Trojans that they have not come unheard-of (*dicite, Dardanidae [neque enim nescimus et urbem / et genus, auditique advertitis aequore cursum]*, 7.195-196). Servius, as often, gives one excessively ingenious interpretation, then one sensitive to the poet’s habits.:

aut ex veste eos Troianos esse cognoscit, quae erat propria gentium singularum; aut κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον²¹² intellegimus famam, quae eos venire nuntiaverat, eandem etiam Troianos esse dixisse.

²¹⁰ See e.g. Gercke 1913, 42.

²¹¹ Austin 1955 *ad* 522: “For *nouam urbem* cf. 298 note: how did Ilioneus know Dido's history?”

²¹² For this term see above (Introduction).

We should be as little surprised by the idea that Latinus has many sources of information,²¹³ or that *fama* has told of a people's movements, as we should be when Ilioneus makes a play on the king's name (*rex, genus egregium Fauni*, 7.213) after we have seen that the Trojans have carefully scouted, even if Latinus' bloodline was not part of the indirect report of what they learned (7.150-151). This is not because the poet has neglected the problem of how characters learn, nor because the loftiness of his genre excuses him from addressing it, but because he has devoted considerable care to designing a world in which wide distribution of knowledge and swift spread, acquisition, and use of it is the norm.

1.4.3 Historical Connections

The last link that helps explain characters' knowledge is history. The degree to which the *Aeneid* is more bound to history and geography than the geographically vague and fantastical *Odyssey* or the literary palace of the *Argonautica* can hardly be overstated. People and places connected in history are connected in the *Aeneid*. When Dido, in the exchange with Ilioneus discussed at the beginning of this chapter, calls Italy "Hesperia" and "Saturnian" (1.569), we should recall that she is a Phoenician, the queen of the people most widely travelled and most knowledgeable about the geography and the inhabitants of the Mediterranean world. The narrator does not need to develop the characterization of Phoenicians as far-travelled and well-knowing because the reader knows that the Phoenicians were.

The historical connection between Carthage and Sicily, Eryx, and Acestes,²¹⁴ about whom Dido displays her knowledge next (1.570), surfaces a few books later. As Book 5 begins, the

²¹³ See Balk 1968, 58f. Klingner 1967, 403 and 508-9, also concerned with how Ilioneus knows, disapproves and contrasts scenes between Nestor and Telemachus in Od.3, explained by Athena's appearance, and Trojans and Dido, justified by Teucer's words.

²¹⁴ Note too that in the world of the poem Acestes is not an obscure ruler (*clari nomen Acestae*, 5.106).

Trojans, having left Carthage, are compelled by adverse winds to make a stop in Sicily. Acestes spies the fleet from a promontory and runs down to meet them, dressed in a striking manner:

*at procul ex celso miratus uertice montis
aduentum sociasque rates occurrit Acestes,
horridus in iaculis et pelle Libystidis ursae* (5.35-7)

The king's garb, of which the narrator bothers to specify both the type (a bear pelt) and the origin (Libya), is far from having "no special relation to the context."²¹⁵ A vague piece of characterization is as far as previous commentators have come in explaining the detail,²¹⁶ and if Vergil wished to create such an effect through clothing, he could have easily done so by employing any epidermis without saying to which animal it used to belong. That the troublesome phrase describing the *pellis* is chosen deliberately is further suggested by its reappearance as the blanket provided by Evander on which Aeneas sleeps during his first night in Pallanteum (8.368). There Clausen suggests a contextual significance:²¹⁷ the Arcadians traced their descent to a she-bear, so Evander's bedding is fitted to his nationality.²¹⁸ A similar connection is part of the

²¹⁵ Clausen 2002, 168 n.33. Williams *ad loc* well noted the double-edged use of *horridus* in the first half of the line, which works first by transference (he bristles with spears), then concretely (with a pelt itself bristling). Later poets admired and imitated this bit of Vergilian verbal color (see Williams 1996 *ad loc*). Imitations include: Ov.*Met.* 8.285 (*setae similes rigidis hastilibus*; of a boar); Tac.*His.* 2.88 (*tergis ferarum et ingentibus telis*; of Vitellian soldiers, probably German [see Ash 2007 *ad loc*]); Val.*Fl.* 1.485-6 (*horrentem iaculis*, of a hero [Acastus, as it happens]); Sil. 8.569-70 (*horrebat telis et tergo hirsuta ferarum*; of Bruttian and Lucanian troops); Prudentius *Contr.Symm.* 2.299-300 (a polemical quotation of Vergil the pagan authority). For *horreo/horridus* with some sort of spear, but without fur, see Aeneid 10.178 (*acies...horrentibus hastis*); 11.601-2 (*ferreus hastis / horret ager*); Hor.*Sat.* 2.1.13-4 (*horrentia pills...agmina*). It is instructive that the imitators simplify; even those that retain the fur do not specify the animal to which it belonged, or its geographical origin.

²¹⁶ Williams 1996 *ad loc* says "to give a picture of the simple huntsman of an early age and a rustic society" is the "main impact" of the phrase. Heinze 1993, 167 takes it as part of an accumulation of rustic details around Acestes (including 5.40 and 301). Moskalew 1982, 95 emphasizes a "formular" significance of the re-use in Book 8 without specifying what that significance might be (the repetition is too far apart to be termed "ring formulaic," as he notes [*ibid*]). For Galinsky 1969, 167 the repetition makes parallel the reception of Aeneas by Evander with that by an earlier *agrestis*, Acestes (this connection is also suggested by Wimmel 1961); but that explains the repetition, not the phrase itself. Manganaro 1984, 295-6 suggests an interesting connection to a figure with a *pilos* on a late 5th-century Segestan tetradrachma.

²¹⁷ *ad* 8.368 Servius is worried about the bear again; for Donatus the garment indicates value; for Eden 1975 *ad loc* "something remote, exotic, valuable." Fordyce 1991 *ad loc* dismisses it as "implausible in this context."

²¹⁸ Clausen 2002, 167-8. He also suggests Eumaeus' goatskin spread for Odysseus at Od. 14.48-51 as a model (as Heyne already noted).

explanation here:²¹⁹ Servius' (*ad* 5.37; also *ad* 1.550) tells us that Acestes' mother is supposed to have been raped by his river-god father in the form of a bear. Surviving coinage suggest that the dominant tradition held him to be a dog.²²⁰

All this explains the she-bear but leaves "Libyan" unexplained.²²¹ Clausen and O'Hara search for answers in Hellenistic precedent, but we do not have enough examples of the odd adjectival form *Libystis* to know what might be the object of allusion.²²² Once the historical as well is admitted as relevant, however, we realize that Vergil would have been hard-pressed to choose any site in the western Mediterranean more closely associated with the Punic than Eryx.²²³ The cult site and the originally Elymian town were thoroughly Punicized.²²⁴ We are about to see Aeneas found a cult site (5.759-761). The appropriation of the Erycinian cult of Astarte into Roman religion during the Second Punic war, marked by the dedication of a temple in Rome to Erycinian Venus, lay within historical memory.²²⁵ This in turn had been accomplished while living men remembered the complex sequence during the First Punic War in

²¹⁹ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 5.35. The *Aeneid* contains other examples of characters who bear accoutrements made from their parent, or the type of animal their parent was. Romulus, nursed by a she-wolf, wears a wolf's pelt (1.275-6). When a bird does the siring, Cupavo, son of Cynus, wears not a pelt but the appropriate feathers (10.187-97). Aventinus, son of Hercules, wears a lion-skin (7.666-9, where the significance is explained [*horridus Herculeoque...amictu*, 669]); although Hercules was not transformed into a lion, the association of offspring with parent via animal garb holds).

²²⁰ The bear in Servius may be the commentator's retroactive correction of the tradition to bring it in line with Vergilian invention, or may suggest that the poet chose a more obscure variant.

²²¹ Ser. *ad* 5.37 questions whether this can literally mean a bear and not some other animal, since there are (he says) no bears in Africa. But see Herod. 2.67.2; 4.191.4; Martial 1.104.5; Dio Cassius 53.27; Pliny 8.83.

²²² Clausen 2002, 168 does not suggest a reason for *Libystis*, other than the decorum of an elevated reference (to Apoll. Rhod. 4.1753; or Callimachus fr.676 Pfeiffer). George 1978 suggests the reference is instead to Acastus at Apoll. Rhod. 1.321-8. O'Hara 1996, 212 senses an allusion and is agnostic.

²²³ From Erice, at the summit of the second-highest mountain in Sicily, it is possible to see Africa on a clear day — so tourist guides and hotel brochures say (e.g. <http://www.hotelmodernoerice.it/ericeeng.php>).

²²⁴ Poly. *Pyrrhus* 22; Guzzo 2012, 124-125. The Phoenicians may have founded the cult; there is little evidence of Erice as a site of worship before their arrival (Galinsky 1969, 71).

²²⁵ Another temple to the same Venus was built in 184 (Livy, 40.34.4). For Roman appropriation see Erskine 2001, 198-205; Kienast 1965; Orlin 2010, 71-76; for Astarte in Eryx see Schilling 1954, 235-239; Galinsky 1969, 244ff. Phoenician stones are visible today (I have seen them) at the base of walls in the sanctuary and the walls surrounding the town of Erice.

which the Carthaginians destroyed and resettled the lower town, the Romans seized the mountain-top citadel²²⁶ within which the sanctuary lay, the Carthaginians laid siege, and the Romans held out for years.²²⁷ Yet another tie with Africa was the annual celebration of the *ἀναγωγή* and *καταγωγή*, during which the departure and return of the local doves was believed to coincide with Venus' brief sojourn in Africa.²²⁸

The verse under examination is far from history's only intrusion into the mythical-poetic world of Book 5. Vergil spends considerable time and burns several ships to show Aeneas founding Segesta (5.715-718; 755-758). The Segestans' defection from the Carthaginian to the Romans in 263 BC, based on their supposed consanguinity, would immediately have leapt to Vergil's readers' minds.²²⁹ Lucius Scipio dedicated a temple near the Porta Capena to the *Tempestates* in 258 after his triumph to celebrate a victory over a Carthaginian fleet not far from Erice;²³⁰ Aeneas sacrifices to the *Tempestates* just before leaving Sicily (5.772). What is remarkable is not that history darts in and out of view in a land so alive with associations, but the

²²⁶ The lines immediately preceding *pelle Libystidis ursae* remind us of the dramatic topography of the area (*at procul ex celso miratus uertice montis / aduentum sociasque rates occurrit Acestes* [35-6]). I have observed approaching ships from this outpost.

²²⁷ See Miles 2011, 276.

²²⁸ Athenaeus (perhaps quoting Aristotle) 9.394; Aelian *Var.Hist.* 1.15 and *De natura animalium* 4.2; Solinus 27.8; see Schilling 1954, 242-48; Galinsky 1969, 71-72; perhaps there was a connection with the worship of Venus at Sicca. The only discussion that pursues the Libyan element here is interesting but probably makes the mistake of excessive obscurity. Braccesi 1992 proposes that Acestes' pelt is part of a pattern of references to the extra-Sicilian origins of Sicilian peoples. His argument: at 9.951-8, Arcens' son is from a region that means he must be Sicanian, and he is wearing a purple Iberian robe; from Thuc.6.2.2 we know that the Sicani were from Iberia; therefore, Vergil must be using garb to reference the extra-Sicilian origin of a people now (in the timeframe of the poem) Sicilian (see also Rizzo 1987b, who conjectures the same in passing). In the same way, Acestes wears a Libyan bear; from Thuc. 6.2 we know that the Trojans stopped off in Libya on the way to Sicily; therefore, Vergil must be using this garb to reference the migration path of the Trojans who later became the Elymians. The argument rests on a detail of a claim so obscure that it receives no other mention that I can find after Thucydides. Much more relevant is the vast array of Carthaginian associations of the area in times closer to the *Aeneid's* composition.

²²⁹ This is attested later (Diod.23.5; Zonar 8.9.12; see Erskine 2001, 178-184 n.73; Heinze 1993, 134); see Battistoni 2009 for a discussion of whether the blood connection was actually the pretext at the time. In any case, by Vergil's time the origin of the city and its help in the Punic Wars was foremost in the Roman mind (Cic.*Verr.*4.72).

²³⁰ Ov.*Fasti.*6.191-6; Russell 2015, 111; Palmer 1997, 54-6; Schilling 1954, 235-9; Erskine 2001, 198.

restraint with which Vergil keeps these associations in the background.²³¹ They are glimpses into a world of relationships unexplored in the narrative, hinted at in the tangle of covert speeches, but supported by the network of mythological aetiologies and in natural accord with the closely interconnected world of the historical Mediterranean.

1.4.4 Italians' Prior Knowledge of Trojan History

The *Aeneid's* Mediterranean is bound together so closely that even in the new world of Italy the Trojans' reputation dogs them. The Trojan embassy cannot speak before Latinus names them *Dardanidae* (7.195), and cannot answer his queries before he begins to ruminate on reports he says he has heard from local elders about their ancestry (205ff). In Pallanteum Aeneas has the chance to propose an alliance, but he does not have the chance to say his own name before Evander recalls ancient friendship with his father (8.154ff). The local holy men sing of how Heracles sacked Troy (8.288ff). In Chapter 2 we will see how the Trojan past is complex enough both to help and to hinder the Trojans in their negotiations with these two kings.²³² In the remainder of the poem, we see that the Italians are familiar with Trojans customs and religion, and have an intimate knowledge of every stage of their history.

Amata, in her plea to Latinus (7.359-72), calls the Trojans *exsules*, and says that these "Phrygians," like the shepherd Paris, are in the habit of carrying off women.²³³ *Phrygius*,

²³¹ Rizzo 1987, 222 argues that the description of the dangers of Lilybaeum (3.706) recalls the nearby Roman naval disasters of the First Punic Wars. Traill 2001 argues that Dares and Entellus recall the famous battles of the First Punic War over Eryx, compared by Polybius at length to a boxing match (Polyb 1.56-1.58). Goldschmidt 2013, esp. 109-115, argues for pervasive associations, mediated by Naevius and Ennius, of Sicily with the Punic Wars. See also Nisbet 1990, 258 and Powell 2008, 87-131 for associations with the recent naval campaigns against Sextus Pompey.

²³² See Chapter 5 for how the Carthaginians' prior knowledge of the Trojans frames the relationship of Aeneas and Dido.

²³³ Amata calls Helen Leda's daughter (364); the matronymic is appropriate in a speech in which a mother claims to be defending her endangered daughter. Turnus makes the abduction of his *coniunx* a repetition of the *casus belli* of the Trojan War (*sunt et mea contra fata mihi ferro sceleratam excindere gentem / coniuge praerepta; nec solos tangit Atridas / iste dolor; solisque licet capere arma Mycenis*, 9.136-139).

first appearing here in an Italian's mouth,²³⁴ is the contemptuous epithet of choice in Italian invective. Along with *praedo*,²³⁵ the phrase *bis capti*, a reference to Troy's sack by Hercules before its sack by the Greeks, becomes a slogan of anti-Trojan sentiment.²³⁶ Turnus knows that Aeneas is regularly aided by his mother (9.135; 12.52-53) and that Jupiter regularly helps the Trojans (9.128-129). Italians know as much about the Greeks at Troy as about the Trojans, including the Atreidae in Mycenae; Vulcan arming Achilles; a thousand ships and ten years of siege; the theft of the Palladium and the Trojan horse (9.138-155);²³⁷ the character of Ulysses (9.602).

Turnus figures himself in the place of Achilles when he wishes to fashion himself the new Trojan-slayer (9.741),²³⁸ exploits the reputation of the irresistible hero when he switches to point out the absurdity of conceiving of the Trojans as invincible (11.403-404), and even positions himself against and above Achilles when he vows to fight on even if Aeneas assumes the mantle of the best of warriors (11.438-440).²³⁹ Twice Italians pair Achilles with Diomedes because they seem to understand that these are the two who defeated Aeneas in single combat (*Il.5.297ff* [Diomedes]; *Il.20.273ff* [Achilles]). Turnus uses the pair to remind Latins near despair that these

²³⁴ In the introductory formula to this speech the adjective characterizes what is from Amata's point of view an intolerable match (*multa super natae lacrimans Phrygiisque hymenaeis*, 7.258). Used in contempt by Juno (4.103; 7.294), the word is used by Italians for the same effect again and again (7.579; 9.134; 9.599; 9.617; 9.635; 11.403; 11.484; 12.75-12.99). Later Numanus Remulus, Turnus' prospective brother-in-law but otherwise not a notable leader, knows about Trojan dress, headgear, dances, religious customs, the material with which they make their instruments, and the geography of the Troad (9.613-620). See Hardie 1994 *ad loc*; cf. 1.649; 1.711; 4.262.; 9.582; 11.768-777.

²³⁵ Amata: 7.362; Mezentius: 10.774; Latin *matres*: 11.484. As a term of invective *praedo* is drawn from Ciceronian political invective (see Opfelt 1965, 133-134).

²³⁶ Numanus Remulus: *non pudet obsidione iterum valloque teneri, / bis capti Phryges, et morti praetendere muros?* (9.598-599); answered in battle taunt by Acanius: *bis capti Phryges haec Rutulis responsa remittunt* (9.635). Turnus: *extollere viris / gentis bis victae* (11.402-402). Helenus gave a positive spin to the idea when addressing Anchises (*bis Pergameis erepte ruinis*, 3.474; cf. Anchises' *satis una superque / vidimus excidia et captae superavimus urbi*, 2.642-643). For imitations see Prop.3.1.32; Silius 1.43; Sen.Tr.133-136.

²³⁷ See Anderson 1957; Highet 1972, 87-89; Schenk 1984, 63-70.

²³⁸ *hic etiam inventum Priamo narrabis Achillem* (9.741).

²³⁹ *ibo animis contra, vel magnum praestet Achillem / factaque Volcani manibus paria induat arma / ille licet.*

particular Trojans can be defeated in battle (*nunc et Myrmidonum proceres Phrygia arma tremescunt, / nunc et Tydides et Larisaeus Achilles, / amnis et Hadriacas retro fugit Aufidus undas*; 11.403-404). Liger, partner in a chariot strike team with his brother Lucagus, speaks of himself as one not to defeat Aeneas like the Greeks did, but to surpass the Greeks by finishing what they started (*non Diomedis equos nec currum cernis Achilli / aut Phrygiae campos: nunc belli finis et aevi / his dabitur terris*, 10.581-3) The two seem to know the story of how Diomedes' companion Sthenelus made off with Aeneas' horses after Aeneas, defeated and unconscious, was spirited away first Aphrodite, then by Apollo. They need not be sure of these details²⁴⁰ to understand that the two heroes they mention were the two whom Aeneas never matched.²⁴¹

These details are drawn from the Trojan War and earlier. The body of Italian knowledge rests on matters uncontroversial in the literary tradition inherited by Vergil,²⁴² and ends before events narrated or invented by Vergil himself. The Italians know nothing about what happened to Aeneas after the sack of his city and nothing about his time in Carthage. A report of the death of Dido, or of her relationship with Aeneas, or even that the Trojans have sojourned in Carthage, has not yet been picked up and spread by *fama* to Italy. Were the story known there, it would be the most natural of arguments with which to attack Aeneas' suit for Lavinia's hand. Amata would surely have made Aeneas' abandonment of Dido an example of the Trojans' perfidious conduct toward women, instead of or in addition to the reference to Paris she chooses. Her words do

²⁴⁰ Lucagus, Liger's brother, begs for his life by a reference to Aeneas' parents (*per te, per qui te talem genuere parentes, / vir Troiane, sine hanc animam et miserere precantis*, 10.597-98) as if he does not know they are, or that Venus is one of them, but this might easily be a formulaic appeal rather than a mark of ignorance.

²⁴¹ Even before the fight in *Iliad* 20, Aeneas, with winning honesty, tells how he was put to flight by Achilles in a battle in the satellite towns of Troy (*Il.20.87-93*).

²⁴² For an exception, Diomedes' speech in Book 11, see below (3.6)

remind the reader, however, of Carthage: *quam primo Aquilone relinquet* repeats Dido's vocabulary of abandonment²⁴³ and the idea that change of winds allows departure,²⁴⁴ but the antecedent of *quam* is the aggrieved mother, not the woman to whom Aeneas will be joined. The half-line *thalamos ne desere pactos* sounds like Dido pleading with Aeneas not to leave her,²⁴⁵ but it is Turnus sarcastically taunting Aeneas — as he thinks; it is an *imago* — for running away from the marriage that has been arranged with Lavinia. This formally ironic arrangement in which the character's words mean more to the reader than the character can know is the mirror image of the arrangement analyzed at the beginning of this chapter, in which the reader must catch a glimpse of a knowing character's otherwise inaccessible knowledge by careful attention to a word or two of his speech.

1.5 Conclusion

Unexplained knowledge of foes is the norm in Homer.²⁴⁶ Vergil rests much more on this convention in Italian battle taunts than he does in the Trojans' wanderings. He also had reflexive and self-conscious references to the literary tradition, unknown to Homer, at his disposal. Ross and Hinds discuss how the Augustan poets' characters mark memory of their mythical and their specifically literary pasts.²⁴⁷ Vergil is very sparing in his use of memory-words to mark such intertextual recall, however.²⁴⁸ The principle seems to be closer to that of characters as perspicuous readers of the tradition.

²⁴³ *relinquere* in Book 4 of abandonment of Dido: 281; 466; see also 315; 432; 495.

²⁴⁴ 4.52-53; 4.309-311; 4.430.

²⁴⁵ Dido uses *desere* at 4.323 and 330 (the narrator at 4.582); *fugio* 4.314; *thalamus* 4.495 and 550. Juno: *pactosque hymenaeos* (4.109).

²⁴⁶ See Introduction above for examples, with critical reaction ancient and modern.

²⁴⁷ See Ross 1975 (who follows Norden 1957 *ad* 6.14) and Hinds 1998.

²⁴⁸ For a reflexive literary marker see Papanghelis 1999 on Aeneas rereading (*relegens*) Odysseus' travels. For a misremembering marked by such a word see below (5.7).

Although no Italian cites his source when speaking of the Trojans and the Trojan War, we should recall that the Greeks are scattered across the map just like those of Trojan blood,²⁴⁹ and that they too tell stories. Dido cites as source for her extensive knowledge of the Trojans' past the account of Teucer, veteran of the Trojan War, exile from his Greek home, who served under her father in Cyprus (1.619ff). Italy is full of Greeks, settled in Magna Graecia in accordance with the myths created to account for historical settlements.²⁵⁰ During the poem lines of communication with Diomedes are opened up.²⁵¹ Agamemnon's son marches in the Latin army.²⁵² The peninsula is even more densely stocked with *reliquae* of the Trojan past, both people and memories, than are Sicily or the "old world" of the eastern Mediterranean. The moment that we see through Aeneas's eyes (*videt*, 1.456; *videbat* 466) Trojan history carved on a far-off land by a people the Trojans have never met is as much an announcement to us readers of what sort of world is to come, what sort of influence *fama* exercises in this world, as it is a source of grief and hope to Aeneas himself.²⁵³ Although the scope of Trojans' wandering may leave the impression that Aeneas is "constantly having to introduce himself to new hosts,"²⁵⁴ never once does he introduce himself to someone who does not already know who he is.²⁵⁵ The Trojan diaspora hosts many of his landfalls (Polydorus in Thrace; Anius in Delos; Helenus and

²⁴⁹ Aeneas in Book 1: *nec quicquid ubique est / gentis Dardaniae, magnum quae sparsa per orbem* (1.601-602).

²⁵⁰ 3.395; see below (Chapter 2)

²⁵¹ 8.9ff.

²⁵² Halaesus *Agamemnonius* (7.723; see Horsfall 2001 *ad loc* for the patronymic; Ahl 2007 *ad* 723 doubts that he is Agamemnon's son.

²⁵³ For this scene see Chapter 5 below (5.4). For a discussion of why Aeneas' spirit might be buoyed by the preservation of his people by *fama*, even through pictures that do not seem to be made in a spirit of sympathy, see Stewart 1971-2, 117-120.

²⁵⁴ Barchiesi 1999, 334.

²⁵⁵ He thinks he is doing so when speaking to Venus in Libya (1.372ff) and Evander (8.127ff). In the former case he introduces himself fully, in the latter he does not; in both cases his addressee knows who he is. We have no reason to believe that the Etruscans (10.148-154) know who Aeneas is. What might be a tedious or a fascinating scene of introductions and negotiation is given in an indirect report.

Andromache in Epirus; Acestes in Sicily). The Harpies on the Strophades and the Sibyl in Cumae possess privileged divine knowledge and name him before he can speak. Achaemenides' presence means that even in the land of the Cyclopes the Trojans find a figment of their past. In the Carthaginians the Trojans come upon the people perhaps most knowledgable of their past.²⁵⁶ Throughout a story in which a people make so many landfalls on a wandering course over all the Mediterranean, the emotion informing most scenes is not wonder at a new kind of men or custom, but the jolt of recognition of heroes and peoples from the past. The verb *agnoscere* punctuates Trojan wanderings of the first and third books especially, and characterizes reactions by them and to them throughout. It is used when Aeneas sees for certain that the welcoming and exotic local was his mother all along (1.405-406); when Aeneas in a strange land sees his past pictured (1.470; 488); when Anius recognizes his old friend Anchises (3.82); when Helenus recognizes his own people (3.347); when Evander, even further removed in time and blood, recognizes the son of his old friend (8.154-155).²⁵⁷ The centrality of memory, the dominance of the themes of repetition and return, require the renunciation of scenes of first meeting and concealment of identity, like those in earlier epics of wandering (the *Odyssey* and *Argonautica*), and require the construction of a world, bound together by swift-moving rumor and by historical connection, in which almost everyone knows a great deal about almost everyone else.

²⁵⁶ Dido's prior knowledge is discussed more fully below in Chapter 5.

²⁵⁷ *agnoscere*: 1.470 (A. sees Rhesus); 1.488 (A. sees himself); 1.406 (A. sees his mother); 2.422 (Greeks recognize that A. is in Greek arms); 3.82 (Anius sees Anchises); 3.173 (A. sees Penates); 3.180 (Anchises realizes true ancestry); 3.347 (Helenus sees Trojans); 3.351 (A. sees Troy); 4.23 (Dido feels love again); 5.576 (Trojans see faces of ancestors in youth); 5.679 (Trojades come back to their senses after being maddened); 6.193 (A. sees doves); 6.407 (Charon sees branch); 6.452 (A. sees Dido); 6.498 (A. sees Deiphobus); 8.155 (Evander sees A.); 8.531 (A. hears noise, recalls his mother's promises); 9.16 (Turnus sees Iris); 9.457 (Latins see spoils after Nisus and Euryalus); 9.659 (leaders recognize Apollo); 9.734 (Trojans see Turnus within camp); 10.224 (nymphs see A.); 10.843 (Mezentius hears men mourning Lausus); 10.874 (A. sees Mezentius); 11.910 (Turnus hears A.'s army behind him); 12.260 (Tolumnius sees an omen). Tarrant 2012 *ad* 12.632 agrees with Hardie 1994 *ad* 9.734, who reads the verb as an echo of "tragic recognition" and points out that often its grammatical object is a deity or divine signal.

Tracking which characters know what — or seem to know; or should know — trains the reader to keep two things in mind: first, the distinction between what is narratively authorized and what rests solely on an unauthorized internal narrator; second, the idea that each character has his own reason, “character motivation,” to speak a name, choose a detail, or refer to a story. Both these skills are necessary for understanding the directedness of each speech, its underlying purpose and rhetorical strategy, and its use of covert or indirect rhetoric. The reader trained to pay attention to these matters will better understand the three diplomatic exchanges most important to the narrative: the formation of alliances in Italy (Book 7-8; discussed in Chapter 2), the internal disputes and war negotiations in Italy (Books 10-12; discussed in Chapter 3), and Aeneas’ strategies of self-presentation to Dido and the Carthaginians (Books 1 to 4; discussed in Chapter 5).

CHAPTER 2: DIPLOMATIC USE OF KNOWLEDGE IN ITALY

Introduction

Speakers in the *Aeneid* do not speak only in order to dispense information or advance the plot. When they are engaged in negotiation, they try to advance their own interest; when they know that they know more than their addressees, they often try to use the situation to their advantage;. These are the two interpretive principles through which I read the diplomatic exchanges between Ilioneus and Latinus in Book 7 and Aeneas and Evander in Book 8. In the second half of the poem a people make landfall with grand ideas about what they will do in a new land, about what they are owed by divine right, and about what is their historical relationship to this land; they approach the natives peacefully and try to broker a mutually satisfactory deal; war breaks out; each side hastens to procure allies. This sequence offers characters the opportunity to use rhetorical tactics of self-presentation and persuasion that depend upon an asymmetry in knowledge. The Trojans advance their claims and try each time to obtain from the local king what they need. The Italian kings try to control the new arrivals by exploiting their own superiority in knowledge. They conceal, distort, and artfully arrange their account of local affairs in order to win an alliance on favorable terms.

2.1 Wartime Diplomacy

2.1.1 Venulus' Embassy

For a paradigm of manipulative diplomacy I begin a passage, after the war has broken out, in which manipulation is easier to detect. Book 8 opens with the leaders of the anti-Trojan alliance, catalogued at the end of Book 7, gathering more men (8.1-9). Before the narrative

returns to Aeneas, a certain Venulus is sent, we are not told exactly by whom, as an envoy to Diomedes, now resident in Arpi far to the south. The persuasive strategy this ambassador is to use is laid out in detail:

*mittitur et magni Venulus Diomedis ad urbem
qui petat auxilium, et Latio consistere Teucros,
aduectum Aenean classi uictosque penatis
inferre et fatis regem se dicere posci
edoceat, multasque uiro se adiungere gentis
Dardanio et late Latio increbrescere nomen:
quid struat his coeptis, quem, si fortuna sequatur,
euentum pugnae cupiat, manifestius ipsi
quam Turno regi aut regi apparere Latino.* (8.9-17)

Venulus is to inform the exiled Argive that Teucrians have landed and settled in Latium (10); that Aeneas has brought to Latium Troy's defeated *penates* (11-2); that he is claiming the support of the fates for his claim to be king (12); that many peoples are joining this Dardanian (12-3);²⁵⁸ that his reputation and power are already widespread and still growing (13). The final and flattering assertion is to be that Diomedes will know better than either Turnus or Latinus what Aeneas' long-term plans are (15-7). Venulus is to appear as if with a report (*edoceat*)²⁵⁹ and leave Diomedes to make the conclusion that it will be in his best interests to interfere.²⁶⁰ No direct reference is made to Diomedes' previous engagement with the Trojans, but the dispatcher's

²⁵⁸ Eden 1975 *ad* 10ff argues that the naming of Aeneas as a *Dardanius vir* is meant to insinuate that he is gathering allies by claiming kinship with Italian peoples.

²⁵⁹ *Edocere* should mean neutral reporting, perhaps by a messenger or informant, and not a legate's persuasive speech (e.g. *edoctisque Carthaginiensibus in quanto res Syracusana discrimine esset*, Liv.25.25.13; *cum M. Aurelius legatus uenisset edocuissetque eum quantos exercitus, quantum nauium numerum comparasset rex*, 31.3.4; *Cicero per legatos cuncta edoctus*, Sall.Cat.45; *ac ni C. Memmius...populum Romanum edocuisset id agi*, Sall.Bell.Jug.27). Earlier Aeneas had no reason not to tell Acestes what Anchises' phantom had told him (*extemplo socios primumque accersit Acesten / et Iouis imperium et cari praecepta parentis / edocet et quae nunc animo sententia constat*, 5.746-8), but later he has very strong reasons to give an account favorable to himself (*regem adit et regi memorat nomenque genusque / quidue petat quidue ipse ferat, Mezentius arma / quae sibi conciliet, uiolentaque pectora Turni / edocet*, 10.149-52). Here in Book 8 the connotation reflects not the narrator's opinion of what is to happen -- that Venulus will in fact be delivering a colorless report -- but the tone that the dispatching leaders wish their legate to assume.

²⁶⁰ Diomedes in his response presents himself not as one turning down suppliants for help but as one rejecting advice and giving some in return: *ne uero ne me ad talis impellite pugnas* (278), he says, not *ne auxilium petite*.

knowledge of Diomedes' role in the siege and destruction of Troy is obvious. Less clear but presumably active is their knowledge that Aeneas was a personal rival with whom Diomedes successfully exchanged blows.²⁶¹

2.1.2 Paradigm of Diplomatic Falsehood

There are at least three falsehoods in the embassy's account: (1) Aeneas has not claimed that he is "the king" or "a king" demanded by the fates (v.12); (2) no *gens* has joined itself to Aeneas (v.13); (3) neither we readers nor the dispatchers of the embassy have any reason to believe that Aeneas has designs on the rest of Italy, still less on Diomedes' lands in particular, as the speech is designed to imply (vv.15ff).²⁶² Even the harmless-looking final line misrepresents a small but important point. The formulation *Turno regi aut regi...Latino* (17) is an appropriately formal diplomatic sign-off,²⁶³ but it also does two extra pieces of work: it positions Turnus and Latinus as equals in kingship, and it implies that Turnus and Latinus are equally responsible for the embassy. In fact Latinus has withdrawn from public affairs and Turnus and his allies are giving orders.²⁶⁴

The first claim, that Aeneas is saying that the fates are demanding him as king (*fatis regem se dicere posci*) can be shown to be false by authorized narrative.²⁶⁵ The Trojans have said

²⁶¹ For the plausibility of this idea see above (Chapter 1). Dido knows from Teucer (1.619-26) of Aeneas' record against Diomedes (1.752).

²⁶² Wiesen 1973, 741; Servius and Donatus *ad loc* catalogue other subtleties of the persuasive technique. To these Eden 1975 *ad* 15 adds a note on the sinister implications of *struere*.

²⁶³ Eden 1975 *ad loc* compares the same repetition in other diplomatic contexts: 10.149 (*regem adit et regi memorat nomenque genusque*) and 11.294 (*et responsa simul quae sint, rex optime, regis / audisti*).

²⁶⁴ Latinus had publicly lodged his objections (594-599) before yielding (599-600, *nec plura locutus / saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas*), and even then he only abrogates responsibility and still refuses to participate in the ritual opening of the war (616-619). At 8.6-7 the leaders in command of martial preparations are listed (*ductores primi Messapus et Vlfens / contemptorque deum Mezentius*). Cairns 1989, 68 notes the deception; Balk 1968, 85 is uncomprehending.

²⁶⁵ The formula may be perceptive, however; Aeneas is the sort to make such a claim, as his earlier formulation (*non indebita posco / regna meis fatis*, 6.66-7) and the later partial echo (*poscor Olympo*, 8.533) show.

nothing about kingship. Below I will argue that the Trojans' diplomatic approach to the Latins is a less than humble appeal, but that embassy claims that the fates drove the Trojans to Italy, not that they drove Aeneas to become king over the Latins, or anywhere on the peninsula. Even a reading sensitive to the force of Ilioneus' demand for land cannot stretch them to include a demand to take over Latinus' city or office. The reference to kingship here in Book 8 makes sense only if it refers to Aeneas' briefly prospective engagement to Lavinia: if he marries the princess, he will eventually be king. We cannot be sure how much Diomedes is expected by Turnus and his comrades to know about Lavinia, so it might be plausible that the accusatory phrase is intentionally ambiguous, able to convince, depending on how much Diomedes knows, either as a truism — demanding kingship is the sort of thing foreign invaders do — or as a tendentious reference to what Aeneas has done by (supposedly) demanding marriage into the Latin royal family.

However, Vergil has laid a trail of evidence to suggest that Venulus' reference to kingship is meant to exploit the currency of reports of the two prophecies about Lavinia.²⁶⁶ The formulation Venulus is supposed to use (*fatis...posci*) echoes the explanation of the prophecy Latinus gave to the Trojans in public (*poscere fata*; 7.272-3), when he knew the Latins, who know the prophecy, were listening.²⁶⁷ This interpretation is made plausible by, and explains the force of, an earlier detail: Latinus does not suppress the content of Faunus' prophecy, and it is carried swiftly by *fama* through the cities of Italy by the time the Trojans arrive (*haec*

²⁶⁶ So Eden 1975, 10 takes it ("he is claiming to be the fated king of Latium [according to the oracle of Faunus]"), but without suggesting how either the dispatchers of the embassy or we readers are to suppose Diomedes knows about the oracle.

²⁶⁷ For the collocation of *fata* and *poscere* as the language of prophecy see also Evander's formulation of the other *externus*-prophecy (*fatis huc te poscentibus adfers* [8.477] and *quem numina poscunt* [512]); cf. also 2.121; 5.707; 4.614.

responsa....circum late volitans iam Fama per urbes / Ausonias tulerat, cum Laomedontia pubes...[7.102-5]). The purpose of Vergil's specification of how and when information was widely disseminated is revealed, and a line otherwise routine ("something happened; then *Fama* reported it") suddenly gains precise purpose. The embassy's words are chosen to make Diomedes think that Aeneas is proclaiming that he is the king demanded by the fates in these widely-reported omens concerning Lavinia's future.

The second falsehood in Venulus' embassy, the claim that many peoples have already joined themselves to Aeneas,²⁶⁸ is the same tactic found in the recent Trojan diplomatic speech to Latinus. Ilioneus used the same *iunctura* (*adiungere gentis*, 8.17) to claim that many peoples have desired to and tried to join themselves to the Trojans (7.236-8, *multi nos populi, multae...et petiere sibi et uoluerunt adiungere gentes*).²⁶⁹ Even without this *comparandum* from Book 8, the inevitable claims that this is a result of incompleteness and inconsistency, or events we do not know about,²⁷⁰ are attempts to avoid the conclusion that it is the sort of fabrication or distortion made by a speaker who calculates that his addressee is in no position to know anything about the events to which the speaker refers. The idea that Ilioneus is not speaking in strict adherence to the truth is supported by the parallel in Venulus' embassy, which depends in the same way on the speaker's supposition that the addressee cannot have his own source of information against which to check the speaker's claims.

²⁶⁸ Eden 1975 and Fordyce 1991 note the falsehood.

²⁶⁹ Fordyce 1991 *ad* 8.13: "a diplomatic misrepresentation like that which Ilioneus offers as 7.238."

²⁷⁰ Balk 1968, 64 n.4 understands that the other offers occurred at some point, but were left unreported in Book 2-3. For a proper reading of this passage see Hight 1972, 287 and Fordyce 1991 *ad loc.*; Horsfall 2000 *ad loc.* is vague: "TCD more sensibly concentrates on V.'s concern to bring off a truly impressive statement (however imprecise) of the Trojans' paradoxical popularity." Vergil is not concerned to say anything of the sort; Ilioneus is.

Aeneas soon takes one step further the tactic of the third piece of manipulation in Venulus' embassy, the intimation that an enemy is planning much more than what he has just begun. In his speech to Evander, Aeneas groundlessly claims insight into his enemies' intentions, saying that they believe that they will be able to send all Italy under the yoke if they drive off the Trojans (*nos si pellant nihil afore credunt / quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant, / et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra*, 8.147-9). Venulus is supposed to say that he is deferring to Diomedes' superior knowledge of a third party's character and intentions;²⁷¹ Aeneas claims that he himself has knowledge of the third party's motivations and assessments of the likely future (8.147-9, esp. *credunt*), and goes on to say what they are.²⁷² The lesson of these parallels is twofold: first, speakers who wish to accomplish the *realpolitik* goal of creating an alliance and defining its terms exploit their advantage in the balance of knowledge by fabricating, distorting, selecting, and ordering facts in their "reports" to their less-knowing addressees; second, this sort of manipulation for the purpose of deception is not a means by which the poet characterizes one side's moral unworthiness, but is employed equally by both sides of the Italian *discordia*.

In wartime diplomacy such as Venulus' embassy, propaganda and spin grow bolder. In the moments before the battle-lines are drawn, however, the Trojans and the rulers in whose land they arrive try more subtly to gain an alliance on their own terms. The exchanges between Ilioneus and Latinus (7.195-285) and Aeneas and Evander (8.126-74) are not unrelated to the

²⁷¹ Eden 1975, 61 notes the parallel.

²⁷² Conington 1876 *ad loc* draws the connection: "Like his opponents (vv. 13, 17), Aeneas seems to think it part of diplomatic policy to exaggerate facts and attribute motives."; Fordyce 1991 *ad* 146: "In these lines Aeneas' diplomacy rests its case on total misrepresentation: for the Italians have done no more than repel the Trojan incomers and there has been no suggestion that they even have designs on anything that is not their own." See also Wiesen 1973, 750.

chaos and enmity that follow. In each exchange neither side is wholly benign in intent or straightforwardly friendly in tone,²⁷³ and no speech can be read as the poet's introduction of themes essential to his communication with the reader without also considering the character's strategy to persuade his addressees. The Trojans' first task is to obtain the local ruler's permission to carve out their own territory on the Tiber banks. After the outbreak of war, surrounded by enemies, they approach the Arcadians in Pallanteum to gain allies. Above I have argued that the rhetorical tactics of each Trojan speaker correspond closely to the diplomatic falsehoods of the Latins in Venulus' embassy. Latinus and Evander, for their part, are neither naive victims of deception nor gratuitously generous. They have definite practical and political aims in their speeches that, although they can be incorporated into a mutually beneficial arrangement, are yet shaped by self-interest. The Trojans are a military force that must be either a threat or an ally in warlike and chaotic Italy. In both cases the kings wish to determine the terms of the relationship and alliance, and in neither case are the terms the king desires the same as those the Trojans propose.

Character motivation is more than usually hard to read in Evander's case, and the rare direct insight into motivation in Latinus' case is, because incomplete, misleading. In Chapter 1 I proposed a reading of character motivation perceptible in a few lines in the structurally parallel diplomatic exchange at an initial meeting: Ilioneus and Dido in Book 1.²⁷⁴ This reading had two advantages: it explained what would otherwise be unmotivated word choices and otiose arguments, and it showed how Dido worked to disprove the newcomer's characterization of her people as ignorant even as she excused the initial hostility that provoked Ilioneus' indignant

²⁷³ For wholly sanguine views of the Italian king's motivation and character see Introduction above (II.2.2).

²⁷⁴ For the connection between the two scenes see Balk 1968, 73.

rebuke. It is, or should be, obvious that the situation in which the exchange between Latinus and Ilioneus takes place is also fraught with tension. The Trojans have landed uninvited in Latinus' lands, just as they did in Dido's; this time they do not remonstrate and ask for an interlude in which to refit, but request a piece of the ruler's land in which to settle.

To understand the two Italian kings' motivations we must piece together the full picture of the demanding circumstances in which they negotiate. After the Trojan landfall the narrator says that he will tell what was the situation in Italy at the moment the Trojans docked in the Tiber mouth (7.37-45). He then tells that Latinus has ruled in peace for a long while (*rex arva Latinus et urbes / iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat*, 46-47) and describes at length that king's ancestors, palace, and two omens concerning his daughter. There is not a word of Latinus' relationship to any king or people outside his borders. The complete picture of the chaotic ethnic, political, and military state of Italy must therefore be pieced together from later narrative and speech, using what we learn after, and sometimes long after, the moment Ilioneus begins to speak before Latinus' throne. This dislocation of contextual exposition makes it difficult on a first reading to understand what Latinus and Evander want other than to help Aeneas, or what they have been doing other than waiting to help him when he gets there. Only later do we learn that, when the Trojans find them, Latinus and Evander are trying to rule territory in an Italy roiled by wars and disrupted by foreign arrival, and that the allies of the one are fighting the other.

2.2 Status Italiae

2.2.1 Status Italiae: A Promise

As Vergil begins his *maius opus*, the second half of the *Aeneid*, he seems to promise a full assessment of the state of Italy (7.37-45):

*Nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora, rerum
 quis Latio antiquo fuerit status, aduena classem
 cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris,
 expediam, et primae reuocabo exordia pugnae. 40
 tu uatem, tu, diua, mone. dicam horrida bella,
 dicam acies actosque animis in funera reges,
 Tyrrhenamque manum totamque sub arma coactam
 Hesperiam. maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo,
 maius opus moueo. (7.38-45)*

The narrator will tell of three topics: (1) the situation when the Trojans arrived (37-40a, objects of *expediam*, limited by the *cum*-clause); (2) how the battle began (40, object of *revocabo*); (3) the war as a whole (41-5, objects of repeated *dicam*). The last promise, set off from the first two by a re-invocation of the Muse (*tu...tu diua*), is fulfilled through the last six books. The second promise, to call back (*revocare*) the beginning of the war (*exordia pugnae*, 40), is fulfilled by the narrative extending from Iuno's reappearance and renewed interference (286ff) through the first exchange of blows (519ff) to the spread of the war and the catalogue that closes the book. What remains is to lay out (*expedire*) the objects of the first promise (37-8): the *tempora*, the *reges*, and the *status* of Latium.²⁷⁵ This is the only portion of the program limited by the *cum*-clause to the situation at the moment the Trojans arrived (*advena classem / cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris*, 39-40). The narrator spends sixty-one verses (46-106) on Latinus, his ancestry, his daughter, her suitors, and the prophecies about her future, before he completes the ring composition (*cum Laomedontia pubes / gramineo ripae religauit ab aggere classem*, 105-6).

²⁷⁵ The question of whether we should take *rerum* with *status* only or with all three is interesting but not essential to my point here. See Horsfall 2000 *ad loc* for bibliography; he favors taking it with *status* only (*status rerum* is almost a technical historiographical phrase: Tac. Ann. 1.2.2 Hist. 1.11.3 esp. Liv. 8.13.2; 27.1.1; 34.22.4; 23.34.10); for argument to contrast see Servius, Conington 1876, Fordyce, 1991 Gransden 1976.

Therefore, until the narrative resumes with the Trojan arrival (107), he need only describe the kings (*reges*), recent events (*tempora*),²⁷⁶ and situation (*status*)²⁷⁷ of *Latium antiquum* (38).

Misdirection here is twofold. Vergil delimits his subject matter so precisely that much lies outside these bounds. A *status rerum* of Latium does not include much of what we would want to know about Italy, and therefore leaves out much that is necessary for an understanding of characters' actions. Who Latinus' people are is not told. Whatever of Latium is outside his direct control is omitted. There is a great deal about Latinus and Turnus, but nothing of the many other Latin rulers (*reges*) who will be players in the coming war. Most important is that, even as we are told of Latinus' domestic and dynastic situation, we hear nothing of what we will later learn is a bloody conflict in which some Latins are engaged. In light of subsequent events, these introductory verses, along with direct characterizations such as *longa placidas in pace regebat* (47) and *ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante* (623), advertised as a setting of the scene so that we can understand the reception of the Trojans in Italy, must be understood not to have done justice to of the fierce and warlike character of the natives. This is to speak of omissions only in the region in which Aeneas lands. Outside of Latium everything is left out: the histories,

²⁷⁶ That is, "the recent events" or "the situation created by recent events" -- not necessarily disastrous, but not good unless with an adjective so indicating. See Forcellini 1771: *Item res ipsae et causae et negotia, calamitates, discrimina, eventus, temporis appellatione significantur.* The word in this sense is as prosaic and political as *status*, and unique in the *Aeneid*. Conington 1876 *ad loc* compares *rei publicae tempus* in Cicero (to which add the historians, e.g. Liv.13.52; 33.31.5; Tac.*Agric.*2.41; Ann.1.10.1).

²⁷⁷ In the historians *status rerum* indicates only the circumstance at one moment that follow from immediately preceding events. In this respect the broad scope of *rerum Romanarum status* at Tac.Hist.1.11.3 is anomalous (Tacitus too rings his his *status rerum: cum Servius Galba* rings with the opening at 1.1.1. *initium mihi operis Servius Galba...*). In the other examples quoted above (**n.X**) only the immediate circumstances and not a comprehensive description are meant (e.g. Livy 8.13.2: *iam Latio is status erat rerum ut neque bellum neque pacem pati possent; ad bellum opes deerant; pacem ob agri adempti dolorem aspernantur*). Contrast this with the usage of *status rei publicae* that indicates the political arrangement or form of government (as in the *optimus status* of Suet.Aug.28.2; Aug.in Gell.15.7.3; Sen.*deBen.*2.20.2 [*civitatis* instead of *rerum*]). For further historiographical echoes in this Vergilian proem see Ash 2002, 262-4.

peoples, and rulers of Etruria, Campania, and Magna Graecia, and their relationships with each other.

2.2.2 The State of Italy Assembled

The state of all Italy at the time of the Trojans' arrival motivates the kings of Italy in Books 7 and 8. Latinus and Evander respond to the situation of Italy that Vergil invents, not that of Vergil's historical record, and not that of the archaeological record available to us.²⁷⁸ In Chapter 1 I tracked what the Italians seem to know about the Trojans and their history with evidence from all six of the latter books of the epic. Here I will attempt the same task for the state of Italy: to assemble references from the whole poem to construct a picture of what Italy was like, what was already true, at the open of Book 7. We can deduce much of the relevant history over the preceding few generations as well as many of the circumstances immediately preceding Aeneas' arrival that the narrator leaves out of his initial *status rerum*.²⁷⁹

In the south, as Helenus — so Aeneas tells Dido — warned the Trojans, Greeks dominate all the lands to “this side” of the Straits of Messina (3.396-8): Ozolian Locrians under Ajax in Locri, Cretans under Idomeneus in Sallentinum, Thessalians from Meliboea under Philoctetes in Petelia (3.399-402). Helenus' words concerning one region suggest ongoing warfare (*Sallentinos obsedit milite campos*, 400). We may suspect that not in Sallentinum only have these city-founders (*posuerunt moenia*, 399) failed to find uninhabited deserts or live in unbroken harmony

²⁷⁸ For a comparison of Vergil's Italy with the historical and archaeological record see Rehm 1932 and Della Corte 1972.

²⁷⁹ The most important attempts to describe the fractured state of Italy are Moorton 1989 and Adler 2003, esp. 167-192.

with the natives, but we know nothing of the original inhabitants of the south.²⁸⁰ Diomedes makes no appearance yet, but when Venulus meets him he seems to be in a military camp (*Argiva castra*, 11. 243) even as he founds Arpi/Argyripa (*condebat*, 247) after an unspecified conquest of locals.²⁸¹

In Latium Latinus, a king of lengthy reign (7.45-6), traces his ancestry back to Saturn, and his people take pride in this descent (7.47-50). His only child, a daughter, is courted by suitors from both within and without her people (54-5). A prophecy that she is destined for an *externus gener* has been twice delivered, and knowledge of it has been disseminated through all the cities of Italy (7.56-105). This is not the only time news spreads quickly beyond Latinus' borders (cf. the news of the Trojans' landing [7.436-7]). Exactly how far Latinus' authority extends beyond his never-named city is not clear.²⁸² The precise terms of the political arrangements between Latinus and the allies summoned in the Book 7 catalogue, including Turnus and the Rutulians, as well as the men impressed nearby (8.7-8), is never made clear. Of the five Latin cities singled out as centers of the production of arms once the war has begun²⁸³ we cannot be sure which, if any, besides the Rutulians' Ardea retain some sort of independence from Latinus. The Rutulians are effectively ruled by Turnus, who is called *rex* and who seems to

²⁸⁰ The narrator's description of Cumae (*Euboicis Cumarum...oris* [6.2]; 6.17; 6.42; 9.710) seems not to refer to the timeframe of the poem; the Trojans find no Greeks there. (It is not really "anachronistic" [Austen 1977 *ad* 6.2], any more than the Greeks long-established in Italy are anachronistic. Reference to Cumae as Euboean is never in the mouth or thoughts of a character, always in the narrative, with the contemporary reader as audience.)

²⁸¹ The epithet *victor* (247) refers to something more recent than Troy, probably to Diomedes' defeat of the Messapians on behalf of his father-in-law (or prospective father-in-law) Daunus (see Horsfall 2003 *ad* 11.247).

²⁸² On Vergil's choice never to name the city see below (5.1.4).

²⁸³ Atina or Amitina, Tibur, Ardea, Crustumarium, and Antemnae (7.629-31).

exercise regal power despite his father's survival.²⁸⁴ Amata's argument for calling Turnus an eligible *externus gener* is that his homeland is *terra...libera sceptris nostris* (7.367-71).²⁸⁵ In origin their leaders are Greek, Argive through Acrisius, father of Danae. Amata's argument and Turnus' armor show that, although his stock has been in Italy for generations and they seem well assimilated, they retain strong markers of Greek identity; to the narrator they are *Argiva pubes* (7.794).²⁸⁶ Italy is such a checkerboard of peoples, an "ethnic melange,"²⁸⁷ that sovereignty over even a small part of it, here Ardea, includes the command of *Auruncae manus* (native Italians?),²⁸⁸ Sicani (Sicilian arrivals long ago),²⁸⁹ mysterious *Sacranae acies* (possibly Cretan settlers), and Labici. It is possible that the diversity of Rutulian subjects is a result of the recent expansion of their power: Turnus has captured cities, as well as the concomitant reputation and trappings of victory.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁴ 10.16 (*Dauno...parenti*). The father's name in the genitive is definitional of Ardea at 688 (*patris antiquam Dauni defertur ad urbem*), just as is Latinus' of his city. 12.22 reassures us, if we need it in addition to his evident command throughout, that Turnus is in charge (*sunt tibi regna patris Dauni*). At 12.90 Turnus has, but forgets, his father's invincible sword, a gift of Vulcan. Daunus is old (*longaevi*, 12.44; *Dauni miserere senectae*, 12.934). I am not sure that Russi 1984 "pur continuando a mantenere il titolo regale, di fatto ha ceduto il potere al figlio" is right either. There is no indication that Daunus maintains the title "king," while Turnus is called *rex* with great frequency by both characters and narrator (e.g. 8.17; 9.274; 9.327; 9.369; 9.728; 10.268; 12.265; but note that Ascanius is *rex* at 12.26).

²⁸⁵ The only verse in which the Rutulians' independence is not clear is 7.650, where Turnus is *Lauren* the adjective properly indicates Latinus' people; e.g., 7.47; 63; 171; 342; 8.38). Perhaps here the adjective is geographical, as in Livy's *ager Laurens* (1.1.4; also Varro 3.13.2).

²⁸⁶ Turnus' helmet and shield at 7.785-92. Brent 2004 argues that Turnus is connected to Dido by common descent from Io.

²⁸⁷ Moorton 1989, 119.

²⁸⁸ At 8.327-8 — if this is the same group — they seem to be the *manus Ausonia*, and therefore the first generation of immigrants; but this is in Evander's telling.

²⁸⁹ See Servius *ad* 1.533; 7.206; for their arrival see Evander's story at 8.328-9 (= *Ausones*); Latinus groups them again with the Aurunci and Rutuli (11.317-8).

²⁹⁰ Turnus' past campaigns: 9.360-4; 11.224 with 385-6; 11.336; 12.22-3 with 7.474 and 7.426; 12.92-100; at 10.280-2 he reminds his men of the martial glories of their fathers (*nunc coniugis esto / quisque suae tectique memor, nunc magna referto / facta, patrum laudes*). Other examples are: the story of Camilla's father Metabus, who was driven from his kingdom by subjects aggrieved by his overweening exercises of power (Moorton 1989, 116-7 points out the parallels to Mezentius); the elaborate back-story of Rhamnes' trappings, gifts securing alliance between a Caedicus and Remulus, that were later taken as war-spoils by Rutulians (9.359ff).

Each region within Italy, including Latium, Campania, and Etruria, is heterogenous and thickly settled by outsiders. Samnite soldiers, or at least weapons, are in the employ of the Latin Aventinus (665). Greeks are well-represented among recent settlers in Latium and Campania.²⁹¹ Besides the Rutulian ruling house, the Tiburtines are also Argive in origin (672).²⁹² Oebalus is a second-generation Teloeboan from Western Acarnania, son of Telon and a nymph of a local Campanian river, the Sebethus.²⁹³ Halaesus is the bastard of Agememnon (723, esp. *Troiani nominis hostis*),²⁹⁴ but now leads Auruncans, Oscans, and Sidicini (727-730).²⁹⁵ Arcens' unnamed son spent his childhood in Sicily, so either he or his father has resettled on the mainland.²⁹⁶ Etruscan Pisa's origin is Elean.²⁹⁷ Vergil's own Mantua is paradigmatic: it has three regions, each inhabited by four peoples. The Greeks in Magna Graecia against whom Helenus warns Aeneas (3.396-402) are Trojan War veterans; it is for this reason that they are *mali*, and are assumed to be hostile to any Trojans. The same is not true for all of Greek origin.

Vergil does not fail to exploit the possibility for pathos that the lives of these displaced men suggests. The dying thoughts of Antores, a companion of Hercules who remained with

²⁹¹ See Williams 1961, 148: "In nearly all instances Greek origins are given for the Italian leaders, and in many cases strongly stressed." Below I omit Virbius, since he leads no people and it impossible to see how he fits into the "map"; see Caviglia 1987 for the debate over how to take *mater* (7.762), which might help localize him. In any case his Greek geographical origin is not emphasized.

²⁹² See *EV* sv. "Tibur" for more Greek aetiologies of the city.

²⁹³ See Rehm 1932, 33.

²⁹⁴ The Sibyl prophesied *et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno./ non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra / defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles* (6.87-9). The Simois and Xanthus and Achilles have to be mapped onto metaphorically corresponding figures in Italy, but Aeneas will face camps filled with literal Greeks.

²⁹⁵ Vergil maintains some ambiguity by referring to a prophecy of Halaesus' fate delivered to (or by) his still unnamed father, and Halaesus' concealment; Garbugino 1984 is convinced that this must refer to birth in Argos and emigration to Italy.

²⁹⁶ See Hardie *ad* 583-585. The description of him (*stabat in egregiis Arcentis filius armis / pictus acu chlamydem et ferrugine clarus Hibera, / insignis facie, genitor quem miserat Arcens / eductum matris luco Symaethia circum / flumina, pinguis ubi et placabilis ara Palici*) does not make his current situation, or how or when his father sent him, clear. For a reference to the extra-Sicilian origins suggested by the Iberian garb see Braccesi 1992 and Rizzo 1987.

²⁹⁷ *Alpheae ab origine Pisae, / urbs Etrusca solo* (10.179-180).

Evander, flee to his dear homeland Argos.²⁹⁸ There is no taboo against intermarriage between natives and new arrivals. Evander took a native woman as mother of Pallas.²⁹⁹ Nine sons were born to an Etruscan with a Greek name, Gylippus, and an unnamed but faithful and fertile Arcadian wife (12.270-2). Loquacious Numanus Remulus is married to Turnus' younger sister (9.593-4); although we do not know Numanus Remulus' background, his name suggests Alba Longa, and *thalamo sociatus* (594), describing his link to Turnus, suggests a dynastic marriage between distinct peoples.³⁰⁰ Turnus' warrior past is not exceptional. Oebalus has succeeded in expanding beyond his paternal kingdom³⁰¹ into Campania. Ufens and his people the Aequiculi characteristically supplement their agricultural yield with spoils (7.748-9). We need not lend full credence to Numanus Remulus' almost identically phrased claim that all the Italians live on spoils (9.613) to suspect that other peoples often raid. When a people has not seen combat for a long time, the situation is far enough outside the norm to merit comment (7.692-4, of Messapus' subjects).

The rulers of Italy in general and Latium in particular, therefore, have had long experience in dealing with newcomers. Latinus himself is the founder and namer of his city of *coloni* (7.59-63). Some arrivals have preserved their identity and founded new cities; others have assimilated and become subject to a native ruler.³⁰² We do not know all the details of these

²⁹⁸ 10.777-782: *at illa volans clipeo est excussa proculque / egregium Antoren latus inter et ilia figit, Herculis Antoren comitem, qui missus ab Argis / haeserat Evandro atque Itala consederat urbe. / sternitur infelix alieno vulnere, caelumque / aspicit et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos.*

²⁹⁹ 8.510: *mixtus matre Sabella*. See Sonnenschein 1897 for the question of what precisely *Sabellus* means.

³⁰⁰ See Hardie 1994 *ad* 593-4. Alba is explicitly under Latinus' control (9.387-8), so this represents another level of coordination between the two realms, perhaps a prelude to unity following the marriage of Turnus and Lavinia.

³⁰¹ *[D]icione premebat* (737) is even stronger than the *dicione tenebat* used by Dido of Belus' foreign expansions (1.622; but observe the *mss* confusion).

³⁰² Note too that the Etruscans arrived from Lydia (8.479-80; 499). Turnus is not himself a founder, but his ancestors were *coloni* from Greece (7.409-11).

settlements, but we can guess that there are models of compromise. During a dip in the Latins' fortunes Latinus suggests that they give the Trojans an out-of-the-way plot once it has been emptied of its inhabitants (11.314-45). In this speech the Latin king avoids any mention of Lavinia and intermarriage, and presumably under this initial proposal the Trojans are meant to remain an independent power. The balance between assimilation and coexistence is essential to the terms of the Trojan-Latin alliance proposed in Book 12, and to their hybrid state after the end of the poem (at least as Jupiter depicts it in 12.821-828). According to the agreement before what was to be a climactic combat, Aeneas would marry Lavinia and presumably inherit the title (and the *sceptra* of 12.206-11),³⁰³ but rather than living with the Latins in Latinus' city³⁰⁴ the Trojans would found their own city and inhabit it apart (12.190-194).³⁰⁵

Typical are Evander and his Arcadians, who have settled up the Tiber in Pallanteum. They have arrived from abroad, and specifically from Greece;³⁰⁶ they have founded a city; they have engaged in conflicts with locals, presumably to carve out their own territory.³⁰⁷ Meanwhile, an Etruscan local ruler, Mezentius, has been driven from his native Agylla with his son Lausus and at least a thousand men (8.478-513).³⁰⁸ He has fled to Turnus and the Rutulians (8.493-494), and together they have been conducting raids on the isolated border-state of Pallanteum

³⁰³ See Allecto's speech, where she asks Turnus if he will allow *tua Dardaniis transcribi scepra colonis?* (7.422); that is, the sceptre will go to Lavinia's groom.

³⁰⁴ This is not an inconceivable model; unity without distinction are the terms Dido offers (1.573-574).

³⁰⁵ *paribus se legibus ambae / invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant. / sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto, / imperium sollemne socer; mihi moenia Teucra / constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen.*

³⁰⁶ Ser. *ad* 8.51 tells that Evander was driven into exile because of either patricide or matricide.

³⁰⁷ Evander tells of slaying thrice-lived Erulus three times under the walls of Praeneste (8.560-567). Pallas mentions past wars (*per ducis Evandri nomen devictaque bella / spemque meam, patriae quae nunc subit aemula laudi,* 10.370-1).

³⁰⁸ It is not clear whether the *mille viros* (7.653) Lausus leads are the same as the *agmina* Mezentius leads (648), or are the son's special command. Servius *ad* 648 suggests the *agmina* of 648 might be troops Turnus has given him, over and above the *mille viros* Etruscans of 653.

(568-572).³⁰⁹ The ally of Mezentius in this war has been Turnus with his Rutulians only, and not, as far as we can tell, the other Latins.³¹⁰ Evander is anxious to tell how Turnus, Aeneas' chief enemy, became Mezentius' ally,³¹¹ just as Aeneas takes care to name the Rutulians only as those warring with the Pallanteans.³¹² There is little indication that Evander has been fighting the Latins as a whole, still less that Turnus has been carrying out this war in Latinus' service.³¹³ The Etruscans have not been content with bloodily throwing off Mezentius' yoke (8.489-491). Now they are making armed demands that Mezentius be returned to them for punishment, although affairs have come to a standstill as they await the fulfillment of a mysterious oracular command (8.498ff).

³⁰⁹ The conflict has gone on for long enough for Pallas to hate Turnus (*cernat semineci sibi me rapere arma cruenta / victoremque ferant morientia lumina Turni*, 10.462-3) and Turnus to hate Evander (*Arcades, haec inquit memores mea dicta referte / Evandro: qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto*, 10.491-492; *sanguine et Evandri totam cum stirpe videbit / procubuisse domum atque exutos Arcadas armis?* 11.394-5).

³¹⁰ For the problems of *hi bellum adsidue ducunt cum gente Latina* (8.55) see Chapter 2 below (2.4.1). According to Schulze 1993, 152 n.4 Rutulians, but not other Latins, tend to have Etruscan names.

³¹¹ (8.474 *hinc Rutulus premit et murum circumsonat armis*; 492-493 *ille inter caedem Rutulorum elapsus in agros / confugere et Turni defendier hospitii armis*).

³¹² 8.146-147 (*gens eadem, quae te, crudeli Daunia bello / insequitur*).

³¹³ On this question see Adler 2003. There are several mistakes on this point. Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.421 (*tot...labores*) speaks of Turnus' "military achievements, primarily at Latinus' side against Evander," adducing as evidence 7.426, 7.474, 8.55, 8.474, 8.493, 11.224, 11.336, 12.22. These passages refer either to Turnus' martial achievements, without any identifying details, or to his raids against Evander. None refer to (a) Turnus fighting with or on behalf of Latinus, or (b) Latinus fighting or supporting a fight against Evander, or (c) Latinus fighting, or sanctioning fighting, or being fought on behalf of. Adler 2003, 172 supposes that *Tyrrhenas, i, sterne acies, tege pace Latinos* (7.426) means that Turnus has *already* been fighting on Latinus' side against the Etruscans. She relies on Conington 1876 *ad* 7.423 ("It is implied v. 426 that Turnus had assisted Latinus in war against the Tyrrhenians.... In 8.55 the Arcadians (who may be meant by the Tyrrhenians here, though this is hardly probable) are said to be constantly at war with the Latins.") I do not see how 7.246 implies any previous war between Latinus and the Etruscans. The command cannot refer to the past; it must mean "lay low the Etruscan formations *now*," just as the second half of the line must refer to bringing peace to the Latins by fighting the Trojans now — the point of Allecto's intervention. To the objection that the Latins have not started fighting the Trojans yet and (by my argument) will not open hostilities against the Etruscans until Book 10, I would answer that such temporal displacement is a typical divine conflation. The intervening divinity — and Allecto is not a careful one — anticipates future events, speaking in a manner impossible for the human interlocutor without knowledge of the future to understand. This is why Turnus in his answer, unable to understand whatever was said about Etruscans, says nothing about them. Iris' message at the opening of Book 9 (*extremas Corythi penetravit ad urbes / Lydorumque manum, collectos armat agrestis*, 9.10-11) makes far more sense if she is telling Turnus of the Etruscans' entry into the conflict for the first time. Note that the only battle taunts directed against the Arcadians are found in Turnus' mouth: 10.491-495: *Arcades, haec inquit memores mea dicta referte / Evandro: qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto. / quisquis honos tumuli, quidquid solamen humandi est, / largior: haud illi stabunt Aeneia paruo / hospitia*. 11.392-395: *aut quisquam merito, foedissime, pulsum / arguet, Iliaco tumidum qui crescere Thybrim / sanguine et Evandri totam cum stirpe uidebit / procubuisse domum atque exutos Arcadas armis?*

Latinus' close ally Turnus is fighting a war. Just over the Tiber to the north an Etruscan civil war rages and threatens to spread south, and both Pallanteum and Turnus have already been pulled into the conflict. Evander commands a tiny and poor city. He has lost much at the hands of Mezentius and Turnus, and has been unable to secure alliance with the other Etruscans. Very little of this information is available to us or to the Trojans when Ilioneus approaches Latinus, or when Aeneas approaches Evander. This is no fairy-tale Italy, no land of the innocent Golden Age, no harbor of peace, no place of spontaneous munificence or observation of justice.³¹⁴ The sorts of political and military calculations into which Venulus' embassy is meant to goad Diomedes are not out of place in this world. Now enter the Trojans, a famed and formidable force, and to each king both a threat and an opportunity.³¹⁵

2.3 Diplomatic Speech in Italy: First Model

2.3.1 Techniques of Diplomatic Speech in Italy

There are three grounds upon which one people in the *Aeneid* makes an appeal to another: mutual interest; kinship; a previous relationship not based on consanguinity. These arguments for cooperation have excellent literary pedigree, but they also correspond roughly to real-life diplomatic strategies, with a history stretching as far back as documented Greek history. Erskine has shown how arguments from supposed consanguinity or supposed favors from the deep imagined past were “not a matter of mere academic interest” in the Hellenistic world as it fell under Roman domination.³¹⁶ Peoples competing for favorable status in a decidedly

³¹⁴ For Latinus' claims on this subject (7.202-204) see below.

³¹⁵ The proof of the Trojans' enduring martial prowess lies ahead in Books 9-12, but it was already clear to the Carthaginians and influenced their dealings (4.48-49: *Teucrum comitantibus armis / Punica se quantis attollet gloria rebus*).

³¹⁶ Erskine 2001, esp. 162-97 (quotation from 1). See also Jones 1999, esp. 81-121. Strabo 13.1.27 and Tac. *Ann.* 12.58 (also 60-1) are entertaining examples, influenced by the *Aeneid*, from a later age.

asymmetrical relationship with new masters in the west searched for arguments in a mythic past nearly infinitely malleable. Vergil, in having his characters call upon the murky depths of mythical time in an effort to set alliance on a firm foundation, is drawing upon the logic and language of real-life diplomatic overtures.

A further requirement for diplomacy, at least as it is represented in inscriptions and described by historians, was the right synthesis of arguments. It was not enough merely to show consanguinity; kinship diplomacy was “a device which need[ed] reinforcement by other pleas — expediency, prestige, self-justification.”³¹⁷ The same principle holds in the *Aeneid*. We should not assume that arguments from self-interest are out of place in an epic world, that appeals are limited to one register by generic considerations of what is decorous, or that arguments from consanguinity or past relationship cannot be combined by arguments from self-interest.

Each character’s choice to rely on one or two of these arguments carries with it a corollary neglect or subordination of other possible arguments. When the anti-Trojan leaders choose to appeal to mutual interest through Venulus’ embassy, and to the old animosity between Aeneas and Diomedes, they choose not to use an argument from kinship. Servius (*ad* 8.9, quoting 11.757-58) reminds us of what we learn much later: Venulus is a Tiburtine and an Argive by descent, and therefore an appropriate ambassador to the Argive Diomedes.³¹⁸ But there is not a trace of appeal to kinship in the arguments with which he is charged.³¹⁹ Elsewhere Servius

³¹⁷ Jones 1999, 35. After case studies he concludes that “arguments from kinship often formed part of a bundle which included other ones such as military advantage.” (133). For a wider bibliography see Erskine 201, 163-8. For a lengthier consideration of the construction of identity underlying these diplomatic interactions, and the degree to which it is possible to call such argument from myth pretextual, see Patterson 2010.

³¹⁸ Or perhaps he is not such an excellent choice, if (with Michalopoulos 2003, 82 n.33) we suspect the name might remind Diomedes of the blasphemy against Venus that has so haunted him. Or perhaps, with Noonan 1993, 114, we take his name to recall Turnus’ mother Venilia.

³¹⁹ Cairns 1989, 109 understands the words of the embassy as emphasizing Aeneas’ “foreignness.” Directed as it is to Diomedes, a foreigner who has invaded and settled Italian soil, it can hardly be meant to suggest that foreignness to Italy is a sufficient reason to fight Aeneas.

comments on why the river god Tiberinus, when he directs Aeneas to Pallanteum, tells Aeneas about the Pallanteans' battles with the Rutulians: *et bene praestandorum auxiliorum exprimit causam, ne magis Turno, quasi Graeco, favere credantur* (ad 8.55). The point is not that Aeneas would expect any and all Greeks to be hostile to him due to the Trojan War (with which Evander had nothing to do), but that he might expect Greek kinship to be natural grounds for alliance in Italy.

Amata, after arguing that Turnus can be the prophecied *externus gener* because he rules independent or sovereign territory, adds another argument for calling him an *externus*: he is descended from Inachus and Acrisius (7.371-372). The name Daunus, in the *Aeneid* that of Turnus' father, is everywhere else³²⁰ associated with Apulia, not Latium. In some versions his daughter marries Diomedes.³²¹ If Vergil has taken Diomedes' father-in-law, moved him to Latium, made him an Argive, and made him father of Aeneas' principal enemy, Turnus, the lack of reference to any connection, of kinship or otherwise, when Turnus sends to ask Diomedes for help, grows more worthy of remark. Venulus' embassy may carry clever and strong arguments, but it neglects the argument that may be staring the reader in the face.³²²

³²⁰ For this vexing question see Russi 1984 with bibliography; add Fletcher 2006, 241 n.48 for more recent bibliography. The point (seen by Russi; *pace* Della Corte 1972, 55; Fletcher *op. cit.*; Holland 1935, 206-8) is that Vergil makes no reference or allusion to any previous relationship between Turnus and Diomedes, and does not have his characters do so *in the embassy*. This is the opposite of his usual practice of touching upon a variant or allowing the possibility that it is still active: here he sets up a situation in which the dominant variant in some form or another should be active (Daunus is related to Apulia, or Diomedes directly), then adds another and related factor (Turnus and Diomedes share Argive identity), but shows the characters making no use of it in exactly the situation in which, were it "true" in the world of the *Aeneid*, one would expect they would.

³²¹ See *Ov. Met.* 14.457-511; or Diomedes kills Daunus for not letting him marry his daughter (in the scholia to Lycophron).

³²² In Horace (*Odes* 1.22:14; 4.6.27; 4.14.26 *Dauni...Apuli*), "Daunian" simply equals "Apulian." In Ovid's densely allusive retelling (*Met.* 14.457-511) Daunus is Diomedes' *socer* and gave him land by marrying him to his daughter. There Diomedes's reason for not interfering in Latium is neither a love of peace nor respect for Aeneas, but a lack of manpower (510-511).

Even without the Daunus nexus, there is ample material for the Latins to make an appeal to consanguinity when they approach Diomedes. There might be any number of reasons for them to eschew such a tactic. We cannot tell who exactly sends it — *mittitur....Venus*, we hear (8.9) — but since it is under the auspices, if not actually the prompting, of Latinus in addition to Turnus, and argues on behalf of a league varied in background, an argument from consanguinity between Turnus and Diomedes might have given Turnus too much prominence as sole leader. Given the context of Vergilian Italy, however, it is more likely that the Latins do not want alliance, which is what an appeal to kinship would imply, and which such an appeal would push toward permanence. It is more prudent only to stir up Diomedes as a temporary enemy of an enemy.

2.3.2 First Model: Latins and Trojans

2.3.2.1 Latinus to Ilioneus

Once we understand the true *status rerum* in Italy, the rhetoric natural to rulers in a land that presents to them such pressing demands, and the type of arguments concerning alliance at the disposal of negotiators, we are ready to understand the exchanges that begin after the Trojans land in the mouth of the Tiber (7.35-6). In what Aeneas assures his men is a fulfillment of the prophecy of the munched table, the Trojans receive confirmation that it is the time and place to build a city (107-47).³²³ Aeneas sends scouts, who return with reports of the local topography and inhabitants (148-51). He then sends a hundred orators to Latinus (152-7), while he marks out the walls of the fortified camp that will soon be called an *urbs* and function as the Trojans' city

³²³ For the difference between Aeneas's account of the prophecy here and his account in Book 3 see below (4.7.2 and 5.8).

(157-9).³²⁴ The embassy engages in an initial negotiation with Latinus and reaches a seemingly satisfactory agreement. The negotiation comprises three speeches: a short opening by Latinus (7.195-211), a lengthy response by Ilioneus (213-48), and a short response by Latinus (259-73).

Latinus speaks first:

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

The speech divides into greeting and inquiry (195-8), invitation to *hospitium* (199-204), and the story of Dardanus (205-211). The opening words are a display of prior knowledge about arriving peoples. The key lines (195-6) divide into three parts: the immediate naming of the arrivals by a patronymic (*Dardanidae*); the claim to know the Trojans' city and people (*neque enim nescimus et urbem / et genus*); the claim not to be surprised by the Trojans' arrival (*auditique aduertitis*

³²⁴ For more on this camp see below (Chapter 4).

aequore cursum).³²⁵ Latinus finally indicates that he knows that the Trojans have docked in the Tiber mouth (*fluminis intrastis ripas portuque sedetis*, 7.201), so he must have heard a report with at least this level of detail.³²⁶

The interpretation, from ancient commentators on, of *Dardanidae* as an immediate recognition and statement of relationship, as if it were shorthand for *cognati* and the equivalent of “natural allies,” makes little sense of the rest of the speech.³²⁷ The use of the patronymic precedes an offer of *hospitium*, which, according to Latinus, springs solely from the hospitable character of the Latin people, and could therefore be made to any stranger. Not only does it not need to be grounded in a close blood relationship, it even seems mutually exclusive with kinship. In fact the idea of consanguinity does not appear in Latinus’ first speech at all. Not everyone in Italy must be related; Dardanus’ supposed place of origin, Corythus, is on the north side of the Tiber, and therefore Etruscan and not Latin.³²⁸ Latinus calls back from memory snatches of information about Dardanus’ Italian origin as an afterthought, after he has extended the offer of *hospitium*.

Latinus does not stop after asking why the Trojans have come (*quae causa...*); he supplies two possible answers: a mistake in navigation, or a storm (199). Neither allows the

³²⁵ Does *auditi*, in a usage hard to parallel, mean “you have come, and we have heard of you” or “we heard that you were coming”? If the first interpretation only were right, the main clause would lose purpose; it is hard to see why one would wish to tell someone that they have come over the sea. *Auditi* best means both, reinforcing that the Trojans are yet again well-known at their first arrival, and signaling to the Trojans that they do not have the advantage of surprise.

³²⁶ Donatus *ad loc* suggests that Latinus is letting pass unauthorized activity that might be thought of as an offense (*nec reprehendit quod Troiani fecerant auctoritate sua et aliud obtulit quod excederet hospitium litoris*).

³²⁷ Servius *ad* 195: ‘*Dardanidae*’ *autem, ac si diceret ‘o cognati.’* Fordyce 1991 *ad* 195:” The king’s opening words show at once that he knows the ties of kinship which bring Trojans to Italy.” It is strange, then, that he spends the next six lines asking why the Trojans have come.

³²⁸ Fordyce 1991 *ad* 206 “*his..agris* is not to be taken literally; Dardanus’ legendary origins were in Italy but, as the following lines explain, in another region of it.”; see also Thomas 2005. For the ideological significance of Corythus see Reed 2007.

possibility that the Trojans had it in mind to come *ad litus Ausonium*.³²⁹ To follow “Why are you here?” with the disjunctive question “Are you lost, or did forces beyond your control drive you here?” is to try to preclude the respondents from saying that they are there on purpose and have a long-term purpose there.³³⁰ The impression that Latinus is trying to control the situation is not lessened by the next third of the speech, in which he offers hospitality:

*sive errore viae seu tempestatibus acti,
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.* (7.199-204)

It is uncertain what, at this point, the proffered *hospitium* entails. It cannot yet mean intermarriage with the king’s daughter or combination of the two peoples. Ilioneus’ speech to Dido in Book 1 suggests a solution. There, speaking first, the Trojan repeatedly denies that his people intended to come to Libya at all and tells, truthfully, that they had been driven by the same exigencies of sea travel Latinus mentions here (1.524: *ventis maria omnia vecti*; and the

³²⁹ Aeneas uses similar language when he is at pains to gain sympathy for having had no choice or intention to arrive in Libya (*diversa per aequora vectos / forte sua Libycis tempestas adpulit oris*, 1.376-7).

³³⁰ Contrast the space for a real answer left by Deiphobus’ inquiry in the underworld: *pelagine venis erroribus actus an monitu divum?* (6.532-3). Horsfall 2000 *ad loc* wants Latinus’ forgetfulness to be the explanation (*ad* 199 “Latinus will need a little longer (a fine touch, this) to remember that there is no mistake and that the Trojans are in fact returning to their homeland.”), but this does not explain why he suggest options that limit the Trojans’ responses. The Homeric scene models are Nestor’s inquiry to Telemachus, repeated verbatim in Polyphemus’ to Odysseus: ὦ ξείνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ’ ὑγρά κέλευθα; / ἢ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἢ μαυριδίως ἀλάλησθε / οἷά τε ληϊστῆρες ὑπεῖρ ἄλλα, τοί τ’ ἀλόωνται / ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες [*Od.* 3.69-74 and 9.252-5]). Hypotheses explaining how Nestor can be so nonchalant toward brigandage include: that the lines should be athetized; that they are a generic formula that has lost its force; that they are an honest question that betrays the lack of a social stigma attached to raiding; or they are an elaborate formula for asking “are you good or bad” (or, “are your intentions towards us good or bad.”) See scholia *ad loc*; Thuc. 1.5.1-3; de Souza 2002, 17-19; Heubeck 1989 *ad* 9.252-5; West 1988 *ad* 3.69-74; Webber 1989; Reece 1993, 8. Neither questioned character answers by explicitly affirming or denying either of the two answers offered by the questioner. What is more important than the elusive tone of the Homeric model is what Vergil has changed. The two Homeric options (on purpose and on business, or by chance while raiding) set parameters for the response with broad limiting extremes: the respondent has a choice from good to bad in inclination, and from purposeful to arbitrary in intention. Latinus’ phrasing, however, gives only one choice: the Trojans did not know where they were going. The only choice he leaves is between two of the sorts of misfortunes that often befall sailors (v.200); his wording is also derived from Odysseus’ answer to Polyphemus (ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλαγχθέντες Ἀχαιοὶ / παντοίοις ἀνέμοισιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης, 9.259-260).

narrative of 534-8).³³¹ He reassures Dido that, although their destination will depend on whether Aeneas is alive, he and his men will leave as soon as their fleet is repaired (551-9). He complains about the attacks on his ships: *hospitio prohibemur harenae* (540). In asking Dido to fix what her people have done, he does not ask for material assistance: the *officium* he requests (548) is only the permission to use space and resources that will allow the Trojans to repair their ships on their own (551-2). This, then, may be the minimum of the *hospitium* Latinus is offering: to allow an accidental arrival temporary use of the shore, and perhaps to give supplies or some other form of help.³³²

Why Latinus introduces the last third of the speech, the story of Dardanus' Italian origin (205-211), hinges on whether and how much he is changing course from the first two-thirds of his speech. Under a reading that supposes that Latinus is always planning to affianc his daughter to Aeneas, in these lines he begins to think out a path toward this close model of alliance. His realization that the Trojans are of Italian origin would then be the "lightbulb" moment that the solution to all the circumstances he is weighing falls into place, and would mark a break with the first two-thirds of the speech. Only in this way can thinking about Dardanus' origin lead to the offer of Lavinia's hand.

But *atque equidem* (205) is not adversative. [*E*]quidem, which marks that what follows is peculiarly from the speaker's perspective,³³³ with *atque* "introduces[s] a fresh point by way of

³³¹ *Hic cursus fuit* (to Italy): / *cum subito adsurgens fluctu nimbosus Orion / in vada caeca tulit, penitusque procacibus austris / perque undas, superante salo, perque invia saxa / dispulit; huc pauci vestris adnavimus oris.* Note that Ilioneus also anticipates the accusation of piracy (or some sort of raiding): *non nos aut ferro Libycos populare Penatis / venimus, aut raptas ad litora vertere praedas* (527-8).

³³² It is impossible to tell exactly what Latinus has in mind here, especially since, according to him, his people are not bound by laws (*gentem haud uincolo nec legibus aequam*, 203). For the legal terminology underlying Ilioneus' request in Bk. 1 and his response here, see below.

³³³ See Solodow 1978.

confirmation,”³³⁴ not a pivot to a new or contradictory idea. Here the phrase introduces Latinus’ memory as source of information about Dardanus’ origin.³³⁵ The most natural way to understand it here is as a confirmation of the offer of *hospitium* that immediately precedes *it*, and not as the moment at which Latinus suddenly realizes that these “foreigners” are prospective sons-in-law. Latinus is suggesting, then, that the Trojans’ Italian ancestry in some way supports his extension of hospitality to them. The story of Dardanus looks backward to the offer of *hospitium* just proffered, not forward to the offer of dynastic alliance to fulfill prophecy. Advertising the Trojans’ supposed Italian origin cannot be meant as evidence that it is the Trojans who were intended by the prophecy of Faunus. The fact that Dardanus is a native Italian, insofar as it has any bearing on the question at all, can only be an impediment to Aeneas’ fulfillment of the prophecy, which prescribes an *externus gener*.³³⁶

The narrator makes no comment on the intent of Latinus’ speech, but does characterize it as spoken *placido...ore* (7.194). It is going too far to say that this by itself shows that Latinus’ “exemplifies the generosity, gentleness, and kindness of the good king.”³³⁷ The Vergilian parallels are Ilioneus about to speak to Dido (*placido sic pectore coepit*, 1.521) and Diomedes about to speak to Venulus (*placido sic reddidit ore*, 11.251). In both cases the speakers advocate a peaceful rather than warlike course, as Latinus does here; but because someone is calm in his

³³⁴ Fordyce 1991 *ad* 7.205. Dido uses *atque equidem* (1.619) to introduce an account of what she heard from Teucer that corroborates the implied affirmative answer to her immediately preceding question about Aeneas’ identity (*tunc ille Aeneas, quem Dardanio Anchisae / alma Venus Phrygii genuit Simoentis ad undam? / atque equidem Teucrum memini Sidona venire / finibus expulsum patriis*, 1.617-620). The collocation is Plautine and otherwise rare.

³³⁵ The couching of the story in so many layers of self-distancing contributes to the impression that the story is far from common currency.

³³⁶ See Cairns 1989, 119-120. He does claim later that “Similarly, in Latinus’ initial welcome to the Trojans he first said *ne fugite hospitium* (7.202) but then, realizing they were Italians (205ff), tactfully spoke of them not as *hospites* but as kin”; but Latinus does not talk about the Dardanians as kin, either here or later.

³³⁷ Cairns 1989, 64. On the elasticity of *placidus* see Austin 1971 *ad* 1.127.

manner, or wishes to create calm, or speaks in a spirit of peace, does not mean that he is disinterestedly benevolent. When the collocation of noun and adjective is used to characterize Ilioneus's speech, he is about to indignantly indict the Carthaginians for an offense against human and divine law; when they characterize Diomedes' speech, he is about to reject a Latin entreaty for help. Both Ilioneus and Diomedes seem to be trying not only to diffuse a potentially dangerous situation, but also to create a situation favorable to themselves and their respective peoples. Here Latinus is trying to do the same.

In his first speech, then, Latinus proposes nothing more than *hospitium*, and he attempts to limit the reasons the Trojans could have had for landing in the mouth of the Tiber — that is, in his territory — to accident or mistake. His introduction of the Trojans' ancestry is not an introduction to an argument for alliance from kinship but an advertisement to his addressees of his own prior knowledge. He justifies the offer of *hospitium* by nothing other than a reference to the Saturn-blessed virtues of his Latin people. He may be advancing the idea that his guests are coming home to the land of the ancestors as a secondary reason to give them a welcome, but homecoming can be the ideology and terminology of colonization.³³⁸ The full import of his words escape him, as he unwittingly provides authority for what the foreigners are about to use as their chief claim to justify their occupation of his land.

³³⁸ The closest analogy is the Dorian Heracleidae, who were told by Apollo to return to the land of their fathers (Apollodorus 2.8.2; Isocrates *Archidamus* 17-18; Pindar *Pyth.* 5.69-72; Pease 1917, 10, n.8). Horsfall 1989, 10-11 calls the theme of return a "oracular commonplace" in colonization narratives, but the idea is surprisingly rare; it is hard to find in e.g. Dougherty's 1993 review of colonization tropes. A more common justification or argument than the idea that a people as a whole are coming home is the idea that a people's ancestors possessed a place (see Erskine 2001, 131-5 on Greek narratives of wandering as "colonization of the mind"; Tod 1913, 132-15 for instances in negotiation of the argument from previous possession).

2.3.2.2 Ilioneus to Latinus

Ilioneus cannot accept an undefined offer of *hospitium* or a vague framing of the Trojans as descendants of someone who might have been associated with Corythus, which is, as Ahl points out, on the other side of the Tiber.³³⁹ The Trojans have been told that they are to settle in Italy, but they have also been told they will find war there (3.458; 3.539-540; 6.86ff; 6.888-892). They cannot be accused of preemptive belligerent action; this embassy comes expressly in peace (154-5, esp. *ramis uelatos Palladis omnis*). Aeneas has not, however, waited for permission to erect a fortified camp that will soon double as a city.³⁴⁰ He and his people cannot be satisfied in the long term with this local settlement if they are to rule far and wide, as they have been told they will.³⁴¹ They have no reason to initiate hostilities, but also no desire to enter into an alliance that subordinates them to the locals, assimilates them on someone else's terms, leaves them another pawn on the chessboard of Italy, or even imposes on them a peer alliance that limits their prospects. They need land under their own auspices, and to obtain this they need their claims of divine support to be acknowledged. If the Trojans were satisfied with the *hospitium* that was Latinus' only offer — no matter how gratuitously made — Ilioneus would not have much to say; he would only have to thank the king and report the offer to Aeneas for his consideration. But hospitality is nowhere near enough, and Ilioneus must clarify the terms on which the Trojans will

³³⁹ Ahl 2007 *ad* 7.209.

³⁴⁰ 7.157-159: *ipse humili designat moenia fossa / moliturque locum, primasque in litore sedes / castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit*. Donatus *ad loc* comments that this is the action of someone with complete confidence in his right to this land (*non putavit Aeneas differenda operum coepta, donec responsum referret misa legatio. gerebat enim fatorum fiduciam, quae illi ipsarum terrarum dominium dederat*).

³⁴¹ Although we do not know whether Aeneas disclosed any of what he heard in the underworld of Rome's future power, Delian Apollo's promise of vast sway, as Aeneas tells it, (*hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris / et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis*. 3.97-98) was the first the Trojans as a whole heard of their fate (*cuncti quae sint ea moenia quaerunt, / quo Phoebus vocet errantis iubeatque reverti*, 3.101-102).

be engaging the natives. This requires a change in the basic terms of the discussion: the Trojans cannot be either guest-friends or beneficiaries of munificence.

Ilioneus, therefore, responds at length:

*rex, genus egregium Fauni, nec fluctibus actos
atra subegit hiems vestris succedere terris,
nec sidus regione viae litusve fefellit: 215
consilio hanc omnes animisque volentibus urbem
adferimur pulsi regnis, quae maxima quondam
extremo veniens sol aspiciebat Olympo.
ab Iove principium generis, Iove Dardana pubes
gaudet avo, rex ipse Iovis de gente suprema: 220
Troius Aeneas tua nos ad limina misit.
quanta per Idaeos saevis effusa Mycenis
tempestas ierit campos, quibus actus uterque
Europae atque Asiae fatis concurrerit orbis,
audiit et si quem tellus extrema refuso 225
summovet Oceano et si quem extenta plagarum
quattuor in medio dirimit plaga solis iniqui.
diluvio ex illo tot vasta per aequora vecti
dis sedem exiguam patriis litusque rogamus
innocuum et cunctis undamque auramque patentem. 230
non erimus regno indecores, nec vestra feretur
fama levis tantique abolescet gratia facti,
nec Troiam Ausonios gremio excepisse pigebit.
fata per Aeneae iuro dextramque potentem,
sive fide seu quis bello est expertus et armis: 235
multi nos populi, multae (ne temne, quod ultro
praeferimus manibus vittas ac verba precantia)
et petiere sibi et volvere adiungere gentes;
sed nos fata deum vestras exquirere terras
imperiiis egere suis. hinc Dardanus ortus, 240
huc repetit iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo
Tyrrenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici.
dat tibi praeterea fortunae parva prioris
munera, reliquias Troia ex ardente receptas.
hoc pater Anchises auro libabat ad aras, 245
hoc Priami gestamen erat cum iura vocatis
more daret populis, sceptrumque sacerque tiaras
Iliadumque labor vestes. (7.213-48)*

He leaves none of Latinus' points unchallenged and none of the terminology the king used unchanged. He makes clear that both of the options offered by Latinus' disjunctive questions about the mode of, and motive for, Trojan arrival were wrong (212-8); he tells who his people and his leader are (219-27); he makes a request (229-30) with a promise of good behavior (231-3); he returns to self-presentation and forestalls the possibility of scorn (234-7); he switches again back to the justification for his claims (239-42); as a clinching incentive he offers gifts (243-8).

The Trojan's salutation *rex, genus egregium Fauni* (213), corresponding to Latinus' *Dardanidae* (195) collapses the addressee's bloodline to as brief an extension into the past as possible. If Ilioneus has learned about Faunus it is possible that he knows the rest of Latinus' genealogy, his grandfather Picus and great-grandfather Saturn (7.47-9), and this would make his omission of his addressee's divine origin all the more jarring.³⁴² As Ahl notes, he is about to telescope his own people's bloodline as far back and as high up as possible.³⁴³ The claim of Jupiter as ancestor a few lines later will best Latinus' claim of Saturn as inspiration for his people, but Ilioneus is careful to allow the Latins not even the older and inferior god in the analogous position as ultimate ancestor. *[N]ec fluctibus actos* (213) emphatically answers in the

³⁴² It is tempting to detect a tone of heavy irony, as in Juno's lines not much later: *egregium Veneris genus et rex ipse Latinus* (7.556).

³⁴³ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 7.212 and 220 for this and other distortions on this point. For an argument based on how many generations separate each speaker is from a god, see Ovid's exchange between Ajax and Ulysses (*Met.* 13.21-30; 140-147).

negative Latinus' leading question (*tempestatibus acti*, 199).³⁴⁴ Latinus' question was not an accusation, but it did require the acknowledgment of a scenario Ilioneus must be at pains to deny. The Trojan briskly dispatches the misconception: *sidus regione viae* (215) corresponds to *errore viae* (199). With *consilio* and *volentibus animis* he says again that the Trojans meant to come here, and builds a paradox with *adferimur*; to “be brought according to plan and with willing minds” is not an unwarranted description of the Trojans' tortured, much-diverted wandering. Finally his *litus* corresponds to Latinus' *litus ad Ausonium* (198). By supplying the geographical specification Latinus adopts the pose of one informing the Trojans that they have gotten to the Ausonian shore; Ilioneus now answers *nec...litusue fefellit*: of course — he says — we knew very well we were coming to this shore.

A brief sideline into Trojan history (*quae...Olympo* 217-218) circumscribes what is relevant about Trojanness — the unique grandeur of Troy — after Latinus said he knew all about them, but failed to specify what he knew.

³⁴⁴ For the analogous Homeric “catch-word” technique see de Jong 2001, xii (“when a character echoes, often at the beginning of his speech, a word or expression from his interlocutor’s speech, often with a different tone or meaning.”); Lohmann 1970, 96-156; Macleod 1982, 52-53 speaks of how “the beginning of one speech echoes with some variation of sense the end of the one before it” and divides this technique into “sympathetic response” and “impassioned or sarcastic retort.” In the *Aeneid* this sort of repetition of key word is even more pointed than in Homer; it is a “no” as emphatic as possible. A character merely providing information, responding in a clearly amicable setting, or feeling his way through the situation, answers without denying the hypotheticals of his host’s inquiry. The responses to both Homeric inquiries about piracy, which provide the model for Latinus’ questions, make the point. Telemachus, in a relaxed situation, does not respond to Nestor’s either-or question allowing him raiding or business as motives for his arrival; he placidly goes about telling why he had come (*Od.*3.79-120). Odysseus, in a much tenser situation, reassures Polyphemus that his intentions were benign not by answering the same questions in the negative, but by reassuring the Cyclops that he and his men are there by accident (*Od.*9.259-72). Only when a speaker makes an accusation does a character hasten to reassure him that he is wrong. In the *Argonautica* Aeetes responds to Argos’ claim that Jason is in Colchis for the fleece, is offering help against the Sauromatae, and deserves consideration as kin (3.320-66), with an angry “no” and an accusation (372ff): ‘οὐκ ἄφαρ ὀφθαλμῶν μοι ἀπόπροθι, λωβητῆρες, / νεῖσθ’ αὐτοῖσι δόλοισι παλίσσυτοι ἔκτοθι γαίης, / πρὶν τινα λευγαλέον τε δέρος καὶ Φρίξον ἰδέσθαι; / αὐτίχ’ ὀμαρτήσαντες ἀφ’ Ἑλλάδος, οὐκ ἐπὶ κῶας, / σκῆπτρα δὲ καὶ τιμὴν βασιληίδα δεῦρο νέεσθε: οὐκ ἐπὶ κῶας, σκῆπτρα δὲ καὶ τιμὴν βασιληίδα δεῦρο νέεσθε. Jason counters with an emphatic “no” himself: οὐτι γὰρ αὐτως ἄστυ τεδὸν καὶ δάμαθ’ ἰκάνομεν, ὥς που ἔολπας, οὐδὲ μὲν ἰέμενοι. τίς δ’ ἂν τόσον οἶδμα περῆσαι τλαίη ἐκὼν ὀθνεῖον ἐπὶ κτέρας; (386-8). The Apollonian scene is an important model for both royal scenes of reception in Italy (see Nelis 2001, 282-7).

*ab Ioue principium generis, Ioue Dardana pubes
gaudet auo, rex ipse Iouis de gente suprema:* (7.219-220)

In all previous acts of self-presentation and self-definition by a Trojan character but one, the Trojans traced their ancestry back to Dardanus or Teucer, and Aeneas called himself descendent of Venus or Anchises.³⁴⁵ Now, by remarkable three-fold repetition, the ambassador of *Troius Aeneas* claims descent from Jupiter.³⁴⁶ Jovian ancestry makes the Trojans' pedigree far more impressive than descent from Faunus, and it trumps Latinus' glorification of his people on the grounds that they belong to Saturn (202-204). Thomas notes that the opposition between the Saturnian and the Jovian is a Vergilian trope resumed from the *Georgics*, and suggests that the passage is portentous because Vergil is introducing a model of violent replacement: the Trojans correspond to Jupiter, who overthrew and cast out Saturn, to whom the Latins correspond.³⁴⁷

This addresses the communication between Vergil and his reader but not that between Ilioneus and Latinus. The Trojan is not responding, like Vergil, to Hesiodic models of the Golden Age, but to Latinus' claim that his people live under a Saturnian dispensation. The absolute assertion of Dardanus' descent from Jove, without appeal to any authority, answers Latinus' groping memory that the Trojans are descendants of Dardanus, based on the authority of thrice-removed hearsay. The Latin's story of the deification or katasterism of Dardanus is ignored. The Trojans need not

³⁴⁵ The exception is 6.123 (*et mi genus ab Ioue summo*), where Aeneas argues he is uniquely qualified to enter the underworld and return.

³⁴⁶ Horsfall 2000 *ad* 219 cites Wills 1996, 285ff for Hellenistic roots of triple repetition, but can find no parallels for Jupiter's name so used.

³⁴⁷ Thomas 2005. Adler 2003, 184-6 thinks that Jupiter enacts this replacement when in the final negotiation with Juno in Book 12 (189-94) he, according to her interpretation, proclaims that he will give himself as a god to the newly combined Latins (who previously worshipped only Saturn) and Trojans.

connect themselves to the divine through deification of a mortal ancestor; they can push one generation back directly to the immortal font.³⁴⁸

After expatiating on the Trojans' fame, and thereby implying that knowledge of them is no mark of distinction (223-227), Ilioneus at last returns to Latinus' first question about purpose. His *tot uasta per aequora uecti* (228) again answers Latinus' *tot per uada caerulea uexit*. He asks for only the tiniest settling place, a bit of unoccupied shore:

*dis sedem exiguam patriis litusque rogamus
innocuum et cunctis undamque auramque patentem.* (7.229-30)

Even if these lines are taken at face value, Ilioneus is omitting any mention of the unauthorized act his king has undertaken in occupying land and founding a military camp. And it is hard to take them at face value. The Trojans will not be satisfied with a tiny outpost, and they have been led to believe that they are not only to make their own kingdom but to expand it throughout the peninsula and beyond.³⁴⁹ A few lines later Ilioneus introduces the idea that peoples have tried to join themselves to the Trojans, ostensibly as a way of making sure Latinus does not treat the Trojans scornfully because they are acting peaceably (*ne temne, quod ultra / praeferimus manibus vittas ac verba precantia*, 236-237). Latinus used no term of contempt, however; the only way in which his offer of *hospitium* could be termed scornful is by comparison with the divine right of ownership the Trojans are about to claim.

³⁴⁸ For this reason I do not agree with Nakata 2012, 346, who thinks that "Latinus' account anticipates the account that the Trojan embassy might have provided." Ilioneus is trying for much more. Later Latinus, advancing his proposal to stop trying to defeat the Trojans by force, invokes Ilioneus' rhetoric (*bellum importunum, cives, cum gente deorum / invictisque viris gerimus*, 11.305-6).

³⁴⁹ Wiesen 1973, 741: "more than a little disingenuous"; "less than honest." Reckford 1961, 261-2 calls Aeneas a "deceiver": "The irony is apparent to us but not to Latinus: The Trojans have not been uprooted so many times and ushered on so painfully towards Italy only to obtain an insignificant piece of shore. Aeneas is even now building his walls."

There is more that cannot be taken at face value here than the scale of the request for an exiguous lot of land. Commentators from Servius on have noted that these lines depend for their force on a legal argument that echoes Ilioneus' argument about *hospitium* in Book 1 (*hospitio prohibemur harenae*, 1.540). The difference between the two arguments is that the first made sense and this one does not. Ilioneus asked Dido, reasonably and in line with legal principle, for the temporary *use* of the shore, for an anchorage, and for the resources needed to refit his fleet, and he promises to leave after repairs are finished; now he asks Latinus for the permanent *possession* of a piece of his kingdom. In Roman law it is not the *possessio* of a *litus* (or *ripa*) that is *communis*, but the *usus*.³⁵⁰ The seashore shore is open to all (*patens cunctis*, as Ilioneus puts it here) because all use it for relief from the sea, not because all may take possession of it. Shipwrecked men can reasonably ask not to be treated as invaders, and can ask for the use of water and land; purposeful arrivals by sea cannot demand to take a piece of land as their own on the same principle.

Above we considered how the effectiveness of the seeming invention the *multi populi, multae gentes* (236-8) who supposedly wished to join themselves to the Trojans depends on the speaker (Ilioneus) knowing that the addressees (Latinus and his people) cannot know any better about the speaker's past. The other arguments just preceding depend on the same exploitation of the addressee's ignorance. Ilioneus' reassurance to Latinus that receiving Troy will not be a

³⁵⁰ Servius *ad* 1.540 (*'hospitio prohibemur harenae' ut alibi "litusque rogamus innocuum." litus enim iure gentium commune omnibus fuit et occupantis solebat eius esse possessio. Cicero in Rosciana "nam quid est tam commune, quam spiritus vivis, terra mortuis, mare fluctuantibus, litus eiectis?" unde ostenduntur crudeles qui etiam a communibus prohibeant*) is a misunderstanding. See Berger 2004 s.v. *litus; mare; res communes omnium*; Johnston 1987, 303ff; Buckland 1932, 183, esp. 186; on *occupatio* see 207-208. Justinian *Institutes* 2.1.1-5: *Et quidem naturali iure communia sunt omnium haec: aer et aqua profluens et mare et per hoc litora maris...proprietas autem eorum potest intellegi nullius esse, sed eiusdem iuris esse cuius et mare et quae subiacent mari, terra, vel harena.* Contrast the language of Ilioneus' tendentious argument with Ovid's typical delight in technical precision: *quid prohibetis aquis? usus communis aquarum est / nec solem proprium natura nec aera fecit / nec tenues undas: ad publica munera veni;* (*Met.*6.349; Latona rebukes the Lycians).

source of disgust or regret (*nec Troiam Ausonios gremio excepisse pigebit*, 7.233) sounds to the reader much like the assurance Aeneas' made to Dido that recalling her would not grieve him (*nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae*, 4.335).³⁵¹ The assurance that Latinus will not lose his reputation or be spoken of badly as a result of allowing the Trojans to settle in his kingdom (*nec vestra feretur / fama levis*, 7.231-2) reminds the reader of Dido's loss of *fama* following the Trojans' visit to her land (*te propter eundem / extinctus pudor et, qua sola sidera adibam, / fama prior*, 4.321-3). The assurance that the Trojans' gratitude for Latinus' good treatment will never disappear (*tantique abolescet gratia facti*, 7.232) recalls for the reader Aeneas' promise that he and his descendant will always praise and remember Dido for what she has done for them (*semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt*, 1.609; also 4.333-336). These words can recall nothing for Latinus due to the a gap in his prior knowledge: no matter how much he may know of the history of Troy, he does not seem to know anything of Dido and Carthage (see Chapter 1). He cannot hear the verbal echoes, nor can he realize how similar his situation is to that of the last ruler to grant Ioneus' requests. The Trojans, understanding that they come as their own messengers, have no need to make excuses for their recent conduct in Carthage.

Having invented some of his people's history and suppressed other parts, Ilioneus makes immediate use of the information the Trojans have so eagerly and efficiently acquired by their recent scouting:

*...hinc Dardanus ortus,
huc repetit iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo
Tyrrhenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici.* (7.240-2)

³⁵¹ See Reckford 1961, 263-265 for links to Dido throughout the scene. Harder to defend is the connection he draws between the description of the embassy (154-5) and the lying Greeks in Book 2 ("the 'veiling,' the name of Pallas, and the bringing of gifts.").

The more features of Italy that Ilioneus names, the more support for his claim that the Trojans have been driven by a single-minded desire for Italy, and the stronger the refutation of Latinus' insinuation that the Trojans had no idea where they were going. In the only part of Latinus' speech with which Ilioneus agrees (*ortus...Dardanus*, 206-207 = *Dardanus ortus*, 240) the echoes of the ideology of colonization, already present in Latinus' mouth, emerge more clearly and with the additional element of divine sanction.

2.3.2.3 Latinus Again to Ilioneus

Latinus is confronted with revenant descendants of Jove who present a *fait accompli*, having already taken possession of the land they request.³⁵² Ilioneus has agreed with nothing Latinus said and used none of the terminology the Latin king used. Without expressly disagreeing with any practical proposal Latinus advanced — this would be difficult, since the king did not propose anything clear — the Trojan proposed his own program. He said that his people will stay where they have stopped. From Latinus' later proposal in the Latin council (11.316-323) we can see that a native ruler is unlikely to want to allow an arrival to stake his own claim; a king has lands of which he can dispose, which he might mind less being rid of, and in which new neighbors might be advantageously settled. Ilioneus' mention of Aeneas' prowess in battle (234-235) is less pointed than it was in the speech to Dido in Book 1, when the natives had already threatened to use force against the Trojans, but it is not gratuitous either. Latinus now has to respond to an interlocutor, not excessively polite, who has publicly made a definite request verging on a demand. The Latin king might give in and give the Trojans what they want, or he

³⁵² For this point see Ahl 2007 *ad* 7.253. Aeneas later says that he would not have come had not the fates give him the place (*nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent*, 11.112). A self-exculpating dislocation of authority onto the fates only make sense if his arrival and his claims represent a demand on the locals.

Instead Latinus tries to win back control of the negotiation by advancing his own

proposal:

*tandem laetus ait: 'di nostra incepta secudent
auguriumque suum! dabitur, Troiane, quod optas. 260
munera nec sperno: non vobis rege Latino
divitis uber agri Troiaeve opulentia deerit.
ipse modo Aeneas, nostri si tanta cupido est,
si iungi hospitio properat sociusque vocari,
adveniat, vultus neve exhorrescat amicos: 265
pars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tyranni.
vos contra regi mea nunc mandata referte:
est mihi nata, viro gentis quam iungere nostrae
non patrio ex adyto sortes, non plurima caelo
monstra sinunt; generos externis adfore ab oris, 270
hoc Latio restare canunt, qui sanguine nostrum
nomen in astra ferant. hunc illum poscere fata
et reor et, si quid veri mens augurat, opto.'* (7.259-73)

In some sense he will grant that which the Trojans require (260), but only through a union of the two peoples that will bring *his* people's name to the stars (271-2). It has been noted that Vergil's insertion of Faunus' prophecy is an attempt to provide greater motivation for a native king to offer his daughter in marriage to a new arrival than the *Odyssey* gave Alkinoos.³⁵⁶ So much time has been spent narrating the divine preparation for the Trojans' arrival, both the omen of the bees and the prophecy of Faunus, that is easy to assume that the omen and the prophecy are the only things on Latinus' mind. But the king represents himself not only as submitting to divine authority. After he offers his daughter he claims that he is recognizing a truth independent of his opinion (*hunc illum poscere fata reor...*), but he also makes himself the decisive agent, choosing with prudent perception of the future (*...et, si quid veri mens augurat, opto, 273*). With the offer

³⁵⁶ See Schlunk 1974. The scholia of the *Odyssey* (*ad Od.7.311*), puzzled by the lack of motivation, suggest ancient mythical custom: ἦν μὲν παλαιὸν ἔθος τὸ προκρίνειν τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν ξένων καὶ δι' ἀρετὴν ἐκδιδόναι τὰς θυγατέρας, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ Βελλεροφόντου, Τυδέως, Πολυνείκου.

of marriage-alliance the king can congratulate himself on four accomplishments: (1) it provides an answer to the riddle of the prophecy of the *externus gener*; (2) it ends the domestic dispute over whom Lavinia is to marry; (3) it gains a formidable ally; (4) it dissolves a potential threat from these new arrivals.³⁵⁷

To achieve the first goal Latinus must construe the puzzling words of priests and visions in a new way. There are four statements of the prophecy that leads to Latinus' decision here:

<p><i>'externum cernimus' inquit 'aduentare uirum et partis petere agmen easdem partibus ex isdem et summa dominarier arce.'</i></p> <p>(local <i>vates</i> interprets the bee-omen, 7.68-70)</p>	<p><i>'ne pete conubiis natam sociare Latinis, o mea progenies, thalamis neu crede paratis; externi <u>venient</u> generi, <u>qui sanguine nostrum nomen in astra ferant</u>, quorumque a stirpe nepotes omnia sub pedibus, qua sol utrumque recurrens aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt.'</i></p> <p>(Faunus to incubating Latinus, 7.97-101)</p>
<p><i>hunc illum fatis <u>externa ab sede profectum</u> portendi generum <u>paribusque in regna vocari</u> <u>auspiciis</u>, huic progeniem virtute futuram egregiam et totum quae viribus occupet orbem.</i></p> <p>(Latinus ponders in his mind, 7.255-8)</p>	<p><i>'est mihi nata, viro gentis quam iungere nostrae non patrio ex adyto sortes, non plurima caelo monstra sinunt; generos <u>externis adfore ab oris</u>, hoc Latio restare canunt, <u>qui sanguine nostrum nomen in astra ferant</u>. hunc illum poscere fata et reor et, si quid veri mens augurat, opto.'</i></p> <p>(Latinus tells Ilioneus the terms of the prophecy, 7.268-73)</p>

The first wording is the most portentous. [*A*]dventare, petere, agmen, dominarier are freighted with military connotations masked by their metaphorical appropriateness to the omen of the bees.³⁵⁸ These are absent in Faunus' version, which adds instead the explicit prohibition against marriage to a Latin and the unlimited future power of the now-plural descendants, and includes a

³⁵⁷ Plutarch tells how one people dealt with the arrival of uninvited columnists: Μήλιοι γῆς χρῆζοντες ἀμφιλαφοῦς Νυμφαῖον ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἀποικίας ἐποίησαντο, νέον ἄνδρα καὶ κάλλει, διαφέροντα: τοῦ δὲ θεοῦ πλεῖν κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦς, ὅπου δ' ἂν ἀποβάλωσι τοὺς κομιστήρας, ἐπεὶ κατοικεῖν, συνέπεσε τῇ Καρία προσβαλοῦσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀποβάσει τὰς ναῦς ὑπὸ χειμῶνος διαφθαρήναι. τῶν δὲ Καρῶν οἱ Κρύασσαν οἰκοῦντες, εἶτε τὴν ἀπορίαν οἰκτίραντες εἶτε δεῖσαντες αὐτῶν τὴν τόλμαν, ἐκέλευον οἰκεῖν παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς χώρας μετέδωκαν: εἶτα πολλὴν ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ λαμβάνοντας αὐξήσιν ὀρᾶντες, ἐπεβούλευον ἀνελεῖν εὐωχίαν τινὰ καὶ θοίνην παρασκευάσαντες (*De Mulieribus* 7).

³⁵⁸ Gossrau 1876, 335 argues that *liquidum trans aethera vectae obsedere apicem* implies these men will be invaders who arrive by sea. de Vasconcellos 2015 argues that *agmen easdem* contains "a kind of cryptogram" of the name "Aeneas."

vicious ambiguity (*qui sanguine nostrum / nomen in astra ferant*, 99-100).³⁵⁹ In Latinus' thoughts at the moment under examination in Book 7, *paribus...auspiciis* is introduced for the first time. Vergil smuggles this interpretation in unobtrusively: it makes sense as a wish the king would project, consciously or not, into the terms, but it is nowhere in the original prophecies.³⁶⁰ Also appearing for the first time in Latinus' head is explanation of how the idea of arrival (present already in *adventare* [7.69], *veniunt* [7.99]) relates to the key word *externus*: the sons-in-law will be foreign because they will have set forth from a *sedes* that is *externa*.³⁶¹ In the prophecies, the adjective *externus* modified *generi*; in Latinus' head, it modifies the place from which the *generi* come. Latinus does not make these subtle but essential changes only in his own head; he tailors his spoken rendition of the terms of the prophecy to his multiple audience. He slips in his interpretation that the *externus* must be from a foreign shore (*externis...ab oris*); he quotes Faunus' words (*qui...ferant*); he says nothing about the world-spanning power the descendants of his *generi* will have (as Faunus did), only that they are eligible to be sons-in-law. For his own people,³⁶² who are privy to the debate over what exactly *externus* means,³⁶³ this new phrasing means that under no argument can Turnus or any other native Italian count as an *externus*, since they are not from foreign shores. There is no appeal to kinship, which would only introduce the complex question of whether someone who might be related and whose ancestry

³⁵⁹ See O'Hara 1990, 63.

³⁶⁰ See Ser. *ad* 4.102-3 (*paribusque regamus / auspiciis*), where Juno proposes equal auspices as the terms under which the Carthaginians and Trojans will be united; see Fordyce 1991 and Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.257 for the usage generally.

³⁶¹ Cairns 1989, 120: "he shifts subtly from 'foreigner' to 'coming from abroad.'" Nakata 2012, 349: "geography over genealogy."

³⁶² It is more than probable that there are Latins in the great *templum* in which he receives the ambassadors (192-194).

³⁶³ See Amata's speech (7.359-72).

was in Italy could be an *externus*.³⁶⁴ As for the Trojans, they will never hear the prophecy in its more ambiguous formulation; they need never be privy to the debate, or question how perfectly the wording they heard is tailored to fit their recent arrival. Neither do they need — so thinks Latinus — to know that they will rule the world; as Ilioneus' speech made clear, their ambitions need no encouragement.

The last matter of note is the surprising order in which Latinus arranges his propositions. After *di nostra incepta secudent / auguriumque suum* (259-60) we, knowing what Ilioneus has been thinking, expect an immediate account of the divine commands, then an offer of marriage. Instead the next six lines are spent granting what Ilioneus has requested in an increasingly grudging tone. Beginning with terminology that seems to verge on the sarcastic (*tanta cupido*,³⁶⁵ *properat; adueniat; exhorrescat*), it ends in a remarkable formulation: *pars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tyranni*.³⁶⁶ It has been alleged that *tyrannus* lacks a negative connotation here and elsewhere,³⁶⁷ but the evidence adduced is circular³⁶⁸ and the conclusion that the word can be neutral, nothing but a synonym for “leader,” is oversimple. In fact the word is never positive and never paired with an approving adjective; it is often negative; it is much more strongly negative in “character speech” than “in narrator speech”; even when not clearly so, it is associated with

³⁶⁴ Servius' comment *ad* 7.367 may credit Amata with too much cleverness (*postea etiam huic argumento alia subvenit argumentatione, Turnum Graecum esse ab Acrisio commemorans. per quod duas res agit latenter: nam dicendo originem considerandam, docet et Turnum Graecum esse ab Inacho et Acrisio, et Aenean Latinum a Dardano.*), but his comment well exposes the latent tension between the conception of Aeneas as a revenant relative and as an *externus*. The utterance of the *haruspex* commanding the Etruscans to follow *externi duces* is much clearer. All Italians are ruled out (*nulli fas Italo tantam subiungere gentem*, 8.502), so the exclusion of Pallas, son of an Italian woman, is uncontroversial (*natum exhortarer, ni mixtus matre Sabella / hinc partem patriae traheret*, 8.510-1).

³⁶⁵ Compare *sed si tantus amor...* (2.10ff). There the force is concessive (“if you really want X so badly, I’ll do it”); here it is admonitory (“if you *really* want X so badly, *you* should do it!”)

³⁶⁶ Balk 1968, 71 says flatly “Latinus ermuntert Aeneas, ihn persönlich aufzusuchen.”

³⁶⁷ According to e.g. Fordyce *ad loc*; Noonan 1993, 116.

³⁶⁸ E.g. Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.342 (*Laurentis tecta tyranni*; of Latinus): “Neither here nor at the similarly alliterative 266 (Lat. of Aeneas himself) is any comprehensibly negative connotation present.”

something oddly foreign and un-Roman.³⁶⁹ It is hard to find the collocation *dextram tangere*³⁷⁰ indicating the same social exchange between peers expressed by *dextram dare* or *dextram prendere*.³⁷¹ In the only Vergilian parallel (*contigimusque manum*, 11.245; Venulus of Diomedes),³⁷² the toucher of the hand is an inferior to, and acting in a supplicatory manner toward, the owner of the hand.³⁷³ It is hard to hear these words as those of an equal partner satisfied with how he has been treated by his new partners; perhaps anger or resentment does, after all, contribute to Latinus' delay.³⁷⁴ Whatever his emotions, he seems to be directing a rebuke at Aeneas for not appearing in person to ratify with his pledge agreement to the demands he has sent through an underling.

2.3.2.4 First Model of Negotiation and Alliance

The local king, having heard that arrivals have stopped in his territory, extends to them hospitality, poses himself as informing them of their history, and attempts to circumscribe the terms in which they can represent their arrival. The arrivals' ambassador reverses point for point the terms in which the king framed their relationship, one-ups the king's self-presentation of his ancestry, demonstrates independent knowledge of the region, and bases on legal argument and ancestral connection claims to land that are in need only of the king's recognition, not his approval. The king has no reason to wish to give the arrivals an independent kingdom, no matter how small, and he is as capable of they are of framing the prospective alliance on terms of his

³⁶⁹ 1.361; 4.320; 7.342; 8.483; 12.75; *Georgics* 4.492; from other authors: Prop.2.8.9; 2.25.11; Hor.*Ep.*1.2.58; *Od.* 1.35.12; 2.13.31; 3.2.7; 3.3.3. See also Ahl 2007 ad 7.266.

³⁷⁰ Liv.25.16.13; 28.9.6; 30.12.13; 33.33.2; *Ov.Am.*3.8.16; *Sen.Herc.Fur.*370f; *Stat.Silv.*3.4.61.

³⁷¹ 1.408; 514; 611 (greeting of dear ones); 2.83; 3.610; 6.613; 7.366; 8.467; 9.289; 10.517; 11.178.

³⁷² Cf. *funemque manu contingere gaudent*, 2.239.

³⁷³ Because Diomedes refuses to help, there is also no ratification of a pledge or alliance that the grasping of right hands normally signifies.

³⁷⁴ Rütten 1912, 79 thinks the Apollonian parallels (see n.355 above) make the conclusion inevitable ("*rex vehementer irascitur*").

own choosing. Instead of granting them their own coastal territory by recognizing their claim, he invites them in as partners bound by marriage alliance.³⁷⁵ Under his proposal he will retain equal *imperium* under equal auspices. This diplomatic exchange ends amicably, but it is a competition by the characters to obtain favorable terms, not an opportunity for the poet to repeat the arrivals' justification concerning which the reader is already fully informed. Circumstances dissolve the alliance before it can begin. We should nevertheless be able to understand that it would have been a very different fate for Aeneas his people, grafted onto the Latin line and assimilated into their city, than the fate that awaits them after the end of the *Aeneid*.

2.4 Diplomatic Speech in Italy: Second Model

2.4.1 Aeneas to Evander

We turn now to the second negotiation between peoples meeting in Italy for the first time, and the second model of alliance between the Trojans and a new people. As Book 8 opens the war has begun, and the outnumbered and beleaguered Trojans are forced to seek allies. Aeneas' thoughts leave him at an impasse, and he falls into a troubled sleep (8.18-30).³⁷⁶ At this crisis the god of the Tiber appears to him. This hoary divinity tells Aeneas to sail up to the Tiber and make a new alliance, and gives him the information necessary to carry out competently these instructions. In Aeneas' approach to Pallanteum the balance of knowledge again determines the characters' arguments and the course of a diplomatic exchange. On the one hand the reader is fully equipped to know what facts Aeneas has at his disposal in forming a convincing appeal,

³⁷⁵ Apollodorus' account of Dardanus' arrival in an Ilium already inhabited by Teucrians (*Bibl.*3.12) provides an interesting parallel for this sort of assimilation: [Dardanus] ὑποδεχθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως [Teucer], καὶ λαβὼν μέρος τῆς γῆς καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου θυγατέρα Βάτειαν, Δάρδανον ἔκτισε πόλιν. Presumably, however, there is no question under Latinus' plan of Aeneas building his own city.

³⁷⁶ Wiesen 1973, 743-744 notes that Aeneas has forgotten the guidance he received in the underworld (6.96-97; 891-892).

because the reader has heard all the reports Aeneas has heard concerning his destination. As he sails up the Tiber, Aeneas has been given an extensive scouting report by Tiberinus (8.51-6) and may even recall the Sibyl's prophecy that an unlooked-for way to safety will appear from a Greek city (6.96-7). The river god tells him that the people are Arcadian (51); they are descended from a Pallas (51); they have followed Evander to Italy (52); they have established a city named after the same Pallas (53-4); they have had drawn-out wars with Latins (55). The Pallanteans resemble the Trojans, and Evander Aeneas, in that they are transplants, first-generation immigrants to Italy, city-founders, and in conflict with the Latins. On the other hand, the reader, with Aeneas, has no idea of what Evander knows about the Trojans. Throughout Aeneas' stay in Pallanteum Evander controls what both Aeneas and the reader know; the reader acquires knowledge at the same time as Evander dispenses it to his guest.

When the Trojan fleet rounds the final bend in the Tiber, Pallas challenges the newcomers with a series of questions.³⁷⁷ The Trojan rhetorical strategy heard in Aeneas' response is new:

*Troiugenas ac tela vides inimica Latinis,
quos illi bello profugos egere superbo.*³⁷⁸
*Euandrum petimus. ferte haec et dicite lectos
Dardaniae venisse duces socia arma rogantis.* (8.117-20)

³⁷⁷ Neither we nor Aeneas know this yet, but the Pallanteans are weak and surrounded by enemies. Their first reaction is fright (109-11: *terrentur uisu subito cunctique relictis / consurgunt mensis. audax quos rumpere Pallas / sacra uetat*; Pallas has to stop them from breaking off the sacrifice because they are about to either attack or run away). Clausen 2002, 159ff traces the Homeric models, including Telemachus and Mentor's arrival in Pylos at the beginning of *Odyssey* 3. The parallels are helpful, but his "Even in the Arcadian wilderness Homeric etiquette prevails" (161) is imprecise. Eden 1975, 54-5 points out the principal difference: the Trojans are "immediately asked 'friend or foe' (112f), and are invited to the feast (172f) only after inquiries and diplomatic interchanges." In Homer either asking an arrival his name and purpose, or waiting until negotiations have been concluded before feeding him, is almost the worst violation of etiquette one can make (see Reece 1993: 132-3; also 63. n.6; 104 n.3).

³⁷⁸ Fordyce (*ad* 188 "a striking piece of diplomatic exaggeration...*superbo bello* is hardly justified by the fact that Latinus has allowed his pledge to be broken") and Thomas 2005, 136 ("Any objective judgement 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") are overstatements. We cannot expect Aeneas to give an objective and balanced account of the events of Book 7, filled with multiple causality and with shades of gray.

Aeneas immediately assuages the fear evident in the Pallanteans reaction to seeing him and his ships (109-10); he establishes that he is, as an enemy of an enemy,³⁷⁹ a friend (117), having already been subjected to mistreatment (118) by the common enemy; he makes sure it is clear that he knows for whom he is looking (119), and that he wishes alliance (120). He names his people *profugi* to make the Latin *superbia* look all the worse, but also to draw the connection between his people's predicament and that of the Pallanteans.³⁸⁰ The switch from the initial and neutral *Troiugenas* (117) to *Dardaniae* (119) makes sense if he has learned, or guesses, that the story of Dardanus' Italian origin is current in Italy and supposed that it may be an effective way of gaining allies.³⁸¹ Aeneas points out that select leaders (*lectos...duces*; not the ambassadors [*delectos....oratores*] of the last embassy, 7.152ff) have come in person, and makes his purpose clear immediately: to ask for *socia arma*. The more direct strategy wins immediate results: *hospitium*, secured immediately with the handclasp that delay prevented from ever occurring between Aeneas and Latinus ("nostris succede penatibus hospes." [says Pallas] *excepitque manu dextramque amplexus inhaesit*, 123-4).

Aeneas has obtained a safe reception and an audience, but, like Ilioneus in Book 7, he needs much more than hospitality. Unlike his ambassador he needs neither land nor acknowledgment of a divine right, but troops:

*optime Graiugenum, cui me Fortuna precari
et uitta comptos voluit praetendere ramos,
non equidem extimui Danaum quod ductor et Arcas
quodque a stirpe fores geminis coniunctus Atridis;* 130

³⁷⁹ His word order is dramatic: *Latinis*, explaining *inimica*, is left to the end of a line.

³⁸⁰ Ser. *ad* 118: *et movet conciliationem etiam ex similitudine fortunae*. Ser. *ad* 51 quotes Varro on the Pallanteans with similar vocabulary (*exules confugerunt*). Tiberinus did not say explicitly that the Pallanteans were forcefully ejected from their homeland, but *signa secuti* (8.52) did not suggest a peaceful exit.

³⁸¹ The idea is reinforced if the idea of *multasque viro se adiungere gentis / Dardanio* (13-14) in Venulus' embassy is that Aeneas is acquiring allies by virtue of being Dardanian.

*sed mea me uirtus et sancta oracula divum
 cognatique patres, tua terris didita fama,
 coniunxere tibi et fatis egere uolentem.
 Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor,
 Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus, 135
 aduehitur Teucros; Electram maximus Atlas
 edidit, aetherios umero qui sustinet orbis.
 vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia
 Cyllenae gelido conceptum vertice fudit;
 at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas, 140
 idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit.
 sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.
 his fretus non legatos neque prima per artem
 temptamenta tui pepigi; me, me ipse meumque
 obieci caput et supplex ad limina ueni. 145
 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.
 accipe daque fidem. sunt nobis fortia bello 150
 pectora, sunt animi et rebus spectata iuuentus. (8.127-51)*

Aeneas acknowledges that for a Trojan to approach a Greek is odd (127-30), but excuses himself, and flatters (131-3). He traces a detailed family tree that connects the two (134-42), and puts forward as a guarantee of how much faith he has in this kinship connection his risking of himself in person instead of using legates and instead of using artful appeals (142-5). Then he appeals to his addressee's interests, pointing out that they share an enemy (146-9), and closes with an appeal for, and offer of, a formidable alliance (150-1).³⁸²

Aeneas must introduce an argument from higher motives before he passes on to necessity or common interest.³⁸³ Reference to a genealogy requiring many steps and much obscurity,

³⁸² The situation recalls the Sibyl's prophecy, which not only mentioned a safety-bringing Greek city but, eight lines before, said that Aeneas would be a suppliant (*cum tu supplex in rebus egenis / quas gentes Italum aut quas non oraueris urbes*, 6.91-2).

³⁸³ On the necessity of an appeal based on these two registers see above (2.3).

though it may seem abstruse or frigid, is not out of place in this context,³⁸⁴ and it is difficult to find other arguments he might have used. He cannot fall back on praise and ethical admiration, as he did the last time he spoke to a *hospes*, Dido, with whom he had no other relationship (1.595-609). Thomas suggests that Aeneas deliberately cuts Jupiter out of his place as a closer ancestral link between the two peoples than Atlas because he wishes to paint the Latins as aggressors, and in the opposition between Jupiter (corresponding to the Trojans) and Saturn (corresponding to the Latins) it is difficult to forget that the former was the one who violently cast out the latter.³⁸⁵ I add that the Trojan now says nothing about coming home to ancestral lands and nothing about fated journeys and future kingdoms. This is neither the time nor the place to press such claims.

Aeneas makes two points concerning consanguinity: first, the negative argument that Aeneas is not afraid of approaching a Greek, even a relative of the Atreidae; second, the positive argument that the Trojans are related to Evander and his Arcadians. The introduction of the Atreidae (130) is exceedingly obscure and introduces difficulties into his later argument. Of the three ways Evander may be related to the Atreidae that Servius speculatively suggests, including the one he claims has Roman poetic authority,³⁸⁶ two run through Atlas. It is hard to reconcile this with the kinship argument, which he is about to make, that he is related to Evander through Atlas; it is hard to argue, “I am not afraid that you have the same *cognati patres* as my worst

³⁸⁴ For the arcane arguments of real-life examples, often depending on literary authority, see Erskine 2001. Jones 1995, 238 calls Aeneas’ genealogy “language faintly evocative of a Hellenistic envoy.” There was yet another way of constructing a united genealogy: Servius *ad* 3.167 says that *Graeci et Varro* say that Dardanus came from Arcadia.

³⁸⁵ See Thomas 2005, 133-8.

³⁸⁶ Servius *ad* 8.130: *quod Accius in Atreo plenius refert*; see Stabryla 1970, 62ff.

enemies (130), because we two are natural allies connected by *cognati patres* (132), who turn out to be exactly the same *cognati patres* (134-41).”³⁸⁷

When Aeneas moves on to the argument of consanguinity through Atlas, he uses a formula displacing the authority for his assertion (*ut Grai perhibent*, 135), perhaps in order to mention a Greek authority in an appeal to a Greek addressee.³⁸⁸ The keystone of the genealogy is the idea that the same Atlas who holds up the world was the father of Electra (mother of Dardanus, who is ancestor of Trojans) and of Maia (mother of Mercury, who is ancestor of Arcadians). This point, which Aeneas belabors and draws attention to with another distancing formula, this time specifying no source (*at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas, idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit*, 8.140-1), is the element least supported by extant mythography or tradition.³⁸⁹ The point is not that Aeneas gets anything wrong within the world of the *Aeneid*³⁹⁰ — as if “accuracy” concerning ever-flexible semi-divine genealogies were either possible or an *optandum* in persuasion³⁹¹ — but that the language of the speech draws attention

³⁸⁷ Another way of putting this might be: a shared forefather (*sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno*) is not an argument for doing anything (like helping Aeneas) if everyone shares the same forefather. If Atlas is the ancestor Evander shares with the Atreidae, the Atreidae are several generations closer to Evander than Aeneas is.

³⁸⁸ Eden 1975 *ad* 135: “a source which Evander would hardly question.” Thomas 2005, 134-5 suggests that this is an “Alexandrian footnote” (for the term see Ross 1975; expanded in Hinds 1998) to Aeneas’ account of Zeus begetting Dardanus (*Il.*20.215-6).

³⁸⁹ Servius *ad loc* says there were three Atlases: one from north Africa (called *maximus*), one Italian (the father of Electra), and one Arcadian (the father of Maia). He insists that Aeneas (or perhaps he means Vergil) is making a “mistake” (*sed nunc ex nominum similitudine facit errorem et dicit Electram et Maiam filias fuisse Atlantis maximi*). Ovid pokes fun at the passage in the *Fasti* (4.31ff, beginning *Dardanon Electra nesciret Atlantide natum / scilicet, Electran concubuisse Iovi?*; see Barchiesi 1997, 171ff).

³⁹⁰ The narrator has already conflated these Atlases: at 4.246ff Mercury alights on Atlas in Africa (presumably to be identified with Iopas’ teacher *maximus Atlas* at 1.741), who is also his ancestor (*materno veniens ab avo Cyllenia proles*, 258).

³⁹¹ Some negative judgments are overstated (e.g., Warde Fowler 1918, 50: “comical...cheap mythology and genealogical nonsense.”; Hollis 1992, 270: “pedantic antiquarianism.”; Eden 1975 *ad* 134-141 “a genealogical tree of doubtful authenticity.”). For a more balanced evaluation see Nakata 2012, 354.

to the argument's artificiality, to the genealogy's tendentiousness, and to the selectivity of the speaker's antiquarianism.³⁹²

The rest of Aeneas' rhetorical techniques are easier to follow. Before Tiberinus' appearance Aeneas has heard no report of the man he calls so famous (*tua terris didita fama*, 8.132). It is difficult to characterize a speech with such a genealogy as ingenuous, as Aeneas tries to do (nothing *per artem* here, of course [143-4]). From the collapse of relations with Latinus Aeneas has learned to come humbly in person (*me, me ipse meumque / obieci caput et supplex ad limina ueni* 144-145). He presses the urgency of an immediate and firm agreement (*accipe daque fidem*, 150). He replaces high-flown promises of the future with practical arguments (146-149) and the offer of tangible help (*sunt nobis fortia bello / pectora, sunt animi et rebus spectata iuuentus*, 150-151). Above I discussed the invention of vv.147-149; here I would add that Aeneas' assumption of knowledge for which he has no basis is of a piece with his positioning of himself in the rest of the speech as knowledgeable in the mythico-genealogical world and the political map of Italy.

There is a gap in the carefully woven links of information-relay upon which Aeneas has based his speech. Although he calls himself hostile to the Latins (117), he seems to know that Evander's enemies are the Rutulians and not the Latins as a whole (*gens eadem, quae te, crudeli Daunia bello / insequitur*, 146-147). This is true; but how does Aeneas know this? Tiberinus had only told him *hi bellum adsidue ducunt cum gente Latina* (8.55). The term is not inaccurate — despite the loaded debate over whether Turnus counts as *externus* or not, the Rutulians may fairly

³⁹² It is possible to smooth over the doubtful nexus of a lengthy genealogy more skillfully, as does Argos speaking to Aetes in the Apollonian parallel (see Clausen 1992, 217-8): τόνδε μὲν, οἷό περ οὐνεκ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος ὄλλοι ἀγερθεν, / κλείουσ' Αἴσονος υἱὸν Ἰήσονα Κρηθεΐδαο. / εἰ δ' αὐτοῦ Κρηθῆος ἐτήτυμόν ἐστι γενέθλης, / οὕτω κεν γνωτὸς πατρώιος ἄμμι πέλοιτο. / ἄμφοω γὰρ Κρηθεὺς Ἀθάμας τ' ἔσαν Αἰόλου υἱεῖς (*Arg.*3.356-61; although this attempt is more artful, is not successful [372ff]).

be described as *a* Latin people, even if they are not under Latinus' direct rule.³⁹³ — but there seems to be no way for Aeneas to know that Turnus is the only Latin with whom Evander has been fighting. All he has heard from Tiberinus is *gens Latina*, yet in his speech he says *Daunia gens*. I suspect that this cannot be explained away as an inspired or hopeful guess by Aeneas, and is a rare Vergilian error.

2.4.2 Evander to Aeneas

Aeneas' failure to mention his own name leaves Evander an opportunity to change the terms of the discussion:

<i>ut te, fortissime Teucrum,</i>	
<i>accipio agnoscoque libens! ut verba parentis</i>	155
<i>et vocem Anchisae magni vultumque recordor!</i>	
<i>nam memini Hesionae uisentem regna sororis</i>	
<i>Laomedontiaden Priamum Salamina petentem</i>	
<i>protinus Arcadiae gelidos inuisere finis.</i>	
<i>tum mihi prima genas vestibat flore iuuentas,</i>	160
<i>mirabarque duces Teucros, mirabar et ipsum</i>	
<i>Laomedontiaden; sed cunctis altior ibat</i>	
<i>Anchises. mihi mens iuvenali ardebat amore</i>	
<i>compellare virum et dextrae coniungere dextram;</i>	
<i>accessi et cupidus Phenei sub moenia duxi.</i>	165
<i>ille mihi insignem pharetram Lyciasque sagittas</i>	
<i>discedens chlamydemque auro dedit intertextam,</i>	
<i>frenaque bina meus quae nunc habet aurea Pallas.</i>	
<i>ergo et quam petitis iuncta est mihi foedere dextra,</i>	
<i>et lux cum primum terris se crastina reddet,</i>	170
<i>auxilio laetos dimittam opibusque iuvabo.</i>	
<i>interea sacra haec, quando huc venistis amici,</i>	
<i>annua, quae differre nefas, celebrate faventes</i>	
<i>nobiscum, et iam nunc sociorum adsuescite mensis.</i>	(7.154-75)

³⁹³ Eden 1975 (*ad* 8.55) may be right that the god is conflating the two distinct ethnonyms because Turnus has by this time effectively taken over command of all Latins.

Evander discards Aeneas' elaborate stemma as irrelevant in his first words. To call Aeneas and his men *Teucrici* (154; repeated at 161) is to dismiss or ignore Aeneas' whole argument based on his descent from Dardanus. The Arcadian instead claims joyous recognition (*accipio agnoscoque libens*) based on an earlier relationship with Anchises.³⁹⁴ Aeneas was wholly ignorant of this much more direct link, and it supplants his argument from distant relationship. Insofar as a genealogy more specific than "Teucricians" enters in, Evander for patronymic uses not *Dardanidae* but *Laomedontides* (158 and 162). The pointedness of the latter's negative associations may vary,³⁹⁵ but Evander uses it in a narrative of a Trojans trip to visit Hesione, living in a foreign land and married to a foreigner because of Laomedontian treachery.³⁹⁶ This activates the negative associations of descent from Laomedon, and, with the immediately following praise of Hercules as sacker of Troy,³⁹⁷ demonstrate Evander's embarrassingly thorough familiarity with the past of Aeneas' relatives.

Evander is not calling names, like others who indiscriminately name all Trojans descendants of the famed traitor.³⁹⁸ He is instead drawing out the contrast between *Laomedontides Priamus* and Anchises by the ordering of events and words in his mini-narrative. He begins with Priam as leader and brother of Ilione, the relict of betrayal (158ff), then switches

³⁹⁴ Note the parallel to Dido's advertisement that Telamonian Teucer (see above Chapter 1) is her source of knowledge about the Trojans.

³⁹⁵ The idea that "Laomedontian" can be a neutral term for "Trojan" is found in e.g. Conington 1876 *ad* 7.105; Fordyce 199 *ad* 158 ("without the implicit reference to Laomedon's treachery"); Wiesen 1973, 744-6 is an important correction.

³⁹⁶ *Quis enim nescit* — Servius proclaims *ad* 8.157 — that Laomedon's refusal to pay Neptune and Apollo for building the walls of Troy resulted in an attack on the city by a sea monster, to whom Laomedon was forced to expose Hesione, only for her to be rescued by Hercules, who, being denied payment, sacked Troy, killed Laomedon, and gave Hesione to his comrade Telamon, who took her back to Salamis, where she gave birth to Teucer and was visited by Priam and Anchises, on which trip Evander met them both as they stopped off in Arcadia? On the same journey Anchises met Anius, king of Delos (see Serv. *ad* 3.82). To Vergil (*satis iam pridem sanguine nostro / Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae*, 1.501-2) and Horace (*ex quo destituit deos / mercede pacta Laomedon*, Ode 3.3.24) the name is shorthand for the Trojan people's original sin.

³⁹⁷ The hymn is explicit: *ut bello egregias idem disiecerit urbes, Troiamque Oechaliamque* (290-1).

³⁹⁸ Cf. Celaeno at 3.248; Dido at 4.542; see also Neptune 5.801-11.

emphatically to Aeneas' father, enjambéd in matching line position: *mirabarque duces, mirabar et ipsum / Laomedontiaden; sed cunctis altior ibat / Anchises* (161-3). The antithetical arrangement reminds us that Aeneas is not literally a Laomedontian³⁹⁹ because he is a descendant of Assaracus and a member of the junior house of the Trojan royal family. The two houses were rivals.⁴⁰⁰ To Aeneas this is a signal that Evander knows the distinction. Evander knows in detail the potential for treachery on one side of Aeneas' house's history, but the precedent of a warm friendship between Evander and Aeneas' branch of the house should set the example for the alliance between the two living speakers.⁴⁰¹ If the import of Evander's background story could be distilled to a bald statement, it would be a warning and an exhortation:⁴⁰² do not be like the house of Laomedon, whose treachery ends in disaster; be like your father.

³⁹⁹ The distinction is observed by Jupiter (*cum domus Assaraci Pthiam clarasque Mycenae / seruitio premet ac uictis dominabitur Argis*, 1,284-285), by Anchises in the underworld (*Ilusque Assaracusque et Troiae Dardanus auctor*, 6.650 and *Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater / educet*, 6.778-779), by Ascanius (*per magnos, Nise, penatis / Assaracique larem*, 9.259), and by Apollo (*iure omnia bella / gente sub Assaraci fato uentura resident*, 9.643). See Skutsch 1985 on Ennius fr. 14 (*Assaraco natus Capys optimus isque pium ex se / Anchisen generat*).

⁴⁰⁰ Resentment between the two branches of the house can be detected in the *Iliad* (13.460: αἰεὶ γὰρ Πριάμῳ ἐπεμήνιε δίῳ / οὐνεκ' ἄρ' ἐσθλὸν ἔοντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὐ τι τίεσκεν; it probably explains Aeneas' resentful Πριάμῳ [20.87], certainly Achilles' taunts [20.179-86]). Presumably it contributes to the accounts that make Aeneas a traitor (e.g. Menecrates [=Muller *FHG* II.343], quoted in Dion.Hal.1.48: Αἰνεΐης γὰρ ἄτιτος ἔων ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ἀπὸ γερῶν ἱερῶν ἐξεργόμενος ἀνέτρεψε Πριάμῳ). Later Dares and Dictys imaginatively play up the theme as a motivation for Aeneas' treachery. In the *Aeneid* Aeneas may have already made covert reference to this, if his Thymoetes (2.32-4), who may be a traitor and who certainly led the party that wanted the horse led into the city, is already Priam's brother (as he is in Dictys; not for sure in Euphorion). A Capys homonymous with Assaracus' son, Anchises' father, leads the party that wants the horse destroyed (2.35-9).

⁴⁰¹ See Eden 1975 *ad loc*; Knauer 1964, 403; Fordyce 1991 *ad loc* for the speech's Homeric parallels, esp. Telemachus and Nestor; they are instructive especially on the motif of recognition. The contrast between Priam and Laomedon is recognized by Binder 1971, 70-1, but his is a thematic reading in which Vergil is the one suggesting to his reader that there is need for a new and better Troy; Binder does not consider what Evander might wish to be suggesting. Petrini 1997, 52-5 appreciates the negative association, but takes them to suggest that Evander is unaware of the associations, that his narrative is blindly optimistic, a sign that his "ideals are fantasies, youthful illusions relived." Wiesen 1973, 751 edges tentatively toward character motivation, saying that *Laomedontiaden* "may also contain a hint that Evander is not unmindful of the treachery that stained Trojan history" and makes the connection to the mention of the sack of Troy (*ad* 291: Conington 1876 calls the mention of Troy "inopportune"; Fordyce 1991, "tactless." Eden's dry caution might also be observed: "[H]ow the Trojan guests reacted to the mention of Hercules' sack of Troy, we are not told; but the hymn was of course composed before they arrived."

⁴⁰² Evander elsewhere tells tales exemplary for his internal audience: on an *ambulatio* through the site that will be Rome, he teaches Aeneas the story of the execution of a faithless guest at the Argiletum (8.345-6). This is not only a self-justification, but also a warning to Aeneas (see Servius *ad loc* for details of the story; Binder 1971, 124; Papaioannou 2003, 699: "[T]he story functions as a warning for Aeneas.").

Evander establishes that he knows more than Aeneas⁴⁰³ by dismissing the latter's genealogy, by ignoring the arguments based on it, and by using a thorough knowledge of his family history to give him both positive and negative *exempla*. The more important effect of the speech, however, is to establish that Evander's relationship to Anchises is more than either a reason he recognizes Aeneas or merely a precedent for a new relationship between Evander and Aeneas. When the Arcadian saw Anchises he burned, he says, with desire to approach and seize his hand, and, when he led him under the walls of his city, he presumably did take his hand (*mihi mens iuvenali ardebat amore / compellare virum et dextrae coniungere dextram; / accessi et cupidus Phenei sub moenia duxi*, 8.163-5).⁴⁰⁴ They exchanged gifts of quiver, arrows, gold-woven cloak, and the golden bits that Pallas now has (166-8). All this builds to Evander's conclusion: *ergo et quam petitis iuncta est mihi foedere dextra* (169). He means not that Aeneas and he should or will become allies as Aeneas requested, but that by virtue of the previous relationship they already are allies. The import, if we expand and paraphrase, is: "Due to the events I have just narrated, as far as I'm concerned the pledge of the right hand you are now asking for has *already* been joined, and an alliance is already in place."⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰³ Aeneas is Evander's silent pupil (with the exception of a response to divine interference at 532ff) through the rest of Book 8. The book ends with Aeneas' ignorance of Rome's future even as he sees it depicted on his shield and as he stands where it will be.

⁴⁰⁴ According to Servius, Varro located Dardanus' origin in this Arcadian city (Serv. *ad* 3.167: *Graeci et Varro humanarum rerum Dardanum non ex Italia, sed de Arcadia, urbe Pheneo, oriundum dicunt*).

⁴⁰⁵ Taking *mihi* with Eden 1975 *ad loc*, who translates "And so the pledge (of alliance) which you seek is (already) established through the bond (of friendship)." Conington's misinterpretation is instructive: "The perf. is used because Evander wishes to say that their request of alliance is already granted, not, as Serv. thinks," — Servius *ad loc*: *antiquis amicitiiis per Anchisae hospitium*— "with reference to the formation of the friendship between Evander and Anchises." The request has "already" been accomplished — precisely by the friendship between Evander and Anchises. Fordyce 1991 *ad* 169 thinks Evander has taken Aeneas' hand as he had been talking; were this so, we would expect some deictic marker to make clear that the action is taking place during speech. Pallas has already taken Aeneas' hand (*dextramque amplexus inhaesit*, 124), but this was a sign of welcome and did not satisfy Aeneas that a treaty had been formed; he still asks Evander *accipe daque fidem* (150). The next day Evander and Aeneas join hands again before Evander reveals the help he promised (*congressi iungunt dextras*, 8.467).

Two slightly different points are intertwined here: the difference between guests and allies, and the obligations of this particular alliance. As usual Vergil is dealing with a mixture of legal categories and epic conventions.⁴⁰⁶ Pallas has already received Aeneas in a friendly manner as a *hospes*. What Aeneas wants, since he needs practical help, is closer alliance, a *foedus*; what he was instructed to obtain.⁴⁰⁷ Evander now asserts that it, or something like it, already exists.⁴⁰⁸ Deriving as it does from the personal connections of past *hospitium* and *amicitia*, this relationship will be closer than one that might have been formed based only on Aeneas' genealogy, and harder to change or break than one based on the circumstance of sharing an enemy.

Evander uses what he knows, and has been able to figure out that Aeneas does not know, to transform the *ad hoc*, temporary union of convenience proposed by Aeneas. The resources Aeneas needs and asked for will not be lacking, however; Evander finishes by promising that he will favor his guest with them, and send him away satisfied at the next dawn (*et lux cum primum terris se crastina reddet, / auxilio laetos dimittam opibusque iuvabo*, 8.170-1).⁴⁰⁹ Why Evander chose to secure a close connection immediately and give help later is revealed next morning.

Evander's first speech was a public welcome, declaration that an alliance existed, and promise of

⁴⁰⁶ The traditional classification of Roman alliances into two distinct types, *foedus aequum* and *foedus iniquum*, has been rejected by Gruen 1986. For a classification into three types as in Livy 34.57, see Bauman 1983, 119 n.177. For *amicitia* see Badian 1958, 11-13, with observations on the slide of *hospitium* and *amicitia*, relationships originally between equals, into hierarchical master-client relationships. For the Greek terminology of συγγένεια, οικειότης, and φιλία, see Jones 1999; Erskine 2001, 165-6; Fragoulaki 2013.

⁴⁰⁷ Aeneas's request *accipe daque fidem* (8.510) is derived from Ennius fr.32 *accipe daque fidem foedusque feri bene firmam*. Tiberinus advised *foedera iunge* (55). Later Aeneas will make an alliance designated by the same word with the Etruscans (*iungit opes foedusque ferit*, 10.149-152).

⁴⁰⁸ Evander uses the key terminology when he calls upon the obligations deriving from their relationship (*nec vos arguerim, Teucri, nec foedera nec quas / iunximus hospitio dextras*, 11.164-5).

⁴⁰⁹ Evander's promise (8.171) repeats Dido's in Carthage (1.571). If the reader detects this, it is not an encouraging foreshadowing. See Newman 2005, 164; Highet 1972, 254.

help.⁴¹⁰ Now, in private and after another grasping of hands (*congressi iungunt dextras*, 467), he creates a new claim on Aeneas by joining Pallas to him, putting the youth under his tutelage and guardianship (514ff). Here is the germination of the seed planted when Evander mentioned the previous day that Pallas now possesses the golden bits given him by Anchises. The creation of this bond, the pledge of faithfulness and transfer of responsibility for the boy, immediately follows Evander's dramatic revelation that he cannot contribute much in the way of troops, and this his *auxilium* will be of a different sort.⁴¹¹ The Arcadians he leads are poor⁴¹² and under attack:

<i>maxime Teucrorum ductor, quo sospite numquam</i>	470
<i>res equidem Troiae victas aut regna fatebor,</i>	
<i>nobis ad belli auxilium pro nomine tanto</i>	
<i><u>exiguae vires</u>; hinc Tusco claudimur amni,</i>	
<i>hinc Rutulus premit et murum circumsonat armis.</i>	
<i>sed tibi ego ingentis populos opulentaque regnis</i>	475
<i>iungere castra paro, quam fors inopina salutem</i>	
<i>ostentat: fatis huc te poscentibus adfers.</i>	(8.470-7)

After line 472 we and Aeneas have been invited to expect some significant and substantive *auxilium*; *exiguae vires*, delayed and enjambed, is an emphatic way to make a humbling admission. It cannot be what Aeneas expected on the previous day. Evander's significance as a source of help is salvageable only by the information he gives Aeneas in the following lines. The Arcadian is not a power broker or negotiator. Despite his attempts to make himself central to the story as the first *externus dux* selected by the Etruscans (505ff), and his proclamation that he is

⁴¹⁰ Evander later draws out the similarities between himself and his guest: *me pulsum patria pelagique extrema sequentem / Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum / his posuere locis, matrisque egere tremenda / Carmentis nymphe monita et deus auctor Apollo* (8.333-6).

⁴¹¹ Just before this speech Evander ponders the service he promised: *hospitis Aeneae sedem et secreta petebat / sermonum memor et promissi muneris heros* (8.463-464).

⁴¹² So, at least, Evander has already claimed (*aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum / finge deo, rebusque veni non asper egenis*, 8.364-5).

the one responsible for adding these forces to Aeneas,⁴¹³ once he has dispensed the necessary information in this speech, he is not a necessary piece of the Trojan-Etruscan alliance. He does not go with Aeneas to arrange a meeting. Aeneas' diplomatic approach to Tarchon⁴¹⁴ does not, so far as we can tell, mention that the Arcadian has authorized him or vouched for him.⁴¹⁵ The *auxilium* Evander gives is only information about the Etruscans' motivations, their need for an *externus dux*, and their current state of readiness.⁴¹⁶ If he had told Aeneas all this before his careful construction of a relationship of binding loyalty, he would be no more than a pit-stop on a scouting mission. But now he has achieved his goal of binding Aeneas to him as closely as possible, with a web of claims based on both past and future, both fathers and sons.⁴¹⁷

Only now can both Aeneas and reader understand the deception by omission latent in Evander's first speech. The natural way to take the words of his promise (*auxilio laetos dimittam opibusque iuvabo*, 8.171) at the time was as a pledge to give Aeneas significant troops, or at least physical resources. But the *auxilium* turns out to be not tangible help from Evander, whose *exiguae vires* leave him none with which to negotiate, but news about how to get the *opes*.⁴¹⁸ Evander in one sense fulfills his promise to the letter, but he does so only in a manner that his new allies cannot have expected, and about which they are unlikely to be overjoyed. He does send his guest away with help; not back down the Tiber with arms, but further up the Tiber to get

⁴¹³ 8.496 *his ego te, Aenea, ductorem milibus addam*.

⁴¹⁴ We hear only a delayed and indirect report of this meeting (10.148-54).

⁴¹⁵ 8.503-7 only means that the Etruscans approached Evander with an offer of leadership; as a mutual enemy of Mezentius he would make a natural ally. But no previous or subsequent connection, still less alliance, is implied.

⁴¹⁶ See 8.497. That they have a fleet to board (10.155) is essential for the nick-of-time arrival back at the mouth of Tiber in Book X. Evander must also tell the Etruscans' location, although the narrator saves for himself a description of the locale of the Etruscan encampment (10.597ff).

⁴¹⁷ The bond is psychic as well as political. It is the images of father and son, the tables hospitably shared and handclasps exchanged, that are before Aeneas' eyes when Pallas dies (*Pallas, Evander, in ipsis / omnia sunt oculis, mensae quas advena primas / tunc adiit, dextraeque datae*, 10.515-7).

⁴¹⁸ The same word is applied to what the Etruscans offer when they join the Trojans (*haud fit mora, Tarchon / iungit opes foedusque ferit*, 10.153-4).

the resources he needs; he equips him not with troops, but with what he needs to know to get troops. By the entrusting of Pallas the Arcadian fixes a binding and permanent alliance, which will remain after the war in which Aeneas is now obligated to defend Pallanteum from its attackers. When the Trojans sailed up the Tiber, Evander ruled an isolated, raided city; now he has an ally committed to fight the raiders, ready to add the Etruscans to the forces defending Pallanteum, and inextricably bound to him and his family.

Aeneas has heard some foreshadowing of his role. Perhaps he felt something of how the implied parallel between Hercules' coming and his own figures him as savior to those in need rather than an aided suppliant. Perhaps he observed that Evander's straitened resources did not hold out much promise of overwhelming force, and heard Evander's plea (*aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum / finge deo, rebusque ueni non asper egenis*; 364-5) not only as a high-minded ethical exhortation.⁴¹⁹ Nevertheless, when Aeneas hears that he must sail further up the river, and that he is charged with his host's son, joy does not spring foremost in his mind:

*vix ea fatus erat, defixique ora tenebant
Aeneas Anchisiades et fidus Achates,
multaque dura suo tristi cum corde putabant,
ni signum caelo Cytherea dedisset aperto.* (8.520-3)

The surprise, the fixing of the eyes,⁴²⁰ the ambiguity of *multa dura putare*, the mixed conditional indicating both that the Trojans were doing whatever that phrase means and that they would have

⁴¹⁹ See also 8.98-100 (*rara domorum / tecta uident and res inopes*); 105 (*pauperque senatus*); 359-60 (*tecta subibant / pauperis Evandri*). Eden 1975, 54 (*ad* 97ff) suggests that the fear with which the Arcadians reacted 109ff is a sign of their desperate, impoverished situation.

⁴²⁰ See above for parallels in the *Aeneid*. To these add Apollonius' Jason after Aeetes sets him tasks to complete before he may take the fleece (ἽΩς ἄρ' ἔφη· ὁ δὲ σῖγα ποδῶν πάρος ὄμματα πήζας, / ἦστ' αὐτως ἀφθογος, ἀμηχανέων κακότητι / βουλὴν δ' ἀμφὶ πολὺν στρώφα χρόνον, οὐδέ πη εἶχεν θαρσαλέως ὑποδέχθαι, ἐπεὶ μέγα φαίνετο ἔργον. / ὄψε δ' ἀμειβόμενος προσελέξατο κερδαλέοισι, *Arg.*3.422-6).

continued to do so had not Venus intervened — all contribute to a moment that has been read as everything from the pause before a triumphant *peripeteia* to a preview of a dire forecast of chaotic civil war.⁴²¹ However we understand Aeneas' reaction, it is a moment of surprise, consternation, and *aporia* because what Evander has just said is contrary to the expectations that Evander raised.

The climax of the sequence of breaking up and delaying information, designed carefully by Evander to draw Aeneas in, and by Vergil to hold us readers in suspense, is Evander's final speech to Pallas. Here we learn more of Evander's martial past,⁴²² but also much more about his present weakness. Grief at his people's losses to Mezentius' attacks (568-71) reveals not one but two instances of incomplete telling earlier in the book. The first was another's distortion: Tiberinus told Aeneas that the Arcadians *bellum adsidue ducunt cum gente Latina* (55). An accurate report would have been that they have been subjected to brutal raids by an exiled Etruscan king with a Rutulian ally.⁴²³ In a similar way Evander on the day before had told of Mezentius' awful crimes in his own city Argylla (478ff), but had then named only Turnus as a hostile to the Pallanteans (*hinc Rutulus premit et murum circumsonat armis*, 474) as if he were moving on to a separate point. There was no suggestion of special hostility between Evander and Mezentius. The motive for such an admissions is now clear: it was much more politic at that time for Evander to appeal to Aeneas by mentioning as his own enemy only Turnus, Aeneas' chief

⁴²¹ See e.g. Otis, 522; Poschl 1950, 98ff.

⁴²² See 8.560ff (of Erulus and Praeneste).

⁴²³ This seems to me the only natural way to understand the run of thought in 568-71 (*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*). Adler 2003, 176 is excessively ingenious in first claiming that *urbem* can mean either Pallanteum or Argylla, then concluding that it does mean the latter, and that Evander is so good-hearted he is rebuking himself for not protecting Argyllans. The first half of Tiberinus' line (*hos castris adhibe socios*) was similarly misleading: the substantive contribution of allied troops will not be "these" Arcadians but the Etruscans. It is convenient both to the narrator and to the speaker that Aeneas be told the minimum about where to go and what to do.

enemy, rather than Mezentius, concerning whom Aeneas had indicated no knowledge. Now that we know that Mezentius has brutalized Pallanteum again and again, we may find it harder to accept even Evander's account of Mezentius' crimes as a disinterested or objective report.⁴²⁴ Now we understand that Evander has coopted Aeneas against both his enemies, not only as a defensive ally who will protect Pallanteum, but an offensive ally who will end the Etruscan civil war to the north.

2.5 Conclusion

In these two diplomatic exchanges the Trojans and their interlocutors speak with practical and political goals. Each side tries to avoid conflict in a tense situation, but also to make use of the other and to shape the terms of alliance to be in his own best advantage. These are the goals that drive characters to choose arguments and words that activate the rich emotional, thematic, and historical associations of the scenes. When the scenes are read with these motives in mind, they spring into life as tense verbal duels. Without these pressing and conflicting motives the scenes have no more point than a decorous exchange of pleasantries.

The arrangements reached at the end of each speech exchange seem satisfactory to both sides, but in both cases the Italian kings have used their superior knowledge to gain an advantage. From the Latins Ilioneus obtains the offer of a peaceable, if unexpected, means of settling in the land the Trojans have been commanded to settle. From the Pallanteans Aeneas obtains a small cavalry force and the information he needs to acquire much more substantial help. Each Italian king, instead of replying to his Trojan interlocutor's arguments or rejecting his

⁴²⁴ Mezentius cannot be innocent of wrongdoing (*iustae quibus est Mezentius irae*, says the narrator [10.714]; *tuum maculavi crimine nomen, / pulsus ob invidiam solio sceptrisque paternis. / debueram patriae poenas odiisque meorum*, says Mezentius [10.851-3]); but for the habit of internal narrators to distort see Chapter 3.

claims, introduces his own model of the alliance by offering his child to the newcomer to establish a permanent connection. Latinus obtains terms under which the newcomers will not take his land and form a separate kingdom, but will become his sons-in-law and will be assimilated into his kingdom. Evander secures a connection that will be treated as the extension of a multi-generational *foedus*, already established and ratified with Aeneas' father and to be extended by entrusting his own son to Aeneas. By directing Aeneas to an alliance with the Etruscans fighting a civil war against the Etruscan who has been raiding Evander's own land, Evander guarantees that Aeneas will have to fight instead of him to protect Pallanteum. Latinus leaves himself in a much better position than he would have been in had he allowed Aeneas to carve out his own kingdom. Evander leaves himself in a much better position than he would have been in had he immediately confessed to Aeneas that his narrowed means did not allow him to give substantive help on his own, or if he had agreed to a looser alliance based on tenuous consanguinity and temporary common interest. In Latinus' case circumstances destroy the prospective alliance before it begins. In Evander's case the dispatching of his son ends in death and the end of his line. These disastrous outcomes should not prevent us from seeing the advantage each king's rhetoric temporarily gains him.

CHAPTER 3: RECAPITULATION AND THE UNRELIABLE SPEAKER

Introduction

In the final four books of the *Aeneid*, the goal of speakers shifts to disputing the responsibility for the outbreak of the war and the question of why the war is being fought. Characters who tell again the events that led to the outbreak of the war know that their addressees know as much as they, and that they therefore have no ability to control or exploit the balance of knowledge. Nevertheless their accounts do not align with authorized narrative. The discrepancy is found not in the speech's accounts of the events themselves but in the assignation of responsibility for the events. Speakers make responsible the wrong agents for divine acts of interference and for human imprudence, not so much to heap blame upon on their enemies as to refocus the discourse. That characters in the course of building arguments feel in no way bound either by what happened, or by their audience's knowledge of what happened, establishes the principal that internal narratives are not a technique of narrative efficiency to avoid repetition, but are to be read as tendentious acts of persuasion adapted by the speaker to his circumstance and audience.

3.1 Latinus to Turnus

Turnus opens the final book of the *Aeneid* by urging Latinus to ratify an agreement according to which the outcome of the war will depend on the issue of single combat with Aeneas (12.11-17). Latinus tries to dissuade the youth. The old king opens with flattery (19-26), recounts the events that have led to the desperate situation in which the Latins find themselves (27-37), and anticipates grim outcomes if Turnus follows through on his commitment (38-42).

He ends with an appeal to prudence and filial pity (43-45). Like the embassy to Diomedes discussed in Chapter 2, his speech makes unmistakable the rhetorical techniques characters use elsewhere more subtly.

25

sine me haec haud mollia fatu

sublatis aperire dolis, simul hoc animo hauri:

me natam nulli veterum sociare procorum

fas erat, idque omnes divique hominesque canebant.

victus amore tui, cognato sanguine victus

30

coniugis et maestae lacrimis, vincla omnia rupi;

promissam eripui genero, arma impia sumpsi.

ex illo qui me casus, quae, Turne, sequantur

bella, vides, quantos primus patiare labores.

bis magna victi pugna vix urbe tuemur

35

spes Italas; recalent nostro Thybrina fluenta

sanguine adhuc campique ingentes ossibus albent.

quo referor totiens? quae mentem insania mutat?

Latinus follows a declaration that he will use honest and open speech (25-26; *sublatis...dolis*)⁴²⁵ with an account of the opening events of the war (27-37) that bears almost no resemblance to the narrative found in Book 7. He makes three claims about the past, all concerned with assignation of responsibility. The first concerns the situation before the Trojan arrival in Latium: he was divinely commanded, he says, not to marry his daughter to those who were then her suitors (*me...canebant*, 27-28). The second claim (29-31) concerns events between the initial agreement

⁴²⁵ Tarrant 2012 *ad loc* argues that there is a hint that “L.’s previous statements have been less than direct,” but it is difficult to think of what statements Latinus might be suggesting were infected by the *dola* now supposedly removed. We might consider as a candidate his speech in the Latin council, in which he took no responsibility for the war and, by saying he was accusing no one, opened the way to accusations against Turnus, the only one who could plausibly be blamed for outbreak and escalation (*nec quemquam incuso: potuit quae plurima virtus esse, fuit; toto certatum est corpore regni*; 11.312-313; Servius *ad* 11.312: *excusatio haec ostendit esse in turnum orationem Latini*). Todorov 1971, 73 argues that when Odyssean characters go out of their way to promise the truth they lie (e.g. 1.179; 14.192; 16.61; 17.15 and 108; 19.269; 24.303). However, even in the *Odyssey* the formulae promising the truth are not a sure signal to the reader that the following speech will be a lie, e.g.: (1) τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι ταῦτα μάλ’ ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω introduces a lie at 1.179 and 14.192; but (with ξεῖνε instead of ταῦτα) it introduces truths at 1.214; 4.383; 15.266 and 352; 16.113. (2) The line-ending unit οὐκ ἐπικεύσω introduces a lie at 19.269 and 14.467, but the truth at 4.744 and 23.265. (At 4.350 and 19.269 the tales are unauthorized, but there is no reason to doubt them.) (3) τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι πάντα μάλ’ ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω introduces a lying tale at 24.303 but a truthful tale at 24.123. On Aeneas’ *neque prima per artem / temptamenta tui pepigi* (8.143-4) see above (2.4).

with the Trojans and the outbreak of war. At that time, Latinus says, he was overcome by affection, considerations of consanguinity, and tears (*victus...amore...cognato sanguine...lacrimis*, 29-30a). The third claim concerns the actions by which the initial accord between Trojan and Latin was broken and the Latins turned to war. Latinus shattered all bonds of restraint, he says, by tearing his daughter from her affianced, Aeneas, and by taking up arms (*vincla...sumpsi*, 30b-31). In his telling of all three events Latinus makes himself alone responsible (*me...fas erat; victus...victus; rupi...eripui...sumpsi*). After summarizing the terrible effects of these acts (33-36) he takes responsibility for the whole sequence of disastrous decisions (37, esp. *totiens*).⁴²⁶

Of these claims only the first is defensible. It is true that prophecies commanded Latinus not to give his daughter to any of her original suitors. His summary here closely echoes not the first divine pronouncement, the prodigy of the bees, but the second, his father's incubatory prophecy:

*me natam nulli veterum sociare procorum
fas erat* (12.27-8 [Latinus to Turnus])

*ne pete conubiis natam sociare Latinis,
o mea progenies, thalamis neu crede paratis* (7.96-7 [Faunus to Latinus])

By this formulation Latinus short-circuits the question of the meaning of *externus*, so much debated at this time.⁴²⁷ The arguments we heard in Amata's mouth, that the Argive Rutulian Turnus is by neither blood nor allegiance a Latin, and is therefore eligible to qualify as an *externus* (7.359-72), are rendered irrelevant. The original terminology to which Latinus draws

⁴²⁶ The phrase is an emotionally heightened transformation of Venus' questions to Jupiter (*quae te, genitor, sententia vertit?*, 1.237).

⁴²⁷ See Chapter 2 above for Latinus' similarly artful restatement to Ilioneus in Book 7.

attention means that the fated *gener* cannot not be one of those with whom marriage to Lavinia was mooted or agreed upon before the incubation (*thalamis...paratis*), and his wording now eliminates any ambiguity that might have remained (*veteres proci*).⁴²⁸ So far Latinus is both right and clever.⁴²⁹

Latinus' second claim, however, is contradictory to the narrative of Book 7. The king now says that he gave in to his love for Turnus and to the tears of his dejected wife (*victus amore tui, cognato sanguine victus / coniugis et maestae lacrimis*). Amata did tearfully (*lacrimans*, 7.358) beg her husband to reconsider his offer of Lavinia to Aeneas and to return her to Turnus, and she did ground her appeal in Latinus' affection for Turnus as a blood relative (*quid cura antiqua tuorum et consanguineo*⁴³⁰ *totiens data dextera Turno?*, 7.365-6) — but Latinus did not give in. He was unconvinced and unresponsive ([Amata] *experta Latinum / contra stare videt*, 7.373-4). The verbal echoes remind the reader that what happened was the opposite of what Latinus now claims.

In assessing the third claim, the one concerning the actions taken at the outbreak of the war, we must recall that we know with precision what Latinus did and did not do. After he stood firm against his wife's appeals, events proceeded first without his command, then against his will. The *prima laborum...causa* (7.481-482) arranged by Allecto, the skirmish over Silvia's stag that escalated into a pitched battle (7.475-539), unfolded without the king's presence or

⁴²⁸ OLD 6a *vetus* "distinguishing the thing spoken of from a more recent example of the same kind."

⁴²⁹ Latinus cannot intend the hyperbole of the following line (*fas erat, idque omnes divique hominesque canebant*, 28) to be taken literally, although it does suggest that something other than levelheaded analysis of the past is in his mind. See Tarrant 2012 *ad loc*: "*Latinus' omnes divique hominesque* may thus be a rhetorical exaggeration, but he could be referring to the portents and prophecies involving Lavinia mentioned in 7.71-80 (cf 79 *canebant*). There could also be an allusion to prophecies not recounted by V., such as the dream described by Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.57."

⁴³⁰ Turnus is probably Amata's nephew; see Servius *ad loc*; Dion.Hal.1.64.2; Horsfall *ad* 7.343.

knowledge. When the veterans of this skirmish, an enraged Turnus, and a band of bacchants all bayed for war, Latinus remained as unmoved as a crag pounded by the seas (7.573-93). He refused to open the twin gates of war (7.616-19), and so took not even a symbolic part in the war. Even if we fault him for ceasing his resistance (*frangimur...ferimur*, 594), this was a withdrawal from authority and an abnegation of responsibility (*saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas*, 7.600), not active participation. He even foretold to Turnus the reckoning that now in Book 12 faces all the Latins (*te, Turne, nefas, te triste manebit / supplicium, votisque deos venerabere seris*, 596-8).

Latinus' analysis of the outbreak of the war into discrete culpable actions (30-1) reminds us that we know who was really responsible for each. By *vincla* (30) he probably refers “principally to the confining force of Faunus' oracle, more generally to moral and religious obligations,”⁴³¹ and so means to say that he acted against divine commands. We know that it was Amata who advocated action against the oracular instruction by a reading (7.359-72) that took into account only the term *externus* and neglected the other words of the prophecy (esp. *thalamis...paratis*). The phrase *vincla...rumpi* echoes the rupturing of restraint that Juno, taking the place of the unwilling king, undertook by smashing open the double doors of the temple of War (*Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postis*, 7.622). By describing the act of snatching away a promised bride from a son-in-law (*promissam eripui genero*, 31), Latinus must mean that he took Lavinia from Aeneas after he had promised her to him. It was again Amata who did this, by spiriting Lavinia off to the mountains to delay official ratification of the marriage (*natam frondosis montibus abdit / quo thalamum eripiat Teucris*, 7.387-8). By *impia arma sumpsi*

⁴³¹ Tarrant 2012 *ad loc.*

Latinus refers to the weapons the Latins took up against the Trojans.⁴³² In fact he refused to participate in the taking up of arms, and condemned such action as unspeakable sacrilege sure to call down punishment (7.594-599). It was the trio of *agrestes*, Turnus, and maddened *matres* who demanded arms (7.573ff) and took them up (7.629-40).

3.2 “Recapitulation” Defined

By “recapitulation” I mean the telling by a character of events that have already been told by authorized narrative.⁴³³ The rhetoric of recapitulations, like Latinus’ speech to Turnus in Book 12, differs from the rhetoric of diplomatic speeches in Books 7 and 8, in which characters make claims concerning events that either have not yet appeared in authorized narrative or never are given an authorized telling. When characters speak about events untouched by the authorized narrative, we cannot know whether they are right or sincere; when characters go beyond the authorized narrative or beyond what the authorized narrative allows them to know, we can guess that they are amplifying or fabricating; but when characters recapitulate, we can track when and how their statements differ from narrated events. In the *Aeneid* characters’ recapitulations are almost always inconsistent with authorized narrative. This is to be attributed not to authorial carelessness or even to purposeful intra-textual incoherence, but to characters competing to interpret events and to control others’ interpretation of them.

Characters recapitulate inaccurately even when their addressees know as much as they. In the diplomatic speeches of Books 7 and 8 the speakers exploit an asymmetry in the balance of knowledge. Each speaker encounters a stranger for the first time, and tells this stranger about

⁴³² See 7.583-84; also the *impia arma* of civil war (6.612-13).

⁴³³ This definition excludes passages in which the narrator is the one summarizing or repeating a story he has already told.

events for which he has no other source of information. Each speaker, able to assess what his addressee does and does not know, designs his persuasive strategy to exploit his superiority in knowledge. Because the addressee knows little or nothing about what the speaker is talking about, the speaker is free to misrepresent, invent, omit, and otherwise structure his account to his own advantage. Now Latinus attempts to persuade Turnus in a wholly different situation.⁴³⁴ He knows no more than Turnus, and knows that Turnus knows as much as he. Turnus was the one who took up arms, roused the rest of the Latins to follow his lead, perhaps even impressed the unwilling (*undique cogunt / auxilia et latos vastant cultoribus agros*, 8.7-8). Nevertheless it is not through a suppression or selection of details about the past that Latinus makes his argument but through a point by point contradiction of what happened. Latinus refers to events that indisputably occurred: the bursting of restraint, the abduction of an affianced, the taking up of arms. It is his attribution of responsibility, not an allegation of fact or the judgment he passes on an act, that is false.

Quinn suggests a reason that Latinus might here assume guilt he has not earned: “To make it easy for Turnus to back down, Latinus avoids giving him a direct answer and stresses instead the wrongness of the war, shifting as he does so the responsibility for it onto his own shoulders.”⁴³⁵ If Latinus and Turnus can agree to ignore what both know to be true and to accept a misattribution of responsibility, Turnus will be able to go home with honor (*sunt tibi regna*)

⁴³⁴ There is some deception by a more knowledgeable speaker in the final four books. Iris tells Turnus that Aeneas has penetrated the Etruscan interior as far as Corythus (*extremas Corythi penetravit ad urbes*, 9.10), but Aeneas has only made it to Caere (see Hardie 1994 *ad loc*; Heinze 1993, 343 n.68 suggests that this is inspired by Iris’ falsehood about Hector’s intent to mutilate Patroclus [*Il.* 18.175; with the scholia *ad loc*]).

⁴³⁵ See Quinn 1968, 256. Tarrant 2012 *ad loc* paraphrases: “Quinn... suggests that L. overstates his own responsibility for the war in order to make it easier for T. to back down.” If Latinus had wished to make this sort of argument, he could have faulted himself for failing to exercise, and then for effectively abdicating, his kingly authority. Instead he describes with some precision the illicit steps taken by his allies and resisted by him, but makes himself the agent of each of them.

after having given up his claim to Lavinia's hand (*sunt aliae innuptae*), while Latinus will be able to do that which he is bound to do anyway if Turnus is defeated: marry his daughter to Aeneas.⁴³⁶ A negotiated return of Lavinia to Aeneas has obviously been the best course for Latinus since Drances proposed it in the previous day's council of Latins (11.352-6). It would leave him not much worse off than he would have been had his first proposal of marriage in Book 7 been ratified and carried out. If the planned single combat goes forward, on the other hand, Latinus risks everything: if the expected happens and Turnus loses, he will be left holding no cards, and his people will be *victi* exposed to ruin. Latinus assumes all the guilt for having started the war to give Turnus an honorable way out, and so to obviate the risk of the worst-case scenario.⁴³⁷

After the outbreak of war, attribution of responsibility is the principal subject about which speakers speak falsely and against the authorized narrative. The critical moments at which characters compete verbally or engage in persuasive acts are the council scenes in Books 10 and 11. The speakers know what happened, and know that both their direct addressees and their secondary audience of passive listeners know what happened. Unlike in the previous diplomatic speeches there are no revelations of new wars in Italy, no sudden recollections of long-past relationships. Rhetoric is aimed at characterizing actions that lead to the outbreak of the war in Books 7 and 8, and apportioning blame for them. Speeches are organized not to control what

⁴³⁶ *si Turno extincto socios sum ascire paratus, / cur non incolumi potius certamina tollo?* (12.38-9)

⁴³⁷ For a reading of Latinus as a "weak king" through Hellenistic and Philodemian models of kingship, see Cowan 2015 (contra Cairns 1989, who absolves Latinus of blame). Speaking of Latinus' resistance to pressure for war (7.586-600), and considering the simile to a rock pounded by waves as focalized through him, Wofford 1992, 131 concludes that "Latinus misreads and misrepresents himself as having fought the storm and finally been broken by it, where in fact he gives way very fast."

others know or exploit what they do not know, but to justify the speaker's actions, to lay blame on others, or to redirect deliberation toward the subject most favorable to the speaker.

3.3 Aeneas Recapitulates

Before we examine the complexities of the council scenes, let us turn to those passages in which Aeneas shows himself to be no more given to even-handed restatement of the war's causes, and even-handed attribution of responsibility for them, than are his opponents. After he breaks the siege of the Tiber camp, Latin messengers arrive asking for a truce during which the dead may be buried. They ask that Aeneas spare those who were once hosts and called fathers-in-law (*parceret hospitibus quondam socerisque vocatis*, 11.105). The Trojan cannot allow the rebuke, bordering on an accusation of disloyalty, to stand:

*quaenam vos tanto fortuna indigna, Latini,
implicuit bello, qui nos fugiatis amicos?
pacem me exanimis et Martis sorte peremptis* 110
*oratis? equidem et vivis concedere vellem.
nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent,
nec bellum cum gente gero; rex nostra reliquit
hospitia et Turni potius se credidit armis.
aequius huic Turnum fuerat se opponere morti.* 115
*si bellum finire manu, si pellere Teucros
apparat, his mecum decuit concurrere telis:
vixet cui vitam deus aut sua dextra dedisset.
nunc ite et miseris supponite civibus ignem.* (11.109-19)

Aeneas' first point is expected: he reminds everyone that he was not the first to attack, and says the Latins are the ones fleeing an amicable relationship (*quaenam vos tanto fortuna indigna, Latini, / implicuit bello, qui nos fugiatis amicos?* 108-109). Although the events of Book 7 leading to the battle following the death of Silvia's stag are ambiguous, it is at least understandable that Aeneas blames the Latins for the escalation that followed: whoever struck

the first blow in the first skirmish, Turnus was the one who massed forces and marched to war. It is again no surprise when Aeneas declares that he is willing to grant peace (111), then that he is not waging war with a people as a whole (*nec bellum cum gente gero*, 113) but with an individual. What must surprise is the next argument, in which he blames the outbreak of the war not on Turnus but on Latinus (*rex nostra reliquit hospitia et Turni potius se credidit armis*, 113-4). He could have distinguished between Latinus with his subjects and Turnus with his Rutulians, extending friendship to the former while blaming the latter; instead he distinguishes between the innocent *gens* and the guilty *rex Latinus*. As we have seen above, Latinus was not the one who abandoned the guest-host relationship that Aeneas never appeared in time to certify, and he did not trust himself to Turnus' arms. By proposing single combat to end the war, Aeneas drives a wedge between Turnus and the rest of the Latins, especially those subjects of Latinus who now may think of themselves as fighting solely for an outsider and usurper.⁴³⁸ Drances immediately drives home the wedge in a well-received speech (122-32; *dixerat haec unoque omnes eadem ore fremebant* [132]), in which he pledges the good will of the Latin *gens* and concentrates blame on Turnus alone. His phrasing echoes the terms in which Aeneas has cast the situation: the Latins wish to rejoin their king to Aeneas (*Latino...iungemus regi*), and will happily cooperate in building the Trojans walls that have been fated (*fatalis...moles*; picking up Aeneas' *nisi fata dedissent*).

⁴³⁸ *iam vero in tectis, praedivitis urbe Latini, / praecipuus fragor et longi pars maxima luctus. / hic matres miseraeque nurus, hic cara sororum / pectora maerentum puerique parentibus orbi / dirum exsecrantur bellum Turnique hymenaeos; / ipsum armis ipsumque iubent decernere ferro, / qui regnum Italiae et primos sibi poscat honores. / ingravat haec saevus Drances solumque vocari / testatur, solum posci in certamina Turnum. / multa simul contra variis sententia dictis / pro Turno, et magnum reginae nomen obumbrat, / multa virum meritis sustentat fama tropaeis* (11.213-24).

Even further divorced from the underlying events are Aeneas' words before Latinus' city in Book 12.

'ne qua meis esto dictis mora, Iuppiter hac stat, 565
neu quis ob inceptum subitum mihi segnior ito.
urbem hodie, causam belli, regna ipsa Latini,
ni frenum accipere et victi parere fatentur,
eruum et aequa solo fumantia culmina ponam.
scilicet exspectem libeat dum proelia Turno 570
nostra pati rursusque velit concurrere victus?
hoc caput, o cives, haec belli summa nefandi.
ferte faces propere foedusque reposcite flammis.'
...
ipse inter primos dextram sub moenia tendit
Aeneas, magnaue incusat voce Latinum 580
testaturque deos iterum se ad proelia cogi,
bis iam Italos hostis, haec altera foedera rumpi. (12.565-73; 579-82)

It is difficult to see how Aeneas can call the city of Latinus the *causa belli*, unless he is addressing it as the seat of Latin power and wishes to treat all Latin power indiscriminately as his enemy. Perhaps he says so because a city that is the cause of war, the font and summit of sacrilege, is the sort of city that one can overturn and leave a flattened and smoking ruin. In the indirectly reported cry that follows, Aeneas again blames Latinus (*incusat...Latinum*), though he took as little part in breaking the Book 12 treaty preceding the single combat as he had in breaking the original Book 7 agreement to unite the two peoples in marriage.

In both of these passages Aeneas' isolation of Latinus as the party responsible for the breaking of treaties is contrary to the story told by authorized narrative. Aeneas' internal audience for the first of these recapitulations, the embassy of olive-branch-bearing Latins, is shocked by his words: *dixerat Aeneas. illi obstipuerunt silentes / conversisque oculos inter se atque*

ora tenebant (11.120-1).⁴³⁹ By the second critics are puzzled: “In any case the city was not responsible for the hesitation of Turnus to meet his antagonist, and there was therefore no reason for attacking it now which did not exist before. The attack on the city is introduced somewhat awkwardly into the narrative...”⁴⁴⁰ But such inconcinnity between what a character claims and what the narrative tells is the rule, not the an exception calling for surprise; the casting of blame on the city is not an awkward introduction of Vergil for thematic reasons, but a wholesale invention by Aeneas to inspire his men to attack it.

3.4 Recapitulation in Councils: Council on Olympus

During the war in Italy there are two scenes of three-sided debate: the council of the gods on Olympus (Book 10) and the council of the beleaguered Latins in Latinus’ city (Book 11). With more than two speakers come more than two agendas. Each speaker must consider more than one audience. Possible outcomes are more open-ended than in the speech-exchanges of previous books, in which the goal of each side was to form an alliance favorable to itself and acceptable to the other. In both councils deliberations are dominated by discussion of the past; by debate over who was responsible for what actions, and how those actions are to be understood and evaluated. In both councils the cleverest speaker — Juno on Olympus; Drances in Latium — exploits another speaker’s obsession with litigating the past in order to change both the subjects under discussion and the terms of the debate. Once this has been accomplished, the dominant speaker can win a significant victory even without having her view explicitly accepted or endorsed.

⁴³⁹ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 11.113: “...not surprisingly. Latinus did not do what Aeneas says he did; and, in line 112, Aeneas declares that fate awards him their lands”; for Quinn 1968 this is an example of Vergil leaving us in the dark about what is happening in characters’ minds.

⁴⁴⁰ Conington 1876 *ad* 12.570.

3.4.1 Council on Olympus: Venus and the *σχῆμα κατὰ πλάγιον*

At the moment Turnus floats back to his companions, after he has leapt from the Trojan camp into the Tiber, the Trojans totter on the precipice of disaster. Most of them are hemmed in a small camp at the Tiber mouth, and have just narrowly escaped destruction at the hands of a single warrior. Aeneas has gone to secure further help, but he is far away, and, so far as the narrative has told, has yet to find the Etruscans. Jupiter calls the gods to Olympus. In response to Jupiter's opening questions Venus recounts a series of events that we readers have seen narrated in the poem:

*o pater, o hominum rerumque aeterna potestas
(namque aliud quid sit quod iam implorare queamus?),
cernis ut insultent Rutuli, Turnusque feratur 20
per medios insignis equis tumidusque secundo
Marte ruat? non clausa tegunt iam moenia Teucros;
quin intra portas atque ipsis proelia miscent
aggeribus murorum et inundant sanguine fossae.
Aeneas ignarus abest. numquamne levari 25
obsidione sines? muris iterum imminet hostis
nascentis Troiae nec non exercitus alter;
atque iterum in Teucros Aetolis surgit ab Arpis
Tydides. equidem credo, mea vulnera restant 30
et tua progenies mortalia demoror arma.
si sine pace tua atque invito numine Troes
Italiam petiere, luant peccata neque illos
iuveris auxilio; sin tot responsa secuti
quae superi manesque dabant, cur nunc tua quisquam 35
vertere iussa potest aut cur nova condere fata?
quid repetam exustas Erycino in litore classis,
quid tempestatum regem ventosque furentis
Aeolia excitos aut actam nubibus Irim?
nunc etiam manis (haec intemptata manebat
sors rerum) movet et superis immissa repente 40
Allecto medias Italum bacchata per urbes.
nil super imperio moveor. speravimus ista,
dum fortuna fuit. vincant, quos vincere mavis.
si nulla est regio Teucris quam det tua coniunx*

dura, per eversae, genitor, fumantia Troiae 45
excidia obtestor: liceat dimittere ab armis
incolumem Ascanium, liceat superesse nepotem.
Aeneas sane ignotis iactetur in undis
et quacumque viam dederit Fortuna sequatur:
hunc tegere et dirae valeam subducere pugnae. 50
est Amathus, est celsa mihi Paphus atque Cythera
Idaliaeque domus: positus inglorius armis
exigat hic aevum. magna dicione iubeto
Karthago premat Ausoniam; nihil urbibus inde
obstabit Tyriis. quid pestem evadere belli 55
iuvit et Argolicos medium fugisse per ignis
totque maris vastaeque exhausta pericula terrae,
dum Latium Teucri recidiuaque Pergama quaerunt?
non satius cineres patriae insedissem supremos
atque solum quo Troia fuit? Xanthum et Simoenta 60
redde, oro, miseris iterumque revolvere casus
da, pater, Iliacos Teucris.” (10.18-62)

Venus leaves out Turnus' recent discomfiture and forced bath in the Tiber, but she is right that he has breached the Trojan walls with great slaughter (20-24). In enumerating Juno's four deeds that she has, she says, no cause to retell, she exaggerates only a little: Juno did plot the burning of some Trojan ships in Sicily (36);⁴⁴¹ she did stir up Aeolus and his windy minions (37-38a); she did send Iris down to stir up trouble (38b); she did employ infernal Allecto in terrestrial Italy (39-41).

After castigating Juno, Venus switches to a sustained display of irony. She claims to abjure her and her people's promised future glories, Aeneas' safety and success, and her hope for anyone other than Tyrians as rulers of Italy, and begs only that she be allowed to spirit her beloved Ascanius to safety (42-62). Highet calls this proposal an example of *σχῆμα κατὰ πλάγιον*,

⁴⁴¹ The Trojan fleet was not "burned up" (*exustas*) on Sicilian shores, but prevented from being burned up by a rain storm that seemed like divine intervention in response to Aeneas' prayer. Four ships were lost. Venus is employing the same *αὔξησις* ("exaggeration") she uses to recount the same event to Neptune (*per scelus ecce etiam Troianis matribus actis / exussit foede puppis et classe subegit / amissa socios ignotae linquere terrae* 5.793-5), where she seems to falsely characterize the leaving behind of the women and the old as a result of a paucity of ships. For *αὔξησις* see Plobst 1911; Buchheit 1960.

a rhetorical device by which the speaker pleads for an outcome that is something other than, though not the opposite of, what she actually wishes to accomplish.⁴⁴² Venus can only expect it to work as a magnification of her *miseratio*: she has endured such offense, and her people such suffering, that she has been reduced to hope for the bare survival of her attenuated line; Jupiter and the whole divine audience will be driven to shame for their past neglect of the Trojans, and be moved to help the Trojans now. Endorsement of an outcome one does not really desire may lead to unforeseen results, however, as Juno's and Jupiter's replies will show.

The vulnerability of Venus' arguments is magnified by her choice of words. Her description of what we have heard was Aeneas' miraculously smooth glide up the Tiber (8.57ff), an expedition toward a place and in pursuit of a goal concerning which he was given knowledge by divine appearance, in terminology appropriate to his earlier helpless enduring of deadly storms on unknown seas (*ignotis iactetur in undis*, 48), approaches self-parody in its tendentiousness.⁴⁴³ She is also imprecise. Juno has acted against the Trojans through Iris twice in narrated time: she sent down her agent in disguise to burn the ships in Book 5, and she sent her again to spur Turnus to action at the beginning of Book 9. Venus neglects to make clear to which of these two she refers (*actam nubibus Irim*, 10.38).

⁴⁴² Hight 1972, 66 (65-72 for his full discussion of the council). Heinze 1993 prefers the term λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος, but this properly indicates situations in which plain meaning has to be disguised because of an imbalance in power between speaker and addressee (Demetrius *On Style* 287-95; Quintilian *Inst.* 9.2.65-99; ps.-Dio. Hal. *Ars.* 8-9; Venus is not Jupiter's equal, but in Book 1 she did not prove shy in confronting him directly). Servius *ad* 10.42 calls it *verecunda petitio et obliqua*.

⁴⁴³ Harrison 2002 *ad loc* calls it "gross misrepresentation." It is a mischaracterization of Aeneas' trip up the Tiber, and, probably around the time of the Olympian council, Aeneas is passing down the Tiber again, again knowing where he is going (*media Aeneas freta nocte secabat*, 10.147; the ring within which the Etruscan catalogue is given ends at *tot lecti proceres ter denis navibus ibant / subsidio Troiae et campos salis aere secabant*, 213-4).

3.4.2 Council on Olympus: Juno and the *remotio criminis*

Juno exploits the weaknesses in Venus' speech:

*quid me alta silentia cogis
rumpere et obductum verbis vulgare dolorem?
Aenean hominum quisquam divumque subegit 65
bella sequi aut hostem regi se inferre Latino?
Italiam petiit fatis auctoribus (esto)
Cassandrae impulsus furiis: num relinquere castra
hortati sumus aut vitam committere ventis?
num puero summam belli, num credere muros, 70
Tyrrhenamque fidem aut gentis agitare quietas?
quis deus in fraudem, quae dura potentia nostra
egit? ubi hic Iuno demissave nubibus Iris?
indignum est Italos Troiam circumdare flammis
nascentem et patria Turnum consistere terra, 75
cui Pylum avus, cui diva Venilia mater:
quid face Troianos atra vim ferre Latinis,
arva aliena iugo premere atque avertere praedas?
quid soceros legere et gremiis abducere pactas,
pacem orare manu, praefigere puppibus arma? 80
tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium
proque viro nebulam et ventos obtendere inanis,
et potes in totidem classem convertere nymphas:
nos aliquid Rutulos contra iuisse nefandum est?
"Aeneas ignarus abest": ignarus et absit. 85
est Paphus Idaliumque tibi, sunt alta Cythera:
quid gravidam bellis urbem et corda aspera temptas?
nosne tibi fluxas Phrygiae res vertere fundo
conamur? nos? an miseros qui Troas Achivis
obiecit? quae causa fuit consurgere in arma 90
Europamque Asiamque et foedera solvere furto?
me duce Dardanius Spartam expugnavit adulter,
aut ego tela dedi fovive Cupidine bella?
tum decuit metuisse tuis: nunc sera querelis
haud iustis adsurgis et inrita iurgia iactas.'* (10.63-95)

The queen of the gods uses here more densely than anywhere else the technique of partial quotation,⁴⁴⁴ making few changes to her rivals' words and not adding or subtracting information:

<u>Venus</u>	<u>Juno</u>
<i>Aeneas ignarus abest</i> (10.25)	<i>Aeneas ignarus abest</i> (10.85)
<i>nascentis Troiae</i> (10.27)	<i>Troiam...nascentem</i> (10.74-75)
<i>Italiam petiere</i> (10.32)	<i>Italiam petiit</i> (10.67)
<i>quisquam</i> (10.34)	<i>quisquam</i> (10.65)
<i>actam nubibus Irim</i> (10.38)	<i>demissave nubibus Iris</i> (10.73)
<i>tua coniunx...dura</i> (10.45)	<i>dura potentia</i> (10.72)
<i>hunc tegere et dirae valeam <u>subducere</u> pugnae</i> (10.50)	<i>Aenean manibus <u>subducere</u> Graium</i> (10.81)
<i>est Amathus, est celsa mihi Paphus... Idaliaeque domus</i> (10.51-52)	<i>est Paphus Idaliumque tibi, sunt alta Cythera</i> (10.86)
<i>miseris...Teucris</i> (10.61-2)	<i>miseros...Troas</i> (10.89)
Perhaps also: <i>Rutuli</i> (10.20)	<i>Rutulos</i> (10.84)

Juno does not quote either the mischaracterization about Aeneas' trip on the Tiber or the one demonstrably false claim Venus made: that Diomedes was rising again to crush Troy reborn (10.26-29). Diomedes either already has rejected the request to march against Aeneas or is about to do so, as we learn only at 11.225ff. If Juno's goal were to contest Venus' accuracy, she would refute this claim. Instead the only demonstrably false claim of Venus is the only claim she leaves unquoted and unanswered. She is concerned not with refuting inaccuracies or disputing assertions of facts, but with contesting Venus' assignation of responsibility and her characterization of acknowledged facts.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁴ For the analogous Homeric "catch-word" technique, see n.344 above.

⁴⁴⁵ Juno's failure to comment on Venus' claim about Diomedes is necessary for a piece of narrative misdirection (see Chapter 4 below).

In Juno's first quotation she grants the point that the Trojans have pursued their goal of reaching Italy driven by prophecies, but attributes them to Cassandra (*Cassandrae impulsus furiis*). According to Aeneas' account Cassandra did speak of an "Italy" again and again, but she was inevitably ignored, and it is hard to concoct a scenario in which her words were any significant motivation for the Trojans' wandering.⁴⁴⁶ By her *esto* (10.67) Juno adopts the pose of one choosing not to dispute the idea that the Trojans are following numinously sanctioned exhortations, as if she were granting *arguendo* points that she might argue. She wishes to displace the authority on which the guiding commands rested, not to dispute that guiding prophecies were given.

Harrison terms this argumentation an instance of *concessio*,⁴⁴⁷ a term that may refer either to a rhetorical "figure" or to a mode of argument. In the figure *concessio* the speaker concedes something to his opponent. Quintilian lists *concessio* among the three figures closely related to *εἰρωνεΐα* or *simulatio*: *confessio nihil nocitura* (for which he does not give a further definition); *concessio* (which he defines *cum aliquid etiam iniquum videmur causae fiducia pati*); and *consensio*, which evidently differs from *concessio*: *hac evidentior figura [consensio] est cum alicui rei adsentimur quae est futura pro nobis, verum id accidere sine adversarii vitio non potest*.⁴⁴⁸ Under this three-fold categorization⁴⁴⁹ Juno's approach is best categorized as

⁴⁴⁶ In Aeneas' account Anchises recalls Cassandra's words about Italy (3.182ff) only after the Penates have already made clear that the mysterious words of Apollo about an "ancient mother" meant Italy.

⁴⁴⁷ See Harrison 2002 *ad* 67.

⁴⁴⁸ Quint.*Inst.*9.50-2.

⁴⁴⁹ Rutilius Lupus distinguishes in a similar manner: *concessio* is *cum aliquot res adversario concedimus, deinde aliquid inferimus, quod aut maius sit quam superiora, aut etiam omnia, quae posuimus, infirmet*; while *consensio* is *cum alicui rei adsentimur, quae est futura pro nobis*. Such fine-grained distinction is absent in the late and much-simplified anonymous *schemata dianoemas quae ad rhetores pertinent* (accessible in *rhetores Latini minores ex codicibus maximum primum adhibitis*, ed Helm. Leipzig, 1863, pp.71ff), which takes this Vergilian passage as its illustration: *συγχώρησις est concessio rei alicuius ut apud Vergilium: "esto: Cassandrea impulsus furiis" (26).*

consensio. Quintilian's definition is useful because it suggests that the tactic of agreeing to something that seems to be helpful to the adversary, but will be helpful to oneself, is only possible if the adversary has made a mistake (*vitium*) that one can exploit.

Juno's concessions here are designed to exploit mistakes Venus made in the design of her argument and in her choice of words. Venus is obsessed with the injustice of a single divine enmity inflicting on the Trojans the string of sufferings that have culminated in their current precarious situation. Juno does not deny or excuse her past interferences; she does not even address them. Instead she argues that it is not she who is responsible for the Trojans' disasters but the Trojans themselves, through their own blameworthy and foolish actions. The species of *pars adsumptiva*⁴⁵⁰ that provides a helpful model is the *remotio criminis*:⁴⁵¹ *remotio criminis est, cum id crimen, quod infertur, ab se et ab sua culpa et potestate in alium reus remove conatur. Id dupliciter fieri poterit, si aut causa aut factum in alium transferetur. Causa transferetur, cum*

⁴⁵⁰ *Concessio* as a figure is to be distinguished from *concessio* as one of the four species of *pars adsumptiva*. *Juridicalis constitutio* (juridical issues) are divided into a *pars absolutiva*, in which the advocate argues that the act on which the accusation is based was itself done rightly, and the *pars adsumptiva*, in which the advocate conceded that the act was wrong but argues that it was excused by mitigating circumstance. As a species of *pars adsumptiva*, *concessio* means a request for acquittal (*concessio est cum reus postulat ignosci*) on the grounds that the accused lacked culpable intent or premeditation (*purgatio*), or that the accused begs for pardon from previous deeds (*deprecatio*). If Juno had chosen to defend herself for her persecution of the Trojans, such a defense might have been analogous to some form of *concessio*, perhaps if she was to be excused for her actions by her love of Carthage, or by the Trojans' many wrongdoings. If she will not admit to interference against the Trojans and then argue that her action should be excused, her alternatives seem limited: she can hardly plead that she was not responsible for the burning of the ships at Eryx, or the storm unleashed by Aeolus, or the summoning of Allecto. As excuse she can plead inadvertence (*imprudencia*), accident (*fortuna*), or necessity (*necessitudo*). This taxonomy is found in the *Rhet.ad.Herr.1.14.24*. Cicero includes in addition to *imprudencia* (which he seems to equate with *inscientia*), *casus*, *necessitas*, and emotional disturbance (*in affectionem animi*) (*De.Inv.1.41*). For more see Martin 1974, 40-1; Lausberg 1973.

⁴⁵¹ Hight 1972, 70 develops this point, but divides Juno's argument differently: "Her *refutatio*... is designed to show (a) that not Juno but Venus herself is responsible for *some of the actions for which she complains* (65-73 + 88-93): this is shifting the onus, called by the rhetoricians *remotio criminis* or *translatio* and *μετάστας*; and (b) that other acts done by Juno and Turnus are justified by the actions of Venus and Aeneas (74-84): this is *relatio criminis* or *ἀντέγκλημα*." But (a) verses 65-73 do not concern the actions Venus complained about (either Turnus' half-successful siege, or interference by Allecto and Iris), and do not attribute responsibility for them to Venus; they single out Aeneas for blame (Aeneas approached the Latins in a hostile manner; Aeneas followed divine commands to Italy; Aeneas left Ascanius in charge of the camp; Aeneas disturbed the Etruscans). Verses 88-93 (b) concern actions leading to the Trojan War, and Venus said nothing about what led to the Trojan War. In each case Juno does not talk about the same actions Venus did, and re-assign agency; she talks about different actions.

aliena dicitur vi et potestate factum, factum autem, cum alius aut debuisse aut potuisse facere dicitur (Cic. *De Inventione* 1.11.15).⁴⁵² Juno transfers the responsibility for the Trojans' dilemma, the *crimen*, onto to the Trojans themselves; Aeneas' decisions following his landing in Italy, his division of his forces, and his careless delegation of command were committed under his own power (*vis* and *potestas*), so the case as a whole (*causa*) should be directed not against Juno but against the responsible party: Aeneas.⁴⁵³

3.4.3 Juno's Arguments

Juno's discourse on responsibility addresses two issues in the past and two in the present: (1) responsibility for the immediate crisis that afflicts the Trojans besieged in their camp at the Tiber mouth; (2) responsibility for the current war as a whole, to be determined by an assessment of the Trojan attitude and actions toward the Latins in Book 7; (3) frequency and effectiveness of interference for or against Trojans in the past; (4) responsibility for the Trojan War.⁴⁵⁴

3.4.3.1 Juno's Arguments: The Camp

Juno abjures responsibility for the Trojans' military crisis by claiming that she cannot be blamed for the fact that Aeneas is up the Tiber and the main body of his men at the camp downriver are on the brink of disaster. She lays the responsibility on Aeneas' decisions as commander, which she mocks as those of a fool. While we might be inclined to be kinder to

⁴⁵² For *μετάστασις* see Hermogenes *On Issues* 6.69-75.

⁴⁵³ Cf. Servius *ad* 12.572 on Aeneas' speech (discussed above) naming Latinus' city as the *caput et summa nefandi: et ad Latinos transfert crimen Turni*.

⁴⁵⁴ Venus identified advocacy against Aeneas with support for Carthage, and advocacy for Aeneas with support for Troy: in the future she proposes, in which Ascanius loses the chance for command in Italy, Carthage seizes the peninsula (53-55). By this strategy she reinforces the identification Jupiter has just made of the current conflict with that between Carthage and Rome (11-14). Rather than advocating for Carthage, Juno passes over the question of who will rule the Mediterranean, and concentrates on defending herself from the charge of responsibility for the Trojans' woes. Highet 1972, 69 thinks that vv.11-14 suggest that many of the listening gods "foresee the Punic wars and intend to support the Romans," but the plurals in 11-15 seem to be directed at the belligerent parties, Juno and Venus; we do not have enough information to know any other gods' opinions, loyalties, or intentions.

Aeneas, remembering that he was ordered up the Tiber by that river's deity, Juno's assessment of the practical outcome of his work as a general is, so far, accurate. Ascanius' coordination of the siege defense has failed on every front: he entrusted his lines of communication to a lone pair of unreliable raiders, Nisus and Euryalus, and it was the improper guarding of the gate (9.717ff) that let in Turnus and almost brought catastrophe. Aeneas' leaving the camp (68-69) and Ascanius in charge (70-71) has gone disastrously wrong. After an interlude Juno returns to this point with sarcasm: "*Aeneas ignarus abest*": *ignarus et absit* (85). Venus mentioned Aeneas' lack of knowledge to create sympathy for his plight and to make vivid the Trojans' desperation; Juno agrees that he is ignorant, but makes it an indictment of Aeneas' incompetence.⁴⁵⁵ She is right that she cannot be said to have effected the separation of Trojan forces through an act of fraud (*in fraudem*, 72) or raw power (*potentia*, 72).

One part of Juno's argument on this first point is duplicitous, and works by exploiting an ambiguity of Venus' formulation. Juno is indisputably involved in one way in the Trojan's immediate plight: by sending down Iris to urge Turnus to act, she made sure the Latin attack was properly timed (9.2ff). Venus does not make clear, however, whether she is referring to that messenger's descent in Book 5 to convince the Trojan women to end their wandering by burning the ships, or to her appearance in Book 9 to inform Turnus of the Trojan camp's vulnerability.⁴⁵⁶ Venus may have intended by this ambiguity to suggest a pattern of ongoing interference: Juno is in such a habit of employing her errand-girl to spread chaos that Venus does not even need to specify which of many actions she means. But Juno exploits the ambiguity to conceal her most

⁴⁵⁵ Servius *ad* 70: *quod Venus ad miserationem, haec ad indignationem posuit.*

⁴⁵⁶ Both actions were introduced by an identical line: *Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno* (5.606; 9.2). Juno also deployed Iris to end Dido's suffering (*tum Iuno omnipotens longum miserata dolorem / difficilisque obitus Irim demisit Olympo* [4.693-4]).

recent interference. By quoting Venus' words she again adopts the pose of one granting *arguendo* that she has interfered at some time, but proving despite this that she did not cause the current crisis. Even if she were confronted with her second use of Iris, she might plead that the determination of the timing of Turnus' attack does not make her responsible for the Trojan mistakes that invited such an attack and made it effective. But it is much more convenient for her that she does not have to confront the charge of having timed Turnus' attack at all, because Venus has not made it clear to which interference through Iris she was referring.⁴⁵⁷

3.4.3.2 Juno's Arguments: The War in Italy

Juno's second argument is to point out that she bears no responsibility for the Trojans' initial attitude and approach to the Latins, which she has just blamed, at the beginning of the speech, for the outbreak of the war: *Aenean hominum quisquam divumque subegit / bella sequi aut hostem regi se inferre Latino* (65-66). To this point she now returns, and lists the misdeeds of which the Trojans are guilty: they have pressed someone else's fields with a yoke (#1; verse 78); they have made off with plunder (#2; verse 78); they have chosen fathers-in-law (#3; verse 79); they have stolen affianced women (#4; verse 79); they have offered peace in one hand and inflicted war with the other (#5; verse 80). Although in no one's balanced judgment could Aeneas be said to have begun in Italy by consciously or purposefully pursuing a warlike course (*bella sequi*), each claim deserves to be evaluated separately. (#2) Other authorities make Trojan raiding the *casus belli*,⁴⁵⁸ but in the *Aeneid* this is not so: Iulus' hunting is not raiding of

⁴⁵⁷ Serv *ad* 10.38: *actam nubibus Irim impulsam, scilicet ut persuaderet matribus incendium navium: ut secundum artem rhetoricam rem unam in duas dividerit, ut latius pateret rei acerbitas interposito alio crimine: nam per Irim naves exustae sunt. sed melius est, ut non sit iteratio, ad Turnum missam Irim intellegere: nec nos moveat ordo conversus, solent enim graviora in principiis et in fine secundum artem rhetoricam poni. nubibus per nubes.* For the idea that this is a mistake by Vergil rather than Venus see Kehoe 1989, with bibliography; Kettner 1879.

⁴⁵⁸ Cato *Orig.* 1 fr.10; Livy 1.1.5; Dion. Hal. 1.57.7 See Chapter below for further discussion.

livestock.⁴⁵⁹ (#4) Although in other versions Lavinia and Turnus are engaged at the moment Aeneas arrives,⁴⁶⁰ in the *Aeneid* this seems impossible after the omen of the bees and the prophecy of Faunus. (#3) In any case it was undoubtedly the prospective *socer* who chose his *gener*, not the other way around, when Latinus offered Lavinia to Aeneas. (#5) The Trojans did approach the Latins seeking peace,⁴⁶¹ and although Aeneas' ships may be hung with shields (*miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe / scuta virum fluvio pictasque innare carinas*, 8.92-3), they, or some sort of identifying weapons, are displayed at all times (cf. after leaving Sicily in Book 1 [*aut celsis in puppibus arma Caici*, 1.183]), and not in order to menace. On the other hand (#1) Aeneas did cut with his plow someone else's land, when he marked out the walls for his new camp before he had communicated with the resident king.

3.4.3.3 Juno's Arguments: The Trojan War

When Juno moves on to the argument from precedent and fairness — other gods can do that; why cannot I do this? — that by now has become a habit for her,⁴⁶² she recounts actions that were committed by a god, but makes the wrong god responsible for each: *tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium / proque viro nebulam et ventos obtendere inanis, et potes in totidem classem convertere nymphas* (81-3). Aeneas in the *Iliad* is twice stolen away from the hands of the Greeks by divine use of a concealing or blinding *nebula*, but neither time is it by Venus. The first time it was by Apollo, after Venus, stabbed by Diomedes, dropped her son (καὶ τὸν μὲν μετὰ

⁴⁵⁹ In Carthage Ilioneus reassures Dido that the Trojans are not pirates (*non nos aut ferro Libycos populare Penatis / venimus, aut raptas ad litora vertere praedas*, 1.527-8).

⁴⁶⁰ See Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.421-432; Servius *ad* 12.31; Thomas 2001 points out that Ovid makes the two engaged (*pactaque furit pro coniuge Turnus*, *Met.*14.451).

⁴⁶¹ *pacem orare manu* recalls the description of the Trojans' original embassy to Latinus: *pacemque exposcere* (7.155).

⁴⁶² In her monologue in Book 1 she spoke of Athena punishing Oilean Ajax (1.39-48); in Book 7 she referred to Mars' punishment of the Lapiths and Diana's of Calydon (7.304-11). For this point see Harrison 2002 *ad* 81.

χερσὶν ἐρύσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / κυανέη νεφέλη, *Il.*5.344-5); the second time it was by Poseidon (αὐτίκα τῷ μὲν ἔπειτα κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν χέεν ἀχλὺν / Πηλεΐδῃ Ἀχιλλῆϊ 20.321-2).⁴⁶³ A book earlier in the *Aeneid* a divinity's power changed Trojan barques into nymphs, but it was Jupiter, prompted by Cybele's intercession, whose power it was (9.77ff).

3.4.3.4: Gods Know Equally

Harrison alleges that Juno's inaccuracy is a product of ignorance: she incautiously but "understandably assumes"⁴⁶⁴ that it was Venus who was responsible for transformation of the ships. Another reader might think instead that Juno is trying to deceive the other gods. Elsewhere in the poem, however, it is clear that gods know which other gods have carried out what interventions in mortal affairs. Neptune knows instantly that Juno is behind the storm in Book 1 (1.130), although she has tried to cover her tracks by suborning Aeolus. Venus knows where Antenor has gone and what he has done there (1.242-49). Venus' knowledge ranges across time, comprehending the history of Dido and her family in detail (1.335ff), and across space, reaching to the shore where Aeneas' lost comrades have landed (387-401). Venus again is immediately sure that Juno is responsible for the storm in Book 1 (1.667-9) and can be confident that Jupiter (1.251-2), Neptune (5.789-92), and even Cupid know the same (*nota tibi*, 1.669). Juno is just as aware of Venus' employment of Cupid to intervene in mortal relationships (4.93-95). Cymodocea knows who is responsible for the transformation of her *facies* from that of a ship to that of a nymph, and knows that Aeneas is in need of a push if he wants to save his camp (10.228). When Juno tries to cover her tracks again by acting through Juturna (12.134-160), Jupiter assures his

⁴⁶³ In the *Aeneid* Neptune has already recalled this event: *Pelidae tunc ego forti / congressum Aenean nec dis nec viribus aequis / nube cava rapui*, 5.809-10.

⁴⁶⁴ Harrison 2002 *ad* 83.

wife and sister that he knows that she has continued to pursue her goals, and that he has seen through the devious means by which she has gone about it.⁴⁶⁵

The only god who wrongly assigns responsibility for divine interventions is Juno in this council on Olympus. There is no reason to think that her misstatements are not purposeful, or that they are not transparent to her audience.⁴⁶⁶ Venus' direct addressee (Jupiter) and her indirect addressees (Juno and the rest of the gods) know that Juno was responsible for all these interferences. Venus' argument at v.54 depends on the audience having some knowledge of the future rivalry of Rome — or at least Italy — and Carthage; apparently not only Juno has heard this much of the future (*audierat*, 1.19). The differences between Juno's speech and authorized narrative cannot be understood as lies or misrepresentations meant to mislead addressees on a matter of fact, and must be considered tendentiousness and exaggeration able to be detected by the listening gods. Non-authoritative speakers' versions of events are unreliable, then, not only when they are exploiting their listeners' ignorance, but even when their listeners are aware, or should be aware upon reflection, of the inaccuracy and misrepresentation.

3.4.4 Jupiter Closes: Another *Relatio* and a Suspension of Interference

Venus advocates for what she cannot sincerely want, and Juno claims what cannot be believed. To understand the effect of each goddess' argument we must compare Jupiter's opening statement, which conditioned both goddesses' arguments, to his closing resolution.

*caelicolae magni, quianam sententia vobis
versa retro tantumque animis certatis iniquis?*

⁴⁶⁵ *aut ensem (quid enim sine te Iuturna valeret?) / ereptum reddi Turno et vim crescere victis?* (12.798-99).

⁴⁶⁶ On Jupiter's taunt to Juno (10.607-10) Nehrkorhn 1971 n.14 notes that "Quinn [=Quinn 1967] observes (p. 281): 'Jove, or Virgil, overlooks Venus' intervention at 331-2.' In my opinion, Jupiter knows very well, Vergil knows too, only Juno does not know — and this is the point of Jupiter's joking." For the usual, less convoluted interpretation see Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.608.

*abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teucris.
 quae contra vetitum discordia? quis metus aut hos
 aut hos arma sequi ferrumque lacessere suavit?* 10
*adveniet iustum pugnae (ne arcessite) tempus,
 cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim
 exitium magnum atque Alpibus immittet apertas:
 tum certare odiis, tum res rapuisse licebit.
 nunc sinite et placitum laeti componite foedus.* (10.6-15)

The father of gods and king of men opens the council on Olympus by claiming that he has forbidden that the Italians fight the Trojans (*abnueram*, 8), and blames the *discordia* that marks deviation from his plan on his listeners' *sententiae* and actions. The statement that the same motive, fear (*metus*), has persuaded both sides to take up arms (9-10), as well as the vocatives and imperatives addressed to both, contribute to an initial pose of even-handedness. Equal dealing ends when Jupiter speaks of what for him is the future, what for us is history: Juno is the one for whom it will be right to give up all restraint only once the path over the Alps lies open to the Carthaginians. Juno, it seems, has deserved this rebuke by her action in Book 7. She summoned Allecto to interfere directly with Amata and Turnus, and so to supply a *casus belli*.

Critics since Servius have noted that verses 8-9a are difficult to reconcile with Jupiter's words to Venus in Book 1.⁴⁶⁷ From Jupiter's words in this council alone we would conclude that action undertaken by recalcitrant gods, or Juno in particular, had caused war against the will of Jupiter and contrary to *fata*. So far as we readers can tell by what we know up to this point, the opposite is true: Jupiter himself foretold the war to Venus (263-4); Helenus (3.458-60) and the

⁴⁶⁷ He foretells wars: *bellum ingens geret Italia* (1.263). Servius *ad* 8 notes the contradiction and proposes a solution: *quia cum uno deo vel dea aliter loquitur—unde est in primo "hic tibi, fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet" —, aliter vero cum omnibus diis utilitatis causa propter removendam eorum contentionem et dissensionem*. Thomas 2004-5, 145 notes the "exquisite intratextual marker" (*sententia...versa* [10.6-7] corresponds to *neque me sententia vertit* [1.260]). See also Lyne 1987, 88-90; Hershkowitz 1998, 98; O'Hara 2006, 103; Hejduk 2009, 296-7.

Sibyl (6.86ff) warned Aeneas of it; Anchises gave Aeneas a detailed preview of it (6.888-92).

Whatever we think of the reliability of each detail of these prophecies, it is difficult to understand how Jupiter can characterize war as forbidden (*vetitum*) by Jupiter or by anyone else. The most economical explanation is that Jupiter in Book 1 depicted the inevitable war in its best light when comforting Venus in private, and that he now, before a crowd of deliberators divided equally in opinion (*cunctique fremebant / caelicolae adsensu vario*, 96-7),⁴⁶⁸ transfers the responsibility for it onto the competing goddesses, and chiefly onto his wife.

All the more surprising, then, are Jupiter's words after his daughter and wife have finished:

*'accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta.
quandoquidem Ausonios coniungi foedere Teucris 105
haud licitum, nec vestra capit discordia finem,
quae cuique est fortuna hodie, quam quisque secat spem,
Tros Rutulusne fuat, nullo discrimine habebo,
seu fatis Italum castra obsidione tenentur
sive errore malo Troiae monitisque sinistris. 110
nec Rutulos solvo. sua cuique exorsa laborem
fortunamque ferent. rex Iuppiter omnibus idem.
fata viam invenient.'*

The god at whose judgment the home of the gods grows silent, the earth trembles, the ether grows still, the winds drop, and the seas grows placid (100-3) flatly reverses his opening statement. Then the *discordia* was the forbidden thing (*vetitum*, 9); now it is the joining of the Italians and Trojans that is in no way allowed (*haud licitum*), and the *discordia* that takes no end. Not only does Jupiter neither stop the fighting nor interfere on the Trojans' side, he does not even prohibit any other god from participating in the battle; he limits only his own action. The other

⁴⁶⁸ The simile that follows compares the murmur of the crowd to the wind rustling through the trees that warns sailors of coming storms. If the vehicle is revealing what is not explicitly told in the tenor, the whispers do not merely indicate indecision; they warn Jupiter of imminent, dangerous strife on Olympus.

gods do interfere. Venus deflects arrows away from Aeneas (331-2), cures him of an arrow wound (12.411ff), and plants in his mind the tactical maneuver that brings about the climactic duel with Turnus (12.554ff). Apollo partly fulfills Arruns' prayer (11.794-5). Juturna gives her brother advice (439-40).⁴⁶⁹ Juno lures away Turnus with an *imago* of Aeneas (10.656ff) and later stirs up Juturna to break the treaty (12.134ff). When Juturna, disguised again as Metiscus, sweeps in to give Turnus the sword he has lost, Venus returns to Aeneas his spear (12.783-7). It does not take long for Jupiter himself, despite his Olympus-shaking Styx-bound oath to be impartial, to interfere: he prevents Pallas and Lausus from meeting (10.436-7), pushes Mezentius to enter the fray (10.689), spurs Tarchon to ride to the forefront of the fighting (725-8), ensures that Turnus marches from the mountain pass just in time to allow the Trojans through (11.901), and in the climactic duel apportions out victory (12.725-7). This last interference is not merely a imitation of Homer dictated by generic code, to be understood by the reader as conventional: Jupiter sends down a *Dira* to drive away Juturna and confound Turnus' senses.⁴⁷⁰

In framing his decision narrowly, as a limitation only of his own interference, Jupiter exploits a weakness in Venus' argument. Venus does not say that the disastrous outcome she has supposedly limited herself to desiring was the destruction of Aeneas, but a scenario in which Aeneas was given no divine aid, and fortune alone determined his actions and their outcomes (*Aeneas sane ignotis iactetur in undis / et quacumque viam dederit Fortuna sequatur*). Jupiter's decision echoes Venus' words, agreeing to the letter, though not the spirit, of her appeal: *quae cuique est fortuna hodie, quam quisque secat spem, / Tros Rutulusne fuat, nullo discrimine*

⁴⁶⁹ Another non-Olympian god, Tiberinus, answers Pallas' prayer (*audii illa deus*, 10.424).

⁴⁷⁰ See Lyne 88-90; Hejduk 2009, 296-7. Feeney 1991, 145 calls the sequence "a sustained crescendo of power which has no parallel in epic." The narrator questions at whose will the two peoples continue to fight (*tanton placuit concurrere motu, / Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?*, 12.502-4).

habebo. A few lines later he hands ver responsibility to each side's *fortuna* yet again: *sua cuique exorsa laborem / fortunamque ferent* (111-2). He has taken the abandonment of the battle to fortune, the scenario Venus disingenuously suggested because she understands it be the abjuration of all that was promised her, and has agreed that it is the fairest and most acceptable scenario.

Jupiter's words between his two appeals to *fortuna* show how thoroughly Venus has lost the argument: *seu fatis Italum castra obsidione tenentur / sive errore malo Troiae monitisque sinistris. / nec Rutulos solvo* (109-11). Jupiter's allowance for the possibility that it is the Italians' fate to besiege the camp seems to be irreconcilable with the idea that the siege is a hate-fueled and unauthorized delay of what has been fated.⁴⁷¹ Even more extraordinary is Jupiter's allowance for the possibility that the Trojans' predicament has been earned either by incompetence (if we take *malus* as an assessment of their skill and *error* as "wandering") or wickedness (if we take *malus* to be moral and *error* as "misdeed."). Even his *monitis sinistris* suggests that the flurry of divine prompts and oracles of which Venus reminded her audience (33-4) may have only been ill-starred or madness-induced in the way Juno claimed (67-8).⁴⁷²

In beginning the council Jupiter identifies the gods' conflict with the war on earth; divine competition (*certare*, 8) is the same as mortal clash (*concurrere*). Venus, by disingenuously claiming that she has given up all hope for Trojan success, means to suggest that she favors either an end to hostile interference by Juno or the need for balancing friendly interference by Jupiter. Juno redirects by reframing the allegations of both preceding speakers that she is solely

⁴⁷¹ Juno acknowledges that she is only delaying the inevitable: *non dabitur regnis, esto, prohibere Latinis, / atque immota manet fatis Lavinia coniunx: / at trahere atque moras tantis licet addere rebus, / at licet amborum populos excindere regum* (7.313-6).

⁴⁷² Ahl 2007 ad 10.110 suggests an alternative: "[P]erhaps Jupiter is aware that the prophecies have kept Aeneas from the site of Rome rather than helped him to recognize it."

responsible for the Trojans' troubles. She avoids advocating any one course of action, but that most suited to her desires would be the continuation of the status quo, under which she can interfere against the Trojans in order to balance out Venus' interference for them. The Olympian audience is evenly divided (*cunctique fremebant/ caelicolae adsensu vario*, 96-7). Jupiter concludes not by promoting his original plea for peace, but by limiting his own further interference, forswearing his role as guide of action, and leaving each man to his own fortune. The decision fully satisfies no one, including the Jupiter of three hundred verses ago; but the character who wins the most is Juno.⁴⁷³

3.4.5 Long-Term Goals: The End of "Troy"

Although after the council the gods continue to interfere on either side, to view the council as a mass of congested arguments without resolution, later made irrelevant by action, would be to neglect its place in the long-term dispute between Venus and Juno. Each goddess' speech is only the most dramatic statement by either side of their argument, which begins in each divinity's speeches in Book 1 and will not see its last expression until Book 12; which has been played out through mortal surrogates in the pre-narrative past and during the present of the narrative, and which will continue in the future. The opposed parties in the past were the Trojans and the Achaeans fighting before the walls of Troy. The opposed parties in the *Aeneid* are the Aeneas with his men and the various obstacles they encounter; by Book 10, that means the Trojans' Italian enemies. The opposed parties in the future will be the Trojans' descendants and

⁴⁷³ Harrison's evaluation (2002 *ad* 111-2) is worth quoting in full: "The precise implications of Jupiter's speech, cast in a lofty, terse, and quasi-oracular style, are not immediately clear, and are not meant to be. His claim of impartiality in this war and his apparent separation of his own powers from those of destiny must be to some degree insincere temporizing in front of a divided divine assembly...he gives the appearance of magisterial fairness and ignorance as the outcome of the war at a point when he is fully aware that the Trojans will win (cf. 1.263-4) with his own help as arbiter and enforcer of fate." See also Feeney 1991, 144-6; E.L Harrison 1980; Block 1981, 86-92; Lyne 1987, 88-90.

the Carthaginians. Juno must lose the present and the future: Aeneas did not die at Troy, and will not die fighting Turnus; his people and his progeny must win and settle, and the Romans must crush Carthage and rule the Mediterranean. The only way in which Juno can succeed is against the name “Troy” and the “Trojans.” Only by making the name disappear now can Juno ensure that she won victory in the past.⁴⁷⁴

In her second programmatic monologue, at the beginning of Book 7, Juno bewails the insufficiency of the past destruction of Troy, and addresses *recidiva Pergama* in the present. The Trojans have not only landed in Latium, despite all her efforts, and Aeneas has not only established a camp; he has marked the borders of his camp, on the morning he sends out ambassadors to Latinus, in lines that end in military jargon but begin with the language of city-founding (7.157-159).⁴⁷⁵ From the beginning of Book 9, when Iris calls this place an *urbs* (9.8), it is spoken of as a city and takes on the functions of a city. The traditional name of this first settlement made by the disembarking Trojans was “Troia,” and it seems to have still been the name of a site in the first century.⁴⁷⁶ The ways in which Vergil leverages the associations in his readers’ minds with the name of Troy, the effects of how he concurrently refers to the settlement

⁴⁷⁴ The frequency with which the names “Troy” and “Trojan” are used by Juno (e.g., 1.19-30; 4.240; 7.295-6; 7.317; 7.322) and Venus (1.232; 1.238-9; 1.247-9; 1.253; 1.679; 4.111; 5.785-7; 5.793) is proportionate to the thoroughness with which these terms dominate their motivations and discourse. Jupiter, by contrast, says the word “Troy” or “Trojan” once (10.609; to distinguish which fighters in Italy he means).

⁴⁷⁵ *ipse humili designat moenia fossa / moliturque locum, primasque in litore sedes / castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit*, 7.157-9; compare 5.755 with Servius’ note; see Horsfall 2000 *ad* 157-9 for the ritual and for further bibliography. For more discussion of this founding see Chapter 4 below.

⁴⁷⁶ Serv. *ad loc.*: *ideo “primas,” quia imperium Lavinium translaturus est. et sciendum civitatem, quam primo fecit Aeneas, Troiam dictam secundum Catonem et Livium; Livy 1.1 Aeneam ab simili clade domo profugum sed ad maiora rerum initia ducentibus fati, primo in Macedoniam venisse, inde in Siciliam quaerentem sedes delatum, ab Sicilia classe ad Laurentem agrum tenuisse. Troia et huic loco nomen est; Servius ad 1.5: aut enim Troiam dicit, quam ut primum in Italiam venit, fecit Aeneas, de qua ait “castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit” et alio loco Mercurius “nec te Troia capit” —Troiam autem dici quam primum fecit Aeneas, et Livius in primo et Cato in originibus testantur; Dion.Hal.Rom.Ant.1.53.3: καὶ τὸ χωρίον ἐν ᾧ κατεστρατοπεδεύσαντο ἐξ ἐκείνου Τροία καλεῖται, ἀπέχει δὲ τῆς θαλάττης ἀμφὶ τοὺς τέτταρας σταδίους; Paul. ex Fest. 367: Troia — locus in agro Laurente, quo primum Italiae Aeneas cum suis constitit. For more see Schroder 1972, 95ff; for the archaeology, see Musti 1981.*

with *urbs* and *castra* to build an “ambivalent” picture, have been well discussed.⁴⁷⁷ Less discussed is how Vergil assigns the appropriate word to the appropriate characters’ perspectives. The site is an *urbs* to the gods (9.8 Iris; Apollo 9.639) and to the narrator introducing the book and the siege (*viginti lectis equitum comitatus et urbi / improvisus adest*, 9.48). It is a city when it is the medium through which a report spreads, and which reacts with emotion to news (*Interea pavidam volitans pennata per urbem / nuntia Fama ruit...*).⁴⁷⁸ It is a city when it is endowed with a woman to mourn the loss of its warrior (*matrisque adlabitur auris / Euryali*, 9.473-5). It is a city to those inside it who have to defend it, who recognize that they have no other walls but its fortifications (*quos alios muros, quaeve ultra moenia habetis? / unus homo...impune per urbem / ediderit?* 12.783-5).⁴⁷⁹ To characters considering tactics or strategy it remains a camp.⁴⁸⁰ It is Troy to those who know what its site will come to be named: the gods and the narrator. The clearest contrast between these perspectives comes when the narrator tells that Aeneas cuts through the Tiber’s waters to save Troy (*tot lecti proceres ter denis navibus ibant / subsidio Troiae et campos salis aere secabant*, 10.213-4), but, when the narrative tells what Aeneas descries from afar, it is only his camp awaiting relief (*iamque in conspectu Teucros habet et sua*

⁴⁷⁷ See Hardie 1994, 10-14 (in Iliadic terms: as an *urbs* the camp is Troy; as a *castra* it is the Greek camp on the shore); Rossi 2004, 171-196 on the terminology linking cities (Troy, Carthage, the Trojan camp, Latinus’ city) and their sieges throughout the poem.

⁴⁷⁸ For the movement of *fama* through *urbes* see n.149 above.

⁴⁷⁹ At 9.728-9 the narrative is focalized through Pandarus (*demens, qui Rutulum in medio non agmine regem viderit inrumpentem utroque incluserit urbi*). For *muri* and *moenia* in the *Aeneid* see Schork 1986. Contrast this city-camp with the workaday military camp before Latinus’ city (*considunt castris ante urbem et moenia vallant*, 11.615).

⁴⁸⁰ Aeneas leaves instructions before he leaves (*namque ita discedens praeceperat optimus armis / Aeneas: si qua interea fortuna fuisset, / neu struere auderent aciem neu credere campo; / castra modo et tutos servarent aggere muros*, 9.40-44); the Latins wonder at the Trojans’ refusal to give battle (*Teucrum mirantur inertia corda, / non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre / arma viros, sed castra fovere*, 9.55-7); Turnus urges his men to attack (*mecum invadare trepidantia castra*, 9.147); Pandarus tells Turnus he is trapped in an enemy camp (*castra inimica vides*, 9.739); internal reinforcements rally (*sed manus e castris propere coit omnis in unum*, 9.801). At these times the Trojan camp is merely the counterpart to the Latin camp against which Nisus and Euryalus make their raid (9.315; 366; 371; 451-2).

castra / stans celsa in puppi, 10.260-1).⁴⁸¹ Apollo's *nec te Troia capit* (9.644) plays upon the settlement's name to indicate the camp is not the field for Ascanius' deeds, and that his descendants' deeds will surpass Troy's.⁴⁸²

Venus' conception of *Troia renascens* (10.26-27), then, makes more than imaginative sense. She understands the camp to be, or wishes it to be, a new Troy not in the figurative sense that it is a home for defeated and suffering ex-Trojans besieged again, but in that it is Troy; a real city, named Troy, dwelt in by Trojans. The city is not similar to Troy because — according to her — an enemy of Troy, Diomedes, is about to attack it; the coming war is a reenactment of the Trojan War because Diomedes will attack a Troy, now in Italy but still inhabited by Trojans. To Venus the establishment of *recidiva Pergama* is the goal of all the Trojans' sufferings and wanderings; reaching Latium is pointless without it (*quid pestem evadere belli / iuvit et Argolicos medium fugisse per ignis / totque maris vastaeque exhausta pericula terrae, / dum Latium Teucris recidiuaque Pergama quaerunt?*, 10.55-58). The identification of the place with Troy carries the danger of an cyclic recurrence of the fate suffered by the Troy in Phrygia, and it is for this that she pleads in her misdirecting petition to the gods: *Xanthum et Simoenta / redde, oro, miseris iterumque revolvere casus / da, pater, Iliacos Teucris* (10.60-62).

Juno is happy to conceive of this new camp-city as a new Troy, as she does when she proclaims her rival Venus' offspring will be like Hecuba' Paris (*quin idem Veneri partus suus et Paris alter, funestaeque iterum recidua in Pergama taedae*, 7.321-2), as long as this means that she can inflict on it a siege that will recall the bloody battles before the walls of Phrygian Troy.

⁴⁸¹ Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.27 is imprecise in saying that "Aeneas follows other Trojan exiles...in naming his new settlement after his original home." Aeneas has carried out marked acts of naming when he founds Aeneidae in Thrace (*tingo*, 3.18) and Pergamea in Crete (*voco*, 3.133). In Latium there is no act of naming, and little indication that Aeneas thinks of the camp as Troy.

⁴⁸² Conington 1876 *ad loc* suggests as a source a story concerning Alexander's fate, recorded in Plut.*Alex.*6.

The longer-term difficulty of this commitment is that, as she already knows (313-4), her action can only be a proroguing, not a repealing, of the dictates of fate that the Trojans will settle and Aeneas will marry Lavinia (313-4). Her insight into the problem is indicated by her biological metaphor: the rare adjective *recidivus* refers either to the renewed growth of a cut plant or to seeds that fall and sprout.⁴⁸³ That Troy will merely be transplanted and will spring up again under its own name is not a remote possibility in the latter half of the poem; it is the end to which events are proceeding unless Juno can change their course.

Each goddess faces what seem like insurmountable difficulties in achieving what she wishes. If we follow the logic of the metaphors originally chosen by Venus and Juno, which are biological (*renascens*; Venus) and botanical (*recidiva*; Juno), it is difficult for Juno to achieve any victory.⁴⁸⁴ She cannot extinguish the *stirps* (7.293). A new iteration of a plant, unlike an animal offspring, will not appear different or behave differently in any obvious way from the original *stirps*. If Troy is like a tree, it will be the same in whatever soil it grows. But Venus too is asking for too much. Troy cannot be separated from its history; if she wants her people's settlement to be in the image of Troy (*Xanthum et Simoenta / redde, oro*, 59-60) she must also

⁴⁸³ See Fordyce *ad* 7.322; Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.58; Pease 1935 *ad* 4.344; Servius *ad* 4.344 *alii recidivum proprie dicunt quod excisum denuo nascitur*; Servius *ad* 10.58: *tractus autem sermo est ab arboribus, quae taleis sectis pullulant* (perhaps he derives his terminology from Juvenal 6.363-4: *his ac uelut exhausta recidiuus pullulet arca / nummus et e pleno tollatur semper aceruo*); Mela 3.47. Both Silius (1.106) and Seneca (*Troades* 472) imitate the rare word's application to Troy. At Horace *Ode* 4.4.53-60 Hannibal compares the Trojan *gens* to a tree, shaved by axes, that derives strength from loss (*duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus / nigrae feraci frondis in Algido, / per damna, per caedes ab ipso / ducit opes animumque ferro*).

⁴⁸⁴ In her speech in Book 7 Juno activates the dead biological metaphor of *stirps* when she names her enemy with it to open her speech (7.293).

ask that they undergo the same fortunes (*iterumque revolvare casus / da, pater, Iliacos*, 61-2).

Whoever will be a Teucrian (*Teucris*, 62) will be wretched (*miseri*, 61).⁴⁸⁵

In her final scene in Book 12 Juno resolves the tension by fixing upon permanent and irreversible triumph over Troy and its name as the point concerning which she can achieve a triumph.⁴⁸⁶ She says that she has given up any hope of obstructing the future of Aeneas and his descendants, and desires only an irreversible end to the name “Teucrians” (*ne vetus indigenos nomen mutare Latinos / neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari*, 823-24) and “Troy” (*occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*, 12.828). Jupiter accedes to her demand as if this were a point to be jovially granted in passing (*do quod vis, et me victusque volensque remitto. / sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt, / utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum / subsident Teucris*, 12.833-36). On the metaphorical level the problem is solved by Jupiter’s metaphor derived not, as we might expect, from another horticultural metaphor (e.g. grafting), but from the inert and predictable separation of a liquid mixture (*commixti...subsident*).⁴⁸⁷

Whether or not we understand this as the moment the Trojans’ problematic moral makeup is subsumed to the superior Italian,⁴⁸⁸ or as another convenient exaggeration by Jupiter,⁴⁸⁹ as far as

⁴⁸⁵ Harrison 2002 *ad* 60-1 is right that on one level this is the culmination of Venus’ “rhetorical despair”; that is, she is continuing in her pose of one who is now resigned to her people’s destruction, and is asking Jupiter to “get it over with.” But Servius is insightful too in understanding that by using this terminology she is asking that, when Jupiter responds to her real intent and saves the Trojans, he save them *as* Trojans (*ambiguum est utrum dicat, redde nobis re vera Troiam antiquam, an, redde nobis terras in Italia ad similitudinem Troiae: novimus enim hanc fuisse consuetudinem, ut advenae patriae suae imaginem sibi redderent, ut "effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis". bene ergo Venus medio usa est genere loquendi, ut utrumque significaret, et antiquae reditum Troiae et imperium Italiae, quod Troianis Iuppiter ad similitudinem Troiae fore promiserat. et magis hoc est quod latenter desiderat atque petit.*)

⁴⁸⁶ It is not obvious how the an arriving people would be named after a unification with locals. When Dido proposes the union of the Trojans with her people, she skirts the question of a name for the unified body (*Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur*, 1.574). On the persistent challenges of such a process see e.g. Livy 1.13-18 (Romans and Sabines).

⁴⁸⁷ See Tarrant 2012 *ad* 836.

⁴⁸⁸ See Feeney 1984, 191-4, who also gives bibliography for the other traditional interpretation (it is a response to the idea of moving the capital to Troy) and the essential intertext (Horace 3.3).

⁴⁸⁹ Lyne 1987, 81-8; Williams 1996 *ad loc* “Jup. perhaps somewhat overstates the case.”

the dynamic between the characters is concerned it is a “a great victory for Juno.”⁴⁹⁰ She departs happy (841-2).

3.4.6 Divine Recapitulation and Its Effects

On Olympus Venus and Juno do not babble in a display of the “traditional satirical stereotype of female loquacity”⁴⁹¹ to be knowingly and wryly savored by a smirking reader. To evaluate the inaccuracy of the one as whining and the other as a product of “almost insane wickedness”⁴⁹² is to misunderstand to what end their inaccuracy is directed. Venus has serious grievances against Juno, and, proceeding from full knowledge of her rivals’ interferences, builds a case against her. Juno is able to shift the question from her own deeds, to win a decision from Jupiter that allows her to prolong Trojan suffering and put off their triumph, by disputing the question of who is responsible. Her falsehoods are directed toward this goal and are not intended to characterize her as uniquely unconcerned with the truth.⁴⁹³ By the end of the poem we can understand that her speeches in the council have not only convinced Jupiter to grant her a delay; they also press upon a real tension in the idea of transplanting Troy and making Trojans the ancestors of Romans. In her exchange with Jupiter in Book 12, by using the same mock-concessive techniques she employed in the council,⁴⁹⁴ she trades something that was never hers to give for the end of Troy’s name and — suddenly — the disappearance of its people’s *mores*

⁴⁹⁰ Feeney 1984, 182. He argues that Juno’s historical allegiance to Carthage, inscribed in the literary tradition by Ennius, means that her reconciliation here cannot yet be full or permanent. E.L. Harrison 1984, 95-115 argues that Juno leaves happily because she is tricked into thinking that Carthage will destroy Rome. For older arguments that the scene represents a real conversion of Juno from a force of *furor* and chaos to a follower of Jupiter’s view of history as intelligible and teleological, see e.g. Wilson 1979; Anderson 1957, 30.

⁴⁹¹ Harrison 2002 *ad* 16-17.

⁴⁹² Hight 1972, 70; cf. Anderson 1957, 20, for whom Juno “can hardly be considered a rational intellect when enraged.”

⁴⁹³ That Juno shows her perfidy by her “lies” is a common opinion, e.g. Nehr Korn 1971, 572: “But in order to equip each of the two quarreling goddesses with the weapon best suited for her, he gives becoming tears to Venus and to Juno lies.”

⁴⁹⁴ *cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto) component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent* (12.821-2).

too (834). If Venus preserves the line of descent of her beloved people, Juno's rhetoric wins her not only the ability to lacerate her enemies for a few thousand more lines and a few more tragic deaths, not only the loss of her enemies' name and with it the completion of her past victory in the Trojan War, but even the reversal of half of what we have seen Jupiter promise Venus as the reward for her beloved son (*moresque viris et moenia ponet*, 1.264).

3.5 Recapitulation in Councils: The Latin Council

When we turn to the Latin council, we see again the rhetorical tactics of changing the subject under debate, seizing upon vulnerabilities and incoherences allowed by an initial speaker, and trying to control the internal audience's interpretation of a story. Latinus calls the council because he is confronted with an enemy army victorious at the camp site on the Tiber, at the same moment he has learned that there is no hope of outside help from Diomedes. The Latin king brings to the fore the violation of his prerogatives by gently reminding his audience that he rightly would have preferred to have taken proper deliberation before arriving at this extremity (302-4). The declaration that he does not accuse any individual borders on preterition; to refuse to fix blame on any one party is to invite the question of what party could be blamed, or might have deserved blame from a less generous judgment. In the talk of his city at this moment there can be only one answer (*ingravat haec saevus Drances solumque vocari / testatur, solum posci in certamina Turnum. / multa simul contra variis sententia dictis / pro Turno, et magnum reginae nomen obumbrat, / multa virum meritis sustentat fama tropaeis*, 12.220-4).

Latinus proposes to offer the Trojans land and the opportunity to build a city in land currently occupied by the Rutulians (316-23). This is odd in two ways. First, he has already offered to conclude an alliance on terms more favorable to the Trojans when, before any

hostilities, he proposed marrying them into his royal line. An offer of land that is, according to his own assessment, landlocked and of mediocre arability can hardly be expected to satisfy the same Trojans who were originally offered much more advantageous terms of integration. The second oddity is that the land offered is someone else's. It is never established to exactly what degree the Rutulians lie under the Latins' control, but it is clear that they retain a hereditary kingship and a city of their own. Nevertheless Latinus offers their land.⁴⁹⁵ He may have argued against verbally assigning blame to Turnus and the Rutulians, but the proposal that they pay the price to preserve Latium only makes sense if they are tacitly agreed to be responsible for the crisis in which Latium finds itself. Latinus finishes with, and spends the most time discussing, the scenario most attractive to all parties at the council: the Trojans will agree to sail away provided that the Latins offer to build them ships. Nothing other than delusion can explain how the king can expect that the people who came proclaiming their manifest destiny and trumpeting Jupiter as their ancestor and the authority guaranteeing their fate to live in Latium will sail away — provided they are given a few oaken craft *gratis*.

Drances seizes upon Latinus' omission of an individual object of blame by casting it all upon Turnus (346-51), and exploits Latinus' failure to mention that over which the war was fought: the hand of Lavinia (352-6). Only this can secure the peace and the permanent *foedus* that Latinus desires. Drances attacks not through a factually false retelling of Turnus' deeds but through characterization of them. Turnus did jump on a ship that that did sail away from battle (*fugae fidens et caelum territat armis*, 351), and it is only Turnus' intention, unknowable to other

⁴⁹⁵ Horsfall 2003 *ad* 318: "I have no idea how Turnus's subjects might be thought to till land of which the king of the Laurentes is made to claim that he disposes freely (though note the qualifications implied by V., and discussed at 7.151: Lat. is in some formal sense Tu.'s superior)." This difficulty is solved if we understand that this amounts to a demand that Turnus and the Rutulians, in return for everyone else's abstention from casting blame upon them, give up their land to appease the outsiders.

characters, that is told falsely. Drances weaves together the accusation of cowardice with the allegation that Turnus' sole motivation is Lavinia's hand, and joins to these the obloquy that Turnus is solely responsible for the disasters befalling Latium. By these attacks he means to shame Turnus into pursuing single combat with Aeneas (360-1; 367-75).

Turnus is so affronted that he spends nearly all his words contrasting Drances' reliance on words and a skillful tongue with his own production of deeds by his skillful right hand. His speech is filled with rhetorical fireworks and scores points against Drances' less attractively ingenuous outpouring of emotion. None of this should hinder us from noticing that the young man concludes by giving Drances what he wanted and by passing over without mention the compromises Latinus proposed. Turnus not only agrees to face Aeneas in single combat, he even proclaims his avid desire for it. He makes no effort to disentangle the question of whom Lavinia is to marry from the question of how to conclude the war.

The three speeches have little immediate effect on the action. The council breaks up when news arrives that the Trojans are approaching the city, and Turnus' mockery of the babbling of old men is understandable (*immo, ait o cives, arrepto tempore Turnus, / cogite concilium et pacem laudate sedentes; / illi armis in regna ruunt* [11.459-61]). But, like Juno, Drances has succeeded in resetting the terms of discourse. When the terms of the treaty to follow the single combat are concluded in Book 12, they include the marrying of Lavinia to Aeneas if he wins. When Turnus sees that he is marked by the eyes of the citizens of Latinus' city, he burns to confront Aeneas (12.1-4). When he is deciding whether and when to finally face Aeneas, he classes failing to disprove Drances' accusation of cowardice with failure to save the homes of his

allies from being destroyed as reasons not to flee (*exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum) / perpetiar, dextra nec Drancis dicta refellam?* 12.643-4).

3.6 Conclusion

*stetimus tela aspera contra
contulimusque manus: experto credite quantus
in clipeum adsurgat, quo turbine torqueat hastam. 285
si duo praeterea talis Idaea tulisset
terra viros, ultro Inachias venisset ad urbes
Dardanus, et versis lugeret Graecia fatis.
Hectoris Aeneaeque manu victoria Graium
haesit et in decimum vestigia rettulit annum. 290
ambo animis, ambo insignes praestantibus armis,
hic pietate prior. (11.282-292)*

Diomedes reasonably excuses his decision to abstain from war on the Trojans by cataloguing the punishments suffered during their homecomings by his fellow Achaeans (255-70), crowned by the transformation of his own men into birds (271-80).⁴⁹⁶ The reader of the *Iliad*, acquainted with Diomedes' defeat of Aeneas (5.166ff) and Aeneas' discomfiture at the hands of Achilles (22.160ff), will find it more difficult to understand his exhortation that the Latins and their allies trust his first-hand experience of how fearsome a warrior Aeneas is.⁴⁹⁷ There is no question of a non-*Iliadic* variant; in no tradition is Aeneas a more formidable opponent of Diomedes than he shows himself in the *Iliad*. The Italians are not ignorant of the events of the war—Liger even seems to know that Diomedes took Aeneas' horses (10.581; see *Il.*20.264-5; 318-270)—and there is no reason to think that the Diomedes thinks they are. The reader of the *Aeneid*, prepared by previous recapitulations, will understand that Diomedes is not referring to another past, and is not trying to limit what his addressees know. He is using the past

⁴⁹⁶ Vergil is the first extant writer to locate this transformation before Diomedes' death; see Papaioannou 2000, 214.

⁴⁹⁷ Horsfall 2002, 171-2 "rewritten"; Hardie 1998, 252-4; Williams 1983, 44; also 100; 144 ("revisionist history").

to make conclusions opposite to those that would follow intuitively from a plain statement of fact and a clear understanding of responsibility. That he is attempting to demonstrate his new-found regard for *pietas* is apparent when he first speculates that if were there two Aeneas', Troy would have conquered Greece; then he pairs Hector and Aeneas, and declares the former more outstanding in martial prowess, the latter first in *pietas*. *Pietas*, in other words, is more formidable in the long run than *arma*.⁴⁹⁸ The demonstration of his new priorities is as important to him as the shifting of blame onto the Trojans was to Juno, and is accomplished by similar means.

The Vergilian narrator may repeat himself only rarely, but Vergilian characters expend much breath recapitulating events that have already been narrated in an authorized manner. No character has use for a balanced re-telling of facts that would admit of the ambiguities the narrator allows. Each recapitulation is marked by addition, omission, or twisting of information by a character with rhetorical goals. To say "Vergil's speakers are seldom wholly accurate"⁴⁹⁹ is to understate. Even something as small as the report to Turnus of Amata's suicide is not straightforward: Amata hangs herself (603), but the messenger Saces suppresses this detail and encourages his addressee to think the queen employed some more honorable means of suicide (*praeterea regina, tui fidissima, dextra /occidit ipsa sua lucemque exterrita fugit*, 12.659-60).⁵⁰⁰

Irreconcilability between authorized narrative and character speech is not a mistake, a product of insufficient attention or time, or an exploration of possible modes of reality; it is not

⁴⁹⁸ Horsfall 2003 *ad* 289: "Diom.'s tribute to Aen. is indeed hyperbolic...but the point is not so much that Diom. is rewriting the record, a little unconvincingly, as that he has changed his mind, to the point of lauding the courage of one of his — as we know, if we pause to ponder coolly — less-than-first-rank adversaries." For this reading of the speech as a change in character see Papaioannou 2000; Fletcher 2006.

⁴⁹⁹ Hight 1972, 264; Hardie 1998 attempts a short comparison to Homeric precedents.

⁵⁰⁰ Ser. *ad loc*: *ut laquei absconderet dedecus*. Tarrant 2012 *ad loc* "Saces aims to confer dignity on characters treated unsympathetically by the narrator."

primarily a way to touch on mythical variants, or a meditation upon memory and its defects. It is primarily a means by which the careful reader can detect the speaker's rhetorical strategy, taking into account the balance of knowledge, the demands put upon the speaker by context, and the goals the speaker wishes to achieve. In Books 7 and 8, characters use these strategies when they inform their addressees, and when they can invent or distort events more freely. In the final three books, characters continue to use these strategies even when their addressees are well aware of what has happened, and when they know that their addressees know. No speaker conceals or reveals information unknown to the internal audience or to the reader; instead, each speaker attempts to control interpretation, and specifically attribution of blame, of a situation concerning which all know the facts.

CHAPTER 4: MANIPULATING THE READER'S KNOWLEDGE

Introduction

The rhetorical strategies used by characters in the *Aeneid* to manipulate and persuade other characters are closely intertwined with the narrative strategies used by Vergil to misdirect the expectations of his readers. By *misdirection* I mean the generation of expectation about the plot that either is not fulfilled or is fulfilled in an unexpected way. A closely related technique is what I call *pluperfect storytelling*, in which a key piece of information about a narrated sequence is held back at the time of first narration and delivered to the readers, either by the narrative voice or by a character, at a later time. One effect of these techniques is to generate tension that ends with surprise; another is to invite or compel readers to reconsider and reevaluate earlier passages.

The rhetoric of the characters enables the the rhetoric of the narrator. In order for misdirection to take effect, one passage (or set of passage) raises an expectation and another either disappoints it or fulfills it in a surprising manner; in order for the reader to be prompted to reevaluate an earlier passage, one passage (or set of passages) seems to bear a clear meaning, and another gives the reader reason to go back and reconsider. The words of one or the other of this yoked team of passages are often delivered by a character in direct speech. If the character speaks the first passage, he tells something false or easily misunderstood; the reader therefore forms a false impression of the past, or a false expectation of the future. If a character speaks the second passage, it is his words that reveal the misdirection, or suggest, although without authorization, that we readers must understand past passages anew. Usually authorized narrative

alone performs one of these two functions, and the words of a character alone perform the other. In the most interesting examples, unauthorized words work with ambiguous narrator's words to raise expectation and to reverse it. It is with such an example that we begin.

4.1 Misdirection through Character Speech

4.1.1 A Character's Falsehood Conspires with Narrative

*nos, tua progenies, caeli quibus adnuis arcem,
navibus (infandum!) amissis, unius ob iram
prodimur atque Italis longe disiungimur oris.* (1.250-252)

Early in Book I Venus asks Jupiter what has changed his mind, why he has allowed the Trojans to wander and to suffer at the hands of the unnamed Juno. Venus bemoans the unspeakable disgrace of the loss of her peoples' ships to her rival's machinations. The first-time reader will not be surprised. The sinking of Orontes' ship in the storm stirred up by Juno at the open of the poem was told in pitiable detail (1.113-117). After the Lycian's ship was lost, other ships were overcome by the storm, took on water, and began to split open:

*iam validam Ilionei navem, iam fortis Achatii,
et qua vectus Abas, et qua grandaevus Aletes,
vicit hiems; laxis laterum compagibus omnes
accipiunt inimicum imbrem, rimisque fatiscunt.* (1.120-123)

Although Neptune saw the fleet scattered (128), and he and his assistants pried some ships off the rocks (145), Aeneas escaped to the Libyan shore with seven ships only (170-71). When he found a point from which to survey the sea, he found within his line of sight not a single ship (184). While his men, sated with venison, were of two minds about the fate of their lost comrades (217-219), Aeneas, thinking them dead, groaned for their cruel fates (220-223).

Because this is all the information the narrative has offered, when Venus complains to Jupiter about the loss of Trojan ships in the plural we readers have every reason to think that she is referring to a fact — the loss of many ships — known to her and to her father. When Aeneas later complains to Venus, disguised as a local huntress, that, though he embarked with twenty ships, only seven remain (381-383), it is contrary not only to Aeneas' expectations, but also to the reader's, when his mother announces that the fleet has been saved. The announcement must be hard for Aeneas and Anchises to believe: the goddess makes no mention of the single ship wrecked before their very eyes. She says only that the fleet has returned, as if miraculously (1.390-401). We readers may be more inclined to believe her, knowing as we do that she has just consulted with Jupiter, been comforted by him, and departed satisfied with his answers. Aeneas, who only learns who she is when she disappears and leaves him groaning for contact, is unlikely to trust her optimistic words (1.407-409). It is for this reason that in the next scene, when suddenly Aeneas' comrades march into Dido's presence, they are a source of equal fear and joy to Aeneas and his comrade Achates (*obstipuit simul ipse simul percussus Achates / laetitiaque metuque*, 513-4). The pair have to parse the mathematics of the prophecy to work out how the solid fact of leaders from twelve ships standing before them matches Venus' augury (1.584-5).⁵⁰¹ Both their shock and Achates' hesitant calculation are difficult to understand if the two did not harbor grave doubts about Venus' encouragement when they first heard it.

In order to achieve this moment of surprise Vergil divides the characters into two groups, then follows the point of view of first group while telling us nothing about the second. He delays

⁵⁰¹ Aeneas says that he started with twenty ships; he landed in Libya with seven ships; of the remaining thirteen, only Orontes' has been lost; the arriving ambassadors have been selected from twelve ships, and so match Venus' twelve swans (1.393). For Venus' omission of unwelcome news see O'Hara 1990, 9-13.

the narration of what has concurrently happened to the second group until the moment of maximum effect, and only then goes back, fills in the gap he left in the story, and tells us what had already happened:

*cum subito Aeneas concursu accedere magno
Anthea Sergestumque videt fortemque Cloanthum,
Teucrorumque alios, ater quos aequore turbo
dispulerat penitusque alias avexerat oras.* (1.509-512)

In one moment we join Aeneas and Achates in seeing the approach of the other Trojans in the narrator's habitual present tense (*videt*); in the next we are pulled out of their perspective by the narrator's intervention to explain the storm's action (*dispulerat...avexerat*), with verbs in the pluperfect to remind us of our temporal relationship to the narrated events. Autopsis by the character is united again with learning by the reader in the words of Achates:

*unus abest, medio in fluctu quem vidimus ipsi
submersum; dictis respondent cetera matris.* (1.584-585)

We readers ourselves also saw Orontes's ship sink in the waves as it happened before Aeneas' eyes (*ipsius ante oculos*, 114), and glimpsed swimming men, weapons, fragments, and treasure as they appeared to him on the surface of the sea (*adparent*, 118).

The technique of temporarily limiting the narrative to the perceptions of one character or set of characters in order to generate tension or surprise can work without the aid of other techniques. When Nisus and Euryalus, striving to escape Volcens' patrol, are separated (9.384-5), the narrator follows Nisus through his successful escape (386), anguished confusion (390-392), and search for his companion (391-393); then we hear with Nisus the sounds of the horses (*audit equos*, *audit strepitus*, 394); with him we catch sight of Euryalus, who has been captured by an enemy patrol "off-stage" (*pervenit ac videt Euryalum, quem iam manus omnis / fraude loci et*

noctis, subito turbante tumultu, / oppressum rapit et conantem plurima frustra; 396-398). The misdirection in Book 1 is more complex and extended. Vergil separates the characters and has the reader follow one group not for ten lines but for two hundred and seventy. The misdirection begins when the narrative leaves the other ships that “the storm overcomes” at the critical moment at which they seem to be foundering (see above, 1.120ff). At the second moment we peer into the distance with Aeneas as he stands on a cliff, trying to find any trace of his companions:

*Aeneas scopulum interea conscendit, et omnem
prospectum late pelago petit, Anthea si quem
iactatum vento videat Phrygiasque biremis,
aut Capyn, aut celsis in puppibus arma Caici.
navem in conspectu **nullam**, tris litore cervos
prospicit errantis.* (1.180-185)

At the pause at the caesura after *conspectu* (184), it seems that Aeneas has seen a ship of his dear comrades; the prospect is dashed in the second half of the line (“of his ships he saw / not a single one”).⁵⁰² The reader’s feeling mirrors the leaping hope of Aeneas as he crests the the hill to reach a point of wide vantage — only to see nothing.

When the narrator lists the missing leaders who Aeneas seems to think are dead, he begins with the one whose death has been narrated.

*Praecipue pius Aeneas nunc acris **Oronti**,
nunc Amyci casum gemit et crudelia secum
fata Lyci, fortemque Gyan, fortemque Cloanthum* (1.220-222)

⁵⁰² Demetrius (*On Style*, 152) gives as an example of *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* a verse (“Οὐτὶν ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἐτάροισιν [*Od* 9.369]) in which the surprise falls immediately after the caesura. He also suggests that the limitation of the reader’s knowledge to that of the character, so that the two are surprised at the same time, makes the *χάρις* that follows from skillful technique all the more effective (οὐ γὰρ προσεδόκα τοιοῦτο ξένιον οὔτε Ὀδυσσεὺς οὔτε ὁ ἀναγινώσκων). For the tendency of the apprehension of truth to have greater effect in someone who has been misdirected, see Aristotle 1412a6: ἔστιν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀστεία τὰ πλεῖστα διὰ μεταφορᾶς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ προσεξαπατᾶν: μᾶλλον γὰρ γίγνεται δῆλον ὅ τι ἔμαθε παρὰ τὸ ἐναντίως ἔχειν, καὶ ἔοικεν λέγειν ἢ ψυχὴ ὡς ἀληθῶς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἥμαρτον. The Greek *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is more often used of jokes than dramatic effects; for the Latin see *Rhet.Her.* 1.6.10 (*praeter expectationem*); Cic.*De Oratore* 2.284-5; 255 (*praeter expectationem*)).

The ordering of the list is psychologically insightful: Aeneas begins by thinking of Orontes because he saw him die, then he lets his mind run on to the others who left his sight. The ordering in Aeneas' mind has a complementary effect on us readers: it makes us recall Orontes' death, and makes us more likely to accept that the others are, like Orontes, lost forever. Venus' use of an inaccurate plural to Jupiter, lying near the beginning of this nexus of misdirecting passages, is more than a specimen of αὔξεισις and characterization of a speaker prone to exaggeration. The inaccuracy is the tool by which the narrator sets up an expectation that he elaborates, exploits for pathos, and overturns.

4.1.2 A Character's Assertion Alone Creates Expectation

Not every misdirection need be so carefully activated and cultivated by the words of the narrator. Character speech alone, aided by narrative reticence or suspension of information, may create a misdirecting expectation. In chapter 3 I considered Juno's failure to respond to Venus' claim, her only demonstrably false one, that Diomedes was readying another attack on the Teucrians (*atque iterum in Teucros Aetolis surgit ab Arpis / Tydides*, 10.28-29). Only a reader encountering the poem for a second time can understand that Venus is wrong. At the moment at which Venus speaks the narrator has only told that the Trojans' Italian enemies have sent an ambassador to the Aetolian (8.1-17). Everything else Venus says in this speech is either accurate or marred only by exaggeration, not by falsehood. The point of allowing Juno, in her otherwise close refutation, to pass over Venus' only falsehood in silence is to encourage the reader to believe that Diomedes will march against the Trojans and into the poem. The expectation is not

reversed until the Latin legates return more than a full book later. The account of the legation's return maintains the suspense for as long as possible:

*ecce super maesti magna Diomedis ab urbe
legati responsa ferunt: nihil omnibus actum
tantorum impensis operum...* (1.226-228)

After verse 226 anyone could be coming “from Diomedes’ great city.” The possibility that it is the Argive or his forces himself is by no means an absurd one.⁵⁰³ The last half of the line dashes the expectation born at the beginning of Book 8 and nursed by Venus’ false speech in Book 10. Again the readers learn about something concerning which they received misdirecting information only at the moment surprised characters learn the same.

4.2 Short-Term Misdirection

The misdirections sketched above require we readers to reassess his understanding of a character’s accuracy once we have learned more later in the narrative. In the two cases mentioned above the characters’ statements must be understood in hindsight to have been untruthful, but in the first case the narrator’s words must also be understood to have been incomplete and misleading. I will be chiefly concerned with instances like these in which a character’s rhetoric conspires with and advances the narrator’s misdirection. Before I proceed to this, a summary of the broader category of misdirection, in which later information compels us to go back and reassess the words either of the narrator or of characters, will help contextualize the species of misdirection that is the narrator’s conspiracy with untruthful characters.

⁵⁰³ Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.29: “Venus, like the reader, expects the embassy recently sent to Diomedes by the Latins (8.9ff) to bring back this formidable warrior to aid the Latin war-effort.” Papaioannou 2000, 206 also thinks that Venus is mistaken, and is thinking of the “other Achilles” prophesied by the Sibyl (6.89).

4.2.1 Short-Term Misdirection: Vanishing Ambiguity with Lingering Effects

On the smallest scale, misdirection encourages an expectation that is reversed in the middle of a line, thought, or colon. In these instance there is no grammatical “ambiguity” by which reader who has read the whole colon can choose between ways to construe a word; what we experience instead is an encouragement to understand words in one way before later words show that they mean something else. The line in which Aeneas sees no ships at all is such a line; there is no ambiguity once we reach the end of the line, but the heightening of pathos, the replication of the experience of the character as he crests a height and eagerly looks on the prospect’s expanse, lingers.⁵⁰⁴ A simple expectation can be raised by the narrator more decisively and manipulatively:

*donec rostra tenent siccum et sedere carinae
omnes innocuae. sed non puppis tua, Tarchon:*
(10.301-302)

A character’s words too can bear one meaning for the reader before the final word resolves the meaning of the earlier words in the line:

huic uni forsā potui succumbere culpae
(4.19)

Until the final word the line unmistakably has more than one meaning, invited both by the sexual implications of *succumbere* and by Latin morphology.⁵⁰⁵ It seems that Dido is admitting her desire to lie under this man alone; then we understand that she is admitting her desire to yield to this fault alone.⁵⁰⁶ Dido is speaking of her admiration for the fascinating foreigner, and is about

⁵⁰⁴ Laird 1999 argues that the fluidity of the hexameter line encourages such effects. Contrast what I discuss here with a genuine, persistent ambiguity like the one Fontaine 2016 argues is to be found in *furiis accensus* (12.946).

⁵⁰⁵ The form of the dative of the demonstrative leaves the gender as well as the part of speech momentarily ambiguous; until it is resolved as a feminine adjective, it sounds as if it is a masculine pronoun.

⁵⁰⁶ *Culpa* too can refer to a sexual wrongdoing; see Clausen 1992, 77, esp. n.7. Pease 1935 *ad loc* lists editors who feel the effect so strongly that they insist on not construing *huic uni* with *culpae*.

to admit, to her sister and herself, that she recognizes the stirrings of erotic desire (*agnosco veteris vestigia flammae*, 4.23). Her weeping (30) and easy acquiescence to Anna's arguments in favor of dropping her self-imposed celibacy (31-38) suggest that her desires are stronger than she will say, and perhaps than she knows. Evanescing innuendo makes memorable this unveiling, and injects a dose of humor.⁵⁰⁷

Although the misdirecting words shed their grammatical ambiguity upon the completion of the line or unit of thought, the fleeting misunderstanding they provoke can have lingering thematic significance:

speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem (4.124)

[D]ux is positioned to suggest that Dido is taking the initiating or dominant role not so much politically, in the relationship between the two peoples, as sexually, in the encounter and relationship between the two persons that is about to follow.⁵⁰⁸ Although by the time the line ends there is no grammatical ambiguity, and *dux* must be taken with *Troianus*, the force of the initial impression is lessened only a little. The hint planted here is exploited when Mercury insults Aeneas (*uxorius*, 266). The question of who initiated or took a dominant role in the relationship between Dido and Aeneas is never directly answered, however.

⁵⁰⁷ For another example see O'Hara 2007, 99 (on 10.565-9): "When the first two-and-one-half lines compare Aeneas to Aegaeon, the reader is apt to think first of the more common myth of Aegaeon as the ally of Jupiter. Only with the second half of the third line comes the information that Aegaeon is fighting 'against Jupiter's lightning: *Iovis... fulmina contra*. Over the course of the few seconds it takes the reader to process the information represented in these lines, the Aegaeon simile embodies the contradictions and ambiguities of the poem's allusions to Gigantomachy..." Hejduk 2009, 305 n.39 comments on 12.801-2 (*mihi curae / saepe tuo dulci tristes / ex ore recursit*): "As so often, a temporary grammatical ambiguity resolves itself in a surprising way. The phrase *mihi curae* appears at first a double dative, indicating that Juno's pain would "be a source of care for me"—but the next line reveals *curae* as a nominative, the gist of the lines being, "so the complaints from your sweet [IRONY] mouth stop giving me a headache.""

⁵⁰⁸ O'Hara 1997, 250; he follows Clausen 1987, 24, who think that 1.364 (*dux femina facti*) strengthens the "ambiguity."

On the Daedalan relief in Cumae we sees through Aeneas' eyes a series of images: Androgeos; the fourteen Athenian offerings; Pasiphae beneath a bull; the labyrinth. The flow of images runs into an intruding explanation (*enim*):

*hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto
Pasiphae mixtumque genus prolesque biformis
Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae,
hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error;
magnum **reginae** sed enim miseratus amorem
Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resolvit,
caeca regens filo vestigia.* (6.23-9)

At the end of verse 27 we expect that the *regina* is Pasiphae, that the love pitied by Daedalus is the lust that led to the conception of the Minotaur, and that Daedalus' merciful action is the construction of the subject of the image most recently described: the labyrinth. This impression is encouraged by the next three words (*dolos tecti ambagesque*, 29); but when the verse concludes with *resolvit*, we understand that the act of Daedalan pity was the unmaking of the labyrinth, and that Ariadne was the one called *regina* a line earlier. The switch-back embodies the reversals of the labyrinthine subject depicted, but, as Putnam points out,⁵⁰⁹ the slightly unnatural application of *regina* to Ariadne also brings to mind the pitiable love of a character in the *Aeneid* who is more naturally named *regina*. Ariadne welcomed an intriguing noble foreigner, fell in love with him, and was abandoned by him, and her love is depicted as an object of pity. What Aeneas feels upon seeing such a character we do not know;⁵¹⁰ but the reader is primed for Dido's reappearance, and for the hero's response to her (*miseratur euntem*, 6.476).

⁵⁰⁹ Putnam 1987.

⁵¹⁰ See Putnam 1987, 188-191, with further verbal echoes to Dido (*monimenta; crudelis; misereor; furt-*); also Putnam 1998, 86-87.

land (6). We expect, then, to see Aeneas found a city.⁵¹² It is not only the proleptic naming of the local shores “Lavinian” that advertises the founding of Lavinium; the association of the cult of Aeneas with Lavinium and the traditional sequence of settlements (Lavinium; Alba Longa; Rome) also suggest that this *urbs* will be Lavinium. The cult of the Penates in Lavinium is attested in the fourth century and, although the town declined, the cult and its place in the Roman mythical world endured, and were being renewed by Augustus.⁵¹³ Jupiter’s subsequent assurance

⁵¹² The narrator does not explicitly promise to sing of the event indicated by *conderet urbem*, which is in *dum*-clause expressing purpose or anticipation that is itself within a relative clause. Nevertheless the words raise expectations. (1) The poem does tell of every other element and event in these lines, including that indicated by the parallel clause (*inferretque deos Latio*). (2) Proems traditionally sketch the events that are narrated in the poem that follows. Although they do so in the most general terms (“very general foreshadowing of its contents,” de Jong 2001, 215), they do not tend to refer to events outside the narrative. This holds true of the events referred to within the relative clauses that describe the objects of the verb of singing in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. These Homeric proems mention very early or very late details rather than an outline of the plot, but the narrative does eventually tell of most of these details. We hear of how Achilles’ μῆνις brought countless griefs to the Achaeans (*Il.*1.2) and sent many a soul down to Hades (v.3); though we do not see dogs and birds of prey feeding on corpses (vv.4-5), yet we see many of the events that would naturally lead to such feeding. So too we hear of Odysseus’ wanderings after the sack of Troy (*Od.* 1.1-2), some at least of his acquaintance with men’s cities and minds (v.3), his suffering on the sea (4), and his failed attempts to save his companions (vv.6-10; although Odysseus in the *Apologos* does not tell that most companions’ νόστιμον ἦμαρ is taken away by vengeful Hyperion [8-9], yet we still hear a narrative of their death). Bassett 1934 argues that the Homeric habit is to touch on early or late details but tell nothing like a summary the tale, whereas Vergil, more like a historian, “gives something approaching a table of contents.” (p.109) Lansing 2008 perhaps exaggerates this same point: “These seven verses, as is well known, comprise an efficient and subtly crafted synopsis of the entire sequence of events that make up the action of the *Aeneid*.” Van Groningen 1946 stresses the tensions between the Homeric proems and the poems that follow, and concludes that “the indications of the contents do not tally with the contents themselves” (p.4) because the poet’s mind, beginning with the thematic opening word, springs freely from thought to thought, and the proems “reflect with startling precision the mental activity of the poets.” (p.13) Satterfield 2011 argues that the ambiguities of the Iliadic proem and the “discrepancies” between it and the narrative (Achilles has two episodes of wrath; corpses are not eaten by dogs and birds; the natural way to take ἐξ ὄψεος does not coordinate with the narrative) are a means of opening up room for the Muse to correct the invoking poet. See further Redfield 1979; Nagler 1990; Walsh 1995. Conte 2007 proposes that there are two distinct types of proem: the “expository,” by which the poet declares what he will sing about, and, beginning in the Hellenistic period, the “programmatically,” in which the poet positions himself against his predecessors and his audience, and declares his poetics. For the proem of the *Aeneid* see further Halter 1964; von Albrecht 1972; Galinsky 1974; Fredricksmeier 1984; Reed 2010, 77-8; Beck 2016. For the function of proems in general, including those outside of epic, see Wheeler 2002; Race 1992; Harden and Kelly 2013 with bibliography.

⁵¹³ Galinsky 1969, 141ff reviews the evidence and disentangles the mythical strands (Aeneas as founder of Rome; Penates in Lavinium; Aeneas as founder of Lavinium); for a newer review of the evidence see Orlin 2010, 49ff; see also Gruen 1992; Norden 1999; Erskine 2001, 143-4; Casali 2010. Reed 2010 discusses the relevance of the names to the question of Roman identity, and on this theme too concludes “The following twelve books of ktistic poetry will exacerbate these questions rather than resolve them.” (p.78).

to Venus that she will see the promised walls of Lavinium (*cernes urbem et promissa Lavini / moenia*, 1.258-259) seems to double as an assurance to the readers that they will see the same.⁵¹⁴

The consistency, the obsessiveness with which the characters speak of a city and its walls as that which makes a homeland can scarcely be exaggerated. The *moenia* of Troy dominate the memories of that city, in its agonized survivors as well as its enemies. When the Trojans encounter the settlers who have gone before them, and have had fewer labors and absorbed less hatred, the *moenia* (or *muri*) mark their *urbs*, which in turn marks their security. From the moment Hector's shade commands Aeneas to leave his city, each speaker who bemoans, summarizes, or prophecies concerning the Trojans' wandering speaks of the founding of a city and its walls as the terminus of their sufferings.⁵¹⁵ Hector commands that they look for the city walls they will set up (*moenia quaere / magna....statues quae*, 2.294-295). On Delos Aeneas begs Apollo for walls and a city that will endure for his weary people, (*da moenia fessis / et genus et mansuram urbem*, 3.85-6). The Penates promise they will grant *imperium* to the city that they urge Aeneas to continue to strive to build (*imperiumque urbi dabimus. tu moenia magnis / magna para*, 159-60). Celaeno tells the *Laomedontiadae* that they will have to eat their tables before they gird their city with walls (*ante datam cingetis moenibus urbem*, 3.255). Helenus warns them that they will have to round Sicily and pass Avernus before they can safely settle a city (*quam tuta possis urbem componere terra*, 3.387). Aeneas speaks of the ever-receding goal of his journey as autopsy of a city he will have given to his people (*gentique meae data moenia cernam*, 3.501). Even the subsequent settlements of Alba Longa and Rome are always wall and

⁵¹⁴ Propertius' miniature reworking of the proem suggests that a city-founding seemed essential to the subject, and perhaps was expected by him: *qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitavit arma / iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus* (2.34.59-64).

⁵¹⁵ The exception is Creusa, who, according to Aeneas, tells only of *res laetae*, a *regnum*, and a *coniunx* (2.783-784).

city. By comparison the generic terms of *domus* or *sedes*, and even *patria*, are rare and specialized. When Jupiter gives Mercury words with which to rebuke Aeneas, they say he is wasting time in one city, Carthage, and not looking to the cities granted by the fates (*fatisque datas non respicit urbes*, 4.225). Aeneas wishes that his father's obsequies remain sacred after his city has been given a place (*urbe...posita*, 5.60). Iris, inhabiting her role of a Trojan woman driven by frustration and exhaustion, asks in agony whether Troy will ever again have walls (*nullane iam Troiae dicentur moenia*, 6.33), then asks who prevents their erection here in Sicily (*quis prohibet muros iacere et dare civibus urbem?*, 5.631).⁵¹⁶ Nautes encourages Aeneas to give the weary who cannot go on these same Sicilian walls (*et his habeant terris sine moenia fessi*, 3.717). Aeneas has a vision of Anchises telling him where to go in order to learn where he will build his walls (*tum genus omne tuum et quae dentur moenia disces*, 5.737). In the imagination of the Trojans the longed-for terminus of their hardships is the founding of a city; the attraction of Italy, mysterious and ever-fleeing (5.628; 6.61; 6.496), is that they are not allowed to build one until they get there.

The reader is encouraged to anticipate a specific site and a moment of founding. Helenus tells Aeneas that where he finds a white sow will be the site of his city and the end of his sufferings (*is locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum*, 3.393). When Aeneas sees the sow he is in no situation to be establishing a city and does not do so (8.81-5). Just before this Tiberinus delivers the prophecy again to Aeneas, but says that the ground on which the sow lies will be the site of Alba Longa, which is not (as we know, but Aeneas presumably does not) the city Aeneas himself will establish (8.42-9).⁵¹⁷ Helenus' words will be fulfilled by a city founded where the

⁵¹⁶ She is responding to the Trojan women's stated wishes (*urbem orant*, 5.617).

⁵¹⁷ See Moskalew 1982, 113 for a bibliography of the controversy over 8.46.

sow is found, but not *the* Lavinian city we readers are encouraged to expect at the time the prophet speaks.

4.3.2 Founding: Expectation Unfulfilled

Despite the expectation raised by the fifth line of the proem and encouraged by the intervening prophecies and anticipations of the Trojans' arrival in Italy, we do not see Aeneas establish, found, or build Lavinium. We do not see him arrive at its site. At the Tiber's mouth he declares the omen of the tables fulfilled, and his men hear the rumor that the long-awaited day of the founding of their city has come (*advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant*, 7.145). Aeneas marks out walls. The demarcation is described the technical jargon of the legion's daily military camp (*ipse humili designat moenia fossa / moliturque locum, primasque in litore sedes / castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit*, 7.157-9). In chapter 3 I discussed how the camp takes on the role of a city in general and Troy in particular, and that the traditional name for this first Trojan settlement in Italy was "Troy."⁵¹⁸ At the abrupt end of the poem we realize that in those Book 7 lines Aeneas founded the only city we will ever see him found. The terminology with which the narrator describes the establishment of the camp in Book 7 (*ipse humili designat moenia*) mirrors the terminology describing the earlier founding of Segesta (*Aeneas urbem designat aratro*, 5.755), the city for the Trojans' women, children, and elderly; although there the ktistic language had no admixture of general's talk.⁵¹⁹ But the narrator did not blend ktistic language into military to elevate the tone of the erection of a military camp, as a sort of preview

⁵¹⁸ See above (3.4.5).

⁵¹⁹ Servius *ad* Servius *ad* 5.755: *quem Cato in originibus dicit morem fuisse. conditores enim civitatis taurum in dexteram, vaccam intrinsecus iungebant, et incincti ritu Gabino, id est togae parte caput velati, parte succincti, tenebant stivam incurvam, ut glebae omnes intrinsecus caderent, et ita sulco ducto loca murorum designabant, aratrum suspendentes circa loca portarum.*

of the grand and climactic founding of a city to come;⁵²⁰ the military language was secondary to the ktistic language, which was applied to the only founding of what can be termed a “city” we ever see. Juno, at least, thinks of this as the end of Trojan wanderings, and beginning of habitation: *moliri iam tecta videt* (7.290).

The expectation that city-founding is the goal contributes to the frustration when each successive moment at which founding can occur is lost. The poem ends with Aeneas killing Turnus after indicating that the foundation of a new city named after his bride, Lavinia, will be a condition of his victory over Turnus. Lavinum remains in the future. The transformation of the two-sided *condere* from the word for the founding of a city (*dum conderet urbem*, 1.5) to the burying of a sword in a man (*ferrum adverso sub pectore condit*, 12.950) has been read as an instantiation of the corrupting influence of madness, or the creative role of violence.⁵²¹ However we understand the change in meaning, it is emphatic not only because the *condere* has one meaning in one place and another in another, but because the city-founding has been expected for so many thousands of lines until the poem ends abruptly in the plunging of the sword. The destructive meaning resounds over the ktistic not only because the killing comes last, but because we never see a founding. In earlier examples, when the second half of a line after a caesura reverses the expectation raised by the first half, the reader had to reevaluate a few words, and the effect may be a sudden jolt of pathos. When the terminus of wandering turns out not to be the terminus of the poem, the reader must reevaluate the proem, the program it lays out, and the poem as a whole.

⁵²⁰ Contrast the language here with the routine military language of the routine camp in front of Latinus' city the night before the final battle (*considunt castris ante urbem et moenia vallant*, 11.915).

⁵²¹ See James 1995; Reckford 1961, 255; Hunt 1973, 5ff; Commager 1981, 113 prefers to juxtapose 1.33 (founding of a nation) and 12.950 (death of an individual).

4.3.3 The Ghost of Troy: Wandering

The change in the Trojans' own conception of their prospective settlement, from a second Troy to a new beginning, seems to be one of the dominant themes of the first six books, and especially of the *errores* in Book 3.⁵²² If, when Juno wins the extinction of the Trojan name in Book 12, we can rejoice because “the death of Troy signifies the birth of Rome,”⁵²³ we might expect to observe Aeneas and his people come to understand that this is so. As the Trojans leave Sicily they conceive of the inspiring future to which they strive as the rise of Troy again (*illic fas regna resurgere Troiae*, 1.206). The names of Aeneas' failed cities — Aeneadeae in Thrace, Pergamea in Crete — signal that a fresh instantiation of Troy is their highest ambition. “Another Troy” is the goal in the pursuit of which Aeneas begs Delian Apollo for direction (*serva altera Troiae / Pergama*, 3.86-7).⁵²⁴ The temptation to make a copy of the past is given form in Buthrotum. Not only the stones of the city built by Helenus and Andromache, but even the landscape itself is remade as an image of Troy and renamed in its tradition.⁵²⁵ Helenus tells much about the new lands for which the Trojans are destined, but his summarizing wish is that his fellow-Trojans glorify Troy there (*vade age et ingentem factis fer ad aethera Troiam*, 3.462). Aeneas responds in kind with mournful tribute:

*effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis
quam vestrae fecere manus, melioribus, opto,
auspiciis, et quae fuerit minus obvia Grais.*

⁵²² Otis 1963, 251-64 and 303 “Aeneas has been finally brought out of the past, to moral duty and his future.” See also Cairns 1989, 109ff.

⁵²³ Anderson 1957, 30.

⁵²⁴ Neither the oracular response at Delos nor the intervention of the Penates mentions the name “Troy.”

⁵²⁵ [Helenus] *qui Chaonios cognomine campos / Chaoniamque omnem Troiano a Chaone dixit, / Pergamaque Iliacamque iugis hanc addidit arcem*, (3.334-6); *procedo et parvam Troiam simulataque magnis / Pergama et arentem Xanthi cognomine rivum / agnosco, Scaeaeque amplector limina portae; / nec non et Teucris socia simul urbe fruuntur* (349-53).

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
Troiam animis: maneat nostros ea cura nepotes.*

(3.496-505)

The local river may be only a representation of the Xanthus, but “Troy” is something one can see (*videtis*) and make (*fecere*) with one’s own hands. When Aeneas speaks of a *fortuna* whose course has been run, and which is not granted to his own people, it sounds as if the ghost of Troy is beginning to fade from his conception of the future: it may be wonderful that Troy can be made here again, but it is not for his own Trojans to do the same. Yet when he ends by envisioning his own city, he declares that the goal of his own act of making will be the same as his friends’, and that together the two will make one new Troy.

Cairns claims that “the Trojans’ abandonment of Buthrotum reiterates their abandonment of Troy at 3.8-12: it begins the de-trojanising of the Trojans.”⁵²⁶ But there is no sign that Aeneas can yet conceive of his task in Italy as anything other than a remaking of Troy. Proof that the series of false starts and failed foundings has not changed his longing for his lost home comes in his speech to Dido in his own defense. In the first six and a half lines Aeneas assures Dido that he will never deny the good she did him or think of her with distaste, although they were not married and he never claimed they were (333-9). In the concluding sixteen lines he enumerates the divine appearances and the love for his son that drive him to leave against his will (345-361; ending with *Italiam non sponte sequor*). The interceding verses begin as a hypothesis of what would be true if he were permitted to follow his own inclinations (*me si fata meis paterentur*

⁵²⁶ Cairns 1989, 117; West 1983, 259 thinks that the envy discernible in his farewell indicates that he “does not yet understand” that Buthrotum represents a “recidivist sentimentality” that he ought to avoid.

ducere vitam / auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas...). It is hard to imagine how it could not be that Dido, along with the reader, expects him at this moment to say that in such a scenario he would stay with her. But his heart's desire is to build Troy on the site of Troy (*...urbem Troianam primum dulcisque meorum / reliquias colerem, Priami tecta alta manerent, / et recidiva manu posuissem Pergama victis*, 340-4). This fullest temptation to slip back into the past — not just to build a city that resembles Troy in a landscape that resembles Troy and give it the name Troy, but to make Troy in the way that it once was and where it once was — comes now, even after we have heard Aeneas leave Troy's image in Buthrotum behind, and heard his men ecstatically cry out the name of their new land (*videmus / Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates. / Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*, 522-4). His wish to tend and remake the remnants of Troy (*colerem...posuissem*) is wrapped around around a clause in which Troy remains (*manerent*); to devote oneself to remaking Troy is to make it as if it never fell. Despite what has happened between him and Dido, the *cura* that he must overcome to pursue Italy not of his own will (*Italiam non sponte sequor*) is not elegiac love crossing genres, but the desire to remain in the past and to reproduce it. Not much later Iris, disguised as Beroe in Sicily, exploits the same longing in the hearts of the old, the weary, and the women:

*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?
quin agite et mecum infaustas exurite puppis. 635
nam mihi Cassandrae per somnum vatis imago
ardentis dare visa faces: 'hic quaerite Troiam;
hic domus est' inquit 'vobis.'"* (5.631-8)

Undying Troy awaits instantiation, awaits walls to which it can be attached as a name (633-4).⁵²⁷ “Troy” is synonymous with home (637-8). A *domus* is not the type of thing of which there can be a second; the first and only *domus* can be found again.

4.3.4 The Ghost of Troy: Troy in Italy

Again and again passages have been read as if they were symbols of necessary forgetting⁵²⁸ because they seem like externalizations of the exorcism of the dominating memory of Troy, but again and again the expectation that Aeneas and the Trojans will forget, or form a new conception of the future, is disappointed. This expectation first crests in Book 3 and is shown to be inadequate by Aeneas in Book 4 and the burning of the ships in Book 5. It surges again in Book 6. In Aeneas’ speech appealing to Apollo for help he asks for rest for the harried gods of Troy (*Latio considerare Teucros / errantisque deos agitataque numina Troiae*, 67-8), but Troy is also for the first time a story that is over, a past with which rupture is necessary: *hac Troiana tenus fuerit fortuna secuta* (6.62). In the underworld Anchises gives as his reason for showing Aeneas the souls that will occupy the bodies of his offspring that it will improve the disposition and emotion with which Aeneas will approach his work in Italy (*has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram / iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum, / quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta*, 6.716-8). In his father’s review of the parade of souls Aeneas hears the name “Rome” (781) and the “Roman” people (789; 810; 857; 870), for the first time in a context in which he can be expected to understand them;⁵²⁹ he is for the first and last time

⁵²⁷ When Aeneas marks the limits of Segesta and allots property, he names districts with the names of home (*hoc Ilium et haec loca Troiam / esse iubet*, 5.756-7).

⁵²⁸ See Quint 1982, 30-8; Most 2001; Toll 1997, 34-56.

⁵²⁹ He heard it first from Mercury: *Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli / respice, cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus / debetur*; 274-6.

Even Aeneas, however, who we might have thought would respond to having heard the name Rome and seen the spirits of Romans, does not seem to have changed.⁵³¹ Above we saw how his first act in Italy is to found what is both a camp and a city that any informed reader would have known was named “Troy.” He remains ignorant enough of Rome to stare at the hills that will be Rome in Book 8 and recognize nothing; more remarkably, to stare in wonder at the shield with his progeny’s history on it and remain in ignorance (*miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet / attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum*, 730-1). At the end there may be a sign that he understands that he cannot replicate Troy: the name of the city he will be allowed to build under the power-sharing agreement he proposes will take effect after he defeats Turnus (*mihi moenia Teucrici / constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen*, 193-4). If this is an intimation that the act of exorcising Troy’s ghost has had effect at last, it comes after innumerable false starts; if “the whole process of forgetting of the familiar past and re-orientation towards an unknown future... [is] the characteristic destiny of the Trojan in the *Aeneid*,”⁵³² we do not see the conclusion of this process; we do not observe them reoriented to the future.

4.3.5 Conclusion

The narrator is as adept at raising an expectation with half a line and reversing it after the caesura as he is raising it in a proem and leaving it in suspension for nearly ten thousand lines. Readers are left to make their own conclusions from the fact that the founding of a new city is anticipated throughout the *Aeneid*, but a city is never founded; or, that the Trojans undergo

⁵³¹ Most 2001 first argues that Aeneas sets the pattern for his people and that his *katabasis* completes his forgetting of the past and re-orientation to the future (“That is why book 7 can open with the death and burial of his nurse Caieta: in a certain sense, Aeneas has finally grown up and left Troy behind him...” [p.163]). Later, however, he acknowledges that Aeneas’ act of remembrance, the recollection of Pallas’ baldric that motivates his slaying of Turnus, complicates the picture. He also notes that Aeneas never either speaks of his *katabasis* or demonstrates that it has changed his character or actions in any way (169-70).

⁵³² *ibid.*, 162.

experiences that should give them an understanding that Troy is gone and they must start anew, but we never see them understand or accept this. With a sense of the scope, complexity, and variety of Vergilian misdirection, we return to passages in which the narrator manipulates expectations through unauthorized but well-motivated character speech.

4.4 Invitation to Retrospective Reevaluation

We have seen that misdirection, whether line-long or architectonic, can be arranged by the narrator's words. We turn now to the type of misdirection in which a character's words do the work either of raising or reversing an expectation. When Jupiter sends Mercury to prepare the Carthaginians for the Trojans' arrival, the narrator tells how the messenger god makes the Punic put aside their native ferocity, and that Dido above all assumes a calm spirit and a disposition benevolent toward the Teucrians (*Et iam iussa facit, ponuntque ferocia Poeni / corda volente deo; in primis regina quietum / accipit in Teucros animum mentemque benignam* [1.302-4]). At the moment the reader, with Aeneas, sees the others Trojans enter through the crowd of Carthaginians, it seems that divine intervention has secured them a gracious reception. Yet Ilioneus asks Dido to restrain her people from using the fire they presumably have threatened to use (*prohibe infandos a navibus ignis*, 1.525), and says that his people have been, against settled custom, kept away from the shore and forbidden to land (*quaeve hunc tam barbara morem / permittit patria? Hospitio prohibemur harenae; / bella cient, primaque vetant consistere terra*, 1.539-41). The reader must change his understanding of the earlier lines that described the effect of Mercury's action:⁵³³ perhaps the Carthaginians are so ferocious that without interference they would have treated the Trojans even worse than they have; perhaps divine action has a strange

⁵³³ There is no dispute over whether the hostile Carthaginian actions that Ilioneus reviled did occur; Dido excuses her people for them (563-4).

relationship with mortal time, and Mercury's was not a one-off intervention, but took effect gradually through time.⁵³⁴ However we reconcile the two passages, it is evident that the divine action cannot have been as efficacious or instantaneous as it seemed, and that the first-time reader's understanding of what seemed to be the plain meaning of the narrator's words cannot have been accurate.

More common than the deceitful character (e.g. Venus bemoaning Diomedes' action in the example above) is the speaker who has no motivation or opportunity to deceive his internal audience, but who misleads the reader by the particular phrasing concerning an event about which the reader as yet knows nothing. In these cases, the revelation that the expectation was false, instead of making us question the trustworthiness of the speaker, urges us to return and re-evaluate the basic meaning of the speaker's words. It is not the truth of these words that is brought into question but their basic denotation; upon consideration, they cannot have meant what they seemed to have meant on a natural first reading.

4.4.1 Approaching an Encounter: Scylla and Charybdis

Aeneas, encouraging his men shipwrecked on the shores of Libya, reminds them of the worse dangers they have survived:

*Vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis
accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopea saxa
experti...* (Aeneid 1.200-202)

He seems to refer to a direct encounter with Scylla and Charybdis as well as with the Cyclopes. The reader may be forgiven for expecting to hear of these adventures when Aeneas tells of his journey from Ida to Carthage in Book 3. Helenus' advice that Aeneas avoid the strait of Messina

⁵³⁴ Austin 1971 *ad* 302: "In fact, the Carthaginians did not 'put off their rough spirit' *all at once*, as is clear from 539 ff." (italics mine)

(3.420-432) may suggest that the Trojans will not pass through the fearsome twosome, but not all inspired advice is followed. When the Trojans hear and see Aetna, Anchises reminds them of Helenus' instructions (3.558ff) and they make a quick left to circle Sicily clockwise. At this point they do experience a brief landing on the rocky lands of the Cyclopes, and fulfill the expectation raised by the second half of Aeneas' Book 1 exhortation (...*Cyclopea saxa / experti*). After Achaemenides finishes his account and Polyphemus, having sensed the Trojans' presence, raises a terrific clamor, the Cyclopes rush down to the shore (675-81). For a moment it seems that the Trojans, caught between fear and weather on the one side and the warnings they still remember on the other, will allow the wind to carry them back north through Scylla and Charybdis (*praecipitis metus acer agit quocumque rudentis / excutere et ventis intendere vela secundis*, 682-3), in accordance with the expectation raised by the first half of Aeneas' exhortation (*sonantis / accestis scopulos*). Suddenly an unexplained North Wind carries them safely south (687-8).

Looking back at Aeneas' words in his *O socii* speech, we see that in the case of the island of Cyclopes, controlled by *experiri*, the Trojans did indeed land and escape, but that in the case of Scylla and Charybdis, controlled by *accedere*, they avoided danger by sailing around. Aeneas meant only what he said: the Trojans knew by experience the Cyclopes' lands, and they approached Scylla and Charybdis. Highet takes Aeneas' words as a distortion: "[A.] speaks as though he and his men had actually braved the dangers of Scylla and Charybdis."⁵³⁵ Feeney corrects, noting that *accedo* need mean nothing more than "approach."⁵³⁶ But the expectation

⁵³⁵ Highet 1972, 288.

⁵³⁶ Feeney 1983, 217 n.91. Servius: *et bene ait 'accessistis'; non enim passi sunt haec pericula, sed his fuere vicini*. Adkin 2000 suggests that the odd form *accestis* is a nod at an etymology of "Acestes," who is introduced a few lines earlier (1.195).

them. The rest of the speech, however, is not ingenuous. Aeneas asks who are Dido's parents as a stranger would be expected to ask (1.606), though he has heard much about her from his mother (338ff). He says that his people are in need of all things (509), though they prove to be not entirely without resources. It more likely, then, that instead of seeking to reconcile Aeneas' words here with his account later, we should understand that he is adapting his broad characterizations to his rhetorical goals: here he wishes to characterize his men as pitiable and destitute, so he claims that Dido is the only one to have pitied them; later he wishes to introduce models of hospitality and show that Trojan influence is widespread, so he tells of hospitable reception by Trojans and old friends of Trojans.

4.4.3 The Sibyl's Foretelling

The Sibyl is first mentioned in Helenus' warning that Aeneas should go to Cumae. There, Helenus says, Aeneas will acquire a detailed report of the peoples of Italy, the wars to come, and how he is to meet them.

*illa tibi Italiae populos venturaque bella
et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem
expediat, cursusque dabit venerata secundos.* (3.891-893)

When Anchises appears to his son in order to tell him to follow old Nautes' advice and leave the women in Sicily, and to go down to Dis to consult him (5.724ff), he tells Aeneas that he will learn about the race of his descendants and about which walls are granted to him (*tum genus omne tuum et quae dentur moenia disces* [5.737]). Aeneas can justly be said to learn from Anchises about his *genus* and the future of his people. From the Sibyl Aeneas hears cryptic vaticination, the most important piece of which is that the wars he will face (*bella, horrida bella* [6.86]) will be the Trojan War fought again:

*non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra
defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
natus et ipse dea; nec Teucris addita Iuno* 90
*usquam aberit, cum tu supplex in rebus egenis
quas gentis Italum aut quas non oraveris urbes!
causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris
externique iterum thalami.*
tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito, 95
*qua tua te Fortuna sinet. via prima salutis
(quod minime reris) Graia pandetur ab urbe.* (6.88-97)

Most of these details are resolved by subsequent narrative: the Numicus and the Tiber are the two important rivers in Italy; Juno is the motive force for war; the verse that is most mystifying at the time (97) is, by Evander's Pallanteum, resolved the most clearly. We may assume that this "other Achilles" will be the leader of the enemies of Troy, but it is Aeneas who becomes the rage-driven Achilles throughout the latter six books, and unmistakably he who plays Achilles in the final combat of Book 12 to Turnus' Hector.⁵³⁷ The words given a peculiar twist by later events are *externi thalami*.⁵³⁸ It is not an illicitly contracted relationship with an outsider that becomes the cause of evil, as Helen's did for Troy, but the question of who qualified as an *externus* to marry the native princess.⁵³⁹ Upon re-reading this passage, we are tempted to throw up quotation marks around *externi* to make the line more accurately reflect future events.

The words with which Helenus urges Aeneas to arduous detour (*et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem*; 3.892) are not fully fulfilled. The Sibyl tells him what hardships he will have to endure, but not how to endure them, nor any that he is to avoid, nor how he is to

⁵³⁷ See Anderson 1957; Knauer 1964, 317-201; King 1982; Quint 1989; Kinsey 1979 points out Aeneas-as-Achilles has Pallas as his Patrocles.

⁵³⁸ Because recurrence of the Trojan war is at issue, the original *hospita coniunx* whose role is to be taken up again must be Helen; but the words also recall Dido.

⁵³⁹ Lavinia is named *causa mali tanti* (11.480; cf. 693) as she leads the procession into Pallas' temple to pray for aid.

avoid them. In the end Aeneas does apparently hear the sorts of useful intelligence Helenus promised, but from Anchises and not the Sibyl (6.888-92):

*quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
incenditque animum famae venientis amore,
exim bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda, 890
Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,
et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem.*

The lines describing what Anchises tells (*Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini, / et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem, 7.891-892*) correspond closely to Helenus' exhortation (*illa tibi Italiae populos venturaque bella / et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem, 3.458-459*) and suggest this is the moment Helenus' words will be fulfilled. But, although the reporting is done, the reporting is only reported to us, and we hear none of its details. Aeneas seems to have learned nothing from them and does not change his actions in the second half of the poem in any way as a result of them. The purpose of the trip to the underworld in Book 6, which was advertised by Helenus as a preview of the Trojans' time in Italy, becomes instead the vision of Rome.⁵⁴⁰

4.5 Unauthorized Speech Muddies Waters

A character's unreliable speech may, instead of setting up an unfulfilled expectation, appear as a surprise in a way difficult to reconcile with expectation set up by the narrator. These speeches muddy waters that seemed clear. They do not contradict earlier narrative or earlier speech, but they are incompatible with the uncomplicated interpretation of the original words the reader might have had without additional information. We are told too little to know where the

⁵⁴⁰ Moskalew 1982, 114 does not notice the change in agent; Austin 1977 *ad* 6.892 falls back on the usual critical reaction: "obviously Virgil would have revised one or other passage if he had lived." See O'Hara 1997, 27-8 for bibliography.

truth lies between the confusing words. They invite the construction of a complex scenario in which both the initial words and the new speech can be reconciled, but do not allow the construction of an argument based on authorized information that this solution is true. The unverifiable suspicion remains that the characters' speech may be something other than unvarnished truth.

4.5.1 Juno - Aeolus - Neptune

The narrator tells how and why Jupiter gave Aeolus by a fixed agreement the power to raise or lower storms when commanded (1.58-63, esp. *regemque dedit, qui foedere certo / et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas*). After Juno lodges with Aeolus a request on her own authority and offers a bride as bribe, we might expect Aeolus to reject her request because it does not come through the proper channels, or to accede to her request and ignore the question of rightful authority; but we cannot expect, based on what the narrator has told us, that he will say that it is his duty to obey Juno because she has made him responsible for power over the winds. Yet this is what he does say:

....tuus, o regina, quid optes
explorare labor; mihi iussa capessere fas est.
Tu mihi, quodcumque hoc regni, tu sceptrum Iovemque
concilias, tu das epulis accumbere divom,
nimborumque facis tempestatumque potentem. (1.76-80)

The chain of command seemed clear before Aeolus began to speak. Aeolus was supposed to check or release the winds when he is commanded by Jupiter, who gave him power. Now we hear Aeolus claim that it was Juno who won him this power, and that it is *fas* for him to obey her orders. The delegation and division of authority becomes even more snarled when Neptune enters and claims for himself sovereignty over the sea:

*maturate fugam, regique haec dicite vestro:
non illi imperium pelagi saevumque tridentem,
sed mihi sorte datum. Tenet ille immania saxa,
vestras, Eure, domos; illa se iactet in aula
Aeolus, et clauso ventorum carcere regnet.* (1.137-141)

It is difficult to see how control over the sea (*imperium pelagi*) can be Neptune's while Aeolus can wield *imperium* (1.54) over the very winds who cause storms at sea. The reader is compelled to reconsider the authorized explication of Aeolus' role: whose command, once given, qualifies Aeolus as having received a proper command (*iussus*, 63)? Only Jupiter's, as it seemed at the time, or other Olympians' too? Did Juno conciliate Jupiter's favor and win the delegated power for Aeolus at some untold point in the past? Does she continue to maintain his power by her influence (*concilias*, 79)? We can work out an ingenious scenario under which all statements can be true: Jupiter, prompted by Juno, gives Aeolus authority, over the objection of Neptune or despite his resentment; and the narrator neglects to mention this (58-63) to allow for surprise in Aeolus' speech. Or is Aeolus, flattered by her condescension, fabricating to flatter her in return? Too much depends on the competing claims of Aeolus and Neptune about their own powers for any such answer to be more than speculation. Too little detail is given by the narrator's account of Jupiter's delegation of power, too much is claimed by unauthorized and self-interested characters, for us to show that any solution we might work out is "Vergil's" own.

4.5.2 Olympian Promises

In Book 1 Venus levels as one of her chief charges against Jupiter's trustworthiness his failure to fulfill a promise he made her:

*Certe hinc Romanos olim, volventibus annis,
hinc fore ductores, revocato a sanguine Teucri,*

*qui mare, qui terras omni ditione tenerent,
pollicitus, quae te, genitor, sententia vertit* (1.234-237)

Jupiter accepts that he has promised a city (*cernes urbem et promissa Lavini / moenia*, 1.258-259) even as he reassures his daughter that nothing has changed his mind (*neque me sententia vertit*, 1.260). When later Jupiter twists his eyes to Libyan shores, he sends Mercury to rebuke dawdling Aeneas. We might expect Jupiter's message to omit any mention of promise and prophecy, or to explain his command as necessary to fulfill his promise to Aeneas' mother; but we cannot expect, based on what the narrator has told us, that he will mention instead a promise that Venus made to him. Yet this is the promise he does mention:

*non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem
promisit Graiumque ideo bis vindicat armis;
sed fore qui gravidam imperiis belloque frementem
Italiam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucris
proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem.* (4.227-231)

The content and wording are similar — [*a*] *sanguine Teucris* is the same; *ac...orbem* corresponds closely to *qui...tenerent* — but the promiser and promisee have exchanged places. Again, we can work out a scenario in which both statements can be neutral and accurate reports by characters — Jupiter promised Venus a city and rule for her descendants; Venus promised Jupiter a particular type of ancestor for this glorious future race— but it is difficult to understand how this could make sense, impossible to make any further argument for it, and equally plausible to imagine that each god is making tendentious claims.⁵⁴¹

⁵⁴¹ There is no source in the extant tradition for the story that Venus has promised Jupiter a particular sort of Aeneas. Jupiter's promise-*cum*-prophecy rests on Naevian precedent (Serv. *ad. 1.198*: Macr.*Sat.*6.2.31). The switch of giver and receiver of promise is rhetorically advantageous to Jupiter: he shifts responsibility to Aeneas to live up to his mother's expectations, and he leaves his own inexorable authority unquestioned.

4.5.3 Aeneas and Anna

In the preceding examples a character asserts something (Juno won Aeolus power; Venus made promises to Jupiter) that has no basis in the extant tradition. In other cases the relationship between these two sources of authority can be inverted, and an assertion that might otherwise seem inconsequential can gain force by touching upon a variant supported by another literary authority. When Dido begs her sister to beg Aeneas to extend his stay, she says, as if referring to something well known to them both, that Anna alone is admitted to the presence and confidence of Aeneas:

*...solam nam perfidus ille
te colere, arcanos etiam tibi credere sensus;
sola viri mollis aditus et tempora noras.* (4.421-423)

We readers have heard not a word of Anna since she joined Dido in oracular sacrifices after her fateful speech on the morning after Aeneas' narrative (4.31ff). Apparently Aeneas and Anna have had an independent relationship for some time.⁵⁴² The claim might be easier to dismiss as a passing fancy or an insignificant detail were it not for what Servius tells us about the tradition: *Varro ait non Didonem, sed Annam amore Aeneae impulsam se supra rogum interemisse* (ad 4.682). It was probably not Varro only who held this, if we are right in thinking that Vergil was the first to make Dido fall in love with Aeneas as well as kill herself because of him.⁵⁴³

If what Dido says is true, we must reassess earlier scenes.⁵⁴⁴ Anna, after she advised her sister to unite with Aeneas, must have continued to act upon her the admiration for the

⁵⁴² Austin 1955 *ad loc.*: "These lines refer to something that Virgil has not told us. Anna must have been acting for Dido in some way." Note the historical infinitive, suggesting repeated or habitual action.

⁵⁴³ Pease 1935 *ad loc.*; Horsfall 1990, 142; Barchiesi 1997; Barrett 1970; Hexter 1992. On this scene see Ahl 1989, 21-22. He concludes that Vergil merges Anna and Dido by giving Anna the last words from the funeral pyre.

⁵⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 22.

fascinating newcomer that is evident in her speech (31-4.53) and developed a special intimacy with Aeneas. But, as Ahl puts, this is a situation in which the reverse of dramatic irony is true: “Characters know things we do not know — and never learn.” Has she been a go-between for some time, perhaps before the queen and king began their relationship? Did she develop her own relationship with the newcomer, independent of the other two? Or is Dido speculating, exaggerating, delusional; perhaps even out of jealousy?

4.5.4 Conclusion

In many of these examples, later events or words make us reconsider either the veracity or the meaning (or meanings) of earlier words, but the basic dynamics of the conversations of earlier scenes — the motivation, tone, thematic significance — is changed little by the revelation that the original words meant something other than they seemed to have meant. Our understanding in hindsight that Venus was not speaking accurately about Aeneas’ fleet or about Diomedes’ army does not change much the scenes in which she spoke. On the one hand, Venus never pretends to be impartial, so we are not surprised that she is unreliable; on the other hand, the force of her complaints is not crippled by the exaggerated form in which they are stated, and Jupiter and Juno still have to construct a powerful reply. We cannot suspect that Aeneas meant to mislead his own men about what they had undergone. We cannot determine exactly which promise, made by Venus, Jupiter meant, but we know that his reference was meant to get Aeneas to move. It is the readers who are the objects of the misdirection and those who perceive it in hindsight, and it is they, not the characters, who are deceived and who must go back and transform their understanding. We turn now to more daring manipulation.

4.6 Pluperfect Storytelling

4.6.1 Turnus' Guilt

Vergil most forcefully demands reevaluation of earlier passages by employing what I call pluperfect storytelling, a technique by which a character (or occasionally the narrator) tells an important event that occurred (or is claimed to have occurred) during a sequence that was narrated without any mention of it. If this new information is true, the original narrative of the sequence must have omitted or suppressed the important event only now described; if this new information is true, our understanding of the origin scene and of the intervening events must change. Turnus' sister Juturna, acting in disguise, drives the plot of Book 12. Disguised as the priest Camers she breaks the treaty that binds Trojan and Latin to abide by the outcome of combat between Aeneas and Turnus (216ff). Having shaken off Turnus' charioteer Metiscus and assumed his guise, she guides her brother away from Aeneas (467-85) and delays their climactic meeting for another two hundred lines. It is not a surprise when Jupiter shows he has known all along what she has been doing (12.798). It should be a surprise when Turnus tells his sister that he has long known that she has been guiding him across the battlefield, not since the first moment she took on the appearance of his companion, but as far back as when she broke the treaty in her first disguise: *o soror, et dudum agnovi, cum prima per artem / foedera turbasti teque haec in bella dedisti, / et nunc nequiquam fallis dea* (12.632-4). Only now are we invited to believe that, when Juturna was driving her brother's chariot, Turnus knew that he was being made to avoid Aeneas. During this time Aeneas gave full rein to his rage (*irarumque omnis effundit habenas*, 499). He knocked the noble Murranus to a gruesome death beneath the hooves of his own horses (529-34), and started the attack on Latinus' city that led to Amata's suicide

(593-611). It is a heavy charge to lay to Turnus' account that he avoided his avowed enemy while he carried out such deeds, and he feels it:

*vidi oculos ante ipse meos me voce vocantem
Murratum, quo non superat mihi carior alter,
oppetere ingentem atque ingenti vulnere victum.* 640
...
*exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum)
perpetiar, dextra nec Drancis dicta refellam?* (Aeneid 12.638-40;
641-43)

Turnus has no discernible reason to be confessing anything other than the truth now. The reader was given no clue that Turnus knew what was afoot when Juturna was driving her brother's chariot in arcs twisting always away from Aeneas (481), but apparently Turnus was watching and hearing his friends die. The last two hundred lines must now be reevaluated.⁵⁴⁵ Only now is it clear that Turnus can be blamed for the disasters that were inflicted on his people while he was fleeing, and only now can we understand that his consciousness of this guilt provide him motivation to face Aeneas.

At the beginning of the chapter we considered sequences in which characters are separated and the narrator follows the point of view of one group. Events happen to the other group concurrently, but the reader remains as ignorant as the characters whose point of view he follows. When the characters are reunited, the narrator intervenes and fills in what has happened. In pluperfect storytelling, by contrast, the temporary ignorance of the reader does not result from

⁵⁴⁵ The narrator told neither that Murratum called out Turnus' name nor that Turnus could see Murratum's death. Servius proposes two solutions: (1) the narrator left this information out; (2) Turnus is hallucinating (*atqui hoc nusquam legimus; sed aut κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον intellegimus, aut mortis est omen audire quod non dicitur, videre quod minime occurrit*). Tarrant's suggests (2012 *ad loc*) that this is a product of self-aggrandizing imagination ("Either the narrator presented an edited account that T. here corrects from first-hand knowledge, or - as seems more likely - T. is describing the event as he believes it must or should have happened; in particular having Murratum invoke T. as he dies would flatter T.'s sense of importance and add to his consciousness of failure."). This does not, however, explain Turnus' claim of autopsy (*vidi oculos ante*). For the sequence see also Williams 1983, 30-33.

tracking one character's point of view. The narrative followed the character to whom the event now told is said to have happened through the time in which the event is said to have happened.

What I am trying to analyze must be distinguished from explanatory digressions.⁵⁴⁶ Some, like the story of Camilla that Diana tells (11.532-96), concern events from before narrated time. Others, like the backstory of Turnus' horses (12.83) or sword (12.90-91), we would not have expected to be told before the moment they appear in the narrative. So too there is little surprise in the late arrival of details, drawn from previously narrated time., that were ancillary to the action. When Cymodocea mentions to Aeneas the cavalry that he has sent ahead (10.238-40), although the division of forces was not been mentioned, it does not come against any expectation, and is easily understood to have occurred between narrated scenes — “off screen,” in our parlance; *κατὰ (τὸ) σιωπόμενον* or *per silentium* in that of Vergil's ancient critics.⁵⁴⁷ That Aeneas' ships were built with wood from a grove sacred to the Magna Mater on Mount Ida (9.80-1) is not a detail Aeneas had any reason to mention to Dido in Book 3. Euryalus' mother's refusal to stay with all the other women at Segesta might feel intrusive if it were planted as a seed in Book 5 instead of told by Nisus in Book 9 (216-8), only two hundred lines before the mother herself appears to mourn. That bullocks had bled on the race track before Nisus trod on it (5.329-30), or the details of Aeneas' instructions to his men on how to defend their camp (9.38-46 and 171-3), may not be foreshadowed or expected, but they do not change the original narrative of the abandonment of the rest of the Trojan women on Sicily, or the sacrifice of the

⁵⁴⁶ For another technique by which Vergil postpones information, see his habit of delaying the name of a character: Juturna, mentioned at 10.439, reintroduced at 12.138, named only at 12.154; Amata, introduced at 7.56, named at 7.343; Lavinia, introduced at 7.52, named at 7.359. Aeneas is not named until 1.92. See Heinze 1993, 377ff; Austin 1971 *ad* 1.92; Hight 1972, 238; Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.80.

⁵⁴⁷ The same applies to the instructions Aeneas gave when he left his camp, which must have occurred at 8.80 but are not told until 9.40 and 9.172.

bull, or Aeneas' departure up the Tiber. They anticipate and explain an event that would otherwise be inexplicable, not one that is contrary to a definite expectation.⁵⁴⁸

4.6.2 Promises in Pallanteum

In pluperfect storytelling, however, the new detail, if accepted as true, requires a serious reevaluation of earlier passages. The relationship between Aeneas and Pallas bookends Book 10 and motivates its action. Earlier in the *Aeneid* we saw the young warrior learning from his guardian, and the guardian taking up again his old role of storyteller (8.159-162). Now grief at his charge's death warrants Aeneas' explosive rage. In Book 8 we saw the relationship between the two sketched, from the young man's ingenuously brusque challenge (8.112-114; cf. Venus in Book 1) to the father uniting the two and giving Aeneas, who did not ask for it, a role as tutor and mentor freighted with responsibility (8.515).⁵⁴⁹ After Pallas' death Aeneas' recollection of his reception in Pallanteum obsesses his mind. With his body he gluts his grief and rage (510-520), seizes men to sacrifice (10.517-20; 11.82-3), justifies by citing Pallas' death his rejection of an enemy's supplication for life (531-4), and slaughters Mezentius (900ff) without answering a word to his pleas. At this point there is ample motivation to explain Aeneas' reaction, and it would be accepted without a thought that something else had happened. Yet Aeneas bids adieu to Pallas' corpse with the following revelations:

non haec Evandro de te promissa parenti 45
discedens dederam, cum me complexus euntem
mitteret in magnum imperium metuensque moneret
acris esse viros, cum dura proelia gente.

⁵⁴⁸ Other examples of explanatory digression: 4.262 the *laena* which Dido had given Aeneas; 5.571ff Iulus rides a horse which Dido had given; 4.495-6 Aeneas had left *exuviae* in Carthage; 9.265-266 two tripods Dido had given; 11.71-75 *geminae vestes* Dido had given.

⁵⁴⁹ On the *contubernium* between the two see Nisbet 1990, 261; see Putnam 1985 for the view that the relationship is couched in amatory language

...
haec mea magna fides? at non, Evandre, pudendis 55
vulneribus pulsum aspicias, nec sospite dirum
optabis nato funus pater. ei mihi quantum
praesidium, Ausonia, et quantum tu perdis, Iule! (11.45-58)

We learn only now that Aeneas promised Evander to protect Pallas. The promises must have been of such a nature as to make the hero break out even in the midst of his sorrow into self-accusation (55).

When Evander speaks upon his son's return we see the same technique at work:

non haec, o Palla, dederas promissa parenti,
cautius ut saevo velles te credere Marti.
(Aeneid, 11.152-153)

If, after having heard of Aeneas' words, we expect Evander to recall promises, we expect them to be Aeneas'; we do hear of promises, but they are those Pallas apparently made to assure his father that he would fight with caution.⁵⁵⁰ The close verbal correspondence between Aeneas' memory (45) and Evander's (152) is not an intratextual reference to the same event but a sort of anti-reference, by which the characters use the same words to speak of two different events. Another such anti-correspondence lurks in Aeneas' account. The Trojan recalls his farewell embrace with Evander (*cum me complexus euntem*, 8.46) with words that recall the narrator's description of Evander's embrace upon the pair's departure (*tum pater Evandrus dextram complexus euntis*, 8.558); but in the narrative in Book 8 Evander was embracing Pallas, not Aeneas.

⁵⁵⁰ It is tempting to take Evander's refusal to blame Aeneas (*nec vos arguerim, Teucri, nec foedera nec quas iunximus hospitio dextras*, 11.164-165) as a reminder that these promises are grounds upon which Evander could affix blame, were he so inclined.

These promises have been given during sequences of time that were narrated in detail. When *fama* spread the news that Trojans and Pallas were leaving Pallanteum, we heard that fear followed and mothers prayed; we heard a speech of Evander and watched him collapse at his son's departure (554-84); we watched with the mothers from the walls, as the army led by Aeneas and Pallas set out (585-96). At no time in this sequence, dwelt upon and mined for pathos, were we told either of Pallas' promise to his father or of Aeneas' pledge to Evander. We heard Evander propose that Pallas fight alongside Aeneas; now we learn that Aeneas pledged himself to guard the young man. The idea that Aeneas engaged his *fides* in a pledge to protect Pallas must make us reconsider the separation between Aeneas and Pallas in the battle scenes and Aeneas' extravagant reaction to Pallas' loss. We might judge him more harshly for allowing Pallas to die, or we might judge more sympathetically his rage in reaction to Pallas' death. Whichever reassessment we choose, we reassess due to the narrator's omission or suppression only, and not deception or manipulation by a character.

4.6.3 Aeneas Hears of Dido

Aeneas' path through the underworld takes him into the *Lugentes campi*, where wander the souls of those who have killed themselves for love. The narrator has told us that the Trojans, as they pulled away from Carthage, saw smoke from Dido's pyre, but could not tell the reason for its source, even if they suspected the worst (5.1-7). We cannot anticipate that Aeneas will say that he received a specific report of her death: *infelix Dido, verus mihi nuntius ergo / venerat extinctam ferroque extrema secutam?* (6.456-7). He has heard, he says, that she committed suicide with a sword. If the claim is true, the attitude of Aeneas toward entry in the underworld, his feelings as he first sees the wounded wandering women in the *lugentes campi*, even his

emotions as he gazed at an abandoned woman on Daedalus' doors (see above 4.2.1), must now be understood to have been much stronger than they were described by the narrator at the time.

When Aeneas tells another mutilated shade from his past, Deiphobus, that he has heard a report about his honorable death in battle, and has set up and fortified a funerary monument to him (500-6), we learn again that Aeneas is just as selective a narrator as Vergil. The report must be supposed to have been heard, and the monument built, during Aeneas' tale at the beginning of Book 3, when he is preparing his fleet on Mt. Ida. In his own account of the sack of Troy he said that Deiphobus' house fell into ruin (2.310-311), but added nothing about the hero's fate.

4.6.4 Palinurus and Misenus

Aeneas is not content with two statements in the underworld about earlier narrated time that find no foreshadowing or substantiation in earlier narrative. A famously cryptic sequence begins when Venus asks Neptune for help. Neptune, after agreeing to protect Aeneas on the sea and claiming that the hero has been a source of concern to him both in Troy (803-11) and on the sea since,⁵⁵¹ claims that a single victim must pay for safe passage over his realm (*unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres; / unum pro multis dabitur caput*; 5.814-815). Somnus flies down and puts to sleep Aeneas' helmsman, Palinurus, who falls into the sea and is left behind by comrades deaf to his shouts. The language in which the fleet runs on in ignorance seems to imply that it does so because the loss of this single man has satisfied the sea god's requirement, and engaged him to fulfill his pledge to Venus (*promissisque patris Neptuni interrita fertur*; 5.863). When the Sibyl mentions that a dead man must be buried before Aeneas

⁵⁵¹ He seems to be exaggerating when he says that he has "often" protected Aeneas by calming the fury of the sea (*saepe furores / compressi et rabiem tantam caelique marisque*, 801-2). The narrative has told only his interference in Book 1.

goes down to the underworld, we must suppose that she means Palinurus, the man who we know is missing. Yet when Aeneas and Achates wander the strand puzzled, they come across the corpse of the previously unmentioned trumpeter Misenus. The backstory explaining his death, a punishment inflicted by Triton for challenging the gods for supremacy in tooting upon a conch shell, is delivered by the narrator with a mark of hesitation (*si credere dignum est*, 173). Nothing at this point is told about whether the Trojans knew about Misenus' before they found him. Later, passing through the underworld, Aeneas finds Palinurus, asks him which god plunged him into the sea, and rebukes Apollo for having prophesied that Palinurus would survive a sea voyage and come unharmed to Italy (341-6). Palinurus denies that any god submerged him and tells how, as he grasped the first rocks ringing the Italian coast, he was slain by the greedy inhabitants (347-362). He ends by begging for the burial that will allow him to leave the realm of the unburied.

The two episodes are a doubling, but they remain coherent. The Sibyl tells that the corpse lying on the shore is one about whose death Aeneas is ignorant, and who is defiling the fleet (*[heu nescis] totamque incestat funere classem*, 6.150). Aeneas was aware of Palinurus' death, so the reader may already suspect that someone else is meant. Neptune's concern was for a scapegoat or payment of passage by the sea-crossing fleet, the inverse of the Sibyl's concern: he needs a death to allow the fleet to go on; she needs the ceremonies that ritually close the pollution of death to allow Aeneas and the fleet to go on. The Trojans do not seem to be at a loss to think of lost comrades whom the Sibyl might have meant (*multa inter sese vario sermone serebant, / quem socium exanimus vates, quod corpus humandum / diceret*, 159-161).⁵⁵²

⁵⁵² This must mean "they were discussing which dead comrade the *vates* could have meant" not "which comrade could the Sibyl have meant was dead."

Again we are reminded that Aeneas as the internal narrator selects and omits details when he speaks again of an event that occurred during his time in the Troad in Book 3: he heard, he says, a prophecy concerning Palinurus, though he mentioned none of this in a story he told Dido. Palinurus did not die at the end of Book 5, as we must have thought when we saw him last, plunging into the sea and crying in vain for his comrades (*praecipitem ac socios nequiquam saepe vocantem*, 5.860). Just as Aeneas did not tell Dido of events that occurred during scenes he narrated in detail, so the Vergilian narrator cut off the story of Palinurus at the moment at which we drew a false conclusion about his place and manner of death.

Palinurus' claim that no god put him to sleep raises a caution concerning inaccurate character speech. The narrative tells that he resisted the exhortation of the assassinating god, disguised as his companion Phorbas, and refused to abandon his post for a nap. In the end he was overcome by the brute divine power of Lethe's spray sprinkled over his temples (843-56). A man who fell asleep is unlikely to have understood that the god of Sleep compelled him to slip into oblivion, and unlikely to talk about how he fell asleep even if realizes that he did so. He would have woken as he crashed into the water still grasping his tiller, and would have attributed his demise to its collapse in a heavy sea (*namque gubernaculum multa vi forte revulsum, cui datus haerebam custos cursusque regebam, / praecipitans traxi mecum*, 6.349-51; for the sea conditions see 354).⁵⁵³ Palinurus' blindness to divine action is matched by the affecting moment at which Aeneas blames Palinurus for trusting the sea (*o nimium caelo et pelago confise sereno*, 870); as we know, his trusty helmsman prudently refused to do this (*mene huic confidere*

⁵⁵³ Palinurus takes an inaccurate guess at why and under the guidance of which divinity Aeneas has descended to the underworld: *aut tu, si qua via est, si quam tibi diva creatrix / ostendit (neque enim, credo, sine numine divum / flumina tanta paras Stygiamque innare paludem* (6.367-369).

monstro?, 849) before his prudence was run over roughshod by divine force. In some cases, then, speakers may be unreliable not because they try to deceive, but because Vergilian mortals are ignorant of divine action.

Pluperfect storytelling reveals that more happens than the narrator tells, even when the narrator seems to be telling much. The narrator did not pass lightly over the parting of Evander, Pallas, and Aeneas, or tell it indirectly. Evander gave a farewell speech to his son, collapsed into the arms of his attendants, and was carried indoors (8.558-584). Misenus died off stage; but Palinurus seemed to die “on stage,” and the narrator omitted his survival of the immediate dangers followed by his death on the point of rescue, a story that would have offered great possibilities for pathos. The narrator does not only neglect to tell everything; he suppresses or conceals even when he tells much.

4.7 Prophecy Recalled and Recounted

4.7.1 Anchises Recalls Cassandra

The *topos* of a character suddenly recalling a prophecy when confronted with an unexpected event runs throughout the poem. It is especially prominent within Aeneas’ narrative in Books 2 and 3. According to Aeneas, his first reaction to the epiphany of the Penates, in which they explain to him the meaning of Apollo’s ambiguous prophecy on Delos, is to make the proper sacrifices (3.176-178), and his next is to explain the matter to his father (179). Anchises’ understanding of the new information and recognition of his original error Aeneas tells indirectly (180-181). Anchises’ quoted response is not a bewailing of the gods’ destructive ambiguity, or an outburst of joy, but a recollection:

*tum memorat: “nate, Iliacis exercite fatis,
sola mihi talis casus Cassandra canebat.
nunc repeto haec generi portendere debita nostro
et saepe Hesperiam, saepe Itala regna vocare.
sed quis ad Hesperiae venturos litora Teucros
crederet? aut quem tum vates Cassandra moveret?
cedamus Phoebos et moniti meliora sequamur.*

(3.182-188)

Only now do Aeneas' audience (the Carthaginians) and Vergil's (we readers) learn that Anchises, when he was trying to puzzle out where the Trojans were directed to go by the oracular utterance at Delos (*volvens monimenta virorum*, 3.102), neglected an important source of information. At that point he had heard enough to remember Cassandra's words about "Hesperia" and an "Italian kingdom," and consider how they could be reconciled with the Penates' words about an unnamed "ancient mother." "Hesperia" was the name by which Creusa called the land to which Aeneas was destined to go (2.781). If Aeneas told Anchises about Creusa's words, they had even more reason to see that Creusa's "Hesperia" and the Delian *mater antiqua* could be reconciled by Italy.

4.7.2 Aeneas Recounts Celaeno

Aeneas did not inherit from his father inconvenient forgetfulness of prophecy. He cultivates a habit of remembering at the most opportune moments his father's most opportune words. At the meager feast following the Trojans' disembarkation on the shores of Latium, Iulus bites into his flatbread and jokes that the Trojans are eating their tables (7.116). Aeneas seizes upon the words and declares that they fulfill a long-dreaded prophecy. When he repeats the prophecy to his men, he assigns it not to the harpy Celaeno, in whose mouth he quoted it in Book 3 (250-257), but to Anchises. The narrator has said nothing about Anchises mentioning such an event, even in the underworld.

Before we try to sort through solutions, we should pause to consider the scene of “recollection” of prophecy that falls between these two recollections by Aeneas:

*o patria et rapti nequiquam ex hoste penates,
nullane iam Troiae dicentur moenia? nusquam
Hectoreos amnis, Xanthum et Simoenta, videbo?
quin agite et mecum infaustas exurite puppis. 635
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
Neptuno; deus ipse faces animumque ministrat.” (5.632-640)*

Here a “Trojan” recalls the words of vindicated Cassandra, just as Anchises did in Book 3, and argues that the local land should be recognized as the promised new homeland on the authority of instructions received in a dream, just as Aeneas will. Actually the speaker is not a Trojan, but Iris, sent by Juno and disguised as an ancient matron, Beroe (5.604-622). Her story is invented from whole cloth, and with malicious intent. She succeeds in convincing the Trojan women to burn the Trojan ships, which are saved only by the rain that falls after Aeneas prays for relief (680-99). Her persuasive technique sounds more than a little like Aeneas’ when he speaks of the eating of tables:

*continuo 'salve fatis mihi debita tellus 120
vosque' ait 'o fidi Troiae salvete penates:
hic domus, haec patria est. genitor mihi talia namque
(nunc repeto) Anchises fatorum arcana reliquit:
"cum te, nate, fames ignota ad litora vectum
accisis coget dapibus consumere mensas, 125
tum sperare domos defessus, ibique memento
prima locare manu molirique aggere tecta.”
haec erat illa fames, haec nos suprema manebat
exitiis positura modum. (7.122-129)*

feast with her, and that he is obliged to push on to Italy.⁵⁵⁴ In the account Aeneas gives his fellow commanders in Book 7 the words of Anchises do not mention Italy; mention of the land they already have reached would add no extra force to the argument. It is the *primi duces* (7.107) who sit with Aeneas and hear his exhortation directly, and the mass of common soldiers who hear the news, with what further detail we do not know, that the day to settle has come (*diditur hic subito Troiana per agmina rumor / advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant* [7.145]). According to the account given in Carthage, Celaeno said that the Trojans would not be able to settle before dreadful (*dira*) famine forced them to eat their tables. When Aeneas speak in Carthage, the utterance is as yet unfulfilled, and the future events as dreadful and mysterious as they were emerging from Celaeno's mouth. In the version Aeneas tells in Book 7, Anchises says that the consumption of tables, provoked by a hunger no longer characterized by a negative adjective, will be the sign by which the Trojans will know that it is the time and place to build their walls. Aeneas changes Celaeno's *terminus ante quem non* to Anchises' definite *terminus*; changes a Harpy's threat to his father's promise.⁵⁵⁵ Such an exhortation to immediate action aligns with his interests now, when he is about to order the building of a fortified settlement in someone else's land, before the Trojans even know who that someone else is. His plan succeeds: the common

⁵⁵⁴ Aeneas makes another change between Book 3 and Book 7. In his tale to Dido the eating of tables is definitely not the sign to found a city; Aeneas says that Helenus told him that the sign to found his city would be a white sow with thirty piglets on a riverbank (*cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam / litoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus / triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit, / alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati, / is locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum*, 3.389-93). Note too that in Aeneas' telling Helenus predicts that Apollo will be the one to save the Trojans: *nec tu mensarum morsus horresce futuros / fata uiam inuenient aderitque uocatus Apollo* (3.394-5). Apollo does not appear in the scene in Book 7.

⁵⁵⁵ By another change in wording Aeneas involves himself in an inaccurate prophecy. According to what he attributed to Celaeno in Book 3, the activity that could not occur before the table-eating was the founding of a city; according to what he says in Book 7, this *fames* is the last suffering and marks the end of the disasters that will befall them (*haec erat illa fames, haec nos suprema manebat exitiis positura modum*, 128-9). The end of wandering does not prove to be the end of suffering. See Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.111 for the history of the story (he notes that "[Celaeno] made table-eating a precondition in terms of chronological sequence, and here it is cited as a means of localising the first settlement," but concludes unconvincingly that "the imprecision is hardly significant.").

soldiers react to the accounts of Aeneas' words (144-145) with joy (146-147), the scouts set out (148-157), and Aeneas marks out what is both a military camp (157-159) and the Trojans' first *urbs* in Italy.

4.7.3 Aeneas Recalls Anchises

When Aeneas is in the inverse situation, compelled to provide a reason for leaving and heading to Italy, he recalls again opportune words of his father. Dido, having learned of his preparations through *fama*'s report, has just asked him what reasons he could have for leaving with such haste. Before he mentions the appearance of Mercury, just narrated as that which jarred him into action (4.259-278), he first claims that he has been visited by the shade of his father every night:

*me patris Anchisae, quotiens umentibus umbris
nox operit terras, quotiens astra ignea surgunt,
admonet in somnis et turbida terret imago.* (4.351-355).

About these visitations the narrator has told nothing. In the narrated exhortation Mercury uses the sorts of arguments that even Aeneas might have thought were best not related to Dido:

*tu nunc Karthaginis altae
fundamenta locas pulchramque uxorius urbem
exstruis? heu, regni rerumque oblite tuarum!
ipse deum tibi me claro demittit Olympo
regnator, caelum et terras qui numine torquet,
ipse haec ferre iubet celeris mandata per auras: 270
quid struis? aut qua spe Libycis teris otia terris?
si te nulla movet tantarum gloria rerum
[nec super ipse tua moliris laude laborem,]
Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli
respice, cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus
debetur.* (4.265-276)

The arguments Aeneas uses are very different:

me puer Ascanius capitisque iniuria cari,
quem regno Hesperiae fraudo et fatalibus arvis. 355
nunc etiam interpres divum Iove missus ab ipso
(testor utrumque caput) celeris mandata per auras
detulit: ipse deum manifesto in lumine vidi
intransentem muros vocemque his auribus hausit. (4.351-359)

Now the reason to leave stirred up in Aeneas' mind by these apparitions is only his obligation not to rob his own son of the kingdom owed him. Now Mercury is the culmination of a sequence of admonishments by Anchises' shade. Aeneas says nothing about Mercury's message other than that he carried the commands of Jupiter.

4.8 Conclusion

The force of Vergilian misdirection can be perceived more clearly in contrast to Homeric misdirection. Morrison argues that Homer, although he operates within the confines of a tradition that fixed the major episodes and the climax of the poem's martial action (Book 21) as well as its thematic resolution (Book 24), nevertheless uses several related techniques "manipulates the audience's perspective by creating a manipulative narrator."⁵⁵⁶ The first technique is early prediction of an event that will occur, but only after lengthy delay ("false anticipation"). The second is the heightening of suspense by withholding commentary from an event that seems like it might occur ("epic suspense"). The third is the prediction of events that never occur ("thematic misdirection"). The narrator by a "deliberate strategy" de-familiarizes the story and stimulates in the reader first surprise, then suspense and questioning of preconceptions, and finally recognition when the traditional events do occur: "Misdirection is one way of probing

⁵⁵⁶ Morrison 1992, 12.

what might have happened...misdirection undercuts the tradition and leads the audience to consider other outcomes to the story.”⁵⁵⁷

The most important and interesting Vergilian misdirections concern events that are not guaranteed by tradition.⁵⁵⁸ The thirteen ships separated and presumed lost in Book 1 could have been sunk without surprising any reader learned in the previous versions of Aeneas’ wanderings.⁵⁵⁹ Diomedes had deep mythical roots in Italy, and the tradition that he desecrated the bones of Anchises suggests that a resumption of conflict with Aeneas was far from unthinkable.⁵⁶⁰ The relationship between Anna and Aeneas to which Dido refers represents the preservation, in a radically transformed state, of a piece of the tradition that seemed until this point to have been ignored by the poem. If the Homeric narrative “includes not only the plot but also the presentation of various possibilities that are formulated, vividly explored, and ultimately rejected,”⁵⁶¹ the Vergilian narrative hints at alternatives rather than fully exploring them, and often does not reject them. In these latter cases, the possibility that what is hinted at may be true is not raised in the mind of the reader only to generate temporary suspense, or to build to the recognition that it is false and the tradition true; the possibility remains open, and invites the reader’s measured judgment.

⁵⁵⁷ Morrison 1992, 22. For a broader view of epic misdirection see Duckworth 1933, 109-110. For a reading, inspired by Morrison, of the “devious” narrator of the *Odyssey*, see Richardson 2006. For misdirection by characters see Olson 1995, 9 (on “deliberate misdirection” by Nausicaa); also 20 n.54.

⁵⁵⁸ The treatment of the founding of Lavinium, which seems guaranteed by tradition but is not told in the poem, bears a closer resemblance to the techniques Morrison describes.

⁵⁵⁹ According to Servius (*ad* 1.170) Naevius gave Aeneas one ship: *bello Punico dicit, unam navem habuisse Aeneam, quam Mercurius fecerit.*

⁵⁶⁰ For this story see Pease 1935 *ad* 4.427. Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.29 believes that “Venus, like the reader, expects the embassy recently sent to Diomedes by the Latins to bring back this formidable warrior to aid the Latin war-effort, and his eventual refusal to come is both a surprise and an indication of the inevitable result of the war.” For Diomedes in Italy see Fletcher 2006.

⁵⁶¹ Morrison 1992, 21.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the first four chapters I proposed readings that proceed from the principle that our reading of the *Aeneid* should take better account of what characters know and intend. In this conclusion I suggest some broader effects these readings of character speech and narrative technique may have on our understanding of the design and meaning of the *Aeneid*. These arguments proceed from the principle that our reading of the *Aeneid* should take better account of what we readers cannot know.

5.1 The Suppressive Narrator

In Chapter 4 I argued that sometimes the plot elements concerning which the narrator temporarily misdirects the reader are significant, but in the end the reader is informed fully. At other times the surprise generated by the reversal of a misdirecting expectation pushes the reader to recognize the ways in which authorized narrative is limited. Concerning unsupported claims about what has been left out by the narrator (see above 4.5), or the opportune recollection of prophecy (see above 4.7), the narrator does not allow us to make a sure conclusion. The moments these uncertainties are revealed share with other reversals of misdirection the element of surprise: we readers suddenly understand how much we do not understand. The difference is that the gap in the narrative will never be filled.

Byre characterizes the Apollonian narrator in words that apply equally to the Vergilian narrator:

The poet is not always omniscient. Although he knows and tells even more than the Homeric narrator in some respects, giving us in his aetiologies many details about peoples, places, and events in times long after the Argonautic expedition, he shows at some points in his narrative that his knowledge of the characters and events of his story

is quite limited and uncertain and that he himself does not know quite what to make of them. Nor is he an “omnicommunicative” narrator; he is, rather ... a “deliberately suppressive”⁵⁶² narrator, who sometimes permanently withholds or temporarily delays information relevant to the reader’s reconstruction of the story, information about what is going on in a given narrative situation, about the events or actions that led up to it, or about what will follow from it; and who, when he does present such information, sometimes does so only in the words of characters, who may have little or no narrative authority for its factuality.⁵⁶³

Indeed, Vergil pushes the technique further. Most of the uncertainties in Apollonius that Byre discusses concern elements like the motivations of characters and the plan or disposition of the gods. Vergil displaces onto characters the authority for events within the timeframe of the narrative — we simply cannot tell whether the thing mentioned happened or not — and he often refuses to tell essential parts of events he does narrate, including their outcomes.

What I mean here is not telling scenes with great restraint — Servius’ *artis poeticae est non omnia dicere*,⁵⁶⁴ Dryden’s “much in little and often in silence”⁵⁶⁵ — or avoidance of moral guidance and reticence concerning character motivation— Quinn’s dictum that “We can only be sure of what goes on in the mind of a character if the author stands nudging us with his elbow explaining uncertainties away.”⁵⁶⁶ Certainly the Vergilian narrator is reticent to the extreme about character motivation. He intervenes to tell thoughts or intentions of speakers that would not be immediately clear from the speech⁵⁶⁷ only when he tells that Aeneas projects hope while

⁵⁶² For these terms see Sternberg 1978, 260-82.

⁵⁶³ Byre 2002, 9. Cuypers 2004, 43 says that Apollonius employs a “Protean narrative *persona*, an amalgam of (at least) the Homeric singer of epic, the hymnic and Pindaric singers of praise, the Herodotean historian, and the Callimachean scholar.”

⁵⁶⁴ *ad* 1.223.

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. Quinn 1968, 316 “by the very simplicity of the techniques to which Virgil has limited himself, an atmosphere has been created which renders the reader sensitive to every hint.”

⁵⁶⁶ *ibid.*, 343. Contrast with Booth 1961, 4-5: “Homer scarcely writes a page without some kind of direct clarification of motives, of expectations, and of the relative importance of events... we move through the *Iliad* with Homer constantly at our elbow, controlling rigorously our beliefs, our interests, and our sympathies.”

⁵⁶⁷ E.g. it grants no extra insight to say that Dido *consilium uultu tegit ac spem fronte serenat* (4.477); we know this from what she has said.

suppressing pain (*spem vultu simulat premit altem corde dolorem*, 1.208-9),⁵⁶⁸ that Neptune detects his sister's attempts to cover her trail by acting through Aeolus (*nec latuere doli fratrem Iunonis et irae*, 1.130), and that Venus sees through Juno's attempt to deceive.⁵⁶⁹ At all other times we are left to our own devices when interpreting direct speech. It is true that the narrator often does not describe characters, scenes, and settings.⁵⁷⁰ It is also true that we may ponder any number of moral quandaries and conclude that "moral judgment was actually being discouraged."⁵⁷¹ But what I mean instead are what Sternberg calls "permanent gaps"⁵⁷² in the narrative. These are unfilled portions in the sequence of narrated events after it has been reassembled in chronological order by a reader who has completed the work (the "fabula"), as opposed to "temporary gaps" in the experience of the reader traversing the narrative in order (the "sujet").⁵⁷³ Morrison and Richardson, who applies the former's analysis of the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*, argue that the effect of Homeric misdirection is to put the reader, misdirected by "temporary gaps," in the same position as the character: unsure about the future, ignorant of the

⁵⁶⁸ Only later (1.218-22) do we learn that Aeneas not only suppressed pain but also concealed his opinion that the missing comrades were dead. In the Homeric model Odysseus tells the Phaeacians what he omitted and why (Σκύλλην δ' οὐκέτ' ἐμυθεόμην, ἄπρηκτον ἀνίην, / μή πῶς μοι δείσαντες ἀπολλήξειαν ἑταῖροι / εἰρεσίης, ἐντὸς δὲ πυκάζοιεν σφέας αὐτούς, 12.223-5).

⁵⁶⁹ 4.105-7 *olli (sensit enim simulata mente locutam, / quo regnum Italiae Libycas auerteret oras) / sic contra est ingressa Venus* and 4.127-8 (*non aduersata petenti / adnuuit atque dolis risit Cytherea repertis*). See Austin 1955 and Conington 1876 *ad loc* for the divergent views of early editors.

⁵⁷⁰ The physical place of scenes, esp. colloquies, is left undescribed (e.g., Tarrant 2012 on opening scenes of Book 12: "The action presumable takes place inside Latinus' palace, but the setting is left remarkably vague."). Griffith 1985 points out that it is impossible to summon up a picture of characters' appearance because their features are never described.

⁵⁷¹ Horsfall 1995, 158 (concerning the responsibility for the war in Book 7). Williams 1983, 215-31 lists "morally ambiguous situations...that the poet refuses to solve."

⁵⁷² Sternberg 1978, 50-3. Hexter 1990 reads the ambiguity of the basic signification of words in Book II through the concept of "gaps" as defined by Iser (Iser 1971, 279-99; Iser 1974, 274-94). Iser's "empty spaces" (*Leerstellen*) are the innumerable interpretative empty spaces — descriptive, lexical, moral — necessarily left by any narrative. For an example of this sort of gap in the *Aeneid* see Griffith 1985. For the distinction between these and Sternberg's gaps in narrated events see Sternberg 1993 n.29.

⁵⁷³ For this terminology see n.13 above. Of smaller significance are the four gaps listed by Feeney 1991, 184-7: did Venus send the doves in Cumae (6.190ff)? Did Jupiter send the rain that saves most of the fleet in Sicily (5.693-9)? Did Juno send the storm in Book 3? Is Anchises the snake at 5.84-96?

totality of events and fellow characters' thoughts, surprised and forced to reevaluate convictions. Through the following examples I argue that, by leaving many more and more important "permanent gaps,"⁵⁷⁴ Vergil invites us readers to pass judgment while taking away from us the ability to claim that our judgment is final.

5.1.1 Time in Carthage

The moment in Book 5 when Aeneas declares that his father has been dead for a year is most naturally taken to mean that it has been a year since the Trojans first entered the narrative, sailing with elation away from Sicily (1.34-5), and therefore that Aeneas stayed in Carthage for a year.⁵⁷⁵ The realization at this moment is not that we necessarily had the wrong idea about how much time passed in Book 4 — there is no telling what impression a first-time reader will have had⁵⁷⁶ — but that we were not given any way to measure the passage of time. During Book 4 (1) on the morning after Aeneas' tale Anna and Dido speak; (2) Dido languishes in love and neglects her royal duties; (3) Venus and Juno conspire and prompt, on a morning hunt, flight to a cave (129ff); (4) *fama* spreads the report that Aeneas and Dido are passing the winter together; (5) Iarbas prays to Jupiter; (6) Jupiter sends down Mercury to prompt Aeneas to leave; (7) Aeneas and the Trojans begin to prepare to leave; (8) Aeneas and Dido converse; (9) the Trojans continue to prepare; (10) Dido sends a message to Aeneas through Anna; (10) Aeneas remains unmoved and the Trojans continue to prepare to leave; (11) Dido despairs; (12) one night Mercury appears

⁵⁷⁴ Richardson 1996 claims that two central questions in the *Odyssey* remain "permanent gaps" (What does Penelope know (or think) about Odysseus in Book 19? How reliable is Odysseus' *Apologos*?) Richardson 2006, 350-9 expands the list.

⁵⁷⁵ The dispute concerning the length of Aeneas' stay Carthage, arising from the inconsistency between 1.755-6 and 5.626, is old. Potter 1926 and Mandra 1934 understand Aeneas to have lingered in Sicily for months after Anchises' death and stayed in Carthage for a few weeks or months. Clark 1932 is an important correction. See also Quinn 1967, 128-9; Dyson 1996.

⁵⁷⁶ In my experience students reading Book 4 for the first time come to very different conclusions before they reach this passage at the beginning of Book 5. More often than not they are surprised at how long Aeneas has been in Carthage, and become more sympathetic to Dido.

to Aeneas and the Trojans leave; in the morning Dido finds the shores empty, and kills herself. Only the sequence in which these events occurred can be determined.⁵⁷⁷ We can recite the speeches to see how long they took, but we have no idea how much time passes between them. When we are told what characters are thinking and feeling — e.g. Aeneas ponders his response to Mercury’s commands (283-6); *fama* tells Dido of the Trojans’ preparations (296-304; note *tandem* 304); Aeneas resists Dido’s second appeal (437-49) — we do not know how long these processes take.

This sort of narrative technique misleads the reader by omission, by withholding information that a reader is used to receiving unobtrusively in a typical narrative. Markers of the passage of time are the norm. The sunrises and sunsets in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, for example, allow for the construction of timelines enumerating the exact number of days taken by the narrative.⁵⁷⁸ In the *Aeneid* events more often appear in the narrative, before our eyes and to our ears, with no temporal markers.⁵⁷⁹ It is impossible to establish how long has passed between any two scenes, or between one set of contiguous narrated scenes and another, because the narrative of the interstices does not discuss time or measure its passing.

⁵⁷⁷ Even those who argue that #1-3 and #5-8 proceed very quickly acknowledge that time passes without measurement in #4. I do not agree that we must understand the events of 4.54-89 to have occurred on one day only, as e.g. Pease 1935 *ad* 6 thinks. It is not clear whether Nelis 2001, 177ff, mapping the sequence onto the Apollonian precedent, understands the days following *fama*’s appearance to be contiguous. This seems impossible (better is Jacobson 1974, 91: “From speech to speech we can perceive the passage of time”). Heinze 1993, 265-9 admits ambiguity at the key points.

⁵⁷⁸ I mean not that Homeric treatment of time is uncomplicated or that these timelines are correct (see Olson 1995, 91-119 for an argument against them), but that markers in the Homeric narrative invite an attempt to track time with this sort of precision.

⁵⁷⁹ DeWitt 1910 does not document his claims, but his conclusions and feel for Vergil’s treatment of this issue have not been bettered (esp.310-11).

5.1.2 Time in Italy

The effects of studied vagueness concerning time intrude again in Book 9, when Nisus and Euryalus claim that they have come to know the whole Tiber and have seen Pallanteum during their habitual hunting (*uidimus obscuris primam sub uallibus urbem uenatu adsiduo et totum cognouimus amnem*, 9.244-5). This must come as a surprise, and it is tempting to say with Hardie that “in fact there has hardly been enough time since the landing for much hunting.”⁵⁸⁰ But how do we know how much time has passed since the landing “in fact”? From Book 7 we know that: as soon as the Trojans determined to stay, Aeneas (1) scouted the locality and (2) sent an embassy led by Ilioneus; (3) the embassy brokered a deal with Latinus; (4) Juno noticed this and summoned Allecto; (5) the Fury snaked around Amata, (6) thrust a torch into Turnus, and (7) guided Ascanius’ arrow into the stag’s flank; (8) Latins and Trojans skirmished; (9) an assortment of Latins were conscripted and marched to Latinus’ city, and declared war on the Trojans; (10) a force of Latins and other Italians gathered against Aeneas. We know the relationship of time between (1) and (2) (*postera cum prima lustrabat lampade terras orta dies*, 7.148-9); after that no amount of ingenuity can mark on which day this or that event happened, how much times passes between any two events, or how much time passed during the whole sequence.⁵⁸¹

These are not trivial issues. Our idea about the amount of time Aeneas spends with Dido will likely influence our understanding of their relationship, and of reactions of each when the

⁵⁸⁰ Hardie 1994 *ad loc.*

⁵⁸¹ Mandra 1934 does attempt to create a definite timeline.

relationship sours.⁵⁸² Our inability to determine how long they have spent together is of a piece with the narrator's severe limitation of the whole account of their relationship. Despite the amount of time spent in Carthage, "the scenes most crucial to a determination of what was said or understood by Dido and Aeneas" — that is, the events in the cave and the pair's time together afterward — "are never put before our eyes."⁵⁸³ Above (2.3.2.3) I discussed how Latinus suggests his displeasure with Aeneas' absence from the embassy. As a result of this absence the grasping of right hands that would have ratified an alliance never took place. In order to evaluate how wisely Aeneas leads his men in Book 7, one would wish to know how much time he allows to pass in the critical period between the embassy's return with Latinus' requests (7.285) and Ascanius' hunting expedition (7.499). The unauthorized words of Nisus and Euryalus in Book 9 raise an issue that, thanks to the lack of temporal markers, on a first reading might have appeared to be no issue at all.

5.1.3 The Body of Mezentius

Vergil lets the narrative run on without temporal markers, inviting the reader to make assumptions, conscious or not, about the passage of time, before inserting a passage that suggests that these assumptions were false, and at a minimum indicates that they were unprovable. The mirror image of this technique is to raise a question concerning a plot point of the highest thematic force, then never to tell what happened. Several important examples can be found in Aeneas' treatment of vanquished enemies. Defeated Mezentius asks not for his life but for a twofold posthumous favor. Aware that his former subjects stand hatefully about him, eager to

⁵⁸² In my experience students reading the *Aeneid* for the first time tend to assume the relationship was short while they are reading Book 4. When they learn in Book 5 that it may have been much longer than they first assumed, they become more sympathetic to Dido.

⁵⁸³ O'Hara 2011 *ad* 106-72.

slake their thirst for vengeance (10.905-906), he begs only that they not be allowed to violate his body and that he be buried with his son Lausus (905-906). He faces death with full knowledge of its arrival, accepts the sword in his throat, and dies (907-908). The narrator tells nothing of his body or his burial.

What Aeneas does with Mezentius' body affects our understanding of Aeneas and touches upon the most important themes of the poem. Mezentius has confessed that he is a *victus* (903). In a later speech (12.568), at what seems the apex of rage, Aeneas allows that his enemies will avoid destruction only by confessing that they are *victi* (*ni frenum accipere et victi parere fatentur, eruam et aequa solo fumantia culmina ponam*, 568-9). He has been told before to spare such men (*parcere subiectis*, 6.853). It may well be that this admonition cannot mean that he must spare the lives of all defeated enemies in all circumstance, but at its bare minimum it might be thought to require respectful treatment of an enemy's corpse when he has humbled himself. Aeneas did follow a gentler course when he returned Lausus' body and his armor to his army and his father without further blemish (*arma, quibus laetatus, habe tua; teque parentum / manibus et cineri, si qua est ea cura, remitto*, 10.827-828; Lausus' body has one wound [842]). On the other hand, as Ahl points out, he taunted the corpse of Tarquitus with the assurance that he would feed birds or fish (10.557-60).⁵⁸⁴

What the narrator does tell is that the next morning Aeneas sets up a victory dedication of Mezentius' arms, including his breastplate pierced through in twelve places, and speaks at it without excessive respect in front of his own men and allies (11.5-16). He departs from his treatment of Lausus by using Mezentius' arms in such a way, and he may have further departed,

⁵⁸⁴ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 10.22.

even before he stripped it, by mutilating the latter's body, by allowing it to be mutilated, or by not restoring it to his followers to be joined with his son's. The only indications that encourage readers to come to a conclusion encourage us to come to the more disquieting one.⁵⁸⁵ This has not prevented critics from leaping into the breach to assert flatly that Aeneas buried Mezentius with honor and with his son. What is interesting here is not that all critics agree on the point—they do not⁵⁸⁶ — but the decisive and dismissive language used by critics who think that Aeneas must be understood to have followed Mezentius' request:

Mezentius has just learned the meaning of parental pietas. It seems inconceivable to me that Aeneas of all people could ignore Mezentius' expression of it.⁵⁸⁷

Serv. has an extraordinary fancy⁵⁸⁸ that these wounds were given to Mezentius by the representatives of the twelve 'populi' of Mantua (10. 202), asserting that it was customary for all the army to stab a slain enemy, and referring to the stabbing of the dead Hector by the Greeks. The real reference of course is to the wounds received by Mezentius during the battle.⁵⁸⁹

Virgil trusts the reader to make judgments where nothing is explicitly said. If there is the slightest temptation to doubt whether Mezentius was allowed burial, it is totally dispelled in retrospective judgment by the speech of Aeneas to the Latin delegation that comes to request a truce to bury.⁵⁹⁰ [N]o doubt is left about the treatment of Mezentius.⁵⁹¹

⁵⁸⁵ Note also the mutilation of the oak Aeneas dresses with Mezentius' weapons (*ingentem quercum decisis undique ramis / constituit tumulo fulgentiaque induit arma*, 11.5-6). Other Latin spoils are thrown on the pyres of the Trojan and Etruscan dead (*hic alii spolia occisis derepta Latinis / coniciunt igni*, 11.193-4).

⁵⁸⁶ Lyne 1987, 113. Seider 2013, "it is unlikely that Aeneas complied with Mezentius' final request." Harrison 2002 *ad* 10.903-4 and 904-5 thinks that Aeneas gives back the body but allows the mutilation; R.D. Williams 1996 *ad* 10.905 passes no judgment ("Virgil does not tell us whether Mezentius' request was granted.")

⁵⁸⁷ Gotoff 1984, 207.

⁵⁸⁸ *ad loc*: *duodecim vulneribus adpetitum: quia, ut supra diximus, totius Tusciae populus in duodecim partes fuit divisus, ut "gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni", qui singulis lucumonibus parebant. moris autem fuit ut interemptos duces omnis vulneraret exercitus, sicut etiam de Hectore Homerus commemorat. unde est "quae circum plurima muros accepit patrios". non ergo ab Aenea, sed ab his qui "uni odiisque viro telisque frequentibus instant": quod ostendit Mezentius, cum sub Aeneae telis iaceret "scio acerba meorum circumstare odia": neque enim hoc in illo momento periculi meminisset, nisi eos cerneret imminere.*

⁵⁸⁹ Conington 1876 *ad loc*.

⁵⁹⁰ I do not agree that this is true, but even if it is, it has no bearing on the question of whether Aeneas allowed the Etruscans to mutilate Mezentius' corpse.

⁵⁹¹ Williams 1983, 114-115.

Leaving gaps in the narrative does not necessarily leave readers undecided and conscious of the undecidability of a question; it can prompt them to make the strongest assertions about never-narrated events.⁵⁹²

5.1.4 The City of Latinus

Although the death of Turnus has dominated the critical assessment of the poem's closure, another plot element is left hanging by the abrupt end of poem. When Latinus' city is last mentioned in the poem, it is under determined assault (12.573-92; 672-5). Its citizens are maddened by grief at the suicide of Amata and rent by *discordia* (12.583-611). It is Venus who first casts into Aeneas' mind the idea that he should turn his attack against the city:⁵⁹³

*hic mentem Aeneae genetrix pulcherrima misit
iret ut ad muros urbique adverteret agmen
ocius et subita turbaret clade Latinos.
ille ut vestigans diversa per agmina Turnum
huc atque huc acies circumtulit, aspicit urbem
immunem tanti belli atque impune quietam.
continuo pugnae accendit maioris imago:*

...

*'ne qua meis esto dictis mora, Iuppiter hac stat,⁵⁹⁴
neu quis ob inceptum subitum mihi segnior ito.
urbem hodie, causam belli, regna ipsa Latini,
ni frenum accipere et victi parere fatentur,
eruum et aequa solo fumantia culmina ponam.*

(12.554-60; 565-69)

The idea Venus casts is explicated by the narrator as if it were a stratagem to influence the Latin troops' movement and mood, but in Aeneas' mind it does not appear to be a temporary tactic.

⁵⁹² See Thomas 2001, 138-9 for how Dryden sanitizes by omission.

⁵⁹³ For assessments of this speech see Nisbet 1990, 262: "bleak, authoritative tones of a real *imperator*"; Quinn 1968, 20: "disagreeably righteous." Johnson 1976, 92ff argues that a response sympathetic to the besieged is invited by the bee simile.

⁵⁹⁴ Hejduk 2009, 294 n.27 points out that Aeneas attributes the plan to Jupiter in order to justify his decision to destroy the city.

First resentment of the guilty city's peacefulness arises in his mind,⁵⁹⁵ then a vision of the "greater fight" of a siege kindles him to action. Attack on the city is not abruptly or arbitrarily introduced by the goddess; the idea that it is facing siege and fighting for its existence has been prepared for a long while.⁵⁹⁶ Turnus expects the Teucrians to destroy the city if he continues to flee (*exscindine domos [id rebus defuit unum] perpetiar?*, 643-4). According to the messenger Saces the besieged have heard Aeneas' threats only too clearly (*fulminat Aeneas armis summasque minatur / deiecturum arces Italum excidioque daturum*, 654-5). Though Aeneas breaks off the assault at Turnus' approach (697-8), in the middle of the duel, as he chases his foe, he continues to threaten to destroy the city (*excisurum urbem minitans*, 762).

The poem ends with the killing of Turnus, and we are left with no information about what will happen to the city or to Latinus. Critics have again been tempted to proclaim sure conclusions in accordance with their own assumptions or desires. It is hard to see how one can confidently assert that "Latinus' city is not going to be sacked and destroyed the way Aeneas' Troy was"⁵⁹⁷ when Vergil's language here so clearly recalls the language used of the destruction of Troy in Book 2.⁵⁹⁸ Tarrant points out the echo and even argues that the death of Amata, who "almost embodies the city," is a "symbolic destruction,"⁵⁹⁹ yet he does not mention the fate of the

⁵⁹⁵ Tarrant 2012 *ad loc* calls *immunem* and *impune quietem* "clearly focalized." Berlin 1998 argues that Aeneas' memory of the fall of the Troy sets the pattern of the assault in his mind and determines his action; see her p.31 n.46 for a bibliography of other views on the assault.

⁵⁹⁶ *nunc iter ad regem nobis murosque Latinos*, 11.17 (Aeneas to his men); *cum muros adsidet hostis*, 11.304 (Latinus in council); *hostes...circumstant undique muros*, 11.387-8 (Turnus in council); *ipse ardua montis per deserta iugo superans adventat ad urbem*, 11.513-4 (Turnus to Camilla); *succedat pugnae Troianosque arceat urbe*, 11.826 (Camilla's message to Turnus; after passing through the pass Aeneas heads straight for the city [*sic ambo ad muros rapidi totoque feruntur / agmine*, 906-7]); *prymaeque mori pro moenibus ardent*, 11.895 (the mothers of the city).

⁵⁹⁷ Fratantuono 2007, 240.

⁵⁹⁸ Tarrant 2012, 232 and 236. Rossi 2004, 171-96 thoroughly charts the plotcraft and language that put Latinus' city in the place of Troy, but says of it and of the Trojans' camp that (p.188) "Although their survival is also, at alternate moments, put in serious jeopardy, the destiny of the two other cities, the Trojan camp and the city of Latinus, is quite different. They survive and continue to exist."

⁵⁹⁹ Tarrant 2012, 232. To his argument here add Latinus' reaction when he hears of his wife's death: *coniugis attonitus fatis urbisque ruina*, 610.

city in his summary of the poem's "afterplot."⁶⁰⁰ He claims that the terms of Aeneas' oath before the prospective duel, under which Latinus will continue to exercise independent or perhaps superior power (*socer arma Latinus habeto, / imperium sollemne socer*, 192-3), along with the agreement between Jupiter and Juno, (12.791-842), "allow no significant event subsequent to T.'s death to remain in doubt."⁶⁰¹ This will come as a surprise to reader who recalls that Jupiter told Venus that Aeneas would rule for three years (1.265-6), but Anchises told his son that he would have a son in his old age (6.763-5).⁶⁰² While the marriage of Aeneas to Lavinia, the founding of a city named after her, and a mixed alliance may not be in doubt, it is harder to conceive of how Latinus, who is last heard of babbling in shock at events he long ago failed to control (*mussat rex ipse Latinus / quos generos vocet aut quae sese ad foedera flectat*, 657-8), after having been dragged to the walls by rebellious citizens demanding the city be surrendered (*urbem alii reserare iubent et pandere portas / Dardanidis ipsumque trahunt in moenia regem*, 584-5), will, as Cairns also claims, "resume direction of events on the Italian side after Turnus' death."⁶⁰³

In some sense Latinus' city must disappear. Vergil, by avoiding giving it a name,⁶⁰⁴ grants it no locality and no remnant in memory or topography with which it can be connected. It floats free of time and space and leaves no trace; it is there to be replaced by the new founding, Lavinium. To a reading sensitive to the change in meaning of *condere* from founding a city in the poem to burying a sword in an individual's body in the finale (see above 4.3.2), we should add that Aeneas also becomes, at least thematically and symbolically, and perhaps more than that, a

⁶⁰⁰ *ibid.*, 8-9.

⁶⁰¹ *ibid.*, 9.

⁶⁰² O'Hara 1990, 91-94; 2007, 81-2 thinks that in the underworld Aeneas is being "deceived" by an excessively optimistic prophecy, but Jupiter too says nothing about how Aeneas will die, when the tradition suggests that it may be in battle (e.g. Livy 1.2).

⁶⁰³ Cairns 1989, 124.

⁶⁰⁴ See Horsfall 2000 *ad* 7.162 for discussion of the mistake of calling it "Laurentum." Concerning why the city is not named he speculates only that Vergil perhaps "wanted to keep Lavinium for Aen.'s foundation and there simply was no other name."

literary tradition creates certain expectations in the minds of the audience, but the poet does not tell us whether these expectations are fulfilled.”⁶⁰⁹ The most important of these earlier examples is the scene in which the mutilation of Mezentius’ body is left open as a possibility. When the epic ends, we are not only left with the question of how to respond to Aeneas’ decision to kill Turnus;⁶¹⁰ we are also left to wonder whether Aeneas’ rejection of the one half of Turnus’ plea, by which he indirectly asks for his life, is accompanied by a rejection of the other, by which he directly asks that his body be returned to his father.⁶¹¹

5.2 Inviting and Resisting Response

“Two voices,”⁶¹² “further voices,”⁶¹³ “polyphony,”⁶¹⁴ “polycentric,”⁶¹⁵ “polysemous,”⁶¹⁶ “ambivalent...a continuing tension of opposites,”⁶¹⁷ “unstable...aporetic”⁶¹⁸ — the choice of the right adjective to capture, or phrase to frame, the *Aeneid*’s “voice,” and especially its presentation of and relationship to Augustan ideology, has absorbed much critical energy.⁶¹⁹ That the binary taxonomy of “Anti-Augustan” or “pessimistic” on the one hand and “Augustan” or “optimistic” on the other has been deconstructed⁶²⁰ does not mean that either readers’ interest in

⁶⁰⁹ Edgeworth 2005, 3-11. His further examples are: (1) we expect the Danaids in the list of figures punished in the underworld (6.580-627), but Vergil leaves them out; (2) we see Aeneas take prisoners he means to sacrifice over Pallas, but we do not see what he decides to do with them (p.4): “Either way, the outcome would have had strong implications for one’s reading of the end of the poem. But instead, what we get is: silence.”

⁶¹⁰ *ibid.*, 7 is a useful bibliography; see also Tarrant 2012.

⁶¹¹ Edgeworth quotes Jenkyns 1998, 67, another emphatic dismissal unsupported by the text: “Virgil is moving with such rapidity that he does not pause to tell us if this supplication is granted, but he does not need to, for we are sure that it is.”

⁶¹² Parry 1963.

⁶¹³ Lyne 1987.

⁶¹⁴ Newman 1964, 64.

⁶¹⁵ Conte 1986, 152-3.

⁶¹⁶ Johnson 1976, 16ff.

⁶¹⁷ Tarrant 2012, 17.

⁶¹⁸ Hexter 2010.

⁶¹⁹ See Thomas 2001, xii-xiii for the terminology; also for his objection to the now-frequent critic’s disclaimer indicating weariness with the question, or that a dichotomous framing of the two alternatives is reductive.

⁶²⁰ See e.g. Martindale 1993; Kennedy 1998.

the question or the force of their reactions to it have diminished.⁶²¹ Others have argued that the *Aeneid* poses problems that invite judgment,⁶²² or the projection of what is already in the reader's mind,⁶²³ and not only concerning ideology. I argue here that one of the chief means by which the poem can invite these projections, and can reasonably bear different interpretations, is by *not* telling; by the limitation of authorized narrative, and the corresponding expanse of events that are either told only by unauthorized speakers, or left in silence.

If what happened in the narrative and how long it took were clear, the division of readers' judgment would be easier to track. It might have been true, for example, that one particular type of person, or a person proceeding from one set of principles, would justify or approve of Aeneas' activities in Carthage, and a person of another type, or proceeding from another set of principles, would condemn him. Instead we see that persons proceeding from the same general conception of what should be considered honorable conduct disagree forcefully about Aeneas' conduct. The gaps in the narrative allow scope for those on either side to fill them with events that follow from their conception of his character or role in the epic. Those who view Aeneas favorably can assume that, after he tells his men that he will find the time to approach Dido, he really is waiting to approach her, and that *fama* tragically anticipates him and tells her what he is doing without

⁶²¹ For this argument see Perkell 1999, 14ff.

⁶²² Bell 1999, 276: "Diversity is encouraged, furthermore, by the poet's determination to subsume within his epic's grand codes not only a vast range of intertextual allusiveness but also those popularly legible Realien that make the *Aeneid* capable of demanding serious engagement and interrogation (and possibly even a verdict too) from a *populus universus*."

⁶²³ Hexter 1990, 122: "the text is a mirror, a blank, a screen onto which its readers project their desires."

telling her his full intentions.⁶²⁴ Those same critics could take his claim of nightly visits from his father as an example of “paralipsis” of events that occurred earlier without being narrated, but are to be accepted.⁶²⁵ They could extend their assumptions further and find that Aeneas did not initiate the encounter with Dido in the cave; that he did not mention either marriage or any more serious or permanent relationship, and perhaps that he deliberately avoided mentioning them; that his intimacy with Anna was imagined by Dido, or wholly innocent.⁶²⁶ The same opportunity is offered to those who take the opposite view and are unfavorable to Aeneas, concerning his conduct toward Dido, or concerning the complex of events at the end of the poem analyzed above. This reader can believe that Aeneas allowed the mutilation of Mezentius’ body and did not return it to be buried; that he razed Latinus’ city; that he treated Turnus’ body without honor. A position on either side of these positions can be supported by evidence from the text, and neither can be proven.

5.3 Interpenetration of Narrator, Reader, and Character: Variants in Competition Within the Fictive World

The final stage of my argument is that Vergil employs another nexus of techniques that work in tandem with this limitation of authorized narrative. When his characters anticipate reader’s reactions, they invite the reader’s engagement in the same activity, but they also close off the possibility that the reader can understand his own engagement to be conclusive. Vergil

⁶²⁴ Hight 1972, 24 bases his opinion about Aeneas’ admonishment to Dido that he had not been planning to leave her silently (“to his hearer, and to nearly all readers, this must appear to be a bare-faced lie”) on the correspondence between 4.289-91 (report of Aeneas’ speech to his men) and 405-6 (Dido to Aeneas). In my experience not “nearly all readers” respond in this way. Feeney 1983, 207 counters: “Vergil, however, takes four lines (291-4) to tell us that Aeneas fully intends to speak to the Queen before going; so that when Aeneas replies that he had not planned to run away without speaking to her, we have no option but to believe him.” This is wrong: 291-4 is a report of Aeneas’ statement to his men. The narrator tells us nothing authorized about Aeneas’ intentions.

⁶²⁵ For this term see above (Introduction III.4.2).

⁶²⁶ For the pairing of Aeneas and Anna earlier in the tradition see Ahl 1989, 21-22; Stark 1999, 262-3.

also makes his characters receivers of a tradition, and has them perform other functions usually performed by a reader or narrator. These characters promote their own account of controversial elements, and judge between multiple reports. They read product of art within their own world (5.4 below). They narrate selectively (5.5). They create new variants that will enter the tradition (5.6). They struggle to read tradition and interpret references to it (5.7). They take on the narrator's role as preserver of tradition and re-maker of memory (5.8). Finally, the narrator takes on the uncertainties and limitations of his characters (5.9).

In the *Aeneid* characters promote their version of a tradition within the world of the poem over competing variants. According to Latinus the Latins are Saturn's people, and they obey norms of goodness without laws (*Saturni gentem haud vinclo nec legibus aequam*, 7.203). Moorton recognizes that the information that "the kings of Latium assume the rods and axes of the *fascēs*, a symbol of the enforcement of law through discipline...impugns Latinus' sanguine assessment of the moral perfection of his people," but concludes that it is "unnecessary" to "assume that Latinus is lying" when we can suppose more charitably that "he is projecting his own just nature onto his people."⁶²⁷ This is again to assume that sincerity is the primary criterion upon which to judge speech: either Latinus is a liar, or Latinus is so innocent that he thinks others are as good as he. The third possibility is that he is attempting to control a new people's conception of him, and framing his own people in as favorable a light as possible, by taking advantage of a tradition of the glorious past of Italy.

We can tell that other interpretations of this story are circulating in Italy. In Evander's telling Saturn is a fugitive and an exile, and his civilizing influence on the natives of the

⁶²⁷ Moorton 1989, 127. He credits Fordyce 1991 *ad* 7.203 for pointing out the inconcinnity between Latinus' claim and 7.173 (*primos attollere fascis*).

peninsula was precisely the giving of law (319-332, esp. *legesque dedit*).⁶²⁸ He remains a venerable figure who ruled in peace and with justice, but he is long dead and gone, and the current residents, the *manus Ausonia* and *gentes Sicaniae* (328), who must include Latinus and his peoples, are those who came and brought the *rabies belli* and *amor habendi* that marked the discoloration of the golden age (326). When we consider the function of the Golden Age in the *Aeneid*, then, we should consider not only how Vergil's represents the Golden Age to his readers,⁶²⁹ but how Ilioneus uses talk of Jupiter to counter Latinus' posing of his people as belonging to the Golden Age (see Chapter 2 above), and later how Evander makes use of the idea of the Golden Age to shape his guest Aeneas' conception of Italy

Multiple accounts of the Trojan past circulate. Characters hear more than one account, and must weigh one against the other. Servius thinks that the odd phrase by which we are told that Aeneas recognizes himself "mixed in with the Achaean leaders" (*se quoque principibus permixtum adgnovit Achivis*, 1.487) is a covert reference to the negative tradition in which Aeneas betrayed Troy (*latenter proditionem tangit*).⁶³⁰ He is discussing the poet as the party responsible for introducing the reference;⁶³¹ but, as Ahl argues, there is also the possibility that the picture was carved by Carthaginian hands to represent Aeneas as a traitor fighting with the

⁶²⁸ Adler 2003, 153-4 discusses how Evander uses "corrective" language to contradict what for Vergil's reader are traditional accounts of the Golden Age.

⁶²⁹ Thomas 2001, 1-7 chooses 6.791ff and *aurea saecula condet* (792) — will Augustus "found" or "bring to an end" a Golden Age? — as his signal example of the ambiguity of Vergil's voice.

⁶³⁰ He raises the point when Antenor is introduced (*ad* 1.142): *hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse dicuntur secundum Livium, quod et Vergilius per transitum tangit, ubi ait "se quoque principibus permixtum agnovit Achivis", et excusat Horatius dicens "ardentem sine fraude Troiam". hoc est sine proditione: quae quidem excusatio non vacat; nemo enim excusat nisi rem plenam suspicionis. Sisenna tamen dicit solum Antenorem prodidisse. quem si velimus sequi augemus exemplum: si regnat proditor, cur pius vagatur? ob hoc autem creditur Graecis Antenor patriam prodidisse, quia "sicut superius dictum est, et auctor reddendae Helenae fuit, et legatos qui propter Helenam venerant suscepit hospitio, et Ulixen in mendici habitu agnitum non prodidit.*

⁶³¹ *ad* 1.647 *laborat autem poeta hoc sermone probare, ab Aenea non esse proditam patriam, si ornatus Helenae, quam cum Antenore Troiam prodidisse manifestum est, ex incendio eripuit bellorum casu, non pro praemio proditionis accepit.* For his use of *latenter/per transitum tangere* of the poet see *ad* 1.382; 1.443; 1.487; 1.526; 2.683; 3.287.

Greeks, or in an ambiguous position to be interpreted either way by those viewing the temple.⁶³² The likelihood that this is so seems to disappear when Dido tells Ilioneus that she knows of the Trojan past before offering the Trojans help. It seems even less likely after she reacts to meeting Aeneas himself by confidently proclaiming his divine lineage as a well-known fact, and by naming as her source Telamonian Teucer, who was so filled with admiration for the Trojans that he boasted of his own half-Trojan lineage.⁶³³ But later we are encouraged to reassess all this. In the intimacy of conversation with her sister, on the morning after Aeneas' tale, Dido speaks of her guest's divine lineage as if it were something to be judged true or false based on the subject's carriage and conduct (*quem sese ore ferens, quam forti pectore et armis! / credo equidem, nec vana fides, genus esse decorum*, 4.11-12). Report or tradition are not, then, taken by characters as a given; judgment concerning them is suspended until evidence can inform judgment. Later, in her first response to Aeneas' refusal to listen to her pleas to linger, Dido declares her disbelief in his ancestry (*nec tibi diva parens generis nec Dardanus auctor*, 365-8). She reverses the choice to believe him that first indicated her intellectual surrender to his person and her fascination with his past. Her original accession to his claims was marked by her declaration that her trust in it was justified (*nec vana fides*); she now declares that no bond of trust can be relied upon (*nusquam tuta fides*, 373).⁶³⁴

The rejection Dido feels is bound up with her rejection of Aeneas' stories. She sarcastically indicates her lack of full belief in his claim that he has been commanded by a

⁶³² Ahl 1989, 26.

⁶³³ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 1.619 for a discussion of Teucer as a source for tales about Trojans.

⁶³⁴ Aeneas, excusing his planned departure, mentions *Lyciae sortes* and Grynean Apollo (345-6), though we and Dido heard from him that he heard nothing from Apollo until Delos. By mentioning something about his time after Troy that he has neglected to tell the first time through, he makes it easier for Dido to believe that he is fabricating excuses *ad hoc*, and to quote him in disbelieving derision (376-7).

messenger from Jove to leave her (her *nunc et Iove missus ab ipso / interpres divum* 377-8 quotes mockingly his 366). The hammer blow falls when a later dawn shows her that Aeneas' fleet is departing. In her distress she speaks with incredulity of the story according to which Aeneas carried his Penates and his father out of the city in a heroic escape:

*infelix Dido, nunc te facta impia tangunt?
tum decuit, cum sceptras dabas. en dextra fidesque,
quem secum patrios aiunt portare penatis,
quem subiisse umeris confectum aetate parentem!* (4.596-9)

The essential detail is the person and number of *aiunt*. Austin says that “it implies that Aeneas’ pietas was all a traveller’s tale,”⁶³⁵ but this is imprecise: Dido has already indicated that she does believe the traveller Aeneas himself, and she does not say *ais*. What we now learn is that he was not the only one, and probably not the first one, to tell her of his escape from Troy: an unspecified “they” also spread the favorable version of his departure from Troy, and it is they in addition to him whom she now disbelieves. It is possible that when she says “people say” this she means that people in Carthage, whether Trojan or Carthaginian, are repeating the account Aeneas first gave, but it seem equally plausible that either Teucer, the source she cited in Book 1, or others like him passed on to her stories of Aeneas’ escape from Troy even before he reached her coast.⁶³⁶ In one sense she sounds like a poet, the receiver of a literary tradition; like Tibullus, for example, who says of Aeneas *ille parentem / dicitur et raptos sustinuisse Lares* (2.5.14-5). In another sense these are the words of a queen of a far-travelled people who sits at a node of information networks, as we saw in Chapter 1, and who demonstrates thorough prior knowledge

⁶³⁵ Austin 1955 *ad loc*; Knox 1995 *ad* Heroides 7.79: “Virgil’s Dido at one point expresses incredulity about Aeneas’ exploits...But O[vid] makes explicit the note of skepticism implied in Virgil’s *aiunt*.” Conington 1876 *ad loc* understands better: “‘Portasse’ is the reading of Med. and another MS., but it is apparently an alteration by some one who did not appreciate the sarcasm of the present—‘who is said always to carry about with him’—or remember Aeneas’ words just referred to.” Lyne 1989, 60 suggests that the lumpily concrete *portare* is contemptuous.

⁶³⁶ For this point see Casali 1999, 203-11.

of the Trojans. We learn for certain, when Turnus' reviles Aeneas as *desertor Asiae* (12.15), that a negative report of Aeneas' departure is current in Italy.⁶³⁷ With this in mind we may think back to Dido's citation of her source in Book 1, and sense that Telamonian Teucer is an odd character to have an unreservedly laudatory view of the Trojans.⁶³⁸

Dido may, then, have already heard a positive version of Aeneas' departure before she asked him for his account, and may have heard a negative one. Aeneas hears and sees enough to suspect that negative traditions concerning him are circulating in this world, and he takes steps to rebut whatever they might have told his host.⁶³⁹ With Aeneas we see the arms of Memnon on Juno's temple (*nigri Memnonis arma*, 1.489), so we know that Dido must have already heard an account of them; yet she asks Aeneas about exactly this detail (*nunc quibus Aurorae venisset filius armis*, 751). Concerning the only detail on Juno's temple that overlaps with Aeneas' tale, we see competition between the version or versions shown on the temple walls and the version Aeneas tells. Dido asks him about Achilles (*nunc quantus Achilles*, 1.752), who is on the temple in a decidedly un-Homeric act of selling Priam Hector's body (*exanimumque auro corpus vendebat Achilles*, 484).⁶⁴⁰ In Aeneas' tale Priam, rebuking Neoptolemus, claims that Achilles blushed out of regard for the rights of a suppliant, and returned Hector's corpse to him (*sed iura fidemque / supplicis erubuit corpusque exsanguis sepulcro / reddidit Hectoreum meque in mea regna remisit*, 2.543). The version put in Priam's mouth by Aeneas is a correction

⁶³⁷ See Tarrant 2012 *ad loc.*

⁶³⁸ See Barchiesi 1999; Fowler 1999, 32 objects. For his flight from Salamis see Hor.*Od.*1.7. Dido introduces Teucer serving under her father Belus in the conquest of Cyprus. Brent 2004, 145: "To recall the Graeco-Punic invasion of Cyprus is surely an odd way to begin a relationship with the Trojan son of Venus." Ahl 2007 *ad* 1.619 suggests that the relationship of Dido's father Belus and Teucer models the relationship between the exiled newcomer (Aeneas) and the receiving monarch (Dido).

⁶³⁹ For a thorough discussion of this point Ahl 1989.

⁶⁴⁰ For the tradition of the ransom, a development of the scenario Achilles rejects at *Il.*22.344-54, see Stanley 1965.

of the version Dido has heard and that he has seen (or thinks he has seen) depicted.⁶⁴¹ When Aeneas swears a solemn oath that he in no way avoided fighting the invading enemy with force and bitterness (2.431-3), he is making sure that the slightest hint of a negative tradition, that he was either a traitor or a deserter, is ruled out.⁶⁴²

5.4 Characters Read Art: Other Misdirections in Carthage

Aeneas is first called upon to read images when he stares in wonder at the depictions of his city's past on the walls of the temple of Juno. Hejduk argues that his paradigm of a character's misreading of art is parallel to many readers' misconception of Vergil's text: "Virgil himself gives us the classic example of a character's hopes engendering a dangerous misreading... It is my argument that readers of the Aeneid, like this reader within it, have been too willing to let their hopes and expectations impose upon the text elements that are in fact conspicuous by their absence."⁶⁴³ The words that describe the pictures cannot be merely what is depicted in a static image, and must include an admixture of Aeneas' memories.⁶⁴⁴ His judgment

⁶⁴¹ Fowler 2000, 79-81 (at 80 n.51 he credits Barchiesi with the argument) argues that it may be that the depiction shows Achilles, Priam extending his hand, and the gold that Priam does bring in the Iliadic account, and that Aeneas reads into the image, through his "selective and tendentious" reading of the events of the *Iliad*, Achilles' demand for a ransom. Even if this argument holds, Aeneas' tale to Dido is a correction of what he thinks he has seen.

⁶⁴² *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* (2.431-3). See Servius *ad loc*; also *ad* 1.488 (*se quoque principibus permixtum agnovit achivis aut latenter prodicionem tangit, ut supra diximus: ut excusatur ab ipso in secundo "Iliaci cineres" et cetera*); Tarrant 2012 *ad* 12.15; for the dissenting view that these lines, under this interpretation, are being over-read, see Horsfall 2008 *ad loc*.

⁶⁴³ Hejduk 2009, 280. Boyd 1990 argues that the ekphrasis "anticipates interpretation... as both an object explicitly observed and interpreted within a narrative by a viewer (or multiple viewers), and as a text read and interpreted from without, by a reader (or multiple readers)." Brent 2004, 160-1 argues that Turnus reads the Danaids' deeds on Pallas' baldric as another episode in the history of his Inachid family; that the danger of "manipulating mythical symbols for propagandistic ends is that they are always open to alternative reading"; that Aeneas, joined by the narrator, reads the Danaids' deeds as a *nefas* cursing Turnus' blood (*scelerato ex sanguine*, 12.949). See further Barchiesi 1999: 330-41; Perkell 1999, 45-46.

⁶⁴⁴ See the bibliography at Fowler 2000, 77, esp. Leach 1989; but the technique was understood already by Servius (*ad* 1.484: *ingenti arte utitur verbis: nam hoc loco, quia pingi potuit, praesens tempus posuit, superius, quia pingi non potuit, sed referri, perfecto exsecutus est tempore dicendo "raptaverat," non "raptabat."*).

that the images might mean safety for his men comes to us before we hear the description of the content of the images:

<i>hoc primum in luco nova res oblata timorem</i>	450
<i>leniit, hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem</i>	
<i>ausus, et adflictis melius confidere rebus.</i>	
<i>namque ...</i>	
... <i>videt Iliacas ex ordine pugas,</i>	
<i>bellaque iam fama totum volgata per orbem,</i>	
<i>Atridas, Priamumque, et saevum ambobus Achillem.</i>	
<i>constitit, et lacrimans, 'quis iam locus' inquit 'Achate,</i>	
<i>quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?</i>	460
<i>En Priamus! Sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;</i>	
<i>sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.</i>	
<i>solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem.'</i>	
<i>sic ait, atque animum pictura pascit inani,</i>	
<i>multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine voltum.</i>	465
<i>namque videbat, uti...</i>	(1.450-66)

We hear that he dares to hope for safety because of what he sees (450-2); then we see that what he sees is the battles of Troy (456-8); then we hear why he hopes for safety (459-63); finally, we see through his eyes the detail of the scenes one by one (466ff). A reading against this framing has become a commonplace:⁶⁴⁵ Aeneas misunderstands what he sees, which is the destruction of his people on the temple of the goddess who accomplished and triumphed in their destruction. These sinister implications can only be uncovered by reading against the order in which the Vergilian narrator has narrated, and against the interpretation proposed by the character Aeneas.

This understanding of Aeneas as misreader of images is open to the objection that Aeneas' supposed obtuseness or rejection of the unendurable does not seem to have any adverse

⁶⁴⁵ Feder 1953-4, 197-209 and Stanley 1965 (esp. 273-4) planted the seeds for this argument. More influential is Johnson 1976, 103ff. See Barchiesi 1994; Boyd 1995; Fowler 2000, 77-82; for the contrary view, Clausen 2002, 32-3.

results and does not seem to be corrected by the narrative.⁶⁴⁶ On the one hand, a canny observer should have perceived that the images might suggest an attitude toward the Trojans less than benign or compassionate; on the other hand, Dido does not slaughter the first Trojans she meets and drag Ilioneus' corpse around her walls three times, but invites them to share her city. Does not knowledge of the Trojans lead to benign treatment of the Trojans? Has not suffering made Dido sympathetic to other sufferers (*non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco*, 1.630)? If all we knew about the knowledge, motivation, and actions of the Carthaginians were the verses of Book 1, we would have to confess that Aeneas, although he may not have read the temple of Juno in a way that followed from the images themselves, was by some intuition correct that that knowledge of his people's suffering would prompt the locals to grant *salus* to him and his men. We should recall that he knows from the tale told by a friendly local maiden (1.335-370) enough to suppose that the sufferings of his people and Dido's exiles are similar in several ways.

However, passages before and after this scene show one divine interference and one human motivation, unknowable to Aeneas, that contributed to making the opening diplomatic exchanges between the two peoples seem so cordial. The first is the interference of Jupiter, prompted by Venus, to ensure that the Carthaginians put aside their vicious hearts (1.302-304):

*et iam iussa facit, ponuntque ferocia Poeni
corda volente deo; in primis regina quietum
accipit in Teucros animum mentemque benignam.* (1.302-304)

⁶⁴⁶ Johnson *loc. cit.*

Such interference would not be necessary unless many a *Poenus* has a *cor* that is naturally *ferox*.⁶⁴⁷ Ilioneus complains of, and Dido excuses, threats the Carthaginians have already begun to make. At a minimum Mercury's interference must have made Carthaginian hostility milder, and Dido's attitude more generous, than it would otherwise have been. The second factor is that Dido, like Evander later, is surrounded by enemies, and has reason to see the Trojans as politically and militarily useful. From Anna we learn that Dido has been fending off marriage proposals from local princes (4.35-8), that her territory is girded by formidable enemies, that it may be threatened from Sidon (39-44), and that Trojan weapons as well as their prestige are considered a valuable addition (48-9).⁶⁴⁸

Even this calculation of Dido's motives is complicated yet again by her later words:

<i>non potui abreptum divellere corpus et undis</i>	600
<i>spargere? non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro</i>	
<i>Ascanium patriisque epulandum ponere mensis?</i>	
<i>verum anceps pugnae fuerat fortuna. fuisset:</i>	
<i>quem metui moritura? faces in castra tulissem</i>	
<i>implessemque foros flammis natumque patremque</i>	605
<i>cum genere exstinxem, memet super ipsa dedissem.</i>	(4.600-6)

Dido appears to be saying not that she made a mistake out of ignorance when she welcomed Aeneas, but that she should have known better at the time; perhaps even that she did know better

⁶⁴⁷ Stewart 1971-1972, 117-8 n.4: "The fact that Venus tampers with her emotions (which Aeneas has no way of knowing at the time), proves nothing about her natural feelings, and how she would have received him if left completely on her own. Indeed the necessity that Venus should intervene to secure Dido's good will for the Trojans proves, if anything does, that Dido's choice of pictures on the temple do *not* of themselves indicate any preconceived sympathy on her part for the Trojans (or for anyone else)." Note also 1.14 *asperrima belli*.

⁶⁴⁸ Note also Gibson 1999, 190: "Certainly an offer of incorporation, made on a first encounter with a deeply offended foreign people, can hardly be accounted for by simple altruism. As Herman has shown, the start of Greek *xenia* relationships are often characterized by spectacular acts of *euergesia*. These acts are not only lavish demonstrations of non-hostility, but also often part of a deliberate strategy to place the recipient in such a state of indebtedness that he can only redeem himself by a display of submission and loyalty towards the donor."

at the time, but calculated that it would be dangerous to fight these Trojans.⁶⁴⁹ This again makes sense if she had already heard at the time a negative tradition of Aeneas' past.

5.5 Aeneas Narrates

Aeneas' tale of the fall of Troy and the wandering of the Trojans is the longest and most important unauthorized narrative in the *Aeneid*. The ring between the speech introduction (*conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant / inde toro pater Aeneas sic orsus ab alto*, 2.1-2) and the speech closing (*sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus unus / fata renarrabat divum cursusque docebat / conticuit tandem factoque hic fine quievit*, 3.716-8) remind us that it is an outsized example of the other direct speeches analyzed in this thesis. Judgment of it should, as usual, take into account the balance of knowledge between Aeneas and his addressees, as well as the motivation Aeneas might have for telling what he does in the way he does. Ahl argues that Aeneas responds to the signs he has seen and heard of the negative tradition of his departure from Troy, and depicts himself first as absent, then "aimless, feckless, and marginal" during the moments the city begins to fall, then "indestructible" and a "symbol of *pietas*" in his escape.⁶⁵⁰ His analysis is based on the rhetoric of narrating characters in ancient epic, on the internal oddities of Aeneas' tale, and on the difficulty of reconciling authorized narrative details from elsewhere in the poem with what Aeneas tells. I add that a reading that understands Aeneas to be narrating ingenuously, with authority equal to that of the Vergilian narrator, would make his the only speech in the poem to work this way. In every other diplomatic or deliberative exchange, the speaker exploits his addressee's ignorance and invents, conceals, or otherwise manipulates. The rule of characters' retellings in the *Aeneid*, when we can check their accuracy, is that they are

⁶⁴⁹ See Ahl 2007 *ad* 4.603 for this point.

⁶⁵⁰ See Ahl 1989 (quotation from p.30).

so much of a distortion that the events they tell could never be reconstructed based on their retelling alone. The rule of Aeneas' speech elsewhere in the poem is that he is as little concerned with ingenuous reporting of events as any other character.

5.6 Characters Generate the Tradition's Variants

Several passages touch upon and activate the variant in which the Trojans provoke a war in Italy by raiding.⁶⁵¹ Within the *Aeneid* this story is false. Ascanius, is hunting and on fire with love of glory when he kills the tame stag of Silvia.⁶⁵² Nevertheless invective labelling the Trojans robbers is directed against them throughout the latter six books.⁶⁵³ Even before this Amata calls Aeneas a robber, when she is likening Aeneas to Paris (*quam primo Aquilone relinquet / perfidus alta petens abducta virgine praedo?*, 7.361-2). Juno's fabrication on Olympus is the scenario that comes down into Vergil's time as a variant, perhaps the dominant variant, concerning the Trojans' arrival (*arva aliena iugo premere atque avertere praedas?*, 10.78).⁶⁵⁴ The epithet is repeated by Mezentius (*uoueo praedonis corpore raptis / indutum spoliis ipsum te, Lause, tropaeum / Aeneae*, 774-6) and by the Latin women praying to Pallas for succor (*frange manu*

⁶⁵¹ *Ibi egressi Troiani, ut quibus ab immenso prope errore nihil praeter arma et naves superesset, cum praedam ex agris agerent, Latinus rex Aboriginesque qui tum ea tenebant loca ad arcendam vim advenarum armati ex urbe atque agris concurrunt.* (Livy 1.1); Cato *Orig.* 1 fr.10 Jordan; καὶ αὐτίκα περὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ πολισματος ἀπάση προθυμίᾳ ὄρμητο ἐλάμβανέ τε καταθέων ἐκ τῶν πέριξ χωρίων ὅποσα εἰς τὸν πολιισμόν αὐτῶ ἦν χρήσιμα καὶ μάλιστα ἔμελλε λυπηρὰ τοῖς ἀφαιρεθεῖσι φανήσεσθαι, σίδηρον καὶ ξύλα καὶ τὰς γεωργικὰς παρασκευάς. (Dio. Hal. 1.57.7). In Carthage Ilioneus denies that the Trojans are there to loot: *aut raptas ad litora vertere praedas* (1.528).

⁶⁵² Starr 1992 points out that a "tame" deer is, by later Roman legal standards, the property of the person to whom it habitually returns. Anchises cannot know this — Starr cites Tiberius Claudius Donatus' speech in defense of Ascanius in his *Interpretationes Vergilianae* (2.75-24-76.6 ed. Georgii), in which the boy pleads ignorance of the status of his prey — but this detail reminds us of the logic underlying the reaction of the Latins whose deer was slain.

⁶⁵³ Rabel 1985, 317-25 argues that when the Trojans kill the cattle on the Harpies' island they act like "pirates taking booty" (319; note *praedam* 3.223), and that this recalls how their stay in Carthage begins with Aeneas' and Achates' "act of hunting in unfamiliar territory [that] appears to symbolize piratical invasion." Nethercut 1968, 94-95 links these two scenes with the *latro* who has speared the lion (=Turnus) in the simile that opens Book 12. See also Putnam 1998, 97ff.

⁶⁵⁴ For another example of propagandistic language first heard from Juno before passing to the Trojans' enemies, see the Book 8 Latin embassy's *victosque penates* (8.11 = 1.68; "from the mouth of Juno" [Eden 1975 *ad loc*]).

telum Phrygii praedonis, 11.484). Within the world of the *Aeneid* the sequence is a paradigm of how a propagandistic buzzword spreads through the population of one side of a war and becomes shorthand for a framing of its enemies: for the Latins to call Aeneas a *praedo* is to call him a thief and a pirate, but also to make him another Paris, woman-stealer and bringer of destruction to his own people.⁶⁵⁵ For the learned reader the false but already widespread attribution is the genesis of what is passed down to him by tradition as a variant.⁶⁵⁶

5.7 Characters Read Tradition

Several of these preceding scenes suggest that characters can preempt our reading by occupying the interpretative role before we readers have the chance to develop our own reaction. As Aeneas begins the celebration of the anniversary of his father's death, he hails his father's shade and mourns his death. A seven-times-enfolded snake crawls from the sanctuary, winds among the implements of sacrifice, and crawls away again (5.84-93). That the narrator says nothing about whether the snake appeared in response to Aeneas' words, or of what it might be a symbol or manifestation, is merely the habit of a suppressive narrator.⁶⁵⁷ More remarkable is the description of the response of Aeneas, who redoubles his devotion to sacrifice, *incertus geniumne loci famulumne parentis / esse putet* (5.95-6). Without the description of an interpreting character's reaction we would probably simply assume the snake's identity.⁶⁵⁸ But

⁶⁵⁵ 4.215ff; 7.321ff; 9.136ff; 10.79. For the equation of Aeneas and Paris from the characters' point of view, see Anderson 1957; for the process from the point of view of the reader, see Seo 2013.

⁶⁵⁶ For the genesis of another false story that leaks into the mortal world, see Juno's claim that it was Venus who protected Aeneas at Troy with a cloud (*proque viro nebulam et ventos obtendere inanis*, 10.82), which is soon repeated by Turnus (12.52-3).

⁶⁵⁷ The episode is mentioned as a permanent ambiguity by Feeney 1991, 184-7 (see n.573 above). This snake recalls the twin serpents in Book 2, concerning the interpretation of which the internal narrator Aeneas offered no guidance. For debates over the judgment of that episode see Horsfall 2008 *ad* 199-233.

⁶⁵⁸ Compare this episode to the rainstorm that follows Aeneas' prayer to Jupiter to save the burning ships in Sicily (5.693), without a narrator's note that the rain is Jupiter's intervention.

the character's reaction preempts the reader, draws attention to the uncertainty, and leaves no grounds on which to build a certain case concerning the question.

In Chapter 4 I discussed how each time we readers have a misdirected expectation reversed, we are prompted either to understand anew the denotation of earlier words or, if they were unauthorized, to reassess their truthfulness. Characters too hear words that create in them expectations of the future, and also react when their expectations are unfulfilled or reversed. By complaining that neither fellow-Trojan Helenus nor grim-prophecying Celaeno told him he would lose his father (*amitto Anchisen...nec vates Helenus, cum multa horrenda moneret / hos mihi praedixit luctus, non dira Celaeno*, 3.710-3), Aeneas positions himself as the victim of misdirection. For him Helenus' prophecy is the misdirecting source to which he attributes authority, and which misdirected by omission. Again, when Aeneas indignantly questions Apollo's prediction of Palinurus' fate, then accepts Palinurus' explanation of the hidden accuracy of the god's words, his reaction parallels those of the reader who at first finds a contradiction between an unexpected event and an earlier passage, then thinks back and understands authoritative words in a new light.

Just as characters may mimic readers when they are disappointed in their expectation of the future, so characters are again positioned like authors and readers of the *Aeneid* when they act as receivers of mythic tradition. Characters' ability to unravel the tangled threads of accounts of the past is essential to their decisions. W.S. Anderson argued that the Italians gravely misread their situation by conceiving of themselves and patterning themselves on the Greeks besieging

the Trojans. The movement of the plot gradually transforms the Italians into, or reveals them to be, the passive and defeated defenders of a doomed city.⁶⁵⁹

The name of “Dardanian” tugs in the tangle of Latinus’ memory on the loose end of a tale, qualified by him as the product of attenuated report, told by elders of a neighboring people (*atque equidem memini (fama est obscurior annis) / Auruncos ita ferre senes* 7.205-6). The idea that the Trojans are descendants of native Italians seems to encourage Latinus to offer hospitality, but would seem to discourage him from viewing them, as he soon does, as the *generi externi* required by omen and prophecy. In a similar way, accurate antiquarianism is essential when the Trojans, ordered to seek out their ancient mother (*antiquam exquirite matrem*, 3.96), are required to determine who is to be considered their ultimate ancestor. Anchises relies on his memory to build an argument in favor of Crete:

*maximus unde pater, si rite audita recordor,
Teucrus Rhoeteas primum est advectus in oras,
optavitque locum regno. nondum Ilium et arces
Pergameae steterant; habitabant vallibus imis.* (3.107-110)

When Anchises is later corrected, he connects the “Italy” that the Penates have just said will be the Trojans’ destination with the “Hesperia” and “Italy” he has heard from Cassandra (3.178-88).

But his original mistake is not to forget Cassandra only; it is to misremember the tradition.

Cruttwell senses the interpenetration of confusion by a character and confusion in the tradition:

“a perplexity of mind, both topographical and genealogical, reflecting that of ‘the memorials of the men of old’ (102); those classical mythographers...from whose variant traditions Virgil

⁶⁵⁹ Anderson 1957; see also Toll 1989, 107-18 (esp. 110-2).

conflated the following version.”⁶⁶⁰ However, Anchises’ mistake can be diagnosed more precisely. His argument for Crete is nearly a quotation of his son’s words in the *Iliad*:

εἰ δ’ ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι, ὄφρ’ ἐὺ εἰδῆς
ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασι:
Δάρδανον αὖ πρῶτον τέκετο νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς,
κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πω Ἴλιος ἰρή
ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
ἀλλ’ ἔθ’ ὑπωρείας ὄκκεον πολυπίδακος Ἴδης. (20.213-8)

In the *Aeneid*, in Aeneas’ account at least, Anchises remembers everything properly except for the point of the recollection, the name: Iliadic Aeneas’ “Δάρδανον” becomes Vergilian Anchises’ “Teucrus.” Vergil marks a character’s act of literary remembering with *si rite audita recorder*, what we now call an “Alexandrian footnote”;⁶⁶¹ but it is a misremembering of the crucial word, and it brings with it disaster. In the *Iliad* Aeneas delivers his Iliadic account of Dardania’s founding while exchanging taunts with Achilles. He tells it as knowledge already shared between the two, derived from a shared community of speakers exchanging the same stories (ἴδμεν δ’ ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας πρόκλυτ’ ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, 20.203-4). The Trojans in the *Aeneid* should know where they come from not because there is no other tradition by Vergil’s day — there is⁶⁶² — but because the authority for the tradition that wins out is Aeneas himself in the *Iliad*. The bodily wandering (*error*) about the Mediterranean is the outward correlative of the internal mistake (*error*) about the tradition. The juxtaposition of adjectives in the description of Anchises’ realization of his error (*seque novo veterum deceptum*

⁶⁶⁰ Cruttwell 1947, 42.

⁶⁶¹ For the term see Ross 1975; expanded in Hinds 1998. The act of misunderstanding the past is further remarked by *tum genitor veterum volvens monimenta virorum* (3.22): in some sense, then, the *monimenta* are not various mythographers but the misremembered lines of the *Iliad*.

⁶⁶² See Hardy 1996, 3 for the tradition that Teucrians were already settled when Dardanus arrived. Aeneas appears to endorse this tradition in his speech to Evander (*advehitur Teucros*, 8.136).

errore locorum, 3.181) mirrors the lesson of the episode: what is old is the true, Iliadic account; what is new is the misremembering of it.

5.8 Characters Play Poet

Aeneas takes on the role of the narrator for a sixth of the *Aeneid*. In this time he promotes the variant in which he leaves Troy over the variant in which he leaves as a traitor, or a Greek ally, or after negotiation with Greeks. At first we find him acting the role of an internal narrator of plausibly limited knowledge. He knows enough of what remains in the future from the point of view of each moment in his narrative that he can draw attention to irony, weave in foreshadowing, or interject emotionally. Nevertheless he adopts the limited knowledge of a historian rather than the insight of a Muse-inspired bard. Apparently unable to know for what reason Thymoetes advocated for the introduction of the horse into the city, he offers the alternative explanations of a historian (*siue dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant*, 2.34); unable to know what held Creusa back in Troy, he again offers alternatives (*heu misero coniunx fatone erepta Creusa / substitit, erravitne via seu lapsa resedit, / incertum;*, 2.738-40). In Book 3 he uses the distancing formula of the poetic narrator to frame mythic aetiologies, of which he makes himself the reporter rather than the endorser (*hinc sinus Herculei (si uera est fama) Tarenti / cernitur*, 3.551-2; *fama est Enceladi semustum fulmine corpus urgeri mole hac*, 3.578-9). As he slips into the poet's role of reporting tradition, he can also boast of his ability to leave behind verse as an immortal commemoration (*rem carmine signo*, of the inscription on Abas' shield [3.287]).

This is only one of several ways in which the characters perform a set of actions normally reserved for the narrator or the poet. In his work on memory in the *Aeneid*, Quint argues that

Vergil tries to make a new social or collective memory for Rome that requires a forgetting of the past and an orientation to the future. Quint argues that characters act as models for the Vergilian readers in this transformation:⁶⁶³

The action of Book 3 may comment upon and even allegorize the *Aeneid's* later strategy. There is an evident analogy to be drawn between the war-weary readers, the survivors of the civil wars, who are offered a fresh start in the new Augustan state... Much like the figure of Anchises, which reveals the benefits that a mythological father can confer in place of a living one, the Trojans' tourney back to their ancient homeland in Book 3 suggests the new sources of strength which the present can find in a past that it continually re-creates to serve its needs.

But the reworking of memory in the *Aeneid's* characters' minds is not their self-directed and self-directing response to the difficulties they encounter. As Seider points out, it is Aeneas who intervenes to shape the memory of his men and of those he meets.⁶⁶⁴ Earlier I discussed the inconsistency between the attribution of the prophecy of table-eating to Celaeno in Book 3 and to Anchises Book 7.⁶⁶⁵ Older readings often saw a mistake.⁶⁶⁶ More recently, Seider argues that the text is "marked" by Aeneas' insistence upon the act of remembrance (*nunc repeto...memento*), that Aeneas is intentionally forming⁶⁶⁷ an "oikotype," a shared, standardized social memory acceptable to the whole community. I add that, based on the evidence compiled in this thesis, we should not be surprised when a recounting character changes the agent responsible for an act (cf. the speeches discussed in Chapter 3) and makes an opportune modification of ambiguous words (cf. Latinus' renditions of oracular words [2.3.2.3]). If we conceive of Vergil trying to form a

⁶⁶³ Quint 1982, 36.

⁶⁶⁴ Seider 2013, 20-23 and *passim*; see also Fentress and Wickham, 2012. Ahl 2007 *ad* 7.122 emphasizes the difference in audience.

⁶⁶⁵ See 4.7.2 above.

⁶⁶⁶ See above, and add e.g. Sidgwick 1879 *ad loc*: "a curious slip"; Page 1900 *ad loc*: a "clear oversight." O'Hara 2007, 82 is alive to the possibilities but unsure about how far to go in our understanding of how conscious Aeneas is of what he is doing here, because the text is "not marked."

⁶⁶⁷ Seider 2013, 40-6; for the term "oikotype" see p. 23 with further bibliography.

new oikotype for the Roman reader, we see that he also exposes the workings of the process by showing his title character forming an oikotype for his internal audience. To my reader I leave the judgment of whether this thematization of the mechanism by which a new social memory is made leaves the Vergilian reader fully prepared to undergo a shaping of his own memory, or too conscious of the process to submit to it himself.

5.9 Narrator Plays Character

As the poem progresses the narrator slides into uncertainty, so far from omniscience that he confesses his own ignorance. The incredulity with which he ends the invocation of the Muse (*tantaene animis caelestibus irae?*, 1.11) is something of foreshadowing of this self-positioning. This question is answered, within the world of the poem at least, with a resounding “yes” throughout the rest of the work.. But questioning a theology or the interpretation of narrated events is different from questioning the narrated events themselves. The common distancing formulae *dicitur* (4.204-5) or *si credere dignum est* (6.173) can be anything from intertextual reference to a paradoxical mark of invention.⁶⁶⁸ There is a constant sense that the past is buried by the intervening weight of time, and that the tradition falters (*multi praeterea, quos fama obscura recondit*, 5.302). Through most of the poem obscurity can be overcome with the aid of the Muses, which must be renewed for a new beginning (7.37ff), for battles (9.525ff), and for catalogues (7.641ff; 10.163ff).⁶⁶⁹ In Book 9 the goddesses still answer to tell which god accomplished a deed, though now the distinction between their power and tradition (*fama*) is fading:

⁶⁶⁸ See notes 142 and 143 above.

⁶⁶⁹ Note too the request to the infernal gods for permission to hand down what the narrator has heard (*di, quibus imperium est animarum, umbraeque silentes / et Chaos et Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late, sit mihi fas audita loqui, sit numine vestro / pandere res alta terra et caligine mersas*, 6.264-7).

*quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris
avertit? tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis?
dicite: prisca fides facto, sed fama perennis.* (9.77-9)

Near the climax of the poem the narrator confesses his ignorance:

*ecce uiro stridens alis adlapsa sagitta est,
incertum qua pulsa manu, quo turbine adacta, 320
quis tantam Rutulis laudem, casusne deusne,
attulerit; pressa est insignis gloria facti,
nec sese Aeneae iactauit uulnere quisquam.* (12.319-23)

There is no tradition because no warrior stepped forward to claim credit for the deed; that is, no character stepped forward to start a tradition. The narrator is stripped of any report, even one to question, reduced to providing alternative explanations and appending an *incertum*. By the end the narrator so severely limits his authority that he is at a loss over which god he is to invoke to tell whether Jupiter willed war between those who will be Romans:

*quis mihi nunc tot acerba deus, quis carmine caedes
diversas obitumque ducum, quos aequore toto
inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros,
expediat? tanton placuit concurrere motu,
Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?* (12.500-4)

This time there is no Muse, and no answer.⁶⁷⁰

⁶⁷⁰ Hejduk 2009, 322 points out the metrical match between 1.11 and 12.503. Note also a final dislocation of authority, used of a detail Vergil invents: *fama est praecipitem, cum prima in proelia iunctos / conscendebat equos, patrio mucrone relicto, / dum trepidat, ferrum aurigae rapuisse Metisci* (12.735-7).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkin, N. "Vergilian Etymologizing: The Case of Acestes." *L'Antiquité Classique* 69 (2000): 205-207.
- Adler, Eve. *Vergil's Empire: Political Thought in the Aeneid*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.
- Ahl, Frederick and Roisman, Hanna. *The Odyssey Re-Formed*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Ahl, Frederick. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome." *American Journal of Philology* 105.2 (1984): 174-208.
- "Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative Structures in Latin Epic: An Essay." *Illinois Classical Studies* 14.1/2 (1989): 1-31.
- *Virgil: Aeneid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Anderson, W.S. "Vergil's Second Iliad." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 88 (1957): 17-30.
- Ash, Rhiannon. "Historical Battle Narratives and the Epic Tradition." In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, edited by D.S. Levene and D.P. Nelis, 253-274. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Austin, R.G. *Aeneid IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- *Aeneid II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- *Aeneid I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- *Aeneid VI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Badian, Ernst. *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Translated by Christine van Boheemen, 2nd ed. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1997.

- Balk, Christel. *Die Gestalt des Latinus in Vergils Aeneis*. Diss. Heidelberg, 1968.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- "Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*." In *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, edited by P. Hardie, 3.324-344. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Barrett, A.A. "Anna's Conduct in Aeneid 4." *Vergilius* 16 (1970): 21-25.
- Bassett, S.E. "The Inductions of the *Iiad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*." *Classical World* 27 (1934): 105-10.
- *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938.
- Battistoni, Filippo. "Rome, Kinship, and Diplomacy." In *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, edited by Claude Eilers, 73-98. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Bauman, Richard. *Lawyers in Roman Republican Politics: A Study of the Roman Jurists in Their Political Setting, 316-82 BC*. C.H. Beck: Munich, 1983.
- Beck, Bill. "Causas Memora: Epic Etiology and Vergil's Aeneid." *Vergilius* 62 (2016): 57-78.
- Bell, Andrew. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the *Aeneid*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999): 263-279.
- Berger, Adolf. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*. Reprint. Clark, NJ: The Lawbook Exchange, 2004.
- Berlin, Netta. "War and Remembrance: Aeneid 12.554-60 and Aeneas' Memory of Troy." *American Journal of Philology* 119.1 (1998): 11-41.
- Berres, Thomas. *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*. Franz Steiner Verlag: Wiesbaden, 1982.
- Binder, G. *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis*. Meisenheim am Glan, 1971.
- Block, E. *The Effects of Divine Manifestation on the Reader's Perspective in Vergil's "Aeneid."* New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Bömer, F. "Studien zum VIII Buch der Aeneis." *Rheinisches Museum* 92 (1944): 319-69.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961.

- Boyd, Barbara Weiden. "Non Enarrabile Textum: Ecphrastic Trespass and Narrative Ambiguity in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 41 (1995): 71-90.
- Bösing, Laurenz. "Zur Bedeutung von 'renasci' in der Antike." *Museum Helveticum* 25.3 (1968): 145-78.
- Braccesi, Lorenzo. "Teucris Mixtisque Sicani: Sicani, Siculi, ed Elimi nella Tradizione Virgiliana." *Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'Area Elima: Atti 1* (1992): 129-137.
- Brent, Hannah. "Manufacturing Descent: Virgil's Genealogical Engineering." *Arethusa* 37.2 (2004): 141-164.
- Broman, Eva. "Narratological Focalization Models — a Critical Survey." In *Essays on Fiction and Perspective*, edited by Goran Rossholm, 57-90. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Buchheit, Vinzenz. *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genes Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristoteles*. Munich: Hueber, 1960.
- Buckland, W.W. *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian*. 2nd. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.
- Byre, Calvin. *A Reading of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica: The Poetics of Uncertainty*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 2002.
- Cairns, Francis. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Casali, Sergio. "Facta Impia." *Classical Journal* 49.1 (1999): 203-11.
- . "The Development of the Aeneas Legend." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael Putnam, 37-51. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- Caviglia, F. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. s.v. "Virbio." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987.
- Clark, W.P. "The Duration of the Action in Aeneid IV." *Classical Journal* 27 (1932): 497-504.
- Clausen, Wendell. *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1992.
- Coleman, R.G. "The Gods in the *Aeneid*." *Greece & Rome* 29 (1982): 143-68.
- Commager, Steele. "Fateful Words: Some Conversations in Aeneid 4." *Arethusa* 14 (1981): 101-14.

Conington, John. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. The works of Virgil, with a Commentary by John Conington*. London: Whittaker and Co., 1876.

Conrads, F. *Quaestiones Vergilianae*. Trier, 1863.

Conte, G.B. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Vergil and Other Latin Poets*. Translated by C.P. Segal. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

——— *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Vergilian Epic*. Edited by S.J. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Cowan, Robert. "On the Weak King according to Vergil: Aeolus, Latinus, and Political Allegoresis in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 61 (2015): 97-124.

Crump, M.M. *Growth of the Aeneid: A Study of the Stages of Composition as Revealed by the Evidences of Incompletion*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1920.

Crutwell, Robert. *Virgil's Mind at Work: An Analysis of the Symbolism of the Aeneid*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Literary in Theory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Cuypers, M.P. "Apollonius of Rhodes." In *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, edited by Irene J.F. de Jong, Rene Nünlist, and Angus Bowie. Brill: Leiden, 2004.

Dachs, H. *Die lysis ek tou prosōpou : ein exegetischer und kritischer Grundsatz Aristarchs und seine Neuanwendung auf Ilias und Odyssee*. Erlanger, 1913.

D'Anna, Giovanni. *Il Problema della Composizione dell'Eneide*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1957.

de Jong, Irene. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: Grüner, 1987.

——— *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

de Vasconcellos, Paolo. "A Sound Play on Aeneas' Name in the *Aeneid*: A Brief Note on VII.69." *Vergilius* 61 (2015): 125-9.

Della Corte, Francesco. *La Mappa dell'Eneide*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1972.

de Souza, Philip. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

DeWitt, N. "The Treatment of Time in the Aeneid." *Classical Journal* 5.7 (1910): 310-16.

Dietrich, B.C. "Views of Homeric Gods and Religion." *Numen* 26.2 (1979): 129-51.

Dindorf, W. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1855 (Reprinted in Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1962).

Dolezel, Lubomir. "Truth and Authenticity in Narrative." *Poetics Today* 1.3 (1980): 7-25.

——— *Heterocosmica: Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Dougherty, Carol. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Duckworth, G.E. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonios, and Vergil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933.

Due, O.S. *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Gyldendal: Copenhagen, 1974.

Dyson, Julia. "Septima Aestas: The Puzzle of Aen. 1.755-6 and 5.626." *Classical World* 90.1 (1996): 41-3.

——— *King of the Wood: The Sacrificial Victor in Virgil's Aeneid*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.

Emlyn-Jones, Chris. "The Homeric Gods: Poetry, Belief, and Authority." In *Homer: Readings and Images*, edited by C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis, 49-64. London: Duckworth, 1992.

Eden, P.T. *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*. Brill: Leiden, 1975.

Edgeworth, R.J. "The Silence of Vergil and the End of the Aeneid." Edited by Rex Stem. *Vergilius* 51 (2005): 3-11.

Eidinow, J.S.C. "Dido, Aeneas, and Iulus: Heirship and Obligation in *Aeneid* 4." *Classical Quarterly* 53.1 (2003): 260-7.

- Erbse, H. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem: Scholia Vetera*. Vols. 1-5. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971-1977.
- *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Erskine, Andrew. *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Fantham, Elaine. "Fighting Words: Turnus at Bay in the Latin Council (*Aeneid* 11.234-446)." *American Journal of Philology*, 120.1 (1999): 259-80.
- Feder, L. "Vergil's Tragic Theme." *Classical Journal* 49 (1953-4): 197-209.
- Feeney, D.C. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983): 204-19.
- "The Reconciliations of Juno." *Classical Quarterly* 34.1 (1984): 179-94.
- *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Fentress, J. and Wickham, C. *Social Memory: New Perspectives on the Past*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2012.
- Fletcher, F.B. "Italian Diomedes." *American Journal of Philology* 127.2 (2006): 219-59.
- Fontaine, Michael. "Freudian Bullseyes in Classical Perspective: The Psycholinguistics of Guilt in Virgil's *Aeneid*." In *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*, edited by Philip Mitsis and Ioannis Ziogas, 131-150. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.
- Fordyce, C.J. *Vergil: Aeneid VII-VIII*. Reprint. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1991.
- Forcellini, Egidio. *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*. Padua, 1771.
- Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Edward Arnold, 1958.
- Fowler, Don. "Deviant Focalization in the *Aeneid*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 216 (1990), 42-63.
- "Virgilian Narrative: Story-Telling." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 259-270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Fraccaroli, Giuseppe. *L'Irrazionale nella Letteratura*. Fratelli Bocca: Turin, 1903.
- Fragoulaki, Maria. *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Fratantuono, Lee. *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007.
- Fredricksmeyer, E.A. "On the Opening of the Aeneid." *Vergilius* 30 (1984): 10-19.
- Garbugino, G. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. s.v. "Halaeso." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1984.
- Galinsky, Karl. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- "Troiae qui primus ab oris." *Gymnasium* 81 (1974): 182-200.
- Genette, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by J.E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Gercke, A. *Die Entstehung Der Aeneis*. Berlin, 1913.
- Gibson, Roy K. "Aeneas as hospes in Vergil, Aeneid 1 and 4." *Classical Quarterly* 49.1 (1999): 184-202.
- Goldschmidt, Nora. *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Goody, Esther. *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interactions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Gossrau, G. *Publii Vergilii Maronis Aeneis*. Quedlinburg, 1876.
- Gotoff, H.C. "The Transformation of Mezentius." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114 (1984): 191-218.
- Gransden, K.W. *Vergil: Aeneid: Book VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Griffith, M. "What Did Aeneas Look Like?" *Classical Philology* 80.4 (1985): 309-319.
- Gruen, Erich. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Reprint in One Volume. University of California Press: Berkeley, 1986.

- Günther, J and Luckmann. "Asymmetries of Knowledge in Intercultural Communication: The Relevance of Cultural Repertoires of Communicative Genres." In *Culture in Communication : Analyses of Intercultural Situations*, edited by A. Di Luzio, S. Günther, and F. Orletti, 295-334. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 2001.
- Guzzo, Maria. "Phoenician and Punic in Sicily." In *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*, edited by O. Tribulato, 115-131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Halter, T. "Vergils Aeneis — Proömium. Eine Deutung." *Wiener Studien* 77 (1964): 78-108.
- Hanford, Timothy. *Senecan Tragedy and Virgil's Aeneid: Repetition and Reversal*. CUNY Dissertation, 2014 (available at http://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/427).
- Harden, Sarah and Adrian Kelly. "Proemic Convention and Character Construction in Early Greek Epic." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 107 (2013): 1-34.
- Hardie, Philip. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- *Virgil: Aeneid: Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- "Fame and Defamation in the *Aeneid*." in *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, edited by H.P. Stahl. London: Duckworth, 1998.
- *Rumour and Renown: Representations of "Fama" in Western Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Hardy, Clara Shaw. "Antiqua Mater: Misreading Gender in *Aeneid* 3.84-191" *Classical Journal* 92.1 (1996): 1-8.
- Harrison, E.L. "The Structure of the Aeneid: Observations on the Link Between the Books." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 31.1 (1980): 359-93.
- "The Aeneid and Carthage." In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by T. Woodman and D. West., 95-115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Harrison, S.J. "Picturing the Future: The Proleptic Ekphrasis from Homer to Vergil." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, edited by S.J. Harrison, 70-92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- *Aeneid 10*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Heinze, Richard. *Virgil's Epic Technique*. Translated by Hazel and David Harvey and Fred Robertson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Hejduk, Julia. "Jupiter's Aeneid: Fama and Imperium." *Classical Antiquity* 28.2 (2009): 279-327.

Hellegouarc'h, J. *Le vocabulaire Latin des relations et des partis politiques*. Paris, 1963.

Hershkowitz, Debra. *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Hexter, Ralph. "Sidonian Dido." In *Innovations of Antiquity*, edited by R. Hexter and D. Selden, 332-384. London: Routledge, 1992.

——— "On First Looking into Vergil's Homer." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, 26-36, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael Putnam, 37-51. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hirst, Gertrude. "An Attempt to Date the Composition of Aeneid VII." *Classical Quarterly* 10.2 (1916): 87-96.

Holland, L.A. "Place Names and Heroes in the Aeneid." *American Journal of Philology* 56 (1935): 202-215.

Hollis, A.S. "Hellenistic Colouring in Vergil's Aeneid." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94 (1992): 269-285.

Horsfall, Nicholas. "Aeneas the Colonist." *Vergilius* 35 (1989): 8-27.

——— "Virgil and the Poetry of Explanations." *Greece & Rome* 38 (1991): 203-11.

——— *Virgilio: L'Epopea in Alambicco*. Naples: Ligouri, 1991.

——— *Vergil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

——— *Vergil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

——— *Vergil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

——— *Vergil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

——— *Vergil, Aeneid 6: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Huebeck, Alfred and Arie Hoekstra. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1989.
- Hunt, J.W. *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Vergil's Aeneid*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.
- Hunter, Richard. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *New Literary History* 3 (1971): 279-99.
- . *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Jacobson, Howard. *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- James, Sharon. "Establishing Rome with the Sword: Condere in the Aeneid." *American Journal of Philology* 116 (1995): 623-637.
- Jenkyns, Richard. *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Johnson, W.R. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Johnston, Douglas M. *The International Law of Fisheries: A Framework for Policy-Oriented Inquiries*. New Haven: New Haven Press, 1987.
- Jones, C.P. "Graia Pandetur ab Urbe." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97 (1995): 233-41.
- . *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Joseph, Timothy. *Tacitus the Epic Successor: Virgil, Lucan, and the Narrative of Civil War in the Histories*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kafalenos, Emma. "Not (Yet) Knowing: Epistemological Effects of Deferred and Suppressed Information in Narrative." In *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*, edited by David Herman, 33-65. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Kehoe, Patrick. "Was Book 5 Once in a Different Place in the Aeneid?" *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 246-263.

- Keith, Arthur. "Vergil's Allegory of Fama." *Classical Journal* 16.5 (1921): 298-301.
- Kennedy, D.F. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by A. Powell, 26-58. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 1998.
- Kettner, Gustav. "Das funfte Buch der Aeneide," *Sokrates:Zeitschrift fur das Gymnasialwesen* 3.3 (1879): 641-53.
- Kienast, Dietmar. "Rom und die Venus vom Eryx." *Hermes* 93.4 (1965): 478-489.
- King, K.C. "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's Aeneid." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 9 (1982) 31-57.
- Kinsey, T.E. "Virgil, Aeneid VI 88-90." *Maia* 31 (1979): 267.
- Klingner, F. *Virgil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis*. Zurich-Stuttgart, 1967.
- Knauer, G.N. *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Knox, Peter. *Ovid's Heroides: Select Epistles*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Kullmann, Wolfgang. "Gods and Men in the Iliad and the Odyssey." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 89 (1985): 1-23.
- Kvicala, Johann. *Neue Beitrage zur Erklarung der Aeneis*. Prague: P. Tempsky, 1881.
- Laird, Andrew. *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Lakoff, George. *Don't Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2004.
- Lansing, Richard. "Vergil's Homage to Homer in Aeneid 1.1-7." *Vergilius* 54 (2008): 3-8.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. Franz Steiner Verlag: Stuttgart, 1973.
- Leach, E.W. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican Augustan Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

- Lloyd, R.B. "The Character of Anchises in the Aeneid." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 88 (1957): 44-55.
- Lohmann, D. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Mack, S. *Patterns of Time in Vergil*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1978.
- Macleod, C.W. *Homer: Iiad XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Mandra, Raymond. *The Time Element in the Aeneid of Vergil: An Investigation*. Bayard Press, 1934.
- Manganaro, G. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, Volume 1. s.v. "Aeste." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1984.
- Marková, Ivana and Klaus Foppa. *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. Prentice Hall, 1991.
- Martin, Josef. *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode*. Munich: Beck, 1974.
- Martinez-Bonati, Felix. "Die logische Struktur der Dichtung." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 47 (1973): 185-200.
- Martindale, Charles. "Descent into Hell: Reading Ambiguity, or Vergil and the Critics." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 21 (1993): 111-50.
- Meijering, Roos. *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*. Groningen: Forsten, 1987.
- Meinel, Rudolf. *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον: Ein Grundsatz der Homerklärung Aristarchs*. Ansbach, 1915.
- Michalopoulos, A. "The Intertextual Fate of a Great Homeric Hero: Diomedes in Vergil (*Aen.* 11.252-93) and Ovid (*Rem.* 151-67)." *Acta antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 43 (2003): 77-86.
- Miles, Richard. "Hannibal and Propaganda." In *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, edited by Dexter Hoyos, 260-279. Oxford: Blackwell, 2011.

Monti, R.C. *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid: Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Moorton, R.F. "The Innocence of Italy in Vergil's Aeneid." *American Journal of Philology* 110 (1989): 105-130.

Morrison, J.V. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Moskalew, Walter. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Most, Glenn. "Memory and Forgetting in the Aeneid." *Vergilius* 47 (2001): 148-170.

Muecke, F. "Foreshadowing and Dramatic Irony in the Story of Dido." *American Journal of Philology* 104 (1983): 134-55.

Muse, Kevin. "'Don't Dally in This Valley': Wordplay in *Odyssey* 15.10 and *Aeneid* 4.271." *Classical Quarterly* 55.2 (2005): 646-649.

Musti, D. "Una citta simile a Troia." *Arch. Class* 33 (1981): 1-26.

Nagler, Michael. "Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem." *Classical Antiquity* 9.2 (1990): 335-356.

Nakata, S.L. "Egrederere O quicumque es: Genealogical Opportunism and Trojan Identity in the *Aeneid*." *Phoenix* 66.3 (2012): 335-63.

Nehrkorn, H. "A Homeric Episode in Vergil's Aeneid." *American Journal of Philology* 92 (1971): 566-84.

Nelis, Damien. *Vergil's Aeneid and The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 2001.

Nethercut, W. "Invasion in the *Aeneid*." *Greece & Rome* 15.1 (1968), 82-95.

——— "The Imagery of the *Aeneid*." *Classical Journal* 67 (1971-1972): 123-43.

Newman, J.K. *Troy's Children: Lost Generations in Virgil's Aeneid*. Hildesheim: Olms, 2005.

Nisbet, R.G.M. "Aeneas Imperator: Roman Generalship in an Epic Context." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's "Aeneid,"* edited by S.J. Harrison, 378-389. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Noack, F. "Die Erste Aeneis Vergils." *Hermes* 27 (1892): 407-45.

- Noonan, J.D. "Daunus/Faunus in Aeneid 12." *Classical Antiquity* 12.1 (1993): 111-25.
- Norden, E.P. *Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*. 5th ed. Stuttgart, 1970.
- "Virgil's *Aeneid* in the Light of Its Own Time." Translated by H. Harvey. In *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, edited by P. Hardie, 3.114-172. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Nünlist, Rene. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- O'Hara, J. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- "Virgil's Style." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 241-. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- *Aeneid 4*. Newburyport, MA: Focus, 2011.
- Olsen, Barbara K. *Authorial Divinity in the Twentieth Century*. Lewiston, PA. Associated University Press, 1997.
- Olson, S. Douglas. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Opfelt, I. *Die lateinische Schimpfwörter und verwandete sprachliche Erscheinungen. Eine Typologie*. Heidelberg, 1965.
- Orlin, Eric. *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Otis, Brooks. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Pallotti, G. "External Appropriations as a Strategy for Participating in Intercultural Multiparty Conversations."
- Palmer, R.E.A. *Rome and Carthage at Peace*. Steiner: Stuttgart, 1997.

Papanghelis, Theodore D. 1999. "Relegens errata litora: Virgil's Reflexive 'Odyssey'." In *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, ed. by J. N. Kazazis & A. Rengakos, 275-90. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag.

Papaioannou, Sophia. "Vergilian Diomedes Revisited: The Re-Evaluation of the 'Iliad.'" *Mnemosyne* 4.53.2 (2000): 193-217.

——— "Founder, Civilizer and Leader: Vergil's Evander and His Role in the Origins of Rome." *Mnemosyne* 4.56.6 (2003): 680-702.

Parry, Adam. "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Arion* 2.4 (1963): 66-80.

Patterson, Lee. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.

Pease, A.S. "Notes on the Delphic Oracle and Greek Colonization." *Classical Philology* 12.1 (1917): 1-20.

——— *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos: Liber Quartus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Pelliccia, Hayden. *Homer Encyclopedia*. s.v. "double motivation." Edited by Margalit Finkleberg. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Perkell, Christine. *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.

Petrini, Mark. *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Plöbst, Walter. *Die Auxesis (Amplificatio): Studien zur ihrer Entwicklung und Anwendung*. Munich: Wolf, 1911.

Pöschl, Viktor. *Die Dichtkunst Virgils. Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Rohrer: Wiesbaden 1950.

Potter, F.H. "How Long was Aeneas in Carthage?" *Classical Journal* 21.8 (1926): 615-624.

Powell, Anton. *Virgil the Partisan: A Study in the Reintegration of the Classics*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2008.

- Putnam, Michael. "Daedalus, Virgil, and the End of Art." *American Journal of Philology* 108.2 (1987): 173-198.
- "Possessiveness, Sexuality, and Heroism in the *Aeneid*." In *Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence*, edited by M. Putnam. 27-49. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Vergil's Aeneid*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011.
- Quinn, Kenneth. "Septima Aestas." *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 128-9.
- *Vergil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968.
- Quint, David. "Painful Memories: Aeneid 3 and the Problem of the Past." *Classical Journal* 78.1 (1982): 30-38.
- "Repetition and Ideology in the Aeneid." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 23 (1989): 9-54.
- Race, William. "How Greek Poems Begin." *Yale Classical Studies* 29 (1992): 13-38.
- Rabel, Robert. "The Harpies in the *Aeneid*." *Classical Journal* 80.4 (1985): 317-325.
- Reckford, Kenneth J. "Latent Tragedy in Aeneid VII, 1-285." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 82.3 (1961): 252-269.
- Redfield, James. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- "The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art." *Classical Philology* 74.2 (1979), 95-110.
- Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Reed, J.D. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- "Vergil's Roman." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael Putnam, 66-79. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.

- Rehm, Bernhard. *Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in Vergils Aeneis. Philologus Supplementband 24.2*. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932.
- Richardson, N.J. "Literary criticism in the exegetical scholia to the *Iliad*." In *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism*, edited by Andrew Laird, 176-210. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Richardson, Scott. "Truth in the Tales of the *Odyssey*." *Mnemosyne* 49 (1996): 393-402.
- . "The Devious Narrator of the 'Odyssey,'" *Classical Journal* 101.4 (2006): 337-59.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Routledge, 1983.
- Ross, David. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1975.
- Rossi, Andreola. *Contexts of War: Manipulation of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Rizzo, F.P. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, Volume 3. s.v. "Lilibeo." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987.
- . *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. s.v. "Palico." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1987.
- Rodman, Jeff. "Juno and the Symptom." In *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self*, edited by Vanda Zajko and Ellen O'Gorman, 133-46. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Rudd, Niall. *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Russell, Amy. *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Russi, A. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. s.v. "Dauno." Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1984.
- Rütten, Felix. *De Vergilii Studiis Apollonianis*. Diss. Munich, 1912.
- Satterfield, Briad. "The Beginning of the 'Iliad': The 'Contradictions' of the Proem and the Burial of Hektor." *Mnemosyne* 64.1 (2011): 1-20.
- Schenk, P. *Die Gestalt des Turnus in Vergils Aeneis*. Königstein: Anton Haig Verlag, 1984.

- Schilling, R. *La religion romaine de Venus*. Paris: Boccard, 1954.
- Schlunk, R.R. *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974.
- Schmit-Neuerburg, Tilman. *Vergils Aeneis und die antike Homerexegese: Untersuchungen zum Einfluss ethischer und kritischer Homerrezeption auf imitatio und aemulatio Vergils*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Schork, R.J. "The Finale Simile in the Aeneid: Roman and Rutulian Ramparts." *American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986): 260-70.
- Schroder, W.A. *Marcus Portius Cato: Das erste Buch der Origines*. Meisenheim, 1972.
- Schuetz, Alfred. "The Stranger: An Essay in Social Philosophy." *American Journal of Sociology* 49.6 (1944): 499-507.
- Seider, Aaron. *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: Creating the Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Seo, J. Mira. *Exemplary Traits: Reading Characterization in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Sidgwick, A. *The Aeneid of Vergil: Book VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1879.
- Skutsch, Otto. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Solodow, Joseph. *The Latin Particle Quidem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Sonnenschein, E.A. "Sabellus: Sabine or Samnite?" *Classical Review* 11.7 (1897): 339-40.
- Stabryla, Stanislaw. *Latin Tragedy in Virgil's Poetry*. Wroclaw: 1970.
- Stanley, Keith. "Irony and Foreshadowing in Aeneid I.362." *American Journal of Philology* (1965): 267-77.
- Stark, J.H. "Fides Aeneia: The Transference of Punic Stereotypes in the Aeneid." *Classical Journal* 94.3 (1999): 255-283.
- Starr, R.J. "Silvia's Deer (Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.479-502): Game Parks and Roman Law." *American Journal of Philology* 113.3 (1992): 435-9.

Sternberg, Meir. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Stewart, D.J. "Sunt Lacrimae Rerum." *Classical Journal* 67.2 (1971-2): 116-122.

Suerbaum, Werner. "AENEAS ZWISCHEN TROJA UND ROM: Zur Funktion der Genealogie und der Ethnographie." *Poetica* 1 (1967): 176-204.

Tarrant, Richard. *Virgil: Aeneid: Book XII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Tatum, J. "Allusion and Interpretation in *Aeneid* 6.440-76." *American Journal of Philology* 105.4 (1984): 434-52.

Thomas, Richard. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

——— "Torn Between Jupiter and Saturn: Ideology, Rhetoric and Culture Wars in the *Aeneid*." *Classical Journal* 100.2 (2005): 121-47.

Tod, M.N. *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *Poétique de la prose*. Editions du Seuil: Paris, 1971.

Toll, Katherine. "What's Love Got to Do With It? The Invitation of Erato, and Patriotism in the 'Aeneid.'" *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series 33.3 (1989): 107-18.

——— "Making Roman-Ness and the *Aeneid*." *Classical Antiquity* 16.1 (1997): 34-56.

Townshend, James R. "Stop Me If You've Heard This One: Faux Alexandrian Footnotes in Vergil." *Vergilius* 61 (2015): 77-96.

Traill, D.A. "Boxers and Generals at Mount Eryx." *American Journal of Philology* 122.3 (2001): 405-13.

Van Groningen, B.A. "The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen* 9.8 (1946): 279-94.

von Albrecht, Michael. "Die Kunst der Vorbereitung im Aeneis Prooemium." In *Antidosis: A Festschrift für Walther Kraus*, edited by Rudolf Hanslik, Albin Lesky, and Hans Schwabl, 7-20. Böhlau: Vienna, 1972.

Walcot, P. "Odysseus and the Art of Lying." In *Homer: Readings and Images*, edited by C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis, 49-64. London: Duckworth, 1992.

- Walsh, Thomas. "Odyssey 1.6-9: A Little More than Kine." *Mnemosyne* 48.4 (1995), 385-410.
- Warde Fowler, William. *Aeneas at the Site of Rome: Observations on the Eighth Book of the Aeneid*. Oxford, 1918.
- Webber, Alice. "The Hero Tells His Name: Formula and Variation in the Phaeacian Episode of the Odyssey." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119 (1989): 1-13.
- West, Stephanie, Alfred Heubeck, and J.B. Hainsworth. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume 1: Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Wharton, D. "Sunt Lacrimae Rerum: An Exploration in Meaning." *Classical Journal* 103.3 (2008): 259-79.
- Wheeler, Graham. "Sing, Muse...: The Introit from Homer to Apollonius." *Classical Quarterly* 52.1 (2002): 33-49.
- *The Death of Turnus: Observations on the Twelfth Book of the Aeneid*. Blackwell: Oxford, 1927.
- Wimmel, W. "Review of M. Monaco, *Il libro dei ludi* (Palermo, 1957)." *Gnomon* 33 (1961): 47-54.
- Wiesen, David S. "The Pessimism of the Eight Aeneid." *Latomus* 32.4 (1973): 737-65.
- Wigodsky, Michael. *Vergil and Early Latin Epic*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1972.
- Williams, Gordon. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Williams, R.D. "The Function and Structure of Virgil's Catalogue in Aeneid 7" *Classical Quarterly* 11.2 (1961): 146-53.
- *Aeneid: Book I-VI*. Reprint. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.
- Wills, Jeffrey. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Wilson, C.H. "Jupiter and the Fates in the Aeneid," *Classical Quarterly* 29.2 (1979): 361-71.
- Wright, John. "The Fabula of the Book of Chronicles." In *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Wofford, Susanne Lindgren. *The Choice of Achilles: The Ideology of Figure in the Epic*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Ziegler, K.H. von. "Das Völkerrecht der römischen Republik." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 1.2 (1972): 68-114.