Making Roman-Ness and the "Aeneid"
Author(s): Katharine Toll
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Apr., 1997), pp. 34-56
Published by: University of California Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/25011053
Accessed: 08/02/2012 08:22

KATHARINE TOLL

Making Roman-ness and the *Aeneid*

VERGIL'S IDEAS ABOUT the Romans, and about the traits or beliefs that composed Roman national character, were much more important to his poem than his ideas about Augustus. Scrutinizing the *Aeneid* for signs of Vergil's attitudes toward the new ruler and his regime impoverishes our notions of the epic's scale and scope, and of its ambitions. I here set Augustus firmly aside in favor of an inquiry into the *Aeneid*'s reflections on Roman-ness. Vergil took care to make Roman-ness an open category, one no single person could expound or circumscribe. The meaning of Roman-ness had to depend, could only depend, on the ways in which hundreds of thousands of Romans went about instantiating it. In this paper I will show that Vergil's poem was to be a companion to that enterprise of making Roman-ness.

To begin with, why Aeneas? That is, what factors in Vergil's own historical circumstance and that of his first readers inspired him to write an ancestor-tale, and to choose Trojan Aeneas as his protagonist? What considerations led him to think that the moment was right to offer an alternative to Romulus, a new foundation story for Rome? I believe that Vergil thought the evolution of his people's national identity was going through a particularly crucial formative phase, in which he aspired to make his poem participate. Thus he designed the *Aeneid* strategically to help the Romans meditate on the duties, problems, dangers, and possibilities of a new national identity.[1] In what sense was it new, and why was Aeneas the right instrument to engage with it?

This essay owes much to Yasmin Syed and the September 1995 Heller conference she organized. Thanks very much to the interlocutors there, and also to G. R. F. Ferrari, Mary-Kay Gamel, Robert Gurval, Ralph Hexter, Sharon James, Gary Mathews, and Gary B. Miles.

1. I use "nation" and "nationalism" here aware that the Roman entities differ from modern ones both in the mechanics of their formation and in the nature of their coherence, and without meaning

One reason to think that the national identity of Roman Italy was new when Vergil was writing is that the unity of Italy (and of Roman citizens outside Italy) was recent and unsteady: his audience's generation, and their parents' and grandparents', had been torn and tortured by increasingly destructive civil wars reaching right back to the 90s B.C.E. Vergil's generation had seen the devastations finally brought to what at least might turn out to be an end, and was now, warily, diffidently, beginning to think about reconstruction. Almost every reading of the *Aeneid* takes into account this fact about the circumstances of the poem's creation. It is most frequently adduced as preliminary to an attempt to establish what conclusions can be drawn from the poem about Vergil's attitude toward Augustus' reconstruction[2] rather than as relevant to his readers' reconstruction of themselves as a nation,[3] but its pertinence is in any case well established.

A second reason to think of the *Aeneid* as preoccupied with a new beginning is that the *Ludi Saeculares* (to commemorate the ending of one *saeculum* [age] and herald the beginning of the next) had last been celebrated in 146, so that the ceremonies, and the new era whose opening they would mark, were due in the 20s when Vergil was writing.[4] There was, in fact, in that generation, a furor of the millennialism which the Christians were soon so dramatically to funnel into their own new vessels, from a wide variety of sources. The Etruscan seer Vulcanius (and others[5]) had interpreted the comet that appeared after Julius Caesar's assassination as the omen of the beginning of a new eon.[6] The neo-Pythagorean philosophers were discussing the millenarian renewal of the world with the dawn of a new Great Year.[7] Already in 43, coins had been struck bearing symbols of a new age of gold.[8] Finally, the advancing of the sun from Aries into Pisces with the precession of the equinoxes was filling Vergil's whole generation with the kind of anticipation

---

to assimilate the two. What I intend these terms to impute to Rome is a combination of strongly felt affiliation, or incorporation, with acknowledged and esteemed homogeneities in a very large group of people. On modern nations, see, e.g., Anderson 1983; on first-century Roman notions of "nationalism," see especially Bonjour 1975 and Miles 1995. I aim in this essay to develop some ideas about the specific version of this Roman nationalism which is implied by the *Aeneid.*

2. A useful survey of recent work is to be found in Harrison 1990:1–120, and the first chapter of Johnson 1976 remains valuable.

3. Bonjour 1975 is an important exception. Cf. e.g. 475: "Il y eut alors un besoin général de refaire le patriotisme romain déchiré par les partis, de rassembler les interêts italiens et le civisme romain. Tel fut l'effort politique d'Auguste. Mais la réintegration sentimentale? Elle fut sur le plan littéraire, en dépit des nobles efforts de Tite-Live, l'œuvre de Virgile." ("There was then a general need to reconstitute the Roman patriotism tattered by the partisans, to reunify Italian interests and Roman civic affairs. That was the political task of Augustus. But reintegration on the level of feelings? In the literary area, despite the noble efforts of Livy, that was the work of Vergil.")

4. See Zetzel 1989.

5. Among them, perhaps, Vergil himself: see *Eclogue* 9.46–49.

6. Servius on Eclogue 9.47. See Scott 1941:257–72, esp. 258–59.

7. Carcopino 1930:30–37.

8. Alföldi 1930:369.

of epochal change which was invoked in the 1960s, in expectation of the next precession (into Aquarius), by the librettists of "Hair."[9]

Further, a feature more specific to Vergil himself and one which deserves emphasis here because it is an important and badly neglected factor in considering how Vergil came to shape the *Aeneid* as he did, is this: it is not clear whether Vergil was born a Roman citizen. Furthermore, it is entirely clear that, at least administratively speaking, he was not born Italian; at the time he was born, his Transpadane homeland had not been an administrative district of Italy, but the Roman province of Cisalpine Gaul. In the 80s Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo had granted full Roman citizenship to the old Latin colonies of the Transpadane district and Latin rights to the native towns. If we knew whether Vergil was born in a *colonia*, or whether the franchise had been obtained *viritim* by his family, we would know whether he was citizen-born. If he was not, he received the Roman citizenship only at the age of about twenty-one, with the passage of a law sponsored by a Caesarian tribune in 49. It was not until seven years after that, when the extension of Italy to the Alps was carried by Octavian at the conference following Philippi in 42 B.C.E.,[10] that Vergil became from an official Roman point of view what perhaps, from his Cisalpine viewpoint, he had always felt himself to be: an Italian.[11]

Remember that a large part of the peninsular people and some part of the provincials were newly Roman as well;[12] if Vergil was newly a citizen, it was something he had in common with a large proportion of his first audience. The occasion for the birth of Roman Italians as one nation had come with the admission of a huge number of Italians to Roman citizenship during and immediately after the Social Wars,[13] or rather with their eventual enrollment in the census of

9. James Rado and Gerome Ragni.

10. For these dates and the evidence for them, see Chilver 1941:7–15. For a list of the *coloniae* North of the Po by 90, see Brunt 1971:168. Mantua is not on the list.

11. Cf. Little 1982:258: "Lacking the narrow and exclusive perspective of the city-born Roman, Virgil could feel the essential unity of Italy, and feel for [Julius] Caesar's recognition of it. What he could admire in Caesar's act of emancipation was the breadth of vision it indicated—the larger view, which Virgil shared with passion, of what Rome and Italy were. In the political unity he sensed a rightness of nature itself."

12. On citizens abroad (old and new), see Brunt 1971:204–65; on the new in particular, see Badian 1968 ch. 5.

13. Cf. Gabba's summary (1976:123): "The fundamental significance of the Social War in the history of the last century of the Roman Republic lies in the fact that those political problems which until then had been Roman (that is, citizen) problems became essentially "Italian." This development could not take place without changing the problems themselves and thereby the whole of Roman politics, since the introduction of *novi cives* was not, and could not be, along the same lines of political development which had been followed at Rome in the past." Klingner 1979:23–25 says that except for Cato nobody had what one could call a notion of Italy until after that war, and that it was in the generation after it that some Romans began to be able to think about their identity and the fundamentals of their existence and essence. Cicero, the younger Cato, Sallust, Varro, however they differ among each other, have this in common, he says, and the historians and poets of the Augustan age are their followers in this respect.

70 B.C.E.[14] which at last gave them the vote and, to some, the right to run for office. This was a vast increase in the population authorized to think of themselves as Romans and to participate in the Roman government: the number of people enfranchised to elect Roman magistrates may even have tripled.[15] This population of the newly enfranchised had, historically, little or no reason to think of themselves and each other as a single people. There had been no long-established tradition of Italian nationalism.[16] If anything, the opposite: Rome had built separate bridges between herself and the various Italian peoples and had discouraged them from forming links among one another.

> The Romans had always practiced the policy of *divide et impera*, opposing associations among the allies and choosing to link the individual units to itself by a multiplicity of legal and political ties.... While there were some political and personal interconnections among the élites of different small towns, these were counterbalanced by local and regional rivalries, and by the development of separate patron-client ties between Italian élites and different aristocratic families at Rome.[17]

What is more, such consolidatory episodes and tendencies as the Italians had had were more likely to divide them from Rome than to assist them and the old Romans in adopting equable, coalescent views of their new union and creating accords and fellowships to keep the new polity from erupting yet again into civil war.[18] Although the immense populations of new Romans had long histories of affiliation with Rome's military enterprises, they had no traditions of connection to the rest

14. See Brunt 1988:135–36 for the argument that the new citizens were not enrolled in the census of 86/5 but had to await the subsequent one. (Gabba 1976:99 thought that Italians "entered Roman political life immediately after 89 BC on an enormous scale." But a delay in the beginning of this process and a gradually gathering momentum in it might go some distance to account for the census figures. See following note.)

15. The census figure of Roman citizens quadrupled between 70 and 28. No modern scholar accepts the accuracy of these numbers, but even if the figures exaggerate the increase in the citizen population, it seems undeniable that there was one and possible that it was very large. For P. A. Brunt's discussion of the imponderables that prevent confident calculation of the citizen population in the last century B.C.E., see Brunt 1971, especially chs. 6–9. See also Brunt and Moore 1967:51. It is Claude Nicolet who estimates the possible tripling: Nicolet 1980:23.

16. See Whatmough 1971 *passim*.

17. Dyson 1992:59: "Italic identity was not annihilated by the assertion of Roman hegemony over the peninsula." See also Pallottino 1991:139 and Klingner 1979:21.

18. There are two important exceptions to my generalization that there was no tradition of Italian nationalism, but both of them would have told against rather than in favor of the Italians' ability to coalesce smoothly into the new entity *Roman* Italy. First, the Italians had identified themselves on inscriptions abroad (maybe from as early as 193 B.C.E. in Sicily) as *Italici*, using one name for all the Italian communities and peoples (Brunt 1988:117 and n. 80); but this cohesion was directed toward people from outside the peninsula only. They were called indiscriminately Rhomaioi by their trading partners, too—an interesting disjunction between the way they saw themselves and the way they were seen by non-Italians. In their relations with Rome, however, the unenfranchised continued to identify themselves as members of their tribes (Marsi, Paeligni, Vestini, etc.) and as Asculans,

of the Roman project,[19] no history, in particular, of partnership in Roman political and administrative affairs. During the forty years that elapsed between the big enfranchisement and the time when Vergil began to work on the *Aeneid*, many things had happened to slow or deter any growth in the Italians' coherence with Rome. The newly enfranchised had little reason to feel that they had become full members of the Roman state.[20] Along with the lack of a tradition of involvement, the alienation produced by proscriptions, confiscations and resettlements still simmered. The reluctance of the Roman élite either to enlarge its own circle or to drain municipal Italy of capable administrators also slowed Italian integration. Less material but probably even more telling was a deeply ingrained status-distinction between Rome and the rest of Italy, a differentiation in which the Romans had long felt and acted superior.[21] The sense of Italian affront at this scornful Roman haughtiness is evident in Velleius Paterculus' turn of phrase, that the Romans *homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis fastidire* ("The Romans treated these men of the same race and blood with disdain").[22] The Italians had

---

Nolans, and so forth (citizens of their cities); towards foreigners they represented themselves as unified, but towards Rome they remained multiple.

The second event that gives evidence of Italian unity of a sort was, of course, the Social War itself; but since the Italian confederacy was specifically (and galvanically) anti-Roman, its unification was not one that would evolve readily into a unity of Roman Italians. It is worth noting, too, that such unity as the coalition achieved was hard won: "in the confederacy centrifugal and separatist forces were predominant." Gabba 1976:77 (Rhomaioi) and 101.

19. In the provinces, Roman and Italian businessmen abroad had common interests and collaborated. See Badian 1970–1971:402 and Gabba 1976:70–96. But joint effort at home was politically impossible. See Beard and Crawford 1985:81.

20. "After a decade of war, Italy was united, but only in name, not in sentiment. At first the new citizens had been cheated of their franchise, a grant which had never been sincerely made; and many Italians had no use for it. Loyalties were still personal, local and regional. A hundred thousand veterans, settled on the lands of Sulla's enemies, supported his domination, promoted the Romanization of Italy and kept alive the memory of defeat and suffering. There could be no reconciliation until a long time had elapsed." Syme 1939:88. "... the number of individuals who made the post Social War transition from the *municipia* to even the lower steps of the Roman *cursus honorum* was relatively small." Dyson 1992:65.

21. For a long time, for example, more Italians than Romans had been conscripted, and while they were in the military their terms of service were worse than those of Roman soldiers (often they were retained when Romans were discharged; they were still subject to the physical punishment of beating, and Italians were less well rewarded when land was distributed). Italian cities and districts had to continue to pay for their contingents even after 167 when Romans were relieved of the *tributum*. It seems entirely likely, in this context, that episodes like the maltreatment given a local dignitary at Teanum Sidicinum as a result of the town's not having provided a bath fast enough (or clean enough) for the wife of a visiting Roman consul were not untypical or unusual. See C. Gracchus frr. 48–49 in Malcovati 1953:191–92 (quoted by Aulus Gellius *NA* 10.3). See D'Arms 1984:440–67, esp. 440–41.

22. Velleius Paterculus 2.15. The phrase is doubly telling, for in *fastidire* one can hear how the Italians were stung at being treated with contumely by self-styled superiors who owed their primacy to victories the Italian allies had won for them (*Petebant eam civitatem cuius imperium armis tuebantur,* says Velleius—"they sought that citizenship whose *imperium* they had protected in arms"), and, in *eiusdem gentis et sanguinis,* how this sting was made sharper by a sense that the Romans were looking down on people whom they ought properly to regard as kin. Brunt 1988:126

been subordinated to Rome (and had no doubt been, accordingly, widely rancorous towards her) for so long that they were slow, even after their acquisition of Roman citizenship, to begin to identify themselves as Romans and to take up the active exercise of their new nationhood. As Ronald Syme said, "Though the whole land was enfranchised after the *Bellum Italicum,* it had not coalesced in sentiment with the victorious city to form a nation. The Italian peoples did not yet regard Rome as their own capital, for the memory of old feuds and recent wars took long to die; and the true Roman in just pride disdained the general and undistinctive appellation of 'Italian.' "[23]

Some of the foundation upon which a sense of national identity could be built was in place: a common religion, a very widespread though not universal common language, much common culture, many common values—what Cicero calls "the ancestral institutions which our state and the long duration of our empire validate."[24] Nevertheless, coalescence round this cultural nucleus of that sense of shared sentiment, a shared past, and a common project which constitutes a nation[25] had not advanced rapidly or far. When Vergil started to write the *Aeneid,* the nation of Roman Italians was still embryonic, still a potential in the very early stages of being realized—if, indeed, it was ever to be realized at all. And that is what Vergil was interested in. This is not to scant the importance of the end of the wars and the restoration of civil stability as the vital occasion which Vergil saw as making this birth at last possible. But it was not Augustus' new regime—or not to the degree that many readers of the poem have thought—that Vergil hoped, with the *Aeneid,* to assist in centering and informing. It was this new nation created by the extension of the franchise.[26] Or rather, it was this new nation as a blastula,

---

opines that a strong Italian craving for status and dignity deserves the greatest emphasis in any account of the sources of Italian discontent at the time of the Social Wars.

23. Syme 1939:286.

24. *maiorum instituta, quae res ipsa, quae diuturnitas imperii comprobat* (*Pro L. Murena* 75). Beard and Crawford 1985:79–80 emphasize the "substantial uniformity in social and economic structure throughout Italy."

25. "History's collective nature sets it apart from memory. . . . [H]istorical knowledge is by its very nature collectively produced and shared; historical awareness implies group activity. . . . Just as memory validates personal identity, history perpetuates collective self-awareness." Lowenthal 1985:213. "National identity requires both having a heritage and thinking it unique." Lowenthal 1994:47. ". . . we are shown [in Livy] an alternative basis for the construction of Roman history, one that uses received tradition not as evidence from which to reconstruct an accurate and reliable record of the past, but presents tradition, rather, as the record of the Romans' own perception of themselves, a record which may be used as the basis for reconstructing and interpreting their identity." Miles 1995:55. Cf. Connor 1990 on the function of the six festivals of memory founded in Attica between 479 and 439 to re-emphasize and consolidate Athenian unity and identity.

26. Not that this aim would have been unwelcome to Augustus, of course. See Syme 1939 with Momigliano 1940. I am only urging that there is sufficient reason to suppose that Vergil conceived his project out of a view and motives in which the *princeps* need not have been central. Gabba 1976:96–97, discussing the gathering momentum of Romanization in Italy, says, "It was implicit in the purpose of the allies that insurgent Italy should Romanize itself, not vice versa. Consequently it follows that Sulla and Caesar . . . did no more than support and maintain this historical process

as the first crucial, formative stage in that process of continual extension which the *Aeneid*'s Jupiter promises shall continue indefinitely (1.278–79). If Roman expansion were to be so indefinitely long and large, it was all the more important to study and nurture the first phase carefully, to make it exemplary for continuing amalgamation.

Perhaps not himself born Roman and certainly not technically Italian, Vergil was the more likely to have considered things from the point of view of the populace of new citizens now officially Roman but not yet so in earnest, and to have understood that the newly enfranchised still needed reasons and motives to conjoin themselves heartily to Rome and identify themselves as Romans. Those citizen-*born* whose Roman identity was longer and more deeply established also needed to rethink and readjust the terms and tempers of their nationalism, especially their old habit of distinguishing themselves disdainfully from the Italians. Vergil was in an excellent position to see that Roman-ness and Italian-ness were not inevitably the same thing, even though after 42 all Italians were Roman. He was able, too, to see that Italian-ness was still an inchoate notion, for if it meant something perceptibly different to him and his fellow Transpadanes from what it meant to the city-born (if the Transpadanes had felt themselves to be Italian before the city officially included them in the category), then it might well mean yet different things to inhabitants of other parts of the peninsula, and to emigrés and colonists and enfranchised provincials abroad, who had their own differing cultures and histories of allegiances. Roman-ness was a family of varied ideas rather than a conception shared by all citizens, but the occasion for the formation of a new, unifying conception had now arisen from the recent Roman enfranchisement of all Italians.[27]

It is presumably because he believed such a unifying conception should be collaboratively produced rather than authoritatively imposed that Vergil was careful to be sketchy about the substance of proto-Roman Italian-ness in the *Aeneid*. The Italian peoples of the poem are endowed with vivid coloring and affection, but with very little institutional or even characterological detail. One can identify only the toga (1.282, and probably 12.825), fortitude, endurance, and courage (Numanus' speech—9.603–13—and 12.827 in particular and the battle episodes of Books 9–12 in general), possibly senates or senate-like councils (8.105, 11.234–462), possibly resistance to tyranny (if the anecdotes about Mezentius and Metabus are indicative), possibly greater-than-Trojan opportunities for capable and influential women (Amata, Camilla, perhaps Sylvia).

---

which was inevitable and which developed beneath their eyes; dictated as it was by a mood that was widely felt and by vast, practical demands, it far outweighed the purpose and decisions of a single administrator, however important he may have been." That is the proportional importance between the historical process and the individual administrator reflected in the *Aeneid*.

27. "It may be presumed that it was found possible in or soon after 89/88 to confer the citizenship on Latins, Italians, and Italiotes living outside Italy." Wilson 1966:94. Brunt 1971:206–209 explains why this can only be a presumption.

Romans had a more or less established identity but had held themselves aloof from the Italians, and no single Italian identity was yet constructed, so that the common national identity of Romans and Italians together, if there was to be such a thing, would have to be created new. Common ground and fellow feeling between Italians and Romans would have to be extended and solidified, and equally, common ground and fellow feeling among Italians. If Vergil thought about these things—and what I am urging here is that the way he wrote the *Aeneid* suggests that he did—it is easy to see that he could have come to reflect that he, a man to whom his own identities as Roman and Italian had arrived separately and who thus had conducted his own reconsideration and scrutiny of them, was peculiarly suited to contribute to his people's already on-going processes of review and adjustment, helping Romans and Italians to think about who they had become, in their new conjunction. Vergil seized on the occasion to conceive of Roman Italians as a new entity, to frame for this new citizenry a new myth of nationhood, and, by means of his myth, to endow posterity with power to sponsor and guide and ameliorate yet further new conjunctions.

This background suggests an interpretation of Vergil's decision to set the *Aeneid* in the deep past and to make it about ancestry and inheritance. It is because the past—or, more accurately, the stories that we shape for ourselves about our pasts,[28] both personal and national—is so important a factor in the forming of identity. Amnesia is frightening and pitiful because the amnesiac does not know who she is; when she recovers her memory she recovers her identity. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, is true for peoples; their beliefs about their origins and histories contribute crucially to their sense of their existence as a people and of what sort of people they are, and a populace wholly amnesic about its past, if such a thing could be imagined, could not know itself as a people.[29] That is why peoples cling so urgently to their sense of their corporate past, no matter how tragic, no matter how bitter, because this sense is so deeply constitutive of their sense of themselves.[30] They identify with this common past, and are partly identified by it. ("Partly" because anticipation of a common future is another equally indispensable element. "To have done great things together, and the will to do more, these are the essential conditions for a people."[31]) People both regard the shared past as very intimately theirs, handed down to them like a legacy, and also think of themselves as belonging to it. The relation is a mutual one, and

28. Cf. "A Matter of Identity," Sacks 1985:108–15. Thanks to Kirsten Anderson for this reference.

29. Greene 1982:10.

30. I admit that there is some circularity here, and some idiosyncrasy as well, for a people has to have some notion of itself as a people or at least some will to that notion before the common past becomes constitutively relevant, and because, obviously, not every shared past constitutes a people. But I would still insist on the necessity and intimacy of its past to a people, for a people defines itself partly by means of and with reference to its past.

31. Renan 1947:904. A new English translation by Martin Thom appears in Bhabha 1990; the cited sentence is on p. 19.

determination and formative energy flow in both directions through it. It is this deep connection between a people's past and its identity that led Vergil, desiring to contribute to his generation's (and its descendants') process of thinking about their identity, to write a poem about their past.

Vergil's choice fell upon Aeneas to be the focus and vehicle of his meditations about national identity for three main reasons. The first and most literary is that Aeneas was Homeric. Aeneas afforded Vergil the occasion to provide for his own nation a poetic prehistory as antique and deep-rooted as the one Homer provided for Greece and Greeks, and to match his own epic to Homer's not only in genre and in detail, but in historical stratum as well. Selecting Aeneas was one more way of setting the *Aeneid* beside the Homeric poems. As a protagonist he served to figure Vergil's aim of matching Homer, perhaps of equaling the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, certainly of being compared with them continuously.

The second reason for settling on Aeneas, this one more strategic for the task of embedding the poem in the extra-literary project of deliberating about Roman Italian identity, is this: Rome already had a founding-father story, but it didn't apply to Italians. With Aeneas, the *Aeneid* could make a bid, not to replace Romulus, but to adopt and at the same time to supersede him. Aeneas is made to function as ancestor to an entity greater than Rome, an entity inclusive of Rome and indeed often <focused upon it, but more extensive and congenerous. Vergil begins the project of getting Rome and the Italians to cohere very simply, by providing them with a common source.

Aeneas' function in this role is emphasized in a very simple way. People usually think of Aeneas' primary epithet in the poem as *pius*, but there is actually another epithet, of equal or even greater thematic importance, with which he is designated many more times, though this fact has received little attention. Aeneas is called *pater* (father) in the *Aeneid* thirty-one times,[32] more than any other character, even Anchises (twenty-five[33]) and Jupiter (twenty-seven[34]); and only six of these instances have his paternity of Ascanius specifically in view. In the great majority of its appearances the epithet means not narrowly father-of-family, but the larger "founding father," or "ancestor." *Pater* Aeneas is the *readers'* father.

32. 1.555, 580, 699; 2.2, **674**, 724; 3.**343**, 716; 4.**234**; 5.130, 348, 358, 424, 461, 545, 700, 827, 867; 7.119; 8.28, 115, 606; 9.172, **300**, **312**, 649 (649 could conceivably designate Anchises instead); 11.184, 904; 12.166, **440**, and 697. The lines in bold type are the instances where Aeneas' specific fatherhood of Ascanius is in view; 7.119 should perhaps also be counted in this group. Mt. Appenninus is also called *pater* at 12.703 in a simile for Aeneas. Note that he is called *pater* on four occasions before Anchises dies: the epithet signifies something which is not coextensive with Aeneas' place in his *familia*. Robert Fitzgerald's translation of the poem exemplifies how this important epithet has been overlooked; he translates *pater* with Aeneas five times as "Lord" and once as "Trojan prince," and leaves it out altogether twelve times.

33. Anchises *pater:* 2.653, 678, 687, 707, 747; 3.9, 144, 263, 525, 539, 558, 610, 710; 4.351, 427; 5.31, 603; 6.679, 713, 719, 854, 863, 867; 7.245; 10.534.

34. Jupiter *pater:* 1.60, 65, 665; 2.617, 648, 691; 3.89, 251; 4.25, 238, 372; 5.690; 6.592, 780; 7.141, 558, 770; 8.398; 9.495; 10.2, 18, 62, 100, 743, 875; 11.789; 12.178.

A second noteworthy usage makes the same point from the other direction. With only a single exception, every time the word *nepotes* (descendants) appears in the *Aeneid*, it is proleptic.[35] It refers to Aeneas' very far-off descendants, to Roman Italians. Thus the progenitor-motif is attached more urgently to Aeneas than to any other character, and the progeny-motif is tied strongly to long-term offspring, a way of emphasizing the continuity of the history the poem delineates and, within that history, the continuity of a heritage transmitted from Aeneas to Vergil's contemporaries and through them to their own descendants. The concentration of *nepotes* on Romans and Romans-to-be has the same effect as the epithet *pater* Aeneas, to privilege the readers' angle on this sequence.

A third reason for choosing Aeneas was, of course, the claim of the Julii to be descended from him, and the opportunity he thus afforded to interweave the epic of national identity with fulfillment of at least some of Augustus' presumable expectations or hopes that the poem would concern itself with him—but that is not my topic here.

The view being enunciated here, that the *Aeneid* is a poem of national identity, requires a discussion of the nationality of Aeneas. The links between him and Troy are steadily weakened through the first half of the poem—by the failure of the settlements which he tried to name after it, by the negative example of Andromache who is hopelessly fixated on it,[36] by the wrenching apart of his bond with the woman for whom his Trojan-ness defines him[37]—and neither Aeneas nor any of his band use the word *patria* of Troy after 6.508. But does he become an Italian?

35. Eleven times altogether (in the plural): 2.194 (here it is Sinon, telling the Trojans that if they take the horse into the city with their own hands then Asia will come to Greece with a mighty war and that fate will await our descendants: what he intends them to think he means is that the Trojans will attack Greece, but the readers understand that the descendants of Asia who will conquer Greece are themselves, the Romans); 3.158 (in the Penates' speech), 3.409 (Helenus says Aeneas' descendants should preserve the custom of veiling their heads for sacrifice), 3.505 (Aeneas promises alliance between Epirus and Italy); 4.629 (the last line of Dido's curse; here *nepotes* includes both Romans and Carthaginians); 6.682, 757, 864 (Anchises surveying his descendants-to-be). I am also counting 6.786 as pertaining to Romans, though it does so only obliquely: Cybele, in a simile in which Rome is compared to her, is said to rejoice in her divine descendants; it is the precision of the match with Rome *felix prole virum* ("happy in her human progeny") (783) in the vehicle that emboldens me to take this instance too as pointing to Romans. *Nepotes* also at 7.99 (Faunus' prophecy to Latinus) and 8.731 (the last line of the eighth book, as Aeneas raises to his shoulder the fame and fate of his descendants). The single exception, where *nepotes* does not refer to the Romans, is 2.320, where the fifty marriage-chambers of Priam's palace are bitterly called ample hope of descendants.

36. Bettini 1997 (this issue), and Greene 1986.

37. Dido seeks to get to know him better by asking questions about the war at Troy at the end of Book 1, and there is heavy emphasis on his and his companions' Trojan-ness in Book 4, especially in the first third, before Aeneas decides to leave: see 4.46, 48,78,103, 111, 124, 140, 162–63, 165,191, 215, 224, 230 perhaps (though the emphasis in this speech of Jupiter's is much more strongly on Aeneas' connectedness to Italy), 312–13, 342–44, 349, 365, 397, 425–26, 537, 542, 626, 640, 647–48, 658.

It is not an easy question. Evander opens the speech in which he proposes that Aeneas should ally himself with Caere by calling Aeneas *Teucrorum ductor* (8.470) ("captain of the Trojans"), and closes it by hailing him as *Teucrum atque Italum fortissime ductor* (8.513) ("mighty captain of Trojans and Italians"). This seems to indicate that Aeneas' confederacy with the Etruscans will be an important step in his naturalization, his progress from having been a Trojan leader to being a leader of Trojans and Italians alike. He is acceptable for the Etruscan command, though, precisely because he is not an Italian: *externos optate duces* (8.503) ("choose foreign leadership") says the Etruscan soothsayer firmly. So Aeneas is an *externus*, an outsider. What then becomes of the joyful acknowledgment with which he recognizes his new home and fatherland in accepting the omen about his companions' eating their tables in Book 7 (*hic domus, haec patria est*, 7.122) ("this is my home, this is my fatherland")? What becomes of Tiber's reassurance, *hic tibi certa domus* (8.39) ("here is your certain home")? Or of the motif of Dardanus' Italian origin and its implication that Aeneas' arrival in Italy is a return to the land of his ancestors? *Is* Aeneas at home in Italy, or is he an *externus* there?[38] The *Aeneid* answers "yes" to both those questions, setting up a play which structurally resembles the mutualities between the readers and their past described above. Aeneas in Italy is neither simply an *externus* nor simply at home, because he is both.[39] He is supplemental *and* intrinsic. Italy, in return, both determines him and is determined by him. Her future shapes him: this is the retrospective shaping from hindsight, written into the poem's plot as fate's prospective pressure. The destiny that draws and drives and produces Aeneas is Italy's destiny. At the same time, as κτίστης (founder), he shapes Italy, founds it, provides its normative origin, imprints it with his struggle and his melancholy. It is this complex relationship, at least as much as the proposed compact with the Etruscans, that allows Evander to hail Aeneas at the end of his speech as captain of Trojans and Italians alike.

It is in connection with this *externus* issue that the *Aeneid* makes its one really revolutionary adjustment of the substance of received ideas of Roman-ness (as opposed to its adjustment of the conventional attitudes toward that concept: on which more below). A. N. Sherwin-White contended that the social wars had created in Italy "a presupposition that the Roman state is an expanding state, with room to spare for all who are prepared to serve her and imitate her truly."[40] I have suggested that we consider the *Aeneid* as earnestly devoted to the question,

38. Note that he is twice called an *externus* in the omens to Latinus, too: 7.68–69 and 98. On his "Italianization," see F. Cairns 1977.

39. Harrison 1977:130 says, about Aeneas' being both *externus* and autochthonous, "Virgil has to juggle when handling the two themes, since when he is dealing with one the other can be an embarrassment." I think this is to miss the point of the doubling, which has an important thematic and protreptic purpose.

40. Sherwin-White 1973:115–16. Nicholas Horsfall has devoted an essay to the sense in which the *Aeneid* adopts this expansionist view: Horsfall 1976:73–89, especially 82–85.

What would be the optimum way of interpreting that project "to serve and imitate her truly"?[41] I intend here to show that the poem inaugurates the process by which an indefinite series of *externi* can go on becoming Roman. The *Aeneid* proposes that Roman-ness has always been, and should and shall always continue to be, a partnership open to further newcomers.

The Augustus section of Aeneas' new shield contains (among other things) two scenes, one narrating Vulcan's depiction of the battle of Actium, and one his selection of scenes from the triple triumph. Each of these segments contains a large collection of *externi*—in the Actium section, the foreign contingents allied to Antonius and Cleopatra, and in the triumph section, the representatives of the foreign nations over whom the ceremony celebrates victories. Fascinatingly, for both groups, Vergil has gone to systematic and stunning lengths to *misrepresent* their foreignness, to make them more foreign than either the allies at Actium or the nations over whom the triumph was held actually were. What can we decipher about his reasons for these startling manipulations, when so many of his original readers would have recognized them at once for false? While it is conceivable that many people in that audience were ignorant about precisely what forces were present at Actium, multitudes of them had actually witnessed the triumph, and could not have read Vergil's claim that there were Leleges and Geloni in the triumphal procession without sitting up straight in surprise and puzzlement.[42]

Let me specify the idiosyncrasies. First, the presence of sixty thousand Roman legionaries, a third of the senate, and both consuls with Antonius at Actium is entirely suppressed. Antonius' own Roman-ness, indeed, gets only a passing and very oblique glance, in the parenthetical *nefas!* of 688: *sequiturque (nefas!) Aegyptia coniunx* ("his Egyptian wife (iniquity!) follows behind"). It was because he was Roman that it was scandalous for him supposedly to have married Cleopatra. Everything else that is said about Antonius, however, paints him in colors not Roman but Eastern. He is surrounded by barbarian riches and assorted armament (*hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis*, 8.685). If *variis armis* may not, on first approach, seem necessarily to connote that Antonius' troops are drawn from many non-Latin-speaking nations, when one returns to it after having read line 723 about the peoples in the triumphal procession, *quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis* ("as assorted in their builds, their clothing, and their armament as in their languages"), one finds the probability that *variis armis* in 685 connotes foreignness enforced. Antonius is called *victor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro* (686) ("victorious from the Dawn's peoples and the red coast")

41. Toll 1991:4.

42. While the Augustan poets standardly exaggerated the extent of anticipated Roman conquests (cf. e.g. *super et Garamantos et Indos* 6.792), nonetheless, flattering extravagance on the subject of prospective achievements, and exaggeration of victories already accomplished, are exercises of two different kinds of license.

and if *litore rubro* is to be understood as the Indian Ocean,[43] the latter phrase is one of the passage's misrepresentations, for Antonius never got any nearer to the Indian Ocean than Media: his foreign connections are being exaggerated beyond any relation to real geography. He is then said to have brought deepest Bactria to Actium with him (*ultima secum / Bactra vehit,* 687–88), again a fantasy, and again portraying the forces opposed to Octavian and Agrippa as more foreign that they literally were. The same tendency mounts to its height of extravagance in the lines with which the battle segment turns to the retreat. As Actian Apollo draws his bow, *omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi, / omnis Arabs, omnes vertebant terga Sabaei* (705–706) ("in terror of this, every Egyptian and the Indians, every Arab and all the Sabaeans turned tail"), and half of the peoples mentioned simply were not there.[44] These falsifications must be driven by some intent other than mere emphasis on the foreignness of the contingents accompanying Antonius. If that had been Vergil's purpose, the truth would have sufficed him: Plutarch gives the list of subject kings who brought or sent troops to join Antonius,[45] and if Vergil had wanted no more than a profusion of non-Italian troops and a welter of non-Latin syllables, the facts would have afforded them. His procedure shows that what he wanted in this representation of Actium was not foreignness *tout court*, but rather misrepresented foreignness, exaggerated foreignness.

This systematic misrepresentation of the foreignness of the conquered at Actium is then extended even further in the lines which close the description of Vulcan's rendering of the triple triumph: five lines are dense with the names of exotic peoples and places, and barely two of them are likely to be true. The triumph was for victories over Dalmatia, for the battle of Actium, and for the conquest of Egypt. But look at the extent of the peoples Vulcan shows:

> hic Nomadum genus et discinctos Mulciber Afros,
> hic Lelagas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos
> finxerat; Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis,
> extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis,
> indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes.
>
> (724–28)

> Here Mulciber [Vulcan] had made the nation of the Nomads, and the Afri in loose robes, here the Leleges and Cares [peoples of Asia Minor] and the arrow-bearing Geloni [from Scythia]; there went Euphrates raveling his

43. Gransden 1976:178 (*in loc.*) says, "not the Red Sea but the Indian Ocean: cf. Horace *C.* 1.35.32," on which latter Nisbet and Hubbard 1989:399 say *Oceano rubro* means "not just the Red Sea (*sinus Arabicus*) but the totality of the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, and Arabian Sea."

44. Gurval 1995:242 speaks of "the Indians, Arabs, and Sabaeans, whom Vergil fancifully included in his depiction of the Actian battle."

45. *Life of Mark Antony* 61: Plutarch says Antonius was accompanied by Bocchus of Libya, Tarcondemus of upper Cilicia, Philadelphus of Paphlagonia, Mithridates of Commagene, Sadalas of Thrace, and by forces sent from Polemon of Pontus, Malchus of Arabia, Herod of Judaea, Amyntas of Lycaonia and Galatia, and the king of the Medes.

> waves more softly, the Morini, furthest of humans [from northern Gaul], the two-horned Rhine, the unconquerable Dahae [also from Scythia], and Araxes [in Armenia], resentful of being bridged.

This is grandiose and glamorous, but most of it is pure fiction.[46]

Now the readers might have thought this was just congratulatory hyperbole, produced in accord with the same aggrandizing impulse as the one which says that the ships at Actium seem as big as uprooted islands or mountains (691–92), or that Octavian consecrates three hundred shrines as his thank-offering for the victories of the triple triumph (716). Indeed, the assumption that the spurious foreigners serve merely to add high coloring presumably accounts for the fact that no critic before Robert Gurval has ever paid specific attention to their fraudulence.[47] There is, nonetheless, a difference between the other exaggerations and the proliferation, both in the battle scene and the triumph scene, of *externi* who were not really there.

I do not find it sufficient explanation of this hypertrophic foreignness that Octavian himself represented the war of Actium as a foreign rather than a civil war,[48] and that Vergil was simply following the line adopted by the new regime. Rather, the saturation of errors makes the portrayal of the defeated here problematic, difficult, hard to accept—not a sign of complacent subscription to a program, but on the contrary, a challenge, a puzzle, a stimulus to questioning and thought.[49] Nor is it entirely satisfying to reflect that the *externi* in the triumph scene are metonyms for the empire, although they certainly are that: the Afri and Nomads stand for its extent to the south, the Morini for its north-western frontiers, the Rhine, the Scythians, and the Cares and Leleges for north and northeast boundaries, and the Euphrates and Araxes for the east. It would be good, though, to find a further explanation of these passages that tried to account for the two prevaricated-foreignness sections not separately, but together, as manifestations of some preoccupation common to both.

Notice, also, that there is yet another noticeable fabrication in each of these segments: each contains an anachronism. In the description of the action at Actium, Octavianus is called Augustus (678), a title which he did not assume until 27 B.C.E., four years after the battle, and Agrippa is seen wearing the naval crown

46. Gurval 1995:35 summarizes: "Censorious modern critics rebuke the exaggeration, anachronisms, and deceit of the epic poet. No race of Nomads, ungirt Africans, or arrow-bearing Gelonians walked in chains in the Augustan triumphal parade. Depictions of the mighty Euphrates, Rhine, and Araxes rivers did not adorn the victor's placards. Triumph in the East (or what was later proclaimed as such by the return of the captured standards from the Parthians) was still almost ten years away. The formal procession of vanquished nations and peoples did not pass by the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, a monument formally dedicated in October of 28 B. C. E., more than a year after Octavian's triumphal ceremony."

47. For his interpretation of Vergil's decisions here, see especially Gurval 1995:239–42.

48. For a brief review of this policy and of its reflection in the writings of the poets, see Paduska 1970:33–34 and 46.

49. For a superlative study of apparent muddle as serious interpretive challenge in the *Aeneid*, see Hexter 1990:109–31.

which he was awarded after the battle. In the section on the triple triumph (which was held on the 13th, 14th, and 15th of August, 29 B.C.E.), Octavian is shown sitting in the porch of and dedicating spoils to the temple of Palatine Apollo, which was not consecrated until fifteen months later, 9 October 28.[50] Because the events being tampered with here were contemporaneous with the lives of most of the readers, these anachronisms would have been potentially disconcerting, and thus congruent in their effect with the supposititious *externi*. Is there an explanation of Vergil's reasons for misrepresenting the truth of foreignness, and adding anachronisms to emphasize that the tinkering has something to do with time?

I suggest that Vergil is here making an important adjustment to his readership's presumable view of the difference between foreign and civil war. A major theme of the *Aeneid* as a whole is that civil war is the ultimate deplorable and heart-breaking calamity, and yet here, where it is his readers' own civil war that he is discussing, Vergil side-steps the theme, and does so by exaggerating about foreignness. I suggest that the problem raised here is close kin to the quandary about whether Aeneas in Italy is a foreigner or not, and that both these problems bear, as analogies, on the relations of Roman Italy to her *externi*, subjects, clients, and foes alike.[51] Just as Aeneas was both an alien in Italy and at home there, so the foreignness of Rome's outsiders as they were represented on Aeneas' shield was not an unproblematic fact. As Aeneas' foreignness is best expressed as a paradox, so the enemies on the shield have a foreignness whose facticity could best be expressed as a misrepresentation precisely because it was not a set fact, but naturally plastic and alterable. Remember that outsiderhood may have been something that *had been* altered in Vergil's personal case, if he was indeed born an *externus* and became a citizen in 49.

To understand the characterization of Antonius' contingents and the defeated opponents at the triumph as counterfeit *externi,* readers have to remember Jupiter's promise in his opening speech: *imperium sine fine dedi* (1.279) ("I have given ⟨to the descendants of Aeneas⟩ rule without end"). If this promise were not mere hyperbole but an actual end which Roman Italy might properly pursue and thus adjust to, then Italy's *externi* were to be *externi* only transitorily. They and the Romans were to become, like the Latins and Trojans of the narrative, *aeterna gentis in pace futuras* (12.503–504) ("peoples who are going to be forever at

50. I note that fusion of non-contemporary events into a single narrative representation was in accord with graphic convention; the appearance of these anachronisms on a sculptural opus, the shield, may have reduced the noticeability of the flag they raise.

51. "The Vergilian representation of battle, the victory of Roman might and morals over the allied peoples of the 'barbaric' East, and *the subsequent union and assimilation of these formerly hostile cultures, prefigured in the triumphal ceremonies described in lines 714–27,* anticipate the resolution of the conflict between Aeneas, the *Troianus dux*, and Turnus, the leader of the Italians, at the end of the epic." Gurval 1995:240 (my emphasis). Gurval argues that Vergil's treatment of Actium and the triumph did not follow and reflect Octavian's public interpretation of the battle, but rather "anticipated and inspired an Augustan political ideology." Gurval 1995:35–36.

peace"). In other words, the *Aeneid* does not envision the expansion of Rome as the extension of dominion over aliens, but rather as their gradual amalgamation—for the reader must also take into consideration Anchises' celebrated unpacking of *regere imperio* (to rule under ⟨your⟩ command) into *pacique imponere morem / parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (6.851–53) ("to add *mos* (civilized traditional customs) to peace, to spare the subjected and to vanquish the disdainful"). It was not all aliens but only *superbi* who would continue to be, as it were, fair game, but even for these, once their opposition was at an end, the Romans' art and duty would be to encompass them in *pax* and *mos*, to conceive and consult their good. This meant that it behooved the Romans to entertain as universal a notion of good as they could imagine. If such a notion could be elaborated and fielded, all alienness to Rome would, in time, become in retrospect as counterfeit as the alienness of the *externi* on the shield, as contradictory and doubtful as Aeneas' foreignness in Italy.[52]

The foes on the shield are misrepresented, exaggerated—at best suspect, at worst false. The point would be that, in the long run of Jupiter's promise, accuracy in this matter is not important. The exaggerations are not an effect of poetic license; they are a challenge to a specific effort of historical thinking. To make sense of the inaccuracies on the shield, the reader must envision the long-range Jovian perspective. For the *Aeneid*, it is that exercise—the readers' imagining a view from deep into the future where the distinction between Roman and alien becomes ultimately unimportant—that is what *is* important. Should expansion of *imperium* continue according to Jupiter's prophecy, *externi* will go on becoming less foreign to Rome, becoming part of an entity of which Rome also is a part, just as Vergil and some of his first audience had. Rome and her *externi* resemble the Trojans and Rutulians in sharing a long-term promise of unification that makes conflict between them terrible and sad.[53] The poem's loathing of civil war becomes identified with its grief at ravage and waste in general. From the perspective of that long-term promise, ultimately all war is war between fellow-citizens, whether actual or potential.

From the divinely knowing perspective on what Roman-ness is which the Vulcanian shield illustrates, any representation of *externi* to Rome must be, can

52. Rudd 1986:27–42 in an essay successfully devoted to showing that the *Aeneid* is not "a clear, ringing celebration of Roman superiority," denies that this idea appears in the poem: "Perhaps Virgil never thought of it, but it seems much more likely that here, too, the explanation lies in the poet's literary purpose. His aim was to present the Augustan age as the *culmination* of a long historical process" (p. 32, his emphasis). But the process does *not* culminate in the *Aeneid* or in its picture of the Augustan age; once the assumption that it must is removed, it is easier to credit Vergil with a premonition that the great enfranchisement of 212 C.E. was going to come about.

53. This suggestion looks even more likely if Don Fowler is correct in suggesting that the scene of Augustus' dedication is actually seen through the eyes of these *externi*. "It is possible to see the use of *superbus* [in 8.721] as representing the focalization of the *victae . . . gentes*." Fowler 1990:51. If this is correct, the reader is being led (even if only fleetingly) to empathize with those *externi*, to identify with them, to recognize their potential common identity with her.

only be, unrealistic, for from that perspective no one is inevitably alien to Rome, all are prospective associates.[54] That is why Vergil calls the future reader, the person who will exist and exercise *imperium*, so long as his song has any audience at all,[55] a *pater*, like Aeneas himself. It is the readers' orientation towards their long-term posterity, parallel to Aeneas' orientation towards them, that determines the focal length of the *Aeneid*, and that accounts for Vergil's de-emphasizing the civil wars and Augustus' achievement in their immediate aftermath in favor of the long view of Roman-ness, from whose perspective all *externi* are potential partners, and all war is civil war.

Examination of the actual substance of the heritage transmitted from *pater* Aeneas to his *nepotes* may at first make the emphasis on Aeneas as father and on Roman Italians as his heirs seem disproportionate, for the program and the values which the *Aeneid* represents as having been transmitted from Aeneas' century to generations of his descendants are ordinary and non-controversial to the point of being hackneyed. If the synaptic connections between Aeneas' century and that of the first audience are enormously important, it is not because anything startling is transmitted through them. The values the *Aeneid* delineates are very commonplace Roman fare, and its formulation of the Roman political program is pointedly not special or peculiar to Rome, but is rather an agenda so broad and general as to be incumbent on any civilized society.

The poem proffers the standard Roman triad of virtues: *virtus* (courage and strength), *pietas* (correct attitudes and behavior towards gods, kin and associates), and *fides* (honesty and constancy), plus the Caesarian fourth, *clementia* (clemency). To these it adds the large general notion that the good life seeks distinction in the service of the state,[56] and the woman's special virtue, *pudor* (continence). This spectrum was conventional and well-worn;[57] the large majority of

54. If this is what Vergil was concerned with when he created the supposititious *externi*, he had impressive foresight, for the long-term outcome was indeed, as Arnaldo Momigliano says, "the imperceptible passing from a Roman to an Italic tradition and the creation of regulations which might be extended to many strata of provincials." Momigliano 1940:79.

55. 9.446–49: *Fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt / nulla dies umquam memori vos eximet aevo, / dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum / accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit* ("Happy pair! No day to come will erase you from the age of memory, if my verse has any power, so long as the house of Aeneas peoples the immovable rock of the Capitol and a Roman father holds *imperium*"). The logic (leaving out the diffident *si quid*) is that so long as that race and its *fathers* endure, they will be *readers* of the poem, and so keep the pair's memory alive.

56. See, e.g., Earl 1967, esp. pp. 21–26.

57. Cicero's tetrad of virtues (adapted from the Stoics) in *De Officiis* 1.15, for example, is *modestia, temperantia, iustitia, animus fortis et magnus* (discipline, temperance, justice, fortitude). The Caesarian tetrad (Julius' and Augustus') was *virtus*, clemency, justice, and piety. H. W. Litchfield's catalogue of Roman virtues includes *iustitia (aequitas); fides; pietas; severitas (disciplina militaris); fortitudo; constantia; paupertas; clementia; moderatio*; and (less frequently cited) *amicitia (concordia); gratia; observantia; gravitas; munificentia (liberalitas)* (justice; honesty; decorum towards gods, kin, and associates; sternness [military discipline]; fortitude; perseverance; moderate

Vergil's first readers surely found in it nothing either surprising or arguable. The coincidence with standard enumerations of cardinal virtues makes Vergil's moral program, at first glance, no challenge to conventional thinking.

While there is thus little attempt to revise the standard Roman notions of virtue, there is, in connection with these values, one important revisionary effect, and it depends tactically on anachronism. By anachronistically setting Roman values in the heroic age,[58] the *Aeneid* represents that, far from being peculiarly or restrictively Roman, the version of these values to which Rome subscribes long antedates Rome, and will be derived by her from the Italian culture to be preserved and extended as a result of Jupiter's final concessions to Juno (*Aeneid* 12.791–842). This is an under-appreciated but effective and salient part of the poem's strategy for getting the Roman-born to be more accommodating and respectful of their new fellow-citizens. Because the poem's world is densely saturated with Roman-ness, strengthened in Italy by the absorption of Aeneas long before Rome was to be founded, the *Aeneid* makes Roman-ness not the exclusive property or attribute of Rome, but rather something that Rome got from Italy in the first place.[59] The point is forcefully underlined in that final colloquy between Jupiter and Juno (12.791–842) in which it is promised that the Trojans shall contribute nothing to the nation to ensue from Aeneas' victory but their bloodlines and their piety.[60] The culture which will become Roman will be inherited, despite the reiterations of the *pater*-Aeneas motif, mostly from the Italians.

A similar denaturing of the tendency of the born Romans to feel superior and exclusive pertains to Anchises' summary of the basic Roman program mentioned above: *pacique imponere morem / parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (6.851–53) ("to add *mos* (civilized traditional customs) to peace, to spare the subjected and to vanquish the disdainful")—for Ilioneus attributes exactly the same program to Dido and her Carthaginians at 1.522–23: *O regina, novam cui condere Iuppiter urbem / iustitiaque dedit gentis frenare superbas* . . . ("Oh queen to whom Jupiter has given ⟨the task of⟩ founding a new city in justice and reining

---

possessions; clemency; temperance and restraint; agreeableness; beneficence; regard for others; seriousness; generosity). Litchfield 1914:9 and charts pp. 28–35. Cf. also Lind 1979:7–58. Quintilian mentions *fortitudo, iustitia, fides, continentia, frugalitas, contemptus doloris ac mortis* (fortitude, justice, honesty, temperance and continence, frugality, contempt for pain and death) (*Inst.* 12.2.30).

58. "Aeneas is shown in the poem establishing a way of life that depends on a series of values virtually unknown to the heroic world." Williams 1983:238.

59. "Turnus . . . fights and dies for what are in reality Roman values." O'Hara 1990:84.

Posing Aeneas, too, as a pre-Roman source of Roman values, Vergil performs some sleight of hand, of course. Aeneas was available to transfuse Roman-ness into pre-Roman Italy in the first place only because he had already been adopted by Rome (see the opening chapter of Gruen 1992, esp. pp. 29–31). On the other hand, it is possible that Aeneas' story came to Rome from the Latin towns to begin with; as Lar Aineias he was identified with a local divinity who was regarded as the father of the Latin people (see, e.g., McKay 1970:156), and he was early known and presumably storied in Etruria and elsewhere (see the first chapter of Galinsky 1969).

60. And the piety is not to repair a deficit, but to supplement a habitus in which the Italians are already thoroughly ensconced when the Trojans arrive. See Harrison 1984 and Feeney 1984.

in the disdainful ..."). This implies that the program Anchises enjoins on *"tu, Romane"* is a mission that applies to every people endowed with *imperium* that claims to be civilized, that aims not to be *superbus* (disdainful). It is evident that this too is not a mission distinctive of Rome,[61] but rather one generally incumbent upon ruling peoples, and undebatable. It does, however, call for a certain humility and a respect for more than one way of going about it, since it is a call to which, presumably, different peoples will respond in different ways. Vergil does not take harmony on the subject for granted. On the contrary, he makes sure, with the simultaneous opposite views of characters and events which he regularly enforces upon his readers, that they will grasp that an equally fundamental attribute of the basic program is controversy about how to interpret and apply it, and that it is proper, inevitable, and salubrious that this should be so.

So what is it then, if not its content, that makes emphasis on the heritage Romans have from Aeneas important? What *does* the poem privilege in its account of the relation between the founder and the successors? Except for its insistence on Aeneas and the Italians as precursors of Roman-ness, the poem's view of Roman-ness is not deeply revolutionary or revisionary. There is, however, one respect in which the *Aeneid*'s formulation of Roman-Italian ideology is really original.

Modern discussions of ideology generally assume that ideological programs tend to be both simplistic and repressive of alternatives.[62] What is impressive about the *Aeneid* considered as a poem of national ideology is that it is neither of these things. The new nationhood it envisions aims at unity and harmony, but not at either simplistic partisanship or conclusiveness about its values. What *is* revolutionary and revisionary in the *Aeneid*'s presentation of Roman values and the Roman task is the way the poem proposes to its readers that this program, however straightforward and unimpeachable it seems, is fraught with difficulties and traps. Far from delineating a heritage in which the readers can simply take pride and invest confidence, the *Aeneid* puts its bland Roman conventionalities into a context that makes them far from bland, calling rather for intense, vigilant cross-examination. Just as the poem requires that its reader entertain more than one judgment about all its major characters, so it also doubles perspectives on its program of values, balancing esteem against admonition.

Vergil subjects his Roman values to assays whose results instill caution about how the abstractions are to be worked out in practice, how the outlines are to

61. The only sense in which the *Aeneid* treats this program as especially Roman is that it assigns to Rome the task of extending, even universalizing, whatever there may be in civilized values and behavior which is worthy to be universalized.

62. See, for example, most of the theorists reviewed and criticized by Thompson 1984. Thompson himself connects ideology with "the relations of domination which meaning serves to sustain," 15. See also Halle 1972, Cuthbertson 1975, and the essays in Gillis 1994, where Rudy J. Koshar says succinctly, "National identity is based on the decentering and suppression of other, 'non-national' identities" (229).

be inked in. He appreciates and celebrates courage, for example, but he also presents *virtus* as a quality that can deteriorate into *furor* (dementia), as it does in Nisus and Euryalus, in Turnus, in Hercules, and in Aeneas at the end. He seems prepared to uphold some possible version of feminine *pudor*, but compels us to acknowledge that what women expect of themselves in connection with it can lead to rack and waste, as Dido's remorseful evaluation of herself by *pudor*'s standard does. He honors *pietas* but also seems to adjure the Romans to take care to put fellowship alongside or even before propriety in the relationships it governs, warned as they have been by Aeneas' isolation from Ascanius, and by Venus' using her relatives as tools, and by Anchises' opacity or indifference to his son's desperate wretchedness in Book 6. He admires *fides*, but seems to urge that it is a value which needs to be regulated by fellow-feeling or by shrewdness, insofar as it can lead to the strict-constructionist iciness which Aeneas turns upon Dido, or to the naive unguardedness that makes the Trojans putty in the hands of Sinon. He honors *clementia*, but in the disturbing last scene shows it usurped in the throes of antagonism, when Aeneas is unable to respond to Turnus' cry for mercy, *Ulterius ne tende odiis* (12.938) ("don't reach any further with hatred"), and surmount the hatred sprung from outraged grief.

In other words, the *Aeneid* puts forward a program of values that both noncontroversially reproduces conventional Roman formulations and at the same time makes clear that acceptable subscription to the program cannot take the form of uncritical conventionality, but must consist of vigorous, vigilant interrogation and reflective scrutiny. The poem does not propose to revise the content of the *mos maiorum*, but it does call for reconsideration of the way that conventional morality had been derived, as L. R. Lind says, "from the noble and patriotic feats of a few men who saw life as *an uncompromising conflict between right and wrong*."[63] The *Aeneid* does everything it can to deter an unexamined confidence that the difference between right and wrong is obvious. What makes the synapses between Aeneas' century and that of the readers (and their heirs) worthy of such emphasis, then, is no novelty in the transmitted values, but rather, on the one hand, the dissolution, with respect to these ideals, of any sharp distinction that can be made between their Roman-ness and their Italian-ness (indeed, between their Roman-ness and their human-ness), and secondly, the way in which the poem is made to carry a set of alarming monitory examples which convey that deciphering and deploying these values is neither obvious nor easy. The *Aeneid* is conventional, but it is not doctrinaire.

This quality of searching into the values which the new nation is to inherit is a large part of what makes me think that the *Aeneid* is devoted to an undertaking greater than that of supplying a view of Augustus and celebrating or criticizing the new regime, for it seems to presume a project that is very much the business,

63. Lind 1979:12 (my emphasis).

not just of the first citizen, but of all citizens, and a project also only realistically conceivable as continuing for many generations, if not forever.[64] History's arrow might catch fire and become something else, a chronicle of justice and uncomplicated virtues, a fulfillment of Jupiter's prophecy about *furor* gagged and chained—but there is no sign in the *Aeneid* that Vergil thought the search was over. He thought the endeavor might be having a new beginning, and tried to involve his poem in its furtherance.

University of California at Berkeley
katetoll@garnet.berkeley.edu

WORKS CITED

Alföldi, A. 1930. "Der Neue Weltherrscher der Vierten Ekloge Vergils." *Hermes* 65:369–84.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London.

Badian, E. 1968. *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Badian, E. 1970–1971. "Roman Politics and the Italians (133–91 B.C.)" *DArch* 2–3:373–421.

Beard, Mary and Michael Crawford. 1985. *Rome in the Late Republic*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Bettini, Maurizio. 1997. "Ghosts of Exile: Doubles and Nostalgia in Virgil's *parva Troia* (*Aeneid* 3.294ff.)." *ClAnt* 16.1.

Bhabha, Homi K., ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London.

Bonjour, Madeleine. 1975. *Terre Natale: Étude sur une composante affective du patriotisme romain*. Paris.

Brunt, P. A., and J. M. Moore, eds. 1967. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford.

Brunt, P. A. 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14*. Oxford.

Brunt, P. A. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford.

Cairns, F. 1977. "Geography and Nationalism in the Aeneid." *LCM* 2:109–16.

Carcopino, Jérôme. 1930. *Virgile et le mystère de la IV^e^ Églogue*. Paris.

Cardwell, Richard A., and Janet Hamilton, eds. 1986. *Virgil in a Cultural Tradition: Essays to Celebrate the Bimillenium*. Nottingham.

Chilver, G. E. F. 1941. *Cisalpine Gaul: Social and Economic History from 49 B.C. to the Death of Trajan*. Oxford.

Connor, W.R. 1990. Pritchett lecture, 5 Nov. Berkeley.

Cuthbertson, Gilbert Morris. 1975. *Political Myth and Epic*. East Lansing, Mich.

D'Arms, John H. 1984. "Upper Class Attitudes toward *Viri Municipales* and their Towns in the Early Roman Empire." *Athenaeum* n.s. 62:440–67.

Deroux, Carl, ed. 1979. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I*. Brussels.

Dyson, Stephen L. 1992. *Community and Society in Roman Italy* Baltimore.

Earl, Donald. 1967. *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Feeney, D. C. 1984. "The Reconciliations of Juno." *CQ* 34:179–94. Rpt. S. J. Harrison, ed. 1990. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, 339–62. Oxford.

64. "[H]is listeners are his descendants." Horsfall 1976:84.

Fowler, Don. 1990. "Deviant Focalization in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *PCPS* 216 (n.s. 36):42–63.
Gabba, E. 1976. *Republican Rome, the Army and the Allies*. P. J. Cuff trans. Oxford.
Galinsky, G. Karl. 1969. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton.
Gillis, John R., ed. 1994. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton.
Gransden, K. W., ed. 1976. *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge.
Greene, Thomas M. 1982. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven and London.
———. 1986. "History and Anachronism." In Gary Saul Morson, ed., *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*, 205–20. Stanford.
Gruen, Erich S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, N.Y.
Gurval, Robert. 1995. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor.
Halle, Louis J. 1972. *The Ideological Imagination*. Chicago.
Harrison, E. L. 1977. "Structure and Meaning in Vergil's Aeneid." *LCM* 2:101–12.
———. 1984. "The Aeneid and Carthage." In T. Woodman and D. West, *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, 95–115. Cambridge.
Harrison, S. J., ed. 1990. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford and New York.
Harrison, S. J. 1990. "Some Views of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century." In S. J. Harrison, ed., *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, 1–20. Oxford and New York.
Hexter, Ralph. 1990. "What Was the Trojan Horse Made Of?: Interpreting Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 3.2:109–31.
Horsfall, Nicholas. 1976. "Virgil, History, and the Roman Tradition." *Prudentia* 8:73–89.
Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible*. Berkeley.
Klingner, Friedrich. 1979. *Römische Geisteswelt: Essays zur lateinischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.
Koshar, Rudy J. 1994. "Building Pasts: Historic Preservation and Identity in Twentieth-Century Germany." In John R. Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, 215–38. Princeton.
Lind, L. R. 1979. "The Tradition of Roman Moral Conservatism." In Carl Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I*, 7–58. Brussels.
Litchfield, H. W. 1914. "National *exempla virtutis* in Roman Literature." *HSCPh* 25:1–71.
Little, Douglas. 1982. "Politics in Augustan Poetry." *ANRW* II.30.1:254–370.
Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge.
———. 1994. "Identity, Heritage, and History." In John R. Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, 41–57. Princeton.
Malcovati, Henrica. 1953. *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. 3rd ed. Torino.
McKay, Alexander G. 1970. *Vergil's Italy*. Greenwich, Ct.
Miles, Gary B. 1995. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca, N.Y.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1940. "Review and Discussion of Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution*." *JRS* 30:75–80.
Morson, Gary Saul, ed. 1986. *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*. Stanford, CA.
Nicolet, Claude. 1980. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. P. S. Falla trans. Berkeley. (French edition Paris, 1976.)
O'Hara, James J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.
Pallottino, Massimo. 1991. *A History of Earliest Italy*. Martin Ryle and Kate Soper trans. Ann Arbor. (Italian edition Milan, 1993.)
Poduska, Donald M. 1970. "Ope Barbarica or Bellum Civile?" *CB* 46:33–34 and 46.
Psichari, Henriette, ed. 1947. *Œuvres complètes de Ernest Renan*. Vol. 1. Paris.

Renan, Ernest. 1947. "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" In Henriette Psichari, ed., *Œuvres complètes de Ernest Renan*, vol. 1, 889–906. Paris (originally published 1882).

Rudd, Niall. 1986. "The Idea of Empire in the *Aeneid*." In Richard A. Cardwell and Janet Hamilton, eds., *Virgil in a Cultural Tradition: Essays to Celebrate the Bimillenium*, 25–42. Nottingham.

Sacks, Oliver. 1985. *The Man Who Mistook his Wife for a Hat*. London.

Scott, Kenneth. 1941. "The Sidus Iulium and the Apotheosis of Caesar." *CP* 36:257–72.

Sherwin-White, A. N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd ed. Oxford.

Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.

Thom, Martin. 1990. "What is a Nation?" English trans. of Renan 1947. In Homi K. Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration*. London.

Thompson, John B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Oxford.

Toll, Katharine. 1991. "The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam Laeto Socii Clamore Salutant*." *Helios* 18.1:3–14.

Whatmough, Joshua. 1971. *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. New York (first published London, 1937).

Williams, Gordon. 1983. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. New Haven.

Wilson, A. J. N. 1966. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester.

Woodman, T., and D. West, eds. 1984. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge.

Zetzel, James E. G. 1989. "ROMANE, MEMENTO: Justice and Judgment in *Aeneid* 6." *TAPA* 119:276–82.