5-2015

City-Foundation in Vergil's Aeneid

David Harris
Trinity University, dharris4@trinity.edu

City-Foundation in Vergil's *Aeneid*

David Harris

A DEPARTMENT HONORS THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT TRINITY UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION WITH
DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

April 16, 2015

_____ _____

Dr. Timothy O'Sullivan, Thesis Advisor Dr. Corinne Pache, Department Chair

_____

Sheryl Tynes, AVPAA

Student Agreement

I grant Trinity University (“Institution”), my academic department (“Department”), and the Texas Digital Library ("TDL") the non-exclusive rights to copy, display, perform, distribute and publish the content I submit to this repository (hereafter called "Work") and to make the Work available in any format in perpetuity as part of a TDL, Institution or Department repository communication or distribution effort.

I understand that once the Work is submitted, a bibliographic citation to the Work can remain visible in perpetuity, even if the Work is updated or removed.

I understand that the Work's copyright owner(s) will continue to own copyright outside these non-exclusive granted rights.

I warrant that:

1) I am the copyright owner of the Work, or
2) I am one of the copyright owners and have permission from the other owners to submit the Work, or
3) My Institution or Department is the copyright owner and I have permission to submit the Work, or
4) Another party is the copyright owner and I have permission to submit the Work.

Based on this, I further warrant to my knowledge:

1) The Work does not infringe any copyright, patent, or trade secrets of any third party,
2) The Work does not contain any libelous matter, nor invade the privacy of any person or third party, and
3) That no right in the Work has been sold, mortgaged, or otherwise disposed of, and is free from all claims.

I agree to hold TDL, Institution, Department, and their agents harmless for any liability arising from any breach of the above warranties or any claim of intellectual property infringement arising from the exercise of these non-exclusive granted rights.”

I choose the following option for sharing my thesis (required):

[x] Open Access (full-text discoverable via search engines)
[ ] Restricted to campus viewing only (allow access only on the Trinity University campus via digitalcommons.trinity.edu)

I choose to append the following Creative Commons license (optional):

[x] This thesis is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which allows some noncommercial copying and distribution of the thesis, given proper attribution. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ or send a letter to Creative Commons, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, California 94305, USA.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus
Dardaniae: fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens
gloria Teucrorum; ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos
transtulit; incensa Danai dominantur in urbe.
Aeneid 2.324-7

"The final day and the inescapable time have come for Troy; we *were* Trojans, this *was* Troy and the great glory of the Trojans. Fierce Jupiter has handed over all to the Argives. The Greeks hold dominion in the burning city."[1]

Panthus speaks these words to Aeneas in Troy in response to his question as to what defensive position they might take. On Aeneas' part, the question indicates a hope, however naïve, that the city might still be saved. He gathers his comrades, not yet grasping the extent of their situation, seeking to rally a defense. Panthus' reply expresses that he believes any such effort to be hopeless, the city's destruction now to be unavoidable (324, *ineluctabile*). He says quite a bit more than this, however. With the city soon to be taken by the Greeks, he laments, "we have been Trojans, this has been Troy" (325: *fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium*). The perfect tense of *fuimus…fuit* expresses the idea of "have been" in the sense of "are no longer." To Panthus, the loss of Troy (not just in the city's destruction, but also in its becoming essentially a Greek possession now that the Greeks have taken it; 326-7: *ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos / transtulit; incensa Danai dominantur in urbe*) means that now there no longer *is* a Troy, and consequently there can no longer be Trojans. For the Trojans, to lose their city means to lose that by which they identified themselves and thus also to lose their identity as a collective. Panthus, having recognized the inevitability of their loss of Troy, has already yielded to the fact that they will soon have to relinquish their Trojan identity. Aeneas, still hopeful, if not for long, that Troy can be saved, is preparing to fight to preserve their Trojan identity from being extinguished. This is

[1] All translations throughout are my own unless otherwise noted.

the nature of the city as a marker of boundaries: it distinguishes between those who are a part of it, those who are literally and spatially within it, and those who are alien to it, those without it. As long as the Greeks, who are hostile foreigners, remained outside the walls of Troy, Trojan identity was safe. Yet now that the Greeks have breached the walls of the city and have come within the boundary, Trojan identity is now under threat and soon to be lost altogether.[2]

Troy in Book 2 of the *Aeneid* is an example of a city being "un-founded." Throughout the poem, we see far more examples of cities being founded, the underlying supposition being that Rome will eventually be founded as a result of Aeneas' efforts. Just as a Troy's destruction leads to the death of Trojan identity, I argue, the subsequent foundation of cities by these ex-Trojans constitutes an attempt to reestablish identity in a more permanent form. Furthermore, since the ultimate goal of these city-foundation exercises will be the foundation of Rome, it seems that what the Trojans slowly approach in their efforts to found a city is a quintessentially Roman identity. It will be seen over the course of the poem that all of the Trojans' attempts to settle a city are unsuccessful, and I will argue that the reason that these failures are important is that the identity upon which each city is founded (including virtues, *mores*, cultural emphasis, and so on) falls short of or is incompatible with a truly Roman identity. By the poem's end, Vergil will have provided his audience with a sketch of what it means to be a Roman, and many of the features of this sketch are revealed in passages of or related to city-foundation. The act of founding a city, it turns out, is just as much about establishing a moral and identity-foundation as it is about the physical building process. In order for this identity transference to take place, the Trojans must attempt cities, fail, and subsequently reject them. This process is a necessary chain of events

[2] There is evidence that the Romans thought similarly about the relation between city and cultural identity. Citing Livy 5.53.7, Catharine Edwards (1996), 47 comments, "Romanness here is presented not as a nebulous, abstract quality but as concretely related to a particular place and imperilled by absence from that place." So too with Troy and the Trojans. They are not merely absent from Troy, there is no more Troy from which to be absent!

linking Rome to Troy, each link in the chain demonstrating that "*Troia capta* is a necessary preliminary to *Roma condita*."[3] Finally, it should be noted that Vergil's establishment of a Roman identity within the *Aeneid* ought not be taken purely as optimism or panegyric, but as an attempt to reassert and define Roman identity at a time in Roman history when the future looked most uncertain. One does not overlook the Romans' troubles in history any more than the Trojans' in the poem, but retains simultaneously a sense of realism and an air of hopefulness. In this, a parallel can be seen drawn between Trojan and Roman.[4]

[3] Edwards (1996) 51.

[4] I am indebted and most grateful to my thesis advisor and mentor Dr. Tim O'Sullivan, who remained supportive and helpful as I wrote this thesis, never failing to offer a useful comment, critique, or food for thought as we discussed my thesis. Without his guidance, this final product would have been far less than it is.

Aeneid 3

The Trojans' wanderings in Book 3 of the *Aeneid* form the crux of the Odyssean half of the epic, wherein their flight away from the fallen Troy constitutes progress towards a new, future identity. The failed settlements of Book 3 threaten a continuous reappearance of the past, a failure to move on from a lost identity. The ability to move on from the past identity is essential to establishing and defining what it is to obtain a quintessentially Roman identity. The *Aeneid* itself comes at a point in Roman history when Rome itself, and what it means to be a Roman, is being redefined and reconstructed. As David Quint notes, the paradox of Augustan ideology is at the forefront of the *Aeneid*'s discussion of the reconstruction of cultural identity: the Trojans, as well as the Romans, must forget about the past and their past identity in order to pave the way for the construction of a new future and a new identity, but at the same time to remember the past is absolutely necessary if they are to know *how* (or how not) to construct the future.[5] Indeed, there is an ambiguity in Augustan Rome as to how one ought to remember the past. Julius Caesar, for example, ought not to be recalled by the Romans as the destroyer of senatorial authority, enemy of republican rule and bringer of civil war, but he is indispensable in his deified form as the source of Augustus' authority and guide to his adoptive heir.[6] This question of remembrance, however they decide to go about answering it, has an influence on the way Augustus chooses to reconstruct his Rome.

It is possible also to think about this struggle and this contradiction via the metaphor of city-foundation. A city, Troy, has been destroyed. Its destruction is the *sine qua non* for the foundation of a new city around which the Trojans are to construct a new identity. They are now Trojans in name only, for, to them, their identity as members of a culture tied intimately with a

[5] Quint 52
[6] See Quint, 61-2.

ruling city is contingent upon that city's continued existence. The Trojan Panthus confirms this during the sack of Troy in Book 2. "We *were* Trojans," he says, "this *was* Troy," so declaring the end of their city and their identity along with it (2.325: *fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium*). This loss of identity is reinforced in the description of the beheaded Priam as a *sine nomine corpus* (2.558), a king now, like his city and people, without identity. There is an echo of this construction in Book 6, when Anchises refers to Roman cities which have yet to be built as *sine nomine terrae* (776). This serves the double meaning that not only do they not yet have names (although in some sense they do, as Anchises names them; Vergil's play with chronology is intentional and used to great effect throughout), as they do not exist, they also do not yet have identities, nor the capacity to confer identity upon their inhabitants.[7] Thus the Trojans, put to flight from Troy and no longer in possession of their Trojan identity, seek to establish a city around which to base their identity. One may be tempted to read this mission in terms of a colonization narrative, and indeed Vergil draws upon many relevant sources in writing Book 3, but in fact it must feel and be different, for the mother city in this "colonization" venture is no more. [8] Thus to attempt to found a new Troy or to found a city as a successor city to or child city of Troy is futile, and all efforts to do so in this book ultimately fail. Troy exists now only in memory, and as such physical manifestations of this Trojan memory will be likewise ethereal (Buthrotum, to be discussed below, is the prime example of this). During this foundation process and on this course of founded and subsequently abandoned cities, the ultimate goal of this process and of the poem itself, the foundation of Rome, is always in mind, and the implications of these examples will influence the poem's overall argument regarding Roman identity. These interim cities are not Rome, but they play an

[7] Feeney's remark, that in Vergil's day these towns are ghost towns, not *sine nomine* but only *nomina*, is well taken; (1986) 7f. This bolsters a reading of prophecy in the *Aeneid* as intentionally deceptive and problematic, a possibility to be discussed in the section on prophecy below.
[8] On the sources for Book 3, see Horsfall (2006), p. 132f.

integral part in defining what it means and does not mean to be a Roman. In building these cities, the Trojans learn how not to build Rome, and each experience of a city rejected and passed by has some wisdom to impart on this score. In this paper, I will attempt to demonstrate that Book 3 of the *Aeneid* presents the city-foundation process not merely as the construction of walls and the digging of a trench as a boundary, but also as the establishment of the people, *mores*, and *ethos* therein contained.

The first city founded by the fugitive Trojans is in Thrace, where they hope to find prosperity and safety, only to have their project halted by an ill omen. From the very start of Aeneas' description, Thrace does not seem likely to be conducive to a successful colonization project (3.13-18):

> *Terra procul vastis colitur Mavortia campis*
> *(Thraces arant) acri quondam regnata Lycurgo,*
> *hospitium antiquum Troiae socii penates*
> *dum fortuna fuit. feror huc et litore curvo*
> *moenia prima loco fatis ingressus iniquis*
> *Aeneadasque meo nomen de nomine fingo.*
>
> A land far off beloved by Mars is inhabited in vast fields (the Thracians plow them), once ruled by fierce Lycurgus, an ancient ally of Troy and friendly household gods while fortune remained. I am borne here and having approached under hostile fates I place the first walls on the curved shore, and I make the name Aeneadae from my name.

Already in this brief introduction to Thrace the outlook for the Trojans appears grim. The reference to "fierce Lycurgus," who once opposed the arrival of Dionysus into Thrace and chased the god out (*Il*. 6), suggests not only an atmosphere of impiety but also a lack of *hospitium*, in which the Trojans had placed their hopes. Betrayed *hospitium*, as we shall see, is the upshot of the story of Polydorus' death. For now, however, the Trojans have no reason to expect treachery. They have a history of *antiquum hospitium* with the Thracians, as well as *socii penates*, such that Priam felt confident in viewing the king of Thrace, Polymestor, as an ally to

whom he could send his son Polydorus along with a massive weight of gold (3.49-50). It is only in hindsight that Aeneas is able in inject the anticipation of misfortune into the narrative, foretelling that they arrived "under hostile fates" and that Thrace was an ally "while fortune remained" (*dum fortuna fuit*), the implication being that it does no longer. There are multiple ways in which fortune no longer remains for Troy; not only do they no longer have Thrace's *hospitium*, but Polydorus is dead, his gold lost, and Troy itself destroyed. Misfortune is compounded upon misfortune in this land, all of them brought to the fore in this narrative. These circumstances also have an effect on the foundation process. The linguistic terms of the foundation of Aeneas' ultimate city have already been laid out in the epic (1.5: *dum conderet urbem*), yet here he uses the word *locare*. While it would make no sense for Aeneas to know what word to use for the city he is *supposed* to be founding, or that he might intentionally be using a word other than *condere* in this context based on that knowledge, the connotations of *locare* suggest a sense of impermanence, which, by the end of the episode, is confirmed. The language and themes of city-foundation possess a consistency and logic that seems to be innate in all the participants in the poem. Lastly, Aeneas relates that he fashions the name "Aeneadae" (whether as the name of the city or as the name of those living in it is not made clear). What is important is that by building a city and creating a name associated with it he has established an identity for himself and his fellow fugitive, identityless Trojans. The city walls, its boundaries, serve as the line for defining what is internal and what is external for its inhabitants, i.e., who is part of the city and who is not. The walls thus serve as givers of definite geographical identity at the same time as they grant those within it a cultural identity, of which the name is a key part.[9] It is for this reason that the shade of Polydorus complains to Aeneas, "Troy did not bear me as a

[9] See Horsfall (1989) for discussion on the significance of names and other cultural signifiers in the establishment of settlements in the *Aeneid*.

foreigner to you" (42-3: *non me tibi Troia / externum tulit*). The city, Troy, had defined domestic and foreign identity by its boundaries, but now, with the city destroyed, this dichotomy becomes unclear, bringing about befouled *hospitium* and Aeneas' laceration of Polydorus. The use of the verb *fingere* (18), however, is suspicious here. It might merely mean "to fashion," but is used in other contexts in the less favorable sense of "to make something to appear to be other than it is."[10] With the benefit of hindsight, Aeneas is able to tell that this city in Thrace was ill-fated from the beginning. The idea that this city would confer upon him and his people any lasting identity, he now realizes, was wishful thinking, and in his telling of their experiences there it becomes clear why the circumstances of this city's foundation make it uninhabitable for them.

Thrace, expected by the Trojans to be a land of *hospitium* and *socii penates*, in fact turns out to be full of vice and ill omen. Aeneas discovers the mound of Polydorus when attempting to gather cornel and myrtle to wreath the altar for a sacrifice to his mother and the gods. His hope was for "divine auspices of the begun works" (19-20: *divisque…auspicibus coeptorum operum*), that is, favorable omens for the building and longevity of the city. As he has already revealed, however, the fates are not on his side. The omen he receives upon tearing the shoots out of the ground is an outpouring of blood and the voice of Polydorus, which exhorts him to "flee these cruel lands, flee this shore of greed!" (44: *heu fuge crudelis terras, fuge litus avarum*). Aeneas had presumably been carrying out his sacrifice to the gods so that they would bless the new settlement he was building, but the appearance of this *horrendum monstrum* (26) signifies not only that this venture is not intended by the gods but also that the very land of Thrace is somehow tainted by impiety. It is not any fault on the part of the Trojans or some failure of theirs to propitiate the gods sufficiently but rather insufficiency of the land itself to sustain a lasting city for the Trojans. That only an impermanent city can be built here is due to the inability of

[10] For discussion and argument related to this use, see Feeney (1983), 208.

Thrace to be conducive to the cultural character and civic values that the Trojans' new city must be able to cultivate. It is also of note that this omen of Polydorus' corpse and blood comes about as a result of physical labor involved in the city-foundation process.[11] The building process is labor-intensive, requiring much physical work to lay a foundation and to construct the walls and buildings that make up the city.[12] The result of this physical process is a physical construct which possesses finite physical and geographical limits and also literally contains a group of people within its walls, but which has symbolic implications as well, including what people are said to be *of* that city (i.e. whose identities are defined by it) and what their values, morals, and laws are. In this case, the physical act of tearing up shoots of myrtle and cornel from the earth and obtaining these plants to make wreaths plays a role in a larger religious ceremony affecting the construction of the city, the goal of which is to ensure the city's success and prosperity. This is physical, manual work performed with a view to a more abstract purpose. This purpose, of course, produces unhoped for results, leading to the abandonment of the city.

In attempting to secure the gods' favor, Aeneas uncovers a land which has earned the hatred of the gods. Polydorus accuses the land of cruelty and greed, and his own fate further implicates Thrace in vice, as he was betrayed by the king, Polymestor (53-7):

> *Ille, ut opes fractae Teucrum et Fortuna recessit,*
> *res Agamemnonias victriciaque arma secutus*
> *fas omne abrumpit: Polydorum obtruncat, et auro*
> *vi potitur. Quid non mortalia pectora cogis,*
> *auri sacra fames!*
>
> He, when the power of the Trojans was broken and Fortune departed, having followed the fortunes of Agamemnon and the victorious arms, breaks off every sacred obligation: he beheads Polydorus, and take possession of the gold by force. O accursed desire of gold, to what end do you not drive mortal hearts!

[11] I am indebted to my thesis advisor Timothy O'Sullivan for this insight.
[12] Horsfall (1989), 15-8 for an overview of this process in the *Aeneid.*

The *Fortuna recessit* of line 53 perfectly answers the ominous *dum fortuna fuit* of line 16. This is the bad news for which Aeneas has been preparing his audience. The *fas* which the king of Thrace breaks off refers to multiple obligations he has betrayed. He has violated *hospitium* by beheading Polydorus, committed murder out of greed, and even betrayed his kinship to Priam (Polymestor was married to Priam's daughter Iliona[13]). The use of the verb *obtruncare* recalls the fate of Priam, beheaded by Pyrrhus (2.663: *patrem qui obtruncat ad aras*).[14] Confronted with the fate of Polydorus, Aeneas reports to the selected leaders of the people and to his father about the omen. They are all of the same mind: to depart from the wicked land, to leave behind the desecrated *hospitium*, and to give the fleets the wind (60-1: *omnibus idem animus, scelerata excedere terra, / linqui pollutum hospitium et dare classibus Austros*). They recognize that the land, being *scelerata*, cannot yield a successful city. The values held by Aeneas and his people, *hospitium*, kinship, *pietas*, lawfulness, and so on, have all been overturned here in Thrace. They will be unable to establish a city encompassing and reflecting these values because the territory is tainted by vice, which will negatively impact their city. The greed embodied by Polymestor is especially incriminating, as it reflects an attitude of primacy of self over community. The poem frequently gives primacy to the communal rather than to the individual in its description of events, emphasizing the importance of the community to the foundation process and to the Trojans in particular in their capacity as proto-Romans. After encountering the omen from the gods, the Trojans decide to leave Thrace immediately. Before departing, they give Polydorus a proper burial, which involves placing his spirit in his tomb (67-8: *animamque sepulcro /*

[13] Mentioned by Servius at *Aen.* 1.653.
[14] Lyndsay Coo (2008) argues that Polydorus' existence as *truncus* here refers to the *Georgics* 2.74-82, where Vergil describes the process of grafting. The idea is that Polydorus' corpse has become a trunk in the arboreal sense and is now able to support the violent grafting of other foliage, here cornel and myrtle, onto it. Thus the image of Polydorus *obtruncatus* provides a metaphor for the "inversion of human order" and the violence of the Thracians via a natural image.

condimus). The use of *condere* here invokes a sense of permanent foundation which was not to be had in the city they built. After long restlessness in a treacherous death, the rest Polydorus' spirit has from a proper burial will be lasting. The tomb also restores his identity to him, as the Trojans are able to mourn his death and recognize his fate after he spent so long as an unrecognized corpse beneath a crop of spears. Lastly, the tomb, a physical construction and product of physical labor, serves important functions beyond its mere physical pragmatic purposes. Its significance for Polydorus in fact lies entirely in the metaphysical, as it allows his spirit to have rest, grants him an afterlife, and re-ascribes him an identity. The tomb, then, shares the multivalence of the city in possessing both physical and symbolic functions, and this parallel is established by the verb *condere*.

Traveling again and still in need of a city, the Trojans put in at Delos, where they consult the oracle of Apollo. Aeneas prays, asking for divine aid and guidance (85-9):

> *da propriam, Thymbraee, domum; da moenia fessis*
> *et genus et mansuram urbem; serua altera Troiae*
> *Pergama, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli.*
> *quem sequimur? quoue ire iubes? ubi ponere sedes?*
> *da, pater, augurium atque animis inlabere nostris.*
>
> Grant, Thymbraean one, our own house; grant us tired people walls and a race and a city that will remain. Guard the other Pergama of Troy, the leavings of the Greeks and of cruel Achilles. Whom do we follow? Or where do you order us to go? Where to place our settlements? Grant, father, an augury, and come into our spirits.

Rather than attempt to settle a new land only to have it turn out to be terrible in the sight of the gods, Aeneas directly asks Apollo to point out the land that they are destined to settle. An augury, he hopes, would preclude error and uncertainty. He also asks divine assistance in securing the city he is to found. In this prayer, his requests for the city are twofold: that it be lasting and that it supply them a stable identity. The longevity of the city will, of course, lead to a stable identity for them. In asking for the city, Aeneas is acknowledging that his *genus* will be

defined by the city that contains it, and asking that the city's longevity grant his race longevity. He acknowledges that the destruction of their old city led also to the destruction of their identity, naming himself and his people "the other Pergamum of Troy" and "the leavings of the Greeks and Achilles." He is not at all deluded or overly optimistic about the state of their identity, likening it to a now destroyed citadel and defining the Trojans in terms of another culture, the Greeks. They are "the ones the Greeks did not kill." They lack any real self-definition except through the memory of Troy. The urgency of this crisis is plain to them. Apollo's reply comes, telling them, "Seek out your ancient mother" (96: *antiquam exquirite matrem*). One wonders if this might somewhat ironically refer back to Troy, their "mother city." In Greek colonization, this would be the city from which the colonists set out to establish new settlements (i.e. the metropolis). Returning there is clearly an impossibility for the Trojans. Anchises interprets this oracle as referring to Crete (104), which turns out to be incorrect. There is nothing for them on Crete but plague. The senior Anchises steers them wrong in this instance, prolonging their wanderings and uncertainties. David Quint argues that in Book 3 Anchises represents the forces of recursion brought up by a fixation on the Trojan past and the danger of refusing to look towards the future (57). Anchises' misinterpretation of the oracle leads to a stagnant, brief stay on Crete, before it is revealed that their destiny awaits in Hesperia. It is true that Anchises often seems to embody regression, as in his reluctance to leave Troy at the end of Book 2 and preference to sail for the familiar Crete rather than the unknown Hesperia. There is a danger, too, in trying to bring back the familiar Troy rather than trying to found a new city, and their lack of success in building a Pergamum on Crete demonstrates in a literal sense that, as Quint writes, "to live in the past is to inhabit a state of death."[15]

[15] Quint 58.

The Trojans were unfortunate in finding death on Thrace in Polydorus. Turning now towards Crete, though, and supported by a divine oracle, they hope for brighter prospects for their next city. Here the city-building process begins anew, and all at once falls apart (132-9):

> *ergo auidus muros optatae molior urbis*
> *Pergameamque uoco, et laetam cognomine gentem*
> *hortor amare focos arcemque attollere tectis.*
> *Iamque fere sicco subductae litore puppes,* 135
> *conubiis aruisque nouis operata iuuentus,*
> *iura domosque dabam, subito cum tabida membris*
> *corrupto caeli tractu miserandaque uenit*
> *arboribusque satisque lues et letifer annus.*
>
> Eager, therefore, I build the walls of the hoped for city, and I call it Pergamum, and I encourage the people happy with the name to love their homes and to raise up the citadel with buildings. And now the ships were drawn up on the almost dry shore, and the youth was occupied with marriages and with new fields; and I was giving out laws and homes, when suddenly, from a corrupt quarter of the sky, there came a plague corrupting to limbs and wretched for trees and for crops, and a death-bearing year.

An air of expectation, high hopes, and zeal for establishing a new city permeates this passage. The typically collected Aeneas describes himself as *avidus*, and the city as *optata*. The excitement upon building the city is palpable. Note that in the same breath as he describes building the walls he recalls the name he gave to the city, which in turn grants identity to the *gens* building and inhabiting it. It is Pergamum they have (re)built, and they are ready to be Trojans again. The process of founding this city includes not only the citadel and houses which comprise its cityscape, but also the laws Aeneas gives to the people and the processes meant to ensure the city's continuation. The Trojan youth is engaged in marriage and in cultivating the new fields, both of which are realms of fertility which sustain the city, either with progeny or with sustenance. The prevalence of life in these first five lines suggests a similar hope for the city. The Trojans are ready to establish a status quo. Further, the polysyndetic *-que…-que* in the passage adds to the speed and ease under which their settlement begins. Just as quickly, however,

the plague comes, in the same line as Aeneas is administering laws and homes (137). Line 137 begins with three dactyls reflecting the ease of city-building, which the plague grinds to a halt with a spondee in the fourth foot. Line 138 then begins with three spondees, emphasizing this point, and line 139 begins with three dactyls again, now demonstrating the speed with which the plague brings death and decay to the people and landscape. The plague is both literally and metrically eating away their settlement. Anchises then urges them to leave Crete, and that night Aeneas is visited by the Penates he saved from Troy, who tell him to make for Hesperia (143-71). The entire venture at Crete is an indication for the Trojans not to be plagued by their past but to look toward the future. To that end they do not even return to Delos, as Anchises urges, to re-seek the omens, but sail to Hesperia from there. The Penates, as Horsfall argues, are emblematic of religious continuity from the fallen Troy to the Trojans' new colony.[16] One can also claim that they are carriers and ensurers of cultural continuity more broadly, as they are the only members of the Trojan exile in possession of self-actualizing identity. As divinities, they comprised a cultural religious identity while at Troy, yet now, with Troy destroyed and without another city in which to be placed, they lack the ability to give an identity to these once-Trojans. They do, however, act as narrative forces which effect a linearity rather than an endless recursion in the narrative.[17]

Again at Buthrotum Aeneas and his survivors encounter another group of Trojans who have attempted to recreate the fallen Troy. The paleness of the imitation, the uncanniness of its prominent features, and the intense obsession with the past that this city exemplifies demonstrate the futility of any such recreations. The inhabitants of Buthrotum are living in a model city, not living, but frozen in time. By being trapped in an imitation of the past, Buthrotum and those who

[16] Horsfall (1989), 17.
[17] For repetition and narrative in the *Aeneid* see Quint 50-3.

inhabit it comprise a city of stagnation and endless regression. Nicholas Horsfall, in his commentary on the passage, rejects such claims, citing examples of Greek colonies modeled on their mother-cities.[18] Elsewhere, in his commentary on the Pergamum on Crete section (121-91), he writes, "it is normal and blameless to name their city-foundations after their mother city" and "a proper devotion to the past is part and parcel of being Trojan (and indeed Roman, the parallelism is significant)."[19] What is unique about the Trojans' "colonization," however, is that they no longer have a mother city on which to model properly their new colony. Though their attempts at founding a new city may structurally resemble those of Greek colonists in their process, it is important to recall that these Trojans are not actually colonists, they are exiles. This distinction completely alters the dynamic of their own identity and that of the city they are to build. How can they truly be called Trojans anymore, now that Troy is gone? This is not to say that all memory of Troy ought to be abandoned; there are more proper ways to memorialize their Trojan origins than by attempting to recreate the city verbatim.[20] The theme at Buthrotum, however, is of the stagnation of attempting to recreate this lost past in the present and of *imagines* standing in for the absences of others.

Upon arriving at Buthrotum and leaving the shore, Aeneas finds Andromache sacrificing at a cenotaph of Hector (301-5):

> *sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona*
> *ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam*
> *libabat cineri Andromache manisque uocabat*
> *Hectoreum ad tumulum, uiridi quem caespite inanem*
> *et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacrauerat aras.*

[18] Horsfall (2006), see also Horsfall 1989 for a discussion of Vergil's use of Greek colonization narratives.
[19] p. 132-3.
[20] E.g., the Troy Games as described in *Aeneid* 5.545-603. The procession serves to reproduce in physical representation the city's body of citizens, the city putting itself on display for its own spectacle in the form of the Trojan youth. In this way, they reproduce the past in a memorialized, dramatized way, but connect it to the present in such a way as not to inhabit it.

> …When by chance Andromache was offering sacred meals and sad gifts to the ashes before the city in a grove at the water of a false Simois and was calling spirits to the tomb of Hector which she had dedicated, an empty tomb with green sod and twin altars, a cause for tears.

It is clear from our first encounter with Andromache that rather than begin life anew in a new city she reaffirmed her old, now meaningless identity and that this turn of fate is a cause for sadness. The gifts and the twin altars reflect Andromache's own sadness, still felt after all this time, at the loss of her Hector. In fact, she seems determined to reduplicate this past identity in her present circumstances. She is still defined as *Hectoris Andromache* (319) despite her new marriage to Helenus and by virtue of this sees herself as thoroughly Trojan.[21] The *falsus Simois*, which Aeneas must himself recognize as a fake based on the original at Troy without being told, echoes this. Soon, he will realize, the entire city and everyone in it views the place as Trojan. The hollowness of this effort is made manifest to the audience (which, we remember, includes Queen Dido, herself a widow). Even the *Hectoreus tumulus* itself is playing this game. It is a cenotaph, an empty tomb; the original, of course, was dedicated in front of the real Troy. In establishing this tomb Andromache is not merely performing her duty as loyal wife to her lost husband. She is participating in a culture-wide effort to self-define, but this attempt is made via an identity that is now lost, and its revival comes in a severely degraded form. Andromache seems to be obsessed with the dead, or with one dead man in particular, and even thinks Aeneas and his men might be dead spirits as they approach (311). She even seems inclined to broach the subject of the past in conversation with Aeneas, as if expecting him to have been similarly affected (339-43):

> *quid puer Ascanius? superatne et uescitur aura?*
> *quem tibi iam Troia –*
> *ecqua tamen puero est amissae cura parentis?*
> *ecquid in antiquam uirtutem animosque uirilis*

[21] Bettini (1997), 9-11.

> *et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitat Hector?*
>
> What of the boy Ascanius? Does he live and does he breathe the air? Whom now, for you, in Troy – However, is there any care for the boy of his lost parent? Do both father Aeneas and Uncle Hector rouse him at all into ancient virtue and manly spirits?

Andromache's curiosity in this instance is how Ascanius is responding to the death of people from Troy. She does not even know yet if Ascanius is alive or dead, but is prepared to make assumptions as to what she expects his experience would be. The dead of Troy occupy her every thought, so why should it not be the case, she thinks, that others should construct their identities the same way? Line 340, a half line, is a mystery. One is almost tempted to take it as an aposiopesis; Andromache is too choked up by memories of the lost Troy to finish her thought once she has brought it up. The events she brings up, however, are events of several years ago at this point. In living in the past, she forces others to come into her manufactured world and act out the past to her satisfaction. In bidding farewell to Ascanius, she refers to him as "the last image remaining to me of my Astyanax" (489: *O mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago*). Having come into Buthrotum, a recreation of a dead city, Aeneas and Ascanius are forced to play the parts of bygone Trojans whom Andromache would prefer to see present. Not only does Buthrotum fail to retain any independent identity for itself and those who inhabit it, it forces them all to relive and remain trapped in an identity that no longer is and can never again be their own. In the case of Ascanius, he is made by Andromache to fill a role that never properly belonged to him, all to satisfy her own obsession with the past and its dead. It is in fact Andromache, Helenus, and the people of Buthrotum who are like the dead, as Bettini notes when he remarks, "…the world is populated by 'doubles' and stand-ins…it is as if the living served as stand-ins for the dead—and for one dead man in particular, Hector."[22] Andromache would prefer to, and expects, to inhabit a world populated by the dead, and the tendency to see living, present people and constructions as

[22] Bettini 14.

stand-ins for those that are gone permeates Buthrotum. The first view of the city itself emphasizes this yet again (349-52):

> *procedo et paruam Troiam simulataque magnis*
> *Pergama et arentem Xanthi cognomine riuum*
> *agnosco, Scaeaeque amplector limina portae;*
> *nec non et Teucri socia simul urbe fruuntur.*
>
> I proceed and I recognize a small Troy and a Pergama having simulated the great one and an arid river by the name of Xanthus, and I embrace the threshold of the Scaean Gate; nor do the Trojans not also enjoy the friendly city.

Helenus has succeeded in bringing about what Aeneas himself has also attempted and been forced to abandon; he has founded a recreation of Troy. The Trojans enjoy the sight, and Aeneas seems pleased enough as well. But how satisfying is this new Troy, really? Aeneas' account seems cynical at best: this Troy is *parva*, this Pergama has only copied the great original, and the river, supposedly named after the great Xanthus at Troy, is actually just an arid riverbed. The inappropriateness of naming a dry river after the Xanthus is striking and no doubt intended, and the same should be no less clear regarding the citadel and city as a whole. These Trojans' efforts are admirable and certainly understandable, but they are attempting the impossible, a realization which Aeneas himself injects into his recollection of the place. It is here however that Aeneas receives a prophecy from Helenus about the site of his future city (389-93):

> *cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam*
> *litoreis ingens inuenta sub ilicibus sus*
> *triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit,*
> *alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati,*
> *is locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum.*
>
> When, for you in distress, a huge sow will lie at the water of a solitary river beneath the oak trees, having given birth to thirty young, reclining white on the ground, her white offspring around her udders, this will be the place of your city, this a certain rest from labors.

There is a promise of a city and an identity for Aeneas elsewhere, and the emphasis there is on prosperity and fertility. Horsfall notes that thirty piglets is a huge number indeed, and that the prodigiousness of this prophecy is without question.[23] It is with this in mind that Aeneas bids farewell to Buthrotum, recognizing it as a city of memory, not of the living. He recognizes their Xanthus as an *effigies* and their Troy as something merely to be seen (497). This model Troy, the like of which he has already attempted to build, cannot sway him, and he presses on unturned from his destiny.

Having left Buthrotum, the wayward Trojans encounter another individual, Achaemenides, a Greek left behind by Odysseus on the island of the Cyclopes. As he says himself, "My thoughtless companions deserted me here in the vast cave of the Cyclops when, frightened, they left the cruel threshold" (616-8: *hic me, dum trepidi crudelia limina linquunt, / immemores socii uasto Cyclopis in antro / deseruere*). As a result of this desertion, he is no longer able to identify himself as before, and seems to have given up on being counted any longer among his fellow Ithacans as he asks the Trojans to take him aboard. Up to this point, the notion of cultural identity, specifically as conferred by a city, and the morals and character this entails have been a main concern of the book, and this idea is reinforced here at the end of the book in this interaction. The presence of *hospitium*/*xenia* has been shown to be a necessary part of the culture Aeneas and his people are to found, a part which their city and civilization must exemplify. This is particularly clear in the lack of *hospitium* in Thrace, and the subsequent failure of their city there, and will be reversed by the example of Evander when he proves to be a good host and ally in Book 8, leading to a Trojan settlement in Italy. For now, however, the lesson of *xenia* and its necessity is recalled from *Odyssey* 9, where Polyphemus' failure to display the expected niceties to Odysseus and his men ends badly for him, and the scene also has

[23] Horsfall (2006) ad loc.

resonances later in the epic, when Odysseus returns home on Ithaca to a similar breach of *xenia*. Aeneas' willingness to accept a Greek man among his Trojan people demonstrates a proper reception of this lesson and its instrumentality in his city-foundation project. It is as if he is commiserating with a fellow outcast, another man lacking a proper identity provided by having one's own city, and in so doing he is establishing the *hospitium* that his city will value once it has been founded. It is altogether fitting that Book 3, the most Odyssean book of the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid*, closes upon a scene reworked from the *Odyssey* and a lesson learned therefrom, the impact of which is strongly felt in the main foundational action of the poem.

The *Aeneid* itself, as it makes clear from its opening lines, is concerned primarily with the foundation of cities, and one city in particular, Rome. Book 3 provides multiple examples of cities that are founded or as they are being founded, all of which are markedly not Rome. Yet it is in the poem's interactions with these cities and their building processes that it argues for the primacy of a city's foundation on the culture of the people who inhabit it, including their values, *mores*, laws, customs, etc. In the various cities introduced in Book 3 one can see examples for Aeneas of how and how not to define the identity of the city he is intended to found. Naturally these examples play a part in casting Aeneas and the Trojans as proto-Romans, and the values they come to hold contribute to the poem's argument for what constitutes a definite Roman character. This can be said to be the purpose of the *Aeneid* as a whole, as R. D. Williams argues, that "the Roman way of life, the march of Roman history, the concept of Roman world-destiny form a central theme of the poem against which other aspects of human behaviour and aspiration can be explored."[24] These specifically Roman attributes which point toward the definition of a Roman way of life are established alongside the laying of the foundation and the building of the walls of the city, and the same is shown to be true for all cities in the *Aeneid*. Often, as in Book

[24] R. D. Williams (1990) 21-2.

3, traits which would lead to an undesirable identity are established with the city, and Aeneas and his men must cut their losses and abandon these cities lest their cultural identity be negatively impacted. The book, then, is an exploration of this process. The city and people are to be characterized by *hospitium*, unlike at the Aeneadae in Thrace, and their past, though it must be remembered and honored, is not to preclude the rise of a new beginning and a new future as at Pergamum on Crete and at Buthrotum. The rejection of and non-success at cities whose established characters were not conducive to a desired cultural identity for the now identityless Trojans contribute to the poem's efforts to define how precisely these Trojans *will* be defined, and by extension what identity the Romans of Vergil's time can claim for themselves. The identity of a people, to the ancient mind, truly is coterminous with the existence of the city to which they belong, and it is for this reason that the *Aeneid* can broach the topic of what it means to have a Roman identity during the time of the "refoundation" of the city under Augustus.

Carthage

In Carthage, the wayward Trojans find a people fulfilling a mission much like their own. Driven out of Tyre, Dido has led the Tyrians to found a new city, where they seek to establish and maintain their identity as a people.[25] The Trojans, we know, are destined to do so in Italy, but what is stopping them from remaining here? Dido offers them an equal share in her new kingdom, saying, "Trojan and Tyrian shall be considered by me with no distinction" (1.574: *Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur*). Such a state of affairs is like that which Jupiter promises to Juno: "mixed in together only in body, the Trojans will subside" and there will be only Latins (12.856-6: *commixti corpore tantum* / *subsident Teucri*). Such an intermingling of cultures is apparently desirable in Italy, and it seems so at first here in Libya as well. But the Trojans, as Aeneas tells in Book 3, have already passed by a number of cities on their way here, both cities of others and cities they attempted to found themselves. The Trojans reject each of these on the basis of some flaw or vice tied up in the city's foundational identity, which would in turn have negatively influenced those who relied on that city as the locus of their personal identity. Dido herself is no stranger to this. She originally left Tyre fleeing her brother Pygmalion, the king, who, in his lust for wealth, killed her husband Sychaeus (1.148-50: *ille Sychaeum* / *impius ante aras atque auri caecus amore* / *clam ferro incautum superat*). Acquiring buried treasure, Dido uses it to finance the building of a new city, Carthage (365-8). Here are two disparate motivations and actions with regard to wealth. Pygmalion, driven by greed, commits murder, a profane act, in order to acquire it. The act is no less profane for having been committed in front of the altar, marking him as *impius*. His act is driven entirely by selfish motives. Dido, meanwhile, to the benefit of all her fellow Tyrians, founds a city, an act which places importance

[25] 1.338-68.

on the community rather than the individual. This distinction becomes crucial for the Carthage episode as a whole. At the start, the very foundation of Carthage is a rejection of vices which assert the primacy of the individual, such as avarice, bloodshed, and impiety. Pygmalion is the embodiment of these vices and, qua ruler, causes them to pervade the city of Tyre. It is for this reason that Dido and the Tyrians must leave the city, rejecting it. In fleeing Pygmalion and his city, they are fleeing this identity, so that a new identity can be established in Carthage. This city, and the identity it confers upon its people, is founded upon a basis of community-fostering virtues, the result being that the city will flourish. What exactly are these virtues, and might they be shared by the exiled Trojans, seeking a new city and identity of their own?

Aside from rejecting the vices of greed and slaughter, the Carthaginians are seen to exemplify other positive qualities as they found their city. Aeneas looks on in awe and, perhaps, jealousy (1.423-9):

> *instant ardentes Tyrii: pars ducere muros*
> *molirique arcem et manibus subuoluere saxa,*
> *pars optare locum tecto et concludere sulco;* 425
> *iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum.*
> *hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris*
> *fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas*
> *rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora apta futuris.*

At first the physical aspects of building a city—the manual labor involved—are described. The Tyrians build walls and a citadel, processes which involve rolling up stones with their bare hands. They select a spot for a house and surround it by digging a ditch around it. Others dig out a port. The words used for these acts of manual labor—*ducere, moliri, subvolvere, effodiunt*—are all evocative of the physical aspect of city-building. Yet hidden among these accounts of physical labor is city-foundation of a rather different kind. It is noted that "they select laws and magistrates and a sacred senate" (426). This is not the labor of establishing a city in the physical

sense, but in a more administrative sense. Yet it is related among (in fact, surrounded by examples of) physical city-building. This suggests that the process of founding a city is just as much about building it as it is about determining its more abstract cultural aspects. In fact, the position of the selection of laws, magistrates, and senate surrounded by the physical buildings of the city in these lines suggests that, in a spatial sense, the physical construct that will be the city will be a bastion for these cultural and fundamental attributes, spatially and conceptually encapsulating them. The kind of city Carthage (and all cities seen founded in the *Aeneid*) will be, in terms of both culture and architecture, is determined at the time of foundation. One cannot help but be taken by the Roman-ness of proto-Carthage, with its laws, magistrates, and, crucially, senate. The senate's importance is further emphasized by its description as *sanctus*. The Roman attitude regarding the centrality of the senate to the city is here echoed in the Carthaginian senate, suggesting a similarity between Carthaginian *mores* and those of Vergil's Rome. This is true not just for the culture but also the physical buildings; the theaters and columns begun by the Tyrians in Carthage cannot but evoke those of Rome.[26] This is the potential that Carthage has at its earliest stages of foundation. Upon seeing this sight, Aeneas is moved to exclaim, "Fortunate are you, whose walls are now rising!" (437: *o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!*). It is a city much like this one that Aeneas must build, and he sees them accomplishing what he has yet to do successfully. He would rebuild Troy, but understands the impossibility of this. The rising walls of this new city counterbalance the walls of Troy which have fallen, figuratively if not literally, and Trojan identity along with them. Aeneas' mission is not to found a new city that will be Troy and embody Trojan identity, but to establish a new city and identity which will become Roman. In the interim, a "Trojan" identity is all that Aeneas and his followers have to which to cling, and this despite the lack of a Troy to which to tether this identity leaves them at somewhat of a loss.

[26] Morwood (1991) 212-3 also makes this observation.

They are more like pseudo-Trojans during this time. Yet seeing a new city rising before his very eyes, Aeneas cannot help but feel a sense of similarity between himself and the Tyrians. Though he cannot know it, it is significant that he is drawn to a city displaying such Roman features, for his destiny is to be instrumental in establishing the real Rome, along with its people, history, way of life, and "world-destiny."[27]

Other than its architectural and administrative similarities, proto-Carthage shares a number of ideal Roman virtues. Advancing into the city, Aeneas comes upon the temple of Juno, in a place where the Phoenicians had unearthed "the head of a fierce horse, a sign which regal Juno had pointed out; for thus the race would be renowned in war and prosperous in lifestyle throughout the ages" (443-5: *signum, quod regia Iuno / monstrarat, caput acris equi; sic nam fore bello / egregiam et facilem uictu per saecula gentem*). In addition, Ilioneus greets Dido as "Queen, to whom Jupiter has granted it to found a new city and to check proud peoples with justice" (522-3: *o regina, nouam cui condere Iuppiter urbem / iustitiaque dedit gentis frenare superbas…*). Dido's project, like Aeneas', is divinely sanctioned.[28] The temple's central location within the city reveals that the city's religious foundation, its divine assurance, is just as much a part of the city's foundation as its cultural aspects and its physical constructions. The identity established by the Carthaginians along with the city is that of a people protected by divine powers. This passage sets Carthage parallel with Rome in this respect, as well as its cultural mission (1.523, *gentis frenare superbas* and 6.853, *debellare superbos*). In addition, Dido embodies the traditional Roman virtue of the *univira*, the *matrona* who has known only one husband.[29] She expresses in her own words her desire to marry no other after the death of

[27] R. D. Williams (1990) 21-2.
[28] See Jupiter's promise to Venus in Book 1, Cybele's intervention on behalf of the Trojans in Book 10.
[29] On the *univira*, see G. Williams (1958).

Sychaeus,[30] hence her passion for Aeneas becoming problematic for this ideal. Aside from this, she is a capable leader, making laws for her people (507: *iura dabat legesque viris*), and displays *hospitium* in receiving the Trojans as friends, despite her many enemies. At the start, Dido seems to be a leader capable of great virtue and successful leadership, and the city will share these qualities. If such a foundation could be maintained, the Trojans might find in Carthage exactly the city they were seeking. If the Trojans and Carthaginians share the same (i.e. Roman) values, as indeed they seem to, would the city not doubly flourish when the peoples combine? Anna expresses enthusiasm for such a possibility in Book 4, telling Dido, "What a city, sister, what a kingdom you will see rise!" (4.47: *quam tu urbem, soror, hanc cernes, quae surgere regna*). The problem there is that what Anna proposes is marriage to Aeneas, which, to the *univira* Dido, would come at the price of *pudor.* As has been shown, the promise that Carthage shows in Book 1 with regard to cultural and virtuous foundation seems to suggest a positive outcome when the Trojans unite with them. Yet it is when these virtues break down that the physical foundation of the city begins to struggle as well, and "Trojan and Tyrian considered with no distinction" becomes a problematic proposition.

As Book 4 begins, Dido is conflicted. She is caught between her newfound love for Aeneas and her pledge of faithfulness to Sychaeus. The latter concern is tied in with her sense of *pudor*, which she is loath to violate and the importance of which she recognizes (4.24-7: *sed mihi uel tellus optem prius ima dehiscat / ...ante, pudor, quam te uiolo aut tua iura resoluo*). This is considered an invaluable virtue for Roman women, one which, if Carthage is to continue in its virtuous path, she would do well to hold on to. Yet Anna convinces her that it is in the city's best interest to give in to her love for Aeneas and unite their two peoples. They are both misled. The damage, however, is done, and Dido "loosens her sense of shame" (4.55: *solvitque pudorem*).

[30] *Aen*. 4.28-9.

She has deviated from the proto-Roman ideals to which the city of Carthage had hitherto (even if only accidentally) been adhering. The effects of this, both in terms of the city's moral and physical foundations, are immediate. Dido "wanders throughout the entire city, maddened" (68-9: *infelix Dido totaque vagatur / urbe furens*), and "leads Aeneas with her through the middle of the walls and shows him the Sidonian wealth and the prepared city" (74-5: *nunc media Aenean secum per moenia ducit / Sidoniasque ostentat opes urbemque paratam*). The views of the city in these lines are not on the city as the Tyrians' cultural project, as before, but on Dido's individual place in it. In fact, Book 4 as a whole focuses on the person of Dido, but, seen through the lens of city-foundation, the negative repercussions of this intense focus are precisely the point. The city is not meant to be a reflection or tool of one individual, but of an entire people. Otherwise, if the individual is flawed, the city as a whole will suffer and begin to decline. At this pivotal moment especially, during its foundation process, Carthage must acquire a foundation that will ensure its survival. Here, though, the city of Carthage has become a stage for Dido's madness, the intensely personal, rather than the more broadly cultural. Aeneas, accompanying her on her tour of the city, is also drawn into this folly. Through his prior actions, it is clear that Aeneas understands for whom a city is truly founded, but the example of Carthage is posing a threat to his ideals.

Book 3 was an account of the Trojans' travels throughout the Mediterranean and their various unsuccessful attempts to find a city to inhabit. This was in fact Aeneas' own narration, which Dido herself heard him give. Over the course of his travels and attempts to build a city, Aeneas learned valuable lessons about the process—including the virtues on which a city should be founded—all of which, for their Roman-ness, will be part of the final project. He sees Queen Dido in a situation similar to his own and offers his story, not merely as entertainment or an autobiography since the sack of Troy, but as advice. In Book 3, as Ralph Hexter points out,

Aeneas learns "to subordinate the emotional and personal to the political and historical."[31] Dido turns out not to have taken his point. One city Aeneas passed by in Book 3 was Buthrotum, a colony of exile Trojans whose intense fixation on the past and desire to revive it, though long gone, in the form of an *imago* fueled their foundation of the city. Aeneas realizes, on some level, that Troy, now destroyed, is gone for good, and any attempt to reproduce it is empty, as Buthrotum ultimately is. The lesson of this anecdote is that one cannot substitute a mere image, a fake imitation, for the genuine article. Dido is seen not to grasp this, as she "absent, hears and sees [Aeneas] though he is absent, or holds Ascanius in her lap, seized by the likeness of his father, if she might be able to deceive her unspeakable love" (4.83-5: … *illum absens absentem auditque videtque / aut gremio Ascanium genitoris imagine capta / detinet, infandum si fallere possit amorem*). Initially, the notion of absence is emphasized in the repetition of *absens absentem*, yet both words are elided as if to emulate Dido's eagerness to forget this fact, to obfuscate the truth for herself, and to deceive herself on that score. With Aeneas gone, she is taken by a mere *imago* of him in the person of Ascanius, and attempts to conflate this substitution with the real thing. The theme here is deception, specifically self-deception, as seen in the use of the word *fallere*. Dido made the same mistake here in Carthage that Andromache and company made in founding Buthrotum: they have become willing to accept an *imago* for that which it replicates, an act of delusion which benefits only the individual. This mindset permeated Buthrotum and was the reason Aeneas could not remain there. If this is a poor ideological ground on which to found a city, reason enough to reject it, and Dido, now founding her own city, has come to embrace it, then the city of Carthage, and the Trojans' future there, is now questionable.

[31] Hexter 66.

With harm already having been done to Carthage's moral foundation, the physical construction of the city immediately begins to falter (4.86-89):

> *Non coeptae adsurgunt turres, non arma juventus*
> *exercet portusve aut propugnacula bello*
> *tuta parent: pendent opera interrupta minaeque*
> *murorum ingentes aequataque machina caelo.*

The building process Aeneas so admired in 1.423-9 has halted. The heavy spondees in these lines, particularly in lines 86-7, reflect the cessation of progress. The city's foundation goes no further, and this comes immediately following the beginning of Dido's moral failures: loosening of *pudor*, focus on the individual over the population as a whole, and acceptance of an *imago* in place of the authentic. Her once successful leadership, under which the city's foundation moved swiftly in all respects—physical, moral, and administrative—has taken a downturn, halting construction and promoting personal rather than cultural values.[32] In fact, Aeneas has had to begin building Carthage on Dido's behalf. Mercury, sent to Aeneas with a message from Jupiter, "sees [him] founding citadels and altering rooves" (260-1: *Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta nouantem / conspicit*). Here Aeneas is doing the physical work of city-foundation, but it is in the wrong place, for the wrong people and the wrong ideals. In founding a city for Dido, he is setting in stone, as it were, her misguided values, the permanence of which would have negative consequences on the people of Carthage, among which the Trojans are now also included.

Jupiter would remind him of his duty, which is to his people and the future of Rome, and he sends Mercury with reasons he should leave Carthage (232-6):

> *Si nulla accendit tantarum gloria rerum,*
> *nec super ipse sua molitur laude laborem,*

[32] This distinction becomes clear in the speeches of Dido and Aeneas. Dido focuses her pleas on personal feelings and begs Aeneas to forget his mission, while Aeneas denies even his own desires, understanding that destiny calls him to something greater for the sake of those dependent on him. This is especially clear in *Aen.* 4.340-3: *me si fata meis paterentur ducere uitam / auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas, / urbem Troianam primum dulcisque meorum / reliquias colerem Priami tecta alta manerent,/ et recidiua manu posuissem Pergama uictis.*

Ascanione pater Romanas invidet arces?
Quid struit, aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur,
nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia respicit arva?

Jupiter outlines three possible reasons that Aeneas might be inspired to resume his journey to Italy and found a city there. First, Aeneas might be moved by thoughts of his own glory (*tantarum gloria rerum*; *sua…laude*). Jupiter discounts this possibility from the start. If Aeneas were interested in his own glory, he would never have been willing to subordinate his own city-building project to Dido's in the first place. More importantly, though, he is genuinely aware that his people and his family take priority. Seeing this, Jupiter proposes a second motivator: Ascanius and his future descendants (*Ascanione pater Romanas invidet arces?... nec prolem Ausoniam et Lavinia respicit arva?*). The theme of fathers and sons figures heavily in the *Aeneid*, both in the question of lineage and descendants (especially in Book 6) and in Aeneas' own interactions with Anchises and Ascanius. Aeneas displays filial piety towards his father, but recognizes also that his son and future descendants are part of his mission. He has an obligation to consider both his ancestors and his descendants when founding his city, as lineage constitutes the lifeblood of a city's continuity. A city's foundation does and ought to take these facts into account, as a city's identity, when founded, does not apply only to the living. Specifically, the identity embodied by Carthage does not do justice to Ascanius and his future children, and it is for this reason that Jupiter mentions a third consideration, that the Carthaginians are "a hostile race" (*gens inimica*, 235). There might be forward-looking resonances here of the conflicts between Carthage in Rome, which would have been on the mind of Vergil's Roman audience throughout this entire episode. Certainly, Dido does pray for eternal enmity between the two races at the end of Book 4.[33] Up to this point, however, they are engaging in friendly cooperation.

[33] 4.622-4: *Tum vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum / exercete odiis, cinerique haec mittite nostro / munera. Nullus amor populis, nec foedera sunto.*

In what sense, then, are the Tyrians a hostile race? Jupiter must mean that they are hostile in that they inhibit the Roman mission that Aeneas must carry out. Not only is he prevented from its completion so long as he remains in Carthage, but the city's *mores*, through Dido, have become profoundly un-Roman. The union of the Tyrians and the Trojans would yield a state of affairs such that Rome would never be founded, but besides this an acceptance of a Carthaginian moral foundation, which undermines *pudor*, rejects the ideal of the *univira*, and accepts the preeminence of the individual, would not yield a Roman identity such as the one on which Romans prided themselves. Mercury repeats Jupiter's admonishments, but adds the further accusation that he has already fallen prey to this Carthaginian trap, focusing his efforts on Dido rather than his own people (265-7: *Tu nunc Karthaginis altae / fundamenta locas, pulchramque uxorius urbem / exstruis, heu regni rerumque oblite tuarum?*). Aeneas has acquiesced to Dido's frame of mind, Mercury claims, and is dedicated more to a single woman's benefit than to his entire people's. That he is currently building her city and not his own is his evidence for this. The descriptions of Aeneas as *uxorius* and *regni rerumque oblitus tuarum* draw this contrast between personal and cultural, the latter and more important of which Aeneas seems to have forgotten.[34]

Terrified by the message, however, Aeneas rededicates himself to his mission and is unable to be swayed, even by Dido. Dido's subsequent suicide sends the entire city into a frenzy, "no different than if all Carthage or ancient Tyre should go to ruin with the enemies having been let in, and raging flames are turned throughout the rooftops of men and of gods" (669-71: *non aliter, quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis / Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes / culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum*). The city's reaction upon Dido's death, then, is as if the city had been sacked and destroyed. Perhaps, on the level of cultural identity, it

[34] In his note ad loc., Maurus Servius Honoratus defines *uxorius* as *nimium uxori deditus vel serviens*, which is a significant problem in the context of cultural foundation.

has. Dido's inattention toward her people and her city, though she may have thought she was doing what was best for her people in pursuing marriage with Aeneas, has proven to be her own ruin, and the city, in response, acts out its own ruin as well.[35] Dido embraced certain values antithetical to the successful foundation of a city (in moral terms), successful in the sense of being potentially Roman. The great pathos with which Vergil writes Dido's death is a testament to his skill as a poet and interest in the personal aspects of broader culture. Yet on the level of narrative it is also a sign of melancholy for the great potential Carthage had in Book 1, now come to naught. The function of the Dido episode, punctuating Aeneas narration of Books 2 and 3, is to emphasize the instructional role that each city in between Troy and Rome can play in ultimately establishing and affirming Roman identity. Aeneas learned several of these lessons in his travels and shared them with Dido, whose subsequent failure to learn from his experience serves as an example for both Aeneas and Vergil's audience. It is crucial to learn from one's own mistakes and those of others, and the penalty for failing to do so, as seen in the *Aeneid*'s Carthage, is a fallen city and a ruined culture.

[35] Niall Rudd, "Dido's *Culpa*," offers a defense of Dido along these lines, that she acted in the city's best interests, clearly felt that the *univira* ideal was important, and felt guilt once Aeneas was about to leave. I do not seek to attack the character of Dido, only to demonstrate that she serves as a vehicle for the loss or lack of certain virtues, even if only temporarily, and that this loss is what Book 4 criticizes as culturally harmful.

Prophecy

The *Aeneid* contains three main scenes of prophecy regarding the future Roman race: Jupiter's speech to Venus (1.257-96), the parade of heroes in the underworld (6.756–886), and the ekphrasis on the shield of Aeneas (8.626–728). Like the city-foundation scenes, the prophecy scenes add to the ever-growing picture of Roman identity by granting a view of what the city will be like in the future (Vergil's present). Yet unlike the city-foundation scenes, which take the form of terrestrial trial and error, the prophecy scenes offer a supernatural or divine, hence all the more vivid, look into Rome's future state. These examples of Roman culture and identity provide more clarity and certainty as to what a truly Roman identity is *meant* to be, as they are images of a time when Rome actually exists. There may also be something to the argument that these prophecies are skewed, overly optimistic, or problematized in the same breath as they are spoken.[36] This is acceptable, as they nevertheless provide, in the world of the poem, a best-case scenario for Rome once it is founded, uniting both Roman hopes and fears. I intend to examine Jupiter speech to Venus in Book 1, the parade of heroes in Book 6, and Jupiter's promise to Juno in Book 12, of which this last provides some closure to the poem and states what role the events of the poem will have on the shaping of Roman identity. This passage should prove elucidating when read in comparison with his speech to Venus. I will not attempt to offer a comprehensive analysis of all occurrences throughout the poem which could be considered instances of prophecy, but will focus instead on what I consider to be the most essential passages as far as determining identity is concerned.[37]

---

[36] This is the primary thesis of James O'Hara in *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's* Aeneid, whose views will be considered throughout this section.

[37] Other possible passages include Hector's speech at 2.285ff., Creusa's speech at 2.776ff., Anchises' (often wrong) predictions throughout Book 3, Celaeno's curse at 3.247ff., Dido's curse at 4.622ff., the oracle of Faunus at 7.81ff., and, of course, the shield of Aeneas at 8.626ff.

Though neither Aeneas nor Ascanius is fated to found Rome itself, nor is the city's foundation depicted in the *Aeneid*, his efforts and destiny as related in the epic are tied explicitly to the origins of Rome and its civilization, as stated in the proem: "Many things he suffered in war, also, until he founded a city and brought his gods to Latium, whence come the Latin race and the Alban fathers and the walls of lofty Rome" (1.5-7: *multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem, / inferretque deos Latio, genus unde Latinum, / Albanique patres, atque altae moenia Romae*). This brief description of Aeneas' quest and its outcomes in the proem serves as a sort of prophecy of Rome's destiny, upon which Jupiter expands later in Book 1. In fact, the Vergilian narrator speaks almost with the same amount of prophetic authority as Jupiter, as all prophecy in the poem has the benefit of hindsight with the city already being founded. He speaks of present facts as though they were prophecy, since the events of the poem which bring about these results have yet to occur. Yet the reader is filled with a sense of import upon reading these lines and the subsequent prophetic scenes. City-foundation is the goal, as seen in the word *condere*, a word which recurs frequently in the poem and in every case reminds the audience of the immediate action's connection to the ultimate goal of Rome's foundation.[38] Further, the *urbs* meant in line 5 is unclear. It might be Rome; although Aeneas does not actually found it, the endgame of his foundational efforts throughout the *Aeneid* is clear, and it might be implied that he "founds Rome" in the sense that he lays the cultural, moral, and ideological groundwork for its future glory. The city he does actually found, though, is Lavinium, so this would better fit the literal sense of the phrase. Yet he founds one other "city" in Latium: a Trojan military camp which his men defend in their war against the native Italians.[39] This is the Trojans' first

[38] In fact, *condere* is used for the final act of the poem, when Aeneas stabs and kills Turnus (12.950-1: *hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit, / fervidus*). The connection between this act and the theme of city-foundation will be discussed in the section on the second half of the *Aeneid*, below.
[39] 7.157ff.

foundational act in Italy, the purpose of which is clear in both function and identity: the Trojans are fated to engage in further warfare in order to gain a foothold in Italy, and the military camp serves that function. Whichever city is meant, it is important to note that all of them, as well as the cities encountered prior to their arrival in Italy, play a role in the ultimate foundation of Rome, which is *the* city of the poem. Just as the Latin race, Alban fathers, and walls of lofty Rome form a sequence, each surpassing the last in importance, building on those prior and becoming increasingly fundamental to Rome itself (its people, its prominent figures, and its delineators of both physical space and cultural identity), each successive city Aeneas and his people found or encounter in between Troy and Rome builds upon an accumulating urban experience. By the end of the poem, one can see an outline of Roman identity, eventually to be tied to the city of Rome itself, expressed in the language of cities and city-foundation. The *moenia altae Romae,* as physical constructs, figuratively enclose the *mores* held by the city, just as cities in the *Aeneid* are seen to have their values established contemporaneously with the cities' physical foundations. It is for this reason that the loftiness of Rome applies equally to its moral character as to its walls.

Jupiter, speaking with divine authority, demonstrates how exactly Aeneas is to lay the groundwork, so to speak, for Rome's foundation, and what effects this will have on Rome's destiny. He says, "He will wage a huge war in Italy and will beat down fierce peoples, and he will put in place *mores* and walls for his men" (1.263-4: *bellum ingens geret Italia, populosque feroces / contundet, moresque viris et moenia ponet*). As already alluded to in the proem, Aeneas will wage war in Italy and be victorious. The foundation process follows this and, crucially, involves the placement of *mores,* laws or customs, at the same time as city walls. In speaking so, Jupiter defines the way of reading all foundation projects seen in the epic: one can see the

manners and identifying features affirmed by a people at the same time as they establish their city. In Jupiter's speech, one can actually see the shift in cultural identity take place. Ascanius' name—Ilus while Troy still stood—now takes on the cognomen Iulus (267-8: *at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo / additur; Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno*). In this change of name, the shift from his old Trojan identity to a new Roman identity is complete. The significance is that in changing from Ilus (cognate with Ilion, for Troy) to Iulus, the Julian gens obtains, preserved in epic, a continuity of progressing Roman identity since the time of Troy. His personal identity, his name, is linked with his city: Ilus "while the Trojan state stood in power," and now Iulus, since the Julian gens will be prominent in Rome, all the more so now under the rule of Augustus. The foundation of Rome as depicted in the *Aeneid* is thus just as much a foundation of a *gens* as an identifying marker as it is about the foundation of a city, which subsequently stands for the identity of its people.[40] This shift from Trojan to Roman identity occurs again, now in full, when Ilia gives birth to Romulus, who founds Rome and names the people Romans after himself.[41] The glory of Rome, now founded, consists of multiple imperial successes: it is granted "empire without end" and beloved by Jupiter and the gods (278-83), will conquer many great races (283-5), will have Julius Caesar "from Trojan origin," whose empire will be bound by the sea and his fame by the stars (286-8),[42] and finally the Roman Empire will bring an end to war and *Furor impius* will be chained shut behind the Gates of War (293-6). The role that the Trojans' multiple foundations throughout the epic play in this ultimate glory is confirmed in Caesar's Trojan origins and the origin of the name Julius from Iulus. The Trojans

[40] See Hardie (1998) 64.
[41] 1.274-7.
[42] Which "Julius Caesar" is meant by these lines is unclear and a topic for debate. One would perhaps assume Augustus.

establish not the city itself but a continuity, a chain of events instrumental in effecting the city's foundation and identity such that it is capable of these great deeds.

Regarding this speech, O'Hara points out, rightly, that "Vergil's point of view cannot simply be equated with Jupiter's" and that "Jupiter deceives or misleads Venus about the difficulties and compromises that await Aeneas in Italy, and the degree to which the culture of her beloved Troy will contribute to that of Rome."[43] By way of demonstrating this, he contrasts Jupiter's claim that Aeneas will impose *mores* and *moenia* on the conquered peoples of Italy with Aeneas' denial that he will impose *mores* on the Latins and promise that the Trojans will build a city for him alone (1.264; 12.192-194). As I have discussed earlier, it is not the case that the Trojan's contribution to Roman culture is in any way slight. Establishing *moenia* in the *Aeneid* is tantamount to establishing *mores*, and inasmuch as the Trojans bring the same *mores* as the Italians to the foundation of Rome, it is fair to say that they have an equal share in establishing its *moenia*. "Trojan" identity slowly disintegrates over the course of the poem, as multiple city-foundation attempts seek to establish a new identity for a wayward people.[44] It is not their old Trojan identity that the Trojans seek to add, but a newfound Roman identity. In this they succeed, and they need not impose their *mores* on the native Latins when these *mores* are already shared. From a Trojan perspective, the reality may seem more dim than was prophesized, yet this is keeping in mind that the Trojans' prospects seemed dim from the outset, and this contrast, moreover, is "quintessentially Vergilian."[45]

The parade of heroes in the underworld in Book 6 brings to light even more prominent Roman figures. This passage is significant in that Aeneas himself is able to witness the future he

[43] O'Hara 130; 137.
[44] Quint, 64 sees this repetition as a form of purgation rather than a constant regression. Under this reading, the Trojans are purging their Trojan identity, no longer grounded in an extant city, in favor of acquiring a new, i.e. Roman, identity, which will ultimately find an urban foundation in Rome.
[45] O'Hara 164.

is enacting and is allowed a glimpse of what it means to possess a Roman identity. Thus he is able to act in accordance with the nature of this future Rome. The circularity of this mode of identity establishment need hardly be brought up, but it should not be forgotten that the assertion of a true Roman identity in the *Aeneid* is as much for Aeneas' benefit as it is for the benefit of Vergil's Roman audience. A Roman hearing this passage could not help but feel a touch of pride, and such a manifestation of Roman values is critical in this post-civil war time when Rome's very identity is undergoing a crisis.[46] As Anchises gives Aeneas a tour of the underworld, we receive some information about the transmigration of souls. Souls due for reincarnation spend a thousand years in the underworld and drink from the water of Lethe, the river of forgetfulness.[47] The figures Anchises shows Aeneas have all lost and forgotten their old identities in order to gain new, specifically Roman identities. This fate is the same as that of the Trojans and Aeneas; with Troy gone, they have lost their authentic Trojan identity and no longer have an identity of their own, hence their need to found a new city upon which to base an identity. In these men, Aeneas sees the fulfillment of an identity to which he has contributed but will not live to see fully established. First are the future kings of Alba Longa, who will continue the Trojan tradition, and future citadels. After naming them, Anchises concludes, "These will be their names then, now they are lands without a name" (776: *haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae*). These words are reminiscent of the description of Priam's corpse in Book 2 (2.557-8: *iacet ingens litore truncus, / auulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus*). These passages describe entities on opposite ends of the identity spectrum. Priam, now dead and beheaded, king of a fallen city, no longer possesses the identifying markers of king, Trojan, or human being. The future sites of Alba Longa's citadels, now lands without any significant features or structures,

[46] Pride especially at Anchises' injunction to embrace Roman identity and at so many prominent Roman figures. Though, as will be seen, their presentation here is not unproblematic.
[47] 6.748-51.

will obtain an identity when settlements are founded and named on those spots. Another important result is that the Trojans, long lacking a true identity, will again be granted one as they build a city on which to base it.

Among these accounts of spirits acquiring new Roman identities is the language of city-building. Romulus' foundation of Rome is described, yet it is as if the city is enacting its own foundation, because it will "equal the power of the earth and the spirits on Olympus, and will place seven citadels around itself with one wall" (781-3: *En, huius, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma / imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo, / septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces*). The city somehow autonomously possesses the power and divinely sustained nature in which its people will share, by which to serve as a bastion by which these individuals already mentioned, those about to be mentioned, and all those who will be Romans in the future will define themselves. Romulus' act of calling Rome by his own name serves as the jumping-off point for this conflation of individual Roman identity and urban Roman identity.[48] In giving his name to the city, he is choosing not to retain it is a marker of personal identity but to offer it up as the name for an urban structure which will define him and his people. Hereafter, the Romans see themselves not as people of Romulus but as the people of the city of Rome. The parade of heroes follows this section (788ff.). As Feeney has pointed out, this passage grounds forward-looking genealogy and history in a sort of mystic eschatology, of which the combination is by no means seamless and, he thinks, ought to give the reader pause.[49] The metaphysics of reincarnation and afterlife are hardly the point of the passage; what is seen, though, in these future Romans is the consistent subordination of individual or even familial identities to national identity. Anchises

[48] And the same is seen attempted in cities founded in Book 3, named after either Aeneas or the Troy in some way. In these cases, individual identity is all one has with which to name the city of an entire people. The alternative is a race name which no longer properly applies now that the city has been destroyed.
[49] Feeney (1986) 1.

makes mention of Republican *gentes*—the Bruti, Decii, Drusi, Gracchi, and others—in and among landmarks of Roman history. Yet as Feeney aptly raises the question, "Which Drusi does he mean in 824? Which Gracchi, which Scipiones in 824-3?"[50] Often it is possible, as Feeney attempts throughout, to divine the identity of an individual distinguished by specific characteristics, or to render a guess as to a possible candidate. Yet perhaps the ambiguity is intentional on Vergil's part. Except in the case of a particularly outstanding individual, it is sufficient for the purposes of broader cultural identity that *gentes* are established rather than individuals. These families, not their individual members, receive focus as the more significant mainstays of Roman identity, or else, why would Vergil not always identify specific individuals? Yet even the *gentes* are not the end-all be-all of Roman identity. This is demonstrated by Brutus the Avenger, who had his sons put to death for starting war. Anchises concludes his mention of him by saying, "Unlucky man, however later people will consider his deeds, love of country and great desire of praise will win out" (822-3: *Infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores, / vincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*). Brutus' actions could not have been uncontroversial among Romans, as the clause *utcumque ferent ea facta minores* suggests. Yet Anchises, in his role as promoter of Roman identity first and foremost, defends him, seeming to argue that loyalty to the Roman *patria* supersedes loyalty even to one's own family members.[51] The hierarchy moves this way, then: individuals comprise *gentes*, and *gentes* comprise Rome, and it is to this Roman identity that Romans owe their greatest devotion.

He further clarifies what it means to be truly Roman. While yielding art, philosophy, and science to the Greeks, he insists, "You, Roman, remember to rule the peoples with empire—these will be your arts—and to put in place a practice of peace, to spare the defeated, and to beat

[50] Feeney (1986) 5.
[51] Though Aeneas succeeds in maintaining both, as is optimal. Filial piety and duty to one's family are still stressed throughout.

down the proud" (851-3: *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento; / hae tibi erunt artes; pacisque imponere morem, / parcere subiectis, et debellare superbos*). Feeney notes the irony here that Anchises, a character in an epic poem, exhorts the Roman not to ascribe too much importance to the arts.[52] Whatever Vergil's reservations regarding the role of the arts in Roman culture and identity, this passage in concrete terms defines a Roman's identity by declaring that the Roman people's world-destiny is to conquer and then maintain peace. The city of Rome, then, as the locus of this identity, is the locus of empire. This imperial identity is compounded with aspects of Roman identity teased out in other parts of the poem, primarily in city-building sections. Hitherto, Anchises' prophecy has been regarding events of Roman history which, for Vergil's audience, have already come to pass. Ending on a note of melancholy, however, Anchises invokes Marcellus, whose death is the closest event to Vergil's present (868-86). The fulfillment of these prophetic visions, then, carries all the way through Roman history to Vergil's day. At this point, however, the prophecy can go no further, and their outlook upon the future from Vergil's point in history is cloudy. As Feeney notes, "Marcellus had embodied the future, a future which is painted gloriously (872-81), and then taken away from us, unrealised."[53] Our ability to look into the future ends here, as Marcellus, on whose shoulders the future had been placed, is now dead. There is no means provided by which to tell or even to guess what the future will hold. Is the ability to prophesize only about events which have already occurred not patently unhelpful? Yet Vergil does not dare have Anchises go any further.

Regarding Anchises' speech in the underworld, I would only echo O'Hara's comment that "Vergil gives eloquent voice to his people's hope that the civil wars of the last decades

[52] Feeney (1986) 15. The irony seems especially intentional if we recall the *compagibus artis* of Jupiter's speech at line 1.293 and read it, as Bartsch (1998) 324-5 does, not as "tight bonds" but as "bonds of *ars*," another instance of *ars* restraining destructive forces.
[53] Feeney (1986) 15.

would not be repeated, that Rome would prosper under Augustus, and that life would somehow be better than it had ever been before."[54] These are hopes, but by no means convictions. The Romans must put their faith in Augustus, as the Trojans must in Aeneas, and the former's success has yet to be proven. Aeneas' ultimate success has been confirmed by these visions of a Roman future. Perhaps, by this parallel, Vergil implies that Augustus will likewise be successful. If one wishes to read this scene merely as Augustan propaganda, this interpretation might serve. Yet much more seems to be going on here. Augustus has not yet proven successful in furnishing a glorious future, but Vergil has provided a rubric by which a city can attain lasting success. Throughout the poem, as the Trojans themselves have sought it, he has laid out a fundamental Roman identity. Establishing and maintaining this identity is the key, and perhaps it is his hope that, reading the *Aeneid*, his fellow Romans will be inspired by this image of themselves and seek to reclaim it. The Roman identity, then, serves as a prophecy for the future from Marcellus onward, which would be fulfilled and bring about success only if it is accepted and followed.

Yet Jupiter's speech to Juno in Book 12, a sort of prophecy like his speech to Venus, seems to counteract the labors of the Trojans up to this point in establishing a uniquely Roman identity. Jupiter seems to rescind his earlier promises. Before this speech, however, Juno makes a number of pleas on behalf of the conquered Latins (12.823-8):

> *"...ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos*
> *neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari*
> *aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem.*
> *Sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,*
> *sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago:*
> *occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia."*
>
> "…that the indigenous Latins do not change their old name, and may you not order that they become Trojans or that they be called Trojans or that the men change their language or change their clothing. May it be Latium, may there be Alban kings throughout the ages,

[54] O'Hara 172.

> may there be Roman offspring powerful in Italian virtue. Troy has fallen; allow that it stays fallen along with its name."

Jupiter grants her wishes, and yields more than she asked (12.834-7):

> *"…Sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,*
> *utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum*
> *subsident Teucri. Morem ritusque sacrorum*
> *adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos…"*
>
> "The Ausonians shall retain their paternal language and customs, and their name shall be as it is. Mingling only in body, the Trojans will subside. I shall add their custom and sacred rites and I shall make them all Latins of one language."

Juno asks that the Latins retain their independent cultural identity, including their name and kingdom, and that they not become or be called Trojans. Of *mores*, she asks only that they retain their manner of dress. She closes by asking not only that Troy remain fallen but also that the name by which the city or those from it could be identified die as well. Tarrant notes the alliteration at 825 (*vocem…viros…vertere vestem*), commenting, "the heavy alliteration, a common feature of early Latin, embodies the linguistic continuity that Juno is striving to preserve and implicitly signals her success."[55] Her use of traditional Latin features in her plea, then, acts as a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy, as it is Latin both in the world of the *Aeneid* and in the text of the *Aeneid*. How, though, do we reconcile the final loss of Trojan identity, which the Trojans have been laboring to reestablish in city-form throughout the entire epic? R. D. Williams suggests that this is necessitated by the two contrasting images of Troy: "on the one hand the glorious home from which came the hero of the poem and through him the Julian *gens*; and on the other hand a barbaric Eastern city lacking in the robust virtues of the simple Italians."[56] There is certainly something to this. In his section on the shield of Aeneas, David Quint draws heavy distinctions between Western and Eastern identity: the disunity, femininity, loss of control, chaos,

[55] Tarrant, note ad loc.
[56] R. D. Williams (1973), note at 12.828.

and loss of identity of the East, and the unity, masculinity, control, order, and permanence of the West.[57] Certainly there is a fear that the barbarism for which the East was reputed would have had a negative impact on the foundation of Rome had Trojan identity not been subordinated to Italian identity. Tarrant acknowledges this, and adds that this has the effect of "attributing Roman greatness to Italian *virtus* rather than to Rome's eastern proto-founder."[58] In this, Vergil is very much constrained by historical and cultural facts. The early Italians did not possess these aforementioned Eastern traits, nor would the Romans have found this acceptable if they had. After all, they were not called Trojans, they were called Latins. In order to make room for a Trojan influence in early pre-Roman history, Vergil must explain away their lack of nominal presence.

Yet the idea that the Trojans would have no influence at all on Roman identity is problematic, and does not fit with facts elsewhere in the poem. When Jupiter promises *moresque tenebunt* (834), this means that the Italians will not have their values changed utterly to Trojan ones, not that Trojan *mores* will not influence Italian ones. In fact, Jupiter says that he will add Trojan practice and ritual to Latin custom, explaining the presence of the Trojan penates in religious practice. Yet the Roman values and *mores* that the Trojans have discovered over the course of the poem through their city-building attempts will and must be included in Roman identity, and it is perhaps this *mos* to which Jupiter refers in 836. We know that Trojan identity cannot fade out entirely—only the city and name—because the Troy Games, seen in 5.545-603, are revived by Augustus in modern Rome. So on some level Trojan practice and custom is carried over into Roman identity, and Vergil goes out of his way to make it so. Perhaps an acquisition of Roman virtues and values was necessary for the Trojans to assimilate into Latin culture, where disparity

[57] Quint, *Epic and Empire* 25.
[58] Tarrant, note at 12.835-6.

in values precluded such assimilation in Carthage. Finally, we might consider Jupiter's audience as he makes this promise. Just as he altered the truth in explaining the Roman future to Venus (1.292, where he promises that Romulus and Remus will rule Rome together, ignoring the tradition that Romulus killed Remus), Jupiter might perhaps be understating for Juno's benefit the degree to which the Trojans will have a role in shaping Rome's future.[59]

Of course, it may be the case that Vergil does not intend these vignettes of Roman identity to be taken at face value. In fact, it would be utterly uncharacteristic of him to be one-dimensional in any aspect of his commentary on Roman identity. The topic of cultural identity and its origins is far too complex for any such generalization. Yet through the ambiguities there is an underlying intent to establish and to comment upon the notion of Roman-ness, and any vagueness on the poet's part only mirrors the complexity of the question with which he is concerned. Trojan identity is at once heroic and virtuous and Eastern and barbaric. Their trials and tribulations throughout the course of their city-foundation mission speak in their favor, however, because it is in these episodes that they, as exiles, and the audience, as observers, see non-Roman identity penalized and Roman identity uplifted. The prophecies scattered throughout the epic take various forms and come from various speakers. Yet the ultimate establishment of Roman identity and the Trojans' role in it is consistently reiterated, as is Rome's lasting glory, even as it is subtly problematized. I believe it must be admitted that Vergil undercuts the surface-level optimism of these prophecies with reservations about whether such a bright, shining future will truly come to pass. I do not mean, by analyzing these prophecies which fundamentally depict Rome's future in a positive light, to suggest that Vergil's message is as simple as this. Rather, an underlying message of doubt and fear is to be found, as O'Hara's analysis of these prophecies has demonstrated. Within the hopefulness of the *Aeneid*'s prophecies lies a strain of realistic doubt,

[59] R. D. Williams (1973), note at 12.835-6 makes this suggestion.

acknowledgment of the horror of the years of civil war, and uncertainty about the future. At this crossroad of Roman history, Vergil attempts to be neither overly optimistic nor utterly pessimistic, retaining instead a sense of realism about their current status. Despite prophecy's apparent ability to elucidate future events, prophecy in the *Aeneid* seems to reveal Vergil's doubts that it can accomplish even this with accuracy, and rather than attempting overconfident guesswork he opts instead to leave future events in the future. His hope, perhaps, is that Roman nature will see the Roman people through whatever may come.

Cities of Italy: Books 7-12

Book 7 of the *Aeneid* marks a turning point in the poem's approach to the foundation process. Not only is it at the beginning of the book that Vergil declares a shift in focus (7.45: *maius opus moveo*), but it is at this point that the city-foundation project moves from experimental, temporary, and theoretical efforts to more concrete, permanent, and certain ones. It is perhaps in this sense that Vergil considers the second half of the poem to be a *maius opus*, because it sees "the achievement of what was sought in the voyage."[60] The learned identity that the Trojans have uncovered over the course of the poem must now be put to the test to see if it can serve as the making of a lasting city. After all, it is here in Italy that the audience expects the foundation of Rome to be secured. All foundation attempts prior to this have been trial runs, none of which were expected, at least by the reader, to last. The groundwork has been laid, the tests run, and it is time to put the plan into action. The problem, however, is that war must first be waged with the peoples of Italy before Aeneas can found his city, and if a lasting city is to come of this war then it must first be won. In it, the audience and the Trojans are introduced to many people and many cities, some friendly, some hostile, all of which develop the character of the land the Trojans have at last reached. In this section, I will review the following prominent figures and cities of Books 7-12: the Trojan military camp which they build upon landing, Latinus, Amata, and their city, Evander and Pallanteum, Mezentius and Agylla, and finally Turnus. I will end by discussing the significance of Turnus' death as a foundational act, focusing on the use of the word *condere* in line 12.950 (*ferrum adverso sub pectore condit*).

[60] R. D. Williams (1973) 164. He also proposes that it is because of the great pathos possible in depictions of war, and the joy Vergil feels at now being able to write about his own Italy and Rome's historical achievements. The second half of the poem is closer to home, and therefore dearer to the hearts, of Vergil's Roman audience.

Upon first landing in Italy, the Trojans set to work on building their settlement. However, upon looking at it, the settlement's beginnings do not have the look of a town or city, but of a military camp. It is noted that Aeneas "himself designates walls with a shallow ditch and labors upon the place and surrounds the first settlements on the shore in the style of a military camp with battlements and a rampart (7.157-9: *Ipse humili designat moenia fossa / moliturque locum primasque in litore sedes / castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit*). The military function that this settlement will soon need to serve is foreshadowed here in the particular emphasis on its military features. Especially of note are the battlements (*pinnae*) and rampart (*agger*), but note, too, the militarily advantageous position on the shore of the river (*in litore*, 158). Any city ought to be built with such considerations, it is true, but it is rare in the *Aeneid* that such focus be placed on the military aspects of a city during the account of its foundation, as the focus is typically on the city's walls and cultural aspects like laws.[61] Yet if a settlement defines the nature of its inhabitants, it must be that the military nature of this camp signals that these Trojans are to take part in another war soon. It might also signal their pride in their military capabilities, but not so far as to indicate an attitude of warmongering, as Aeneas immediately sends envoys to Latinus' city to ask for peace.

As the Trojan envoys approach, the distinction between the structures of the established city and the new military camp could not be more stark (7.160-3):

> *Iamque iter emensi turris ac tecta Latinorum*
> *ardua cernebant iuvenes muroque subibant.*
> *Ante urbem pueri et primaevo flore iuventus*
> *exercentur equis…*

[61] Carthage strikes me as an obvious exception (4.86-8: *non arma iuventus / exercet, portusve aut propugnacula bello / tuta parant*) because of Carthage's pressing potential threats and perhaps because, as with the Trojans' military camp, there is a foreshadowing of conflict, here between Carthage and future Rome (also 1.14, where Carthage is described as *studiisque asperrima belli*).

> And now having measured out their journey the youths spied the towers and high rooves of the Latins and they came under the wall. Before the city, boys and youth in blossoming young age are practicing horses…

As opposed to the Trojan camp, which at this point has only designated a location for its walls with a ditch, the Latin city is complete with high walls and towers. This difference also accounts for their disparity in cultural identity. The Latins have long been native to this land and the completeness of their city reflects that. The Trojans are not only foreigners in this land, but they have yet to reestablish their own identity as a people, which purpose a city will serve. There is, however, one similarity between the two settlements: both are preparing for the possibility of war. The Latin youth are practicing horsemanship, as well as other forms of combat (bows, spears, boxing, 164-5). This is not in preparation for any foreseen military threat on their part, as it has been established that Latinus' rule and his city are peaceful (7.45-6: *Rex arva Latinus et urbes / iam senior longa placidas in pace regebat*). These accounts of military preparation, then, other than displaying responsible preparation on the leaders' part, foreshadow the conflict soon to arise between the Latins and the Trojans. It is to this city that the Trojan envoys come to treat with the king. Latinus' response is gracious, as he replies to their request for peace saying, "It shall be granted, Trojan, what you ask for, nor do I reject your gifts" (260-1: *dabitur, Troiane, quod optas, / munera nec sperno*).[62] The prospects for friendly cooperation and successful integration seem good. The extension of *hospitium* and the maintenance of peace are favorable virtues both for the city and for Latinus as a ruler, and the *longa pax* suggests that the Latins have managed, like the future Romans, to bind *Furor impius* with chains in their own kingdom.

Yet this peace is not to last for much longer. Queen Amata becomes frenzied by Allecto, stirred up by Juno, and becomes *furor* personified (348: *quo furibunda domum monstro*

[62] R. D. Williams (1973) ad loc. compares this response to Dido's at 1.569f. There is also the further significance between the frenzied Amata and Dido, discussed below.

permisceat omnem; 349-50: *Ille … fallitque furentem*; 377: *immensam sine more furit lymphata per urbem*). Her *furor* is revealed through the words *furibunda…furentem…furit* repeated throughout these lines, and by this description she is shown to be under Juno's influence. It is this force of *furor* which Aeneas has opposed in its variant forms throughout the poem, a harmful force incompatible with the foundation of a successful city, especially not Rome. Amata's description here is reminiscent of Dido, who likewise "burns and wanders the entire city, maddened" (4.68-9: *uritur infelix Dido totaque uagatur / urbe furens*). As seen in Book 4, Dido's *furor*, which proved the detriment of her foundation project and betrayed an undesirable focus on the individual rather than the community, was allowed to pervade the entire city. This occurs not only as a result of her leadership affecting her city and her citizens, but is also communicated through her literal, physical movement throughout the city, as if spreading her *furor* everywhere she goes. The same occurs here with Amata, who "frantic, rages without restraint throughout the massive city" (7.377). The positive *mores* which the city holds and has hitherto displayed no longer restrain Amata, as she acts *sine more*. This has the effect of throwing the city into chaos, demonstrating that a city's ruin can come from within as well as from without. Her lack of restraint is demonstrated in the simile in lines 7.378-81, in which she is compared to a top driven about by children. In this sense, Amata no longer possesses the autonomy of independent identity, but is under the control of Allecto, as a sort of toy. Williams notes also that "the top was a sacred symbol of Bacchus" and that "the association with Bacchus chimes in with the rest of the passage."[63] This is another connection Amata shares with Dido, as Dido was compared to a Bacchant in Book 4 (300-3):

> *saeuit inops animi totamque incensa per urbem*
> *bacchatur, qualis commotis excita sacris*
> *Thyias, ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho*

[63] R. D. Williams (1973) at line 378f.

orgia nocturnusque uocat clamore Cithaeron.

Amata goes so far as to simulate Bacchic rites, as "she even went out into the forests under the pretended divinity of Bacchus, approaching a greater crime and giving rise to a greater *furor*" (7.385-6: *Quin etiam in silvas, simulato numine Bacchi, / maius adorta nefas maioremque orsa furorem*). This *furor* properly belongs outside the city, as do authentic Bacchic rites, yet Amata has already introduced such unrest and chaos within the city, causing a threat to the city's very identity. This is proven to be the case when the Latins, originally committed to peace with the Trojans, are forced into armed conflict with them. Some fundamental change in the way these peoples (Latins and Trojans) identify themselves has occurred here to cause this sudden change in attitudes. This introduction of *furor* will prove to be to the Latins' detriment, as it will result in a war in which they are defeated. In this way, unfortunate for the Latins, the cultural foundation of their city has been altered from within, from one that is peaceful and hospitable to one that is furious and hostile. Such a city cannot coexist with one such as the Trojans will found with their newfound *mores*, as the people of that city are defined by it just as the person of Amata is able to negatively influence the sort of city it is.

The Trojans find enemies in the Latins and their city (and also in Turnus, the Rutulians, and their city of Ardea), but also find allies in Evander, Pallas, and their city of Pallanteum. Pallanteum is significant in that it exists on the future site of Rome, and thus its foundational layout looks forward to that of Rome in Vergil's day. This view of Rome before it was Rome serves as a sort of prophetic look at the city, yet the differences between Pallanteum and Rome are significant and worth noting. Aeneas is in the same position as the audience of the poem, an observer of and listener to this description of proto-Rome. His response is nothing short of awe, as he "wonders and bears obedient eyes around all things and is seized by the places and happily

seeks out and hears about the monuments of earlier men, one by one" (8.310-12: *miratur facilisque oculos fert omnia circum / Aeneas capiturque locis et singula laetus / exquiritque auditque virum monimenta priorum*). His amazement displays an understanding of the significance of this site that he cannot possibly possess. Somehow the place resonates with him as spatially significant, it being the future site of Rome. Priam is titled "the founder of the Roman citadel" (313: *Romanae conditor arcis*) by virtue of his being the ruler of Pallanteum and the pre-foundational relationship in which he stands to Rome itself. These men are both instrumental in the future glory that is Rome, so perhaps it is fitting that they find friendship. Yet is Aeneas' amazement at this place justified by its appearance? Many of the staple landmarks of Rome have yet to be founded, and the city itself is humble and rustic. Pallanteum is itself the site of prior inhabitants, and the vestiges of a greater age still remain there.

Pallanteum bridges the gap between the site's past glory under Saturn and its future glory under Augustus, reminiscent of a past golden age now lost, but looking forward to a golden age yet to come. The first inhabitants, notes Evander, were rustic and uncultured (8.314-18):

> *Haec nemora indigenae fauni nymphaeque tenebant*
> *gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata,*
> *quis neque mos neque cultus erat, nec iungere tauros*
> *aut componere opes norant aut parcere parto,*
> *sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat.*
>
> "Indigenous fauns and nymphs held these groves, and a race of men born from trunks and hard oak, who had neither law nor culture, nor did they know how to yoke oxen or to gather wealth or to set aside goods, but branches and the harsh sustenance of the hunt used to nourish them."

Here we see the origins of Pallanteum before it was even a city, but was a place of forests and groves. Its inhabitants were fauns and nymphs, figures symbolic of the rustic and untamed, and the men who inhabited this land alongside them were not civilized, either, but in fact were *born* from the wilderness itself. They possessed "neither law of life nor culture," and did not know the

skills by which city-dwelling man came to tame nature and put it to his own use. These were not settlers or farmers, but hunter-gatherers, having no city to call home, or even to by which to identify themselves. For it is by urban settlement that mankind firmly establishes civilization and asserts its dominance over nature, a cultural feat of which Rome is most proud. Yet it is not a city or its culture that gives this knowledge to these early settlers of Pallanteum, but Saturn (319-25):

> *Primus ab aetherio venit Saturnus Olympo,*
> *arma Iovis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis.*
> *Is genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis*
> *composuit legesque dedit Latiumque vocari*
> *maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutis in oris.*
> *Aurea quae perhibent illo sub rege fuere*
> *saecula.*
>
> First Saturn came from Olympus of the upper-air, fleeing the arms of Jupiter and an exile with his kingdom having been taken away. He brought together the race, untaught and dispersed among the high mountains, and he gave them laws and preferred to call it "Latium," since he lay hidden on these safe shores. Under that king was what they call "The Golden Age."

The story of the arrival of Saturn serves as an aetiology for the development of human culture. This culture includes the possession of laws and cultural unity, despite their not having a city to unify them physically and spatially. They nevertheless have a common identity as people of Latium, and this is made possible by the Golden Age brought on by Saturn's rule. Within this space occupied by Pallanteum is the local history of a Golden Age of civilization, and we know that Rome is destined also to occupy this space. As Pallanteum bridges the two time periods and two civilizations, could the poet be looking forward to a time in Rome's future when there will once again be a "Golden Age"? Catharine Edwards proposes that such a thing is not possible, claiming that "These traces are a poignant reminder of the irrecoverability of the past, a sign of its profound absence. The age of Saturn, whose ruins still stand in Evander's proto-Rome, is a

prelapsarian golden age which can never return."[64] The truth of this becomes clear as Evander describes the downfall of the Golden Age, that "Saturn ruled the peoples in calm peace, until little by little there came an age, lesser and lacking in brightness, and the madness of war and the love of possessing" (325-7: *Sic placida populos in pace regebat, / deterior donec paulatim ac decolor aetas / et belli rabies et amor successit habendi*). This is the time when the peoples of Italy became disunified and began distinguish themselves separately under various cultural titles. The phrase *decolor aetas* might be working in pointed opposition to the so-called "Golden Age," perhaps referring not only to a less prosperous age but also an age signified by lesser colors of metal (the silver and bronze of the Silver Age and then the Bronze Age). Humankind also begins to pursue war, and with this all hope that a Saturnian Golden Age might be reestablished in Rome is crushed. There has just been a civil war; the Romans of Vergil's time are still very much in these circumstances. Humanity cannot go back to a time when warfare is undesirable to it. But now we see the Latins, Rutulians, Arcadians, and Trojans embroiled in the same sort of conflict in Italy. These peoples, each linked to a major city as the locus of their identities, and each possessing disparate identities, will come to blows over these differences. Yet we see in Saturn the same function being performed on a divine level that a city serves on the mundane level. Both provide unity and the means to express that unified identity as separate from others' identities, and both confer or are symbolic of culture, laws, *mores*, and civilized life generally. In the history of Pallanteum we can see being acted out the same interaction between peoples and the way that they identify themselves, the only difference now being that the site of Pallanteum now has the city established there. Likewise, the only difference between Pallanteum and Rome in this schematic is the completeness of the city, and the Roman identity that, through the Trojans, will then be established there.

[64] Edwards (1996), 11.

With the history of the site established, Evander gives Aeneas a tour of modest Pallanteum. Modesty, we shall see, is the key feature of the settlement, not just as a fact of its humble circumstances, but also as its prime virtue. Yet many of the future features of Rome can be seen here, including a shrine to Carmenta, the future location of the Carmental Gate (338), the Lupercal (343), and the Capitol (347), where Evander notes that some god or other (he does not know which) inhabits the grove (352). The awe felt by Jupiter's presence on the Capitoline is already palpable, as it will become the site of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, an addition which Fowler describes as "a noble forecast of the greatest of Roman worships."[65] The past, then, is indelibly present in Vergil's modern Rome, as all of these significant Roman fixtures are rooted in an ancient, mythic past. On this, Edwards notes that "ancient authors [were] perhaps unwilling to admit to a time when Rome had ever been wholly unfamiliar to them," and as a result "with pride but also nostalgia, explored the tensions between Rome's modest origins and its later grandeur."[66] The entirety of the *Aeneid* is an exercise in this, as it portrays Roman origins and the city's current greatness as a historic surety, such that the success they enjoy could not have been anything other than divinely ordained by fate. A Roman reader could not help but feel a touch of pride when hearing how Roman identity and those who founded the city withstood not only the test of time but also countless other hardships since the fall of Troy. To see the site of the city itself in Pallanteum is architecturally equivalent to what the parade of heroes in Book 6 was genealogically. It is important to keep in mind that both of these aspects of the city contribute to its identity. In humble origins when neither the walls nor the peoples of Rome were established the makings of greatness can nevertheless be seen. The virtues, perhaps, were already in some way there, as Evander, leading Aeneas to his humble abode, where

[65] Fowler, "Aeneas at the Site of Rome," 74.
[66] Edwards (1996), 10-11.

Hercules once entered, offers the following advice: "Dare, my guest, to condemn wealth and make yourself, too, worthy of godhood, and do not come harsh upon affairs which are lacking" (364-5: *Aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum / finge deo rebusque veni non asper egenis*). Fowler tells us that "This was almost the exact spot where stood the abode of Augustus, of which Suetonius [Aug., 72] tells us that it was comparatively modest and unpretending."[67] Evander stresses modesty as a necessary virtue, one which a proper Roman ought to have, which Aeneas himself does and ought to demonstrate, and which is revealed to be an authentic Roman virtue in Augustus' adherence to it.[68] Also on the Capitoline in Vergil's time, though, is the hut of Romulus, which makes an appearance on the shield of Aeneas (8.654). In terms of their modest living conditions, Edwards compares Evander and Romulus, saying, "Thus Evander the proto-founder of Rome and Romulus the actual founder can be seen as resembling one another in their living conditions and therefore their virtuous lifestyles."[69] The acts of founding a city in its physical aspect and founding it in its moral aspect are irrevocably linked, and these two founders of Rome are seen to possess the same virtue upon which the city is to be successful. The "divinity" (*deo*, 365) which is achieved by means of this humility is achieved both by Hercules and by Aeneas. These virtues, then, play a role in securing divine support for a city and its people, and this idea influenced the way Romans thought about their identity. They would take care to cultivate their values and identities in such a way as to lead to the gods' favor, and this would yield success for the city. The same has been seen in city-foundation throughout the poem, when failure to cultivate such virtues has led always to the failure of a city.

[67] Fowler, "Aeneas at the Site of Rome," 75.
[68] Or, in Fowler's words, "These noble words were as applicable, when they were written, to Augustus as to Aeneas" (77).
[69] Edwards (1996), 36.

The tour of Pallanteum now completed, Evander now shifts his focus to a city nearby that has been overtaken by vice: Agylla.[70] Here, too, he begins by relating the city's origins: "Not at all far off from here is inhabited the seat of the city of Agylla, founded on ancient stone, where once the Lydian race, renowned in war, settled upon the Etruscan ridges" (8.478-80: *haud procul hinc saxo incolitur fundata uetusto / urbis Agyllinae sedes, ubi Lydia quondam / gens, bello praeclara, iugis insedit Etruscis*). This city's past, like that of Pallanteum, is still remembered and retained in the structure of the city, as if the *vetustum saxum* from which it was built absorbed the memories and virtues of the Lydian race that settled there. We have seen already in Pallanteum remnants of the remote past of the city still present, just as the poem, looking forward, is able to place vestiges of Evander's Pallanteum in Vergil's Rome. The physical stone that makes up the city is interwoven with the identity of the people who inhabited it. Here, too, the ancient city of a people "renowned in war" recalls its past identity, in this case lamenting the loss of that identity in the present. King Mezentius altered this *status quo*, Evander tells Aeneas, by introducing vice to the city. "King Mezentius," he says, "held the city, flourishing at that time for many years, with arrogant rule and savage arms. Why should I recall the unspeakable killings, the savage deeds of the tyrant? May the gods reserve that for his life and race!" (481-4: *hanc multos florentem annos rex deinde superbo / imperio et saeuis tenuit Mezentius armis. / quid memorem infandas caedes, quid facta tyranni / effera? di capiti ipsius generique reseruent!*). The *deinde* of line 481 applies properly to the participle *florentem*, distinguishing the contrast between the prosperity of the city prior to Mezentius and its decline under his reign. The phrase *hanc multos florentem annos* is an interlocked word order, nicely self-contained and, crucially, logically and metrically separated from *rex*, whose presence reversed the state of the city. His *superbum imperium* reveals the vice of arrogance on his part, and the *saeva arma* with which he

[70] Called Caere by the Romans.

rules the city contrast with the *gens praeclara bello* of line 480. King Mezentius is shown misusing the strength of arms to maintain his rule, and is guilty of murder and wrongdoings besides this. A *rex* in 481, he is now a *tyrannus* in 483. One might recall that Carthage underwent the same decline in Book 4, when Queen Dido shifted her focus away from the community-driven foundation project. Here, too, the ruler has the power to cause the city's progress to take a downturn or to prevent it. One particular unspeakable act of which Mezentius is guilty is a form of torture in which he tied living bodies to corpses, "and he would kill them in that way with a slow death, with gore and corruption mingling in that wretched embrace" (487-8: *et sanie taboque fluentis / complexu in misero longa sic morte necabat*). Under his rule is a grotesque intermingling of life and death. Though not so morbid, we have seen this sort of combination before in the inhabitants of Buthrotum, living Trojan colonists inhabiting a dead city under a dead identity. There, a sense of pathos and loss pervaded the passage, that the settlers would accept an *imago* of their beloved Troy as a substitute for the true city. Here, though, there is only outrage (felt though Evander's exclamation, *di capiti ipsius generique reseruent!*, 484) at Evander's perversion of the natural order. Death cannot coexist with life, just as the dead Polydorus was a bad omen for the Trojans' settlement in Thrace (Book 3), and such a state of affairs must be rectified. The people of Agylla do so, and drive Mezentius out.[71] The king, like Amata and Dido, is described as *furens* (489-90: *infanda furentem / armati circumsistunt ipsumque domumque*), which, for a leader, always proves to be the detriment of the people and the city. Unlike the cases of Dido and Amata, the people realize this, rise up, and take action. Evander concludes this aside by telling Aeneas that Mezentius has taken refuge with

[71] 8.489-493.

Turnus, and that all Etruria, as a result, is demanding war and justice.[72] Can this Turnus, an ally to a man such as this, ever be a friend to Aeneas and the Trojans?

If the cultivation of Roman virtue is the goal, it seems that Mezentius, who has displayed vice, "unspeakable killings, and deeds of a tyrant," is inevitably the Trojans' enemy. One might say that Turnus, as his defender, is just as culpable and just as much an enemy. However, if we put aside this "the friend of my enemy is my enemy" logic, there are still other reasons to be found that Turnus' death is necessary for the foundation of Rome. One minor example is the unwillingness to compromise he displays in Latinus' war council in Book 11.376-444, after the fighting has gone badly for the Latins and Rutulians. Turnus still insists that they continue with the fighting, in a speech in which, in the words of R. D. Williams, "he replies without finesse or subtlety, in terms of forthright abuse, exaggerating his own achievements (393-3, 396-8), and making no reference to the recent disasters that have befallen the Latins."[73] Turnus reveals in his speech that he is just as violent in word as in deed, and that his focus is on his individual self, not the wellbeing of his allies. His desire for personal glory and fulfillment is reminiscent of Dido's desire for Aeneas, a self-consuming drive which led to her own demise and her people's misfortune. If Dido was worth considering hostile to the Roman mission for this, ought not Turnus, who is already an enemy, be considered equally so?[74]

The final scene of the *Aeneid* focuses not on the triumph and glory of Aeneas but on the death of Turnus. The two are not explicitly linked, but I would argue that in depicting the latter Vergil is implying the former. Aeneas is hesitating to deliver the final blow, perhaps about to

---

[72] 8.492-495.
[73] R. D. Williams (1973), note at 376f.
[74] As R. D. Williams (1973) notes at 843f., Turnus is further compared with Dido, as Juturna's actions and words echo those of Anna. 12.871 repeats 4.673 (*unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis*), 12.880f. (*Possem tantos finire dolores /nunc certe et misero fratri comes ire per umbras!*) recall 4.677-9 (*Comitemne sororem / sprevisti moriens? Eadem me ad fata vocasses / idem ambas ferro dolor, atque eadem hora tulisset*), and 12.883 (*O quae satis ima dehiscet*) recalls Dido at 4.24 (*sed mihi vel tellus optem prius ima dehiscat*).

grant Turnus mercy, when he sees Pallas' belt on Turnus' shoulder, and all hesitation vanishes (12.945-52):

> *Ille, oculis postquam saevi monimenta doloris*
> *exuviasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira*
> *terribilis, "Tune hinc spoliis indute meorum*
> *eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas*
> *immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit."*
> *hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit*
> *fervidus. Ast illi solvuntur frigore membra*
> *vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.*
>
> And he, after he drank in with his eyes the monuments of his savage grief and the spoils, enflamed by fury and terrible in his wrath, "Are you, clad in the spoils of my men, going to snatch yourself away from me? Pallas, Pallas sacrifices you by this wound and exacts the penalty from your wicked blood." Saying this, he buries his sword in his chest opposite, seething. And his limbs are slackened with a chill and with a groan his life flees indignant beneath the shades.

First of note is the use of the verb *condere* in line 950. It clearly means something like "to bury a sword" in this instance, but has been used throughout the poem to mean "to found a city." Here in Vergil, in fact, is the first attested use of the verb to mean "to bury a sword."[75] The first use of the word *condere* in the poem was in the foundational sense (1.5: *multa quoque et bello passus dum conderet urbem*), and I suggest that there are resonances of that sense here.[76] There seems to be a sense of unity in the poem and fulfillment of a ring composition if the *Aeneid*, which is concerned with the foundation of Rome, both opens and closes with language of city-foundation. So in what sense is the act of killing Turnus foundational for Rome? Many have suggested that it is at this point that Aeneas succumbs to the *furor* which he has been resisting all along. Reading the passage in that sense, Aeneas has failed, and the *condere* in which he gives in to his *furor* will cause resonances in Rome making the same mistakes in choosing violence over peace. Anger is certainly a focal point of the final passage, with the emphatic enjambment of the words

[75] Tarrant ad loc. It is actually used in this sense earlier for Euryalus (9.347-8) and Nisus (9.442-3). The same "argument from foundation" that I am about to make on Aeneas' behalf could perhaps apply to these two as well.
[76] James (1995), "Establishing Rome with the Sword: Condere in the Aeneid" surveys these connections as well.

terribilis and *fervidus*. Vergil is unwilling to let the audience forget the role that anger and violence have played in Rome's foundation, and even in the civil war that took place in the years prior to the *Aeneid*'s composition.

Yet it must not be forgotten that destruction can serve a constructive force as well. The destruction of Troy, after all, was necessary for the foundation of Rome, and for all the events in the poem. Another important and unexpected word in these final lines is *immolare*, to sacrifice. Aeneas says that it is Pallas sacrificing Turnus with this blow. One way to read this is as an act of revenge in expiation for Aeneas' failure to safeguard Pallas' life, as he promised Evander he would.[77] Thus, compelled by shame, grief, and guilt, Aeneas is moved by the sight of Pallas' belt to take Turnus' life. This does something to rescue Aeneas' virtue, but is not by itself sufficient. Yet another possible reading presents itself. Another sense of *immolare* here, perhaps evoked by the subsequent use of *condere*, is that of a sacrifice to purify a city.[78] Under this reading, the death of Turnus is a necessary act without which Rome's future could not be secured. Turnus is then representative of certain negative aspects which must be purified out of the foundational events leading up to Rome. It is his death that achieves this purification, and thus the sword stroke by which the city is "founded" serves the function of securing the city's foundation. What aspects are there in Turnus, specifically, that require purifying? His Dido-like focus on the individual, for which Dido herself also died, has already been mentioned. Fowler defends Aeneas' decision not to spare Turnus on a number of levels. He argues that Turnus seizing Pallas' belt and wearing it himself was an act of "rude egoism of a savage warrior," that, in Homer, the act of taking spoils typically serves as an ill omen for the despoiler, and that Aeneas was motivated "partly [by] revenge for a cruel and ungenerous deed, partly too, perhaps, indignation at the

[77] Aeneas recalls this promise at 11.42-48.
[78] My thanks to my thesis advisor Timothy O'Sullivan for bringing this possibility to my attention.

breach of an ancient rule of honorable warfare; but above it all is the memory of the sacred relation in which he himself had stood to Pallas and his father Evander."[79] He concludes, "Thus all that was best in the pure and wholesome Italian tradition of family life and social relationship is placed at this last moment of the story in contrast with the wantonness of individual triumph…To spare Turnus would have been the betrayal of the mission of Aeneas in Italy."[80] The killing of Turnus, then, is upholding traditional Roman values as Aeneas has come to embody them throughout the poem.[81] Just as the city of Rome is meant to be founded upon these virtues, so too is the killing of Turnus (with the verb *condere* providing foundational resonances) a foundational act. Vergil is not so innocent as to believe that human nature can resist violence entirely, but upright and heroic men, like Aeneas, can give in to their humanity, yet still oppose violence with violence when it is necessary.[82] The violence receives the focus of the passage, yet it is the underlying ideology of that violence which supports Aeneas' killing of Turnus without compromising his proto-Roman virtue.

War and bloodshed overtop of the vestiges of a peace that could have been are the theme of the second half of the *Aeneid*, often called the Iliadic half for that reason. There is hope for peace in the Trojans' initial dealings with Latinus, but their war camp and the Latins' combat training foreshadow the inevitable military struggle. It is at this point that we begin to see the prominent figures and cities of Italy in a more negative light, with Amata and Mezentius as embodiments of *furor* and Turnus as the antithesis of proper Roman social and martial behavior. These figures place their focus on the individual rather than civilization as a while, allowing

---

[79] Fowler, "The Death of Turnus," 155-6.
[80] Fowler, "The Death of Turnus," 156.
[81] James (1995) points out that this act is also foundationally significant in that it is the killing of an Italian prince and the extinguishing of his lineage. She argues that, given its foundational implications, this act is problematic in the context of Turnus demonstrating mindfulness of his own father and *pietas*. Yet Pallas demonstrates the same mindfulness before his death at the hands of Turnus (10.449-51: *"Aut spoliis ego iam raptis laudabor opimis / aut leto insigni: sorti pater aequus utrique est. / Tolle minas."*).
[82] See R. D. Williams (1973), Introductory note to *Aeneid* 10, pp. 319-21.

personal desires or impulses to supersede what is most beneficial for the plurality, and thus they are roadblocks to Rome's foundation. The recurrent imagery of violence is perhaps problematic for a positive-outlook reading of the final six books, especially in light of Rome's recent civil wars, yet I would answer these problems in the same way that I answered the problems of the ambiguous prophecies; Vergil is not one to obfuscate the bad, but neither will he allow it to overshadow the positives to be seen. War is a human reality to be avoided when possible, but one which can effect positive change when it is over. So it has done in the case of the Trojans in Italy and, the audience of the *Aeneid* hoped at the time, would do in the case of Augustus in Rome. When Roman identity and the city itself are founded as a result, perhaps the price paid in warfare was worth the gain.

Conclusion

My treatment of the theme of city-foundation in Vergil's *Aeneid* has by no means been exhaustive. Given the vastness of the world of Vergilian scholarship, it would be impossible to consider every opinion ever posed on any topic, especially given that the topic of city-foundation ranges throughout the entire poem. There are other scholars to be consulted and other passages deserving of consideration which I have omitted (the imagery on Aeneas' shield in Book 8 and the Trojans' foundation of a new city under Acestes in Book 5 immediately come to mind). One further unexplored interpretation is that Vergil is seeking to establish not just a Roman identity but also an Italian identity.[83] Both Vergil and Augustus have an interest in establishing an identity and linking it specifically to a physical space, and an Italian identity in this case would be just as important as a Roman identity. Although articulating country-identity in a physical medium would be more far more difficult than articulating city-identity, Vergil has demonstrated in the *Georgics* that such an Italian identity can be found in Italian land, soil, and its many positive identifying markers.[84] Connecting this to the theme of foundation in the poem would prove more of a challenge, but could prove compelling given further investigation.

Yet despite the existence of further avenues for exploration on this topic, I hope to have demonstrated conclusively (if not *ad nauseam*) the connectedness of identity to the physical structure of the city in the poem. I have presented this not as a merely self-evident fact of urban societies, but as a unique and not at all essential way that the characters in the epic (and, I would argue, the Romans themselves) framed their identity. To them, cultural and city identity superseded individual identity, just as the city itself is a greater unit comprised of many

[83] Credit and thanks for pointing out this possibility to me go to my thesis advisor Timothy O'Sullivan.
[84] See, for example, *Georgics* 2.136-258, in which Vergil praises Italy's landscapes and features, and especially 2.155-7 regarding its cities: *adde tot egregias urbes operumque laborem, / tot congesta manu praeruptis oppida saxis / fluminaque antiquos subter labentia muros*.

individuals. There is one identity for all of them, and those who denied this truth, as we saw time and again in the *Aeneid*, ended up functioning counter to the city's continued success, which is ultimately not just to their own detriment but that of all in the city. This is not only a matter of practical necessity, that the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the one, but it is also important *how* they identify themselves, that is, what are the laws, customs, *mores*, virtues, common ideas, assumptions, behaviors, and so forth that underlie the culture. These cultural aspects, it is seen, are established as their cultural identity at the same time as the city itself is being founded, such that the foundation of a city and the foundation of the city's identity are inextricable. It is for this reason that if a city was seen to have been inadvertently founded upon or to possess faulty values it had to be rejected. Because the Trojans' ultimate goal was a Roman identity and the foundation of Rome, anything short of this was passed by.

The result is that by the end of the poem Vergil has provided his audience with a sort of blueprint for Rome and Roman identity. This is articulated not only through the rejection of cities and individuals guilty of some moral fault, but also through prophecy signifying the divine surety of Rome's success. It is the quintessentially Roman identity revealed in these ways that ensures this success. Such an affirmation of Roman identity and the success it will bring is badly needed, I think, at the time Vergil composed the *Aeneid*, which followed a period of social turmoil and civil war. The poem sympathized with the Romans' plight while at the same time promising (or at least being hopeful about) the return of stability with the solution the poem offers. The poem is not mere propaganda on the political sense, but is a source of comfort to individuals feeling anxiety about the future by offering them comfort in taking refuge under a larger identity. As Catharine Edwards has demonstrated, there is evidence elsewhere in Roman literature that attests to the acknowledgment of this explicit connection between city and

identity.[85] This allows the patriotic Romans to feel a sense of pride in their city as the locus of their Romanness, and the *Aeneid* plays into this by providing a mytho-historical account for their formulation. Given Rome's historical circumstances, the Romans' love for mythologically based aetiologies, and Vergil's moving poetic style, the product, unfinished though it is, serves the function it was designed to serve.

[85] Edwards 47, citing Livy 5.53.7.

Works Cited

Bartsch, Shadi. "*Ars* and the Man: The Politics of Art in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Classical Philology* 93.4 (1998): 322-42.

Bettini, Maurizio. "Ghosts of Exile: Doubles and Nostalgia in Vergil's *parva Troia* (*Aeneid* 3.294ff.)." *Classical Antiquity* 16.1 (1997): 8-33.

Coo, Lyndsay. "Polydorus and the Georgics: Virgil *Aeneid* 3.13-68." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 59 (2008): 193-199.

Edwards, Catharine. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge University Press: New York, 1996. Print.

Feeney, Denis. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *The Classical Quarterly* New Series 33.1 (1983): 204-219.

---. "History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 212 (n.s. 32) (1986): 1-24.

Fowler, W. Warde. *Virgil's "Gathering of the Clans"; Aeneas at the Site of Rome; The Death of Turnus*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1978. Print.

Hardie, Philip. *Virgil* (*Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No.* 28*)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.

Hexter, Ralph. "Imitating Troy: A Reading of *Aeneid* 3." *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid*: An Interpretive Guide*. Ed. Christine Perkell. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 1999. 64-79. Print.

Horsfall, Nicholas. "Aeneas the Colonist." *Vergilius* 35 (1989): 8-27.

---. *Virgil,* Aeneid *3: A Commentary.* Boston: Brill, 2006. Print.

James, Sharon L. "Establishing Rome with the Sword: *Condere* in the Aeneid." *The American Journal of Philology* 116.4 (1995): 623-37.

Morwood, James. "Aeneas, Augustus, and the Theme of the City." *Greece & Rome* Second Series 38.2 (1991): 212-23.

O'Hara, James J. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's* Aeneid. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. Print.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993. Print.

Rudd, Niall. "Dido's *Culpa*." *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid. Ed. S.J. Harrison. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1990. 145-66. Print.

Tarrant, Richard, ed. *Virgil:* Aeneid *Book XII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

Williams, Gordon. "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 48.1/2 (1958): 16-29.

Williams, R. D. "The Purpose of the *Aeneid*." *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid. Ed. S. J. Harrison. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990. 21-36. Print.

---, ed. *Virgil:* Aeneid *VII-XII*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1973. Print.