

**FROM *IGNOBILE VULGUS* TO *RERUM DOMINOS*:  
THE EMERGENCE OF THE ROMAN CROWD IN VERGIL'S *AENEID***

by

**Erin Elizabeth O'Bryan**

Greek and Latin, B.A. The Catholic University of America, 2002

Classics, M.A. The University of Pittsburgh, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
the School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

School of Arts and Sciences

This dissertation was presented

by

Erin Elizabeth O'Bryan

It was defended on

May 27, 2011

and approved by

Dennis Looney, Associate Professor, Department of French and Italian

Andrew Miller, Professor, Department of Classics

Mark Possanza, Associate Professor of Classics

Dissertation Director: Mae J. Smethurst, Professor, Department of Classics

Copyright © by Erin Elizabeth O'Bryan

2011

**FROM *IGNOBILE VULGUS* TO *RERUM DOMINOS*:  
THE EMERGENCE OF THE ROMAN CROWD IN VERGIL'S *AENEID***

Erin Elizabeth O'Bryan, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

*Aeneid* 1 presents the Romans as the “lords of the world,” and the heirs of a destined *imperium sine fine* (1.279-282). In a stunning deviation from the normal epic conventions, Anchises in his prophecy calls them out by name, “*tu...Romane*” (6.851), addressing everyone from Aeneas’ illustrious descendant Augustus down to the humblest member of the poem’s audience. In the *Aeneid*, “the people” cannot afford to serve – as they do in Homeric poetry – more or less solely as accessories to the sense of fame and honor (the *kleos*) of individual heroes. In an epic in which the man in the crowd of both past and present has a stake, the Trojan people, as the precursors of the Roman people, must serve as a character in their own right.

To this end, an analysis of the attributes of the various crowds of the *Aeneid* reveals that they more closely resemble the dangerous and unruly crowds of Rome’s history than any of the fanciful crowds of the epic universe. This affinity is clear from the outset: the first simile of the poem compares the calming of the upstart winds by Neptune to the calming of an *ignobile vulgus* by a respected statesman (*Aeneid* 1.148-153). In his picture of the Trojans, the soon to be incorporated Italians, and other crowds, both human and divine, Vergil has painted a comprehensive picture of the quest “to found the Roman race” (*Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33)

by telling the story of the ancestors of that race, the sometimes *ignobile vulgus* who are destined to become the *rerum dominos*. In the realm of epic poetry, the crowds of Vergil are exceptional. With a better picture of this entity that plays so decisive a role in the history of the nation, the *Aeneid* can be viewed not merely as an Augustan epic, but a fully Roman one.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. HOMERIC CROWDS.....	3
B. THE ROMAN CROWD.....	6
C. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP.....	8
D. PURPOSE AND OUTLINE OF STUDY.....	10
I. THE URBAN MOB: <i>AD COEPTAM MAGNITUDINEM ROBORIS</i> .....	13
A. INCLUSIVENESS.....	15
B. POLITICAL VIRTUE.....	21
C. <i>PIETAS</i> .....	35
D. COMPETITIVENESS AND FONDNESS FOR SPECTACLE.....	39
E. CAPACITY FOR HARD WORK AND ENDURANCE.....	45
F. COLLECTIVITY.....	48
II. THE INDECISIVE ASSEMBLY.....	51
A. ASSEMBLIES OF THE AENEID.....	52
B. THE TROJAN CROWD IN COUNCIL: PRELUDE TO DISASTER I.....	53
1. The Force of <i>Fama</i> .....	55
2. <i>Sententia</i> .....	56

3.	Interruptions: Laocoön and Sinon.....	59
4.	Sinon’s False Crowd.....	62
5.	Trojan Pity, Piety, (and Ambition).....	64
C.	THE LATIN CROWD IN COUNCIL: PRELUDE TO DISASTER II.....	68
1.	Aeneas and the Latin Ambassadors.....	69
2.	<i>Fragor</i> and <i>Sententiae</i> : The Latin Council Begins.....	71
3.	<i>Seditioe Potens</i> : Drances Speaks.....	75
D.	THE DIVINE COUNCIL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS.....	78
E.	A NEW MODEL <i>CONCILIUM</i> ?.....	81
III.	THE CROWD IN TRANSIT.....	84
A.	SAILORS AND EXILES.....	85
1.	Collective Activity and Perspective.....	87
2.	Collective Piety.....	88
3.	Political Virtue at Sea: Obedience and Efficiency.....	90
4.	<i>Certamina</i> .....	93
5.	Suffering of the <i>Dardanidae Duri</i> .....	94
6.	Trojans and Greeks: The Achaemenides Episode.....	100
7.	<i>Laetitia</i> .....	103
B.	THE RECOVERY OF CIVILIZATION.....	105
C.	CARTHAGINIAN BEES AND TROJAN ANTS.....	107
D.	THE TROJANS COME HOME: BOOK 7.....	112
IV.	THE WATCHING CROWD: SPECTATORS.....	114
A.	BOOK 5 GAMES.....	115

1. Nature of the Games.....	116
2. Aeneas: <i>Editor Ludorum</i> .....	117
3. The Circus.....	118
4. Who Watches the Games?.....	119
5. The Role of <i>Fama</i> .....	121
6. The Crowd Views the Competitions.....	122
<b>a. The Ship Race: The Crowd Competes</b> .....	122
<b>b. The Footrace: The People’s Favorite, Euryalus</b> .....	127
<b>c. The Boxing Match: Unification through Division</b> .....	128
<b>d. The Archery Contest: The Crowd at Prayer</b> .....	130
<b>e. The <i>Lusus Troiae</i></b> .....	131
B. TROJANS AND OTHERS AT WAR.....	133
1. Female Spectator Crowds.....	135
2. Watching Aeneas in Battle.....	137
3. Aeneas Versus Mezentius.....	138
4. Aeneas Versus Turnus.....	139
V. SEDITION AND DISORDER.....	146
A. THE WINDS: THE STATESMAN SIMILE: 1.148-153.....	147
B. SEDITION OF THE <i>TROADES</i> .....	152
C. SEDITION OF THE LATINS: BOOK 7.....	158
1. The Women (Amata).....	160
2. The Men (Turnus).....	163
3. The Trojans (And Everyone Else).....	165



4. Absence of the Statesman: The Mob as Storm: 7.586-590.....	167
D. PROBLEMATIC LEADERS.....	169
E. LATIN SEDITION OF BOOK 11: <i>DIVIDE ET IMPERA</i> .....	171
F. STORMS OF POPULAR FRENZY TO STORMS OF JAVELINS: BOOK 12.....	175
1. Rutulian Irresolution.....	175
2. The Statesman Fails: The Final Storm.....	178
3. <i>Discordia</i> in the City.....	180
4. Mourning as Prelude to Disaster: Amata and Dido.....	181
VI. WAR AND THE PEOPLES OF ITALY.....	185
A. PROPHECIES AND FOREBODINGS OF PEOPLES AND WARS.....	187
B. THE INDIVIDUAL PEOPLES.....	190
1. Italians/Ausonians.....	192
<b>a. Latins/Laurentians</b> .....	197
<b>b. Rutulians</b> .....	201
<b>c. Volscians</b> .....	206
<b>d. Etruscans</b> .....	207
<b>e. Arcadians</b> .....	212
2. Trojans.....	216
<b>a. Trojan <i>Duritia</i></b> .....	216
<b>b. Political Virtue and Collectivity</b> .....	222
VII. THE ROMAN CROWD EMERGES.....	229
A. UNITY IN WAR.....	231
1. Fighting.....	232

2. Funerals.....	236
3. <i>Foedera</i> .....	243
B. LEGES AND MORES: THE ROMAN CROWD EMERGES.....	250
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	256

## PREFACE

It is not easy to find words adequate to express thanks to the numerous people who have helped and guided me in ways both great and small while I worked toward the completion of this project. I have primarily to thank my dissertation director and committee, whose encouragement and advice were invaluable throughout the process. I owe much gratitude to the entire faculty and staff of the Department of Classics at the University of Pittsburgh for helping me to attain an education of the highest caliber, one that is only beginning. I also owe thanks to the faculty of the Department of Greek and Latin at the Catholic University of America for their excellent instruction during my undergraduate years, especially William McCarthy and Linda Safran. I would also like to thank my first Latin teacher, Mrs. Margaret Soisson, whose instruction and example inspired me to pursue the study of classics. I would like to thank the students of the Lyceum, especially those in my Vergil and Roman History courses, whose spirit of inquiry and enthusiasm were inspirational in the year preceding my completion of this project.

I will always be grateful to my entire family, but especially to my parents, Michael and Sandra Boyles, for fostering in me a love of learning, and for their love and encouragement over the years. I would like to thank my fellow graduate students in the Classics Department at the University of Pittsburgh for their friendship and for many friendly debates. Finally, for his love, support, and – perhaps most importantly – his patience, I would like to thank my husband, Jeffrey. *omnia vincit Amor.*

## INTRODUCTION

*Aeneid* I presents the Romans as the “lords of the world,” and the heirs of a destined *imperium sine fine* (279-282).<sup>1</sup> In a stunning deviation from the normal epic conventions, Anchises in his prophecy calls them out by name, “*tu...Romane*” (6.851), addressing everyone from Aeneas’ illustrious descendant Augustus down to the humblest member of the poem’s audience.<sup>2</sup> In the *Aeneid*, “the people” cannot afford to serve – as they do in Homeric poetry – more or less solely as accessories to the sense of “fame and honor” (the *kleos*) of individual heroes. In an epic in which the man in the crowd of both past and present has a stake, the Trojan people, as the precursors of the Roman people, must serve as a character in their own right.<sup>3</sup> The author himself, after all, tells us in *Georgics* 3 that he intends to depict the Trojans, and likely their descendants, in his “temple of song.”<sup>4</sup> But who are they, exactly? What sets them apart from the other peoples whom they encounter in their travels and, more importantly, contributes to their unification with the peoples of Italy? Through a close examination of the Trojan, Italian, and Roman crowds of the *Aeneid*, it may be possible to discern whether the poet is making a

---

<sup>1</sup> All texts quoted in this work are taken from the Oxford editions. Translations are from the Loeb editions unless otherwise noted. Any deviations from the Loeb translations will tend towards more literal renderings. Significant changes are explained in the notes.

<sup>2</sup> Austin on 6.851. See also Toll 1991, 6, and Rossi, 148.

<sup>3</sup> Heinze describes Vergil’s task as presenting “...the deeds and sufferings of a whole series of people” as “the experiences of one single man,” but nonetheless distinguishes Aeneas from Odysseus in that the *Odyssey* involves mostly Odysseus himself (Heinze, 3).

<sup>4</sup> “The lineage of Assaracus and the glorious names of Jupiter’s race” (*Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Iove gentis nomina*, *Geo.* 3.35-36).

prescription for the future Romans, or whether he is merely projecting the realities of his own people and their character onto their ancestors in order to promote a sense of recognition, and hence of reassurance, for his Roman audience. In either case, he has painted a comprehensive picture of the quest “to found the Roman race” (*Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33) by telling the story of the ancestors of that race, the sometimes *ignobile vulgus* who are destined to become the *rerum dominos*.

When the Trojan mob first appears under the leadership of Aeneas at the end of Book 2, they are a far cry from the projections of greatness to which the reader has already been privy:

Atque hic ingentem comitum adfluxisse novorum  
invenio admirans numerum, matresque virosque,  
collectam exsilio pubem, miserabile vulgus.  
undique convenere animus opibusque parati  
in quascumque velim pelago deducere terras. (2.796-800)

And here, astonished, I find that a vast number of new comrades has streamed in, mothers and men, a band gathered for exile, a piteous throng. From all sides they have come, with heart and fortune ready for me to lead them over the sea to whatever lands I will.

They may be a less than impressive bunch,<sup>5</sup> but they already exhibit hints of essential characteristics that are rather unique to the Trojans and their Roman descendants. Their description as “piteous” (*miserabile*) and a “throng” (*vulgus*) is not exactly encouraging, yet their behavior is not characteristic of the typical (negatively characterized) Roman *vulgus*.<sup>6</sup> For one, they constitute a mixed group of both men and women (*matresque virosque*) who have managed

---

<sup>5</sup> DiCesare e.g., remarks: “the freshly prophesied destiny loses its luster in the face of this *miserabile vulgus*” (DiCesare, 59).

<sup>6</sup> Austin notes that Virgil only uses the word ‘*vulgus*’ once “with a clear implication of scorn” (1.149 ‘*ignobile vulgus*’); he uses it of ‘ordinary people’, ‘the masses’, (cf. 99, 119, 11.451, 12.223), sometimes contrasted with leaders (as in 39); in 1.190 the general herd of stags is *vulgus*, in contrast to the *ductores ipsos*. It often has a touch of pity (1.190; 12.131, of non-combatants; *Geo.* 3.469, the plague-stricken cattle) (Austin on 2.798).

to assemble themselves, thus showing their ability to act collectively.<sup>7</sup> For another thing, they have a single will to follow their leader, thus showing a certain political maturity in being able to recognize and obey a rightful leader.<sup>8</sup> Finally, they are showing a quiet dignity in their endurance of suffering. The Trojans may be “piteous” (*miserabile*), but they are also “ready” (*parati*) for whatever their destiny may bring.

### A. HOMERIC CROWDS

The Trojans of Vergil’s epic bear far less resemblance to their Homeric counterparts than one might expect. In the proem to the *Odyssey*, Odysseus’ men are “fools” (νήπιοι) from the outset,<sup>9</sup> whereas the *genus unde Latinum* (1.6) looms over Aeneas and his people.<sup>10</sup> The Trojans have a serious responsibility, and they behave accordingly. In the *Iliad*, crowds are passive and easily swayed. Never do the *aristoi* lose the sense of control that they exert with effortless aplomb over the masses; the abortive revolt of Thersites is checked by a few whacks of a staff and some harsh words from Odysseus. The revolts that crop up in the *Aeneid*, on the other hand, are almost uniformly successful: they divide a people, start a war, and render a city easy prey to attack. Furthermore, both Trojan and Italian crowds in the poem display an advanced political

---

<sup>7</sup> Schauer observes that the Trojans display a sense of community and unity throughout the poem (63).

<sup>8</sup> Schauer compares this scene to the more obvious public election by which Jason becomes leader of the Argonauts in the *Argonautica* (1.328-33). Aeneas need not convince his men to follow him or compete for his position: “Aeneas muß nicht um seine Position kämpfen, weder muß er sein Volk überzeugen, ihm zu folgen, noch muß er sich gegen Konkurrenten durchsetzen wie Jason gegen Herakles” (139).

<sup>9</sup> “For through their own blind folly they perished – fools, who devoured the kine of Helios Hyperion” (ἀυτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο, νήπιοι, οἱ κατὰ βούης Ἐπερίονος Ἡλίοιοι ἦσθιον, *Odyssey* 1.7-9).

<sup>10</sup> I owe this suggestion to Professor Mark Possanza.

sensibility. The crowds of the *Aeneid*, in other words, more closely resemble the sometimes unruly, but also often astute and active crowds of Rome's history than any of the fanciful crowds of the epic universe.<sup>11</sup> This affinity is clear from the first simile of the *Aeneid*, which compares the calming of the upstart winds by Neptune to the calming of a *sedition* by a respected statesman (*Aeneid* 1.148-153).<sup>12</sup>

Homer might seem the natural point of comparison for an exposition of Vergil's Trojan crowd, but there are several reasons to direct sustained attention elsewhere aside from the obvious one that the Homeric crowd is already a well-trodden field of academic inquiry. First, the crowds of Homer and Vergil stand in a radically different status in relation to their leaders. Haubold has commented that the Homeric *laoi* "cannot be understood without their leaders."<sup>13</sup> Although they may speak their minds on various occasions (such as in the assemblies), Homeric crowds constitute a separate entity attached to their leaders – accessories to the *kleos* of various heroes, or mere subjects.<sup>14</sup> Their fate is not joined to that of their leaders in the sense that the *Aeneadae* are joined to Aeneas.<sup>15</sup> Odysseus' men may live or die (and they do die!) without any real adverse effect on Odysseus' status as a king or as a man.<sup>16</sup> Aeneas, on the other hand, is responsible for his people. Had he misled them or allowed them to mislead themselves, the *Romana gens* would have been cut off at its source, and with it any potential legacy of its leader.

Secondly, there are considerable differences in character between the crowds of the two authors. Vergil eschews the use of a Latin equivalent of the "*tis eipeske*" formula of Homer that

---

<sup>11</sup> In this vein, Rossi has dealt specifically with Vergil's battle scenes (73-149.).

<sup>12</sup> See subsection V.A.1 for a full discussion of the simile.

<sup>13</sup> Haubold, 48.

<sup>14</sup> Rossi hints at this: "group scenes are key to a definition of the imagery and ideology of war represented in the *Aeneid* as opposed to the *Iliad*" (Rossi, 83). See also Haubold, 10.

<sup>15</sup> Schauer remarks of Homer's ἑταῖροι that no basis for their sticking together (e.g. common worship, political convictions) is stressed (157).

<sup>16</sup> See Haubold, 126-136.

allows for the possibility – if an illusory one – of individuation within each vocalization. Instead, Vergil’s crowds speak in “one voice,” except in instances of possible sedition, in which case the words themselves are individuated, but not the speakers (e.g. *varius...fremor*, 11.296-7). Sedition is not a major factor in Homer. The *locus classicus* of Homeric sedition, the Thersites episode of *Iliad* 2, does not represent the voice of a nameless, faceless crowd – it is not clear that the crowd had ever agreed wholeheartedly with Thersites to begin with – so much as that of one disgruntled rabble-rouser.<sup>17</sup> Other episodes that might be classified as sedition are somewhat limited groups with specific interests, such as Penelope’s suitors or Odysseus’ crew, and so they are not easily classified as widespread political rebellion. Another distinction involves the fact that Vergilian crowds (especially at the end of Book 12) do not hesitate to watch and to react to combat scenes between their leaders, a clear gladiatorial echo. Homeric crowds are silent at such moments, though both Homeric and Vergilian crowds vocalize during their respective “games” scenes. Additionally, Hilary Mackie has shown of crowds in the *Iliad* that Trojan and Greek crowd-behavior differs sharply, but her findings on Trojan behavior do not appear to be consistent with the behavior of the Trojans of the *Aeneid*.<sup>18</sup>

The final reason why Homer cannot serve as a satisfactory model, as has been noted above, is connected to Anchises’ “*tu...Romane*” prophecy. Homer’s world is one of heroic, mythical distance from its listeners. Passages such as the catalogue of ships, and a general

---

<sup>17</sup> Laird views Thersites as a uniquely Homeric (as opposed to Vergilian) example of one of “numerous speeches from personages far lower in status than their interlocutors” (197), but neglects the consequences Thersites faces for his outspokenness.

<sup>18</sup> Mackie has determined that the Trojans in the *Iliad* are characterized by “lack of social order” manifested by their frequent clamor (*klangê*) in group situations. The Achaeans, by contrast, use clamor “as a prelude to harmony” (*kosmos*) (Mackie, 15-16). This essential finding suggests for the purposes of this study that some fundamental change comes over the Trojans following the fall of their city. Conversely, though, the Italians in the second half of the poem may have taken on some aspects of Iliadic Trojan behavior.



consciousness of totemic loyalty to the heroes associated with various Greek cities would have connected the audience to the poems, but with nothing like the resolute intent that Vergil showed in connecting his Roman audience to their Trojan and Italian progenitors. The events of the *Aeneid* may fall precisely “between the action of the Homeric epics and the history of the Roman people,”<sup>19</sup> but future events and institutions intrude subtly but insistently on the action of poem, especially the latter half. This pattern makes it clear both to the Trojans and to the reader that the Trojans have an important future destiny,<sup>20</sup> although only the reader has a clear idea of the Roman nature of that destiny.

## B. THE ROMAN CROWD

It is a commonplace that the Roman mob pervades the nation’s history. Livy makes the bold claim that in the Roman mob (*turba*), present as it is from the foundation of the city, rests Rome’s future greatness (1.8.6). The character of that mob is seldom noted, but in point of fact there is an uncanny predictability to the character of the Roman mob throughout its history. For instance, by the time of Augustus the Roman mob would have included a wide range of ethnic and cultural elements,<sup>21</sup> but even the mytho-historical tales related by Livy present an inclusive group that welcomes peoples from all over Italy. Could this be chalked up to Augustan propaganda? Possibly, but when the same characteristics are evident in Republican sources as well the picture takes on broader dimensions. The Romans also exhibit a unique political sense –

---

<sup>19</sup> Zetzel, 189.

<sup>20</sup> Zetzel, 189: The later books of the poem “gradually abandon the framework of the Homeric world...in favor of Italy and Rome, introducing both Aeneas and the reader to a new future and a different past...”

<sup>21</sup> This is partially due to the large numbers of slave manumissions that took place during the Late Republic (Yavetz, 8).

a certain “political virtue” by which they are conscious of their constitutional importance and therefore protective of their rights, a consistently expressed piety, a competitive streak embodied by their love for spectacles, a capacity for hard work and the patient endurance of suffering, and the ability to express all of the above characteristics as a collective whole.

In the portrayal of the Trojan people when they first come under the command of Aeneas and Anchises, there is scarce a hint of their future Roman greatness. They are a *miserabile vulgus* (2.798) organized by nothing more than a unified will to follow Aeneas, but the poem shows a subtle development from this initially pathetic assemblage to the more self-assured group that emerges later in the poem and exemplifies the rewards of what Pöschl terms the “Roman will for duration.”<sup>22</sup> The behavior of the Trojan crowd – from their frantic questions in *Aeneid* 5 about the prophecies of Helenus to their confident cheer for Aeneas’ arrival in *Aeneid* 9 – reveals a group who will progress from hopeless refugees to an imperial people confident in their destined homecoming. Other scenes, such as the uprising in Latium in *Aeneid* 7 at the outbreak of war, provide insight into the types of crowd behavior that are ideally to be avoided, but also a possible explanation for the infamously feisty character of the historical Roman mob. The Italians, after all, are not in the end enemies to be suppressed, but distant kin with whom the Trojans are destined to reunite. Be it the “proto-Roman” Trojans and Italians of Vergil, the early Romans of Livy, or the Romans of the Augustan era, all share the same basic characteristics, as well as an awareness – if at first a dim one – of their ultimate destiny.

---

<sup>22</sup> Pöschl, 11.

### C. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

For the most part, critics have treated the Trojans and the various Italian groups of the *Aeneid* as mere background to the actions of the main characters and the gods.<sup>23</sup> Crowds in the poem (such as the boys of the *lusus Troiae*) have been seen as mere κωφὰ πρόσωπα, “dumb characters” who “are conjured into existence for a momentary effect (*multis cum milibus ibat*, 5.75)” only to vanish.<sup>24</sup> Where their behavior is noted, it is often in a reductive sense that treats the Trojans as extensions of Aeneas, and the Italians as a barbarian “other,” or else the Trojans as despoilers and invaders who take on the role of the Iliadic Greeks versus a group of peaceful natives.<sup>25</sup> The abstract “crowd” is written off as a fickle and seditious entity, easily led astray by *furor*,<sup>26</sup> but more often, the crowd is ignored.<sup>27</sup>

Somewhat recently, Markus Schauer has accomplished some important work on the idea of Aeneas as a Trojan *Anführer*. His study truly opens the door for a consideration of the Trojan people in his treatment of Aeneas as not only an epic hero, but as the founder and leader of an entire *Volk*, whose central role in the epic he discusses throughout his study.<sup>28</sup> Yavetz remarks, after all: “the urban crowds and their leaders represent two sides of the same coin.”<sup>29</sup> Earlier studies on the piecemeal “public” versus “private” voices, or “further voices” of the poem have

---

<sup>23</sup> E.g., Laird, 175: “It is manifestly obvious to us as modern readers that epic, particularly Roman epic, devotes little attention to the lower strata of society...” and Newman and Newman, 209-10: Vergil imitates Homer’s πληθύς with the *plebs*, e.g. in the Catalogue of Italians he “replaces individual heroes largely with allusions to peoples and tribes” with the end that a sort of “leveling” takes place.

<sup>24</sup> Newman and Newman, 20. The young men of Latinus’ city (7.162f.) are seen as “extras” (21)

<sup>25</sup> The work of Richard Thomas (1982) is a primary example of this approach.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. LaPenna, 285.

<sup>27</sup> It is instructive in consulting the commentaries to see how few of them take real interest in the crowd and its activities. Austin and Horsfall are welcome exceptions.

<sup>28</sup> Schauer 2007, 89. Also of interest, but not within the bounds of this study, are his observations on the egalitarian nature of the social structure of the Trojan community (257-9).

<sup>29</sup> Yavetz, 7.

drowned out its majority of proto-Romans,<sup>30</sup> comprising both the Trojans and the soon-to-be-incorporated Latins. This approach often has literal connotations in relation to examinations of speech and power; the fact that “the masses” in the *Aeneid* do not often “speak” in terms of having their direct speech reported by the narrator is viewed as an indication of their relative unimportance and lack of power,<sup>31</sup> although their actual vocalizations – prayers, shouts, applause, etc. – are numerous and often very important to the plot. The work of Andrew Feldherr on spectacle has helped somewhat to dispel this notion as far as both Livy and Vergil are concerned.<sup>32</sup> The once-popular though much discredited “Stoic Aeneas” model,<sup>33</sup> however, has left a long-term side-effect in a tendency to imagine the poem as a solitary voyage in which various individuals and peoples (including Aeneas’ own) feel the brunt of his imperialistic mission.<sup>34</sup> The scope of the universalizing Trojan/Italian/Roman voice has been downplayed and drowned out. This voice is the key to understanding the emergence of a “Roman identity” in the course of the poem, and although many critics have alluded to the importance of this identity,<sup>35</sup> few have actually given any indication as to what it means.

Because the *tu...Romane* injunction is not aimed only at the highest classes of Roman society, it is only by taking into account the Roman mob of history, especially those of historical periods that Vergil imagined in his epic, that we can fully grasp Vergil’s thoughts, whether conscious or otherwise, on his people. Yavetz’s work remains a valuable contribution in this

---

<sup>30</sup> Parry 1963, Lyne 1987.

<sup>31</sup> E.g. Laird, 192: “In the *Aeneid*, far more than in previous epics, it seems to be for those in authority to speak and the inclination or the duty of those with less power to remain silent.”

<sup>32</sup> Feldherr 1995 and 1998.

<sup>33</sup> Bowra 1933.

<sup>34</sup> Lyne 1987, 182-3.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., Toll 1997, 34. Vergil “designed the *Aeneid* strategically to help the Romans meditate on the duties, problems, dangers, and possibilities of a new national identity.”

regard, as does Vanderbroeck's focused study on the collective behavior of the crowd.<sup>36</sup> Millar's view of the Roman crowd will be largely accepted; his acknowledgement of the influence the *populus*, whatever its actual constitutional powers, upon the imaginations of their leaders and rulers – who exhibit a persistent compulsion to please them<sup>37</sup> – is consistent with Vergil's picture of the crowd whether it is the Trojan/Italian crowd prior to their adoption of an institutionalized government, or the future Roman crowd. Most recently, Wiseman, largely in support of Millar's views, has presented more specific observations regarding the populace that take into account their sovereign role.<sup>38</sup>

#### D. PURPOSE AND OUTLINE OF STUDY

The importance of this study will consist in its attention to a neglected “character” of the *Aeneid*.<sup>39</sup> It is my hope that in pursuing this angle on the poem, some of the natural exuberance of the epic, almost all of which is transmitted by the Trojans and Italians,<sup>40</sup> may be recaptured. If *Discordia* and war are realities in history of the nation and its people, there is no reason to

---

<sup>36</sup> Yavetz 1969, Vanderbroeck 1987.

<sup>37</sup> “...our whole conception of the Roman Republic has been distorted by theories that have allowed us not to see these open air meetings (*contiones*) of the *Populus Romanus* as central to Roman Politics” (Millar, 1). Other scholars, e.g. Mouritsen, see the involvement of the *populus* in politics as “almost entirely symbolic” (15).

<sup>38</sup> Wiseman, esp. 1-31.

<sup>39</sup> Studies of individuals in the poem have been a consistent trend, especially in Germany after 1945 (Harrison 1990, 12).

<sup>40</sup> Schauer, e.g. comments that in a few episodes in the epic Vergil allows the enthusiasm of the anonymous Volk to become almost audible, “läßt Vergil die Begeisterung des anonymen Volkes geradezu hörbar werden” (240).

dismiss the occasional periods of *Concordia* and peace that they enjoy as somehow less real.<sup>41</sup>

In this process, what needs to be recognized is how their behavior and modes of expression divorce the proto-Romans of Vergil – an inclusive, pious, politically sensible, competitive, enduring, collective – from the legendary crowds of Homer and bind them to their historical descendants. In the realm of epic poetry, the crowd of Vergil is exceptional. With a better picture of this entity that plays so decisive a role in the history of the nation, the *Aeneid* can be viewed as not merely an Augustan epic, but a fully Roman one.

The organization of this study will proceed from an overview demonstrating that the Roman mob of the *Aeneid* is consistent with the Roman mob of history (*Chapter I: The Urban Mob: Ad Coeptam Magnitudinem Roboris*) to a reading of key passages of the poem. This portion of the study will be based on a loose chronology of the Trojans. *Chapter II: The Indecisive Assembly*, will begin with the Trojans in assembly and compare them to other assembly scenes of the poem, most notably the Latin assembly of Book 11 and the divine assembly in Book 10. *Chapter III: The Crowd in Transit* will discuss primarily how the Trojan crowd at work and at sea reveals its characteristics and its orientation towards the actions of its leaders. *Chapter IV: The Watching Crowd: Spectators* will treat the crowds of Book 5 (The Trojan Games) and 7-12 (various spectator scenes in the context of war). *Chapter V: Sedition and Disorder*, will deal with the sedition scenes of the poem, the women by the ships in Book 5, the Latins upon the arrival of Aeneas in Book 7, and the breakdown of civil order in Latium in Books 11-12. *Chapter VI. War and the Peoples of Italy* will examine the characteristics of the

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf., e.g. Johnson: “Vergil’s world...prefigures (it does not affirm) a world where matter and reason and unity *may* be only illusions, where madness and discord *may* be the only realities, here below, in space and time” (13).

different groups whom the Trojans encounter (as well as the Trojans themselves) and thus set the stage for *Chapter VII: The Roman Crowd Emerges*, which will explore the final identity of the Trojan/Italian crowd – a group embodying all of the characteristics of their Roman descendants.

## I. THE URBAN MOB: *AD COEPTAM MAGNITUDINEM ROBORIS*

The historical background of the Roman mob provides a crucial context for understanding the Trojan and Italian crowds of the *Aeneid*, the characteristics of which will be explored in the remainder of this study. A surprisingly coherent picture (whether real or idealized) can be formed of the Roman *populus* both in the *Aeneid* and in various periods of Rome's history: mytho-historical accounts of Aeneas' arrival in Italy through the establishment of the Republic treated primarily by Livy, the writings of Cicero and others during the Late Republic, and in the records of the early Principate. In this chapter, the Roman crowd shares many characteristics with the Trojans and Italians throughout the poem.

References throughout the *Aeneid* to the Roman people, e.g. on the shield of Aeneas when Aeneas lifts onto his shoulders "the fame and fortunes of his children's children" (*famamque et fata nepotum*, 8.731), present a picture of the Romans as the fulfillment of the entire Trojan endeavor.<sup>1</sup> The Romans are often pointed to as the *nepotes* of the Trojans and Italians in ways that serve to compliment and exhort both groups. According to Poseidon's prophecy in the *Iliad*, the Romans represent the Trojans who "shall be born in days to come"

---

<sup>1</sup> Heinze remarks on the *maiestas populi Romani* (majesty of the Roman people) as a "source of the sublime" that "does not often come to the surface in Vergil's poem, but is all the stronger when it does, and its subterranean rumble accompanies the poem from beginning to end" (Heinze, 382).



over whom the “children’s children” of Aeneas are destined to rule (*Il.* 20.307-8).<sup>2</sup> In the *Aeneid*, an advanced consciousness of an historical role pervades the treatment of both the Trojans and their Roman descendants. The Romans are destined to be a people who have distinct *labores* to complete as a part of their role in Jupiter’s plan, yet the poem does not depict them in the almost nonstop action of the Trojans. The implications of this are important; the *Romani* of Vergil’s time have (at least for the time being) defeated the monster *Discordia* who has lurked over much of the action of the poem. The Romans have a clear consciousness of their national destiny; for the Trojans and Italians, as will be seen later, this element is still indistinct and only beginning to take shape.

The Romans of the future embody the Trojan/Italian national destiny; to that end, they share the same qualities as their Trojan and Italian ancestors. In both the history of Rome and in the *Aeneid*, the Roman crowd is portrayed as (1) inclusive of others and therefore capable of sustaining a unified, multi-ethnic society; (2) possessed of a basic political virtue whereby they are conscious of their constitutional importance and therefore protective of their rights (This trait often makes itself known as a natural exuberance that is tempered by a willingness to obey good leaders.); (3) pious; (4) competitive and therefore fond of spectacles; (5) hardworking and enduring; and (6) able to act as a unified collective in all of the above circumstances.

---

<sup>2</sup> νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

## A. INCLUSIVENESS

In both the poem and in history, inclusiveness is an idea that evolves from a limited conception of who can be considered Roman to a more universal one. The fall of Troy marks a definite milestone for the Trojans,<sup>3</sup> but Aeneas himself represents their transition from the Trojans to the foundation of the Romans.<sup>4</sup> In Livy's account, Aeneas (not the gods) makes the determination of a common name to unite the Trojans and Latins (Livy 1.2.4, cf. Vergil 12.823-825, 835-6). In shifting the responsibility from Jove to Aeneas, he makes the Romans directly responsible for embracing their future destiny and identity as a nation of mixed national origin, but not at the expense of the historical momentousness of the union. In *Aeneid* 12, Jupiter's designation (12.819-840) joins only the Trojans and Latins as one people, but this is merely a start. Aeneas' own son Silvius, who will allow the Trojan race to rule in Alba Longa (6.760-6), is described as having "Italian blood in his veins" (*Italo commixtus sanguine*, 6.762) and an "Alban name" (*Albanum nomen*, 6.763).<sup>5</sup> Emigration and absorption, at least among the peoples of Italy, thus constitute "a crucial pattern in the development of the Roman state."<sup>6</sup>

Anchises introduces the entire cavalcade of future descendants, who are described both as a "number" and his "beloved children" (*numerus, carosque nepotes*, 6.682), as an inextricable mix of Trojan and Italian, with a stress on the Italian factor. While the Trojans bring *gloria*, the

---

<sup>3</sup> E.g. "we Trojans are no more, Ilium is no more, nor the great glory of the Teucrians" (*fuius Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens gloria Teucrorum*, 2.325-326), and "it pleased the gods above to overthrow the power of Asia and Priam's guiltless race" (*res Asiae Priamique evertere gentem immeritam visum superis*, 3.1-2). See also Feldherr 1998, 114: "Romans are made, not born. Thus it is particularly appropriate that the first ever event in Roman history is the destruction of a previous fatherland, Troy."

<sup>4</sup> Aeneas serves as a "Vermittlerfigur" (Schauer, 89).

<sup>5</sup> Austin on 6.766, Toll 1997, 45: "...the poem inaugurates the process by which an indefinite series of Roman-ness has always been, and should and shall always continue to be, a partnership open to further newcomers."

<sup>6</sup> Feldherr 1998, 113.

Italians are connected with *nepotes*:

Nunc age, Dardanium prolem, quae deinde sequatur  
gloria, qui maneant Itala de gente nepotes,  
inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras.  
expediam dictis, et te tua fata docebo. (6.756-759)

Now then, the glory henceforth to attend the Trojan race, what children of Italian stock are held in store by fate, glorious souls waiting to inherit our name, this shall I reveal in speech and inform you of your destiny.

The emphasis on unity is consistent with Juno's request of Jupiter for a "Roman stock" that is "strong in Italian valor" (*sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago*, 12.827). Jupiter assures her that the Trojans will "sink down, merged in the mass" (*commixti corpore tantum subsident Teucris*, 12.835-6), and a new race will rise "blended with Ausonian blood" (*hic genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget*, 12.838).<sup>7</sup> The Trojan element, however, is not to be lost entirely. Anchises in the underworld bids Aeneas to "behold this nation, the Romans that are yours" (*hanc aspice gentem Romanosque tuos*, 6.788-789).<sup>8</sup> This blending is treated as something of an ideal; the mixed heritage of Marcellus the younger (6.875-877) marks him as the quintessential product of the "land of Romulus."<sup>9</sup> The portrayal of Marcellus also accords with the prophecy given to Latinus in the second half of the poem, that the children who spring from the mixed Trojan/Latin

---

<sup>7</sup> In his speech preceding the war in which he complains of Teucric power (*Teucros in regna vocari*) and that "a Phrygian stock is mingled," while he is "spurned from the door" (*stirpem admisceri Phrygiam, se limine pelli*, 7.578-9), Turnus does not so much reveal an inherent problem with the mixture of races as his own insecurities about losing that to which he believes he is entitled.

<sup>8</sup> Further evidence that Trojanness is not to die out entirely can be found in the *lusus Troiae* (5.545-603), and in the number of Roman families with supposed Trojan origins that are mentioned on several occasions: Cluentus "*Romane Cluenti*" (5.123), "soon to be Italian" (*mox Italus*) Mnestheus and the "Memmian line" (5.117), and Sergestus and the infamous Sergian *domus* (5.121). See also Heinze, 125 for the "bridge" Vergil builds "between the remote past and his own time" through the introduction of Roman names. The names of the boys in Trojan troop also allude to more Roman families (5.563-569).

<sup>9</sup> "No youth of Trojan stock (*Iliaca...de gente*) will ever raise his Latin ancestry (*Latinos...avos*) so high in hope nor the land of Romulus (*Romula...tellus*) ever boast of any son like this." Austin (on 875-6) notes the "ingenious racial association": *Iliaca...Latinos...Romula*.

stock (*quorumque a stirpe nepotes*, 7.99-101) will rule the world.

In both Vergil and history, Romulus marks the real “Roman shift” in more ways than one. First, the people are technically ruled “under Hector’s race” (*gente sub Hectorea*, 1.273) until the reign of Romulus, when the Romans are given their name:

Romulus excipiet gentem et Mavortia condet  
moenia Romanosque suo de nomine dicet. (1.276-277)

Romulus...shall take up the line, and found the walls of Mars and call the people Romans after his own name.

The next, more important change alluded to by Vergil (8.342-3) as well as Livy, is Romulus’ *asylum*, and with it, a more (if somewhat amorphous) “Roman” mob:

Eo ex finitimis populis turba omnis, sine discrimine liber an servus  
esset, avida novarum rerum perfugit, idque primum ad coeptam  
magnitudinem roboris fuit. (Livy 1.8.6)

Thither fled, from the surrounding peoples, a miscellaneous rabble, without distinction of bond or free, eager for new conditions; and these constituted the first advance in power towards the greatness at which Romulus aimed.

Rome augments her greatness not only by military exploits or the pursuit of empire, but by the simple addition of more people – a *turba* of both free men and slaves.<sup>10</sup> This crowd – like the one Aeneas finds at the end of Book 2 – is ready for a new future, perhaps one in which social and cultural differences are of little consequence.<sup>11</sup> That the maintenance of that *multitudo*

---

<sup>10</sup> Romulus had achieved the recruitment of his urban mob (*adiciendae multitudinis causa*) by means of a fib that they had been born from the earth (1.8.5), a stance that mirrors rather well typical upper-class Roman condescension toward the mob as something rather useful if not desirable to be around (e.g., *odi profanum vulgus et arceo*, Horace, *Odes* 3.1). The attitudes of the upper classes though can be dismissed to some extent for the purposes of this study as somewhat moot; mixed origins and status (free and slave) are a fundamental characteristic of the Roman mob. In the *Aeneid*, at any rate, a class of nobles (der Adel) does not play an important roll (Schauer, 268-9).

<sup>11</sup> Papaioannou remarks that the treatment of the asylum is evidence of Vergil’s “vision of Rome” as “a community that became great because it was always open to foreign influences without discrimination” (697).

(1.9.1) was to involve the abduction of the Sabine women only corroborates that initial identity.<sup>12</sup>

The preparations for the games to be held for the purpose of luring the Sabines into Rome so that their women can be abducted supplies the first example not only of Roman fondness for games, but of the eagerness of the various groups that converge upon the city to witness them. Their eagerness to witness Roman games marks the faint stirrings of the Sabines' desire to become Romans themselves.<sup>13</sup>

Multi mortales convenere, studio etiam videndae novae urbis,  
maxime proximi quique, Caeninenses, Crustumini, Antemnates;  
iam Sabinorum omnis multitudo cum liberis ac coniugibus venit.  
Invitati hospitaliter per domos... (1.9.8-9)

Many people – for they were also eager to see the new city – gathered for the festival, especially those who lived nearest, the inhabitants of Caenina, Crustumium, and Antemnae. The Sabines, too, came with all their people, including their children and wives. They were hospitably entertained in every house...

Vergil places this episode, along with the war that soon follows it, prominently on the shield of Aeneas (8.635-638), thus highlighting the “fusion through combat” between the two communities.<sup>14</sup> As in the spectacles of *Aeneid* 5, special attention is paid not only to the spectacle itself, but also to the fact of a mixed crowd from the various nearby communities coming together with a common zeal for seeing (*studio...videndae*) the new city.<sup>15</sup> Of course, Roman “inclusiveness” can also be said to manifest itself in the conquests of the Roman nation;

---

<sup>12</sup> The mention of the Sabine Clausus in the catalogue of Italian allies points to the inclusion of the Sabines into Rome as well as the origin of the Claudian gens (7.706-9). See, e.g. Horsfall on 11.706-22.

<sup>13</sup> Feldherr 1998 remarks that the Sabine women's acting as “mediators” in the crisis following the initial kidnapping serves to “establish a precedent for the crucial intervention of women in public crises and for the incorporation of outsiders” (217) as well as how the importance of the love of wives and children contributes to “harmony within the newly liberated *res publica*” (211).

<sup>14</sup> Fordyce, xxix.

<sup>15</sup> “*Multi mortales*” is potentially inclusive of both free people and slaves. See Ogilvie's note (on 1.9.8) for the term's historical usage as a more “impressive” substitute for *multi homines*. For the idea of spectacle as transformative of “outsiders” to “insiders” throughout Roman history, see Feldherr 1995, 256-7.

Feldherr mentions specifically the forceful addition (or re-integration) of the people of Alba Longa into the Roman citizen body.<sup>16</sup> There is often a hint of potential warfare in the Roman tendency to bring others under the umbrella of Roman conquest, but this is not always the case.

The idea of a common Roman interest becomes clearer by the Late Republic. Cicero reveals the concept of a kinship of Roman citizens in expressing his concern for the Roman citizens of Sicily who have been suffering from the tyrannical behavior of Verres. The multitude of Roman citizens may be in Rome or elsewhere. A Roman citizen in any part of the growing empire is still a citizen, and so the idea of a far-flung Roman *populus* is beginning to take hold:

quid nunc in nostro sanguine tandem facere debemus? Nam civium Romanorum omnium sanguis coniunctus existimandus est, quoniam et salutis omnium ratio et veritas postulat. Omnes hoc loco cives Romani, et qui adsunt et qui ubique sunt, vestram severitatem desiderant, vestram fidem implorant, vestrum auxilium requirunt; (*In Verr.* II.V.67.172)

How must we be affected now, when we hear of the anguish of our own kinsmen? I say our kinsmen, for we must recognize blood-kinship between all Roman citizens; truth, not less than concern for general safety, bids us do so. And now in this place all the citizens of Rome, all those who are here and all who are elsewhere, are looking to you to do strict justice, appealing to your honor, imploring your help.

The notion of a mixed crowd united by a common Roman identity undergoes a vast extension by the early Principate. Though Augustus himself attempted to limit new conferrals of citizenship and manumission of foreigners, within his own family both Livia and Tiberius sought the privilege of Roman citizenship for dependants of theirs (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 40.3). In this case, Augustus' move towards exclusion is less significant than his family members' wish to include friends who happened to be foreigners in the ranks of Roman citizens. This wish is reminiscent of Julius Caesar's inclusion of his Gallic friends in the Roman Senate (Suetonius,

---

<sup>16</sup> "...their incorporation is ultimately presented as a reunification of what is essentially one nation" (Feldherr 1998, 115). Additionally, the conflict is treated in Livy "as a means of articulating and responding to one of the central crises of Livy's day, the fault lines implicit in the construction of a Roman national identity" (Feldherr 1998, 125). See subsection I.D for how this works out in practice.

*Div. Jul.* 76.3). The resentment garnered by Caesar’s activity, however, seems to have stemmed more from the fact that the foreigners were not merely fellow-citizens, but senators. The Roman people did not resent them for being citizens of foreign origin so much as for having been positioned as their betters.<sup>17</sup> Membership in the *plebs* was never exclusionary. Large numbers of slave manumissions that had taken place during the Late Republic had already begun to swell the ranks and alter the ethnic makeup of freeborn Roman citizens.<sup>18</sup>

The mainstream Roman impulse toward cultural inclusiveness by the time of Augustus – whether the *princeps* shared it entirely or not – was thus one of broadening conceptions of Romanness beginning with Italy and ending in faraway lands. In the *Aeneid*, Syed observes, “the concept of Romanness” is “an inclusive category, able to supersede the more narrowly ethnic categories.”<sup>19</sup> The poem can thus be seen as representative of a “change in Roman identity during Vergil’s own time” that came with the citizenship of the Italians after the Social War.<sup>20</sup> In his triumph depicted on the shield of Aeneas, Augustus sacrifices to “Italy’s gods” (*dis Italis*, 8.715), but he is also presented as the unifier of various peoples (8.724-728):

dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis  
postibus; incedunt victae longo ordine gentes,  
quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis. (8.721-723)

He (Augustus) reviews the gifts of nations and hangs them on the proud portals. The conquered peoples move in long array, as diverse in fashion of dress and arms as in tongues.

We do not know whether these people are supposed to be happy to have been conquered by Augustus. The oath that all of Italy and a few provinces swore in support of him, though, seems

---

<sup>17</sup> Likewise, Livy’s early Romans are not enthusiastic about the possibility of a Sabine king, “The original Romans spurned the idea of an alien king” (*Romani veteres peregrinum regem aspernantur*, Livy 1.17.2).

<sup>18</sup> Yavetz, 8.

<sup>19</sup> Syed, 215.

<sup>20</sup> Syed, 218.

to suggest that they were, at least insofar as Augustus had finally brought about peace.<sup>21</sup> The scene marks the fulfillment, in Augustan terms, of the Roman virtue of inclusivity; various peoples have come together in a state of concord, in spite of their differences. Aeneas himself, after all, had only served as a unifier of perhaps three separate peoples (Arcadians, Italians, and Trojans),<sup>22</sup> but Augustus is here presented (if imaginatively) in the same role in reference to up to ten (8.724-728). The scene is a perfect illustration of Syed's identification of Romanness as a category that is "based on cultural practice rather than ancestry."<sup>23</sup>

## B. POLITICAL VIRTUE

Another aspect of the Roman crowd is their consciousness of a real or symbolic voice in Roman politics, which is tied closely to their intolerance for poor leaders, but respect for and compliance with good ones.<sup>24</sup> Although a true democratic sensibility is notably weak in Roman thought, self-government in the sense of a people doing the work of a direct (or even merely a representative) democracy is superseded by the people's ability to convince a ruler (or ruling class) to fulfill their needs. Hence, the dynamism of the populace outweighs its savvy as the necessary "Roman" political trait.<sup>25</sup> Augustus himself dealt with potential rebellion on several

---

<sup>21</sup> *Iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua, et me belli, quo vici ad Actium, ducem depoposcit. Iuraverunt in eadem verba provinciae Galliae Hispaniae Africa Sicilia Sardinia (Res Gestae, 25.2).* Text of the *Res Gestae* is from Scheid's edition. See West 1998, 306.

<sup>22</sup> Schauer, 71.

<sup>23</sup> Syed, 217.

<sup>24</sup> Because of the largely male-dominated nature of Roman political discourse, the discussion in this section will deal only with male political behavior. For a discussion of the historical precedents for female political virtue, see subsection V.B.

<sup>25</sup> Of course, the upper classes did not often see it that way, e.g. Cicero: *Non est enim consilium in vulgo, non ratio, non discrimen, non diligentia, semperque sapientes ea qua populus fecisset ferenda, non semper laudanda dixerunt (Pro Planc. 4.9).*



occasions during his reign, a fact surely not lost on Vergil. Indeed, a strong ruler is deemed by Livy to have been necessary for the Roman people in its infancy as a check on their natural over-exuberance (Livy 2.1.4-6). Most importantly, though, the Roman people display a certain sense of right and wrong in the realm of politics, despite attempts by their betters to characterize them as “brutish”<sup>26</sup> or “fickle.” This political sense lends weight to the common Roman idea that their superior laws and organization justify their “empire without end” (*imperium sine fine*) (1.279) over other nations.

In the *Aeneid*, the political virtue of the Roman people of the future is often seen through a lens of their future political power. There are numerous examples of this: Juno’s concerns about the “people, kings of broad realms” (*populum late regem*, 1.21) who are destined to overthrow Carthage, Venus’ reminders to Jupiter of his promises that the Romans would be “rulers” (*ductores*, 1.235) who would “hold the sea and all lands beneath their sway” (*qui terras omnis dicione tenerent*, 236), and Jupiter’s affirmation of his promise of “no bounds in space or time” (*nec metas rerum nec tempora*, 278) but “empire without end” (*imperium sine fine*, 279) regarding the “Romans, lords of the world” (*Romanos, rerum dominos*, 282) who will one day bring a conquered Greece “into bondage” (*servitio premet*) and “hold lordship” (*dominabitur*, 285) over it.

It is not only the gods who are privy to this information. Aeneas himself has several indications of the destiny of his people in Italy, first from Apollo:

hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris  
et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis. (3.97-8)

There the house of Aeneas shall lord it over all lands, even his children’s children and the race that shall be born of them.

A little later, from the Penates:

---

<sup>26</sup> Yavetz, 34.

idem venturos tollemus in astra nepotes  
imperiumque urbi dabimus...(3.158-9)

We too, shall exalt to heaven your sons that are to be, and give empire to their city.

Latinus is given the prophecy that the children who spring from the Trojan stock will rule the world:

externi venient generi, qui sanguine nostrum  
nomen in astra ferant, quorumque a stirpe nepotes  
omnia sub pedibus, qua sol utrumque recurrens  
aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt. (7.98-101)<sup>27</sup>

Strangers shall come, to be your sons, whose blood shall exalt our name to the stars, and the children of whose race shall behold, where the circling sun looks on each ocean, the whole world roll obediently beneath their feet.

One passage suggests that these future endeavors are connected inextricably with the political virtue of the future Romans:

tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento  
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,  
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos. (6.851-853)<sup>28</sup>

You, Roman, be sure to rule the peoples (be these your arts), to set the stamp of civilized order upon peace, to spare the vanquished and to crush the proud.<sup>29</sup>

This command is the opposite of a passive assumption of destined power. Further, it curbs sharply the Romans' ability to engage in other activities. The work of empire and civilization is a job, and not only for the leaders, but for an entire people, and one in possession of an outstanding political character. Nor does the command to rule necessarily imply undue violence

---

<sup>27</sup> The fact that the king repeats this information in a meeting with the Trojan envoys at 7.255-258 and 7.270-272 demonstrates that he believes and accepts it immediately, despite later developments.

<sup>28</sup> See Austin's note (especially on 6.853ff.) on Vergil's "epigrammatic precision" in enumerating "policy familiar from other sources," e.g. Cicero *De Off.* 1.35, Polybius 18.37.7, Livy 30.42.17.

<sup>29</sup> Austin's translation of 6.852. The Loeb's "crown peace with justice" contains too much moral weight. The alternate reading *pacisque* has little support; see Conington, et. al.

or exultation.<sup>30</sup> The Roman mission is emphatically one of civilizing. War (*debellare superbos*) is presented as a last resort, or as a means necessary to the establishment of peace.

It is important to keep in mind the distinction between an “ideal” and “actual” in Roman politics.<sup>31</sup> For the purposes of this investigation, the idealization of Roman political virtue is almost more revealing. Livy recognizes that the *populus* is united by rule of law from the beginning of the monarchy (Livy 1.8.1). In a later *concilium* called by Romulus, the Senate (*patres*) and People (*populus*) engage in one-upmanship in which each attempts to concede power to the other. The Senate, suspecting that they were about to lose it anyway, first grant to the people the power of electing kings, and the people in turn grant the power back to the Senate (1.17.6-11). Political reality may reveal a picture in which the *populus* has little real authority, and so the idea of the early Romans as governed by laws and not men sounds like retrofitting, but it establishes a principle, if not always an absolute reality, from which a voice for the *populus* can be claimed.

For example, in *Aeneid* 6, Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, makes “the infant city secure on a basis of laws” (*primam legibus urbem fundabit*, 6.810-811). In Livy, Tullus Hostilius calls the people to council so that they may pass judgment upon Horatius:

Rex ne ipse tam tristis ingratiq[ue] ad volgus iudicii ac secundum  
iudicium supplicii auctor esset, concilio populi advocato ‘Duumviro[s],’  
inquit, ‘qui Horatio perduellionem iudicent, secundum legem facio.’ (1.26.5)

The king, that he might not take upon himself the responsibility for so stern and unpopular a judgment, and for the punishment which must follow sentence, called together the council of the people and said: “In accordance with the law I appoint duumvirs to pass judgment upon Horatius for treason.”

---

<sup>30</sup> See Horsfall’s note on 7.101. He suggests that *vertique regique*, “depend in dominion” (Horsfall’s translation) could be taken as hendiadys on *regere imperio*, and also Camps, 19.

<sup>31</sup> “...there was a stark contrast between the extensive powers of the *populus Romanus* as a collective political agent and the restrictive way in which this role was performed in practice...” (Mouritsen, 16).

It is clear that Tullus appoints a jury to judge Horatius because he does not want to incur popular resentment (it is, after all, a difficult case, since Horatius had killed his own sister for being in love with one of the enemy Curiatii), which is a fair enough reason for caution. But the other side of the coin is that he recognizes the importance of popular opinion, if not in its fundamental constitutional basis, at least in the sense that he could lose influence if he does not rule wisely.<sup>32</sup>

The Roman people from the beginning exhibit a rather feisty character; they do not suffer tyrants. They may turn violent if they feel powerless, but they do not rise in full-scale revolt for an insufficient cause.<sup>33</sup> The series of events leading up to the downfall of Tarquinius Superbus provides a perfect illustration of this. During the greater part of the monarchy, Livy portrays a mostly quiet *populus*, but at the accession of Tarquinius Superbus there is an immediate reaction, as though their natural mettle had been lying dormant during the years of decent governance.<sup>34</sup> First, a crowd gathers outside the Curia when Tarquinius seizes the throne: “Shouts arose from the partisans of each, and the people began to rush into the Senate house” (*clamor ab utriusque fautoribus oritur et concursus populi fiebat in curiam*, 1.48.2).<sup>35</sup> Tarquinius only stops this mob scene by hurling Servius Tullus down the steps of the senate house, and so order is restored, if only temporarily.

---

<sup>32</sup> Contrast the situation in which Tarquinius Superbus finds himself: The king, sensitive to the fact that he rules “neither by popular decree nor senatorial sanction” (*neque populi iussu neque auctoribus patribus*, 1.49.3), cannot trust in the affection of his people (*caritate civium*, 1.49.4) and so resorts to ruling by fear (1.49.3-4). In doing so, Tarquinius tries cases himself in contravention of the precedent set by Tullus, thus subverting the people’s constitutional privilege.

<sup>33</sup> Vanderbroeck (146) and Toner (163) note the extreme rarity of outright political rebellion in the Roman world.

<sup>34</sup> See discussion of Livy 2.1 below (pp. 27-8).

<sup>35</sup> “...the words conjure up a picture of a battle on a heroic or larger-than-life scale which is appropriate to such a tense moment of history” (Ogilvie on 1.48.2).

Fear may prevent any further immediate action, but it opens up an important means to power and expression in an otherwise often seemingly powerless crowd – rumor. The Latins get wind of the fact that Tarquinius’ people have nicknamed him “Superbus,” though they only use the designation “secretly and in whispers, but still quite generally” (*ita clam quidem mussitantes volgo tamen*, 1.50.3).<sup>36</sup> The use of rumor points to a reclaiming of authority on the part of the people in their arrival at a collective decision regarding Tarquinius.<sup>37</sup> When the body of the dead Lucretia is exhibited in the forum of Collatia as evidence of the monarchy’s crimes, the people gather (*concientque*, 1.59.3), and are able to speak more boldly and individually: “Every man had his own complaint to make of the prince’s crime and his violence” (*Pro se quisque scelus regium ac vim queruntur*, 1.59.4).<sup>38</sup>

Sitting around and complaining about the injustices done to them, however, is not the correct response for “men and Romans” (1.59.4), as Brutus emerges to make clear to them. The enthusiastic response by the bravest of the youth, and then by the rest,<sup>39</sup> makes clear that the people have changed from an “individual to a unified response to the rape” and as such, begin to conceive of themselves as Romans while beginning to view “the Tarquins as public enemies.”<sup>40</sup> The group then sets out for Rome, where it at first causes consternation in the crowd, until the

---

<sup>36</sup> This observation about the Roman people comes from the speech of the Latin Turnus Herdonius of Aricia (1.50.3-7) who is himself called by Livy “factious and turbulent” (*seditiosus facinerosusque homo*, 1.50.7). Cf. his Latin predecessor, the *seditione potens* Drances.

<sup>37</sup> Theory of Turner and Killian (Vanderbroeck, 12).

<sup>38</sup> This is a rough Latin equivalent to a Homeric *tis*-speech (DeJong). In a sense, it is more individuated because it allows for the possibility of different expressions instead of a repetition of the same one, as is often the case in the Homeric paradigm. Politically, it provides proof of how the “private and domestic ambitions of the Tarquins...continually results in the enslavement of Roman citizens, both collectively and individually” (Feldherr 1998, 202).

<sup>39</sup> “The boldest of the young men seized their weapons and offered themselves for service, and the others followed their example” (*Ferocissimus quisque iuvenum cum armis voluntarius adest; sequitur et cetera iuventus*, 1.59.5).

<sup>40</sup> Feldherr 1998, 199.

people of Rome see that it is led by the “chief men of the state” (*primores civitatis*, 1.59.6). The perceived virtue of the leader of the disturbance is of paramount importance. There is reason to suspect that a leader perceived to be of lesser virtue than Brutus would not have commanded the same enthusiastic following. When he makes his speech in Rome it is in his official capacity as Tribune of the Celeres. Since only qualified officials were permitted to convoke *contiones*,<sup>41</sup> the apparently spontaneous march of the people on Rome is now given constitutional legitimacy.

The Romans progress from initial “terror and confusion” (*pavorem ac tumultum*, 1.59.6) at the sight of Brutus and the people of Collatia to an excited rush to the forum: “from every corner of the city men came running to the Forum” (*ex omnibus locis urbis in forum curritur*, 1.59.7).<sup>42</sup> Somewhat superfluously, it seems, a crier summons the people (*populum advocavit*, 1.59.7) for Brutus’ speech. The result of the speech is that Brutus inflames the people (*incensam multitudinem perpulit*, 1.59.11), and exile is pronounced on the king. A speech by a Roman citizen of known virtue and leadership ability impels the people finally to take collective action and overthrow the monarchy. That the dissolution of the monarchy takes place with the help of Brutus highlights the importance of leaders who are respected by the Roman people as a key element of Roman political virtue.

Livy explains the necessity of the monarchy as a temporary form of government intended to cope effectively with a politically immature nation. In forming his point, he hypothesizes on a Roman nation freed prior to the overthrow of Tarquinius:

Quid enim futurum fuit, si illa pastorum convenarumque plebs, transfuga ex suis populis, sub tutela inviolati templi aut libertatem aut certe impunitatem adepta, soluta regio metu agitari coepta esset tribuniciis procellis, et in aliena urbe cum patribus serere certamina, priusquam pignera coniugum ac liberorum caritasque ipsius soli, cui longo tempore

---

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Millar, 46.

<sup>42</sup> Ogilvie observes the similarity between this and “scenes of confusion which followed the assassination of Julius Caesar (cf. especially Plutarch, *Caesar* 67)” (on 1.59.7).

adsuescitur, animos eorum consociasset? (Livy 2.1.4-5)

For what would have happened if that rabble of shepherds and vagrants, having deserted their own peoples, and under the protection of inviolable sanctuary having possessed themselves of liberty, or at least impunity, had thrown off their fear of kings only to be stirred by the ruffling storms of tribunician demagogues, breeding quarrels with the senators of a city not their own, before ever the pledges of wife and children and love of the very place and soil (an affection of slow growth) had firmly united their aspirations?

*Discordia* and the inevitable dissolution of the state (2.1.6) are the consequences of premature liberty. As Livy makes the transition into the rest of his work at the beginning of Book 2, he makes it clear that the Roman people under the Republic are thoroughly free, and freedom is one of their defining characteristics. Book 2 of Livy opens with a statement that makes this orientation abundantly clear:

Liberi iam hinc populi Romani res pace belloque gestas, annuos magistratus, imperiaque legum potentiora quam hominum peragam. (2.1.1)

The new liberty enjoyed by the Roman people, their achievements in peace and war, annual magistracies, and laws superior in authority to men will henceforth be my theme.

In the parade of heroes in the underworld, Brutus has his own rebellious sons executed *pro libertate*, 6.821, and during the attack of Porsenna on the city as portrayed on the shield of Aeneas, the *Aeneadae* rush on the sword “for freedom’s sake” (*pro libertate*, 8.648). In spite of Livy’s confident claim of rule of law as well as the identification of the Roman people as “free,” caution surrounds the concept of *libertas* in the psyche of the Roman elites. As Mouritsen explains, it was “central to the self-image of the Romans and at the heart of their political identity,”<sup>43</sup> yet it was a concept adapted freely by politicians of various stripes in order to advance very different agenda. What is more, it needed to be balanced by the idea of *dignitas*, an idea that proceeded from social status rather than simple equality.<sup>44</sup> Without such concerns, there was a real danger of *libertas* becoming excessive. Cicero even defines the unrestrained

---

<sup>43</sup> Mouritsen, 11.

<sup>44</sup> Mouritsen 10. See also 9-10 for an informative outline of the use of *libertas* in the political discourse from the time of the Gracchi to Augustus.

*libertas* of the people when they dared to defy the senate's *auctoritas* as *licentia*.<sup>45</sup> But *libertas* was not without its benefits. In the *Aeneid*, two out of three occurrences of the word *libertas* in the poem (Books 6 and 8) are in connection to the birth of the *res publica*. This *libertas*, however, was always in danger because of the potential storms of popular politics alluded to by Vergil in the statesman simile (1.148-153), by Livy, and earlier, by Cicero.

As the Republic drifts towards its gradual dissolution, the *populus* appears to assert its power more frequently.<sup>46</sup> Famously, the *populus* overrides the Senate in electing Marius to the command against Mithridates (Sallust, *Bellum Jug.* 73.7), preferring his humble origins to Metellus' nobility (73.4), and allowing themselves to be led by seditious leaders:

Praeterea seditiosi magistratus volgum exagitare, Metellum omnibus contionibus capitis arcessere, Marii virtutem in maius celebrare. Denique plebes sic adensa uti opifices agrestesque omnes, quorum res fidesque in manibus sitae erant, relictis operibus frequentarent Marium et sua necessaria post illius honorem ducerent. (Sallust, *Bellum Jug.* 73.5-6)

More than this, seditious magistrates were working upon the feelings of the populace, in every assembly charging Metellus with treason and exaggerating the merits of Marius. At length the commons were so excited that all the artisans and farmers, whose prosperity and credit depended upon the labor of their own hands, left their work and attended Marius, regarding their own necessities as less important than his success.

Millar writes of the episode, "a decision and strategic choice that had previously been subject to a complex constitutional procedure was now the subject of a public debate and popular voting.

With that, moreover, a first hint begins to appear of the connection between popular sovereignty, imperialism, and the concentration of power in the hands of an individual."<sup>47</sup> It might be noted

---

<sup>45</sup> Cicero, *Rep.* 3.23, *Q. fr.* 1.1.22; *Flacc.* 16 (Mouritsen 10-11).

<sup>46</sup> Cicero remarks that the Roman people make their *iudicium* known on three occasions: "at a public meeting, at a voting assembly, at a gathering for plays and gladiatorial shows" (*contione, comitiis, ludorum gladiatorumque consessu, Pro Sestio* 50/106). As the political assemblies lose significance with the rise of the Principate, the *ludi* become the real expression of a unified political voice of the people, and more importantly, of their bond with their *princeps*.

<sup>47</sup> Millar, 52.



that the presence of the “seditious” tribunes was not a necessary prerequisite for popular action in this, and certainly many other instances. Marius’ own experience, as well as the mistreatment he had received from his superiors despite his proven ability, recommended him very strongly to the populace (*Bellum Jug.* 64-65, 85-86). The people, in other words, have a great sense for determining which man is right for the job.

Crucial to their long-term political development, then, is the *populus*’ consciousness of right and wrong, and the degree to which they are capable of giving voice to it. Nowhere is this better demonstrated than in the behavior of the people following the assassination of Julius Caesar.<sup>48</sup> The urban mob is at first silent in its outrage,<sup>49</sup> and they eventually act out on their emotions at Caesar’s funeral. In their affection for Caesar, owing at least partially to the benefits they had incurred from him,<sup>50</sup> the people do not view his elite murderers as “liberators.”<sup>51</sup> Rather, they are simply conscious that a “friend of the people” has been assassinated, and are rightfully angry.<sup>52</sup> Wiseman reads the statesman simile of *Aeneid* 1.148-53 as the Roman people “reacting to murder and sacrilege” in the notorious act, but he assumes that Vergil intends by it a slur upon the character of the Roman people in keeping with the predominant aristocratic attitudes towards the mob.<sup>53</sup>

The problem with Wiseman’s reading of the simile is the fact that Caesar’s successor,

---

<sup>48</sup> See Wiseman’s excellent analysis (218-237).

<sup>49</sup> Yavetz, 63-5 and Wiseman 220 remark on crowd silence as a characteristic of passive opposition.

<sup>50</sup> Although there is no reason to assume that they were “bribed or coerced” into granting him honors (Wiseman, 198).

<sup>51</sup> Yavetz remarks that this is because the conspirators “had failed to create an image of themselves” as such (64).

<sup>52</sup> “There is no need to assume that the masses were incited by political agitators, since the mere sight of Caesar’s body disfigured by its wounds was enough to infuriate the people” (Yavetz, 67).

<sup>53</sup> Wiseman, 237.

even taking the more problematic aspects of his reign into account, overwhelmingly followed Caesar's footsteps as a supporter of the populace.<sup>54</sup> The interaction between the people and Augustus is a complex phenomenon; there is no easy formula that predicts particular outcomes whenever some question arises involving some favor that the plebs wish the *princeps* to grant. The sources tell us of frequent and generous gifts to the people (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 41), but they are more detailed on occasions when he refused their demands outright. This could take place when he felt that they were either unreasonable, as in the case of their expectation that he increase the amount of a largesse that he was about to confer when the ranks of citizens had increased, or downright trivial, as in his alleged quip to a crowd complaining about the high price of wine, "My son-in-law Agrippa has taken good care, by building several aqueducts, that men should not go thirsty" (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 42.2).

So too, the fact that opposition was curbed under Augustus becomes a slur against the people, a testimony to their weakness.<sup>55</sup> In place of real opposition, there are only idle murmurs. With accounts like these, it is easy, with Tacitus, to dismiss the state of political virtue under Augustus as grim indeed:

quotus quisque reliquus qui rem publicam vidisset?  
Igitur verso civitatis statu nihil usquam prisca et integri moris:  
omnes exuta aequalitate iussa principis aspectare,  
nulla in praesens formidine, dum Augustus aetate validus  
seque et domum et pacem sustentavit. (Tac. *Ann.* 1.3.5-1.4.9)

Few indeed were left who had seen the republic. It was thus an altered world, and of the old, unspoilt Roman character not a trace lingered. Equality was an outworn creed, and all eyes looked to the mandate of the sovereign – with no immediate misgivings, so long as Augustus in the full vigor of his prime upheld himself, his house, and peace.

---

<sup>54</sup> Yavetz, 94-96.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Syme: "Debauched by demagogues and largess, the Roman People was ready for the Empire, and the dispensation of bread and games" (100).

And yet Augustus had gained power only by means of a gradual process that was often explicitly supported by the people. Rioting and stoppages of work that took place during the war between Octavian and Antony versus Sextus Pompey culminated in a demand that an agreement be reached with Pompey (Dio 48.37.2), and finally toward the signing of the treaty of Misenum (Vell. Pat. 2.77). As late as AD 6 during a famine, the people “argued loudly in the streets, defamatory proclamations against the regime were published at night, but there was no violence” (Dio 55.26.1-2 and 55.27.1-2).<sup>56</sup>

Yavetz remarks on the significance of episodes of a more positive nature: “Sometimes the impression is even gained that demonstrations of a certain type were very acceptable to the authorities, and where these did not occur spontaneously, someone went to the trouble of organizing them. Such appear to have been the manifestations of joy on Octavian’s return to Rome from his successful campaigns against Sextus Pompeius in 36 BC following the victory of Naulochus” (Dio 49.15.1-3). Following the battle of Actium, too, we are told that the people acclaim Augustus (Vell Pat. 2.89).<sup>57</sup> Suetonius reports on an effort led by the plebs to confer upon him the title of “Father of his Country”:

Patris patriae cognomen universi repentino maximoque consensu detulerunt ei: prima plebs legatione Antium missa; dein, quia non recipiebat, ineunti Romae spectacula frequens et laureata; mox in curia senatus, neque decreto neque adclamatione sed per Valerium Messalam. (*Div. Aug.* 58.1)

The whole body of citizens with a sudden unanimous impulse proffered him the title of Father of his Country: first the commons, by a deputation sent to Antium, and then, because he declined it, again at Rome as he entered the theatre, which they attended in throngs, all wearing laurel wreathes; the senate afterwards in the House not by decree or by acclamation, but through Valerius Messala.

Yavetz questions whether this apparently spontaneous gesture was in fact organized,<sup>58</sup> but the

---

<sup>56</sup> Yavetz, 13, Vanderbroeck 196.

<sup>57</sup> Yavetz, 16.

<sup>58</sup> Yavetz, 17.

connotations of the former should be considered as carefully as the latter. Tacitus once again deserves some attention:

...militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit.  
(Tac. *Ann.* 1.2.21-22)

He conciliated the army by gratuities, the populace by cheapened grain, the world by the amenities of peace.

Lurking in this statement is not only the obvious charge of political pandering; Augustus had done what no Roman leader had been able to accomplish in decades – to bring about peace. If the people supported him, it was only after years of the uniquely unbearable sufferings occasioned by civil war.<sup>59</sup> In any case, the rise of Augustus represents not so much the coup that Tacitus describes, but rather an expression – if an often ambiguous and even problematic one – of political self-determination on the part of the Roman people. They are still a sovereign force, a fact that Augustus admits, if unintentionally in the anecdote of his sarcastic remark and quote of *Aeneid* 1.282 upon looking at ill-dressed Romans in the forum: *En, Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam* (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 40.5).<sup>60</sup> However they may dress, by the Augustan era, the Romans are the “lords of the world.” Augustus furthers the promise of *imperium sine fine* to his own people by advancing that *imperium*:<sup>61</sup>

...super et Garamantas et Indos  
proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus...  
extra anni solisque vias...(6.794-796)

...he will advance his empire beyond the Garamants and Indians to a land which lies beyond our stars, beyond the path of year and sun...

---

<sup>59</sup> For more on this problem, see subsection I.E below.

<sup>60</sup> See West 1998, 305.

<sup>61</sup> The suggestion that there is some limit to Roman power is explicit in the hyperbolic remark that the gods would have deemed the *Romana propago* (6.870) too powerful had the young Marcellus lived.

This passage, a description given by Anchises to Aeneas in the underworld, seems to be slightly more focused upon the achievement of Augustus himself, but the depiction of Actium on the shield of Aeneas brings the Romans themselves more into focus. The shield pictures “the story of Italy and the triumphs of the Romans” (*res Italas Romanorumque triumphos*, 8.626). Gransden points out that most of the actual conflicts pictured on the shield are, in fact, “the early wars of Rome with her Sabine and Etruscan neighbors.”<sup>62</sup> Carthage is ignored, as is the more recent civil war. The shield then seems to present episodes that focus primarily on Italian unification. In its depiction of Actium, Augustus leads Italians (*agens Italos*, 8.678) into battle “with Senate and People, the Penates of the state, and all the mighty gods” (*cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis*, 8.679). The presence of a good leader should not be overlooked,<sup>63</sup> but there is also a strong sense of the unified, sovereign will of the people in this important event. In the course of the battle, Augustus defeats the specter of *Discordia* (8.702) that had so haunted Roman history, but he also contributes to granting the Roman people their destined *imperium*. Vergil has already equated the reign of Romulus with the beginnings of Roman world *imperium* (6.781-2). As Augustus is able to boast in his *Res Gestae*, he “extended the territory of all those provinces of the Roman People which had neighboring peoples who were not yet subjected to our authority,”<sup>64</sup> and “added Egypt to the Empire of the Roman People” (*Aegyptum imperio populi Romani adieci, Res Gestae*, 27.1).<sup>65</sup> That he also claims, in

---

<sup>62</sup> Gransden, on 8.626ff.

<sup>63</sup> Newman and Newman remark, “for the first and only time in the poem the Italians, under constructive leadership, are on the winning side,” but they do not neglect to bring up the atrocities perpetrated by Octavian previously against the Italians (25).

<sup>64</sup> Translations are based on those of Alison Cooley. (*Omnium provinciarum populi Romani, quibus finitimae fuerunt gentes, quae non parerent imperio nostro fines auxi, Res Gestae* 26.1).

<sup>65</sup> See Cooley on 27.1 for the propagandistic manifestations of this claim in coinage and art.

the end, to grant the *res publica* back to the *Senatus Populusque Romanus*,<sup>66</sup> shows that no matter what the actual extent of powers held by the Roman people at the time, Augustus himself took very seriously the idea that the political clout of the Roman people was not something to be regarded lightly.

### C. PIETAS

One of Jupiter's promises to Juno in Book 12 is that the Romans – a mixed race – will be outstanding in piety:

hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,  
supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,  
nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores. (12.838-840)

From them shall arise a race, blended with Ausonian blood, which you will see overpass men, overpass gods in piety, and no nation will celebrate your worship with equal zeal.”

It is not surprising, then, that Helenus advises Aeneas to “let your children's children in purity stand fast” (*hac casti maneant in religione nepotes*, 3.409).<sup>67</sup> In like manner, Livy's early Romans demonstrate a piety that transcends the generations. In foundation after foundation of festivals, priesthods, and temples, the piety of the early Romans bears eloquent testimony to the piety of their descendants in their scrupulous upkeep of the same institutions, e.g. the Lupercalia (1.5.1-2), the Ara Maxima and the Potitii and Pinarii (1.7.10-15), the Temple of Jupiter Stator

---

<sup>66</sup> *In consulatu sexto et septimo, postquam bella civilia exstinxeram, per consensum universorum potens rerum omnium rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli (Res Gestae 34.1).*

<sup>67</sup> Other examples of Roman piety can be discerned throughout the poem, especially its latter half: the rites of Hercules and the origin of the Ara Maxima (8.268-305), Roman priests (the Salii and Luperci) (8.663-664), and *castae...matres* borne through the city for sacrificing their gold for the good of the state (8.665-666).

(1.11.6), and the *pomerium* (1.44.3 -5). It might be noted that this piety is not simply a characteristic the Romans possess by nature; they have to become pious owing to the efforts of their king, Numa Pompilius (1.19.4ff.) Yet the people take up their new religious concerns eagerly, and replace a “dread (*metus*) of laws and penalties” with “regard (*fides*) for promises and oaths” (1.21.1). The possession of the trait of piety is an unmitigated benefit for the Roman populace, and even for their neighbors, who begin to refrain from violence against the pious Romans (1.20.2).

The piety of the early Romans does not serve only to provide etiologies for modern Roman religious practice; Roman piety contrasts sharply with the behavior of their neighbors. The Albans, for instance, send envoys to examine an alleged rain of stones on the Alban Mount, whereupon they are greeted by another rain of stones along with a divine voice from a grove ordering them to renew ancient sacrifices that they had ceased to observe, but the Romans begin a nine-day public celebration (1.31.1-4). It is not clear, Livy remarks, whether the Romans had done so because of the same “divine utterance” (*voce caelesti*) as the Albans had, or because of soothsayers (*haruspicium monitu*, 1.31.4). The important point is that the Romans are portrayed as having a natural religious sensibility that is absent from the behavior of their Alban counterparts.

The death of Romulus provides a more important connotation of the piety of the Roman people: superstitious or not, it is an impulse that proceeds from the people directly and not the elites. When Romulus disappears during a military review *contio* in the Campus Martius (*ad exercitum recensendum contionem*, 1.16.1), the soldiers present first believe the senators’ claim that he had been taken up in a storm, but after a short interval of silence and sorrow, they take the initiative in a more “pious” interpretation of the event:

Deinde a paucis initio facto deum deo natum, regem parentemque

urbis Romanae salvere universi Romulum iubent; pacem precibus  
exposcunt, uti volens propitius suam semper sospitet progeniem. (1.16.3)

Then, when a few men had taken the initiative, they all with one accord hailed Romulus as a god and a god's son, the King and Father of the Roman City, and with prayers besought his favor that he would graciously be pleased forever to protect his children.

The impulse to deify Romulus comes not from the *patres*, who might have been expected to downplay Romulus' legacy to their own advantage (especially in light of the tradition that the senators themselves had in fact murdered Romulus and torn him to pieces), but from a grateful *populus*.<sup>68</sup>

Although it remains a part of Roman political life consistently throughout Rome's history, at times *pietas* or its perceived neglect takes on serious political connotations. Especially in the Late Republic, there is a heightened sense that the old Roman piety is not what it used to be – the mansions of Sallust's contemporaries dwarf the temples of the more pious early Romans (*Bellum Cat.* 13). Impiety on the part of political figures is charge that is more frequently bandied about, a development that can only speak to a Roman public that is exceedingly concerned about *pietas*. Thus, the rebel Catiline becomes an atheistic blood-drinking monster (Cicero's *Cat.* 1.24, Sallust, *Bellum Cat.* 22) who has an affair with a Vestal Virgin (*Bellum Cat.* 15), and Publius Clodius' murder and death can be read as an example of divine justice for his profanation of the rites of the Bona Dea (Cicero, *Pro Mil.* 31/85-6).

When the Roman aristocracy expresses charges such as these, it is easy to see how popular piety can be used for political ends, but the state of popular piety in the event of the assassination of Caesar becomes especially clear. The Roman people seem almost single-minded in their devotion to Caesar after his death. As seen above, the event of Caesar's funeral

---

<sup>68</sup> The senator Proculus Julius, though, corroborates the people's impulse with a report of an alleged divine appearance of Romulus. This Livy treats with a mild skepticism, but he still marvels at the *fides* that the people in general placed in the senator's story (1.16.5-8).



shows the people expressing their will that Caesar's death had been "murder and sacrilege."<sup>69</sup> Appian recounts an episode in which a crowd, some of whom are concerned for vengeance, accosts Antony and Lepidus following a Senate meeting. Both men immediately identify those concerned with revenge as actually the side concerned most with religion, especially insofar as the killing of Caesar involved the breaking of oaths (Appian *B.C.* 2.130-1). At Caesar's funeral, the people intend to bury his body in one of the temples, but it ends up cremated in the forum. An altar is erected where later the Temple of Divine Julius would stand (Appian, *B.C.* 2.148).<sup>70</sup> Octavian/Augustus' dedication of this temple (*Res Gestae* 19), as well as his carrying out of the people's (at least partially piously motivated) impulse to exact vengeance upon the murderers of Caesar,<sup>71</sup> demonstrates that he was in support not only of their political will but also of their religious feeling.

The religious activities of Augustus himself need no comment, but one of the events that he lists in the *Res Gestae* is of some importance; this is Augustus' assumption of the office of Pontifex Maximus by popular demand after the death of Marcus Lepidus in 12 BC (*Res Gestae* 10). On the occasion of this event, Augustus reports: "such a great crowd assembled from the whole of Italy, the like of which no one has recorded as having previously happened at Rome."<sup>72</sup> The people were clearly in favor of Augustus' taking the same office held by his adoptive father. In the *Aeneid*, the triumph of Augustus in 29 BC provides an outstanding example of the scrupulous piety of the Augustan era. Not only does Augustus himself dedicate "to Italy's gods

---

<sup>69</sup> Wiseman, 237.

<sup>70</sup> Wiseman, 223.

<sup>71</sup> Wiseman notes that Augustus "was where he was because the citizens in 43 BC had given him authority to avenge the sacrilege" (Appian, *B.C.* 4.8.35 and 4.9.36) (Wiseman, 223).

<sup>72</sup> *cuncta ex Italia ad comitia mea confluyente multitudine, quanta Romae nunquam fertur ante id tempus fuisse* (*Res Gestae*, 10.2). Syme describes the event as a "unique and spontaneous manifestation" that "bore the character of a plebiscite" (Syme, 469).

his immortal votive gift – three hundred mighty shrines throughout the city” (8.715-716), but the people take part eagerly in sacrifices:<sup>73</sup>

omnibus in templis matrum chorus, omnibus arae; ante aras  
terram caesi straveri iuveni. (8.718-719)

...in all the temples was a band of matrons, in all were altars, and before the altars slain steers covered the ground.

The piety here on display is not only that of the *princeps*, but of the entire *populus*.

#### D. COMPETITIVENESS AND FONDNESS FOR SPECTACLE

The competitive and spectacle-going nature of the Roman people is captured very prominently on the shield of Aeneas, where the Rape of Sabines is conflated with the duel of the Horatii and Curiatii:

nec procul hinc Romam et raptas sine more Sabinas  
consessu caveae, magnis Circensibus actis,  
addiderat, subitoque novum consurgere bellum  
Romulidis Tatiaoque seni Curibusque severis. (8.635-638)

Not far from here he had set Rome and the Sabine maidens, lawlessly carried off, when the great Circus games were held, from the theatre's seated throng; then the sudden uprising of a fresh war between the sons of Romulus and aged Tatius and his stern Cures.

These same two episodes appear prominently in Livy's characterization of the people of Rome as possessed of an enthusiastic fondness for popular spectacle that serves as the outlet for a more fundamental characteristic of competitiveness. Toner perhaps describes best the Roman attitude toward the games as “a re-enactment of Roman life, an image of how Romans saw themselves and how they wanted to be seen – brave, competitive, not beyond cheating, clever, ritualistic, and

---

<sup>73</sup> The official context is that of a *supplicatio*, in which temples were opened, cult statues exhibited on *pulvinaria* and “the whole adult population visited them in turn with their prayers” (Fordyce on 8.718f.).

above all, winners.”<sup>74</sup> This competitive streak might be said to be at the root of Rome’s imperialistic policies. As Livy states in the preface to his history:

...iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum  
populi pro virili parte et ipsum consulisse; (*Praef.3*)

...it will be a satisfaction to have done myself as much as lies in me to commemorate the deeds of the foremost people in the world.

When the Romans are preparing for the games that will serve as the “bait” for the Rape of the Sabines, they take care to promulgate the expectation of a spectacle that would be in accord with this image:

Indici deinde finitimis spectaculum iubet; quantoque apparatu tum  
sciebant aut poterant, concelebrant ut rem claram expectatamque  
facerent.(1.9.7)

He then bade proclaim the spectacle to the surrounding peoples, and his subjects prepared to celebrate it with all the resources within their knowledge and power, that they might cause the occasion to be noised abroad and eagerly expected.

A high level of crowd interest is observable in most Roman spectacles; it is no accident that in this latter example, the abductions take place the moment at which everyone is engrossed in the shows: “and people’s thoughts and eyes were busy with it” (*deditaeque eo mentes cum oculis erant*, 1.9.10).

Games can take on more serious implications, however. The duel of the Horatii provides a very detailed account of early Romans at such a spectacle:

Cum sui utrosque adhortarentur, deos patrios, patriam ac parentes,  
quidquid civium domi, quidquid in exercitu sit, illorum tunc arma,  
illorum intueri manus, feroces et suoapte ingenio et pleni adhortantium  
vocibus in medium inter duas acies procedunt. (1.25.1)

On either side the soldiers urged on their champions. They reminded them that their fathers’ gods, their native land, their parents, and all their countrymen, whether at home or with the army, had their eye only on their sword and on their right hands. Eager for the combat, as well as owing to their native spirit as to the shouts of encouragement that filled their ears, the brothers advanced into the space between the two lines of battle.

---

<sup>74</sup> Toner, 121.

It is difficult to imagine such behavior at the duel between Paris and Menelaus!<sup>75</sup> Although the armies are in no danger themselves, they are still concerned over the *imperium* that is at stake (1.25.2).<sup>76</sup> Because of this, there is intense concentration: “alert, therefore, and in suspense, they concentrated their attention upon this unpleasing spectacle” (*Itaque ergo erecti suspensique in minime gratum spectaculum animos intendunt*, 1.25.2). In this sense, the duel of the Horatii and Curiatii resembles that between Turnus and Aeneas at the end of the poem. Both fights are not mere athletic contests, or even gladiatorial combats in which the death of one of the participants is of little consequence; the victories of both the *Horatii* and Aeneas will decide the fate of the Roman people.<sup>77</sup> It is not surprising then, to find that the audiences of both fights are highly engrossed and emotionally involved in the action.<sup>78</sup> When the two armies clash, “a deep shudder ran through the onlookers, who, as long as neither side had the advantage, remained powerless to speak or breathe” (*horror ingens spectantes perstringit; et neutro inclinata spe torpebat vox spiritusque*, 1.25.4). Feldherr remarks that it is difficult to tell the armies apart at the beginning, but this will change as the fight goes on.<sup>79</sup>

As the fight grows more intense, there is more vocalization, and it is of a more partisan nature. The Albans shout when two of the Romans are cut down:

---

<sup>75</sup> The Paris versus Menelaus duel contains a brief “*tis eipeske*” speech in which the men pray that the better man win, amazement on the part of the crowds of both sides, and an applause by the Achaeans, but only after Agamemnon claims his brother to be the winner. The Homeric crowd is far more passive than the Roman in this event. See subsection IV.B.4, n.79.

<sup>76</sup> This battle is “unlike a Homeric battle” because it is “told from the spectators’ point of view...” (Ogilvie on 1.24.9).

<sup>77</sup> Feldherr 1998 remarks on how each champion in this type of duel acts as a “surrogate for the Roman people as a whole” (93, 128). Also see Rossi, 150ff.

<sup>78</sup> Feldherr 1998 discusses the significance of the literary model of this duel: “Thucydides’ description of the battle in the harbor of Syracuse, where the land armies can only look on as the naval combat decides their fate” (Thuc. 7.71.3-4), but points out that Thucydides’ crowd only has a “limited perception” of the events, but Livy “has sacrificed strict verisimilitude in order to keep the link between spectators and spectacle unbroken” (129).

<sup>79</sup> Feldherr 1998, 130.

Ad quorum casum cum conclamasset gaudio Albanus exercitus,  
Romanas legiones iam spes tota, nondum tamen cura deseruerat,  
exanimis vicem unius quem tres Curiatii circumsteterant. (1.25.6)

At the fall of the Romans a shout of joy burst from the Alban army, while the Roman levies now bade farewell to all their hopes; but not to their anxiety, for they were horror-stricken at the plight of the single warrior whom the three Curiatii had surrounded.

When, in the course of a thrilling pursuit, Horatius kills the first of the Curiatii, the Albans shout to the others. Livy's overt comparison of the crowd noise in this archaic scene to that experienced by his readers transforms it into an emblematic Roman spectacle.<sup>80</sup>

...et dum Albanus exercitus inclamat Curiatiis uti opem ferant  
fratri, iam Horatius caeso hoste victor secundam pugnam petebat.  
Tunc clamore qualis ex insperato faventium solet Romani adiuvant  
militem suum; et ille defungi proelio festinat. (1.25.9)

...and while the Alban host were calling out to the Curiatii to help their brother, Horatius had already slain him, and was hastening, flushed with victory, to meet his second antagonist. Then with a cheer, such as is often drawn from partisans by a sudden turn in a contest, the Romans encouraged their champion, and he pressed on to end the battle.

This cheer influences the course of battle, for immediately after it, Horatius slays the second of the Curiatii. After the third is dispatched, the crowd goes wild:

Romani ovantes ac gratulantes Horatium accipiunt, eo maiore cum  
gaudio, quo prope metum res fuerat. (1.25.13)

The Romans welcomed their hero with jubilation and thanksgivings, and their joy was all the greater that they had come near despairing.

The Roman victory has important consequences. For the short term, the Albans have been made subjects,<sup>81</sup> and the Romans are "exalted with imperial power" (*imperio...aucti*, 1.25.13). The victory draws a clear distinction between the two sides that cements the Roman self-perception, in keeping with their competitive nature, as "winners." But it has arguably even more important implications for the Albans. They have been conquered, but not collectively;

---

<sup>80</sup> Ogilvie notes the similarity between this passage and *Aeneid* 5.148 (*faventum*) (on 1.25.9).

<sup>81</sup> It should be noted though, that the *Curiatii* as mentioned by Vergil in the Catalogue of Italian allies, are destined to be the "*Quirites*" (7.710), and Livy later portrays the incorporation of the Albans into the citizen body (1.29). Subjugation is not a permanent condition.

their surrogates, in taking on the responsibility of achieving a victory, have through their deaths absolved the Albans of the ignominy of defeat. Secondly, by viewing the event as spectators, they have been “profoundly affected” and in effect been prompted into “becoming members of the Roman state.”<sup>82</sup>

To return to the attitude of the victorious Romans, Brutus’ speech prior to the overthrow of the monarchy is in keeping with this “winning” mindset. In addition to denouncing the king’s crimes, he reminds the people of the king’s arrogance and the plight of the Roman plebs, framing his argument in an appeal to a kind of proto-imperial dignity:

Addita superbia ipsius regis miseriaeque et labores plebis in fossas  
cloacasque exhauriendas demersae; Romanos homines, victores  
omnium circa populorum, opifices ac lapicidas pro bellatoribus factos. (1.59.9)

He reminded them, besides, of the pride of the king himself and the wretched state of the commons, who were plunged into ditches and sewers and made to clear them out. The men of Rome, he said, the conquerors of all the nations round about, had been transformed from warriors into artisans and stone-cutters.

While the charge of demagoguery might be leveled at Brutus for putting forth this argument,<sup>83</sup> the fact that he makes it at all highlights the importance to the Roman psyche of their status as winners and conquerors.

During the years of the Republic, though, it begins to become common for politicians to hold games, specifically *munera*, in order to exploit the competitive impulses of the people. Cicero advises C. Scribonius Curio to avoid relying too much on spectacles in his political pursuits (*Fam.* 2.3.1) – wisely, it turns out, because Curio’s debts will allow Caesar to buy his support. As Roger Dunkle observes, the enormous popularity of gladiatorial spectacles rendered

---

<sup>82</sup> Feldherr 1998, 163. For more on the unifying effect of games, see CHAPTER IV.

<sup>83</sup> Vanderbroeck pinpoints some of the qualities of a typical demagogue as that of flattering the populace, causing sedition, and aiming at personal power (Vanderbroeck, 270). Brutus, according to this scheme, shares the first two of these with such disparate characters as Caesar, Catiline, Pompey and Crassus, though to be fair to Brutus, these other leaders are also said to aim at personal power at some point.

any cancellation of a *munus* that had already been announced “political suicide.”<sup>84</sup> In spite of Cicero’s advice, though, the spectacles were enormously popular among people of all classes. In fact, a larger percentage of elites is known to have attended the games than the lower classes, and the political clout of the former was greater as far as the voting assemblies were concerned,<sup>85</sup> but the games also had a unifying and leveling effect on the various classes. Even Cicero uses the first person plural in his analogy drawn from the arena to explain Milo’s stoic expression during his trial.<sup>86</sup> In the context of the games, class was less important than the collective competitive consciousness of being a Roman spectator.

There is little need to elaborate on specific examples of spectacles given during the reign of Augustus here,<sup>87</sup> but as a crucial element in the Augustan program, it bears stating that Augustus was renowned for the number and the lavishness of his games, as well as to the degree of attention to which he paid them by his personal attendance in contrast to Julius Caesar’s habits (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 43-45),<sup>88</sup> although the latter did spend money famously on giving lavish spectacles (Suetonius, *Div. Jul.* 39). In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus boasts not only of the spectacles that he had paid for, including a naval battle (22-23), but also of improvements to the Flaminian Circus and Circus Maximus (19), as well as of rebuilding the Theater of Pompey (20). The more important element of the games, as has been said, is their political dimension, the manner in which they become the primary means by which the people express themselves, and an important vehicle for their national self-perception. In the triumph of Augustus shown on the

---

<sup>84</sup> Dunkle, 160.

<sup>85</sup> Vanderbroeck, 69-80, Dunkle, 161.

<sup>86</sup> *timidos atque supplices et vivere liceat obsecrantis etiam odisse solemus, fortis atque animosos et se acriter ipsos mortis offerentis servare cupimus* “it is natural in us even to despise the quaking suppliant who craves permission to live, while we are anxious to save the courageous and spirited who hotly fling themselves on death” (*Pro Mil.* 34/92).

<sup>87</sup> More specific episodes will be discussed in subsections IV.A.2-3.

<sup>88</sup> See Suetonius, *Div. Jul.* 39 for games given by Caesar.

shield of Aeneas, there is a strong sense of the spectacle of Rome's glory: "The streets were ringing with gladness and games and applause" (*laetitia ludisque viae plausuque fremebant*, 8.717).

#### E. CAPACITY FOR HARD WORK AND ENDURANCE

The proem of the *Aeneid* makes clear that the Romans (and the Trojans) were not to have their *imperium* handed to them: "So vast was the effort to found the Roman race" (*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33),<sup>89</sup> and so it follows that the Romans themselves are to be characterized by *duritia*. In Book 12, Juno asks for a "Roman stock" that is "strong in Italian valor" (*sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago*, 12.827). Rome is described as "blessed in a brood of men" (*felix prole virum*, 6.784) and in a hint at the quality of those *viri*, compared to Cybele in her joy over her "hundred grandsons, all divine" (6.786-7).

But the Romans need a theatre in which to demonstrate their hardworking and enduring nature, and in the sweep of Roman history, war provides them with one. They must work to subject other nations to their rule, but they must also endure the repeated threat of civil war. As seen earlier, foreign wars of domination can serve as important indicators of the political virtue of the Romans insofar as they extend the people's *imperium*, but they also assume the necessity of activity (especially military) in order to maintain *duritia*. Vergil's evocation of Tullus Hostilius, the third, warlike king of Rome, as rousing to war an "inactive folk" (*residesque... viros*, 6.813-814) and "armies long unused to triumphs" (*iam desueta triumphis agmina*, 814) provides the paradigm for an active Roman people for whom the enjoyment of

---

<sup>89</sup> McGushin describes the use of *molis* here as evocative of a "heavy burden shouldered enduringly by a massive frame, but at the cost of immense and tedious exertion" (229).



Golden Age peace (which they had enjoyed under Numa, the previous king) is no longer an option.<sup>90</sup> Civil war, though, as horrific as it is to the Roman mind, is also a kind of test of endurance. Dido's curse, with its pollution of an indeterminate future with civil war, is a testament to this: "war may they have, themselves and their children's children" (*pugnent ipsique nepotesque*, 4.629).<sup>91</sup>

Livy provides evidence for the enduring nature of the Romans as early as in his treatment of the Trojans. We are told that after their "all but immeasurable wanderings" (*ab immenso prope errore*, 1.1.5) they had little left save their swords and ships, yet they have immediately to contend with the raids of the Latins. Soon afterward, the Trojans either defeat the Latins in battle, or – in a turn of events even more complimentary to the Trojans – Latinus strikes a treaty with the Trojans and grants them land (1.1.8-11). His reason for doing so is his admiration for "the renown of the race and the hero, and his spirit prepared alike for war or peace" (*nobilitatem...gentis virique et animum vel bello vel paci paratum*, 1.1.8). This statement may be slightly more directed toward Aeneas himself, but it also points conclusively in the direction of the attitude of the *miserabile vulgus* at the end of *Aeneid* 2: "with heart and fortune ready for me to lead them over the sea to whatever lands I will."<sup>92</sup> Sallust sums up the condition of the early Romans, once they have achieved a successful state, as one of constant vigilant hard work:

At Romani domi militiaeque intenti festinare parare, alius alium hortari,  
hostibus obviam ire liberatem patriam parentisque armis tegere (*Bellum Cat.* 1.6.5)

---

<sup>90</sup> Messapus' Latins are also "tribes long inert" (*iam pridem resides populos*) with "armies unused to war" (*desuetaque bello agmina*, 7.693-4).

<sup>91</sup> Servius comments that this could refer to the civil war, but Pease finds it to be more strictly referential to the Punic Wars (on 4.629). The poem contains several foreshadowings of Rome's wars: Dido: "persecute with hate his stock and all the race to come" (*vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum exercete odiis*, 4.622-3), Jupiter: *exitium magnum* (10.13) will come upon Rome from Carthage, Anchises: when Caesar and Pompey live, "what mutual strife, what battles and bloodshed will they cause" (*quantum inter se bellum...quantas acies stragemque ciebunt*, 6.828-9).

<sup>92</sup> *animis opibusque parati, in quascumque velim pelago deducere terras*, 2.799-800.

But the Romans, putting forth their whole energy at home and in the field, made all haste, got ready, encouraged one another, went to meet the foe, and defended their liberty, their country, and their parents by arms.

Cicero in the *Philippics* identifies the endurance of *labor* and *dolor* in the service of keeping the republic free as a defining characteristic of the Roman people as opposed to other nations:<sup>93</sup>

Omnes nationes servitutem ferre possunt, nostra civitas non potest,  
nec ullam aliam ob causam, nisi quod illae laborem doloremque fugiunt,  
quibus ut careant, omnia perpeti possunt, nos ita a maioribus instituti atque  
imbuti sumus, ut omnia consilia atque facta ad dignitatem et ad virtutem  
referremus. (*Phil X*, 10.20)

All nations can bear slavery; our state cannot, and for no other reason than that other nations shun toil and pain, and, to be free from these, can endure all things; but we have been so trained and our minds so imbued by our ancestors as to refer all our thoughts and acts to the standard of honor and virtue.

By the time of Augustus, though, the otherwise enduring Roman people have become wearied by the constant civil war of the late Republic, as Tacitus bemoans at the opening of the *Annales*:

non Cinnae, non Sullae longa dominatio; et Pompei Crassique potentia  
cito in Caesarem, Lepidi atque Antonii arma in Augustum cessere, qui  
cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium accepit.  
(Tacitus, *Annales* 1.1.4-8)

Neither Cinna nor Sulla created a lasting despotism: Pompeius and Crassus quickly forfeited their power to Caesar, and Lepidus and Antony their swords to Augustus who, under the style of “Prince,” gathered beneath his empire a world outworn by civil discord.

Vergil seems to have taken a view, also seen at the end of *Georgics* 1 (461-514), that civil war was a horror to which he never wanted to see his fellow citizens subjected again. He only needed to negotiate a way in which to portray the Roman people so as to capture their “character” adequately without concluding, as Tacitus does, that something has been lost irreparably with the coming of the Principate.

---

<sup>93</sup> Kristol remarks that it was a characteristic in which they took particular pride (79).

## F. COLLECTIVITY

The final defining characteristic of the Roman people, which can be detected in most of the previous examples, may help to ameliorate the picture of a nation who only accepts a sole ruler because they are tired of war. The Romans often show a capacity for collectivity, and not necessarily at the prompting of their leaders. This is a crucial characteristic of the Trojans in the *Aeneid*, and it contrasts them conclusively with the less organized Latins.<sup>94</sup>

Collectivity, often simply a function of a military-style discipline and single-mindedness, finds a political application as well. At Castrum Minervae, when the Trojans first sight Italy, Aeneas sees the omen of four horses that, according to Anchises, portend war (3.539-540) but also signify future *Concordia* and peace:

sed tamen idem olim curru succedere sueti  
quadripedes et frena iugo concordia ferre:  
spes et pacis... (3.541-543)

But yet...those same steeds at times are wont to come under the chariot and beneath the yoke to bear the bit in concord; there is hope also of peace!

Williams remarks here that *concordia* “symbolizes the whole concept of the Roman mission.”<sup>95</sup>

*Concordia*, in its Ciceronian sense, applies mostly to the *concordia ordinum*. In this sense, while important to the Roman mission, it is particular to the discourse of political class. The word can also take on a simpler, broader sense: concord as the opposite of discord. We can thus take Anchises’ prophecy to signify that the Romans are to have a commitment to peace and concord among the different peoples in their empire, as well as among the different factions in their own

---

<sup>94</sup> Heinze, though, asserts that Virgil shows a tendency to move from the actions of crowds to that of smaller groups and individuals in his narrative (e.g. 2.837, 6.212ff., 1.172-179) (Heinze, 286-7). Heinze’s explanation for this is the potential of crowd behavior, if not portrayed as “acting as a single-minded unit” to “confuse the imagination and blur the picture.” The use of *pars...alii* constructions, though, can point either to differentiation of action in crowd engaged in collective activity, or divisions within a crowd. For the Trojans it is usually the former.

<sup>95</sup> Williams on 3.543.

state. The fact that Caesar and Pompey only have *Concordia* in the underworld (*concordes animae*, 6.827)<sup>96</sup> sounds foreboding, and yet it creates the possibility that concord is still possible in the world, if it is not necessarily the norm. After introducing his son to these two figures, Anchises goes on to give this warning:

ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella  
neu patriae validas in viscera vertite viris; (6.832-3)

Steel not your hearts, my sons, to such wicked war, nor vent violent valor on the vitals of your land.

Anchises exhorts Caesar to be first to “show mercy” (*tuque prior, tu parce*, 6.834). As for Aeneas, we know that the necessities of his position by the end of the poem do not allow him to do so. Whether he shows mercy, however, is of lesser importance than whether his descendants, the *pueri* addressed, do, and Anchises’ descendent Julius Caesar certainly does.<sup>97</sup> As for Augustus, he is to end civil war and bring about a new Golden Age in Latium (*aurea condet saecula*, 6.792-793), if, paradoxically, one that will not be completely without the Roman pursuit of war. Vergil’s portrayal of the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra – and with them *Discordia* (8.702) – at Actium is portrayed as a foreign and not a civil war.<sup>98</sup>

The goal of large-scale political concord in Rome and its empire often finds expression in the poem at the level precisely of the Roman mob. As discussed above, when Augustus leads his army into battle on the Shield of Aeneas, it is collectively, “with Senate and People, the Penates of the state, and all the mighty gods” (*cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis*, 8.679). Vergil portrays the people of Rome as having attained to a perfection of single-minded joy as

---

<sup>96</sup> This is the only other usage of *concordia/concors* in the entire poem.

<sup>97</sup> Austin on 6.834.

<sup>98</sup> See 8.685-688: Antony with “barbaric might” (*ope barbaria*, 8.685) and “bringing in his train Egypt and the strength of the East and farthest Bactra” (*Aegyptum virisque Orientis et ultima secum Bactra vehit*, 687-688). Also, Augustus in *Res Gestae* 2: “afterwards I defeated them twice in battle when they were making war on the republic” (*postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici bis acie*).

they celebrate Augustus' triumph.<sup>99</sup> There is a general attitude of joy (*laetitia ludisque viae plausuque fremebant*, 8.717), and the collective movements of groups of people can be discerned. The mothers have formed choruses in all of the temples (*omnibus in templis matrum chorus*, 8.718), and even the conquered peoples – otherwise of a rather diverse nature, “as diverse in fashion of dress and arms as in tongues” (*quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis*, 8.723) – “move in long array” (*incedunt...longo ordine*, 8.722) with the discipline of a Roman legion. That the triumph described here happens to be highly unconventional can only draw more attention to it.<sup>100</sup> The most notable aspect of it is easily the detailed treatment of the crowd in all of their collective activity. The Roman people's capacity for collectivity, especially in their official capacity, constitutes a kind of unifying characteristic for them – the special quality that brings all of their other characteristics, both collective and individual, together.

In order for the entirety of the *Aeneid* to be of any great significance to their Roman descendants, it is important for the poet to demonstrate how closely the Trojans (and later the Italians) resemble their Roman descendants. The similarities can be observed in a number of different situations: their travels, spectacles, seditions and situations of public disorder, and in war. But the most obvious crowd scenario is the classic “assembly” scene.

---

<sup>99</sup> West observes that crowd scenes and sacrifices are common themes of Roman reliefs (West, 1990, 299), and so the shield represents the crowd in a manner in which the crowd might have actually seen itself in the visual arts.

<sup>100</sup> Morwood cites a description in Dio Cassius of the triumphs of 29 BC that demonstrates that they were in fact conventional (51.21.5-9), and so having it end on the Palatine (instead of the Capitoline) and including the review of nations comes across as almost fanciful (1991, 220).

## II. THE INDECISIVE ASSEMBLY

One of the most straightforward means of determining the character of the Trojan and Italian crowds of the *Aeneid* is by observing their behavior at assemblies. In such cases, the people are gathered in one place for a single purpose, as opposed to going about various activities or mingled in the confusion of war. An assembly may be defined as an event in which all of the people come together, usually bidden by an authority figure, for the purpose of making a decision. Based on this definition, Homeric crowds attend numerous assemblies, but the Trojans of the *Aeneid* do not attend any.<sup>1</sup> The closest they come is the sprawling informal crowd scene in Book 2 in which the crowd decides to bring the Trojan horse into the city, thus determining the fate that carries them inexorably through the poem. This informal “assembly”<sup>2</sup> provides insights into the poet’s wider perspective on the social and political dynamics of any assembly, as well as a “before” picture of the proto-Roman Trojans.<sup>3</sup> In their early assembly scene, the Trojans display all of the characteristics discussed in the previous chapter in various degrees of perfection – except that of political virtue. The assembly of the Latins, appearing much later in the poem, calls attention to the essential similarity between the two peoples; the Latins, like the Trojans before them, experience political discord and divisiveness. Even the gods do not

---

<sup>1</sup> The occasional meeting of a smaller council of *proceres* reveals a situation not dissimilar to a Roman magistrate who refers a *sententia* to the Senate (Horsfall 1989, 16-7 and Nisbet, 15).

<sup>2</sup> DiCesare, 173.

<sup>3</sup> Horsfall (on 2.42) remarks that “Vergil will often enough build up a picture of the Trojan-in-the-street as foolish and excitable...they will not be seen as turning into sober, vigilant proto-Romans for a fair while yet.”

manage to hold a constructive assembly, a fact that has caused a great deal of consternation among critics concerned for the moral soundness of Vergil's epic universe, though upon closer inspection it may actually contain a certain degree of reassurance for the humans in the poem. As far as problematic assembly scenes are concerned, as above, so below.

#### A. ASSEMBLIES OF THE *AENEID*

Assemblies do not play a large role in the poem in terms of numbers of lines or frequency of episodes. Whereas in the *Iliad*, there are no fewer than nine,<sup>4</sup> the *Aeneid* has a grand total of only two "formal"<sup>5</sup> decision-making councils (*concilia*, 10.2 and 11.234). Another, the gathering of Trojans in Book 2 to determine what to do with the horse, takes form spontaneously and only assumes a sense of order as events develop. With their rhetorical shouting matches, changeable moods, and lack of any semblance of productive debate and consensus, most assemblies of the *Aeneid* are realistic if not reassuring. Changes of opinion or consensus are not won by reasoned argument. Instead, the winning side is often the most passionate, or else the one that shouts the loudest or has the largest number of supporters.<sup>6</sup> Crowds that meet in assemblies are often comprised of different factions who meet to force a course of action that each group has already agreed upon. The crowd itself, in other words, is a dynamic force, but a divided one.

---

<sup>4</sup> For assemblies in the *Iliad*, Hammer lists 1.54-305, 2,84-398, 2,788-808, 7.345-379, 7.381-412, 7.414-20, 9.9-79, 18.243-313, and 19.34-237 (Hammer pp. 233-234, note 14). Feeney considers that Vergil may have refrained from "representing constant consultation" because he feared that "he would produce an impression, not of harmony but of dither" (Feeney, 216).

<sup>5</sup> In the sense that they are called officially, designated as "*concilia*," and presided over by a definite authority.

<sup>6</sup> Barker explains that "fruitful dissent" in the Homeric assembly proves to be largely non-existent (23, 89). In the *Aeneid*, the situation is similar, but the implications are not.

Perhaps this should come as no surprise – the *concilium* and especially the *contio*<sup>7</sup> as Roman political institutions are not historically always places of serene concord, much less reasoned debate. Vergil does not use the latter term, nor should we expect him to have done so. *Concilia* in the *Aeneid* may mimic elements of spontaneous popular gatherings, (unruly) Senate meetings, *contiones*, and, when they carry the force of an official decision made by the people, *comitiae* and *concilia*. Lacking the political context of the historical institutions, however, it makes sense to treat Vergil’s assemblies broadly, but with the historical assemblies in mind.

As has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, an almost predictable political virtue remains a constant characteristic of the Roman crowd. The Trojans of the *Aeneid* begin to exhibit this characteristic as they evolve into a *populus* worthy of their destiny as Romans, but not until somewhat later on. Good leadership constitutes a determining factor for political virtue in all of the crowds of the poem. This type of figure who is able to control a difficult crowd, and do so decisively so as to prevent undermining or seditious behavior (like the statesmen in the simile of 1.148-153) is, however, a rarity in the poem, even among the gods.

## B. THE TROJAN CROWD IN COUNCIL: PRELUDE TO DISASTER I

In strictly chronological terms, the Trojans act upon the plot of the *Aeneid* for the first time at their spontaneous assembly in the opening of Book 2, prior to the fall of the city. That it forms the first half of Aeneas’ account of his prior adventures as told to Dido might occasion the attention of narratologically-inclined readers eager to catch Aeneas in the act of attempting to

---

<sup>7</sup> Mouritsen (38) discusses the various purposes for a *contio*, defined simply as a “non-decision-making meeting” to take place as serving informative, emergency, legislative, and ad hoc purposes.



cast the Trojans' actions in a positive light, but there is surprisingly little fodder for such an approach.<sup>8</sup> The fact that Aeneas tells the story of this assembly himself constitutes a unique perspective on the assembly in epic literature, even more so because the Trojans (Aeneas himself included) form a crowd of decisively problematic character.

Trojan behavior in the Book 2 assembly reflects almost exactly a definition of (disorderly) collective behavior given by Turner and Killian (as quoted by Vanderbroeck): “Collective behavior is non-institutionalized behavior” that occurs “when the established organization ceases to afford direction and supply channels for action. The situation is ambiguous and unstructured. There is a feeling of uncertainty and urgency in the crowd.”<sup>9</sup> It must be noted that the Trojan crowd is not portrayed as all bad – they are scrupulously pious (although this too helps to precipitate their downfall), and they are capable of taking pity on Sinon and welcoming him into their number. But they also act of their own accord in various non-constructive ways, fail to come to a consensus, are distracted by spectacle, are eager to put an end to the long war by any means, and cast blame on a figure of authority. While outright

---

<sup>8</sup> From the beginning of his tale, Aeneas acknowledges his involvement in the events as both a witness (*ipse...vidi*, 2.5) and a participant (*quorum pars magna fui*, 2.6). His consistent use of the first person plural pronouns and verbs (e.g. *nos* at 2.25 where he includes himself in those who thought the Greeks had departed) implicates him in the failings of a crowd of which he is an eminent part at this point, but not yet the clear leader. Later scenes in which he uses the third person plural may distance Aeneas himself as an active participant (e.g. the ruse with the armor in 2.394-395) but do not absolve him from responsibility. It is somewhat notable that Aeneas' “I” is absent during much of the assembly scene, not to reappear until the night battle. See also Heinze, 16 and Anderson 1968, 7.

<sup>9</sup> Vanderbroeck, 11-12.

conflict (as will be displayed by the querulous Latins in Book 11) is absent, the Trojans' lack of order and indecisiveness, aggravated by their deficiency in good leadership, leave them open to Sinon's manipulation.<sup>10</sup>

### 1. The Force of *Fama*

Before the prominent appearances of Laocoön and then Sinon, the Trojan people have, in essence, already allowed themselves to be led astray in the matter of the Trojan horse.

According to Turner and Killian, they have accepted a common "norm" in the form of a rumor.<sup>11</sup> They fall prey to a rumor (*ea fama vagatur*, 2.17) that the horse is a gift. This false assumption leads them to make a second assumption that the Greeks have gone away (2.25). With their guard down, the Trojan crowd opens the gates and gazes upon the deserted shore. Despite another *fama* that Tenedos is a "well-known" (*notissima*, 2.21) island, the Trojans fail to connect its existence and possible suitability for hiding a fleet to the *fama* that the horse is a gift and the false assumption to which it gave rise. The Greeks have pretended very deliberately (*simulant*, 2.17) that this is the case,<sup>12</sup> but the rumor this ruse initiates spreads more spontaneously. It suggests that independent speech exchanges have taken place throughout the city.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> It is true that the gods have predestined this fall, but Vergil does not seem to give this much consideration in the immediate context of the crowd scene. When fate or divine hostility comes up in the account of the horse, it is only hinted at darkly and in connection with a human element. In this case it is treachery: *sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferabant* (2.34), "either it was treachery or the doom of Troy was already tending that way."

<sup>11</sup> Vanderbroeck, 12. Horsfall (on 2.17) notes that Vergil "has a sharp, contemporary sense of the importance of rumor in troubled times."

<sup>12</sup> Servius and Hyginus suggest that the Trojans know this because the horse had been marked by an inscription specifying it as such (Conington on 2.17). *Simulant* could also point to a ruse of some sort conducted near the horse such as prayers to Pallas, or a possible explanatory exchange between Greek soldiers and Trojans at the walls.

<sup>13</sup> People would be taking note of the horse, asking what it is, and getting responses such as, "Oh, I heard it was a gift from the Greeks!" and so forth.

As if this false *fama* were not enough, Sinon will make very effective use of allegedly false rumors in his speech. In this sense, *fama* – in connection with the crowd – defeats the Trojans twice in the course of Book 2. Yavetz explains away this credulity as a common feature of all crowds in any time or place,<sup>14</sup> and so there is no cause to fault the Trojans especially. As the appearance of *fama* in other places in the poem demonstrates though, a crowd may be credulous, but it need not act upon credulous impulses as the Trojans do here.<sup>15</sup> Good leadership and an innate political virtue can serve as important checks upon credulity.

## 2. *Sententia*

Aeneas does not formally introduce the Trojan crowd, but rather segues into the crowd's reactions following an impersonal report of joyful relief at the beach deserted of Greek troops (2.26-28). The crowd seems to materialize out of nowhere they begin to consider seriously what is to be done with the horse.<sup>16</sup> The description of their deliberations is not encouraging from a Trojan perspective:

pars stupet innuptae donum exitiale Minervae  
et molem mirantur equi; primusque Thymoetes  
duci intra muros hortatur et arce locari,  
sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant.  
at Capys, et quorum melior sententia menti  
aut pelago Danaum insidias suspectaque dona  
praecipitare iubent, subiectisque urere flammis,  
aut terebrare cavas uteri, et temptare latebras.  
scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus. (2.31-39)

Some are amazed at maiden Minerva's gift of death, and marvel at the massive horse: and first Thymoetes urges that it be drawn within our walls and lodged in the citadel; either it was treachery or the doom of Troy was already tending that way. But Capys, and they whose minds were wiser in counsel, bid us either hurl headlong into the sea this guile of the Greeks, this distrusted gift, or fire it with flames heaped beneath; or else pierce and probe the hollow hiding-place of the belly. The wavering crowd is torn into opposing factions.

---

<sup>14</sup> Yavetz, 134.

<sup>15</sup> Austin calls them here "frank and unsuspecting to the point of recklessness" (on 2.2-39).

<sup>16</sup> *Odyssey* 8.499-520 provides a far less involved account of this episode.

From the first description of what can safely be assumed to be the Trojan people en masse reacting to the horse, there is a hint of disunity. Often, *pars* used to denote a subsection of a group of people has an *alii* to answer it. Here, *et molem mirantur* (2.32) elaborates on what the same people are doing – merely gazing dumbly at the horse (*pars stupet*, 2.31).

The absence of “*alii*” begs the question of what a hypothetical second group would be doing. The possibly traitorous Thymoetes, who suggests that the horse be brought inside, and the wiser Capys supply the answer in beginning to speak about the horse and to make suggestions.<sup>17</sup> Thymoetes is only the “first” (*primus*, 2.32) who “urges” (*hortatur*, 2.33) the others to bring the horse within the walls. Likewise, in the opposing party, Capys does not necessarily initiate the action; he is one of a group, since Aeneas uses the plural (*iubent*, 2.37).<sup>18</sup> This faction is portrayed as being the more influential, as well as wiser (*et quorum melior sententia menti*, 2.35), but it is worth noting that Aeneas has complete hindsight in making this judgment. *Sententia* in the Roman political context, however, is a loaded word. It is not simply “opinion” in the loosest sense, but an official Senate proposal. It carries more weight than a demand or suggestion shouted out by an unthinking mob. Unfortunately, even the group with the better *sententia* has, strictly speaking, three different possible courses of action in mind: hurl the horse into the sea, burn it, or poke at it. Capys and his faction may be reasonable, but in addition to lacking the necessary stature as leaders who might have lent them more credibility, they have failed to articulate a clear proposal to the crowd. Thymoetes’ group, in contrast, has provided a clear suggestion to bring the horse in to the city and set it up on the citadel (2.32-33).

---

<sup>17</sup> Servius tells a story that Thymoetes’ wife and son were put to death by Priam (Williams on 2.34). Horsfall comments (on 2.35) that Capys’ tone “is indeed quite like Cicero’s, expatiating on *boni cives*.”

<sup>18</sup> Austin (on 2.35) strangely proposes “presumably Aeneas includes himself in this category,” but the use of the third person plural does not seem to support this. Cf. Horsfall (1995, 110) who comments that we do not know which of these two groups Aeneas is in.

Amid this apparent indecisiveness and plurality of ideas, all are rendered vulnerable to what is to come. The line summing up the passage then, with the *incertum...vulgus* “torn” (*scinditur*, 2.39) into factions, is foreboding.<sup>19</sup>

In contrast, the leaders of the Greeks are portrayed as having acted in absolute accord to reach this point, as evidenced by the uniformity of third-person plural verbs to describe the execution of the plan: *aedificant*, *intexunt*, *simulant*, *includunt*, *complant* (2.13-20). The men inside the horse have been chosen by lot, and an explanation for the gift (upon which Sinon will elaborate) has been carefully crafted. The whole operation smacks of organized consensus. At some point, a meeting of Greek leaders is presumed to have taken place, and the assembled – whether they were kings only or members of the army – would have given their assent, as occurs so many times in the assemblies of the *Iliad*. At this stage in the action, it is difficult to imagine a figure like Thersites attempting to sabotage the proceedings.<sup>20</sup> Mackie makes the argument that in the *Iliad*, Greek behavior in assemblies is characterized by organized public debate that brings about consensus, whereas the Trojan plurality of voices tends to contribute to mass chaos.<sup>21</sup> It would appear that Vergil has drawn upon this model in his initial portrayal of Greeks and Trojans, although it does not apply to the Trojans by the end of the poem. It is possible, however, that Mackie’s concentration on “Greeks” versus “Trojans” may be better conceptualized in Vergil as descriptions of victorious and vanquished groups, respectively. For

---

<sup>19</sup> Horsfall describes the Trojan behavior: “honest uncertainty perhaps seen as a first step towards noisy and unprofitable partisanship” (on 2.39).

<sup>20</sup> Indeed, in the Trojan assemblies of the *Iliad*, as Mackie observes, “no one publically wrangles with Hektor as Achilles, Thersites, Odysseus, and Diomedes antagonize Agamemnon.” If Hektor’s men cast blame upon him, it is “almost never in an assembly” (Mackie 31).

<sup>21</sup> Mackie, 15-16.

in the end, Vergil will show how Trojans can also be victors (who behave in organized consensus), with the Latins and Rutulians in place of the Trojans as the disorderly, and hence vanquished.

### 3. Interruptions: Laocoön and Sinon

Before the crowd in their makeshift council has the opportunity to reach a conclusion, the first of two interruptions takes place, both of which contain elements of the spectacle and its implications of competitiveness.<sup>22</sup> Laocoön rushes down from the citadel “with a great crowd accompanying” (*magna comitante caterva*, 2.40).<sup>23</sup> He speaks alone, presumably shouting from a distance (*procul*, 2.42).<sup>24</sup> The addressed are *cives*, but they are also *miseri* (2.42). At the close of his short warning speech, Laocoön hurls his spear into the side of the horse, casting in effect a physical vote to “pierce and probe” at the contents of the horse. The Trojans make no sound, but the caverns of the horse resound and give a groan: *insonuere...gemitumque dedere* (2.53). It is an odd juxtaposition of sounds; the first is almost certainly inanimate, but the “groan” is more distinctly human. The tension of the moment is almost unbearable. Aeneas remarks here that Troy would still stand “had the gods’ decrees, had our mind not been perverse” (*si fata deum, si mens non laeva fuisset*, 2.54),<sup>25</sup> as Laocoön would have driven the Trojans to pry open the horse

---

<sup>22</sup> Heinze, e.g. invites the reader to “imagine the scene on the stage” with citizens supporting either Thymoetes or Cayps when Laocoön “comes rushing onto the stage” (Heinze, 9).

<sup>23</sup> Vergil applies similar ablative-of-accompaniment phrases with *caterva* to Dido (1.497 and 4.136), Androgeos (2.370), Aeneas (5.77), and Amata (11.478). The common factor in all of these cases save that of Aeneas is that the impressively accompanied individuals are doomed. See also Heinze, 10.

<sup>24</sup> Mackie finds that Hector often shouts at his men from a distance rather than exhorting them individually (125).

<sup>25</sup> Conington and Mackhail take *non laeva* only with *mens*; Austin (following Servius *auctus*) seems to be correct in allowing for the line to take into account both fate and the Trojans’ own misinterpretations (Austin on 2.54).

(2.54-6). Where the Trojans might have rallied together at Laocoön's rebuke, they instead remain in their earlier pose of stunned silence. Heinze remarks that Sinon arrives "at the very moment at which Laocoön's advice and action are on the point of exposing the Greek ruse,"<sup>26</sup> and his interpretation seems likely given the extent to which the Trojans are about to be interrupted and thus diverted from the opportunity of fully discussing the matter of the horse.

The Trojan pose of silence does not last long. A third crowd (in addition to the first group out of the gates and Laocoön's crowd) appears on the scene: a group of shepherds noisily dragging a captive:

Ecce, manus iuvenem interea post terga revinctum  
pastores magno ad regem clamore trahebant  
Dardanidae... (2.57-9)

But meanwhile, some Dardan shepherds with loud shouts were haling to the king a youth whose hands were bound behind his back.

A fourth crowd of the Trojan youth then gathers. This group vies at mocking the captive, an important indication not so much of Trojan cruelty, as of a competitive nature that seems to break free in the joy and excitement of the moment:

undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus  
circumfusa ruit, certantque inludere capto. (2.63-64)

From all sides, in eagerness to see, the Trojan youth run streaming in and vie in mocking the captive. Both the noise of the shepherds (*clamore*, 2.58) and the taunts of the youth (*inludere*, 2.64) evidently fall quiet as Sinon in plain sight (*conspectu in medio*) begins his speech (2.67).<sup>27</sup> The deliberative functions of the gathering have been completely derailed in favor of the entertainment, as it were, of a public spectacle,<sup>28</sup> and Sinon does not disappoint.

---

<sup>26</sup> Heinze, 13.

<sup>27</sup> See Millar for discussion of the *conspectus* of the crowd in Roman political ideology (45-6).

<sup>28</sup> Austin (on 2.63) observes this: *visendi* "suggests the excitement of a show, backed up in *undique, studio, circumfusa ruit, certant*."

His skill as a public speaker and consummate performer is on full display. Sinon looks over his audience (*circumspexit*, 2.68). The specification that he does so with his eyes (*oculis*) suggests that Sinon is making eye contact with individual Trojans within the crowd. His first remark bemoans his lack of place in the world, since both the Greeks and Trojans oppose him. Embedded in Sinon's rhetorical questions lurks the claim that the Trojans too demand his blood (*Dardanidae infensi poenas cum sanguine poscunt?* 2.72). This statement, of course, is blatantly untrue.<sup>29</sup> We have not been told of any Trojan howling for Sinon's blood. He is simply being taken to the king (2.58-59), but the suggestion alone of bloodthirstiness is enough to sway the Trojans in Sinon's favor:

quo gemitu conversi animi, compressus et omnis  
impetus. Hortamur fari quo sanguine cretus  
quidve ferat; memoret quae sit fiducia capto. (2.73-75)

At that wail our mood was changed and all violence checked. We urge him to say from what blood he is sprung and what tidings he brings. 'Tell us,' we cry, 'on what you rely, now that you are our prisoner.'

First, there is a "sudden wave of Trojan sympathy"<sup>30</sup> as Sinon complains of his misery. Second, the Trojans with piqued curiosity – Aeneas included – begin to urge Sinon (*hortamur*, 2.74) to tell the rest of his story, both his own history (*quo sanguine cretus*, 2.74) and what news he brings (*quidve ferat*, 2.75).<sup>31</sup> Most importantly, they ask him for what is essentially an oath (*memoret quae sit fiducia capto*, 2.75),<sup>32</sup> which he at first delays.

---

<sup>29</sup> Though it is, of course, a natural enough assumption given the fact that Sinon is an enemy.

<sup>30</sup> Austin notes that the compounds *conversi* and *compressus* mark this (on 2.73).

<sup>31</sup> Heinze describes the process as "an intensification of emotions of the Trojan side" (Heinze, 8).

<sup>32</sup> Williams on 2.75. Servius provides another possible translation: "let him remember what a captive must depend on."



#### 4. Sinon's False Crowd

The speech of Sinon that follows, often praised as a rhetorical masterpiece, if a devious one, manipulates the idea of *fama* (rumor) as it applies both to Palamedes and to Sinon himself. The appeal to the spoken word of many people as a device lends an authority to the crowd that it might not have had. First, Sinon refers to Palamedes, a conscientious objector of sorts and kinsmen of Sinon's, of whom he believes the Trojans have heard:

fando aliquod si forte tuas pervenit ad auris  
Belidae nomen Palamedis et incluta fama  
gloria... (2.81-83)

If it chance that speech to your ears has brought some rumor of Palamedes, son of Belus, and the glory of his fame...

Sinon claims that even the Greeks who put him to death now mourn Palamedes (*demisere neci, nunc cassum lumine lugent*, 2.85).

It is striking that so long as Palamedes was "strong in the councils of the kings" (*regumque vigeat conciliis*, 2.88-89), Sinon still had a good reputation (*nomenque decusque*, 2.89). But Ulysses ruins him, and he does so by means of rumors:

hinc mihi prima mali labes, hinc semper Ulixes  
criminibus terrere novis, hinc spargere voces  
in vulgum ambiguas et quaerere conscius arma. (2.97-99)

Hence for me the first taint of ill; hence would Ulysses ever terrify me with new charges; hence would he sow dark rumors in the crowd and with guilty fear seek weapons.

*Voces...ambiguas* suggests merely that the rumors that Ulysses spreads against Sinon are of an uncertain nature; *quaerere conscius arma* is stronger, but still vague. *Consciis* suggests that Ulysses is a "conspirator," but *arma* could refer to "suspicion, hostility,"<sup>33</sup> or less likely, to literal weapons. Who is this mysterious man, the enemy of the *vulgus* of his own homeland? The

---

<sup>33</sup> Williams on 2.99

Trojans are at this point hopelessly ensnared (*tum vero ardemus scitari*, 2.105). Aeneas implicates himself firmly with this crowd.

The second part of Sinon's speech makes use of an ingenious irony – a fictional fearful crowd of Greeks to deceive the crowd of Trojans. He describes the Greeks as desirous of returning home and giving up the war (2.108-9),<sup>34</sup> but he does so in the third person, for these other “Greeks” are no longer to be identified with him personally. When the Greeks become terrified by storms during the construction of the horse (2.110-12), they send a representative to the oracle of Apollo. The god's answer strikes more fear into the crowd:

... vulgi quae vox ut venit ad auris  
obstupere animi, gelidus per ima cucurrit  
ossa tremor, cui fata parent, quem poscat Apollo. (2.119-21)

When this utterance came to the ears of the crowd, their hearts were dazed, and a cold shudder ran through their innermost marrow. For whom is fate preparing this doom? Whom does Apollo claim?

The two indirect questions closing the speech should likely be taken as internalized, with the Greeks silent not only because of fear, but owing to a kind of religious sensibility in which the god's reply would have generated an occasion for holy silence. In the following lines, Ulysses drags Calchas into the midst of the crowd:

hic Ithacus vatem magno Calchanta tumultu  
protrahit in medios...(2.122-3)

On this the Ithacan with loud clamor drags the seer Calchas into their midst...

It is clear that Ulysses, and not the crowd, is the source of the *tumultus*.<sup>35</sup> The people, though, are said to have been “prophesying” Sinon's death:

...Et mihi iam multi crudele canebant  
artificis scelus, et taciti ventura videbant.(2.124-5)

---

<sup>34</sup> *Iliad* 2 provides the clearest account of this sentiment. Clearly, Sinon has mingled some truth with his lies.

<sup>35</sup> Austin and Conington-Nettlehip on 2.122.

And now many predicted that I was the target of the schemer's cruel crime and silently saw what was to come.

The Greeks are portrayed as speaking in prophetic tones (*canebant*) of Ulysses' crime, yet watching silently as the inevitable comes to pass (*taciti ventura videbant*).<sup>36</sup> It is a characterization from which the Greeks emerge in their assent to Sinon's ostensible doom as coldhearted and cowardly, willing to sacrifice Sinon to the greater good without a thought – Agamemnon's murder of Iphigenia is the obvious precedent:

adsensere omnes et, quae sibi quisque timebat  
unius in miseri exitium conversa tulere. (2.130-131)

All approved; and what each feared for himself they bore with patience, when turned to one man's ruin. With these devastating words, Sinon makes all of the Greeks out to be cowards who are easily cowed by a bullying Ulysses.<sup>37</sup> The story may be an outright fabrication, but it so consistently depicts the Greek character as perceived by the Trojans that it absolves them of much of the blame for their credulity. Furthermore, Sinon has manipulated the Trojans into thinking that they would be just like the murderous Greeks if they decide to kill him, and so the Trojans' only real choice if they want to remain true to their character as Trojans is to spare his life.

##### 5. Trojan Pity, Piety, (and Ambition)

In the lines following the close of this first speech (2.144), the Trojans act in concord to take pity on Sinon: "To these tears, we grant life and pity him besides" (*His lacrimis vitam damus, et miserescimus ultro*, 2.145). Priam (in his arguably too-subtle appearance) even personally welcomes him as one of them (*noster eris*, 2.149). The Trojan ability to show pity and welcome

---

<sup>36</sup> Austin on 2.125 suggests, "Sinon's friends brooded over what they saw coming to him, as well as speaking their fears."

<sup>37</sup> See especially 2.122-1229 for the Vergilian picture of Ulysses. It is not, however, altogether inconsistent with Odysseus in *Iliad* 2.

the outsider – the important trait of inclusiveness – is one of the distinguishing attributes which Vergil allows them to keep, and to affirm, later in the poem.<sup>38</sup> It should also be noted that pitying Sinon does not necessarily mean that the Trojans have made the determination to bring the horse into the city. That constitutes another misstep entirely, and the Trojans make it because of another of Sinon’s lies, but not before Sinon has thoroughly gained their confidence by means of his religious oath.

Priam had already asked the Sinon whether the horse constituted a religious offering (*quae religio?* 2.151),<sup>39</sup> and Sinon had previously begged for mercy in a shorter oath of sorts: “by the gods above, by the powers that know the truth” (*per superos et conscia numina veri*, 2.141). His tour de force, though, in bringing the Trojans around to his side is the religious appeal of this oath:

‘vos, aeterni ignes, et non violabile vestrum  
testor numen,’ ait, ‘vos arae ensesque nefandi,  
quos fugi, vittaeque deum, quas hostia gessi:  
fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resolvere iura.  
fas odisse viros atque omnia ferre sub auras,  
si qua tegunt, teneor patriae nec legibus ullis.  
tu modo promissis maneat servataque serves,  
Troia fidem, si vera feram, si magna rependam. (2.154-161)

‘You, everlasting fires,’ he cries, ‘and your inviolable majesty, be my witness; you, altars, and accursed swords which I escaped, and chaplets of the gods, which I wore as a victim, grant that I may rightly break my solemn obligations to the Greeks, rightly hate them and bring all things to light if they hide aught; nor am I bound by any laws of country. But Troy, stand by your promises and, yourself preserved, preserve your faith, if my tidings prove true and pay you a large return!’

Sinon uses language that is drawn directly from the Roman religious register, e.g. *numen*, *arae*, *vittae*, *sacrata*. Most emphatic is his treatment of *fas* and *nefas*. The “swords” of Ulysses are in

<sup>38</sup> See subsection III.A.6 on the Achaemenides episode. Heinze finds in this scene a correlation to the Carthaginian deception at Cannae (Val. Max. 7.4 ext 2) in which Carthaginians claiming to be deserters falsely attacked the Roman army. For other peoples whom the Romans suspected of “perfidy,” see Heinze (7, n.9).

<sup>39</sup> The fact that he also pictures it as a *machina bella* (2.151) seems not so much to serve as a simple foreboding (which the audience does not need anyway) so much as a means of absolving the Trojans of the charge of naivety.

essence, *nefas*, but Sinon's repudiation of his fate is *fas*. The Trojan audience is swayed by their awe of the religious connotations of sparing Sinon. It also does not hurt that a few lines later, Sinon will paint Ulysses as an "*impius*" (2.163) arch-defiler of the temple in his theft of the Palladium (2.163-8). Ulysses' crime breaks the strength of the Greeks and alienates them from Athena's favor, for the absence of which Sinon cites omens and the prophecy of Calchas as proof (2.169-182). The Trojan crowd, like their pious Roman descendants, will take concerns such as these seriously.<sup>40</sup>

Sinon's explanation of the horse's origins and its significance for Troy is quite revelatory of the Trojans' motives. These are not as pure as one might expect. The horse, once brought into the city, does not only "guard the people under shelter of their ancient faith" (*populum antiqua sub religione tueri*, 2.188); it promises a great war waged by Asia against the "walls of Pelops" (2.193-4) as a fate that awaits "our grandchildren" (*nostros...nepotes*, 2.194). Sinon has not already mentally identified with the Trojans; he is talking about the Greeks here, and giving the Trojans the chance to imagine what it would be like if the tables were turned. He is tempting the Trojans to act "Greek" in pursuing a war on Greek territory, hardly a peaceful, self-defensive act. The Trojans do not bring the horse into the city out of simple naivety; they are ambitious.<sup>41</sup> It is a premature ambition, seeing as the Trojans are not in any position to initiate conquests.<sup>42</sup> Certainly, it hints at the sense of destiny that the Trojans are in time to gain as the poem progresses, but this is not to be a destiny arrived at easily by a simple charm, such as the horse is said to represent; it will take much hard work and endurance.

---

<sup>40</sup> Sinon appeals to his Trojan (proto-Roman) audience's sense of family...religious scruple and sense of law" (Lynch, 175).

<sup>41</sup> Not surprising then, is Aeneas' impersonal final pronouncement on the Greek deception (*credita res*, 2.196).

<sup>42</sup> It may, however, point to the later Roman conquest of Greece (Williams on 2.193-4).

To complete the scene, just as, one can imagine, the Trojans are breathing a sigh of relief while they welcome Sinon, Laocoön meets his doom in the form of twin sea serpents. The Trojans, Aeneas included, “scatter pale at the sight” (*diffugimus visu exsanguis*, 2.212) as the serpents attack Laocoön and his sons (2.212-224). The fact that these serpents retreat to the sanctuary of Minerva (225-7) makes it easy for the Trojans to assign blame:

tum vero tremefacta novus per pectora cunctis  
insinuat pavor, et scelus expendisse merentem  
Laocoönta ferunt, sacrum qui cuspidē robur  
laeserit, et tergo sceleratam intorsit hastam  
ducendum ad sedes simulacrum orandaque divae  
numina conclamant. (2.228-233)

Then indeed a strange terror steals through the shuddering hearts of all, and they say that Laocoön has rightly paid the penalty of crime, who with his lance profaned the sacred oak and hurled into its body the accursed spear. ‘Draw the image to her house,’ all cry, ‘and supplicate her godhead.’

The words of the crowd are related with third-person plural verbs. A first-person plural would not have been appropriate here (as it was at 2.74) because then Aeneas would have implicated himself in the colossal error (however divinely inspired and logically sound at the moment) of blaming Laocoön for his own death. The use of the third person here (*ferunt, conclamant*) allows Aeneas to distance himself (and possibly even the Trojans currently with him at Carthage) from those whose behavior contributed to the city’s fall.<sup>43</sup> The Trojans’ blaming of Laocoön is heavily influenced by the religious concerns already very much on their minds, but Laocoön is still a figure of authority whom the Trojans have effectively dismissed.<sup>44</sup> The last we hear from the Trojans before disaster strikes is the unmarried boys and girls who sing and rejoice (*canunt...gaudent*, 2.239) as the horse is brought into the city. Heinze remarks here that the Trojans “were bound to proceed to their decision and its execution” after being convinced by

---

<sup>43</sup> Aeneas does, however, include himself with those who carried out the fateful decision of the crowd: *dividimus muros et moenia pandimus urbis*, 2.234.

<sup>44</sup> Laocoön, as a son of Priam and priest of Neptune (Williams on 2.41), seems deserving of more respect than he is accorded by the Trojans.

Sinon, “though perhaps not with so much haste and with such unanimous enthusiasm.”<sup>45</sup>

Indeed, it is the same individuals who had listened so silently before who now “eagerly set to work” to bring about their own destruction.<sup>46</sup> Afterwards, with their guard entirely let down, the Trojans become silent (*conticuere*, 2.253) as sleep overtakes them.<sup>47</sup>

The council of the Trojans regarding the horse is a crowd that acts reasonably in the face of overwhelming deceit and divine interference, but ultimately brings about its own downfall through indecisiveness, credulity, and ambition – all facilitated by their lack of good leadership.<sup>48</sup> Nisbet comments perceptively (though with perhaps too much focus on the type of Trojan government) on the assembly: “There is an implicit moral on the dangers of oligarchy and plutocracy, where a leaderless nation listens to uninformed voices, and nobody is in overall charge. Such a lesson would seem a natural one in Augustan Rome...”<sup>49</sup> Never again in the course of the *Aeneid* will the Trojans make a mistake of such magnitude, but the Latins will.

### C. THE LATIN CROWD IN COUNCIL: PRELUDE TO DISASTER II

By the time Latinus, Drances, and Turnus meet in council to deal with the problem of the Trojan newcomers, battle is long underway. Although Aeneas has just slain Lausus and Mezentius (Book 10 had ended precisely with Mezentius’ death), no formal truce stops the fighting.

---

<sup>45</sup> Heinze, 11.

<sup>46</sup> Heinze, 12.

<sup>47</sup> This scene mirrors the sleep of the drunken Rutulians prior to a Trojan raid (9.161-67, 189-90, 316-19), although the Trojans also sleep because of their genuine exhaustion from war. See subsection VI.B.1.b.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Lynch, though, who explains that Troy falls because of the “good qualities of her people: their innocence, their honesty, their sympathy, their sincerity – in short, their artlessness” (Lynch, 177-8).

<sup>49</sup> Nisbet 1990, 378.

Instead, the battle comes to a natural halt following this decisive death.<sup>50</sup> In the time it has taken Aeneas to found a camp, visit Evander and then the Etruscans, and fight in a crucial battle, the Latins and Rutulians have only responded in part to the arrival of the Trojans. Latinus, after all, had declined to participate. The council, when it does occur, however, provides important insight into how the Latin and Rutulian crowd operates,<sup>51</sup> and more importantly, a counterpoint to the Trojan crowd.

#### 1. Aeneas and the Latin Ambassadors:

A miniature council of sorts between Aeneas and ambassadors from Latium precedes the main tumultuous council scene. The requests of the suppliant “envoys” (*oratores*, 11.100) are reported in indirect speech. Agents of the peace party of Drances,<sup>52</sup> they are “asking for a truce” (*veniamque rogantes*, 11.101) to bury the dead (11.102-105),<sup>53</sup> and Aeneas, of course, grants it.<sup>54</sup> Drances, apparent spokesman for both envoys and Latins in general, then praises Aeneas to the skies. Aeneas’ absolution of himself from all blame, and insistence that he is not waging war against their people (11.113-114), brings about an astonished but revelatory reaction from the Latins:

...illi obstipuerunt silentes  
conversisque oculos inter se atque ora tenebant. (11.120-1)

They stood dumb in silence, and kept their eyes and faces turned on one another.

---

<sup>50</sup> See subsection IV.B.3 for a discussion of why this natural halt occurs.

<sup>51</sup> Feeney, 216, e.g. calls it “a mere shouting match.”

<sup>52</sup> Fratantuono on 11.100.

<sup>53</sup> The ambassadors’ assertion that there can be no contest with the dead (*nullum cum victis certamen et aethere cassis*, 11.104) could be a subtle criticism of the Trojan competitive streak.

<sup>54</sup> Aeneas’ speech (his last in the book, as Gransden observes, 11.108-119), serves the important function of “arousing Latin bitterness against Turnus and deflecting any anger they might feel toward Aeneas on account of the deaths they have suffered” (Fratantuono on 11.100). Also, it has the immediate function of silencing his listeners, a characteristic Aeneas shares with Jupiter (10.101) (Fratantuono on 11.121).



It appears that they are unsure of what they should do, likely searching one another's faces for a clue at what their policy should be.<sup>55</sup> They may also be simply astonished that Aeneas has accepted their truce, but they are also open to Drances' personally motivated, if diplomatically astute machinations; rather than simply accepting the truce, Drances is ready to surrender Latin sovereignty to help the Trojans. Using the first person plural, he promises that the envoys will bring Aeneas' words to the king and "if Fortune grants a way" join Aeneas to king Latinus (*te...Latino iungemus regi*, 11.128-9).<sup>56</sup> As for the Latins in general, Drances is more cautious in his expression. He uses an impersonal *iuvabit* to express delight – but on the part of an indeterminate group of Latins in helping to build the Trojans' walls:

quin et fatalis murorum attolere moles  
saxaque subvectare umeris Troiana iuvabit (11.130-131)

It will rather be our delight to rear those massive walls that your destiny ordains, and to bear on our shoulders the walls of Troy.

There is universal assent (*dixerat haec unoque omnes eadem ore fremebant*, 11.132),<sup>57</sup> and the truce takes place with Trojans and Latins wandering the woods together without incident.<sup>58</sup> The problem with this truce, however, is that it has been made without the definite support of a large segment of the *populus* by irresolute ambassadors who have been led by a leader who represents

---

<sup>55</sup> Gransden usefully notes the similarity to 2.1, where everyone is silent as Aeneas begins to speak (*conticuere omnes*), but in that case there is no *inter se* (Gransden on 11.120-1). Frantantuono suggests that *conversi* "to turn," foreshadows the Latins breaking the truce (on 11.121), but this seems to stretch the meaning. Quinn posits that either they are "moved by his magnanimous humanity," or Aeneas has voiced "the ambassadors' own thoughts" (1968, 235).

<sup>56</sup> This is in reference to Latinus' offer of friendship made by Aeneas to Ilioneus at 7.263-4, which Turnus rejects (Gransden on 11.128-9).

<sup>57</sup> Horsfall cautions against asking the question of whether Latins, Trojans, or both cheer Aeneas' words (on 7.132).

<sup>58</sup> The only sounds come from trees being felled and wagons groaning under the weight of the cut wood (11.133-138). As will be seen in CHAPTER III, Vergil tends to portray in a favorable light crowds that are busy with various tasks but otherwise mostly silent. See also VII.A.2.

only one faction within the state, however correct that leader may be. Drances is careful to depict Turnus (falsely) as standing alone,<sup>59</sup> but as will be seen in the Latin Council, Turnus has a number of supporters whom Drances has effectively left disenfranchised.

## 2. *Fragor* and *Sententiae*: The Latin Council Begins

The chain of events that end in the council, one that Latinus states ought never have been called under such dire circumstances (11.302-4), begins with grief at the Latin dead. The mothers, daughters-in-law, sisters, and orphaned sons of the slain Latins do not display the lofty, resigned grief of the Trojans and their allies (11.182-202).<sup>60</sup> More important, however, is the mourning within the city following the funeral:

iam vero in tectis, praedivitis urbe Latini  
praecipuus fragor et longi pars maxima luctus.  
hic matres miseraeque nurus, hic cara sororum  
pectora maerentum puerique parentibus orbi  
dirum exsecrantur bellum Turnique hymenaeos;  
ipsum armis ipsumque iubent decernere ferro,  
qui regnum Italiae et primos sibi poscat honores. (11.213-219)

But inside the walls, in the city of rich Latinus, is the chief uproar and most of the prolonged wailing. Here mothers and their sons' unhappy brides, here the loving hearts of sorrowing sisters, and boys bereft of their fathers, curse the dreadful war and Turnus' marriage: "He, he himself," they bid, "should decide the issue by arms and the sword, he who claims for himself the realm of Italy and foremost honors."

*Fragor* (uproar) is suggestive of the "divisions in the Latin populace that are about to explode in the forthcoming war council."<sup>61</sup> Far removed from the stately Trojans, the Latins are an insistent crowd who "curse" (*exsecrantur*)<sup>62</sup> the war and "bid" (*iubent*) Turnus to fight for the kingdom and honors he seeks for himself. Indeed, it is to the "indigenous Latins" that Vergil "gives his

---

<sup>59</sup> "Let Turnus seek alliances for himself!" (*quaerat sibi foedera Turnus*, 11.129).

<sup>60</sup> For a discussion of the Trojan versus the Latin grief, see subsection VII.A.2.

<sup>61</sup> Fratantuono on 11.213.

<sup>62</sup> A rare word in the poem used less forebodingly by Aeneas and his men at 3.273 as they "curse" Ulysses (See Fratantuono on 11.217). See also subsection III.A.6.

most powerful anti-war sentiments.”<sup>63</sup> Their concerns do not go unheard, for they find a champion in the orator Drances, who immediately attests that Turnus alone is called to battle (11.220-1).

But Turnus is not without his own supporters, who are, for their part, also vocal:

multa simul contra variis sententia dictis  
pro Turno, et magnum reginae nomen obumbrat,  
multa virum meritis sustentat fama tropaeis. (11.222-4)

At the same time, opposed to them many an opinion in varied phrase speaks for Turnus; the queen’s great name is his shelter, and many a tale with well-worn trophies supports the hero.

Vergil seems to avoid mention of the crowd, and sublimates its nameless speakers into their disembodied *sententia*, which is, as Horsfall reminds us, “not only an opinion but that opinion expressed in an assembly.”<sup>64</sup> The *nomen* (the literal “name,” or perhaps “influence”) of Turnus’ would-be mother-in-law, rather than being described literally as being merely “whispered” by the crowd or appealed to, actually “protects” Turnus. Likewise, the hero’s *fama* with his deserved trophies “supports” him. *Nomen* and *fama* both have obvious verbal connotations; the *nomen* of the queen stands for her implicit but well-known support for Turnus, and Turnus’ *fama* points, in Homeric terms, to his *kleos*, the fact that men talk about his deeds. Thus, Vergil uses both to stand for more involved verbal expressions. Treated impressionistically, rather than with, for example, a Homeric *tis*-speech, the opinions of the crowd are de-personalized, but in a sense this gives them greater power because it conveys an apparent single-mindedness.

Up to this point, vocalizations by the Latin crowd have been spontaneous, but a series of official speeches commences to alter the state of affairs, if gradually. First comes the arrival of ambassadors who had been sent previously (8.9-10) to Diomedes. They return to a city in chaos

---

<sup>63</sup> Gransden on 11.217. Stahl remarks: “...the reader, emotionally influenced by the sorrows of these bereft victims, is given reason to view Turnus’ savage rage as a sort of private war that he is waging at the cost of his people...” (183).

<sup>64</sup> Horsfall on 11.222.

(*inter motus, medio in flagrante tumultu*, 11.225). In addition to gifts of gold that had been offered to the famed hero, the Latins' prayers (*magnas...preces*, 11.229) had not been strong enough to convince him to join the war effort. Latinus convenes a council, specifically, a *concilium magnum* (11.234):

ergo concilium magnum primosque suorum  
imperio accitos alta intra limina cogit.  
olli convenere fluuntque ad regia plenis  
tecta viis. sedet in mediis et maximus aevo  
et primus sceptris haud laeta fronte Latinus. (11.234-8)

Therefore his high council, the foremost of his people, he summons by royal command and convenes within his lofty portals. They assembled, streaming to the king's palace through the crowded streets. In their midst, oldest in years and first in regal state, with little joy upon his brow, sits Latinus.

The people at large, it seems, are already crowding the streets in eager curiosity like a Roman mob awaiting the results of a senatorial debate.<sup>65</sup> While Latinus himself still claims the royal power, seated appropriately *in mediis*, he will not ultimately do much to exercise it. Even so, his people are still obedient to his commands.

Latinus bids Venulus, one of the ambassadors, to give his account. The hall is silent in anticipation of his speech (*tum facta silentia linguis*, 11.241), and its closing identifies Diomedes' response as a *sententia* (11.295), hearkening back the significant *sententia* in Book 2 that is likewise not followed by the crowd.<sup>66</sup> The effect of the ambassadors' report on the crowd, a direct-speech account of Diomedes' reasons for not wishing to tangle with Aeneas once again, is powerfully elemental – a simile evokes a stream bursting its banks:

vix ea legati, variusque per ora cucurrit  
Ausonidum turbata fremor, ceu saxa morantur  
cum rapidos amnis, fit clauso gurgite murmur  
vicinaeque fremunt ripae crepitantibus undis. (11.296-299)<sup>67</sup>

<sup>65</sup> LaPenna, 284-5 elaborates on this senatorial model.

<sup>66</sup> *at Capys, et quorum melior sententia menti* (2.35). The people, of course, have their own *sententia* (11.222). Also cf. Latinus' doubtful *sententia* at 11.314.

<sup>67</sup> Gransden points out that Knauer here compares *Il.* 2.144-8, but that the "resemblance is purely formal." Rather, in this passage, the "effect of the envoy's speech is to produce a confused and

Scarcely had the envoys spoken thus, when a various murmur ran along the troubled lips of Ausonia's sons: even as, when rocks delay a rushing river, there rises a roar from the pent-up flood, and the neighboring banks echo to the plashing waters.

The line that prefaces the speech of Latinus (*ut primum placati animi et trepida ora quierunt*, 11.300) is filled with “ugly elisions” that “serve to underscore the tensions and disagreements in the Latin camp.”<sup>68</sup> In his offer to cede land to the Trojans, Latinus anticipates that they may instead decide to sail for other lands, in which case, they may “prescribe” (*praecipiant*) the number of vessels and their design (11.329). The offer itself seems unlikely to work out for the best.<sup>69</sup>

Latinus' apprehension of the situation is a very different one, though, from that of the ambassadors, who had not ruled out war, but had offered other possibilities of seeking outside military assistance and making peace with the Trojans (11.229-230). Only Latinus, for all of his irresolution, has apprehended correctly the character of his adversaries. There may be considerable hyperbole in his description of the Trojans as a “race divine” (*gente deorum*) and even a revision of history in his assertion that they are “men unconquered” (*invictisque viris*, 11.305-6)<sup>70</sup> – though to be fair, he qualifies this in 307. But he is right on the mark in his

---

excited murmur like the noise of a river among rocks” with strong “alliterative and onomatopoeic effects” (Gransden on 11.297-9). Fratantuono notes, “though the verb *fremere* is used some forty times in Virgil the noun appears only here; it is a very rare word in all periods. The simile describing the noise of the crowd is recalled at the very climactic moment 12.921-23, where *fremunt* and *crepitus* recall *fremor/fremunt* and *crepitantibus* here. *Crepitans* can indicate “a pleasant or unpleasant sound” (Fratantuono on 2.299).

<sup>68</sup> Fratantuono on 11.300. *Placati* appears also at 1.142, 2.116 and 3.69.

<sup>69</sup> As Fratantuono observes, Latinus cannot “expect his people to leap so quickly from chopping wood for funeral pyres to cutting wood for transport ships to help fashion a new fleet for Troy” (Fratantuono on 11.325).

<sup>70</sup> Servius quotes Ennius (*Ann.* 493): *qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur*. Hor. *Odes* 4.4.50f. and Livy 27.14.1 (Hannibal's assessment of the Romans) contain similar sentiments (Williams on 11.305-6).

assessment of their endurance (11.306-307) as well as in his assumption of how they speak and act in consensus (11.323-329) rather than as subjects obeying the dictates of a king. Latinus' offer is to be made to the Trojans as a group (11.321), and Aeneas is not even mentioned.

### 3. *Seditioe Potens*: Drances Speaks

Following the recommendation of Latinus, Drances speaks. The talented orator but reluctant soldier is described with a phrase that would have put Vergil's Roman audience on alert:

*seditioe potens* (11.340).<sup>71</sup> The only other appearance of *seditio* in the poem, a word, as Fratantuono remarks, "uncommon in poetry of all genres" is in the statesman simile, only "there was a man ready to calm the strife; here there will be none."<sup>72</sup> In some senses, it is not surprising that Drances has been compared to Thersites. Both are associated with the lower classes.<sup>73</sup> Both give speeches attacking a leader, though Highet points out in defense of Drances that he directs his insults against Turnus alone.<sup>74</sup> Both seem to embody the voice of the people. But if Thersites "personifies" a rather ill defined "mutinous spirit" on the part of the men,<sup>75</sup> Drances represents an actual partisan faction.<sup>76</sup> Thersites' "revolt" is a rather disorderly and spontaneous rush to the ships.<sup>77</sup> What takes place in the Latin assembly involves speech and reflection – and

---

<sup>71</sup> See Horsfall on 11.340 for some historical parallels.

<sup>72</sup> Fratantuono on 11.340. Horsfall remarks that *seditioe potens* is "the very antithesis of the *pietate gravem ac meritis...virum*."

<sup>73</sup> In Drances' case, only in part, and he is of sufficiently high a class to feel jealousy of Turnus (11.336-7, 340-341). See also LaPenna, 285ff. for Drances' portrayal as a seditious *popularis* leader after the fashion of Catiline.

<sup>74</sup> Highet, 250.

<sup>75</sup> Highet, 249.

<sup>76</sup> Burke's view of Drances is more reasonable – he is more like Polydamas than Thersites (Burke, 17ff.). After all, no matter how unlikeable a character he is, Drances is right, even if he is right for the wrong reasons (his hatred of Turnus). Cf. Gransden 1984, 179ff.

<sup>77</sup> Highet claims, rather harshly, of Thersites: his speech "dramatically...has no result whatever" in an episode that is "detachable from the fabric of the poem" (Highet, 249). Of course, had

that makes it far more dangerous. Drances' speech stirs up Turnus, and ultimately contributes to continued civil strife, and the eventual fall of the city to the Trojans.<sup>78</sup>

Drances' speech reveals the mood of at least some of the Latins in regard to Turnus; they are either afraid of him or upset with him, because rather than speaking freely, they hesitate:<sup>79</sup>

...cuncti se scire fatentur  
quid fortuna ferat populi, sed dicere mussant. (11.344-345)

All admit that they know what course the public fortune prompts, but they shrink from speech.

Throughout the speech, Drances identifies himself with the *populus*, as he consistently uses the first-person plural.<sup>80</sup> He chastises Turnus for hurling his “unhappy countrymen” (*miseros...civis*) into danger (11.360-1). He is on the side of peace (*pacem te poscimus omnes*, 11.362), or so he claims. After Turnus' fiery retort, in which he accuses the orator of trying to terrify the people (11.400-402), the Latins continue to squabble: “Thus, in mutual strife, they were debating doubtful issues” (*Illi haec inter se dubiis de rebus agebant certantes*, 11.445-6).<sup>81</sup> But at this point, it is too late for the Latins. The disorderly Latin council has been brought to a close by the

---

Thersites' arguments won the day and Odysseus not “curbed” him, the Achaeans might have decided once again to sail off, effectively ending the war.

<sup>78</sup> DiCesare defends Turnus as maintaining “a kind of heroic integrity” while both Latinus and Drances “appeal to the fickle mob” (DiCesare, 206). Servius' note on 11.340 states simply of Drances, “*praepotens in movenda, non in conprimenda seditione.*”

<sup>79</sup> Gransden notes that the use of the infinitive with *musso* to mean “hesitate” is without parallel, though the usual sense of “mutter in indecision” occurs later at 454 (Gransden on 11.345).

<sup>80</sup> Vergil has already proven Drances false in his assertion that he is speaking on things “accepted by all” based on the controversy between his own opinion and that of an indeterminate opposing faction (11.220-224) (Fratantuono on 345), but he does possess some supporters (11.222-224), though his accusations are of the type of the typical Roman politician who is eager to cast his opponent as “an inconsiderate, egotistical tyrant,” who “scorns the people as a worthless mob” (Heinze, 325). Horsfall comments on the limited right to speech in both the assembly and the senate, here and in Rome (on 11.346-51).

<sup>81</sup> This state of affairs, as well as the situation at the opening of the council (11.213-224) seem to belie Quinn's claim that Turnus' “fiery speech is largely to blame...for the wave of hysteria aroused by the news of the Trojan advance” (1968, 238).

decisive and organized collective actions of the Trojans.<sup>82</sup> The Latins themselves are now completely vulnerable to sedition.<sup>83</sup> Turnus delivers a perfectly biting remark that sums up the pointlessness of holding *concilia* at such a time.<sup>84</sup>

‘immo,’ ait ‘o cives,’ arrepto tempore Turnus  
‘cogite concilium et pacem laudate sedentes;  
illi armis in regna ruunt.’... (11.459-461)

“Very well, then, my fellow citizens,” cries Turnus, seizing the moment, “convene a council, and sit there praising peace; our enemies are attacking our realm under arms.”

The seditious character of the Latins so evident here has already been revealed in Book 7 and will be brought to its full force to tear the state apart in Book 12. Owing to their display of open dispute, hints of sedition, and three “leaders” not one of whom manages effective crowd mastery, the Latins most resemble the Greeks of *Iliad* 1 and 2, but without an Agamemnon or an Odysseus,<sup>85</sup> much less a *pietate gravis ac meritis...vir* to control them. By this token, it can be safely concluded that the council of the Latins constitutes the single most dangerous assembly scene of the *Aeneid*.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>Fratantuono claims that Aeneas has effectively broken the truce for burial (on 11.234 and 445-6), conveniently neglecting not only that the Trojans have not actually attacked the city, but that Latinus had already broken the earlier treaty (11.113-114).

<sup>83</sup> See subsection V.E for the continuation of this scene.

<sup>84</sup> To be fair to Latinus, he had also expressed the sentiment that the council was not called at the best time (11.302-304), and in fact that a council meets at all at this point suggests “the old popular right to decide on issues of peace and war” (Horsfall on 11.460).

<sup>85</sup> This would support Mackie’s argument that the Achaeans (who allow and encourage debate to an extent) have learned how to deal with dissent in their assemblies, but the Trojans (whose assemblies tend to be dominated by the royal families (See Barker 67-8) have not (Mackie 21).

<sup>86</sup> See LaPenna, 285ff., Hardie 1998 “Fame” 245.



#### D. THE DIVINE COUNCIL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

The *Aeneid*'s only divine council in Book 10<sup>87</sup> provides an important paradigm for the human councils of the poem. More reminiscent of a Senate meeting at its opening than an assembly of the common people, it comes to resemble the latter more closely. Jupiter “calls” the council of the gods in the same way a meeting of the Senate is called (*consiliumque vocat*, 10.2).<sup>88</sup> The council starts in discord, and though the reader knows that this is primarily due to the disagreement between Venus and Juno, Jupiter seems to be addressing all of the gods more generally:

caelicolae magni, quianam sententia vobis  
versa retro tantumque animis certatis iniquis? (10.6-7)

Mighty sons of Heaven, why is your decision reversed, and why do you quarrel with hearts so discordant?

The reference to a *sententia* is also indicative of a senatorial resolution.<sup>89</sup> Jupiter’s accusation that the gods have gone back on their word on so serious an issue is not to be dismissed.

After both Venus and Juno have had their say (immediately following Juno’s final arguments), the gods respond. It is the only time in the *Aeneid* that all of the gods as a crowd vocalize:

Talibus orabat Iuno, cunctique fremebant  
caelicolae adsensu vario, ceu flamina prima  
cum deprensa fremunt silvis et caeca volutant  
murmura venturos nautis prodentia ventos.  
tum pater omnipotens, rerum cui prima potestas,  
infit (eo dicente deum domus alta silescit

---

<sup>87</sup> Harrison and Williams agree that this is the sole divine council (Williams and Harrison on 10.1. ff.) Cairns finds three, including what appear to be only one-on-one conversations between Jupiter and Venus, and Jupiter and Juno, respectively, at 1.277ff. and 12.79ff. (Cairns 207-208). The passage is modeled on *Iliad* 8.1, with other divine councils at the openings of *Iliad* 4, 15, and 20 (Williams on 10.1. ff.).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Il.* 20.4: ἀγορήνδε καλέσσαι; *vocare* was also used for calling a meeting of the Senate (Cic. *Cat.* 2.26, *Dom.* 11, etc.) (Harrison on 10.2).

<sup>89</sup> Harrison on 10.6-7.

et tremefacta solo tellus, silet arduus aether,  
tum Zephyri posuere, premit placida aequora pontus): (10.96-103)

So argued Juno, and all the celestial company murmured diverse assent, just as when rising blasts, caught in the forest, murmur, and roll their unseen moanings, betraying to sailors the coming of the gale. Then the Father Almighty, prime potentate of the world, begins; as he speaks, the high house of the gods grows silent and earth trembles from her base; silent is high heaven; then the Zephyrs are hushed; Ocean stills his waters into rest.

*Fremere*, according to Fordyce, is a common audience response that conveys “inarticulate or confused sound.”<sup>90</sup> The *adsensu vario* is, as Harrison observes, an oxymoron, as the gods are only differing in their agreement with one of the two goddesses.<sup>91</sup> If the reader is left in any doubt as to the existence of a fundamental disagreement among the gods, the simile elaborates on the divine uproar as a storm. The repetition of *fremere* (10.96, 98) and the *caeca murmura* (98-99) together represent “a clear element of correspondence between context and simile, corresponding to the *murmura* of the gods receiving Juno’s speech in the council.”<sup>92</sup> The simile describes the *murmura* as issuing from the breezes, the *flamina*, which will presage for sailors, in turn, more dangerous winds (*ventos*). It is an apt analogy to the expression of latent hostilities in a crowd that is capable of breaking out into open revolt. In the storm of 1.124-147, a great murmur (*magno misceri murmure pontum*, 1.124) accompanies the overturning of the sea by the rebellious winds (*venti*, 1.133).

These murmurs and whispers are only quieted by the intervention of Jupiter – proof that the king of the gods only tenuously holds sway over an unruly mob of fellow deities. After he has his word, the council finally arrives at what is still a temporary consensus, what Cairns calls

---

<sup>90</sup> Fordyce on 7.389, cf. βρέμειν; Harrison on 10.96-7 lists examples of its use for audience reactions to speeches.

<sup>91</sup> Harrison on 10.96-7. Additionally, the phrase immediately precedes the storm simile.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. 12.591 ‘*murmure caeco*’ (of the buzzing of bees): *caecus* suggests an indiscriminate noise (TLL iii. 46. 4ff.), much like *fremere* and *murmur*, an effective use of a sight adjective to characterize sound, a poetic μεταλήψις αἰσθήσεως...’ ‘*murmura*’ is also used in speech-receptions in Ov. *Met.* 1.206, 12.124, Lucan 1.352, Livy 3.56.8, 32.22.1). Vergil also commonly uses *volutare* in connection to sounds (1.725, 5.149) (Harrison on 10.98-9).

an “interim solution”<sup>93</sup> as opposed to the more decisive one at 12.791-840. Jupiter’s calming of the gods (by force of his “word”) then bears a very striking resemblance to the calming of the mob in the statesman simile in Book 1.<sup>94</sup> The degree of unruliness is very different in the two scenes, but the gods are not unlike that mob whose spirits the statesman “sways” with his words (*regit dictis animos*, 1.153). Harrison considers the repetition of verbs “of silence” in the divine council (i.e. *silescit...silet*, 10.101-2)<sup>95</sup> to be indicative of a “holy silence,” as *silesco* appears only here in Vergil. To place such weight on Jupiter’s silencing of the gods will carry with it important connotations when what happens later is considered; the council ends with Juno immediately engaging in behavior that undermines Jupiter’s (and the council’s) decision.

Jupiter may “rule” more decisively over the council over which he presides in the *Aeneid* than Zeus does over any of his in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, but there is no getting around this problem – Jupiter, and the consensus of the gods, are undermined by the rebellious Juno and her various divine lackeys.<sup>96</sup> Jupiter certainly makes his will known, but he does not go out of his way to see that it is carried out among the lesser divinities. Confident in the inevitability of Fate, he can afford to allow the occasional sidetrack in the form of minor rebellions and interferences from Juno. What the gods of Vergil’s *Aeneid* may appear to demonstrate is first, that divine (and likewise human) discord is just as necessary as concord, and perhaps more the norm. Secondly, it shows that the assent of the many, even at the divine level, is not necessarily as efficacious as one might hope, especially when powerful enemies are thrown into the mix.

---

<sup>93</sup> Cairns, 207.

<sup>94</sup> Hardie 1986, 205.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 1084-5, Theocr. 2.38, Pac. *Trag.* 77, Cat. 46.3. “*silesco* is found only here in Vergil” (Harrison on 10.101-2).

<sup>96</sup> DiCesare, 177.

The main conclusion that can be drawn from the decision-making councils of the *Aeneid* is that they are not fully to be trusted. Lack of a strong leader (*a pietate gravis ac meritis...vir*) can contribute to indecisiveness and credulity in a crowd (as happens to the Trojans). An atmosphere of more open debate in which there is the possibility for a multitude of different voices to be heard, even if only the upper classes are speaking, is suspect in that it tends to contribute only to the kind of personal political rivalries that mar the political proceedings of the Greeks in the *Iliad* and the Romans of the late republic (as happens to the Latins). The divine council, where conflicting views lead to untold suffering for the mortals on both sides of the issue, provides the final nail in the coffin to the decision-making assembly as a useful political institution. Judging by their single decision-making assembly scene, it is apparent that the Trojan crowd of the *Aeneid* does not find its real place as an idealized *plebs contionalis*,<sup>97</sup> but as an urban mob united under a single *princeps*. If the debate of an assembly scene appears to bring about situations of disunity and danger for the *populus*, a unified *populus* under a sole *princeps* is secure, but more importantly, it is highly effective at anything it sets out to achieve.

#### E. A NEW MODEL *CONCILIUM*?

After their early, disastrous incarnation as a true urban mob in the Trojan horse scene, the Trojans no longer meet in the context of anything that resembles a political assembly in which both leaders and populace attempt to arrive at a joint decision. In illustration of this, Book 5 contains a different sort of assembly of Trojans in which they demonstrate a high degree of cohesion. Termed a *coetum* (5.43) and a *concilium* (5.75), it is not a true decision-making

---

<sup>97</sup> See, e.g. Mouritsen, 14.

*concilium*, nor does it fit neatly into any of the traditional uses of a *contio* typical of the Republic. At this “assembly” (5.43-103), which Aeneas calls prior to the games of Book 5, only *socii* appear to be included at least initially.<sup>98</sup> More crucially, its purpose is merely the announcement of the games and injunction to perform the necessary sacrifices; it lacks a fundamental deliberative character. Instead, it comes across as a meeting of a single-willed Trojan people under its now sole *princeps*: Aeneas speaks “from a mounded eminence” (*tumulique ex aggere*, 5.44), and the people obey his command to “be silent all, and wreath your brows with leaves,” (5.71). The youth, specifically, follow the lead of Aeneas, Helymnus, Acestes, and Ascanius (*sequitur quos cetera pubes*, 5.74). Most importantly, the people join Aeneas in the sacrifices preceding the games:

ille e concilio multis cum milibus ibat  
ad tumulum, magna medius comitante caterva. (5.75-7)

Then from the assembly to the mound he passed, amid many thousands, the centre of the great attending throng.

This passage differs from similar depictions of leaders who are accompanied by great crowds in that the other leaders are all doomed.<sup>99</sup> This scene, in contrast, projects a calm dignity, and the content is not a warlike or tense situation, but an unhurried sacrifice. Though this scene is relatively unusual, it reflects – in spite of the sedition of the *Troades* to come – the already well-established Trojan sense of collectivity, as well as their political virtue in acknowledging their rightful leader.<sup>100</sup> In this sense, they echo distantly the *miserabile vulgus* of Book 2 (798), but they have come a long way towards the fulfillment of their destiny.

---

<sup>98</sup>5.43-44: *socios in coetum litore ab omni advocat Aeneas*. However, see Cairns 58-59, who claims that this council involves all of the Trojan people (which may be the case), and “anticipates the later council of the gods and of the Italians.”

<sup>99</sup> See note 23.

<sup>100</sup> In Book 2, Aeneas relates to Dido that the crowd was prepared to obey him, but there is almost a note of surprise in his treatment of the whole scene (i.e. *admirans numerum*, 797). See

As the poem progresses, the Trojans continue to operate as a wholly collective entity that, far from coming across as a mindless race of automatons, shows remarkable self-sufficiency and political maturity. With the good leadership of Aeneas, the Trojans no longer need to act up in rebellion. In their place, the Latins take up the mantle of the unruly urban mob, the *ignobile vulgus*. In any case, both the Trojans and the Latins are conquered in war immediately following their “assembly” episodes, but neither is doomed to final destruction or ignominy. An unruly mob, it would seem, does not spell ultimate doom for the group that gives rise to it; on the contrary, it may hint at that group’s vitality – the presence of a basic political virtue. Of course, the Trojans do not need a formal assembly to show their basic virtues, and in fact throughout a large portion of the poem, they are far too occupied with the work of exile (and later of war) to spend time in assemblies.

---

Heinze, 63. Not that Aeneas lacks the requisite leadership ability at this stage, but his statement acknowledges that the situation of having people ready to obey him (2.799-800) is new to him.

### III. THE CROWD IN TRANSIT

A Trojan identity has already been established during and in the aftermath of the downfall of Troy,<sup>1</sup> but it is not until the trials and travails of their sea voyage that the Trojans come into their own in the sense of refining that essential identity. During this process, the Trojans are constantly in motion, always putting out to sail or keeping up with offerings to one deity or another, while the more stationary peoples they encounter – especially the Carthaginians – provide a hopeful paradigm for a future ideal of urbanized repose.<sup>2</sup> The constant activity the Trojans display while on their travels demonstrates their essential character as inclusive of others, obedient and efficient, pious, competitive, enduring of hard work and dignified in suffering, and perhaps most importantly, capable of almost single-minded collective activity. In almost all of these respects, the Trojans set themselves apart from their Homeric predecessors, the ἑταῖροι of Odysseus.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In the informal assembly concerning the horse and in their gathering at the end of Book 2. The events during the fall of the city, including the night battle, will not be treated in this project because it consists primarily of the actions of a small band of men who gather around Aeneas (and who are either killed eventually or desert him), but there is no general organization of Trojan forces (See Heinze, 20).

<sup>2</sup> They had been the “instruments of their own misfortune” in Book 2, but Book 3 will show them as “the instrument of the regeneration of their hopes” (Quinn 1968, 124).

<sup>3</sup> Schauer, 259.

## A. SAILORS AND EXILES

The Trojans begin to take their first steps toward becoming an urban populace very early in their travels. At the opening of Book 3, Aeneas continues his tale of the Trojans who have only just become a *miserabile vulgus* (2.798). Often Aeneas and the *proceres* or *duces* have been distinguished from the *populus*, as at 3.58-61, where Aeneas reports the omen of Polydorus to the chiefs and follows their common *sententia* on the matter.<sup>4</sup> More often, Aeneas implicates himself as one of the people. All of them, after all, start out in this book as exiles:

...feror exsul in altum  
cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis. (3.11-12)

An exile, I fare forth upon the deep, with my comrades and son, my household gods and the great deities. Naturally, their chief motivating desire is to have a home of their own. When they arrive in Crete, in a line that belies a longer passage of time than the swift narrative lets on, Aeneas immediately exhorts the men to build their new city, Pergamum, and the youth begin to marry and tend to the fields (*conubiis arvisque novis operata iuventus*, 3.136), while Aeneas himself gives laws and homes (3.137). The Trojans' desperate need for a stable home and land reflects a basic human aspiration. Livy's discourse on the birth of *libertas* in a people (2.1.4-6)<sup>5</sup> cites this precise sort of situation as a prerequisite for civilization.

---

<sup>4</sup> Horsfall 1995 points out that Aeneas' use of *refero* "suggests a respectful, Roman procedure of consulting the senate" (121). Aeneas' report at 3.60-1 of the outcome of this council, that "all are of one mind" (*omnibus idem animus*) to depart from Thrace seems to refer immediately only to the *proceres*, but Schauer infers that the decision must be supported by the greater populace as well: "Wenn auch hier die Einstimmigkeit in der angedeuteten Ratsversammlung gemeint ist, so insinuiert die Formulierung *omnibus idem animus*, daß dieser Entschluß auch beim ganzen Volk Beifall findet" (239).

<sup>5</sup> See subsection I.B.



The relationship between leader and group at this stage in the poem is already very close.<sup>6</sup> Aeneas often uses the first person plural to describe himself and his people.<sup>7</sup> He uses the third person plural, normally with *socii* or *Teucrici*, with about the same frequency. Although the term *socii* can refer to the Trojans as a whole or the sailors specifically,<sup>8</sup> this group bears little resemblance to Odysseus' troublesome bunch. They do not complain, they follow orders, and they are scrupulously religious. In turn, Aeneas is attentive to his people's needs, and he never leaves a man behind who does not wish to be left behind.<sup>9</sup> Most deaths that occur are from natural causes (Anchises) or the intervention of the gods (Palinurus, who in fact dies as an expiation to Neptune for the common good, though he does not know it: "one life shall be given for many," (*unum pro multis dabitur caput*, 5.815). The failure at oracular interpretation on the part of Anchises leads to an indeterminate number of Trojan deaths in Crete.<sup>10</sup> Only the foolhardy Misenus (6.162-174) brings about an unnecessary death through (his own) foolish behavior.<sup>11</sup> Among the Trojans, leaders and led are united through mutual responsibility. Aeneas and Anchises lead their men competently and show qualities of obedience and efficiency themselves, and as a result, the men return the favor.<sup>12</sup> Aeneas never has cause to call his men

---

<sup>6</sup> Schauer remarks that they are fundamentally one in their unanimity (289).

<sup>7</sup> Approximately 20 occurrences, though 3.6 and 3.8 appear to refer to a group of *proceres* who gather the common people and thus reflects an "us" versus "them" viewpoint rather than the more typical inclusive "we."

<sup>8</sup> Schauer remarks that "*socii*" or "*comites*" are often used for the entire group in order to show that all the Trojans are – literally and figuratively – in the same boat, "im selben Boot" (68).

<sup>9</sup> At 3.190, *paucis relictis* squares with the legend that Aeneas founded the city of Pergamum (Connington/Nettleship and Williams on 3.190). These, we hope, would have been volunteers and not castaways like the unfortunate Achaemenides.

<sup>10</sup> The description of Trojan plague deaths is somehow both placid and impersonal in its tone: *linquebant dulcis animas et aegra trahebant corpora* (3.140-141).

<sup>11</sup> Elpenor's death (due to a drunken fall) (*Od.* 10.552ff.), is clearly on a lower level than that of Misenus. Misenus' pursuit of excellence at least lends to his death an element of dignity.

<sup>12</sup> See Schauer, 239-41, 259.

foolish, e.g. “They in their great folly did not listen” (τοὶ δὲ μέγα νήπιοι οὐκ ἐπίθοντο, *Od.* 9.44), nor does Aeneas ever lament, as Odysseus does, “we were lost through their own folly” (αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθ’ ἀφραδίησιν, *Od.* 10.27).<sup>13</sup>

### 1. Collective Activity and Perspective

The traveling crowd in exile is busy more often than not. Much of their action takes the form of the simple, collective work involved in building and then manning the ships, leading them out to sea, and bringing them in at the various ports of call. In this regard, they are similar to Odysseus’ men; the latter may have the capacity for collectivity, but they also have a far more rebellious streak. The *Aeneadae* act in single-minded unity: In Book 1: 157-5 (they strive to reach shore) and 210-215 (prepare food and eat).<sup>14</sup> In Book 3: 4-8 (we are driven in exile, build a fleet, and muster the men), 124-7 (we leave Ortygia, fly over the sea, and steer between islands) 131 (we glide to Crete), 200-4 (we are shaken from our course and wander), 222-4 (we slay cattle, build couches and eat), 268 (we flee on the waves), 272 (we flee the rocks of Ithaca), 276 (we sail to Apollo’s shrine and draw near the town), 291-3 (we graze the shores of Epirus, enter the harbor, and approach the city), 506 (we are conveyed upon the sea), 509-510 (we rest), 519-520 (we break camp, start on our way, and spread the sails), 532 (the *socii* trim the sails and twist the ships to shore), 549-550 (we turn the ships from Greek islands and leave), 564-5 (we are raised and sink on the waves), 569 (we drift up to the Cyclops’ shores), and 666-8 (we set out quietly to avoid Polyphemus). In Book 5: 32-34 (they seek the harbor of Sicily and turn in to

---

<sup>13</sup> Williams (1990) perceptively identifies Aeneas as a “social man” who “has to bring his lesser men safely to Hesperia with him” in contrast to the “great individualist” Odysseus, whose “lesser men are all lost” (28).

<sup>14</sup> This latter episode (1.210-215) to be discussed in detail below follows chronologically upon the bulk of their voyage and has further significance to the Trojans’ development as a people.

shore) and 830-832 (all set the sheets, let out the canvas, and turn the yard-arms). In Book 6: 2-8 (they glide to Cumae, turn the prows seaward, a band of youth leaps forth, builds fires, hunts, and looks for water). In Book 7: 10 (they skirt the shore).

At times, the sailors (Aeneas included) are only taking in their sense impressions in a common perspective as they sail. Occasionally, these are related impersonally: the clouds snatch the sky and day from the eyes of the Trojans when the storm hits (1.88-89), the rumor of Helenus reaches their ears (*Hic incredibilis rerum fama occupat auris*, 3.294), and the noise of Circe's animals is heard (7.15-18). More often Aeneas makes use of the first-person plural: 3.220-1 (we see cattle), 522-3 (we see Italy), 556 (we hear the sea), 567 (we see the stars), 584 (we do not see what makes the sound), 593 (we look back), and 655-8 (we see Cyclops coming). But of course, these elements of the communal voyage are not necessarily unique to Aeneas and the Trojans; Odysseus also includes himself with his men when describing events.<sup>15</sup> Both Odysseus' and Aeneas' men are on a communal voyage, but closer investigation reveals a Trojan character and destiny that is far removed from that of their Greek counterparts.

## 2. Collective Piety

A major category of Trojan crowd activity has to do with religion. Piety is not only a characteristic of Aeneas. The reader has already been party to Ilioneus' speech, in which he asks Dido and the Carthaginians to "spare a pious race" (*parce pio generi*, 1.526), and Anchises reminds the gods that the Trojans are pious, "graciously save the pious" (*placidi servate pios*, 3.266), when they leave the Strophades. When taken in comparison with Odysseus' travels as he relates them to the Phaeacians, it is apparent that Odysseus' comrades and the *Aeneadae* display

---

<sup>15</sup> E.g. *Od.* 9.231-3, 236; 10.27, 56-63.

remarkably different attitudes towards religion. Odysseus' men only engage in religious activity when they offer sacrifices before meeting the Cyclops (*Od.* 9.231-3), when they lift their hands to Zeus after the Cyclops eats their comrades (*Od.* 9.294-5), when entering the underworld (after Odysseus himself has ordered them to do so) (*Od.* 11.44-7), and during the sacrifice of the cattle of the sun, a blatant act of impiety in itself, which they carry out contrary to Odysseus' wishes (*Od.* 12.353-363).

In Book 3 alone, the Trojans demonstrate more piety than Odysseus' men do over the course of all of their travels: 3.62-8 (we hold funeral rites for Polydorus – Trojan women included), 88 (Aeneas asks Apollo whom we should follow), 93 (we fall to earth before Phoebus), 118-20 (sacrifices are made to Neptune, Apollo, and the Zephyrs), 222-3 (we call upon the gods to partake of the plunder),<sup>16</sup> 278-280 (we pray to Jove and make offerings prior to the Actian games), and 3.543-7 (we pray to Pallas who accepts the prayers, we veil ourselves, and offer sacrifice to Juno). In Book 5: 72-4 (the youth veil their heads with myrtle), and 100-103 (the *socii* prepare sacrifices prior to the games in Sicily). In Book 6: 176-182 (the *socii* work to prepare an altar for Misenus' tomb), and 212-228 (they celebrate Misenus' funeral). One more passage, Helenus' instructions to the Trojans, is also revelatory:

hunc socii morem sacrorum, hunc ipse teneto;  
hac casti maneant in religione nepotes. (3.408-9)

Hold to this mode of sacrifice, you and your company; let your children's children in purity stand fast.

---

<sup>16</sup> This is in the context of the Trojans killing the cattle and goats in the Strophades. Putnam is concerned that the Trojans have seized the cattle “without hesitation or hint of concern over the legality of their act” (Putnam 1980, 4), and that “Aeneas, unlike his Homeric predecessor” is proven “to be as culpably blind as his men” (Putnam 1980, 14) in joining in with them in the plunder. Yet he conveniently neglects to mention the Trojans' thoughtful prayer.

Putnam remarks that this passage suggests “stability,”<sup>17</sup> but it comes with the important instruction that the Trojans are to “hold to” the custom in order to keep their descendants *casti...in religione*. This is a grave responsibility, one that hints at the importance of piety as a central Trojan trait. Of the use of the word *nepotes*, Toll remarks that every time it is used in the *Aeneid*, it has a proleptic sense.<sup>18</sup> In other words, this passage makes direct mention of a concrete identification between the Trojan and Roman crowd. Both are outstandingly pious.

Trojan piety is rewarded in Book 7 when Neptune spares the pious Trojans (this is the only instance in which *pious* modifies a proper noun referring to them) from suffering a run-in with Circe, as Odysseus’ (rather impious)<sup>19</sup> crew had:

quae ne monstra pii paterentur talia Troes  
delati in portus, neu litora dira subirent,  
Neptunus ventis implevit vela secundis,  
atque fugam dedit et praeter vada fervida vexit. (7.21-4)

But so that the pious Trojans should not suffer so monstrous a fate on entering the harbor and setting foot on the accursed shore, Neptune filled their sails with favoring winds, giving them flight, and bore them past the seething shallows.

The Trojans’ piety has begun to pay off for them, but they still have much to accomplish.

### 3. Political Virtue at Sea: Obedience and Efficiency

In some cases, those involving the actions both of sailing and of performing religious rites, the poet goes out of his way to tell us that the Trojans are eager and quick to follow orders<sup>20</sup> – a clear indication of their political virtue. In Book 3: 3.69-72 (as soon the sea is favorable, the *socii* launch ships and we are carried from the port), 3.207 (the sailors don’t delay *haud mora* to get

---

<sup>17</sup> Putnam 1980, 8.

<sup>18</sup> Eleven occurrences (Toll 1997, 43). See CHAPTER I for more on the *nepotes* theme.

<sup>19</sup> Servius remarks that Odysseus’ men suffered the fate they did because they were *impii* (Williams on 7.21). Trojan “*pietas* deserves divine protection in return” (Fordyce on 7.21).

<sup>20</sup> Schauer, 193.

going). In Book 5: 32-3 (they make for the harbor of Sicily after Aeneas' words *haec ubi dicta* and turn in to shore). In Book 6: 176-182 (all without delay *haud mora festinant* obey the commands of the Sibyl and build the altar for Misenus), 212-228 (the Trojans hold Misenus' funeral), and 248-249 (others, *alii*, assist the Sibyl and Aeneas in the sacrifices that will allow Aeneas to enter the underworld). This sort of reaction is not unique to Aeneas' men; Odysseus' comrades are also quick to obey on numerous occasions,<sup>21</sup> but there are many instances – for better or worse – in which they do not act in accord with their leader's wishes.<sup>22</sup>

There are several more significant instances of obedient and efficient collective behavior. Aeneas is able to order the *socii* to go into battle against the Harpies,<sup>23</sup> and they respond efficiently to a signal from Misenus:

...sociis tunc arma capessant  
 edico, et dira bellum cum gente gerendum.  
 haud secus ac iussi faciunt tectosque per herbam  
 disponunt ensis et scuta latentia condunt.  
 ergo ubi delapsae sonitum per curva dedere  
 litora, dat signum specula Misenus ab alta  
 aere cavo. invadunt socii et nova proelia temptant  
 obscenas pelagi ferro foedare volucris (3.234-241).

Then I bid my comrades seize arms and declare war on the fell race. They do as they are bidden, lay their swords in hiding in the grass, and bury their shields out of sight. So when, swooping down, the birds screamed along the winding shore, Misenus on his hollow brass gave the signal from his watch aloft. My comrades charge, and essay a strange combat, to despoil with the sword those filthy birds of ocean.

This reaction, however, could be attributed to the men's military discipline, as it clearly comprises only the fighting men.<sup>24</sup> Later, there are several examples in which both the *socii* and

---

<sup>21</sup> Odysseus' men acting or obeying swiftly: *Od.* 9.103-4, 156-8, 177-180, 468-72, 484-86, 563-566; 10.128-9, 178-80; 11.638; 12.199-200, 222, and 401-2.

<sup>22</sup> Odysseus' men's disobedience: *Od.* 9.43-4 (refusal to stop sacking Cicones), 224-8 (urging Odysseus to steal some of the Cyclops' food and escape), 492-500 (urging Odysseus not to taunt the Cyclops), 10.34-46 (scheme to unleash the winds), 264-70 (Eurylochus wants to stay behind), 429-38 (Eurylochus disagrees, blames Odysseus for killing men), 441-6 (men prevent Odysseus from killing Eurylochus), 471-5 (men reproach Odysseus for staying with Circe), 12.278-294 (Eurylochus wants to stop because Odysseus is pushing the men too hard), 339-342 (men go along with Eurylochus' scheme to kill the cattle).

<sup>23</sup> The Harpies themselves are described as a "noisy crowd" (*turba sonans*, 3.233).

Aeneas himself follow orders. First, upon the encounter with the temple of Minerva after first sighting Italy and the four auspicious horses, the Trojans follow the advice of Helenus:

...tum numina sancta precamur  
Palladis armisonae, quae prima accepit ovantis  
et capita ante aras Phrygio velamur amictu,  
praeceptisque Heleni, dederat quae maxima, rite  
Iunoni Argivae iussos adolemus honores.  
Haud mora, continuo perfectis ordine uotis  
cornua velatarum obvertimus antemnarum  
Graiugenumque domos suspectaque linquimus arva. (3.543-550)

Then we pray to the holy power of Pallas, queen of clashing arms, who first welcomed our cheers, before the altar veil our heads in Phrygian robe, and, following the urgent charge which Helenus had given, duly offer to Argive Juno the prescribed sacrifice. At once, soon as our vows are paid in full, we point seaward the horns of our sail-clad yards, and leave the homes of the Greek-born race and the fields we distrust.

Not only have the Trojans (Aeneas included) acted on their own out of piety in offering sacrifice to Pallas who had welcomed them as they cheered upon sighting Italy (*ovantis*, referring to 3.523-4),<sup>25</sup> they have acted out of obedience by following the injunction of Helenus to pray to Juno, and then efficiently got on their way. The prayer to Pallas, in other words, was reflective of piety, but the men could not have known that they were to offer this special, additional sacrifice to Juno. Aeneas must have given them some instruction to that effect, as he was the only person party to Helenus' prophecies. After the rites, they set off "at once" (*haud mora*, 548). Later, speed and obedience are again in evidence as Anchises (who incidentally fills the role of leader of the Trojans more fully than his son at this juncture) orders the *socii* to steer away from Charybdis, and they do this as bidden (*haud minus ac iussi faciunt*, 3.561). Aeneas even includes himself among those following orders on one occasion when they arrive in Ortygia: "as bidden, we worship the great gods of the land" (*iussi numina magna loci veneramur*, 3.697).

---

<sup>24</sup> Horsfall on 3.236 comments that the Trojans "behave like good Roman soldiers."

<sup>25</sup> *Ovantis*: "no more, perhaps, than rejoicing, but tinged with ritual" (Horsfall on 3.544).

The most informative example of the Trojans' obedience and efficiency is their behavior when Aeneas gives the order to leave Carthage: "at once all gladly obey his command and do his bidding" (*ocius omnes imperio laeti parent et iussa facessunt*, 4.294-5) and Dido points out to Anna the sailors bustling about on the shore (4.416-8). The implications of this will be discussed in more detail below.

#### 4. *Certamina*

Another distinguishing quality of the Trojans is their competitiveness. In Book 2 it is apparent when the Trojans strive with one another to mock Sinon (*certantque inludere capto*, 2.64), a correct if ignoble reaction. The quality will be developed and directed into more positive channels in the games of Book 5, but it can already be detected in the Actian games and in the Trojans' earlier travels. The Trojans do not squabble; they exhibit a friendly competitive spirit that can be prized as a desirable quality, even insofar as individuals are part of a collective whole.<sup>26</sup> Their real-life competitiveness first manifests itself in the activity of sailing. A *nauticus clamor* arises "in varied rivalry" (*vario certamine*, 3.128) as the Trojans determine in agreement with Anchises to approach Crete.<sup>27</sup> The *socii* exhort themselves and their leaders (*hortantur*) to seek Crete (*Cretam proavosque petamus*, 3.129). This type of competition is also in evidence immediately following the briefly related Actian games. Both following the Actian games (3.290), and after the more elaborate games of Book 5, the men show competition in the activity of sailing: "with rival strokes his comrades lash the sea and sweep the waters" (*certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora verrunt*, 3.290 and 5.778). It is as though the games –

---

<sup>26</sup> Caesar praises his soldiers Vorenus and Pullo for this very quality (*Bellum Gallicum* 5.44).

<sup>27</sup> Horsfall suggests that the *certamina* are between the different ships, and thus a prelude to the ship race (Horsfall on 3.128).



notwithstanding the nasty incident of the burning of the ships – have given the highly competitive Trojans a second wind.<sup>28</sup> The Actian/Trojan games themselves are related only briefly:

Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis.  
exercent patrias oleo labente palaestras  
nudati socii: iuvat evasisse tot urbes  
Argolicas mediosque fugam tenuisse per hostis. (3.280-283)

...and (we) through the Actian shores in the games of Ilium. My comrades strip and, sleek with oil, engage in their native wrestling bouts, glad to have slipped past so many Argive towns, and kept on their flight through the midst of foes.

The Trojan competitive spirit, affirmed and strengthened by the travels and games of Books 3 and 5, carries the Trojans forward with energy and determination, even when they are suffering.<sup>29</sup> In a strangely touching vignette in Book 6, for example, they “strive” (*certant*) even in building Misenus’ funeral pyre:

...tum iussa Sibyllae  
haud mora, festinant flentes aramque sepulcri  
congerere arboribus caeloque educere certant. (6.176-8)

Then, weeping, they quickly carry out the Sibyl’s commands, and strive to pile up trees for the altar of his tomb and rear it to the sky.

##### 5. Suffering of the *Dardanidae Duri*

Weariness, sorrow, uncertainty, and fear follow the Trojans wherever they sail prior to arriving in Italy. In fact, their endurance of this suffering is central to their identity,<sup>30</sup> but they must carry it out to the end, as even the Penates have to remind Aeneas not to “shrink from the long toil of

---

<sup>28</sup> Kristol, 34.

<sup>29</sup> In escaping from the Cyclops, e.g., they sail away “with eager oars” (*certantibus...remis*, 3.668).

<sup>30</sup> McGushin treats this in detail as a trait of both Aeneas and the Trojans (226-9). Heinze remarks that much of what Aeneas suffers is of an emotional rather than a physical nature, in contrast to Odysseus. However, “Virgil certainly did not intend to give the impression that his hero had an easier lot” (Heinze, 84).

flight” (*longumque fugae ne linque laborem*, 3.160). Aeneas encourages his men along these lines in his speech after the storm.<sup>31</sup>

O socii (neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum),  
o passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem. (1.198-199)

O comrades – for ere this we have not been ignorant of misfortune – you who have suffered worse, this also god will end.

But the end does not come easily. Venus, identifying herself strongly with her Trojan progeny, complains to Jupiter of the many deaths they have suffered for the sake of Italy (*quibus tot funera passis*, 1.232), and has to question him on “what end of their toils” (*quem das finem....laborum*, 1.241) is in store. The toils consist in being “tried by so many disasters” (*tot casibus actos*, 1.240), betrayal on account of the anger of one (Juno), and being kept from Italy (*prodium atque Italiam longe disiungimur oris*, 1.252). For the most part, they rise to their challenges with grace and quiet dignity. As Schauer notes, the Trojans actually tend to take on difficulties willingly.<sup>32</sup> Helenus gives Aeneas the prophecy of Apollo to go to see the Sibyl at Cumae no matter how much his comrades complain (*quamvis increpitent socii*, 3.454), but the Trojans do not complain, either about this or any other of their travails. Perhaps there is a subtle dig here at Odysseus’ men, who are notorious complainers. The Trojans, by contrast, tend to be perceived by others as pitiful, but they themselves do not say as much.<sup>33</sup> Apollo addresses the Trojans as *Dardanidae duri* (3.94), and Achaemenides urges them to flee, calling them “*miseri*”

---

<sup>31</sup> The model passage, *Od.* 12.208ff. differs considerably in that “Odysseus is unsure of his men” but “sure of himself,” whereas Aeneas “trusts his men, and gives them credit for steadfastness” (Austin on 1.198ff.).

<sup>32</sup> Schauer, 167.

<sup>33</sup> Passages that feature Aeneas or another leader referring to Trojan sufferings for diplomatic purposes (e.g. Ilioneus using *Troes...miseri* as the subject of a first person plural verb (1.524-525) provide more information about politics and diplomacy than actual characterization of the Trojan crowd.

(3.639).<sup>34</sup> Another common designation for the Trojans throughout the first half of the poem is that of being the *reliquiae* of Troy or, more commonly of the Greeks.<sup>35</sup>

The most persistent attribute of the Trojans' suffering is their weariness.<sup>36</sup> They are the *defessi Aeneadae* (1.157)<sup>37</sup> after the storm as they turn in to the shore of Carthage. They are, again, *fessi rerum* (178) as they begin to prepare their meal. In the more extended sea-voyage narrative of Book 3 this weariness is even more pronounced. Delos receives the weary Trojans (78), and Aeneas prays for a home for the weary (85). After the plague, Aeneas states his determination to ask Apollo again about an end for their weary lot (*fessis...rebus*, 145). Later, they (Aeneas included) are weary as they approach Apollo's temple at Actium (276). On the night before sighting Italy, they are weary (511), and the wind deserts the weary Trojans at sunset before they drift to Sicily (568-9). The tone of this weariness, however, changes as the Trojans approach their destination. In Book 5, Acestes consoles the weary Trojans with friendly cheer (41). On the night after the games, the sailors are not weary but relaxed, they "relaxed their limbs in quiet rest" (*placida laxabant membra quiete* 5.836-7). The exceptions, ominously, are the mutinous women and those who are left behind in Sicily (5.615-6 and 717). Once they arrive in Italy, weariness is a thing of the past for the Trojans.

---

<sup>34</sup> This latter address, however, could be taken as merely in reference to the immediate danger of a Cyclops attack.

<sup>35</sup> *reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli* (1.30, 3.87), *reliquias Danaum* (1.598), *dulcisque meorum reliquias* (4.342-3), *reliquias Troiae* (5.787).

<sup>36</sup> Non-Trojan groups who are "*fessi*" include Mezentius' Etruscans before they rise up and cast him into exile (8.478) and the Latins during the war (11.335 and 12.593).

<sup>37</sup> The poet ceases to refer to the Trojans as *defessi* after Book 2 (cf. 2.285 of Aeneas himself seeing Hector and 565 of the men who desert Aeneas in battle).

Sorrow besets the Trojans on several occasions during their travels, but they do not feel sorry for themselves.<sup>38</sup> The Trojans always mourn for those who are lost or deceased. In Book 1 their sorrow is directed at comrades whom they suppose to have been lost at sea (1.197 and 217-9). In the latter passage, “in long discourse they yearn for their lost comrades” (*amissos longo socios sermone requirunt*). At 6.175-6 and 212-235, there is mourning for the untimely death of Misenus. Trojan sorrow is not restricted to Trojans, however. The men are even capable of feeling sorrow for Dido on suspecting her passing (5.5-7),<sup>39</sup> a clear indication of their inclusive nature. In contrast, however, we have the almost incessant lamentations of Odysseus’ men, who weep only for the loss of their friends and their own misfortunes.<sup>40</sup> With their city in ruins and no familiar home to which to return,<sup>41</sup> the Trojans might be said to have more reason for sorrow than Odysseus’ men, but self-pity is not the Trojan way.

Trojan sorrow is most poignant as the Trojans are about to depart from Sicily and leave behind a portion of their own. A “mighty wail” (*ingens...fletus*) arises along the shore (5.765), and the people delay the departure through embracing one another (*complexi inter se noctemque diemque morantur*, 5.766). The physical separation of one segment of the *populus* from its main body appears to mark an unusually difficult event for the Trojans, being diminished in numbers as they are. The mothers and some of the men who had been weary of the sea now wish to go along with Aeneas and his men, but this is not to be (5.765-769). The sedition of the women has

---

<sup>38</sup> Horsfall’s characterization (1989, 11) of the Trojans’ state as “depression” seems excessive.

<sup>39</sup> Quinn sees the men as “in the background” (1968, 153), yet it is not with Aeneas (5.1), but with the sorrowing *Teucrorum pectora* that the poet closes the Dido episode (5.7).

<sup>40</sup> Weeping and lamentation on the part of Odysseus and his men: *Od.* 9.294-5, 306, 436, 466-7, 543-5, 563-6, 10.48-9, 55, 133-4, 142-4, 198-202, 206-9, 397-9, 408-9, 453-7 (Circe tells Odysseus to check the men’s weeping), 566-8 (about going to Hades), 11.5, 12.12, 234, and 309-11. Odysseus’ men are also more vocally and visually sad than the *Aeneadae*, e.g.: κλαίοντες, στενάχοντες, γοῶντες, ὀδυρόμενοι, ὀλέσαντες, θαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες, etc.

<sup>41</sup> Morwood (1991) discusses the implications of this for Aeneas himself, but not for his men (216).

disqualified this group from inclusion in the Trojan crowd. Aeneas consoles these people and leaves them with Acestes (5.770-771).<sup>42</sup> In the final estimation, Trojan sorrow is infrequently expressed, and measured and appropriate to the occasion when it is.

The Trojans are frequently in a state of doubt during their travels (*dubii* or *incerti*),<sup>43</sup> but nowhere after Book 3 is this expressed.<sup>44</sup> In Book 1, Aeneas' comrades are *dubii* "between hope and fear" regarding the fate of their lost friends (1.218). At the opening of Book 3, they are *incerti* as to where the fates will bear them (3.7). Otis (typical of many commentators who reduce "the Trojans" to "Aeneas") points out that Odysseus' men know where they are going, but Aeneas "is hampered primarily by his uncertainty."<sup>45</sup> Indeed, the fates will bear them along in this state for some time, as they remind Helenus of their status, "we are still summoned from fate to fate," (*nos alia ex aliis in fata vocamur*, 3.494). They seem to be downright lost (*ignarique viae*, 3.569) when they drift to the coast of Sicily where the Cyclops lives.

The Trojans are fearful on a few occasions, though it is always expressed with subtlety.<sup>46</sup> In the storm in Book 1, the "cries of men" are heard with the "creaking of cables" (*clamorque virum stridorque rudentum*, 1.87). Fear is not mentioned in the context of the men, but Aeneas is said to be fearful a few lines later (92), and so clearly their shouts are due to fear. He exhorts his

---

<sup>42</sup> See subsection V.B for more on this episode.

<sup>43</sup> Uncertainty had lead to trouble earlier in the poem: *scinditur incertum studia in contraria uulgus* (2.39). See II.B.2.

<sup>44</sup> In the underworld, Anchises poses the enigmatic question to his son: "do we still hesitate to make known our worth by exploits or shrink in fear from settling on Western soil?" (*et dubitamus adhuc virtutem extendere factis, aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?* 6.806-807). The actual recent Trojan behavior does not reflect this hesitation. Anchises may be going on outdated information, though he does show awareness of the stop in Carthage (6.694). Schauer also notes that the Trojans are no longer *incerti* by the time of their delegation to Latinus in Book 7 (152).

<sup>45</sup> Otis, 251.

<sup>46</sup> Fear on the part of Odysseus' men is more common, though usually quite warranted: *Od.* 9.74-5, 236, 256-7; 10.219, 447-8; 12.203-4, 243-6.

men in the speech after the storm to “recall your courage and banish sad fear” (*revocate animos maestumque timorem mittite*, 1.202-203), reminding them of the dangers they had already overcome. A “chill shudder” (*gelidus...tremor*) runs through the Teucrians “sturdy frames” (*dura...ossa*) when the Sibyl begins her prophecy (6.54-5); here, Trojan strength offsets their fear.<sup>47</sup> At times, the fear is more severe. In Book 3 when the men are staying in Sicily, it is said that they bore “monstrous horrors” (*immania monstra...perferimus*, 3.583-584) in the woods, but again, the focus is on their endurance. The only obvious cases of outright fear (*trepidi*) are during the actual escape from the Cyclops (3.666), an understandable source of fear if ever there was one, and 3.259 where the *socii* are afraid due to Celaeno’s prophecy. This latter instance of fear leads to demoralization, a more serious but not insurmountable condition for the Trojans.

Demoralization sets in as the Trojans express dissatisfaction with their sufferings after the Harpy attack and Celaeno’s prophecy. Here, the *socii* beg Aeneas to sue for peace, but without overt complaint:

at sociis subita gelidus formidine sanguis  
deriguit; cecidere animi, nec iam amplius armis,  
sed votis precibusque iubent exposcere pacem,  
sive deae seu sint dirae obscenaeque volucres. (3.259-262)

But my comrades’ blood chilled and froze with sudden fear; their spirit fell, and no longer with arms, but with vows and prayers they now bid me sue for peace, whether these be goddesses, or dread and ill-omened birds.

Anchises capitulates immediately in the form of a prayer to the gods (3.263-6), but there is no reason to believe there was ever a real disconnect between the intention of the leaders and the rank and file in this circumstance. The fact that the Trojans do make their feelings known,<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Austin on 6.54ff.

<sup>48</sup> Horsfall remarks (on 3.260) that this is a “regular form of Virgilian reference to popular clamor.”

however, is an important step towards regaining the political involvement of an urbanized populace. That their leaders heed them testifies to their unity with the populace and attentiveness to their needs.<sup>49</sup>

## 6. Trojans and Greeks: The Achaemenides Episode

With the crowd's misgivings settled, the leaders share with the crowd a common negative impulse in their hatred of Ulysses by cursing his land (*terram altricem saevi exsecramur Ulixi*, 3.273). The word *exsecror* used here is one of only two appearances in Vergil.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, while it is rather common in a political context, it is a most unusual word in epic. It is not in this case that the Trojans are doing something beneath their dignity, but that they are rightfully condemning, in language suited perfectly to such a circumstance, a man and a political model completely at odds with their own.

Despite this dreadful hatred for Ulysses (and, it might be argued, for Greeks in general), the Trojans show their capacity for showing kindness to a suffering individual Greek in their impulse to welcome the groveling and pitiful Greek castaway Achaemenides. This episode depicts in essence a reversal of fortunes from the Trojan situation in Book 2. As Putnam observes, “a Greek becomes *supplex* before Trojans gradually gaining control over their own destiny.”<sup>51</sup>

...qui sit fari, quo sanguine cretus,  
hortamur, quae deinde agitet fortuna fateri. (3.608-9)

We urge him to tell who he is, of what blood born, and then what fortune pursues him.

---

<sup>49</sup> Aeneas takes the opinions, worries, and interests of his people seriously, “Aeneas nimmt die Meinungen, Ängste, und Interessen seiner Leute ernst” (Schauer, 243).

<sup>50</sup> The other is in 11.271 (See subsection II.C.2).

<sup>51</sup> Putnam 1980, 12.

In support of this general gesture of acceptance, Anchises offers Achaemenides his hand (610-11). Yasmin Sayed discusses the importance of this episode in its confirmation of “a characteristic trait of the Trojans – their trust, while at the same time showing that it is a noble trait.”<sup>52</sup> As was also the case in the Sinon episode that it obviously mirrors, however, simple trust is not so much in evidence as pity. True, the Trojans are credulous, but this, as Yavetz observes, is a characteristic of all crowds.<sup>53</sup> The Trojans’ primary characteristic here (as in Book 2) is their capacity for showing pity: *his lacrimis vitam damus, et miserescimus ultro* (2.145). Seeing as Troy is already destroyed, and no hostile Greek army threatens the Trojans, there is no reasonable cause for the Trojans to fear this man. Standing only to gain from bringing him, they are rewarded not only with a good story about Ulysses and the Cyclops, but also with his knowledge of some of the local islands (3.687-691).<sup>54</sup> Even so, sparing him counts to the Trojans’ credit; it is, in Putnam’s words, “a primal Roman civilizing act.”<sup>55</sup>

The Achaemenides episode also lends further evidence of the distinction Vergil has drawn between Aeneas’ men and the *hetairoi* of Odysseus.<sup>56</sup> Even in a passage that is often taken to be in rather a rough state, it is still evident that the poet intended to set the *Aeneadae* on a higher moral plane. Achaemenides’ *socii* are, it turns out, poor *socii* indeed. He sums up his situation when first beginning his story:

hic me, dum trepidi crudelia limina linquent,  
 immemores socii vasto Cyclopi in antro  
 deseruere...(3.616-18)

---

<sup>52</sup> Sayed, 201.

<sup>53</sup> Yavetz, 134. See subsection II.B.5.

<sup>54</sup> Horsfall on 3.588-561.

<sup>55</sup> Putnam 1980, 13.

<sup>56</sup> A word could be said on Apollonius’ Argonauts, but because they were not involved in the Trojan War, they lack the political resonance. Also, their behavior is far more reflective of Odysseus’ men than of the *Aeneadae*.



Here my comrades, when running away in fear from the grim gateway, thoughtlessly left me in the Cyclops' vast cave.

As already has been seen, the Trojans are also described as *trepidi* when they leave Sicily with Achaemenides (3.666). The designation is in itself not such a bad thing, especially in such dire circumstances. Their reaction to their fear is what matters here. The Greeks have left a man behind (*deseruere*, 618); the Trojans do not: “taking on board a suppliant so deserving” (*recepto supplice sic merito*, 666-667) in spite of that fear, which the poet mentions almost simultaneously (3.666). The other adjective besides *trepidi* describing Achaemenides' comrades, *immemores*, carries with it a much less ambiguous negativity.<sup>57</sup> The Greeks have been thoughtless, but the Trojans think to “silently cut the cable” (*tacitique incedere funem*, 667), even as the use of historical infinitives points to efficiency. Although their fear drives them to sail “for any course,” they have the presence of mind to recall Helenus' instructions not to sail through Scylla and Charybdis (684). The Trojans' escape from the Cyclops thus demonstrates their ability to function as an intelligent collective, and not just a fearful mob.

The men of Odysseus as portrayed by Homer manifest a number of problematic characteristics when compared to the *Aeneadae*: they are not demonstrably pious, they weep and lament on far more occasions than Aeneas' men, are fearful, act contrary to their leader's wishes, and behave in a generally foolish and undignified manner. In the men's defense, they make poor decisions no more frequently than their leader does. Also, some of their characteristics could be taken as flukes rather than patterns of behavior due to the outlandishness of their adventures. Yet the lack of piety shown by Odysseus' men, especially in slaughtering the cattle of the sun –

---

<sup>57</sup> A false rumor of Dido and Aeneas calls them *regnorum immemores* (4.194). Euryalus (9.374) is another negative example. Cf. 6.750 of the souls crossing the Lethe.

the very opening of the *Odyssey* tells us as much<sup>58</sup> – is a far more quite literally damning aspect of their character. The sidetrack that the poet allows the *Aeneadae* to take into adventures of Odysseus’ men then has an important function in directing the reader’s attention to the essential differences between the characters of the two groups.

### 7. *Laetitia*

Little has been said about the happiness of the Trojans during their travels. At least the first few times they are said to be happy, the emotion proves to be misguided or premature. Juno notices them happily sailing before she has Aeolus stir up the storm (1.35-8). Three of these examples are in connection with their stay in Crete. After the oracle of Apollo, for example, there is *laetitia* with mixed tumult, and, in one of the few instances in the poem in which the speech of the Trojans is reported word-for word, they all ask where they are going:

...mixtoque ingens exorta tumultu  
laetitia, et cuncti quae sint ea moenia quaerunt,  
quo Phoebus vocet errantis iubeatque reverti. (3.99-101)

...and mighty joy arose, mingled with tumult; all ask, “What walls are those? Wither calls Phoebus the wanderers, bidding them return?”

This speech manifests a healthy curiosity. After the determination to sail for Crete, the sailors (or perhaps all of the Trojans?) raise a cheer, and the *socii* exhort them:

nauticus exoritur vario certamine clamor:  
hortantur socii Cretam proavosque petamus. (3.128-129)

The sailors’ shouts rise in varied rivalry; the crews raise the cheer: ‘On to Crete and our forefathers!’

It is evident that the Trojans here, like the Trojans prior to leading the horse into the city, have

---

<sup>58</sup> “For through their own blind folly they perished – fools, who devoured the kine of Helios Hyperion; but he took from them the day of their returning” (αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο, νήπιοι, οἱ κατὰ βουῆς ‘Υπερίονος’ Ἡλίοιο ἥσθιον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ, *Od.* 1.7-9).

allowed themselves to be lead to a destructive end – in this case, the plague. No one has spoken up about the possibility that Anchises is wrong about the destination. Relatively unfazed by their traumatic experiences on the island, “all rejoicing” (*cuncti...ovantis*) heed Anchises once again after the decision is made to leave Crete (3.189). Of course, they end up blown by a storm to the Strophades, the home of the Harpies.

As the poem progresses, Trojan joy becomes appropriate; they are not prone to premature outbursts. Trojan joy is also measured; there is no occasion that would warrant them being described, as Odysseus’ men are, as “frisking cattle” (*Od.* 10.410-415). The *socii* are glad to have escaped from the Harpies on the occasion of the Actian/Trojan games (*iuvat*, 3.282). They enjoy their time in Buthrotum, “the Teucrians enjoy with me the friendly city” (*Teucri socia simul urbe fruuntur*, 3.352). In both of these situations, they still face impending escapes from the Cyclops, Scylla and Charybdis. Their greeting of Italy “with a happy clamor” (*Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*, 3.524), as the reader well knows, is only the beginning of more turmoil, but at least now, having made the Cretan mistake, they can rest assured that they have interpreted the prophecy correctly. The Trojans are also happy (*laeti parent et iussi facessunt*) upon Aeneas’ order to depart from Carthage (4.295). Dido too senses their joy (*laeti*) as she watches the sailors along the shore. In this case, the Trojans seem to understand more clearly than their leader that they are on the right track.<sup>59</sup> The Book 5 games provide more opportunities for happiness as the Trojans make sacrifices in preparation for the games (5.100-104). Their happiness turns out to be catching, as the neighboring peoples in Sicily fill the shores “in a happy gathering” (*laeto...coetu*, 5.107) to see the *Aeneadae* or to compete (5.104-108). They will also,

---

<sup>59</sup> Austin on 2.295ff, *facessunt*: “Note how uneasy Aeneas’ men have been in Carthage, and compare their simple alacrity with his worried indecision: *they* have no problems like his to complicate their little world.” Terribly dismissive of men who understand the mission of Rome!

of course, be happy upon their arrival in Italy (7.130). Lasting happiness for the Trojans, then, is based not on immediate gratification of their desire for respite from their travels, but in the final attainment of their goals – or even in activities directed toward that attainment.

## B. THE RECOVERY OF CIVILIZATION

The Trojans have already displayed in some form the makings of a settled, civilized people throughout the most trying leg of their journey (related primarily in Book 3). When the reader encounters them following the storm of Book 1, the Trojans are working slowly toward that state, first in their recovery of the basic necessities of life, and then in the affirmation of civilized urban behavior they receive from the people of Carthage. They have already passed through many hardships and seen their own earlier attempts at city foundation collapse in disaster. After the storm, they are picking up the pieces of the settled state that has thus far eluded them:

tum Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma  
expediunt fessi rerum, frugesque receptas  
et torrere parant flammis et frangere saxo. (1.177-9)

Then, wearied with their lot, they take out the grain of Ceres, spoiled by the waves, with the tools of Ceres, and prepare to parch the rescued grain in the fire and crush it under the stone.

The weariness of the Trojans has been established, but it is no obstacle to completing the tasks at hand. The work itself is of interest, and the fact that Vergil takes such pains to describe what is in its essence a mundane, agricultural task should tell us something. It is, for one thing, the recovery of the necessity of bread, a foreshadowing of the humble feast of fruits and grain cakes of which the Trojans will partake in Book 7 (107-115).<sup>60</sup> It is also the sort of slow, laborious work that Livy might qualify as contributing to a love for the land, a *caritas ipsius soli* (Livy

---

<sup>60</sup> This latter episode also makes emphatic use of the metonymic Ceres: *Cereale solum* (7.111) and *exiguam...Cererem* (7.113).

2.1.5), but one that is not as exciting or rewarding as building a city. It is, however, the basic necessity for a settled, urbanized existence, or more, immediately, a militarized one.<sup>61</sup> The passage, as Nisbet remarks, is “more systematic than anything in Homer,”<sup>62</sup> and the reason must be that the Trojans need to be organized in order to survive, and ultimately to fulfill their destiny.

In their second step towards becoming an urban rather than seafaring people, the Trojans become guests at Dido’s banquet. There is some excitement on the part of the chosen party who approach Dido: “chosen men advanced, craving grace, and with loud cries made for the temple” (*lecti...ibant...orantes veniam et templum clamore petebant*, 1.518-9). They allow Ilioneus to speak for them, but they also cheer at his speech, “all the sons of Dardanus loudly shouted assent” (*cuncti simul ore fremebant Dardanidae*, 1.559-560). Both the Trojans and then the Tyrians assemble (*conveniunt*, 1.700, *convenere*, 708) for the banquet, and both groups enjoy themselves: “the Tyrians too are gathered in throngs throughout the festal halls” (*nec non et Tyrii per limina laeta frequentes*, 1.707). Later, the Trojans follow the lead of their hosts in applauding the performance of Iopas: “with shout on shout the Tyrians applaud, and the Trojans follow” (*ingeminant plausu Tyrii, Troesque sequuntur*, 1.747). They politely listen along with the Carthaginians to Aeneas’ retelling of their travels: “All were hushed, and kept their rapt gaze upon him” (*Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant*, 2.1),<sup>63</sup> and he finishes speaking “before an eager throng” (*intentis omnibus*, 3.716). The Trojans are now not only behaving as a settled, civilized people, but they are doing so in civilized situations where they can see more clearly once again what it is like to be settled.

---

<sup>61</sup> Nisbet points out that the Trojans “follow the prosaic priorities of the Roman army” in attending to the lighting of fire and baking of bread (Nisbet, 381).

<sup>62</sup> Nisbet, 381.

<sup>63</sup> Austin asserts that *ora* should be construed as a “variation or extension of *conticuere*”; “utterance” rather than “face or expression” (on 2.1).

### C. CARTHAGINIAN BEES AND TROJAN ANTS

On the surface, the Trojans stopover in Carthage offers Trojans a respite from the hardships of their sea voyage, and, more importantly, a glimpse of what “home” may look like.

Aeneas’ expression of Trojan longing for a home, “happy they whose walls already rise...” (1.437) reveals that the true nature of happiness for the Trojans is in keeping with the Aristotelian ideal of active virtue; the Trojans must work in order to be happy. Aeneas’ immediate recognition of the desired goal for his own people – their own city in which they may exercise their particular virtues – points to the approaching fulfillment of the Trojan dream.

The Carthaginians first appear to the Trojans as the paragon of the crowd that is hard at work: *instant ardentis Tyrii* (1.423). It is a task made all the more poignant to Aeneas because the Carthaginians had themselves only recently been in a situation similar to that of the Trojans, “tossed by waves and whirlwind” (*iactati undis et turbine Poeni*, 1.442). They are described as completing the various tasks of building a city. *Pars...alii* is used prominently (423-428) to distinguish different groups of laborers. Most notably, the people as a whole are described as voting: “they are choosing laws and magistrates, and an august senate” (*iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum*, 1.426).<sup>64</sup> The people of Carthage then clearly are not without a political voice; in fact, voting is the one activity in which it appears everyone takes part. Most importantly, this line suggests that the people of Carthage have a “state” in both its physical and

---

<sup>64</sup> “Campbell places this line after 368 in the Carthage account related by Venus, where it highlights the pressing nature of this task. Most manuscripts place it at 426 (FMPR), where it compliments better the more physical aspects of founding a city. In either scenario, it precedes the physical building both in time and importance. Austin remarks perceptively that “it is nothing that Aeneas could see, only what (from a Roman point of view) would come into his mind when he saw a city being built, i.e. the preparations for a settled community under law and authority” (Austin on 1.426). Morwood (1991, 212-3) also characterizes the Carthaginians’ city as “decidedly Roman.”

political aspects. In their fevered but happy activity, the Carthaginians are thus compared to bees:<sup>65</sup>

qualis apes aestate nova per florea rura  
exercet sub sole labor, cum gentis adultos  
educunt fetus, aut cum liquentia mella  
stipant et dulci distendunt nectare cellas,  
aut onera accipiunt venientum, aut agmine facto  
ignavum fucos pecus a praesepibus arcent;  
fervet opus redolentque thymo fraglantia mella. (1.430-436)

Even as bees in early summer, amid flowery fields, ply their task in sunshine, when they lead forth the full-grown young of their race, or pack the fluid honey and strain their cells to bursting with sweet nectar, or receive the burdens of incomers, or in martial array drive from the drones, a lazy herd; all aglow is the work and the fragrant honey is sweet with thyme.

*Agmine facto* (1.434) is used commonly to describe the natural world. The winds, the deer that Aeneas lays low, and the swans in the omen seen by Venus all use it. It is more commonly reflective of the order of battle. The implications of this term become clearer after the Trojans are preparing to leave Carthage. *Fervet opus* is obviously the operative phrase, as it will reappear in a slight variation later of the Trojans as they leave Carthage (4.407). The Carthaginians work in silence with this exception. *Ferveo* suggests the buzzing of bees, a natural humming of productive sustained work. While Dido is pining for Aeneas, this eager work will stop (or at least slow down) (4.86-9), but it is apparent that it resumes again after the “marriage” ceremony with Aeneas himself as overseer (4.259-61).<sup>66</sup> Although, as Mercury points out, Aeneas is building walls for the wrong people, at least work is getting done.

---

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the peaceful scene of souls in the underworld awaiting rebirth, likened to buzzing bees in a sunny meadow (6.706-709), whom Aeneas nevertheless understands to be pitiful (*miseris*, 721).

<sup>66</sup> Morwood 1991, 214.

The Trojans are also depicted at work when they are about to leave Carthage.<sup>67</sup> Whereas Aeneas had been divided in his resolve, the men show their eagerness to leave (*fugae studio*, 4.400) – and thus their complete dedication to the mission – by their fevered activity (*tum vero Teucrici incumbunt*, 4.397). The Trojans are therefore likened to ants, an insect perhaps even more legendary for its capacity for work than bees:<sup>68</sup>

migrantis cernas totaque ex urbe ruentis:  
ac velut ingentem formicae farris acervum  
cum populant hiemis memores tectoque reponunt,  
it nigrum campis agmen praedamque per herbas  
convectant calle angusto; pars grandia trudunt  
obnixae frumenta umeris, pars agmina cogunt  
castigantque moras, opere omnis semita fervet. (4.401-407)

One could see them moving away and streaming forth from all the city. Even as when ants, mindful of winter, plunder a huge heap of grain and store it in their home; over the plain moves a black column, and through the grass they carry the spoil on a narrow track; some strain with their shoulders and heave on the huge grains, some close up the ranks and rebuke delay; all the path is aglow with work.

Both this passage and the Carthaginian bee simile compare hard workers to insects. In both, the work “is aglow” (*opere omnis semita fervet*, 4.407).

There are considerable differences, however. The bees work in a scene of summer sun, but the ants must be mindful of winter (*hiemis memores*, 4.403). The bees make honey from flowers, lead out the young, and pack the cells with nectar, but the ants “plunder” a heap of grain<sup>69</sup> and move in a black line on a narrow trail through the grass. The bee simile appeals to

---

<sup>67</sup> DiCesare notes that there is no mention of Tyrian or Trojan workmen while Aeneas is “playing at building a city” earlier on (DiCesare, 32). This seems to be a clear indication of his (temporary) neglect of the interests of the crowd.

<sup>68</sup> See Pease’s note (on 402) for a list of proverbs and fables featuring ants. He also suggests the comparison between this simile and 1.430-6.

<sup>69</sup> Putnam seems to take this to far in a negative direction, describing the Trojans as “symbolic despoilers of the land, absconding darkly with its booty...” (1980, 17). Also Nisbet, 382: The Trojans exhibit the “legalized destructiveness of the Roman army.”



the senses of sight, sound, taste (*dulci*, 1.433) and smell (*redolentque thymo fragrantia mella*, 1.436), whereas the ant simile uses only sight and sound.<sup>70</sup>

More striking is the behavior. The essentially productive bee work is leisured – a reflection perhaps, of the notion of the Carthaginians as *facilem victu*, “rich in substance” (1.445). The bees, crucially, are also settled at their home, the hive. But the ants, clearly in a more precarious migratory mode, hurry to anticipate winter. The bees help one another for the most part, and only have to keep away the pesky drones; the very existence of an idle class is notable. The ants, on the other hand, toil collectively,<sup>71</sup> and have to chastise one another in order for the work to continue (4.406-7). Where the bees organize themselves into columns (*agmine facto* 1.434), the ant *agmina* need some urging from their superiors (*agmina cogunt*, 4.406). The term *agmina* is not applied to the Trojans at all throughout Books 1 and 3, the two books that most strongly depict them as a people in exile. It thus appears symbolic of a quality that the Trojans have lost, if temporarily, over the course of their travels. Now, when they have it back, it takes on a military tone.<sup>72</sup> Idleness, as any good Roman aristocrat knew, was a disastrous state for the *populus*.

The (Trojan) ants also make more noise than the practically silent (Carthaginian) bees; Dido hears their eager shouts as they work along the seashore:

quosve dabas gemitus, cum litora fervere late  
prospiceres arce ex summa, totumque videres  
misceri ante oculos tantis clamoribus aequor! (4.409-11)

...or what sighs did you utter, viewing from the top of the fortress the beach aglow far and near, and seeing before your eyes the whole sea astir with loud cries!

---

<sup>70</sup> Austin notes on 4.404ff.: “The conspicuous clash of accent and ictus (404 and 405 have an exactly similar rhythm) marking the difficulty of the work.”

<sup>71</sup> *convectant* “implies manual labor...as well as a co-operative effort” (Austin on 4.404ff.).

<sup>72</sup> *agmina cogunt* is a “technical military term” (Pease and Austin on 4.406).

The Trojan clamor is here in support of the orders of their leader, though he – and certainly the heartbroken Dido – probably would have preferred a more subdued response. Their joy seems to reveal the Trojan understanding of their ultimate destiny; they seem aware that their time in Carthage was to be only temporary.<sup>73</sup> Aeneas cuts the cable and prays for safe voyage, affirming Trojan piety and consciously hinting at an absolute unity of intention between leader and led: “We follow you, holy among gods...and again joyfully obey your command” (*sequimur te, sancte deorum...imperioque iterum paremus ovantes*, 4.576-7).<sup>74</sup> At this point, the Trojans resume a joyful but quiet collective activity in their sudden and swift departure.<sup>75</sup>

idem omnis simul ardor habet, rapiuntque ruuntque;  
litora deseruere, latet sub classibus aequor,  
adnixi torquent spumas et caerulea verrunt. (4.581-3)

The same zeal catches all at once; with hurry and scurry they have quitted the shore; the sea is hidden under their fleets; lustily they churn the foam and sweep the blue waters.

In any case, the ant/Trojan labor as opposed to the bee/Carthaginian labor is of a rather stern and unpleasant character. The Trojans are not destined to bask in the sunny and prosperous peace of

---

<sup>73</sup> See, e.g. Ilioneus’ speech to Dido, which makes clear a basic intent to go to Italy, or to Sicily in the event of Aeneas’ death (1.550-558). Horsfall’s assertion (based on 1.700, 4.289, 295 and 573ff.) that the Trojans “did not much enjoy their time in Carthage” (1995, 132, n. 52) is possible, but cannot be concluded with certainty.

<sup>74</sup> In an earlier line where Dido wonders if she should “alone accompany the exultant (*ovantis*) sailors in their flight” (4.543), both the indignity of accompanying rather than being accompanied (cf., e.g. 1.497 *magna iuvenum stipante caterva* and 4.136 *magna stipante caterva* – she next rejects the idea of giving chase “surrounded by all my Tyrian band” (*Tyriis omnique manu stipata meorum*, 4.544-5) – and the Trojan joy in the face of her potential disgrace seem to prompt Dido to choose death.

<sup>75</sup> Is the sense here that the Trojans have “deserted” Dido as Achaemenides’ comrades deserted him (3.618)? The other two occurrences of the form occur when Aeneas’ men desert him during the fall of Troy (2.565), and the Latin matrons desert their homes (7.394). The perfect tense conveys swiftness (Pease and Williams on 4.582), and this seems to be the primary point in all of these passages. Dido is hurt, but she has stayed behind willingly, and she is not in the desperate plight of the castaway.

a foreign city ruled by a “queen bee” (Cleopatra’s Alexandria comes to mind). Even in the event of their attaining to their *imperium sine fine*, the Trojan/Roman destiny is tireless, unglamorous work.

#### D. THE TROJANS COME HOME: BOOK 7

After their arrival on Italian soil, the Trojans continue to display the same characteristics they had while still on their travels. Though they are permitted to believe a *rumor*, it is one that has come to them via Aeneas’ announcement, presumably only audible to a smaller group of *socii* at first, that they have arrived in their new home and country (7.120-2). It is only spoken by the Trojans at large, however, after an omen of thunder and lightning (7.141-3), so it should not be taken as idle credulousness.

The Trojans’ behavior at the celebration upon discovering this (thanks to Ascanius’ correct interpretation of the prophecy of Celaeno) thus exemplifies many of their already-established characteristics.<sup>76</sup>

diditur hic subito Troiana per agmina rumor  
advenisse diem, quo debita moenia condant.  
certatim instaurant epulas atque omine magno  
crateras laeti statuunt et vina coronant. (7.144-147)

Then suddenly through the Trojan band runs the rumor that the day has come to found their promised city. Emulously they renew the feast, and cheered by the mighty omen set on the bowls and wreath the wine.

---

<sup>76</sup> Kristol claims that after this point, the Trojans no longer experience any labors, but this is only true in the sense that the poet, “by emphasizing the labors of Aeneas and drawing attention away from the Trojans as a discrete people in the latter half of the *Aeneid*” emphasizes their coming assimilation with the Latins (Kristol, 122). For the descendants of both groups, there is much *labor* in store.

The Trojans are here truly capable of being formed as a whole into *agmina*.<sup>77</sup> They strive amongst themselves (*certatim*) in the context of the banquet (7.146). Finally, too, they are joyful (*laeti*, 149).

The next day, Aeneas sends a group of a hundred envoys to speak to Latinus. As during their travels, Trojan efficiency and obedience are stressed:<sup>78</sup> “They linger not, but hasten at his bidding and move with rapid steps” (*haud mora, festinant iussi rapidisque feruntur passibus*, 7.156-7). The Trojan crowd in transit, on the whole, represents *concordia* between the *populus* and their leaders. The Trojans soon cease to be a crowd “in transit” and become, instead, a settled crowd, albeit one at war. Schauer identifies this moment as 7.290-1 when they desert the ships and begin to build walls (*moliri iam tecta videt, iam fidere terrae, deseruisse rates*).<sup>79</sup> In their travels, the Trojans have demonstrated their ability to work obediently and efficiently as a collective, their essential piety, their competitiveness, and their capacity for endurance. Once settled, the Trojans set the example for their Roman descendants as a hardworking people both at peace and in war. This does not suggest, however, that they are constantly in motion. At times, the Trojans as well as the Italians act as spectators to the activities of others.

---

<sup>77</sup> The disappearance of this term from Book 3 has already been discussed; it is also notable that the prophecy of the arrival of the Trojans given to Latinus refers to an *agmen* of bees (7.69). Horsfall notes that while they need not be “thought of as eating their tables by ranks,” Vergil “might be hinting e.g. that they eat in groups... They are still an expedition in a strange land and... they have no reason to expect an entirely peaceful reception” (Horsfall on 7.144).

<sup>78</sup> Horsfall on 7.156: *iussi* as “an unobtrusive indication of obedience... (cf. 1.63, 3.697, 4.703).”

<sup>79</sup> Schauer, 61. Cf., though Morwood, who notes that the first Trojan settlement described here, Lavinium, and Alba Longa are all “stopgap cities” for the Trojans until the founding of Rome (Morwood 1991, 216).

#### IV. THE WATCHING CROWD: SPECTATORS

Spectator crowds provide some of the most recognizably “Roman” varieties of crowds in the *Aeneid*. These scenes occur in the contexts of the (at least initially) peaceful games of Book 5 and in various battle scenes, most notably the final duel between Aeneas and Turnus. Such crowds are, inherently, not so much active as reactive; they do not act of their own volition so much as respond to the actions of the main players. This does not by any stretch of the imagination, however, suggest that they are passive. Rather, the spectator crowd scenarios will bring out the Trojan trait of competitiveness and love of spectacle, and so they are lighthearted in the context of the games, but deadly serious when they occur in the context of war.

An audience watching a game and one watching a battle differ obviously in the sense that the stakes are far higher for those watching the battle.<sup>1</sup> The two are similar, though, in a basic expectation of the crowd’s level of activity. In the scenarios of both games and war, the crowd who watches is not expected to intervene, but to watch and react to a spectacle. To the extent that their leader responds to their wishes, he wins approval. Their reactions, then, call attention to these crowds and characterize them in a way that other forms of description cannot. As will be evident in all spectator crowd scenarios, the qualities or situations that the crowd favors have the potential to tell us a great deal about the nature of the crowd itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> Livy’s portrayal of the duel of the Horatii and Curiatii is a good (ostensibly) historical example. See subsection I.D.

## A. BOOK 5 GAMES

Book 5 of the *Aeneid* has been analyzed alternately, as a “diminution of tension” between Books 4 and 6, and as a sort of prefiguring of the Augustan revival of athletics.<sup>2</sup> If the occasion of the games allows Aeneas to “display royal qualities,”<sup>3</sup> as Cairns puts it, it provides no less an opportunity for his Trojans and the others assembled to act as a civilized nation. As Quinn observes, “the rank and file of the Trojans...advance into the limelight, while Aeneas withdraws temporarily into the background.”<sup>4</sup> Cairns considers Book 5 to be the first “formal assembly” of Trojans in the *Aeneid* that anticipates not only the council of the gods in Book 10 and the Italians in Book 11, but later “Roman assemblies with their long and significant history.”<sup>5</sup> There seems to be no good reason to take the games so broadly; the realm of the Roman spectacle provides more than ample room for comparison. It is important to distinguish, moreover, between these “spectator” scenes and more politically charged councils or assemblies both in the poem and in history. The spectator crowd does not make decisions; it merely voices its approval or displeasure of the various competitors in the contests. Strictly speaking, the Book 5 games, like those for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23, constitute a ritual in honor of Anchises, and not an (overtly) political event. Nevertheless, it is important for an understanding of the dynamics of the spectator crowd to note who is cheering (or shouting, praying, or laughing) for or at whom at each point and why.

---

<sup>2</sup> Williams on 5.104ff. and Feldherr 1995, 247.

<sup>3</sup> Cairns, 59. Quinn also finds that Book 5 constitutes an opportunity to “heal” an “alienation of commander from his men” because of the Dido affair (Quinn 1963, 48).

<sup>4</sup> Quinn 1968, 153.

<sup>5</sup> Cairns, 58.

## 1. The Nature of the Games

The organization of the games begins on the morning after Acestes had welcomed Aeneas and his Trojans to Sicily. Aeneas had called his *socii* to an anomalous *coetus/concilium*,<sup>6</sup> which appears to include a far larger assemblage by its conclusion (5.42-44, 75). In his announcement of the games, Aeneas had stated that he intended to found a new Trojan institution (“I will ordain contests for the Trojans,” *Teucris ponam certamina*, 5.66), and that he wished all not only to be present, but to display a specific attitude of involved excitement: “Let all appear and look for the palm, the prize of victory” (*cuncti adsint meritaque exspectent praemia palmae*, 5.70).<sup>7</sup> That the day of the games is eagerly awaited (*Exspectata dies aderat*, 5.104) points to their assured success.

It is quite apparent that the games of the *Aeneid*, though based on episodes from *Iliad* 23 and *Odyssey* 8 (The Phaeacian Games), diverge from the Homeric treatments significantly. On a superficial level, for one, the games of the *Aeneid* use terms familiar from the Roman circus.<sup>8</sup> The Homeric games are far more limited in scope, as only aristocrats compete; Aeneas has opened up the competitions to anyone who wishes to participate.<sup>9</sup> The Homeric crowds are also appreciably quieter than their Vergilian counterparts. Vergil’s crowd responds vocally to the events eleven times,<sup>10</sup> but the games in *Iliad* 23 only contain six crowd vocalizations, and the

---

<sup>6</sup> See subsection II.E. This gathering differs in nature from the other assemblies discussed in that chapter and provides a more characteristic picture of the Trojan people once they have become identified with their proto-Roman destiny.

<sup>7</sup> It is possible that the order that “all appear” is not obeyed by the women by the ships.

<sup>8</sup> Feldherr notes that Vergil uses many terms familiar to the Roman circus rather than Homeric epic: *carceres*, *auriga*, *lora*, *verbera*, etc. (1995, 246).

<sup>9</sup> Quinn 1968, 153.

<sup>10</sup> Heinze claims that “Vergil has done no more than his Homeric model” in referring to the crowd (139, n. 14): Vergil: 5.181-2, 227-30, 272, 338, 343, 369, 385, 450, 491, 529, 555, 575ff.

Phaeacians do not make any noise, except to cower at Odysseus' discus throw (*Od.* 8.189-92). The mood of the games of *Iliad* 23 is "prosaic and matter of fact" while Vergil's games are notably joyful.<sup>11</sup> This is probably because Anchises' death had taken place a year prior, whereas Patroclus' is recent. Most importantly, many of the crowd reactions of the *Aeneid* games exert direct influence on the actions of the competitors. They are not mere background noise for the *aristoi*,<sup>12</sup> but "part of the overall scene."<sup>13</sup> A final difference pertains to Aeneas himself and how he organizes the space in which the games are to be held.

## 2. Aeneas: *Editor Ludorum*

Aeneas' presentation in the games following the ship race bears noting for the degree of pomp it contains:

Hoc pius Aeneas misso certamine tendit  
gramineum in campum, quem collibus undique curvis  
cingebant silvae, mediaque in valle theatri  
circus erat; quo se multis cum milibus heros  
consessu medium tulit exstructoque resedit. (5.286-290).

This contest sped, pious Aeneas moves to a grassy plain, girt all about with winding hills, well-wooded, where, at the heart of the valley, ran the circuit of a theatre. To this spot, with many thousands, the hero betook himself into the midst of the company and sat down on a raised seat.

Aeneas' seat had evidently been constructed ahead of time (*exstructoque resedit*, 5.290), and so it is clear that some foresight had gone into selecting the location with an eye to the perspective of the spectators; all must be able to see the whole of the action,<sup>14</sup> as well as Father Aeneas.

---

Homer: 23.728, 766, 784, 815, 822, 840, 869, 881. However, a reference does not necessarily equal characterization.

<sup>11</sup> Heinze, 136.

<sup>12</sup> Heinze notes the "Greeks' obsession with competition" in *Iliad* 23 (Heinze, 121). Where the Romans differ is in the closer association of competition with spectacle.

<sup>13</sup> Heinze, 131.

<sup>14</sup> Poor perspective for some of the audience had been a cause of trouble in *Il.* 23.350ff. (Feldherr 1995, 246 n. 4).



Suetonius tells us that Augustus either viewed spectacles from houses of friends overlooking the Circus, or from the imperial box (*Div. Aug.* 45.1), and when he wished to exhibit a group of Parthian hostages, he made sure that they were seated two rows behind him (*Div. Aug.* 43.4). The central location of Aeneas stands in sharp contrast to the presentation of Achilles in the games of *Iliad* 23. Achilles does mark out space, set out prizes, and act as the general officiator, but he is never set physically over and above the other *basileis*. The fact that Aeneas is accompanied by “many thousands” (*multis cum milibus*, 5.289)<sup>15</sup> also points to his exalted position over competitors and spectators alike. Aeneas makes use of a herald (5.244-5), for the distribution of prizes after the ship race. Achilles does not, but Augustus does (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 84.2). Although Achilles is more often “in the foreground,”<sup>16</sup> the manner in which Aeneas will intervene in the proceedings is far more decisive than Achilles in *Iliad* 23. The differences are both striking and central to the distinctions not only between Aeneas and the Homeric heroes, but between Homeric and Vergilian crowds.

### 3. The Circus

In the games, Vergil sets up a very different theater for crowd behavior than can be observed elsewhere in the poem. Aeneas (here not unlike Achilles in the chariot race, *Il.* 23.331-33) has marked off the space for the ship race himself.<sup>17</sup> In addition, the games after the ship race (the

---

<sup>15</sup> Also at the organizational meeting at 5.75. See Schauer, 193-196 for more on Aeneas’ often exalted position among the Trojans.

<sup>16</sup> Heinze, 129. His characterization of Aeneas as a “much weaker character than Achilles” (Heinze, 130) in the games, though, is strikingly unfair. If anything, Aeneas is a stronger character, only more distant – he does not get his hands dirty as readily as Achilles. See also Quinn 1968, 153.

<sup>17</sup> Feldherr’s comments on this aspect of the ship (and the games as a whole) as political metaphor are perceptive: “The competitors aim to win *laus*, *honor*, and *decus*, the traditional rewards of a successful political career. Yet as the *meta* established by Aeneas forces the

footrace and boxing match) take place in a natural *circus* that is described in picturesque detail in 287-9. Aeneas had already set the prizes *in medio circo* (5.109). Williams argues that *theatrum* (288) is used in its loosest sense of “place for watching,”<sup>18</sup> but when the word is used in so close a connection to *circus*, the connotations of Roman *ludi* are unavoidable, especially when the word *campus* describes the location. The sportsmanly and military associations of the Campus Martius as well as the chariot races of the Circus Maximus combine to create a very pronounced Roman, and especially Augustan effect given the emperor’s conscious efforts to give games, be seen at them, and appear to be interested in them.<sup>19</sup> Most important, however, as Felherr points out, is the association between “the natural order and political order” that the “highly differentiated space” of the circus has created, thus imposing “order on all who enter it, incorporating them into a unified vision of state and universe.” In this vision, even the apparent discord that the games may generate does not threaten civil war, but rather serves as a part of the rhythms of the natural world.<sup>20</sup>

#### 4. Who Watches the Games?

Three features of the makeup of the crowd that watches the games are immediately observable from the text. First, it is a crowd comprised of two ethnic groups: Trojans and Sicilians. Prior to the footrace that follows the ship race, the competitors are listed, and it is noted that a huge crowd of Trojans and Sicanians has mingled together (*undique conveniunt Teuceri mixtique*

---

captains “to bend back their long courses,” so the victor in the ship race will not be the one with the greatest desire for praise but the one who can best accommodate or harness his desire to the constraints imposed by the competition” (Feldherr 1995, 253).

<sup>18</sup> Williams on 5.288-9.

<sup>19</sup> For Augustan spectacles, see Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 43-45 and the further discussion in subsections I.D and V.A.1.

<sup>20</sup> Feldherr 1995, 250 (The *factiones*, e.g. are compared to the four seasons or elements), 255.

*Sicani*, 5.293).<sup>21</sup> Second, both groups are free to watch or compete in the games.<sup>22</sup> Two Sicilians, Helymus and Panopes (300) clearly participate in the footrace, as well as many nameless others (302). In the *Iliad* only the chief men participate, but the Trojans are inclusive, competitive, and above all, they have too important a stake in the future to sit by idly. It is evident that many of the spectators are in fact natives (104-8, 293), there to see the *Aeneadae* or to compete themselves (*visuri Aeneadas pars et certare parati*, 108). Third, it appears – though it cannot be taken as certain – that only men comprise the crowd. We are told that the *Troades* have segregated themselves by the ships (5.613-17),<sup>23</sup> but the equestrian games of the youth are said to take place before the faces of the parents (*ante ora parentum*, 5.553). It is most likely, then, that *parentum* refers strictly to the fathers, but it could conceivably also include a few women.<sup>24</sup> During the games, perspective shifts back and forth between the spectators and participants. Feldherr remarks, for example, that the sailors in the ship race “constitute a new audience of watchers” in waiting for the signal to begin. While Aeneas is busy organizing the audience at large with the games, the captain of each ship must “engage and inspire” the miniature “audience” on his ship in order to bring about success.<sup>25</sup> The small ship crowds also serve to confirm the egalitarianism of participation in the games.

---

<sup>21</sup> Feldherr 1995, 256-7. Powell suggests that this line suggests the melding of Trojans and Italians “into a Roman future” as well as a more specific reference to the future Roman colony of Segesta (89). See also subsection I.D for a treatment of spectacle as a means of bringing about unity in Roman history.

<sup>22</sup> Feldherr 1995, 258.

<sup>23</sup> Williams on 5.613 cites Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 44, which references Augustus’ prohibition of the women from the *ludi funebres*. Cf. Nugent, who claims that the “return” of the Trojan women (i.e., the mother of Euryalus) suggests that the women are only used “as a mere narrative function in the service of the text’s ideological program” (Nugent 271-272).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. 2.531 (the death of Polites) and 11.887 (the slaughter before the walls of Laurentum) where *ante...ora parentum* assumes the presence of both male and female parents. The Loeb translates *parentum* in these two instances as “parents,” but uses “fathers” at 5.553 and 556.

<sup>25</sup> Feldherr 1995, 258.

## 5. The Role of *Fama*

The Trojans, Sicilians, and other local people do not assemble in an immediate response to a command from a leader calling them together, as in the case of the Homeric formulae,<sup>26</sup> but due to *fama*, the rumor of the games, and the reputation of their actual host, Acestes (*nomen Acestae*):<sup>27</sup>

famaque finitimos et clari nomen Acestae  
excierat; laeto complebant litora coetu  
visuri Aeneadas, pars et certare parati. (5.106-108)

The name and fame of noble Acestes had stirred the countryside; in a happy gathering the people thronged the shore, some to see the sons of Aeneas, and some ready to contend.

The fame of Acestes then may be considered either to eclipse Aeneas' own at this early stage, or to supersede Aeneas' by virtue of this being the older hero's own city. As elsewhere in the poem, *fama* personifies the unregulated informal speech of the people. Here its purpose is fully sanctioned by a leader, and its joyful tone also renders it non-threatening.<sup>28</sup>

During the games themselves, fame is a common theme. Cloanthus' crew will be spurred on to win the ship race by their concern for *laus* (5.229-230). Of the competitors in the foot race, there are many competitors whom *fama* obscures: *multi praeterea, quos fama obscura recondit* (5.302). Nisus and Euryalus have only been mentioned a few lines earlier, and their connection to *fama* will become far more prominent in Book 9. Thanks to the poet's mention of them in both episodes, they have been rescued from the ranks of the nameless. They will only become

---

<sup>26</sup> Especially in Greek as opposed to Trojan gatherings (Mackie, 24-5), though the Greek funeral games of Patroclus begin almost spontaneously following the funeral (*Iliad* 23.257).

<sup>27</sup> Though a trumpet (*tuba*) will proclaim their formal opening once the people have already assembled (5.113).

<sup>28</sup> Contrast, though, the more threatening *Fama* of Book 4 (173-197).

more famous than they already are owing to their noble deaths – also destined to be uncannily in the public eye (9.465-7) later on.

During the boxing match, concern for *fama* is of paramount importance. The reaction of Entellus to his fall (and to the shout that accompanies it) is devastating to Dares, and the reason for this is similar to the reason why Cloanthus' crew had been stirred on by applause – fame. Acestes' remark to Entellus brings this up. It is a distinctly local fame throughout Sicily, but it is fame nonetheless: “Where is your renown over all Sicily?” (*ubi fama per omnem Trinacriam?* 5.392-3). Entellus insists that his love of glory has not given way to fear: “no cowardice has banished love of honor or thought of renown” (*non laudis amor nec gloria cessit pulsa metu,* 5.394-5) but rather, that old age holds him back (5.395-6). After Entellus falls and Acestes rushes to help him up, he returns to the fight more determined than ever because of *ira*, *pudor*, and consciousness of *virtus* (5.454-5). The lessons that the audience is to absorb from this are unmistakable, and their reaction to the outcome of events largely reflects these concerns.

## 6. The Crowd Views the Competitions

**a. The Ship Race: The Crowd Competes.** The first competition is less a passively observed contest than a complex interaction between two sets of crowds – the men on the ships and the spectators by way of an array of different vocal expressions including cheers, applause, murmurs, and – on one occasion – laughter. It is appropriate then, that the first people to cheer in the games are not the spectators proper but the aforementioned miniature “audience” of ship race participants, whom we meet at the opening of the ship race as a group excited to compete and eager for glory:

considunt transtris, intentaue bracchia remis;  
intenti exspectant signum, exsultantiaue haurit  
corda pavor pulsans laudumque arrecta cupido. (5.136-8)

They man the thwarts, their arms strained to the oars; straining, they await the signal, while throbbing fear and eager passion for glory drain each bounding heart.

In this vignette, the sailors in the ship race exemplify the trait of competitiveness that is being celebrated in the games to a high degree. At the trumpet, they make a “nautical clamor” (*clamor...nauticus*, 5.140-1) that strikes the heavens (*ferit aethera*, 5.140). A *nauticus clamor* had also appeared at 3.128-9, where the Trojan navy cheers before the *socii* affirm Anchises’ disastrous idea of sailing to Crete. That *nauticus clamor* had arisen in the context of a foreboding situation; here, it marks the sailors’ joy and excitement in beginning the race at the signal.

The applause of the crowds during the ship race (5.148-50) that marks the first reaction of the crowd at large will “mimic the action within the events themselves”:<sup>29</sup>

tum plausu fremituque virum studiisque faventum  
consonat omne nemus, vocemque inclusa volutant  
litora, pulsati colles clamore resultant. (5.148-150)

Then with applause and shouts of men, and zealous cries of partisans, the whole woodland rings; the sheltered beach rolls up the sound, and the hills, smitten, echo back the din.

The sounds made by the men in this scene are echoed in the natural setting.<sup>30</sup> The emphatic *consonat* (149) suggests that in the peace and unity that prevail, “the voice of the people sounds together.”<sup>31</sup> The final duel between Turnus and Aeneas in Book 12, though a far more serious event, will manifest an almost identical effect. The passage immediately preceding this is a simile comparing the ships to chariots (5.144-47).<sup>32</sup> The simile and the following applause serve to position the games firmly in the Roman context of arena sports as a previously quiet Sicilian

---

<sup>29</sup> Feldherr 1995, 258.

<sup>30</sup> Similar language of “rolling voices” appears in Dido’s banquet in 1.725-6.

<sup>31</sup> Feldherr 1995, 251.

<sup>32</sup> The suggestion being that the chariots are not so swift (*praecipites*) and headlong into the competition (*proni*) as the ships are.

valley is transformed into the circus or the arena. Feldherr explains this phenomenon: The sound of the people applauding “moves outward to impose itself on the natural world,” and as a result, “the different enthusiasms of the people are harmonized into a single *vox*.”<sup>33</sup> The people’s opinions, rather than lie dormant and break out in less productive ways, of which open sedition is only the most threatening, are expressed freely. In this sense, the games are succeeding in bringing the people together despite their naturally differing enthusiasms.

Before the close of the race, a fairly uncommon phenomenon in the *Aeneid* takes place – the Trojans laugh. The incident is very obviously modeled on the Greeks’ laughter at Ajax at *Il.* 23.784, but there is an important difference: Ajax slips and falls, but Menoetes, the butt of the Trojans’ laughter, is a victim of his captain’s wrath. Gyas had unceremoniously shoved the old man off the stern of his ship because Cloanthus had just passed his own ship. The leader of one of the miniature audiences of Book 5 thus forcibly removes an unsatisfactory member of his “audience.”<sup>34</sup> The verb “to laugh” (*risere...rident*) is repeated to emphasize the manner in which the crowd responds to Menoetes’ misfortunes as they unfold; Otis observes here that the shift to the present tense “puts us immediately en rapport with the bystanders”:<sup>35</sup>

illum et labentem Teucri et risere natantem  
et salsos rident revomentem pectore fluctus. (5.181-2)

The Teucrians laughed as he fell and swam, and they laugh as he spews the salt waters from his chest.

It is apparently only Trojans, and not the Sicilians who laugh at Menoetes. What is the reason for this? Is it because the Trojans know Menoetes and laugh out of friendly familiarity, or (if he

---

<sup>33</sup> Feldherr 1995, 251.

<sup>34</sup> Vergil does not fail to note that Gyas’ “Chimaera” falls behind because she is “robbed of her helmsman” (*spoliata magistro est*, 5.224). Gyas wins third prize, but is not named in the distribution of prizes. Heinze remarks: “the decisive factor is not so much the quality of the ships as the character of the commanders” (Heinze, 125).

<sup>35</sup> Otis, 59. Though cf. Quinn 1968, 155 who detects reader sympathy in spite of the crowd.

was known to be a troublesome figure) *schadenfreude*?<sup>36</sup> If this is the case, and it is reasonable to assume so, is there a cultural disconnect in which the Sicilians do not find an old man's near-drowning an occasion for humor,<sup>37</sup> or are they simply uncomfortable laughing at an outsider? Or perhaps we can take *Teucris* here to refer only to the mini-audience of sailors who are participating in the race (or even only those on Gyas' ship), and who can be expected to have a far clearer view of Menoetes' sufferings than the crowd watching from the shore. In any case, the event punctuates the competitive impulses of the Trojan crowd and allows them a rare laugh. Another, more subtly expressed laugh from the crowd may be found when Sergestus' maimed ship comes in, apparently to the sound of the crowd's jeers (*inrisam...ratem*, 272).<sup>38</sup> Of course, lest it be forgotten, the last time the Trojans had this much fun was in mocking Sinon, a clear anticipation of their doom. The destruction of the ships by the women is fast approaching, and so perhaps the lesson to take away is that while joy may be acceptable provided it is expressed with restraint, it is an ambiguous behavior for the Trojans, and in fact usually foreshadows trouble for them.

The next cheer from the crowd makes it clear that their competitive focus has not been lost on account of the comic relief, but it will serve a far more important function:

Tum vero ingeminat clamor cunctique sequentem  
 instigant studiis, resonatque fragoribus aether.  
 hi proprium decus et partum indignantur honorem  
 ni teneant, vitamque volunt pro laude pacisci;  
 hos successus alit: possunt, quia posse videntur. (5.227-231)

---

<sup>36</sup> It would have been possible metrically for the poet to substitute "*cuncti*" for *Teucris* had he wished to convey this sense.

<sup>37</sup> This does not seem to be a point to make much of because of the well-attested cruel streak in much ancient humor. Menoetes, besides, is not seriously harmed.

<sup>38</sup> Both of these occurrences of laughter take place in the highly controlled setting of the games, outside of the prospect of real danger, and so a near drowning and a shipwreck can be treated as funny, where elsewhere, real drownings and shipwrecks (the storm in Book 1, as well as the deaths of Palinarus and Misenus) are a cause for sorrow. The events of the games mirror those of reality.



Then indeed the shouts redouble, all together with cheers hearten the pursuer (Mnestheus' ship), the sky echoes to their din. These (Mnestheus' men) think it shame not to keep the honor that is theirs, the glory that they have won, and would barter life for fame: those success heartens; strong are they, for strong they deem themselves.

Everyone (*cuncti*) cheers for the underdog, the ship of Mnestheus as it gains on the ship of Cloanthus. Now the men are eager for their rightful *decus*, *honos*, and *laus*.

Earlier in the race, Mnestheus had already proven himself to be an excellent “coach” of sorts, in giving a speech while pacing among his men amid-ships (*at media socios incedens nave per ipsos*, 188) in an effort to rouse them to action. In his speech, he addresses them as *Hectorei socii* (190), chosen *comites* (191), and perhaps rather surprisingly given that all of his competitors are also Trojans, *cives* (196). The men push themselves, “straining to the utmost, his men bend forward” (*olli certamine summo procumbunt*, 197-8), but victory is not to be theirs.

Oddly enough, the fateful cheer for Mnestheus in 227-228 exerts the opposite effect of a sort of “home-field advantage” in which the team that gets the most cheers goes on to win; Cloanthus, the captain of the ship in the lead, is spurred to offer a prayer to Neptune,<sup>39</sup> which allows him to win the race. A cheer from the crowd, then, influences the action of the race, though it does not, arguably, influence the outcome – Neptune and the Nereids do that (239-243). Piety is rewarded above all, but “steady effort combined with skillful leadership” also brings a measure of success. “Reckless audacity,” as shown by Sergestus, and to a lesser extent, Gyas, brings ruin.<sup>40</sup> The crowd will continue to exert great effect in the remaining competitions, but it

---

<sup>39</sup> The earlier apostrophe to “Cluentius of Rome” (*Romane Cluenti*, 5.123) appears to call out the Cluentii for especial honor due to the outstanding piety of their ancestor. See subsection I.A n.8.

<sup>40</sup> Heinze, 126.

is already clear from the ship race that in the games, as Quinn remarks, “we feel the *collectam exsilio pubem, miserabile vulgus*, of 2.798 begin to acquire the stature that will be needed of them for the events of Books 7 and 12.”<sup>41</sup>

**b. The Footrace: The People’s Favorite, Euryalus.** The footrace, as seen before, includes both Trojans and Sicilians (293). Like the ship race, it reveals support for the underdog, when Euryalus wins the race thanks to Nisus’ cheating: he “flies on amid favoring applause and cheers” (*plausuque volat fremituque secundo*, 5.338).<sup>42</sup> In the course of the dispute led by the disgruntled Salius over the allocation of prizes, it becomes clear that simple popularity had been the reason for the strong crowd reaction:

hic totum caveae consessum ingentis et ora  
prima patrum magnis Salius clamoribus implet,  
ereptumque dolo reddi sibi poscit honorem.  
tutatur favor Euryalum lacrimaeque decorae,  
gratior et pulchro veniens in corpore virtus.  
adiuvat et magna proclamat voce Diores,  
qui subiit palmae frustra ad praemia venit  
ultima, si primi Salius reddentur honores. (5.340-7).

Hereupon Salius fills with loud clamor the whole concourse of the great theatre and the gazing elders in front, claiming that the prize wrested from him by fraud be given back. Good will befriends Euryalus, and his seemly tears and worth, that shows more winsome in a fair form. Diores backs him, making loud protest; he has reached the palm, but in vain won the last prize, if the highest honors are restored to Salius.

The crowd clamor in this event does not affect the action in any substantive way, but it is rather telling of the conflict to come. The Homeric precedent is the longer and rather complex dispute that breaks out over the chariot race in *Iliad* 23. In this episode, Achilles wants to award to the fallen man, Eumelus, the second prize (a mare) with the support of the Achaeans, but the young and rash Antilochus refuses to cede to him. Achilles responds by offering another prize to

---

<sup>41</sup> Quinn 1968, 155.

<sup>42</sup> This is the only noise made by the crowd in the otherwise more intimately narrated race scene. Their applause contains an element of “joyful surprise” (Heinze, 131).

Eumelus so Antilochus can keep the mare, but after Menelaus, who comes in third, complains of Antilochus' driving, the young man gives the mare to him, at which point Menelaus promptly gives it back (*Il.* 23). In essence then, Achilles' response to the dispute is reactive; by his arbitrary allocation of prizes, he creates a situation in which he must deal with new disputes as they crop up. Aeneas cuts off the arguments almost before they begin, assuring all that no one will lose a prize, and instead compensates Salius himself, and then Nisus as well after the latter speaks up (353-361).<sup>43</sup> Through both his words and actions, he demonstrates a remarkable level of control over the situation. In spite of the fact that Aeneas' allocation has allowed two cheaters to walk away with prizes, he has prevented a display of the elaborate one-upmanship shown by Menelaus and Antilochus, and thus has preserved his own absolute sway over the crowd as the chief beneficiary. No one may stand out as more generous than *pater* Aeneas.

**c. The Boxing Match: Unification through Division.** A more complex crowd dynamic is manifested in the boxing match. In contrast to the races, comprising whole groups of competitors (likely all Trojans for the ships, and a mix for the footrace), the binary nature of this contest gives rise to a purely nationalistic reaction from the Trojans. First, when the Trojan Dares stands to fight, there is a "murmuring" from the crowd (*magnoque virum cum murmure*, 5.369). The phrase seems to recall the winds of Book 1; this scene then, from the outset reflects both the sheer power and size of the boxer, and the uneasiness of the crowd. Both sides would presumably be speculating on who could possibly beat Dares (whose great reputation is detailed in 5.368-377), but with obviously very different feelings. When an opponent is sought from the crowd, no one can be found:

quaeritur huic alius; nec quisquam ex agmine tanto

---

<sup>43</sup> Heinze asserts that "Virgilian heroes do not quarrel" (Heinze, 129), but they have come awfully close!

audet adire virum manibusque inducere caestus. (5.378-9)

For him a match is sought; but none from all that throng durst face him or draw the gloves on to his hands.

The situation grows more tense when Dares demands his prize from Aeneas. The Trojans shout in support of Dares' demands:

...cuncti simul ore fremebant  
Dardanidae reddique viro promissa iubebant. (5.385-6)

At once all the Dardans shouted applause, and bade the promised prize be duly given him.

This shout marks a pivotal moment – the Trojans are making a demand of Aeneas (*iubebant*).

Will Father Aeneas award the prize to one of his own or wait for a challenger to emerge? If he awards the prize to Dares, does he risk alienating the friendly Sicilians? A false move could cause bad feelings. Luckily for Aeneas, he is relieved of the unpleasant task of such a potentially unpopular call. The demand from all of the Trojans (*cuncti*) prompts Acestes to chide the old boxer Entellus (387-393), and thus influences Entellus to enter and win the contest.<sup>44</sup>

The crowd is first amazed (*obstipuere animi*, 404)<sup>45</sup> by the impressive boxing gloves of Entellus. There is no reason to believe this does not include the Sicilians as well as the Trojans. During the fight itself – when Entellus misses a heavy swing and falls – the youth of both the Trojans and Sicilians stand and shout:

consurgunt studiis Teucris et Trinacria pubes;  
it clamor caelo...(5.450-1)

Eagerly the Teucrians and men of Sicily rise up; a shout mounts to heaven...

---

<sup>44</sup> Though Acestes is the king of the Sicilians, he and Entellus are seated merely upon “the green couch of grass” (*viridante toro...herbae*, 5.388). This could be another of the rustic touches of which Vergil is so fond, but here it also serves the more practical function of portraying Acestes and Entellus as spectators rather than rivals to Aeneas.

<sup>45</sup> Vergil uses this phrase in the exact wording in 2.120 (Sinon's pretend crowd), and in variations in 8.530, 9.123, and 11.120.

Williams translates *studiis* “with rival cries of support.”<sup>46</sup> Though it has the connotation here of an actual verbal expression, the word also has the more common sense of zeal or eagerness for victory. The word has already been used twice in the ship race for applause. First, it describes the general applause of the crowd at the opening of the ship race (5.148), where no one “favorite” is being applauded above the others. Next, it is used of the applause in which everyone (*cuncti*) cheers for the trailing ship of Mnestheus (5.227-228). The shout in the boxing match appears to mark more of a division between the two ethnic groups. The overall image, though, reflects unity. When the youth of both teams “stand up together” (*consurgunt*), attention is drawn not to the division between the loyalties of the groups, each of whom would presumably root for his own, but to their shared zeal for victory (*studiis*). The competition may have been intense, but Aeneas – with only a short remark pitying Dares for overestimating his own strength (465-7) – brings the fight to an amicable close: “He spoke, and with his voice broke off the fight” (*dixitque et proelia voce diremit*, 467).

**d. The Archery Contest: The Crowd at Prayer.** Aeneas initiates the archery contest immediately after the prizes are given for the boxing match (*protinus*, 485), a deft move in keeping excitement up and possible unruliness down. The archery contest turns out to be less a contest than a showpiece, a transition stage that leads the crowd out of the heated competition of the boxing match and into a situation of communal piety and religious awe. The crowd reacts only to the first and last competitors, Hippocoön and Acestes. As in the boxing match, there is a clear initial favorite: Hippocoön.<sup>47</sup> The crowd cheers for him “with a supportive clamor” (*clamore secundo*, 5.491). He also wins applause from the crowd when he hits the mast with his

---

<sup>46</sup> Williams on 5.450.

<sup>47</sup> Hippocoön, son of Hyrtacus may be the brother of Nisus, son of Hyrtacus (9.406) (Williams on 5.492). Nisus had been associated with the “crowd favorite” in the footrace, Euryalus.

shot (*ingenti sonuerunt omnia plausu*, 5.506). The cheer comes from all quarters, more from the locale than the people.<sup>48</sup> A similar characterization will have more complex connotations in the context of the “war spectator” crowd that watches the duel of Aeneas and Turnus. The closing of the archery contest will be marked by a very different crowd vocalization – prayers.

In Book 5, the only occasion in which the crowd prays occurs when the arrow of Acestes, the final archer to make his shot, bursts into flame:

attonitis haesere animis superosque precati  
Trinacrii Teucrique viri... (5.529-30)

In amazement the Trinacrians and Trojans stood rooted, praying to the powers above...

The prayers of the people may lack any set object, like the verbalized prayers of Aeneas and Cloanthus, but they are no less efficacious. Despite the poet’s silence on what the people pray for, what matters is that they have, as a pious people,<sup>49</sup> correctly assessed the situation as being of divine origin. Aeneas’ reaction proves that he acknowledges with his people and the Sicilians (“nor did great Aeneas reject the omen,” *nec maximus omen abnuit Aeneas*, 5.530-1), that the flaming arrow has a supernatural cause. He awards Acestes first prize. Aeneas acts as the *editor* of the games – a role Augustus would have taken – in following his people’s lead.

**e. The *Lusus Troiae*.** At the close of the competitive portion of the games, which have already drawn to a natural close with the appearance of the omen during the archery contest, the Trojan youth begin their equestrian display, and the crowd as a whole joins in admiration for the equestrians:

---

<sup>48</sup> In the end, the crowd favors Acestes who pulls off the worst “shot” in the competition. The prayer of the crowd (see below) takes the place of the more customary cheer.

<sup>49</sup> The easy inclusion of the Sicilians with the Trojans in their pious observance has definite political resonance; the Trojans and Latins do not pray together. Heinze suggests a connection between this scene and the important role of Segesta as a Roman ally in the first Punic War (Heinze, 134).

...quos omnis euntis  
Trinacriae mirata fremit Troiaequae iuventus. (5.554-5)

As they pass by, the men of Trinacria and Troy murmur in admiration.

The Trojans applaud the youths, who accept the gesture nervously:

excipiunt plausu pavidos gaudentque tuentes  
Dardanidae veterumque agnoscunt ora parentum. (5.575-6)

The Dardans welcome the anxious boys with applause and rejoice, as they gaze, to recognize in them the features of their departed parents.<sup>50</sup>

More important than this outward sign, though, is what happens inwardly; they rejoice in looking on them, and recognize the faces of their own ancestors (5.575-6). The Sicilians can only appreciate the equestrians at face value, that they are organized soldiers and competent horsemen.<sup>51</sup> The Trojans, on the other hand, feel themselves connected to their own ancestors in an event that links past generations of Trojans with present and future.<sup>52</sup> Both Trojan and Sicilian, however, have taken part in and enjoyed the spectacle of the games, and the “calm atmosphere” that prevails sets the stage for the surprising and troubling event of the burning of the Trojan ships.<sup>53</sup> The end result of watching the games then, has been “to redefine their participants as members of a new community of proto-Romans.”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> See above n. 24.

<sup>51</sup> This quality is not to be dismissed though: the “future heroes of the Latin War” are shown “exhibiting in games the qualities they are about to show in war” (Otis, 274).

<sup>52</sup> The tone of the episode is read very differently by critics: “Vergil’s gaze lingers with exceptional tenderness on the youngest surviving generation of ancient Troy,” and the scene radiates peace and joy in spite of coming losses of young men in battle, and expresses a certain yearning for peace for the younger generation despite the losses of civil war. “The longing should not be underrated simply because it was not destined to be fulfilled” (Heinze, 128-9). Newman and Newman are far less positive (20, 42ff.).

<sup>53</sup> Heinze, 133.

<sup>54</sup> Feldherr 1995, 256. Syed also highlights the importance of the scene as an indication that “Romanness” is something that can be learned; it is “based on cultural practice rather than ancestry” (Syed, 216-7). See subsection I.A.

## B. TROJANS AND OTHERS AT WAR

Both Homeric and Vergilian spectator crowds cheer at games,<sup>55</sup> but Homer's crowds rarely cheer during one-on-one battle confrontations. When Agamemnon announces Menelaus' victory against Paris, the Achaeans cheer in the closing line of the book (ἐπὶ δ' ἦνεον, *Il.* 3.461), but this is a victory by default, and the cheer does not come until the very end. Instead, Homeric crowds often pray for victory in the form of a *tis*-speech.<sup>56</sup> Cheers and shouts during the fights are out of the question, unless the troops themselves are involved, as when the Trojans shout when Odysseus is wounded, but follow up by closing in (*Il.* 11.459-60). The closest that the Homeric crowds come to an outright cheer at a duel in which they are merely spectators is the Greek rejoicing at (εὐρήθειον) and Trojan fear of Ajax prior to his fight with Hector in *Iliad* 7.<sup>57</sup> Following this episode, there is some limited rejoicing (by the Trojans, though not by the Greeks, who only accompany the rejoicing Ajax (*Il.* 7.307-312),<sup>58</sup> but there are no cheers during the fight itself. Vergil's crowds of Trojans and Latins as they watch one-on-one battles are often quite vocal, especially during two crucial battles involving Aeneas, which also, crucially, bring the action of battle to a halt. Moreover, they do not offer individualized prayers as the Homeric

---

<sup>55</sup> In fact, the crowds of Homer's games of *Iliad* 23 and *Odyssey* 8 cheer approximately as many times as the crowd of Vergil's games in *Aeneid* 5.

<sup>56</sup> E.g. the Achaean/Trojan *tis*-speech prayers prior to Menelaus' fight with Paris (*Il.* 3.297-302, 3.319-324), and the Achaean *tis*-speech prayer for one of their own men/Ajax to win (7.177-181/7.200-206).

<sup>57</sup> *Il.* 7.214-15. It is notable that Hector in this scene (using a "*tis*-potential speech) expresses concern for what men will say about them (7.299-303). The potential voice of the crowd is more important than its actual voice.

<sup>58</sup> The use of the verb χαίρω to express the rejoicing in these instances does not even necessarily suggest vocal cheers.



crowds do. Instead they shout, murmur, and cheer – just like a crowd in the arena watching a gladiatorial combat.<sup>59</sup>

There are a few instances in which spectators react to an episode in the fighting, but none of these possesses the same gravity as the more formal duel scenes involving Aeneas. When Ascanius kills the obnoxious Remulus in Book 9, the Trojans cheer him with joy:

...Teucri clamore sequuntur  
laetitiae fremunt animosque ad sidera tollunt. (9.636-7)

...The Teucrians second him with cheers, they shout for joy, and raise their spirits to the skies.

The circumstances here are that the Trojans are defending their walls from a Rutulian onslaught, and so it is likely that the Trojans cheer because most of them can see the action from the ramparts. The action, however, does not come to a halt. If anything, battle continues with even greater ferocity.

Likewise, Tarchon's actions in Book 11 (more than his words) serve to rally his Etruscan troops, who had been wavering (*cedentiaque agmina*, 11.729) when faced with Camilla.

Tarchon chides his men, but they do not spring into action until he has slain Venulus, at which point a clamor is raised:

tollitur in caelum clamor cunctique Latini  
convertere oculos...(11.745-6).

A shout rises to heaven, as all the Latins turned their eyes on the sight.

His men then go into battle following his “example and success” (*exemplum eventumque secuti*, 11.758).<sup>60</sup> In both of these cases, the battle has not come to a halt sufficient to render *clamor* as the shout or cheer of true spectators rather than the more ubiquitous battle cry.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Hardie (1986) comments on the “strong feeling of the gladiatorial about the death of Turnus” (151). Another overt gladiatorial reference is Messapus’ remark of “*hoc habet*” (the typical phrase uttered by arena spectators when a gladiator was hit with a death blow) on the death of Aulestes (12.296).

The death of Camilla has a greater effect. Her own Volsicans primarily take notice:

convertere animos acris oculosque tulere  
cuncti ad reginam Volsci...(11.800-801)

...all the Volsicans turned their eager eyes and minds to the queen.

But the event is significant enough for other crowds present in the battle as well to cry out “a boundless uproar arose, striking the golden stars” (*immensus surgens ferit aurea clamor sidera*, 11.832-3). In spite of the momentary picturesque detail, the battle goes on, with Trojans, Etruscans, and Arcadians gaining the upper hand (11.834-5).<sup>62</sup>

### 1. Female Spectator Crowds

The death of Camilla brings to the fore an often forgotten crowd, that of the women. In scenarios of battle especially, the women are often out of sight or in the background, but when they do appear, it is almost always as a spectator crowd, and not necessarily one far removed from the action. The Arcadian *pavidae...matres* (the same phrase used at 2.489 for the women in Priam’s palace during the fall of Troy) stand on the walls of Pallanteum watching their men and their new Trojan allies depart for war (8.592). There is something static about their dignified reserve. One unique scenario in female spectator crowds is in reference to Camilla on the occasion of her introduction into the story at the end of Book 7:

illam omnis tectis agrisque effusa iuventus  
turbaque miratur matrum et prospectat euntem,  
attonitis inhians animis ut regius ostro  
velet honos levis umeros, ut fibula crinem  
auro internectat, Lyciam ut gerat ipsa pharetram  
et pastoralem praefixa cuspide myrtum. (7.812-817)

---

<sup>60</sup> See also Pallas’ example to his Arcadians (10.397-411) discussed in subsection VI.B.1.e.

<sup>61</sup> A battle cry as opposed to the cheering of spectators might involve a crucial turning point in the larger battle, but the men continue to fight without interruption. Clear “battle cry” occurrences: 8.595, 9.38-9, 54-5, 466-7, 503-4, 791-6, 10.738, 799, 11.622, 12.409-10, 12.462-3.

<sup>62</sup> For more on the effects of a leader like Camilla, see subsection VI.B.1.c.

All the youth, streaming from house and field, and thronging matrons marvel, and gaze at her as she goes; agape with wonder at how the glory of royal purple drapes her smooth shoulders, how the clasp entwines her hair with gold, how her own hands bear a Lycian quiver and the pastoral myrtle tipped with steel.

Two points are immediately clear: first, that she has earned a special sort of attention from a mixed crowd of Rutulians – both youths and women – whom Turnus himself had not been able to inspire with such admiration,<sup>63</sup> even though they are the very groups who started the war.<sup>64</sup> Second, that the attention is not of the best sort – Camilla is an object of wonder, but presumably only because of her outward appearance and the strangeness of someone of her gender in the role that she has taken on.

But while the men of the city who had witnessed the death of Camilla in their own spectator crowd are now perishing in heaps before the gates of Laurentum during the Trojan onslaught,<sup>65</sup> the Latin women have been witnessing everything “from the watchtowers” (*e speculis*, 11.877).<sup>66</sup> It is clear, then that not only men can be the spectator crowds of battle scenes. In fact, it is apparent that the women as spectators of Camilla’s death are more important than the Latin men involved in the battle; the latter had given the Trojans and their allies the opportunity to attack, but the Latin *matres*, inspired by Camilla’s bravery (*ut videre Camillam*, 11.892), attempt to defend the walls with whatever they have on hand.<sup>67</sup>

ipsae de muris summo certamine matres  
(monstrat amor verus patriae, ut videre Camillam)  
tela manu trepidae iaciunt ac robore duro

---

<sup>63</sup> Horsfall imagines her appearance as “an heroic reenacting of the *adventus* of a great republican magnate.” For *effusa*, he notes specific political occasions in which the word describes crowds, e.g. Livy 1.14.8, CLE 271.13, Cic. *Pis.* 51. “Choice of words repeatedly confirms that for V., this is a familiar scene from Roman public life” (on 7.812).

<sup>64</sup> DiCesare, 134.

<sup>65</sup> See subsection V.E.

<sup>66</sup> Fratantuono on 11.877: “Virgil’s emphasis is on how the *speculae* have allowed the *matres* to view the day’s combat.”

<sup>67</sup> Rossi comments, “the Latin mothers are able to bridge the gap between female and male spheres of activity and engage in a role that, with the exception of the Amazons, was denied to the epic women of the *Iliad* and of Quintus (120).”

stipitibus ferrum sudibusque imitantur obustis  
praecipites, primaeque mori pro moenibus ardent. (11.891-5)

The very mothers from the walls, in keenest rivalry (true love of country points the way), when they marked Camilla, fling weapons with trembling hands, and hastily do the work of steel with stout oaken poles and seared stakes, and burn to be the first to die defending their walls.

Once the Rutulian men have already fled (*turbati fugiunt Rutuli*, 11.869), the Latin *matres*, thanks to their experiences as spectators, now exhibit the kind of competitive spirit (*summo certamine*, 11.891) valued by the Trojans as well as endurance and capacity for collective activity. They have also shown a misguided piety earlier in their prayer for Aeneas' death, but a piety nonetheless (11.481-485).<sup>68</sup> The possession by the Latin women of at least some of the key characteristics of the Trojan crowd serves to highlight the manner in which spectacle and spectators can influence one another to great effect,<sup>69</sup> but more importantly suggests the coming Trojan/Latin unity.<sup>70</sup>

## 2. Watching Aeneas in Battle

Aeneas himself constitutes an important force for the Trojans' success in battle. Although Aeneas is absent for the fighting of Book 9, his appearance on his ship brings about a much-needed morale boost to his beleaguered troops:<sup>71</sup>

Iamque in conspectu Teucros habet et sua castra  
stans celsa in puppi, clipeum cum deinde sinistra

---

<sup>68</sup> “Virgil frames the crucial battle narrative of Book 11 with the Latin *matres*, who, in their move from votive offering to martial valor, show their abandonment of the deities who have abandoned them” (Fratantuono on 11.479-80).

<sup>69</sup> Rossi notes the “process of evolution in the space of this brief scene” that the Latin women have undergone (123).

<sup>70</sup> Zarker (21) praises the independence and fighting spirit of the Italian *matres* as “fit ancestors for the fighting Romans of the Augustan age and for the strong-willed women of imperial Rome.”

<sup>71</sup> The simile is based on *Il.* 3.3-7 (the cranes versus the Pygmies), but there, the Trojans simply make noise upon entering battle; here, their joy is specific to the arrival of Aeneas (Harrison on 10.264-5).

extulit ardentem. clamorem ad sidera tollunt  
Dardanidae e muris, spes addita suscitatur iras,  
tela manu iaciunt, quales sub nubibus atris  
Strymoniae dant signa grues atque aethera tranant  
cum sonitu, fugiuntque Notos clamore secundo. (10.260-266)

And now, as he stands on the high stern, he had the Trojans and his camp in view, when at once he lifted high in his left hand his blazing shield. The Dardans from the walls raise a shout to the sky; fresh hope kindles wrath; they hurl their weapons – just as below black clouds Strymonian cranes give signal, while clamorously they skim the air, and flee before the south winds with joyous cries.

The Rutulians will be awed by this change of mood until they see the ships (267-9), but it is clear that the Trojans respond not to the sight of the ships alone, but specifically to Aeneas' gesture.

The flame that materializes upon his head is compared to a comet or to Sirius (272-5), an indication that Aeneas' entry into battle will be as bad for his opponents as it is good for the Trojans. Most important here is the fact that Aeneas' appearance alone – there is no need for words – is enough to give his men a second wind.

### 3. Aeneas Versus Mezentius

The first proper “duel” scene of the *Aeneid* takes place between Aeneas and the exiled king Mezentius. By the time the crowd shouts, Aeneas has already wounded Mezentius, and the latter is asking after his son Lausus, whom Aeneas has just killed in an attempt to defend his retreating father. Mezentius charges at Aeneas and hurls several javelins at him. Mezentius circles Aeneas. The latter delivers a deathblow to Mezentius' horse. When the horse falls, taking his rider with him, the crowd makes a *clamor*: “Trojans and Latins set heaven aflame with their cries” (*clamore incendunt caelum Troesque Latinique*, 10.895). It is a single line, but it has a

bold effect.<sup>72</sup> The fact that the Trojans and Latins literally “ignite” the sky with their noise brings into focus the ultimate force of coming unity that this duel, as well as the final duel between Aeneas and Turnus will take on.

The posture of the combatants as described at this stage is not dissimilar to that of two gladiators in the arena: Aeneas holds his sword to Mezentius, while the latter acknowledges his impending doom, asking only for a burial. That he does this, in fact, hearkens back to the “righteous fury” (*furiis...iustis*, 8.494) that Mezentius’ people had expressed when they had forced him into exile; they are likely to abuse the body if they capture it.<sup>73</sup> When Aeneas cuts Mezentius’ throat, there is no hint at any noise from the crowd, but Book 10 ends on that grim note. The fact that Book 11 opens with a truce suggests that the duel has been truly a decisive “spectator” event, and not simply another battle vignette. The action of the battle – in fact, of the war itself – has come to a standstill both during the fight and in its immediate aftermath.

#### 4. Aeneas versus Turnus

The duel between Aeneas and Turnus constitutes the most decisive one for both Trojans and Latins. Turnus himself initiates the duel. This is fitting, as he had conceived of the idea of a duel attended by Latin spectators: *sedeant spectentque Latini* “let the Latins sit and see it” (12.15).<sup>74</sup> It is also fitting because the Rutulians will break the truce intended to allow for the

---

<sup>72</sup> Servius comments “*abusive dixit*”, but Heyne quotes Aesch, *Persae*. 395: “σάλπιξ δ’ αὐτῆι πάντ’ ἐκεῖν’ ἐπέφλεγεν” (Williams on 895). Harrison (on 895) notes the synaesthetic effect (μετάληψις αἰσθήσεως) and Vergil’s fondness for the pairing of *clamor* and *caelum* (5.451, 9.504, 11.192, 878, and 12.462).

<sup>73</sup> It is only fair to Mezentius to note that he acknowledges that he deserves his people’s hatred: *debueram patriae poenas odiisque meorum* (10.853).

<sup>74</sup> See also 12.78-9.

settling of the war by means of the duel in the heightening emotions that commence at 12.216.<sup>75</sup>

The planned nature of the fight sets it apart from the occasional *ad hoc* calling out of an opponent in battle. Latinus expresses his concerns at the beginning of Book 12 concerning the negative publicity that will be rampant among Rutulians and all of Italy if he “should betray Turnus to death” while he is courting Lavinia (12.40-2). Turnus’ idea of the outcome, implicit in his wish not so much that the Trojans, but specifically that the Latins see the fight, suggests that he sees in it (aside from his different idea of the likely outcome) the chance for the Latins to witness his prowess and his victory over the Trojan interloper.

When the Trojan and Rutulian troops assemble with the intention of witnessing the duel of their leaders very early in Book 12, they work together to prepare the field for the *certamen* (12.116), an obvious foreshadowing of their forthcoming unity.<sup>76</sup> The description of the spectators of the match is telling:

utque dato signo spatia in sua quisque recessit,  
defigunt tellure hastas et scuta reclinant.  
tum studio effusae matres et vulgus inermum  
invalidique senes turris ac tecta domorum  
obsedere, alii portis sublimibus astant. (12.129-133)

As soon as, on the given signal, each has retired to his own ground, they plant their spears in the earth, and rest their shields against them. Then, eagerly streaming forth, mothers and the unarmed throng, and feeble old men, have beset towers and housetops; others stand upon the lofty gates.

There are two very distinct groups. First, there is the military contingent who watch from the field itself, but even these have effectively abrogated their martial responsibilities by laying aside their weapons. Second is the *vulgus inermum* (almost certainly a recollection of the Trojan *ignobile vulgus* in 2.798-800) who watch from the walls of the city. The Trojan group had included *pubes* and *viri* along with the *matres*, but this group includes only the *matres* and

---

<sup>75</sup> See subsection V.F.1.

<sup>76</sup> For discussion of this passage, see VII.A.3.

*invalidi...senes*, as the youths and the men are presumably on the battlefield.<sup>77</sup> The latter group, moreover, has taken up their position on the walls, as expressed by the instantaneous perfect *obsedere*, in order to have a good view of the fight.<sup>78</sup> The spectacle of the duel, however, is not to happen just yet thanks to the interference of Juno and some of this crowd's innate problematic characteristics.<sup>79</sup>

When the fight itself is actually about to take place, Turnus orders the Rutulians to fall back and the Latins to stop fighting. The troops yield to his command: "All those between them dispersed and gave room" (*discessere omnes medii spatiumque dedere*, 12.696). The reference to the center (*medium*) here is reminiscent of 5.110, where Aeneas marks off a space for the prizes during the games. The Rutulians, Trojans, and Italians are said to turn their eyes (*convertere oculos*, 12.705) to watch. This is not unique to the spectator crowd scene (e.g. Tarchon and Venulus: *cuncti Latini convertere oculos*, 11.745-6). What is more informative is the addition of the adverb *certatim* (12.704):

iam vero et Rutuli certatim et Troes et omnes  
convertere oculos Itali, quique alta tenebant  
moenia quique imos pulsabant ariete muros  
armaque deposuere umeris...(12.704-7)

Now indeed, all eagerly turned their eyes – Rutulians, and Trojans, and Italians, both those who held the lofty ramparts and those whose ram battered the walls below – and took off the armor from their shoulders.

They are struggling to see the action of this event that is more important to all of their combined fates than all of the fighting between the armies up to this point, a fact that Latinus himself

---

<sup>77</sup> A clever recollection, perhaps, of the Augustan seating arrangements at the games?

<sup>78</sup> Quinn 1968, 97.

<sup>79</sup> See subsections V.F.1-2.



recognizes as he too joins the crowd in watching (12.707-9).<sup>80</sup> The emphasis is on the fact that both the attackers (Trojans) and the defenders (Rutulians and Italians) put down their weapons (12.707). The formerly active, warlike crowd have reverted to the posture of Book 5, but no longer wielding the power, very real if trivial by comparison, that they had demonstrated in that book to influence the course of the games. Now, they are truly only spectators.<sup>81</sup>

The fight begins. Almost immediately, a simile that takes into account the whole scene creates a highly significant “trespass” effect. Aeneas and Turnus are fighting bulls, whereas the crowd is compared to a herd of mooing heifers:<sup>82</sup>

ac velut ingenti Sila summove Taburno  
cum duo conversis inimica in proelia tauri  
frontibus incurrunt, pavidi cessere magistri,  
stat pecus omne metu mutum, mussantque iuvencae  
quis nemori imperitet, quem tota armenta sequantur;  
illi inter sese multa vi vulnera miscent  
cornuaque obnixa infigunt et sanguine largo  
colla armos lavant, gemitu nemus omne remugit: (12.715-722)

And as in mighty Sila or on Taburnus’ height, when two bulls charge, brow to brow, in mortal battle, in terror the keepers fall back, the whole herd stands mute with dread, and the heifers dumbly wait to see who will be lord of the forest, whom all the herds will follow; with mighty force they deal mutual wounds, gore with butting horns, and bathe neck and shoulders in streaming blood; all the woodland echoes with their bellowing...

What does this mean? Can Vergil be treating the once-valiant troops of both sides as a herd of helpless bovines? The herd is silent (*mutum*) but it is possible that the heifers “murmur” (*mussant*) over who will lead them. Before the fight had commenced, the earth had been said to give a groan (*gemitum*, 12.713). Here, the whole grove resounds with a groan (12.722).

---

<sup>80</sup> Rossi points out in comparison that the duel between Paris and Menelaus, “although meant...to put an end to the war, does not extend beyond a personal conflict between the two contenders” (153).

<sup>81</sup> Rossi, 156.

<sup>82</sup> The simile is based on Apollonius 2.88-9, but Vergil emphasizes “the conflict for leadership” (Williams on 12.715).

The subsequent battle has both sides vocalizing with equal vehemence. First, the Trojans and Latins, noted as being nervous (*trepidi*), cry out and strain to see as Turnus makes a decisive-seeming strike – another indication of the gladiatorial character of the fight:

...exclamant Troes trepidique Latini,  
arrectaeque amborum acies...(12.730-1)

The Trojans and nervous Latins cry aloud; both armies are alert with excitement.

Turnus runs in circles, in a panic, but the Trojans close in on him:

undique enim densa Teucris inclusere corona  
atque hinc vasta palus, hinc ardua moenia cingunt. (12.744-745)

...for on all sides the Teucrians enclosed him in a crowded ring, and on one side a waste fen, and on another steep ramparts hem him in.

Critics have long noted the absolute terror and isolation that is characteristic of the last moments of Turnus, but few have appreciated the sense of claustrophobia conveyed by the encroaching crowd.<sup>83</sup> Rossi notes that the Trojans make a “communal and organized effort” here to help Aeneas “to neutralize the enemy.”<sup>84</sup> Hardie comments that the leaders fight “in total isolation, despite and because of the huge audience of spectators.”<sup>85</sup> Their being so completely surrounded only heightens the sense of the arena being conveyed; if isolated, both men are completely in the public conspectus. There is another *clamor* as Aeneas pursues Turnus around the ring:

tum vero exoritur clamor ripaeque lacusque  
responsant circa et caelum tonat omne tumultu. (12.756-7)

Then indeed a din breaks out; the banks and pools make answer, and all heaven thunders with the tumult.

The dominant idea is that of an echo. The land has become at this stage a part of the crowd. It is apparent, though, that not all of the encroaching men are hostile to Turnus. While Turnus had

---

<sup>83</sup> Rossi remarks that he is “hemmed in” (157).

<sup>84</sup> This stands in contrast to Hector’s rejection “of such aid” during his duel with Achilles, an action that “underscores unequivocally the lack of identification between individual and collectivity, personal glory and public interest, that defines the relationship between heroes and collectivity in the Homeric world” (Rossi, 157).

<sup>85</sup> Hardie 1986, 151.

called out for his sword, even calling some of his men by name (758-9), Aeneas threatens anyone who comes forward (presumably to the assistance of Turnus) with death and the destruction of his city (12.760-2). The threats sound savage, but they are in essence a warning to the crowd to stay within their boundaries and to allow the two leaders to settle the conflict as promised.

Turnus soon becomes disoriented by the stress of battle, but he gazes upon his Rutulians (*Rutulos aspectat et urbem*, 915), whom he has, in his own mind, let down, just before Aeneas lays him low by a spear-wound to the thigh. At this, the Rutulians react:

consurgunt gemitu Rutuli totusque remugit  
mons circum et vocem late nemora alta remittent. (12.928-9)

The Rutulians start up with a groan; all the hills re-echo round about, and far and near the wooded slopes send back the sound.

There is no reason to assume that all nature is involved in Turnus' tragedy as Pöschl has claimed.<sup>86</sup> Rather, the sound of the Rutulians recalls the echoes in an arena, as has been seen in a more lighthearted context in the Book 5 games.<sup>87</sup> Turnus' men can no longer help him, but for that he has himself to blame, since he had claimed all of that power for himself by proposing the duel. The Rutulians are merely an audience and their groan is the only expression of "power" they have left. Of course, this final vocalization is more than the Trojans get;<sup>88</sup> Jupiter has just stated that "the Teucrians shall but sink down" (*subsident Teucrici*, 12.836), and so the Rutulians have the distinct honor of not fading into obscurity at the end of the poem.

---

<sup>86</sup> Pöschl, 135. See also Williams on 12.928-9.

<sup>87</sup> 5.148-150. Rossi comments that the groan symbolizes the "response of the entire body at its self-destruction and dismemberment" (165), a strange reading considering that Aeneas' victory over Turnus has the opposite effect in restoring the *foedus*. See subsection VII.A.3.

<sup>88</sup> Pöschl explains that the Trojans are silent because they "do not rejoice at Turnus' death and the Rutulians' grief." Cf. the Greek paean at the death of Hector. The difference is "intended to arouse our compassion for Turnus" (135).

In the cosmically significant battle between Aeneas and Turnus,<sup>89</sup> both the Trojans and Italians are reduced (if only for the immediate present) to the status of spectators at the games rather than warring nations, but this status has considerable advantages for both sides. The Italians have been spared the ignominy of defeat, and the Trojans have been spared being in the awkward position of conquerors destined to merge with their would-be subjects.<sup>90</sup> Both groups will, of course, in time become the Romans, and in that eventuality, enjoying the sense of competition inherent in entertaining spectacles will become one of their most cherished national pastimes. War and the tasks of empire, however point to a more serious application of the Roman competitive spirit (emphatically outward, and not to internal disputes). As seen in CHAPTER I, however, the people of Rome are not fated, for much of their history, to enjoy unlimited peace. In the meantime, there are some serious political issues that the Trojans and Italians must iron out before they truly become one people.

---

<sup>89</sup> See Hardie 1986, 147 for the echoes of gigantomachy found in this scene.

<sup>90</sup> Gransden comments: "This is a war in which nobody loses" (1984, 120). Cf. Thomas 1998, 283: "nobody wins."

## V. SEDITION AND DISORDER

The *Aeneid* opens with unruly crowds in both divine and human spheres. Disorder starts at the divine level with Juno, and Vergil frames the cosmic event of the storm at sea in terms familiar to any Roman citizen, the sedition of an urban mob (1.148-153).<sup>1</sup> It is ironic that although Neptune curbs the imagined sedition of the simile almost immediately, the divine sedition for which it stands (understood in terms of Juno's undermining of Jupiter's will) goes on until almost the very end of the poem (12.818). The Trojan women in Book 5 effectively rebel, and war in Latium breaks out in Books 7 and 11-12 as a division between the Amata/Turnus faction and that of Latinus. On the divine level, Juno causes both of these, but not without the seeds of discontent already present in these groups.<sup>2</sup> Jupiter may cede the "death" of the Trojan name to Juno (12.828), but ultimately disorder cannot be stamped out. The Romans will struggle through sedition after historical sedition, ranging from relatively minor urban disturbances to all-out civil war. The poem reveals that *seditio* is a constant in both the human and divine realms,<sup>3</sup> but as will be seen, it does not always have entirely negative connotations.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 1.149 marks the first appearance of the word *seditio* in the poem. 11.340 (the description of Drances) is the second and last.

<sup>2</sup> Claims that Juno has "tainted" the Trojan/Italian union (e.g. Johnson, 138-9) fail to take this into account the latent tendencies of the groups involved, although Juno is certainly the catalyst.

<sup>3</sup> The crowd of the unburied dead that Aeneas encounters in the underworld (6.305-331) also exhibits disorderly traits, e.g. *turba...effusa ruebat* (305) *turba* (325), *motusque tumultu* (317), but this is understandable, as the order of the civilization of the living is not operant (Likewise, Deiphobus refers to the underworld as the "land of disorder" (*turbida loca*, 6.534). Each

#### A. THE WINDS: THE STATESMAN SIMILE: 1.148-153

Immediately following the poem's proem, Juno sets off sedition by seeking help from Aeolus. The winds, like a typical Roman crowd, are an innately unruly bunch that Jupiter had already curbed by covering them with a mountain and giving them a king (1.61-2). Much of the vocabulary used to describe them is typically applied by Vergil to disorder in both the human and natural world: *luctantis ventos tempestatesque sonoras* (1.53), *illi indignantes magno cum murmure montis circum claustra fremunt* (1.55-56), *Interea magno misceri murmure pontum* (1.124).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the storm that the winds stir up at Juno's behest causes the first human noise of the epic, the shouting of Aeneas' men (*insequitur clamorque virum*, 1.87).

The rebellion of the winds is reminiscent of Livy's portrayal of the early Romans under the monarchy who, had they attained premature freedom, would have been "stirred by the ruffling storms of tribunician demagogues" (*agitari coepta esset tribuniciiis procellis*, Livy 2.1.4).<sup>6</sup> Livy uses a commonplace metaphor of "storm winds" of popular politics,<sup>7</sup> so the fact that Vergil creates a rebellion consisting of winds is not surprising; nor is the statesman simile that he uses to lend it immediacy for his audience. Clearly the winds, like the (hypothetically) problematic Romans in later years, have "thrown off their fear of kings" (*soluta regio metu*, Livy 2.1.4). Although they do obey their king, Aeolus, as long as he restrains them, they do so

---

unburied soul, further, desires only his or her individual burial. Contrast the happy individualized activities of the souls in the Blissful Groves (642-659).

<sup>4</sup> Putnam is right to acknowledge that, "a certain turbulence is important in the creative individual as well as in mankind as a whole," but his suggestion that Aeneas has somehow forced "individual irrationalities" on the Latins (and Trojans) and thus done "fatal harm" to their societies fails to give proper consideration to the turbulence in "mankind as a whole" (Putnam, 1970, 428), and is thus in danger of leading him into an overly authoritarian view of humanity.

<sup>5</sup> Williams on 1.124: *misceri* is "a favorite word with Vergil to denote turmoil."

<sup>6</sup> See subsection I.B on the historical background.

<sup>7</sup> A common classical trope, e.g. Cicero, *Pro Planc.* 4.11, 6.15.

begrudgingly (1.52-4); when he gives them free rein, they run rampant.<sup>8</sup> Neptune's control of the winds in the simile has more important connotations.

As if to conflate the divine and human realms – or, more precisely, to demonstrate how unruly crowds at the divine level can cause disorder in human crowds – Vergil compares the “divine” crowds (the unruly winds) to an unruly human crowd.<sup>9</sup> The idea of a simile comparing something in the natural world to something in the human realm is not unknown,<sup>10</sup> though it is less common than similes that work the other way around. Nor is the trope of comparing crowds to waves or storm winds, as Homer does on multiple occasions.<sup>11</sup> What is unique in Vergil's version is that someone appears to end the disorderly conduct. The god Neptune is compared to a man outstanding in his piety who calms the angry mob:

ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est  
seditio saevitque animis ignobile vulgus  
iamque faces et saxa volant, furor arma ministrat;  
tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem  
conspexere, silent arrectisque auribus astant;  
ille regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet: (1.148-153)

And as, when oftentimes in a great nation tumult has risen, the base rabble rage angrily, and now brands and stones fly, madness lending arms; then, if perchance they set eyes on a man honored for noble character and service, they are silent and stand by with attentive ears; with speech he sways their passion and soothes their breasts.

---

<sup>8</sup> That Neptune calls Eurus and Zephyrus onto the carpet for taking part in the sedition (1.131-141) reveals that the crowd of winds has an internal hierarchy of leaders, who might have been expected to act as restraining forces.

<sup>9</sup> See Cairns, 94 for a verbal comparison between the sedition of the winds and the sedition in the simile, e.g. *rex* (52) and *regit* (153); *furentibus* (51) and *furor* (150).

<sup>10</sup> Similes from the human realm are more common in Homer than in Vergil. Cf. *Il.* 14.413f. and Callimachus, *Epigr.* 1.9f. (Williams on 7.378f.).

<sup>11</sup> E.g. *Il.* 2.207-210, 394-397, 4.422-432, 13.330-338, 14.392-401, 15.381-4, 16.294-300, and 16.262-266. See Austin 1.148ff. for a more complete list. Vanderbroeck mentions Vergil's simile in conjunction with several Ciceronian examples: *Clu.* 138, *Planc.* 15, and *Mur.* 35-6 (Vanderbroeck, 187).

References to historical events and persons, as well as connections to Aeneas,<sup>12</sup> have been detected in this passage (esp. to Cato or to Menenius Agrippa), and likewise an appeal to a more universal principal of good leadership and the order of the universe.<sup>13</sup> Most studies, however, have only concentrated on one side of this equation, the “man honored for noble character and service” to the neglect of the “base rabble,”<sup>14</sup> though further insight into the possible identity of the leader could shed light onto that of the crowd.

What, ostensibly, would be the hypothetical political context of this *sedition*? This episode – especially given the fact that it is quelled – cannot be taken as a serious revolution. A *contio* seems to be the most likely candidate.<sup>15</sup> It is a common occurrence (*saepe*, 148). The crowd itself is angry (e.g. *saevit*, 149, *furor*, 150), loud (a fact that can be deduced from the later *silent*, 152), and potentially violent (*faces et saxa volant*, *furor arma ministrat*, 150). Mouritsen lists a number of noisy historical *contiones* dating from 169 BC,<sup>16</sup> and so potential historical paradigms are not lacking. The most informative aspect of the simile is not the crowd or leader

---

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Cairns, 95, Anderson 1968, 4.

<sup>13</sup> The assent in the divine assembly of 10.96-99 (which also contains a storm wind simile) is a good example of the latter. Hellenistic treatises on kingship (e.g. Diotogenes, quoted in Cairns and Thesleff) stress that an important function of a king is to bring “a kingdom, both as a whole and in its parts, into a harmony” because the harmony of the state is “an imitation of the order and harmony of the world” (Cairns 22-23). To this end, Harrison poses the interesting suggestion that Vergil has modeled the simile on Hesiod, *Theog.* 81-94 (1988, 55-59).

<sup>14</sup> It has been noted (e.g. Cairns 9, 1989) that this scene is connected to positive models of kingship. Conversely, the simile suggests the existence of scenes with the opposite significance – bad kings and bad leaders who ineffectively control their people (Latinus) or even goad them into seditious behavior (Turnus and Drances).

<sup>15</sup> Mouritsen defines the *contio* as “a non-decision-making meeting called by a magistrate or priest with *ius contionandi*...” with informative, emergency, pre-legislative, or *ad hoc* functions (38).

<sup>16</sup> See Livy 43.16.8 for this particular *contio* (Mouritsen 47ff.).



alone, but the interplay between them. The crowd's calmness at the first sight of the leader is fairly anomalous<sup>17</sup> and should not be overlooked.

A speaker at a *contio* or less formal gathering could lose control of a crowd. As Mouritsen relates, no less a figure than Pompey was shouted down during his defense of Milo in 56 BC.<sup>18</sup> Cicero was jeered while defending Rabirius (Cicero, *Rab. Perd.* 18), as was Lepidus by a hired crowd (Appian *B.C.*, 2.131). Speakers could regain this lost control, but not (usually) until they actually spoke. It is surprising then, that Vergil's *pietate gravis ac meritis...vir* has been identified so consistently with these speaking figures.<sup>19</sup> If a historical figure must be brought in, Augustus provides a better paradigm.<sup>20</sup> In spite of a far from perfect crowd relations record,<sup>21</sup> he demonstrates some of the firmness of a Cato in terms of his ability to disagree with a crowd, as he does in refusing to recall Julia from exile despite popular petition (Suetonius *Div. Aug.* 65.3), or even to rebuke it when necessary, as he does when the populace demands a largess that he had never promised to them (42.2).<sup>22</sup>

What is somewhat unique about the leadership style of Augustus is that on several occasions he manages to make an impression on his people by sight alone. He calms a panic concerning unstable seating at a theatre simply by moving his own seat to the threatened section

---

<sup>17</sup> Instances where there is a threat of force in spite of the leader's presence, e.g. Cicero, *Pro Milo.* 1-3, have nothing to do with the respectful silence accorded the man in the simile.

<sup>18</sup> Cicero, *Fam.* 1.56.1; Q. Fr. 2.3.2; Plutarch, *Pompeius*, 48.7.65 (Mouritsen, 44-5).

<sup>19</sup> Morwood, I think, is right to note this general point. His identification of the speaker as Menenius Agrippa from Livy's account of the secession of the plebs and Agrippa's fable of the parts of the body (Livy 2.32-33.3) does not explicitly depict a speaker who calms the crowd by appearance alone. He is right to dismiss Cato because he only affects the crowd by his demeanor and words after they have assaulted him (Plutarch, *Cato Minor* 44, Morwood 1998, 196-8).

<sup>20</sup> Another figure who represents good leadership in the face of disaster in the context of the *Aeneid* is Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who will "steady" the Roman state when it "is reeling under a brutal shock" (*hic rem Romanum magno turbante tumultu sistet*, 6.857-8).

<sup>21</sup> Suetonius describes an incident in which he has a civilian who was seen taking notes in an assembly of soldiers murdered on the spot (*Div. Aug.* 27.4).

<sup>22</sup> For further discussion of Augustus and the crowd, see CHAPTER I, and subsections IV.A.2-3.

(Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 43.5). He checks “unseemly flattery” by the people at a performance merely “by look and gesture” (*manu vultuque*, 53.1). Suetonius’ account of the Gallic chieftain who refrained from throwing him off a cliff due to the emperor’s calm expression (*vultu erat,, adeo tranquillo serenoque* 79.1) – he elaborates on a “divine power” that Augustus liked to have people perceive in his eyes (79.2) – gives further point to this attested ability of the emperor’s. The rhetorical skills of previous leaders had served to bolster their authority and the respect accorded to them by the crowd, but Augustus (like Aeneas) is “strikingly laconic.”<sup>23</sup> Perhaps taking a cue from his distant monarchical predecessor Romulus,<sup>24</sup> Augustus recognizes the importance of the visual on the crowds of Rome. And yet, although Augustus does provide a good model for the statesman,<sup>25</sup> Pöschl sensibly suggests that no one historical individual may be meant by the simile, but rather “the idea of a statesman whose authority dominates the crowd.”<sup>26</sup> It is they, after all, to whom we must direct our attention.

The winds may be representative of a Roman mob, and their leader may recall Augustus, or at least an Augustan ideal of leadership, but in the *Aeneid*, the winds are not the only troublesome crowd. The noise of the “seditious” crowd in this case illuminates both the divine sedition of the winds instigated by Juno, and the later human seditions of the epic. The simile is to be cast and recast in the medium of the action of the poem, but in a largely negative sense in which an *ignobile vulgus* rages, but no *pietate gravis ac meritis...vir* appears. Sedition caused by Juno is another thread that can be traced throughout the epic, if at times hers is a rather lonely sedition, with only a few of her agents (mainly Allecto and Juturna) to back up her schemes. In

---

<sup>23</sup> West 1998, 314.

<sup>24</sup> Romulus is said to begin “to surround himself with greater state” in his institution of lictors, the *sella curulis*, and the *toga praetexta* (Livy 1.8.1-3).

<sup>25</sup> Pöschl seems to suggest as much in citing the expression of the “idea of regulation” in the *Aeneid*: Aeolus, Neptune, Aeneas, Augustus, and Jupiter are all portrayed in this role (22).

<sup>26</sup> Pöschl, 21.

many cases, as with the winds, the other participants in Juno's seditions are not aware of the extent to which their own involvement may cause harm. The behavior of various crowds involved in these seditions reflects the magnitude of this harm and its often far-reaching ramifications. The primary scenes in which sedition can be said to cause such chaos are the revolt of the women in Book 5, the onset of war in Italy in Book 7, and the final dissolution of order in Latium in Books 11 and 12.

## B. SEDITION OF THE *TROADES*

Book 5 of the *Aeneid* is commonly viewed as an instance of rest and calm in the middle of the voyage of the Trojans.<sup>27</sup> The sedition of the *Troades* at the instigation of Juno near the end of the book, however, poses a considerable challenge to that view. The scene rates as an instance of crowd behavior that escalates from mere mourning, complaint, and prayers to a seditious action that threatens the well being of the entire people.<sup>28</sup> Nugent is correct to suggest that this scene, often overlooked but crucial in the development of the *Aeneid*'s crowd dynamic, should be examined "functionally, for its role in the forward movement of Aeneas' quest," rather than for its intertextual relations, logical inconsistencies, or structural unity.<sup>29</sup>

Mourning by itself is not always a problem in the *Aeneid*, but in Book 5 it sets the stage for sedition. Most of the mourning in the poem takes place in something of a collective environment, even if it is frequently only a specific group within the crowd (such as the women

---

<sup>27</sup> Williams claims that it serves as a "diminution of tension" from the earlier part of the poem (1972, 394). See Nugent, 256 for a list of other such assessments.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Schauer, for whom this is not sedition so much as the exercise of free speech: "offenbar entscheiden die Troer selbst, ob sie weiterziehen oder bleiben wollen" (259).

<sup>29</sup> Nugent 258-9.

or the elderly) who are mourning. In Book 5, the mourners are not only a distinct group – the women – but they have removed themselves physically from the crowd at large:<sup>30</sup>

at procul in sola secretae Troades acta  
amissum Anchisen flebant, cunctaeque profundum  
pontum aspectabant flentes. heu, tot vada fessis  
et tantum superesse maris, vox omnibus una;  
urbem orant, taedet pelagi perferre laborem. (5.613-617)

But far apart on the lonely shore the Trojan women wept for Anchises' loss, and all, as they wept, gazed on the fathomless flood. "Ah, for weary folk what waves remain, what wastes of sea!" Such is the one cry of all. It is a city they crave; of the sea's hardships they have had enough.

We are told that the women are mourning the deceased Anchises; is it possible that these women preferred his leadership for some reason we cannot know to that of Aeneas?<sup>31</sup> In any case, the first thing that these isolated women speak of is weariness (5.615-616), presumably their own more than that of the Trojans at large.<sup>32</sup> They speak with a collective voice, in "choral unison"<sup>33</sup> (*vox omnibus una*, 616). Nugent claims that "no woman ever speaks in this voice and no man ever hears it..." and that in the end the men "assume the voice of the women" only to exert greater authority over them,<sup>34</sup> but this understanding of the text refuses to acknowledge that the (male) poet has just taken up the voice of the women as his own and thus made it available to the

---

<sup>30</sup> Book 5 appears to portray all of the women mourning by the ships, but this need not be the case (5.553 and 5.650-2). The appearance of Euryalus' mother and other Trojan women in the second half of the poem suggest either that not all of the women segregated themselves at this point in the book, or that not all of those who participated in the ship-burning episode end up being left behind. More important to the fulfillment of Juno's scheme (and to the development of the plot) is the fact that the men are busy with the games, and thus unable to intervene until it is too late (See Heinze, 123).

<sup>31</sup> The rebellion does seem to represent, in Quinn's words, "a fresh challenge to Aeneas' moral ascendancy over those he leads, an ascendancy which...is still precarious after the alienation of Book 4" (Quinn 1968, 157).

<sup>32</sup> See Horsall 1989, 16, n. 60 for historical precedents involving the protestations of women on colonizing missions.

<sup>33</sup> Laird, 178. See also Newman and Newman, 46.

<sup>34</sup> Nugent 255.

audience; *heu* represents “the merging of his voice with that of the women.”<sup>35</sup> The complaint that the poet and the women convey is universal to the Trojan crowd at large, as will be demonstrated by the end result of the episode.

Prior to Juno’s intervention, the speech of the women has been spontaneous. More importantly, it has been harmless and ineffectual. The women had been mourning along the seashore, but without the malevolent divine intervention, nothing might have happened. As in the case of the Latins in Book 7, however, it might be argued that the women are in the right frame of mind for sedition. No real trouble begins until Iris disguised as Beroë begins to rile them up by urging them to set fire to the ships. As Beroë hurls a torch and claims the support of Neptune (639-643), the Trojan women are simply startled (*arrectae mentes stupefactaque corda*, 5.643). The word *arrectae* suggests the alertness of the women; they are shocked, quite frankly, by the behavior of their supposed friend.

It takes an actual woman, not the false Beroë, ultimately to bring them to disastrous action. Pyrgo speaks, *una e multis* (5.644), noting the divine aspect of the visitor, and claiming that the woman they believe to be Beroë cannot possibly be Beroë because the actual woman is ill (5.650-652). Pyrgo does not suggest any course of action; her proof of the visitor’s divinity is enough to push the women over the edge. What mortal could argue with a god? And in keeping with the pious Trojan sensibility, why would a god have ill intent? And yet, the women still do not leap to immediate action:

at matres primo ancipites oculisque malignis  
ambiguae spectare ratis miserum inter amorem  
praesentis terrae fatisque vocantia regna, (5.654-6)

But at first the matrons were gazing on the ships doubtfully and with jealous eyes, torn between an unhappy yearning for the land now reached and the destined kingdom that beckons them on.

---

<sup>35</sup> Laird, 179.

They are highly ambivalent. The new kingdom calls to them (*vocantia regna*) as it had to Aeneas and the rest of the Trojans (3.494), but now they are tempted to stay because of an idea that has been introduced by a deity who seeks to help them – or so they think.

Iris/ Beroë clearly realizes that she needs to do better in order to elicit some action.<sup>36</sup> The rainbow she creates, an appeal to the visual as a means of crowd control as well as to the Trojans' inherent piety, does the trick:

tum vero attonitae monstris actaeque furore  
conclamant, rapiuntque focus penetralibus ignem  
pars spoliant aras, frondem ac virgulta facesque  
coniciunt...(5.659-662)

Then, indeed, amazed at the marvels and driven by frenzy, they cry aloud, and some snatch fire from the hearths within; others strip the altars, and throw on leaves and twigs and brands.

The rebellion of a group of women finds no precedent in Homer, but it has several parallels in Roman history. From a very early point in the history of their people, Roman women are characterized by a certain vociferousness in political affairs, at least when these affairs threaten their own wellbeing or that of their families. Their actions can range from lofty in spirit to rather trivial. When the Sabines attempt to re-capture their daughters following their unceremonious kidnapping by the men of Rome, the women throw themselves in front of their husbands and avert a battle (Livy 1.13).<sup>37</sup> Much later, when a cadre of senators (including Cato) is attempting to block the repeal of the Oppian Law (which restricted the amount of gold a woman could possess), an angry crowd of women gathers in front of the Senate House to protest their ill-treatment (Livy 34.1). Cato attempts to paint the women's actions as a *seditio* and a *secessio* (34.3.7-8), but their actions are efficacious; the bill is repealed (34.8.1-3). In both of

---

<sup>36</sup> Incidentally, we are never told what Juno's "orders" to Iris had been – only that she had sent her and that she was angry. Room has been left then, for Iris to improvise based on the crowd dynamic that she will encounter.

<sup>37</sup> Ogilvie remarks that Livy uses "the Sabine women like a Greek chorus as a constant background to each episode" (Ogilvie on Livy 1.9-13).

these examples, the women interrupt the political overtly male political discourse in order to introduce their own perspective. The inclusion of their voice in the *Aeneid* picks up on this common Roman historical trend.<sup>38</sup>

The women have had their say, but the rebellion cannot go on. It threatens the fulfillment of the Trojan destiny, although the women have acted out of what are ostensibly good intentions for the people. The young Ascanius, an unlikely *pietate gravis ac meritis...vir*, attempts to quell the rebellion. A herald, Eumelus, bears news to those assembled at the games, “to the tomb of Anchises and the seats of the theatre” (*Anchisae ad tumulum cuneosque theatri*, 5.664) that the ships are on fire, and an indefinite number of Trojans look back at the smoke (*respiciunt*, 5.666). It is apparent that others also respond to the disaster, but Ascanius is first to react and to reach the ships, though his trainers attempt to restrain him (5.667-9). The young man addresses the women as “wretched citizens” (*miseræ cives*, 5.671), a tactic reminiscent of Julius Caesar’s appeal to the shame of his tenth legion when he addresses them as “*Quirites*” (Suet. *Div. Jul.* 70).<sup>39</sup> Apparently, though, the women do not yet recognize Ascanius, even when he reminds them of his name, and that he is “their” Ascanius (*vester Ascanius*, 5.672-3).

It takes Aeneas, the true leader, to bring them back to their senses. As he rides up, accompanied by the Trojans, the women – like Adam and Eve in the garden – suddenly recall their sense of shame:

ast illae diversa metu per litora passim  
diffugiunt, silvasque et sicubi concava furtim  
saxa petunt; piget incepti lucisque, suosque  
mutatae agnoscunt excussa pectore Iuno est (5.676-679).

---

<sup>38</sup> Zarker provides a list of the important protagonistic functions of women (whether *Iliades* or *Latinae*) in the *Aeneid* (22).

<sup>39</sup> Zarker remarks that this address stresses “their membership in the body politic” (17).

But the women scatter in dismay over the shores this way and that, and make stealthily for the woods and the hollow rocks they anywhere can find. They loathe the deed and the light of day; with changed thoughts they know their kin, and Juno is shaken from their hearts.

The women may now “recognize” their men (*suosque mutatae agnoscunt*, 5.678-9), and the sedition of the women has been quelled.

Like a legion that has engaged in mutiny, though, the crowd of rebellious women must be dealt with. Aeneas clearly cannot decimate them,<sup>40</sup> so he simply leaves them behind (along with the elderly and anyone who is weak and fearful) at the suggestion of Nautes:

longaevosque senes ac fessas aequore matres  
et quidquid tecum invalidum metuensque pericli est  
delige, et his habeant terris sine moenia fessi; (5.715-7)

Choose out the old men full of years and sea-worn matrons, and all of your company who are weak and fearful of peril, and let the wearied find their city in this land...

The significance of this action is to rid the Trojan people of those who might pose a problem because of their weakness and, if not outright sedition, at least a less-than-enthusiastic attitude toward the mission.<sup>41</sup> It is crucial to note that those “left behind” had chosen to stay. Aeneas, after all, is no quasi-fascist:

transcribunt urbi matres populumque volentem  
deponunt, animos nil magnae laudis egentis. (5.750-751)

They enroll the matrons for the town, and set on shore the folk who wish it so – souls with no craving for high renown.

When this group manifests an apparent change of heart (5.765-769),<sup>42</sup> Aeneas sees through it as the people’s disinclination to be parted from their loved ones and not a real change of mind, and so consoling them and commending them to Acestes is clearly the right thing to do (770-1). The

---

<sup>40</sup> It is evident, in fact, from 5.700-703 that Aeneas had been profoundly upset about the incident (Schauer, 243-4) and had, if only “for a moment” identified with the women (Nugent, 269).

<sup>41</sup> Nugent, 272: “The women serve in the text as a lightning rod for the volatile problem of dissent. Their presence permits the possibility of dissent to flash briefly on the horizon of the epic... Their repudiation, however, ensures that this dangerous force is harmlessly discharged.”

<sup>42</sup> For more on this scene, see subsection III.A.5.



Trojans, with the potentially seditious elements in their number left behind, will never again show any kind of disunity as the story progresses into the second half of the work. The fact that the placid and joyful games have ended with this sedition, though, reflects the larger destabilizing forces of the poem, and yet holds out hope for eventual unity.<sup>43</sup> The group left over at the end of Book 5 is “scant of number,” but they are also “a brave band alive for war” (*exigui numero sed bello vivida virtus*, 5.754).

### C. SEDITION OF THE LATINIS: BOOK 7

Like the Trojan women, who had already been talking about their dissatisfaction with the voyage when sedition broke out, the Latins are already on alert by the time the Trojans arrive thanks to a series of portents of a coming *magnum bellum* (7.80):

id vero horrendum ac visu mirabile ferri:  
namque fore inlustrem fama fatisque canebant  
ipsam, sed populo magnum portendere bellum. (7.78-80)<sup>44</sup>

That (the Lavinia portent) indeed was noised abroad as an awful and wondrous vision; for she, they foretold, would herself be glorious in fame and fortune, yet to her people she boded a mighty war.

It is – more problematically – some of the leaders of the Latins who are to introduce sedition into their ranks. Of course, as Juno herself acknowledges, it is not the leaders who will pay the price,<sup>45</sup> but the *populus*:

at trahere atque moras tantis licet addere rebus,  
at licet amborum populos excindere regum.  
hac gener atque socer coeant mercede suorum:

---

<sup>43</sup> Feldherr 1998, 265.

<sup>44</sup> At 7.104-5 *Fama*, now a more concrete personification, flies to the Ausonian cities to spread the news of the oracle given to Latinus by Faunus (*sed circum late volitans iam Fama per urbes Ausonias tulerat*). See subsection I.A for a discussion of the content of the oracle (7.96-101).

<sup>45</sup> Ironically, the “kings” alluded to here, Aeneas and Latinus, are not the ones to be infused with Allecto’s madness.

sanguine Troiano et Rutulo dotabere, virgo...(7.315-318)

...yet to put off the hour and to bring delay to such great issues – that may I do; I may yet uproot the nations of both kings. At such a price of their people’s lives may father and son-in-law be united! Blood of Trojan and Rutulian shall be your dower, maiden...

Harrison notes an ominous echo of Roman civil strife in the use of *gener atque socer*, the slogan used to describe Caesar and Pompey’s war.<sup>46</sup> The suffering of both peoples in the Latin War is consistent with a civil, and thus a tragic rather than glorious war, although the presence of the “ambiguous” verb *coeant* points to the ultimate unity that will result.<sup>47</sup> Juno’s intent is clear, and it is even more so in the specific instructions she gives to her agent of doom, Allecto:

‘hunc mihi da proprium, virgo sata Nocte, laborem,  
hanc operam, ne noster honos infractave cedat  
fama loco, neu conubiis ambire Latinum  
Aeneadae possint Italosve obsidere finis.  
tu potes unanimos armare in proelia fratres  
atque odiis versare domos, tu verbera tectis  
funereasque inferre faces, tibi nomina mille,  
mille nocendi artes. fecundum concute pectus,  
dissice compositam pacem, sere crimina belli;  
arma velit poscatque simul rapiatque iuventus.’ (7.331-340)

“Grant me, maiden daughter of Night, this service, a boon all my own, that my honor and glory yield not overmastered, and that the sons of Aeneas be not able to cajole Latinus with wedlock or beset the borders of Italy. You can arm for strife brothers of one soul, and overturn homes with hate; you can bring under the roof the lash and funeral torch; you have a thousand names, a thousand means of ill. Rouse your fertile bosom, shatter the pact of peace, sow seeds of wicked war! In the same hour let the men crave, demand, and seize the sword!”

This is to be nothing less than an onslaught on the *populus* of both the Latins and the Trojans.<sup>48</sup>

As Fantham notes, “each immediate victim of Allecto is associated with a group uprising.”<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Harrison 1991, xxv, n. 14: “The echo is confirmed by Vergil’s use elsewhere of *socer* and *gener* without other indication for Caesar and Pompey (6.830-1), Fordyce on 7.317, Camps 97: “for the currency of the slogan in the 50s BC cf. *Cat.* 29.24.”

<sup>47</sup> Camps, 97: “Come together in agreement” or “come together in collision.” See also 11.292 and 12.709.

<sup>48</sup> To blame Aeneas for “bringing madness” and renewing “a natural rudeness” in the natives (Putnam 1970, 410) is unfair given Juno’s actions.

<sup>49</sup> Fantham, 138.

Juno understands well that the diplomatic and strategic abilities of the Trojans guarantee that they will be able to achieve their destiny, and that she could not have altered this (7.313-4). Her interference brings about sedition and a tragic civil war, but it also forces the two sides to prove themselves in the struggle. The first of Allecto's powers that Juno cites is her ability to arm for battle "brothers of one soul" (*unanimos...fratres*, 335), which suggests that the strife to come is to be divisive even to the level of the individual household, where Allecto's attack is to begin. In a sense that takes into account both the hereditary and the future bonds between Trojans and Italians, the war is to be fratricide.<sup>50</sup> The final injunction is directed specifically at the *iuventus*, the men of fighting age. Turnus, Allecto's second victim, falls under this category as well as the rustics who seize weapons in her third interference. This group is to be entirely committed to the war in thought, word, and action (*arma velit poscatque simul rapiatque*, 340). They will, as is the case in most wars, bear the brunt of the casualties. Allecto's attack on the people of Latium bears close scrutiny for the manner in which it involves all the elements of society in Juno's planned civil war.

### 1. The Women (Amata)

The circumstances leading up to Allecto's attack on Amata depict the queen's apprehension as not only that of a mother concerned over her daughter's marriage "to exiled Teucrians" (*exsulibusne...Teucris*, 7.359), but also of a queen genuinely concerned for her people.<sup>51</sup> Her complaints offer political justification for keeping Aeneas from marrying Lavinia based on a "solemn pledge" between Turnus and Latinus (*sancta fides*, 365), the "old love for your own"

---

<sup>50</sup> See Horsfall's note (on 7.335) for a list of literary examples of the common concept of civil war as fratricidal.

<sup>51</sup> Toll's summary of the *Aeneid*'s descriptions of "proto-Roman Italian-ness" mentions "capable and influential women" as an aspect of this (1997, 40).

(*cura antiqua tuorum*, 365), pledges between the two (366), and the foreignness of all of the peoples of Italy (369-70). In the context of this investigation, the love of one's own and the definition of the universality of "foreignness" (and thus the potential for an Italian to fill the requirements of Latinus' prophecy) are her most pertinent arguments.<sup>52</sup> She does not know of Juno's curse that only by a payment in the blood of ones own (317-8) will the peoples be united.

When Latinus cannot be prevailed upon, Amata goes forth into the city itself (*immensam...per urbem*, 377). Here, the poet presents us with a striking simile drawn from the human realm. In contrast to the equally serious comparison between divine and human made in 1.148-153, the comparison here is rather the grave human situation of potential war to a trivial one of boys playing with tops. As in the statesman simile, prior interpretations have focused more on the individuals in question: Amata, Allecto, and Juno rather than the crowd.<sup>53</sup> In this simile, the baffled Latins are transformed into a band of boys as they watch a spinning top:

ceu quondam torto volitans sub verbere turbo,  
quem pueri magno in gyro vacua atria circum  
intenti ludo exercent – ille actus habena  
curvatis fertur spatii; stupet inscia supra  
inpubesque manus mirata volubile buxum;  
dant animos plagae: non cursu segnior illo  
per medias urbes agitur populosque ferocis. (7.378-384)

As at times a top, spinning under the twisted lash, which boys intent on the game drive in a great circle through an empty court – urged by the whip it speeds on round after round; the ignorant childish throng hang over it in wonder, marveling at the whirling boxwood; the blows give it life: so, no slacker in her course, is she driven through the midst of cities and proud peoples.

The *pueri* of the simile are imagined less as instigators (even though the children playing with a top would, in fact, have needed to set it in motion) than as audience. First of all, they are intent

---

<sup>52</sup> The latter concern will be addressed more fully in the final chapter.

<sup>53</sup> E.g. Fordyce, xxi-xxii (following West 1969, 49) visualizes Juno and Allecto as the boys, in spite of the implied presence of a real crowd of Latins. Horsfall, though, (on 7.382) compares the line with 812ff. to imply that the Latins are looking "at the inexplicable spectacle...of their queen spinning, wildly."

upon the action; the description of an attentive crowd is generally a very positive trait for crowds in the poem.<sup>54</sup> The Latins must be stopping whatever they are doing to gape at the queen. Second, they are amazed at what is certainly a bizarre spectacle (*stupet...mirata*). Third, they are “ignorant” and “childish”: *inscia...impubesque manus* (381-2). Finally, they stand in perspective above the odd action they witness (*supra*, 381). Perhaps this takes the interpretation too far in a literal direction, but the perspective of the simile seems to trespass into the realm of the city, where spectators on both the street level and from buildings above could be looking down upon the mad queen – a quite striking inversion of the normal order of the interaction between royal and commoner. In Rome, the poorest of the poor lived in apartments on the highest floors of the *insulae*. It seems at least possible that the poet had this angle on the wanderings of the crazed queen in mind when crafting his brilliant simile. In any case, Amata does not initially affect the people at large, aside from perhaps confusing them with her erratic behavior.

The women, however, prove more receptive to the frenzy that she sows. Zarker considers them rightly to be the “counterparts of the Trojan women” who burn the ship in Book 5.<sup>55</sup> After she takes to the forest to feign the rites of Bacchus, *Fama* flies to the matrons of the city and they join in:

fama volat, furiisque accensas pectore matres  
idem omnis simul ardor agit nova quaerere tecta.  
deseruere domos, ventis dant colla comasque;  
ast aliae tremulis ululatibus aethera complent  
pampineasque gerunt incinctae pellibus hastas. (7.392-396)

Fame flies abroad, and the matrons, their breasts kindled with fury, are driven on, all by the same frenzy, to seek new dwellings. They have deserted their homes, and bare their necks and hair to the winds, while some fill the sky with tremulous ululations and, clad in fawn-skins, carry vine-bound spears.

---

<sup>54</sup> Other occurrences of the word are the description of the Trojan and Carthaginian audience as Aeneas begins his story (2.1) and the participants in the ship race waiting for the signal (5.137).

<sup>55</sup> Zarker, 18.

Their foray into the wild is an upheaval of the norm for the Latin mothers. They have, most frighteningly, “deserted” their homes (394).<sup>56</sup> Others ululate, an action usually reserved for situations of severe turmoil; the Trojan women perform it during the fall of the city (2.488), and nymphs ululate at the “marriage” between Dido and Aeneas (4.168).<sup>57</sup> It matters not that these are rather disparate situations; in both cases, there is a presentiment of doom. When the madness reaches its zenith in the call to arms in Latinus’ city, it is specifically the sons and husbands of these maddened women who lead the call to battle (7.580-582).<sup>58</sup>

## 2. The Men (Turnus)

Allecto next visits the city of Ardea, where Turnus is her target. His initial response being insufficient to her purpose, he is far more receptive after she hurls the torch at him, at which point he begins to fulfill the purpose of Juno in causing the youth to become incensed for battle. He calls for arms (*arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit*, 7.460) and orders the youth to arm themselves:

ergo iter ad regem polluta pace Latinum  
indicit primis iuvenum et iubet arma parari,  
tutari Italiam, detrudere finibus hostem;  
se satis ambobus Teucrisque venire Latinisque. (7.467-70).

Therefore, profaning peace, he orders his chief warriors to march upon Latinus, and bids arms be made ready. “Defend Italy,” he cries, “drive the foe from her borders; I come, a match for both Teucrians and Latins.”

---

<sup>56</sup> The Trojans had deserted Aeneas in the sack of Troy (2.565), as had the comrades of Ulysses deserted Achaemenides (3.618), and the Trojans themselves deserted the shores of Carthage (4.582). The Latin women’s activities desertion of their homes “suggests leaving a doomed city” (Gransden 1984, 76).

<sup>57</sup> Pease on 4.168 provides a list of occurrences in other works and concludes that ululation usually suggests “the sad or the uncanny.”

<sup>58</sup> Horsfall on 7.580. See below.

In his boast, he is willing to rend the alliance between Rutulians and Latins, and this is exactly what will happen in terms of the fissures created in both states. Turnus' Rutulians<sup>59</sup> rush to obey enthusiastically, with almost Trojan efficiency and emulousness:

certatim sese Rutuli exhortantur in arma.  
hunc decus egregium formae movet atque iuventae,  
hunc atavi reges, hunc claris dextera factis. (7.472-4)

...the Rutuli vie in exhorting one another to arms. One is moved by the peerless beauty of his form and youth, one by his royal ancestry, another by the glorious deeds of his hand.

Despite the good qualities of the Rutulians, they suffer from poor leadership. The technique of revealing the various motivations of the *iuvenes* appears to be quite unparalleled; it allows for some individuation within the Rutulian crowd, albeit revealing a people who continue to hold to a very ancient heroic ideal – the Rutulians admire looks, youth, birth, and (martial) deeds, not political or diplomatic prowess. Ominously, Turnus fills them with “daring courage” (*animis audacibus*, 7.475). The effect Turnus exerts on the youth is impressive, but dangerous:

extemplo turbati animi, simul omne tumultu  
coniurat trepido Latium saevitque iuventus  
effera... (8.4-6)<sup>60</sup>

...straightaway men's hearts were troubled; all Latium at once swears allegiance in eager uprising, and her sons rage madly.

Turnus is the opposite of the *pietate gravis ac meritis...vir*; rather than quelling it, he causes sedition and disorder.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Horsfall (on 7.472) is careful to distinguish between this group and those of 623ff.; the former are only Turnus' people.

<sup>60</sup> *extemplo turbati animi* also occurs at 11.451 (Gransden on 8.4), the moment when Aeneas' attack causes actual civil order to break down in Latium. *coniurat* may carry a suggestion of a military oath (Fordyce on 8.5), but the sense of *tumultus*, *saevit*, and *effera* undercut any semblance of order.

<sup>61</sup> Stahl describes him as the “oracle-defying head of a local faction” who “does not represent an Italian consensus” (177).

### 3. The Trojans (And Everyone Else)

With Turnus and his men beginning to muster for battle, it is only left to Allecto to ignite the spark of war; the Trojans must make some grave mistake. Of course, the Trojan army is too well disciplined to go blundering off into native territory to steal cattle, or ransack a village, so an easier target must be found.<sup>62</sup> The young Ascanius (via his dogs) serves this function perfectly.<sup>63</sup>

Once the sacred stag has been wounded, a chain of events is set in motion. First, Silvia summons the country folk (*duros agrestis*, 7.504), who respond with gusto:

olli (pestis enim tacitis latet aspera silvis)  
improvisi adsunt, hic torre armatus obusto,  
stipitis hic gravidi nodis; quod cuique repertum  
rimanti telum ira facit. vocat agmina Tyrrhus...(7.505-508)

They – for the fell fiend lurks in the silent woods – came unlooked for, armed one with seared brand, one with heavy-knotted stick; what each can find in his quest, wrath makes a weapon. Tyrrhus summons his bands...

*Improvisi* captures the strange “sixth sense” the rustics seem to possess in coming when they had only just been called. Like the mob in the statesman simile, the crowd here makes use of ad hoc weapons. *Hic...hic*<sup>64</sup> captures the differentiation of the men’s weapons and creates a dissonance between the disorderly nature of the rustic mob and their designation as *agmina* (508). Unlike the statesman simile, though, this mob lacks a discernible leader; as Heinze describes them, they are “undisciplined bands” who act “on the impulse of the moment, passionately, and without

---

<sup>62</sup> Heinze notes Cato’s tradition in which war breaks out between Latins and Trojans due to Trojan raids. Juno picks up on this accusation (10.316) (Heinze, 201), but there is no evidence that the Trojans execute any kind of raids on Latin territory until the mention of animals seized for sacrifice for the Trojan funerals (11.98-99), but this is at a much more advanced stage in the war when such behaviors would be expected.

<sup>63</sup> It is unfair to blame Ascanius for his youth and desire for glory; he (and the dogs who led him) had no reason to suspect that the stag he shoots is sacred. In any case, the offense committed by the Trojans has been made as slight as possible, “yet serious enough to motivate the anger of the Latin country-folk” (Heinze, 153). See also DiCesare, 131.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. the motivations of Turnus’ men, above at 7.473-4.



mature reflection.”<sup>65</sup> Thus, they are the perfect targets for Allecto. After she sounds the shepherd’s signal (511-515), the next and more serious stage begins in which the Trojan warriors – who are certainly more experienced fighters than the rustic Latins<sup>66</sup> – come to the aid of

Ascanius:

et trepidae matres pressere ad pectora natos.  
tum vero ad vocem celeres, qua bucina signum  
dira dedit, raptis concurrunt undique telis  
indomiti agricolae, nec non et Troia pubes  
Ascanio auxilium castris effundit apertis.  
derexere acies. non iam certamine agresti  
stipitibus duris agitur sudibusve praeustis,  
sed ferro ancipiti decernunt...(7.518-525)  
...  
fluctus uti primo coepit cum albescere vento,  
paulatim sese tollit mare et altius undas  
erigit, inde imo consurgit ad aethera fundo. (528-30)

...and startled mothers clasped their children to their breasts. Then indeed, hurrying to the sound, with which the dread clarion gave the signal, the wild husbandmen snatch up their weapons and gather from all sides; no less do the Trojan youth pour through the camp’s open gates to help Ascanius. The lines are ranged: now they do not contend in rustic quarrel with heavy clubs or seared stakes, but with two-edged steel they try the issue...as when a billow begins to whiten under the wind’s first breath, little by little the sea swells and lifts its waves higher, till at least it rises to heaven from its lowest depths.

In their terror, the Latin mothers mirror the Trojan *pavidae...matres* (2.489) who wander about the palace of Priam,<sup>67</sup> but the men muster for battle. Though Allecto offers to carry the war into surrounding towns (548-551), Juno recognizes that enough has been accomplished. Both Trojans and Latins are now involved, and the rest will follow. The less-serious rustic *certamen* stage has passed, and all-out, organized (civil) war with the sword (*ferro ancipiti decernunt*, 525) has broken out, as Allecto announces to Juno: *en perfecta tibi bello discordia tristi* (545).

---

<sup>65</sup> Heinze, 154.

<sup>66</sup> Heinze, 154.

<sup>67</sup> In the case of the Trojans, Vergil’s concentration on words illustrative of the “inner” nature of Priam’s palace, e.g., “*domus intus*” (483), “*penetralia*” (484) “*domus interior*” (486), and “*penitusque*” (487) point to a social chaos that has moved disastrously inward to a setting where it is the most troubling. See Zarker, 15.

*Discordia* symbolizes the “social aspect of *Allecto*, the sower of civic and military violence” as well as the “symbol of individual furor raised to a social dimension.”<sup>68</sup> The comparison of the people to windblown surf in the final lines of this passage (528-30) is thus appropriate. It connects the activities of this passage to the later confrontation between *Latinus* and his people, in which the people represent a full-blown storm.

By the end of Book 7, all Ausonia is “ablaze” (*ardet*, 623). The youth “joy to bear the standards” (*signaque ferre iuvat*) “and hear the trumpet call” (628).<sup>69</sup> “All cry out for arms” (*omnes arma requirunt*, 625), and make the preparations for war.<sup>70</sup> *Juno*’s command to *Allecto* to inflame the youth of the Latins in thought, word, and action (*arma velit poscatque simul rapiatque iuventus*, 7.340) has come alive in frightful detail.<sup>71</sup>

#### 4. Absence of the Statesman: The Mob as Storm: 7.586-590

After the first casualties of this melee, a young man (*Almo*) and an old man (*Galaesus*), who had attempted to plead for peace (7.531-539),<sup>72</sup> are brought back into the city, the crowd rushes in (*ruit omnis in urbem pastorum ex acie numerus*, 573-4), with the intent to call the gods to

---

<sup>68</sup> Otis also points out that there is no inconsistency between the two since “the mob is but the single person writ large” (323-4).

<sup>69</sup> Horsfall on 7.528: “...thanks to divine malignity, induced madness and war-fever, the young men of Latium now take actual pleasure In forsaking their (prevalent) rustic idyll for the business of arms.”

<sup>70</sup> 7.624-640. The passage is typical of Vergil’s “scenes of multiple activity” (Horsfall on 7.624).

<sup>71</sup> Heinze remarks: “once *discordia* has sprung up between men, its own inner nature forces it to erupt into war” (Heinze, 155). Fraenkel adds that the preceding scenes reveal that “only through the spread of a particular kind of insanity can people who shortly before were leading normal and peaceful lives be brought to the state of mind in which they will resort to something so horrible as war” (Fraenkel 1990, 259-60).

<sup>72</sup> These are not members of the mob, however, since both have some means of distinguishing them from the rest of the community. *Almo*, the eldest son of *Tyrrhus* (7.532), the king’s chief herdsman (485-6), is distinguished in his birth. *Galaesus* had been the most just and the wealthiest man of Ausonia (*iustissimus...diutissimus*, 536-7).

witness and Latinus to account (*implorantque deos obtestanturque Latinum*, 576). With the support of Turnus (577-9), about which more will be said below, and Amata (584), the crowd (including, notably the sons or husbands of the mothers in Amata's faction) takes on the responsibility for their own demise:

tum quorum attonitae Baccho nemora avia matres  
insultant thiasis (neque enim leve nomen Amatae)  
undique collecti coeunt Martemque fatigant.  
ilicet infandum cuncti contra omina bellum,  
contra fata deum, perverso numine poscunt.  
certatim regis circumstant tecta Latini: (7.580-585)

Then they, whose matrons, frenzied by Bacchus, tread the pathless woods in dancing bands (for of no light weight is Amata's name), draw together from every side, and importune the War God. Straightway, one and all, despite the omens, despite the oracles of the gods, because of a perverse divine will, clamor for unholy war. With emulous zeal they swarm round Latinus' palace.

All of the Latins here<sup>73</sup> manifest a warped competitive nature (*certatim*) as well as a pronounced impiety (*contra fata deum, perverso numine*) that sets them at odds with their equally competitive but ever-pious Trojan rivals. The Latins act in profound rebellion against the series of omens they have been given (7.58-106) regarding the coming of the Trojans.<sup>74</sup>

The simile that follows the mustering of Latin forces picks up the earlier windblown surf imagery (528-30) in comparing Latinus to an ocean cliff withstanding a full-blown storm.<sup>75</sup> Comparisons between this and the first simile of the poem (1.148-152), in many ways the reverse of this simile, are inevitable:

ille velut pelago rupes immota resistit  
ut pelagi rupes magno veniente fragore,  
quae sese multis circum latrantibus undis  
mole tenet; scopuli nequiquam et spumea circum  
saxa fremunt laterique inlisa refunditur alga. (7.586-590)

---

<sup>73</sup> Horsfall notes that *cuncti* is "not a simple synonym for *omnes*," but conveys a sense of "all together" (Horsfall, 7.583).

<sup>74</sup> The portent involving Lavinia involves widespread public speech (*ferri*, 7.78; *canebant*, 79), and *Fama* spreads Faunus' supposedly secret oracular response to Latinus throughout the Ausonian cities (7.104-5).

<sup>75</sup> The simile elaborates *Il.* 15.618ff. (Gransden on 9.586ff.).

He, like an unmoved ocean-cliff, resists; like an ocean cliff, which, when a great crash comes, stands steadfast in its bulk amid many barking waves; in vain the crags and foaming rocks roar about, and the sea-weed, dashed against its sides, is whirled back.

The simile is highly complimentary to Latinus; in the simile, the cliff holds steady against the waves, but in reality, it is broken. The Latins, however, come off as “clamorous and importunate” as their complaints from the narrative trespass into the simile as “barking waves” (*latrantibus undis*, 588).<sup>76</sup> The end result is that both Latinus and his people “are broken,” as his cry reveals (*frangimur heu fatis...ferimurque procella*, 594). He goes on to chide the people for impiety and to prophesy their impending doom, with the blame placed squarely on Turnus’ shoulders (595-599), but he also bears some blame in that he has failed to calm the storms of popular frenzy and prevent the outbreak of open war.<sup>77</sup>

#### D. PROBLEMATIC LEADERS

Latinus’ removal of himself from a position of leadership at this early point in the war draws attention to a major problem of the Latins in their war against the Trojans – a lack of good leadership. In the episode illustrated by the simile, far from being a headless angry mob, the Latins have a seditious leader in Turnus (*medioque in crimine*, 7.577) who redoubles the terror

---

<sup>76</sup> Lyne 1989, 97. Cf. Willcock, 90, who seems to take *frangimur* as the “royal we.”

<sup>77</sup> Williams comments that this episode contrasts “markedly with his previous regal dignity and nobility of behavior when all was going well” (Williams on 7.572f.). DiCesare considers Latinus to be a “wavering ruler whose power depends upon factional politics” whose “unilateral action” had actually provoked the war (DiCesare, 136). Cairns views Latinus as having basically good “kingly qualities”: his opposition to the war “stigmatizes the Italians’ cause as the worse one” and even his abdication (7.586-600) “does not mark an abandonment by him of his royal virtues” (Cairns, 66). More specifically, his devotion to the treaty with the Trojans, even up to the point of the Council of the Latins (11.330-335), demonstrates his essential political wisdom in spite of a personal lack of clout.

(*terrorem ingeminat*, 578).<sup>78</sup> His arguments for war are based mostly on self-interest and fear-mongering regarding the Trojan newcomers. Later, the position held by Drances, who is described as “powerful in sedition” (*seditione potens*, 11.340)<sup>79</sup> as well as willing to allow his personal resentments to influence public discourse,<sup>80</sup> may not point to a palpable threat to Latinus’ own power, but it does represent the persistence of faction within the Latin state.

The most troubling aspect of Italian leadership, though, is the presence of tyranny and tyrants. Metabus, the father of Camilla, after being “driven from his realm by his subjects’ hatred of his oppressive tyranny” (*pulsus ob invidiam regno virisque superbas*, 11.539), ends up living in the wild because no city will receive him (11.567-9). As will be seen in the following chapter,<sup>81</sup> Camilla’s leadership shows no signs of being tyrannical, but it does create some problems for her people. One of the most problematic leaders of the Italians is the Etruscan Mezentius. At the head of Turnus’ allies in Book 7 marches the famous *contemptor divum* (7.648) and tyrant (8.483), known for ruling with “arrogant sway and cruel arms” (*superbo imperio et saevis...armis*, 8.481-2). This is a man against whom, as we will learn later, his own people have staged a successful revolt:

at fessi tandem cives infanda furentem  
armati circumstant ipsumque domumque  
obtruncant socios, ignem ad fastigia iactant.  
ille inter caedem Rutulorum elapsus in agros  
confugere et Turni defendier hospitis armis.  
ergo omnis furiis surrexit Etruria iustis,  
regem ad supplicium praesenti Marte reposcunt. (8.489-495)

But at last his exhausted citizens take up arms and besiege the monstrous madman, himself and his palace, cut down his followers, and hurl fire on his roof. Amid the carnage, he flees for refuge to

---

<sup>78</sup> Cairns notes the origin of Turnus’ name: *τύραννος* (Cairns, 67).

<sup>79</sup> The Loeb’s “in faction strong” seems not to capture Drances’ full potential in creating general uproar.

<sup>80</sup> 11.122-123 and 336-337.

<sup>81</sup> Subsection VI.B.1.c.

Rutulian soil and finds shelter among the weapons of Turnus his friend. So all Etruria had risen in righteous fury; threatening instant war they demand the king for punishment.

This passage is related to Aeneas by Evander, who has a definite plan for Aeneas that has very significant implications for Aeneas' status as ruler in Italy over the soon to be combined peoples.<sup>82</sup> At this stage though, the Etrurian revolt against Mezentius establishes a basic concern for the voice of the crowd in Roman politics, and even perhaps the suggestion that the crowd may be of varied origin, as in the case of the Etruscan city of Mantua which takes up arms against Mezentius.<sup>83</sup> The Trojans, it might be said, have not needed to stress constitutional legitimacy yet, because they have not yet had the misfortune of suffering from tyrannical leadership. Aeneas' response to the pleas of Mezentius for a proper burial and defense from his people's *odia* and *furorem* (10.904-6) – he slays him without a word (907-8) – is a veiled warning to tyrants.<sup>84</sup> The lines have been drawn: Turnus and the Latins have allowed a man like Mezentius to serve with them as an ally. The Trojans, conversely, have sided with the Etruscan people against the tyrant, setting a precedent for Rome as a supporter of *libertas*.

#### E. LATIN SEDITION OF BOOK 11: *DIVIDE ET IMPERA*

As soon the Latins detect Aeneas' move to advance on Latinus' realm in Book 11 at the close of the disorderly Latin council, there is a notable shift in the people's emotional state: "Tottering

---

<sup>82</sup> To be discussed in subsection VII.A.3.

<sup>83</sup> Vergil introduces his hometown in Book 10 as "not all of one stock" (*non genus omnibus unum*, 10.201).

<sup>84</sup> The poet leaves the fulfillment of Mezentius' pleas ambiguous (Williams on 10.905).

between fear and rage,”<sup>85</sup> the people are first confused and shaken, and then they spring into angry activity:

extemplo turbati animi concussaue vulgi  
pectora et arrectae stimulis haud mollibus irae.  
arma manu trepidi poscunt, fremit arma iuventus,  
flent maesti mussantque patres. hic undique clamor  
dissensu vario magnus se tollit in auras, (11.451–455)

At once the minds of the people are confounded, their hearts shaken, and their passions roused by ungentle spurs. Brandishing their fists they call for weapons; “Weapons!” the young men shout; their unhappy fathers weep and moan. And now, from every side, there rises to heaven a loud din with varied discord...

The fact that the youths roar for weapons (*fremit arma iuventus*, 11.453)<sup>86</sup> creates a “powerful” contrast “between the attitude of the fathers and their sons.”<sup>87</sup> A *clamor* rises into the air with varied discord (*dissensu vario*, 11.454-455). A simile compares the people to birds; the fathers are compared to birds settling in a grove and, the youths, more vividly, to swans making noise around “clamorous pools” (*dant sonitum rauci per stagna loquentia cycni*, 11.458). Verbally, the episode shares many features with the statesman simile of Book 1: *vulgus* (1.149, 11.451), *animi* (1.149, 153), *pectora* (1.153, 11.452), *arma* (1.150 and 11.453) and *arrectae* (1.153, 11.452), not to mention the presence of anger (*furor* in 1.150 and *irae* in 11.452) and, more importantly, discord (*seditione*, 1.149, *dissensu*, 11.455). Though the word *seditione* is not used immediately in this passage, the council that set off the sedition included the speech of Drances, a leader who is described ominously as *seditione potens* (11.340). The conclusion to be drawn from this seems to be that the Latins have no decisive leader to pull them back from the edge.

---

<sup>85</sup> Fratantuono on 11.453. Hardie comments that the council “collapses into a Babel of discord...of dissenting voices” (Hardie 1998 “Fame”, 244).

<sup>86</sup> *Fremere* is also used transitively (“shout for”) by the Latins during the meeting between Aeneas and the Latin envoys earlier in the book at 11.132 (See subsection II.C.1). Turnus had also used it at 7.460 (subsection V.C.2) after his visit from Allecto.

<sup>87</sup> Fratantuono on 11.454.

As Latinus disappears from the proceedings, the activities of the people take center stage, but their desperation is palpable. The entire city is in a state of uproar as the people rush to the walls (*in muros tota discurritur urbe*, 11.468). Some dig trenches and carry stones and stakes (*saxa sudesque*, 11.473-4) in a last-ditch effort to save the city.<sup>88</sup> The mothers and boys (*matronae puerique*) ring the wall as “the final struggle summons them all” (*vocat labor ultimus omnis*, 11.476).<sup>89</sup>

The prayer of the women at 11.482 would seem to mark a strangely calm interlude in the chaos, and yet the Latin women’s prayer is vindictive in tone, asking Minerva for the death of Aeneas (11.483-5).<sup>90</sup> It reveals the utter despair to which they have sunk, as well as their resistance “to the course of fate.”<sup>91</sup> Meanwhile, the death of Camilla on the battlefield causes a complete rout of the Rutulian forces (*turbati fugiunt Rutuli*, 11.869).<sup>92</sup> The turn in battle is marked by a failure of leadership when there is a wholesale rout after Camilla’s death, most notably by the leaders:<sup>93</sup>

prima fugit domina amissa levis ala Camillae,  
turbati fugiunt Rutuli, fugit acer Atinas,  
disiectique duces desolatique manipuli  
tuta petunt et equis aversi ad moenia tendunt (11.868-71)

Their mistress lost, Camilla’s light squadron flees first; in rout the Rutulians flee, valiant Atinas flees; scattered captains, and troops left leaderless, make for shelter, and wheeling their horses, gallop to the walls.

---

<sup>88</sup> Fratantuono remarks that *sudis* is “essentially a weapon of last resort” (11.474).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Aeneas’ experiences during the fall of Troy (2.336-338). Kristol observes an affirmation of the value of *labor* (cf. the bees at 1.430) “even when it is not actively sought” (41).

<sup>90</sup> Quinn remarks (1968, 244): “even the *matres*, to whom Vergil extends his pity so freely, are coarsened by war, lashed to a mood of hatred.”

<sup>91</sup> The *vox* of the Trojan women above (5.616) has a similar significance (Laird, 179).

<sup>92</sup> See Rossi’s analysis of these lines (869ff.) for a treatment of its reliance on the battle topoi of historiography (primarily Livy): e.g. *turbati*, *mixto agmine*, the closing of the gates, death in the *fossa*, and the involvement of the women (112-124).

<sup>93</sup> Fratantuono on 11.870, Horsfall on 11.868-95. For a discussion of the witnessing of Camilla’s death by both the troops and the *matres* in the city, see subsections IV.B-IV.B.1.



As the Rutulians attempt to reenter the city, the mothers inside get wind of the disaster and raise their clamor (*femineum clamorem ad caeli sidera tollunt*, 11.878).<sup>94</sup> A horrific scene of slaughter follows in which people in the city refuse to open the doors to their own *socii* despite their pleas (*orantis*, 11.884):

qui cursu portas primi inrupere patentis,  
hos inimica super mixto permit agmine turba,  
nec miseram effugiunt mortem, sed limine in ipso,  
moenibus in patriis atque inter tuta domorum  
confixi exspirant animas. pars claudere portas,  
nec sociis aperire viam nec moenibus audent  
accipere orantis, oriturque miserrima caedes  
defendentum armis aditus inque arma ruentum.  
exclusi ante oculos lacrimantumque ora parentum  
pars in praecipitis fossas urgente ruina  
volvitur, immissis pars caeca et concita frenis  
arietat in portas et duros obice postis. (11.879-90)

Upon those who broke at full speed through the open gates their presses hard a throng of foes, mingling with their ranks, nor do they escape a piteous death, but on the very threshold, their native walls about them, and within the shelter of their homes, they are pierced through, and gasp away their lives. Some close the gates, and dare not open a way to their friends, nor receive them inside the walls, implore as they may; and slaughter most piteous ensues, both of those guarding the entry sword in hand, and of those rushing upon the sword. Shut out before the eyes and gaze of weeping parents, some, driven by rout, roll headlong into the trenches; some, charging blindly with loosened rein, batter at the gates and stoutly barred doors.<sup>95</sup>

The internal divisions among the Latin people have brought about a physical division; the people within the city must quite literally fight with those outside in order to protect themselves. The repetition of *pars* (883, 888, 889) presents a sharp contrast with the earlier mustering of the Latin forces (7.624-640), when the differentiated actions of the crowd were all in the service of the

---

<sup>94</sup> The women constitute “female” variation on 11.745 “*tollitur in caelum clamor cuntique Latini convertere oculos*” (11.745) – a “spectator” crowd, if only for a moment, watching Tarchon in battle. See subsection IV.B.

<sup>95</sup> There is a question here (*hos inimica super mixto premit agmine turba*, 11.880) as to whether the “throng of foes,” *inimica..turba* constitutes the Trojans or Latins (*pace* Forbiger), or a mixture of the two (Page and Williams) (Fratantuono on 880). The more crucial point is that of the *mixto...agmine* suggesting a breakdown of military order.

same goal.<sup>96</sup> The situation for the Latins seems as though it can get no worse, and although things do get better for a short time during the resumption of the treaty, civil breakdown will once more threaten the Latins.

## F. STORMS OF POPULAR FRENZY TO STORMS OF JAVELINS: BOOK 12

### 1. Rutulian Irresolution

When Juno gives Turnus' sister Juturna two choices of how to save her brother – to snatch him from battle or kindle battle so as to break the truce – why is it that she chooses the latter? The answer is clear. Although Turnus would not have abided the easy way out, his people have already shown signs of irresolution and outright discord. In her appraisal of the situation, Juturna finds that the people rather than Turnus himself are the more promising target of her involvement. The Latins are shown becoming “more and more antagonistic towards the duel” between Turnus and Aeneas until all-out fighting breaks out.<sup>97</sup>

At vero Rutulis impar ea pugna videri  
iamdudum et vario misceri pectora motu,  
tum magis ut proprius cernunt non viribus aequos  
adiuvat incessu tacito progressus et aram  
suppliciter venerans demisso lumine Turnus  
pubentesque<sup>98</sup> genae et iuvenali in corpore pallor.  
quam simul ac Iuturna soror crebrescere vidit  
sermonem et vulgi variare labantia corda  
in medias acies formam adsimulata Camerti

---

<sup>96</sup> *pars pedes ire parat campis, pars arduus altis pulverulentus equis furit; omnes arma requirunt* (7.624-5), etc. Rossi comments on the frequent use this narrative device in historiography, especially “in scenes of disorder and confusion” (143-4), but as seen, e.g. in subsection III.C (the Carthaginians at work and the ant simile) this is by no means the rule in Vergil.

<sup>97</sup> Otis remarks that the Latins “are ready in their hearts for the demonic suggestion” to break the treaty (Otis, 373-4).

<sup>98</sup> Goold uses here the alternate *tabentesque*. Williams comments (on 12.221) on the inferiority of this reading and the very different meaning of the other use of *tabentes* in Vergil (1.173).

cui genus a proavis ingens clarumque paternae  
nomen erat virtutis, et ipse acerrimus armis,  
in medias dat sese acies haud nescia rerum  
rumoresque serit varios ac talia fatur: (12.216-228)

But to the Rutulians the battle had long seemed unequal, and their hearts, swayed to and fro, had long been in turmoil; all the more now, when they beheld the combatants at closer view, in ill-matched strength. Turnus swells the unrest by advancing with noiseless tread and as a suppliant venerating the altar with downcast eye – swells it by his youthful cheeks and by the pallor of his youthful frame. As soon as Juturna his sister saw these whispers spread, and the hearts of the throng wavering in doubt, into the midmost ranks, in feigned semblance of Camers – noble his ancestral house, glorious in the renown of his fathers worth, and he himself most valiant in arms – into the midmost ranks she comes, knowing well her task, scatters diverse rumors, and speaks these words:

Juturna, then, waits to see signs of division before she acts to push already extant tensions to the brink. That she takes the form of a man known for his good name and virtue recalls the statesman simile of 1.148-153. It is ironic that instead of encouraging their resolve in a potentially difficult situation, the speaker eggs on the crowd – not surprisingly, a *vulgus* – by appealing to their sense of shame at allowing one man to die for all (229) and their collective desire for *fama* (235), a boon that will be lost if the Rutulians sit idly by and allow Turnus to fight for them. Turnus' appearance, moreover, supplies a further impetus for their fighting spirit. Instead of rousing them on to battle, Turnus has become a figure of pity, hardly appropriate for the preeminent military leader of the Italians. The speech has its desired effect, a change in all present, but the spark has not yet ignited, so Juturna creates a false omen:

Talibus incensa est iuvenum sententia dictis  
iam magis atque magis, serpitque per agmina murmur:  
ipsi Laurentes mutati ipsique Latini.  
qui sibi iam requiem pugnae rebusque salutem  
sperabant, nunc arma volunt foedusque precantur  
infectum et Turni sortem miserantur iniquam.  
his aliud maius Iuturna adiungit et alto  
dat signum caelo, quo non praesentius ullum  
turbavit mentes Italas monstroque fefellit. (12.238-246)

With such words the warriors' resolve is kindled yet more and more, and a murmur creeps from rank to rank. Even the Laurentines, even the Latins are changed; and they who but lately hoped for rest from the fray, and safety for their fortunes, now long for arms, pray that the covenant be undone, and pity Turnus' unjust fate. To these Juturna adds another and mightier impulse, and in high heaven shows a sign, than which none was more potent to confound Italian minds and cheat them with its miracle.

Only a few lines earlier, the Rutulians only had been concerned that Turnus not fight the duel. Here the Italians, specifically the Latins, have changed their stance. The Latins had previously supported the idea of a duel between Turnus and Aeneas (11.215-219), and Turnus himself had been conscious of Latin resentment against him for not ending the war sooner.<sup>99</sup> Once the omen appears, “the Italians become alert” (*arrexere animos Itali*, 251), and the Rutulians (an important distinction, as the latter only represent Turnus’ people) accept the omen by spreading out their hands, a gesture indicative of their wish to fight.<sup>100</sup>

Tum vero augurium Rutuli clamore salutant  
expediuntque manus... (12.257-258)

Then in truth the Rutulians hail the omen with a cheer and spread out their hands.

Their acceptance of this omen that restarts the war may testify to the piety of Latins, but it is closer to superstition than to the piety of the Trojans.<sup>101</sup> At this point, Tolumnius presents himself in the action as something of a Latin version of Laocoön, egging the crowd on and hurling a spear (12.258-268). The crucial difference is that Laocoön had given sensible advice to the also wavering Trojan crowd, but in the end it was not heeded. Tolumnius, in contrast, is the mouthpiece for Juturna’s false omen, which presents Aeneas as an eagle pursued by native Italians as waterfowl (12.247-256). Tolumnius’ rousing speech, interpreting the omen as a sign that the Trojan invaders could be put to flight, together with his action of hurling the spear,<sup>102</sup> is the official sign of the outbreak of war:

---

<sup>99</sup> E.g. 12.1-3, 15. See also Heinze, 194-4, n. 70.

<sup>100</sup> A *consensio militaris* (Servius, *ibid.*).

<sup>101</sup> The omen had been described as a *signum* “than which none was more potent to confound Italian minds and cheat them with its miracle” (*quo non praesentius ullum turbavit mentes Italas monstroque fefellit*, 12.245-5).

<sup>102</sup> An official declaration of war by a Roman *fetialis* (Livy, 1.32).

...simul hoc, simul ingens clamor et omnes  
turbati cunei calefactaque corda tumultu. (12.268-269)

At this deed, at once rises a mighty shout, the crowds are all in confusion, and their hearts hot with turmoil.

## 2. The Statesman Fails: The Final Storm

The outbreak of fighting is described along similar lines as that of Book 7: Vergil describes an individual fatality, that of a half-Arcadian, half-Etruscan son of Gylippus. For this death, no one Rutulian or Latin pays the price, but all of Italy. As the brothers of the slain man prepare to fight, battle is joined:

...quos agmina contra  
procurrunt Laurentum, hinc densi rursus inundant  
Troes Agyllinique et pictis Arcades armis:  
sic omnis amor unus habet discernere ferro.  
diripuere aras, it toto turbida caelo  
tempestas telorum ac ferreus ingruit imber,  
craterasque focosque ferunt. fugit ipse Latinus  
pulsatos referens infecto foedere divos.  
infrenant alii currus aut corpora saltu  
subiciunt in equos et strictis ensibus adsunt. (12.279-288)

...Against them (the brothers of the dead youth) charge the Laurentine columns; from the other side again Trojans and Agyllines pour thickly in and Arcadians with blazoned arms. Thus all are ruled by one passion – to let the sword decide. They have stripped the altars; through the whole sky flies a thickening storm of javelins and the iron rain falls fast; bowls and hearth fires are carried off. Latinus himself takes flight, carrying away his defeated gods, the covenant now void; the others rein their chariots or leap on to their horses and with drawn swords stand ready.

All order has broken down; even the people's piety has been affected, with the altars being stripped and the various accoutrements of the sacrifice being carried off. This is more than political sedition; it is a storm (*tempestas*) of popular frenzy that has been carried over into the military realm.

Despite the attempts of *pious Aeneas* (311) to curb the fighting with his peaceful entreaties,<sup>103</sup> *discordia* is rampant (313):

quo ruitis? quaeve ista repens discordia surgit?  
o cohibete iras! ictum iam foedus et omnes  
compositae leges. mihi ius concurrere soli;  
me sinite atque auferte metus. ego foedera faxo  
firma manu; Turnum debent haec iam mihi sacra. (12.313-317)

Where are you rushing? What is this sudden outburst of strife? Curb your rage! The truce has already been struck and all its terms fixed; I alone have the right to do battle. Let me act; banish your fears; this hand will prove the treaty true; these rites make Turnus already mine!

This is yet another example of a subversion of the statesman simile of 1.148-153. We might expect, at this point in the story, a more perfect fulfillment of that ideal, but the poem, not unlike history, presents a leader who, although he is arguably more in control of the mob than other heroes of the poem, or even Homeric heroes, is not all-powerful. What seems most troubling is that the supposedly well-ordered Trojans are not immune to disorder. If not for line 282 (*sic omnis amor unus habet decernere ferro*), it would have seemed that the Trojans were attacking only out of self-defense, but clearly they are not. Even if they themselves are no longer prone to sedition, when they are faced with the Latins, a *populus* who are fraught with it, there is little they can do but give in to the general uproar. Thus when Aeneas is wounded in the act of attempting to stop the fighting, it is not surprising that the battle takes a turn for the worse, apparently for both sides (12.406-410).

Of course, the storm reappears later, but this time it is in the form of Aeneas himself, a storm breaking over the sea (12.451-5), rather than the typical storms of popular frenzy. This event causes fear for the Italians (*gelidusque per ima cucurrit ossa tremor*, 447-8),<sup>104</sup> but a greater sense of cohesion for Aeneas and his allies as “densely they gather, one and all, to his

---

<sup>103</sup> I.e. with uncovered head and unarmed (12.311-312).

<sup>104</sup> Stahl explains that the Italians have a “guilty conscience” for breaking the treaty (190).

side in close-packed columns” (*densi cuneis se quisque coactis adglomerant*, 12.457-8). Aeneas and Turnus both will slay their share of men before they meet in their final duel, but by this point Aeneas and his men are firmly resolved to bring the treaty back into effect.<sup>105</sup>

### 3. *Discordia* in the city

Aeneas’ final assault on the city brings with it more disorder, but it also represents a final result of the seditious character of the Latins. Aeneas swoops in as a representative of order who will quell the chaos once and for all through his duel with Turnus. The Latins in their turmoil are compared to swarming bees:

exoritur trepidos inter discordia civis:  
urbem alii reserare iubent et pandere portas  
Dardanidis ipsumque trahunt in moenia regem;  
arma ferunt alii et pergunt defendere muros,  
inclusas ut cum latebroso in pumice pastor  
vestigavit apes fumoque implevit amaro;  
illae intus trepidae rerum per cerea castra  
discurrunt magnisque acuunt stridoribus iras;  
volvitur ater odor tectis, tum murmure caeco  
intus saxa sonant, vacuas it fumus ad auras. (12.583-592)

Strife rises among the anxious citizens: some bid unbar the town and throw wide the gates to the Dardans, and drag the king himself to the ramparts; others bring arms, and hasten to defend the walls. As when some shepherd has tracked bees to their lair in a rocky covert and filled it with stinging smoke; inside, anxious for their safety, they scurry to and fro through the wax fortress, and with loud buzzing whet their rage; the black stench rolls through the dwelling, the rocks within murmur with blind hum, and smoke billows out into the empty air.

In contrast with the discord in connection with the council in Book 11, this discord is brought on by desperate circumstances. Where the earlier Latin mustering scene (11.451-485), had only shown the various activities of the people with often an assumed undercurrent of division (asking for arms, mourning, etc.), here there is an actual division between factions.<sup>106</sup> The two “camps”

---

<sup>105</sup> Subsection VII.A.3 will discuss this process.

<sup>106</sup> Anderson notes that while Aeneas can be read as the villain, and the Latins the victims in this scenario (Anderson 1968, 10-11), the real situation is that the Latins have by this point broken

in this disagreement are unmistakable: to put it in rather simple terms, it is Drances' earlier "peace party" twisted and taken to violent ends versus Turnus' "war party." They are also a party of words versus a party of deeds. The peace group is in favor of coercing Latinus to surrender, but they lack the will or the means to carry it out. Ironically, they are urging the same course of action that Latinus himself had been from the very beginning in Book 7 (7.572-600), minus the ill treatment of Latinus. The usual Vergilian ruler-to-people relationship has been inverted in the Latin state, and the results are playing out at the end of the poem.

The simile is fraught with more potential implications for the Latins. Bee imagery is used in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 2.87-93) and Vergil to describe large groups of people. In Book 1, for example, a bee simile describes the Carthaginians as they peacefully build their city (1.430-60). The Carthaginian bees are happy and productive,<sup>107</sup> but here Aeneas is at the gates of the city accusing the Latins of twice breaking their oath (12.580-2), and so *discordia* and fear<sup>108</sup> are the prominent characterizations of the Latin "bees." Of course, although the bees feel fear at the beekeeper of the simile, it might be noted that ancient beekeepers were aware that smoke has a calming effect on bees;<sup>109</sup> is the poet casting a wry smile at the still confused Latin bees?

#### 4. Mourning as Prelude to Disaster: Amata and Dido

The rout of the Rutulians as Aeneas storms the city brings about the final stage in the "sedition" of the city prior to its downfall, the loss of Queen Amata. Up to this point, disaster has not yet taken hold completely, as the citizens had retained the ability to contemplate courses of action.

---

the treaty, and Aeneas' actions do lead to the settlement of the war (Anderson 12). The Latins' own *Discordia*, more than Aeneas himself, brings destruction upon them.

<sup>107</sup> See subsection III.C for a treatment of this passage. Another bee simile occurs at 6.707ff.

<sup>108</sup> E.g. *trepidi* 11.453.

<sup>109</sup> E.g. *Geo.* 4.228-30, where the keeper is advised to approach a hive with a mouthful of water and a fumigator in order to avoid upsetting the bees.



After the suicide of Amata, the “weary Latins” (*fessis...Latinis*, 12.593) are devastated, and their mourning spirals out of control. Mourning is in itself a somewhat problematic crowd activity. At times, it serves to unify, but it is always marginally dangerous because of its tendency to get out of hand, and its connection primarily to women, with whom it often starts. The death of Amata is remarkably similar to the death of Dido (4.665-71) in its importance. Both queens’ deaths bring about complete social dissolution in their respective peoples through an initially “*private* wound and *private* conflagration into a *public* catastrophe.”<sup>110</sup> Civil disorder is also occasioned in both by the involvement of *Fama*.<sup>111</sup>

The trouble starts – as it had in the very different matter of the sedition involved in the outbreak of war in Book 7 – with the Latin women (*miseræ...Latinae*) hearing the news (12.604), and then Lavinia first (*prima*, 605) begins a frenzied mourning, followed by a noisy crowd of citizens. At last, *Fama* takes over, spreading the news of Amata’s death throughout the whole city, and the news takes a devastating psychological toll:

...tum cetera circum  
 turba furit, resonant late plangoribus aedes.  
 hinc totam infelix vulgatur fama per urbem:  
 demittunt mentes, it scissa veste Latinus  
 coniugis attonitus fatis urbisque ruina,  
 canitiem immundo perfusam puvere turpans. (12.606-611)

...then all the throng around her (Lavinia) falls into a frenzy; the wide halls ring with lamentations. From here the woeful rumor spreads throughout the town. Hearts sink; Latinus goes with rent raiment, dazed at his wife’s doom and his city’s downfall, defiling his hoary hair with showers of unclean dust.

The crowd noise occasioned by the “city’s downfall” (*urbis...ruina*, 610)<sup>112</sup> brought about by Amata’s death serves as a warning to Turnus, who can hear the *clamor* from a distance:

attulit hunc illi caecis terroribus aura  
 commixtum clamorem, arrectasque impulit auris  
 confusae sonus urbis et inlaetabile murmur. (12.617-9)

---

<sup>110</sup> Otis, 72.

<sup>111</sup> “*Fama* is “active here as she is in Book 4” (4.173-97, 666) (Fantham 144).

<sup>112</sup> Also 12.594.

To him the breeze bore a cry blended with terrors unknown, and the sound and joyless murmur of the town in turmoil fell on his straining ears.

Likewise, in the case of Dido, the queen's suicide is described not merely as a sad event in which the Carthaginians would have been able to rely on a new leader and move on; it is likened to the downfall of their state:<sup>113</sup>

...it clamor ad alta  
atria: concussam bacchatur Fama per urbem.  
lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu  
tectata fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether,  
non aliter quam si immissis ruat hosibus omnis  
Karthago, aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes  
culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum. (4.665-71)

A scream rises to the lofty roof; Rumor riots through the stricken city. The palace rings with lamentation, with sobbing and women's shrieks, and heaven echoes with loud wails – as though all Carthage or ancient Tyre were falling before the intruding foe, and fierce flames were rolling on over the roofs of men, over the roofs of gods.

The picture, at least in the immediate context, is of a city and its people thrown into total chaos by the death of its queen. The fact that all of Carthage is “stricken” (*concussam*, 4.666) is emphasized.<sup>114</sup> The sounds of mourning coming from the people are varied from a groaning of lament (*gemitu lamentis*) and the cry of the women,<sup>115</sup> to the “indistinguishable hum of sound” implied by *fremunt* (4.668).<sup>116</sup>

The deployment of *Fama* and the highly charged *bacchatur* would have signaled no less than social chaos to the Roman readership, whose familiarity with the Bacchanalian “conspiracy” would have allowed them to grasp instantly the dangerous implications of the civil

---

<sup>113</sup> The comparison of the fall of one person as the fall of the whole city appears in *Il.* 22.410ff. in reference to Hector (Williams on 4.669). In fact, though, the reaction of the people is only one part of the equation; both Troy and Carthage (though much later) are destined to fall. In essence, the reaction to Dido's death is an extreme prolepsis of the future of Carthage.

<sup>114</sup> Austin on 4.665.

<sup>115</sup> “*ululatu*,” cf. at 4.168 for Dido's “wedding” (Pease and Austin on 4.667).

<sup>116</sup> Austin on 4.668.

chaos.<sup>117</sup> Indeed, Amata's earlier ravings in the forest have been tied very strongly to Bacchus.<sup>118</sup> The fact, however, that the chaos here is in a foreign land that had once harbored enemies of Rome renders it far less potentially frightening. When the word appears in Latin contexts, there are more significant implications. Civil chaos may have been temporarily suppressed, but it is a tendency that lies dormant in the Roman crowd, ready to emerge at any time in the absence of political *concordia* and good leadership.

In the end, despite the suggestions of ruin, the Latins – like the Carthaginians – will live to fight another day. The Latins will do so, their internal rifts healed, side by side with their enemies, the Trojans, with whom they are destined to become one. Sedition, for both human and divine crowds, remains a constant in human society, which can be ameliorated by political virtue and collectivity, but not altogether eliminated. In the end, it can contribute to growth and renewal for the crowds involved. Sedition has proven devastating for both Trojan and Latin, but the process of melding and rebuilding the new nations is already long underway, and the poet has even provided a suggestion of how this is to be achieved in the form of the statesman simile of Book 1. The Trojans, but especially the Italians, will need a strong leader to curb and channel their latent seditious tendencies in order to bring them closer to their collective Roman destiny. Both groups, possess unique characteristics that will help them better to contribute to that destiny.

---

<sup>117</sup> Fantham notes Friedrich's remarks on "the Roman horror of Bacchic rioting" (145).

<sup>118</sup> 7.385, 389 and 405.

## VI. WAR AND THE PEOPLES OF ITALY

As the story of the Trojans draws to a close, while the story of the proto-Roman Italian/Trojan amalgamation begins, the poet begins to drop hints that the Trojans are not the sole possessors of their consistently held characteristics: inclusivity, political virtue, piety, competitiveness, endurance, and collectivity. That the Italians so frequently share in these virtues (especially in piety and *duritia*)<sup>1</sup> speaks well of their coming unity.<sup>2</sup> As Fraenkel points out, the *Aeneid* was designed as “the national epic, not of Rome only, but of Italy.”<sup>3</sup> In fact, the references to the various ancient Italian tribes would have resonated with members of Vergil’s audience who came from those groups and cities.<sup>4</sup> In the end, the poet treats the Italians with great sympathy, and even admiration.<sup>5</sup>

In spite of attempts to paint the Trojans as conquerors – or, even worse, as despoilers – it is plain from Jupiter’s agreement with Juno that the Trojans are to become Italians/Latins

---

<sup>1</sup> Horsfall 1990 “Numanus,” 307.

<sup>2</sup> Otis, 318: “The opponents of Aeneas are anything but villains...they are not only Latins or Italians, whose virtues for obvious reasons must be insisted upon, but human beings whose tragedy is accentuated by their virtues.”

<sup>3</sup> Fraenkel 1990, 265.

<sup>4</sup> Eg. The reference to Mantua (10.198-203) Heinze, 376. The catalogue of heroes also allows Vergil to single out “for special characterization the most prominent of Aeneas’ enemies” (Fraenkel 1990, 265-266, Basson, 114-126).

<sup>5</sup> Camps, 95. See also Zetzel, 195: Vergil’s Italians are “worthy antagonists.” Vergil highlights “the invaluable contribution made by the Italian element in the formation of the new nation” (Basson, 120).

(12.827, 834-840), not vice-versa.<sup>6</sup> The Trojans have attained a higher level of civilization than the Italians (hence the taunts of effeminacy),<sup>7</sup> but the Italians are of a (perhaps marginally) “harder” character, even if they tend towards uncouthness and unruliness, the latter of which can be chalked up almost entirely to their deficiency in good leadership.<sup>8</sup>

It follows, then, that the modern *Romani* will share, along with both Trojan and Italian lineage, all of the characteristics that come with both peoples,<sup>9</sup> who were never terribly different to begin with. Zetzel remarks that in the war depicted in the latter half of the poem, in fact, the Italians are “both like the Trojans and unlike them” in that “the tidy polarities of civilization and barbarism, of progress and decline, of war and peace are carefully disturbed and redistributed throughout Vergil’s account of Italy.”<sup>10</sup> An examination of the characteristics and behaviors of the various peoples at this point in the epic (including the Trojans) brings the nature of their coming unity (and eventual *Romanitas*) into focus.<sup>11</sup> The war serves as a catalyst for the positive

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Thomas’ portrayal (1982, 98) of the Latins as a “doomed” culture.

<sup>7</sup> Though Horsfall contends: “Trojan *luxuria* represents an obviously later and worse cultural level than Rutulian *duritia*” (Horsfall, 1990 “Numanus,” 311).

<sup>8</sup> Hardie (9.18) remarks: “The difficulty that critics experience in deciding how qualified our admiration for the Italians in the *Aeneid* should be, and how favorable we should be towards Trojans civilization reflects...ideological tension” in the text between primitive rural values and those of an urbanized society. Thomas finds a more serious indictment of Trojan (and by extension Roman) culture (1968, 102). Cf. Margaret Taylor’s balanced view: “certain of the Italians...reveal their need of the more ‘civilized’ virtues of Aeneas” but Turnus “is certainly no primitive barbarian” (272-3).

<sup>9</sup> “...there is, from the point of view of the Augustan present, no more difference between Roman and Italian than between Trojan and Italian” (Zetzel, 193).

<sup>10</sup> Zetzel, 191. For Zetzel, the “ambiguity” of the portrayal of both the Trojans and Italians is in keeping with “Vergil’s construction of history in general” (192).

<sup>11</sup> Heinze claims, “in characterizing whole nations, Virgil often restricts himself to a handful of outstanding traits which were common currency to his contemporaries and himself” (Heinze, 222). If this is the case, it need not be read as a lack of originality, but as a way to promote understanding and identification in his audience.

characteristics of each of the peoples to be refined and merged with those that they share with others (e.g. piety) and for any negative characteristics (e.g. the Etruscan tendency toward tyranny and Trojan “Easternness”) to gradually dissipate under the auspices of peace.<sup>12</sup>

#### A. PROPHECIES AND FOREBODINGS OF PEOPLES AND WARS

By the time the *Aeneadae* arrive at their destined home in Italy in Book 7, both they and the reader have at least an inkling of what they are up against. The twin themes – touched upon in most of the prophecies and forebodings of Italy – are the *populi* and *bella* with which the Trojans (and Romans) will have to contend in order to achieve their destiny. The reader has been aware of this since almost the beginning of the poem:

hic tibi... (1.261)  
bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis  
contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet, (1.263-4)

This your son...shall wage a great war in Italy, shall crush proud peoples, and for his people shall set up laws and city walls...<sup>13</sup>

Aeneas also hears of war in Italy in the prophecy his father makes upon seeing the omen of the four horses in Italy:

...bellum, o terra hospita, portas:  
bello armantur equi, bellum haec armenta minantur. (3.539-540)

Tis war you bring, land of our reception; for war are horses armed, war these herds portend.

---

<sup>12</sup> Horsfall hints at the distinctions (on 7.15, also 1995 173ff.), but his view of the Trojans as having “all the advantages...in the face of the Italians’ simple, disorderly (noble, tragic) valor” (on 7.151) seems to give the Italians too little credit, and to neglect the role of divine involvement.

<sup>13</sup> Conington on 1.264 remarks: “*Mores* conveyed to a Roman many of the notions which political institutions and a social system convey to us.” Cf. 8. 316. Austin further differentiates *mores* as “political institutions and a social system,” and *moenia* as “building of a city” with “a settled civil government” (Austin on 1.264).

But this is only the first part of the prophecy; the second half has happier implications that will be discussed in the final chapter.<sup>14</sup> When Jupiter instructs Mercury to pay a visit to Aeneas in Carthage, the emphasis is on the hardness of the land (really its people), but also upon the future Roman task of imposing law:

sed fore qui gravidam imperiis belloque frementem  
Italiam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucris  
proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem. (4.229-231)

...but he it was who should rule Italy, a land teeming with empire and clamorous with war, hand on a race from Teucer's noble blood, and bring all the world beneath his laws.

Oddly, Mercury does not repeat Jupiter's words to Aeneas; he only tells him to think of Ascanius "to whom the kingdom of Italy and the Roman land are due" (4.274-276). While the Trojans are leaving Carthage, the reader is given another foreboding of war in the form of Dido's curse that the Trojans and their Roman descendants shall be afflicted with war: "war may they have, themselves and their children's children" (*pugnent ipsique nepotesque*, 4.629).<sup>15</sup> Finally, when the Trojans have arrived in Italy, Vergil's introduction to the *maius opus* (7.45) makes it clear to the reader one last time that wars and peoples are in the Trojans' inevitable future:

...dicam horrida bella,  
dicam acies actosque animis in funera reges,  
Tyrrenamque manum totamque sub arma coactam  
Hesperiam...(7.41-44)

I will tell of grim wars, will tell of battle array, and princes in their valor rushing upon death – of Tyrrhenian bands, and all Hesperia mustered in arms.

What Aeneas himself, and presumably also the *Aeneadae*, are also aware of is similarly expressed. Helenus tells Aeneas (in rather vague terms) what the Sibyl will reveal:

illa tibi Italiae populos venturaque bella  
et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem,  
expediet...(3.458-460)

---

<sup>14</sup> See the opening of CHAPTER VII.

<sup>15</sup> See subsection I.E, n. 90 for more on Dido's curse.

The nations of Italy, the wars to come, how you are to flee or face each toil, she will unfold to you...

But even before he speaks to her, Anchises reveals to Aeneas in a dream the nature of the people of Italy:

...lectos iuvenes, fortissima corda,  
defer in Italiam. gens dura atque aspera cultu  
debellanda tibi Latio est...(5.729-731)

...chosen youths, the bravest hearts, lead to Italy. A people hard and rugged in nurture must you subdue in Latium...

Aeneas has not yet heard his father's exhortation to the future Romans to "crush the proud" (*debellare superbos*, 6.853), but the affinity between these earlier words and his later words is clearly designed to instruct his son on the nature of the wars and peoples in Italy. The Sibyl's prophecy is more specific, warning of a "new Achilles" and giving advice to Aeneas to seek aid from Evander, but it also hammers home the general points about the wars (*horrida bella*) to come and the peoples of Italy, this time with the information that some of those peoples will in fact be on the side of the Trojans:

o tandem magnis pelagi defuncte periclis  
(sed terrae graviora manent), in regna Lavini  
Dardanidae venient (mitte hanc de pectore curam),  
sed non et venisse volent. bella, horrida bella,  
et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno. (6.83-87)

...  
...nec Teucris addita Iuno  
usquam aberit, cum tu supplex in rebus egenis  
quas gentis Italum aut quas non oraveris urbes! (6.90-92)

O you that have at length survived the great perils of the sea – yet by land more grievous woes lie in wait – into the realm of Lavinium the sons of Dardanus shall come, relieve your heart of this care. Yet they shall not also rejoice in their coming. Wars, grim wars I see, and the Tiber foaming with streams of blood...nor shall Juno anywhere fail to dog the Trojans, while you, a suppliant in your need, what races, what cities of Italy will you not implore?

Finally, Anchises' last words to Aeneas in the underworld suggest that Aeneas himself may know more about these peoples and wars than the poet has let on, although the explicit



elaboration of such information surely would have been a poor narrative decision. Sufficient to say, it suggests that Aeneas understands quite well the situation his Trojans are to face:

quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit  
incenditque animum famae venientis amore,  
exim bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda  
Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,  
et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem. (6.888-892)

After Anchises had led his son over every scene, kindling his soul with longing for the glory that was to be, he then tells of the wars that the hero next must wage, the Laurentine peoples and Latinus' town, and how he is to flee or face each peril.

By the time the Trojans arrive in Italy, both they and the reader have been hearing incessantly of the peoples and wars that the Trojans are to face in Italy. How these groups are presented, as well as how the war plays out, reveals the nature of Trojan/Italian unity.

## B. THE INDIVIDUAL PEOPLES

The poet's treatment of each of the individual peoples of Italy – as well as of the Trojans once they arrive in Italy – warrants careful attention.<sup>16</sup> The tribes have a complex history, and even those who are closely related are far from identical.<sup>17</sup> The Rutulians, for example, cannot simply be treated as an offshoot of the Latins. All of them bear unique characteristics – some in keeping with the Trojans, and some not – that will influence their fate throughout the course of the war.

---

<sup>16</sup> Horsfall comments on Vergil's rather "romanticizing" usage of the various terms for groups of Italians, e.g. *Sicani*, *Aurunci*, *Latini*, etc. For further discussion of Vergil's treatment of the ethnographical tradition, see Horsfall 1990 "Society," 526-7.

<sup>17</sup> Toll 1997 finds that in the poem "The Italian peoples are endowed with vivid coloring and affection, but with very little institutional or even characterological detail." She locates "the toga, fortitude, endurance and courage...senates or senate-like councils, possibly resistance to tyranny...opportunities for capable and influential women" (40), but she makes no further attempt is made to uncover differences in national character between the groups. Margaret Taylor finds several material differences, e.g. the primitive hut of Evander vs. Latinus' palace, the *legio agrestis* of Praeneste (7.681-90) versus Turnus' elaborate arms (270-1).

On the one side are the bulk of the Italians/Ausonians: Latins/Laurentians, Rutulians, and Volscians.<sup>18</sup> On the other are other “Italian” groups who constitute Trojan allies: the Arcadians and Etruscans, as well as the Trojans themselves.

The history of Italy told to Aeneas by Evander includes the original peaceful “Saturnian age” followed by a violent, presumably “Iron” age (8.314-327), and finally the arrival of the *manus Ausonia* and the *gentes...Sicanae* (8.328), in Italy.<sup>19</sup> What is compelling about the story he relates is that Saturn had taken upon himself the very tasks with which Aeneas has been charged: he “gathered together the unruly race (*genus indocile*), scattered over the mountain heights” (8.321-22) “and gave them laws” (*legesque dedit*, 322). The next stage has been the cause for much controversy on the nature of the situation in Italy at the time of the Trojans’ arrival: Later he “ruled the peoples in perfect peace” (*placida populos in pace regebat*, 325)<sup>20</sup> until the “frenzy of war” (*belli rabies*) and “passion for gain” (*amor...habendi*, 327) that come with the lesser generation (*deterior...ac decolor aetas*, 8.326) put a stop to the Golden Age.<sup>21</sup> Under close scrutiny of the different groups, however, the alleged inconsistency in the portrayal of the Italians becomes less problematic.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Turnus assumes the support of the cities and nations of Italy (*urbes Italiae populique*, 11.420).

<sup>19</sup> See Fordyce on 8.314ff. for the full background of the legend.

<sup>20</sup> See also Latinus ruling “lands and towns in the calm of a long peace” (*arva...et urbes...longa placidas in pace*, 7.46-7), Ausonia as “sluggish and unmoved” before war has broken out (*inexcita...immobilis ante*, 7.623) and Messapus’ troops as “tribes long inert and troops unused to war” (*iam pridem resides populos desuetaque bello agmina*, 7.693-4).

<sup>21</sup> Thomas views the Trojans as “contributing to the decline that follows Saturn” (See also Zetzel, 190-1), but as Thomas himself notes, the assumption that they are parallel contains an “essential discrepancy” in that “Saturn operates specifically outside the bounds of military action, which can hardly be said for Aeneas...” (Thomas 1982, 97 n. 20). More problematic is Thomas’ identification of the Trojan arrival as “the element which motivates the change from the age of Saturn to that of Jupiter” (1982, 100), when Evander describes clearly a shift that had already taken place. See also Putnam, who blames Aeneas for renewing the “natural rudeness” of a “wild though pastoral people,” but defends (correctly) the Italians’ right to self-defense (1970, 410).

## 1. Italians/Ausonians

In the aforementioned story told by Evander, it is notable that the Arcadian Greek identifies himself and his people as “Italians.”<sup>23</sup> This may seem to complicate matters, since most words indicating “Italians” or “Ausonians” refer to the Italians who are fighting against Aeneas. The frequent overlap of terminology, though, gives the reader a glimpse of the coming Italianness of the Trojans themselves.

The character of the Italians becomes clear on many occasions. The Catalogue of Italians, for example, through its “lovingly detailed”<sup>24</sup> descriptions of the Italian armies, helps to increase their stature as foes of the Trojans and to point to the coming unity of the races. In the opening of the catalogue, the innate strength<sup>25</sup> of Italy is stressed: “with what manhood even then did kindly Italy bloom” (*quibus Itala iam tum floruerit terra alma viris*, 7.643-4). The most usual trait assigned to them is *duritia*.<sup>26</sup> The boastful Numanus Remulus (himself actually a Rutulian, which will turn out to be explanatory in itself) delivers a taunt to Ascanius that

---

<sup>22</sup> Kristol, 126-134 treats in detail the alleged inconsistency in the portrayal of Italy. Camps treats as intentional the presence of two conflicting “traditional conceptions of ancient Italy” (134-5). O’Hara agrees that the inconsistency “allows the Trojans to be seen both as civilizers and invaders” (217). Rosivach perceptively views the emphasis on the Latins’ warlike accomplishments as necessary because “if there is to be an alliance between Trojans and Latins, it will be an alliance of equals” (151).

<sup>23</sup> “fierce Thybris with giant bulk from whom we Italians (*Itali*) have since called our river Tiber” (8.330-332).

<sup>24</sup> Harrison 1991, xxv.

<sup>25</sup> Horsfall 1990 “Numanus,” 306-7. Of *duritia*: “peculiarly Roman, for there is no Greek word to convey a condition of laudable physical toughness.” Horsfall also lists here possessors of this trait. Cf. Otis for a view of the Italians as “unsophisticated primitives whose courage is put to a very bad use” (329).

<sup>26</sup> Of course, the trait is well attested of the Trojans as well. See subsection III.5 and below. Kristol remarks: “The *Aeneid*...presents a case study...of particular labors imposed on, and borne by, particularly tough peoples” (15).

amounts to a confrontational *laus Italiae*: while Trojans are weak, lazy, and cowardly,<sup>27</sup> Italians are tough, hardworking, and brave:

durum a stirpe genus natos ad flumina primum  
deferimus saevoque gelu duramus et undis;  
venatu invigilant pueri silvasque fatigant,  
flectere ludus equos et spicula tendere cornu.  
at patiens operum parvoque adsueta iuventus  
aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello.  
omne aevum ferro teritur, versaque iuvenum  
terga fatigamus hasta, nec tarda senectus  
debilitat viris animi mutatque vigorem:  
canitiem galea premimus, semperque recentis  
comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto. (9.603-613)

A race of hardy stock, we first bring out newborn sons to the river, and harden them with the water's cruel cold; as boys they keep vigil for the chase, and tire the forests; their sport is to rein the steed and shoot arrows from the bow; but patient of toil, and inured to want, our youth tames the earth with the hoe or shakes cities in battle. All our life is worn down with iron's use; with spear reversed we goad our bullocks' flanks, and sluggish age does not weaken our hearts' strength or change our vigor. Onto white hairs we press the helmet, and we ever delight to drive in fresh booty and live on plunder.

There is no reason to call Italian *duritia* into question or to assume that Numanus is exaggerating, though he does make use of Roman popular images of the Sabines,<sup>28</sup> as well as early Roman stereotypes of rustic endurance, “ethnographical notices of barbarian peoples,” and idealized pictures of the Cretan and Spartan states.<sup>29</sup> The designation *patiens operum*, connected as it is to a certain endurance of suffering, however, may not be at this stage a demonstrably “Italian” trait,<sup>30</sup> as will become apparent later in this chapter. In addition, the picture Numanus presents contains “nothing of rural piety,”<sup>31</sup> an omission that implicitly acknowledges a known

---

<sup>27</sup> See below, also 4.206-218 and 9.598-602, 614-620.

<sup>28</sup> Heinze, 222.

<sup>29</sup> Horsfall 1990 “Numanus,” 306 n.8. Ibid. for the suggestion that Vergil “may have been influenced by speculations about the environment on natural character.” See Cato, *De Suis Virtutibus* and Lucretius 2.430. Servius remarks on 9.600: *Italiae disciplina et vita laudatur, quam et Cato in Originibus et Varro in gente populi Romani commemorat.*

<sup>30</sup> Kristol characterizes the Italians in general as “hardy” but “too impetuous and fickle to be truly patient” whereas the Trojans have shown their ability to “bear protracted labor, or suffering” (133).

<sup>31</sup> Horsfall 1990 “Numanus,” 314.

Trojan strength. Juno's request of Jupiter that the Romans be "strong in Italian valor" (*sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago*, 12.827) affirms the importance of Italian strength as a valuable asset.<sup>32</sup>

Aeneas understands Italian *duritia*, and he knows that fighting the Italians is a necessary challenge with which he has to contend in order to complete his mission. He laments before the corpse of Pallas that the boy's father had fearfully warned him "that valiant were the men and hardy the race we confronted" (*acris esse viros, cum dura proelia gente*, 11.47-8).<sup>33</sup> There is no reason to impute to Aeneas an admission of Trojan weakness just because he is able to pay a compliment to his enemy. This admiration, in fact, will contribute to the coming unity of the peoples.

To return to Numanus' speech, most of the Italians' qualities enumerated there are admirable (if primitive), save one found in the final two lines: the explicit joy that the Italians take (*iuvat*, 9.613) in capturing spoils. Some critics have suggested that taking spoils does not comport with the Trojan mission of civilization, and certainly not with the Augustan program,<sup>34</sup> but this is somewhat untenable given the actual frequency with which Trojans and Trojan allies resort to plundering throughout the poem,<sup>35</sup> as well as the poem's references to spoils in

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the Carthaginians, who never could have served as a suitable race for the Trojans to join with due to their riches and easy lifestyle (*dives opum and facilem victu...gentem*) in spite of martial prowess (1.14 and 1.445) and Crete with its *uberrima regna* (3.106), whereas Italy has rich soil (*ubere glaebae*) but is also powerful in arms (*potens armis*) (3.164).

<sup>33</sup> These two lines present a source of controversy. Fratantuono takes *mitteret in magnum imperium* as the Trojans fighting "against a great empire" because they are destined "to be joined to it in body only" (12.835 *mixti corpore tantum*), not in customs and way of life, as well as a suggestion of Trojan weakness (Fratantuono on 11.47). But Heyne and Conington-Nettleship *ad loc* agree that it is the destined one that Evander himself had in essence bequeathed to Aeneas.

<sup>34</sup> Horsfall 1990 "Numanus," 311: Due to the predominance of piracy in the Mediterranean, "that the Rutuli lived from rapine would strike the Augustans as peculiarly vicious."

<sup>35</sup> E.g. 9.185-385 (Nisus and Euryalus); 10.77-78, 462-3, 541-2; 11.5-92 (The Trojan Funerals), 746-758.

connection with Augustus himself and his family.<sup>36</sup> Plunder itself is not a problem, whether taken in the context of heroic warfare or of the later regular policy of the Roman army,<sup>37</sup> it is the attitude toward plunder that matters, and the Italians seem to enjoy it a little too much. The eagerness and even joy exhibited by the Italians in spoils is evident both individually, as in the Volscian Camilla's "woman's passion for booty and spoils" (*femineo praedae et spoliarum...amore*, 11.782),<sup>38</sup> or more famously when Turnus "exults in the spoil, and glories in the winning" of Pallas' sword belt (*ovato spolio gaudetque potitus*, 10.500), and collectively. In the Catalogue of Italians, Ufens and his Aequiculi are described as taking joy (*iuvat*, 7.749) in carrying off plunder, a clear verbal foreshadowing of Numanus' remarks.<sup>39</sup> Later, Italians "crowd around" (*concurrunt Itali*) and – in a macabre touch – "despoil the still warm limbs" (*spoliantque calentia membra*) of the Etruscan king Aulestes (12.297). In contrast, the Trojans and their allies, despite actually taking plunder more often than the Italians, offset any joy that might come as a result of it<sup>40</sup> by frequently allowing their enemies to keep their arms.<sup>41</sup> The Italians, in contrast, take full advantage of every opportunity they have to take plunder. It is not

---

<sup>36</sup> 1.289-90 and 8.682-4 (Augustus), 6.855-6 (Marcellus).

<sup>37</sup> The tradition of the *spolia opima* is also worth keeping in mind; the dedication of spoils can thus be read as a mark of piety. See Horsfall 1995, 176-179 for more detail.

<sup>38</sup> Whether the general (Italian) love for spoils is feminine, or only Camilla's love for spoils is does not matter – the implication is that love for spoils can be construed as a feminine trait.

<sup>39</sup> Horsfall on 7.749 notes the connection but tries to downplay the negativity of relishing *praedas* by reference to Thucydides' comments on the acceptability of taking plunder in ancient times (1.5.1).

<sup>40</sup> *ovare* occurs during the Trojan funerals (though it is unclear whether this is simply in reference to victory or to spoils (subsection VII.2), and in the case of Tarchon's slaying Venulus (11.746-758).

<sup>41</sup> 10.825-8 (Aeneas allows Lausus to keep his arms) and 11.790-2 (Arruns seeks no *exuviae*, *tropaemum*, or *spolia* for killing Camilla). The fact that the Trojans also burn at least some of their captured spoils in the funerals for their comrades in Book 11 (193-6) also suggests that the Trojans acknowledge the religious importance attached to the dedication of the arms of defeated enemies more than simply the material or even honorific value of such objects. See Harrison on 10.449-50 for the *spolia opima*.

surprising, then, to find their army described as “rich in horses, rich in embroidered robes and gold” (*dives equum, dives pictai vestis et auri*, 9.26).<sup>42</sup> To their credit, none of Vergil’s heroes of any race “neglect their other duties for the sake of taking spoils” or “fight over them” as do Homeric heroes.<sup>43</sup>

But the Italians’ joy in taking spoils is a relatively minor flaw in their national character. On the whole, they exhibit martial valor and *duritia*, though they are not characterized as explicitly warlike.<sup>44</sup> Divine interference, to a far greater extent than their own character, brings them into conflict with the Trojans. When Juno opens the gates of war, “all ablaze is Ausonia, which before was sluggish and unmoved” (*ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobilis ante*, 7.623). In spite of this, the Italians still end up taking much of the blame for the war. Jupiter himself reminds all the gods that he had forbidden “Italy to clash in war with Troy” (*abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teucris*, 10.8). The syntax here is important – it is the Italians who are clashing with the Trojans. Diomedes, too, in his message to the council remarks that the Ausonians have brought war upon themselves (11.252-4), though he is unaware of Juno’s considerable interference. In the larger picture, of course, the Italians are not destined to be at war with the Trojans forever, but to merge with the Trojans. As such, the poet has given them an admirable *duritia*, as well as other good qualities. These will emerge as the characteristics of the more distinct groups within their race (who are also at war with the Trojans) become apparent.

---

<sup>42</sup> Hardie notes a “hint of barbarian splendor” as well as the fact that this depiction runs in direct opposition to Numanus Remulus’ descriptions. “For Roman disapproval of opulent armor,” see Livy 9.40.4-6; 10.39.12-13; Tac. *Ann.* 6.34.3 (Hardie on 9.26).

<sup>43</sup> Heinze, 165.

<sup>44</sup> There need not be a problematic contradiction (detected by, e.g. Zetzl, 191); later, the Latins are portrayed as putting edges on their fathers swords – a consistent picture of a people who are only “sporadically warlike” (Horsfall on 7.636).

**a. Latins/Laurentians.** By the end of the poem, it is announced that the Latins and the Trojans are to be inextricably joined, indeed that the Trojans are to become Latins (12.829-840); but overtures towards Trojan/Latin unity can be seen even earlier. Aeneas' words to the Latin ambassadors after much fighting has already taken place insist that the Trojans are the friends of the Latins:

quaenam vos tanto fortuna indigna, Latini,  
implicuit bello, qui nos fugiatis amicos? (11.108-109)

What undeserved chance, Latins, has entangled you in so terrible a war, that you fly from us your friends? He insists that his war is with Turnus, not with the Latins, "nor do I wage war with your people" (*nec bellum cum gente gero*, 11.113).

The Latins are, like the Italians in general, of a warlike nature, but to a more pronounced degree.<sup>45</sup> When the Trojans first begin to scope out the territory after realizing that they are, in fact, in their destined home, they find where the "brave" Latins dwell (*fortis...Latinos*, 7.151), and the Trojan envoys are greeted by the sight of boys and youths engaged in various athletic and military activities:

ante urbem pueri et primaevo flore iuventus  
exercentur equis domitantque in pulvere currus,  
aut acris tendunt arcus aut lenta lacertis  
spicula contorquent, cursuque ictuque lacesunt. (7.162-5)

Outside the city, boys and youths in their early bloom practice horsemanship, or break in teams amid the dust, or bend eager bows, or hurl with their arms tough darts, and challenge each other to race or box.

This first look gives evidence of the enduring and competitive nature of the Latins. It is in keeping with the general picture of Italian *duritia*, though Horsfall notes that while Numanus Remulus' Italians "value sport as training for banditry...Latinus' *iuventus* take exercise because

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the poet's description of Latinus ruling "lands and towns in the calm of a long peace" (*arva...et urbes...longa placidas in pace*, 7.46-7).



it is good for them – but also will make them better warriors.<sup>46</sup> When Allecto drives Amata insane, the queen is driven “through the midst of cities and proud peoples” (*populosque ferocis*, 7.384). The reader may call to mind that the same phrase had appeared in Jupiter’s words to Venus at 1.263.<sup>47</sup> Even Juno admits during the Council of the Gods that the Latins constitute “savage hearts, and a city teeming with war” (*gravidam bellis urbem et corda aspera*, 10.87). On one occasion during the siege of the Trojan ramparts, Mars actually infuses the Latins with a fighting spirit (while sending fear upon the Trojans):<sup>48</sup>

Hic Mars armipotens animum virisque Latinis  
addidit et stimulus acris sub pectore vertit, (9.717-718)  
...  
undique conveniunt, quoniam data copia pugnae,  
bellatorque animo deus incidit... (9.720-721)

At this Mars, the mighty in war, lent fresh strength and valor to the Latins, and in their hearts plied his keen goads... From all sides gather the Latins, since scope for fight is given, and the god of battle seizes on their souls.

This tendency is not, however, necessarily all bad. The Latins, after all, have to be worthy adversaries of the Trojans, as well as worthy ancestors for the Romans.

They do have some faults, though. For one, they are characterized by *superbia*, a trait that destines them to war with Aeneas (*debellare superbos*, 6.853). Aeneas introduces himself to Pallas and the Arcadians with the following:

Troiugenas ac tela vides inimica Latinis,  
quos illi bello profugos egere superbo. (8.117-118)

You see men of Trojan stock and arms hostile to Latins – men whom they have driven to flight by insolent warfare.

---

<sup>46</sup> Horsfall on 7.163.

<sup>47</sup> *populosque feroces*.

<sup>48</sup> For the Trojans, see below, subsections VI.B.2.a-b.

Fordyce considers Aeneas to be guilty of “a striking piece of diplomatic exaggeration”<sup>49</sup> in considering the broken pledge of Latinus to constitute *superbia*, yet Venus echoes this characterization of Latin insolence (*Laurentis...superbos*, 8.613) when she brings her son the armor made for him by Vulcan. And it is “insolence” that will bring the Latins almost to the point of destruction in the end – Aeneas threatens that he will raze their city “unless they consent to receive our yoke and submit as vanquished” (*ni frenum accipere et victi parere fatentur*, 12.568). The Latins do not know when they are beaten.

On other occasions, they are guilty of following (or perhaps cursed with) poor leaders. Saces must remind Turnus that the Latins look to him (*in te ora Latini, in te oculos referunt*, 12.656-7). When they are routed in battle, no one appears to muster them.<sup>50</sup> In this case, after a Latin soldier (Aconteus) is thrown from his horse and killed by an Etruscan (Tyrrhenus), the Latins flee, casting their shields behind them.<sup>51</sup>

Extemplo turbatae acies, versique Latini  
reiciunt parmas et equos ad moenia vertunt;  
Troes agunt, princeps turmas inducit Asilas.  
iamque propinquabant portis rursusque Latini  
clamorem tollunt et mollia colla reflectunt;  
hi fugiunt penitusque datis referuntur habenis. (11.618-623)

At once the lines waver, and the routed Latins cast their shields behind them, and turn their horses toward the city walls. The Trojans give chase; Asilas in the van leads the squadrons. And now they were approaching the gates when again the Latins raise their shout, and wheel about their horses' supple necks; the others (the Trojans) flee, and retreat far off with loosened rein...

---

<sup>49</sup> Fordyce on 8.118 (defining *superbia* as “disregard of the rights of other which is most conspicuous in a tyrant”) and 146.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. the Etruscans at 11.758ff.

<sup>51</sup> Gransden on 11.618-9: “They slung their shields over their shoulders to cover their backs during their retreat.” See the discussion of the continuation of this encounter (11.629-35) (subsection VII.A.1).

Following is a simile comparing battle to ocean tides (11.624-628),<sup>52</sup> which should call to mind the statesman simile, as well as the poem's two similes comparing leaders (Latinus and Mezentius) to ocean crags being pounded by waves. In this particular instance, however, the Latins are notably without a leader. Although Turnus had entrusted these forces to Camilla, she is too busy glorying in the battle (*At medias inter caedes exsultat Amazon*, 11.648-649) to take note of her men; the Trojans on the other hand are led competently by Asilas. They are driven back in rout, but they recover quickly in the following lines.<sup>53</sup>

A final, problematic characteristic belonging to the Latins has been evident from much earlier in the poem. Latinus describes his people as having characteristics that are somewhat antithetical to the mission of both Rome and Aeneas himself:<sup>54</sup>

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

...and be not aware that the Latins are Saturn's race, righteous not by bond or laws, but self-controlled of their own free will and by the custom of their ancient god.

The description sounds admirable, at least in the sense of its promotion of Saturnian peace, but the Latins have effectively set themselves up as a perfect foil to the Trojans, whose very mission it is to bring *leges* and *mores*<sup>55</sup> to a land (and a world at large) that is no longer "Saturnian."<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> This is based on *Il.* 11.305-8, but the idea of the "ebb and flow of battle" is unique to Vergil (Williams on 624f.) Knauer adds *Il.* 14.16-19, "but neither is really parallel" (Gransden on 11.624-8).

<sup>53</sup> See below for how good leadership prevents similar routs from occurring among the Etruscans and Trojans (subsections VII.B.1.d and VII.B.2.b).

<sup>54</sup> Aeneas: to impose *mores* and *moenia* (1.263-264) and *totum sub leges mitteret orbem* (4.230). Rome: *pacique imponere morem*, 6.852).

<sup>55</sup> Gransden (on 7.203f.) detects an inconsistency in the Latins having the *fasces* (7.173).

<sup>56</sup> See subsection VI.B, especially n.21.

The Latins believe themselves impervious to the changes to come, but it will only take Juno as a catalyst to bring out their latent seditious tendencies<sup>57</sup> and to reveal the fallacy of their belief that they can live in the absence of law and order.<sup>58</sup>

**b. Rutulians.** When it comes to the Rutulians (often conflated with the *socii* of Turnus), Vergil leaves us with less that makes for a good impression. Even when the poet pays a compliment to the Rutulians, some other problematic quality is usually lurking.<sup>59</sup> Their behavior throughout the course of the war reveals a people who are warlike to a fault, prone to anger and pride, eager for spoils, under poor leadership but overly dependent upon their leaders, and somewhat lazy and undependable.

The Rutulians' warlike nature is demonstrated by their identification with *audacia*.<sup>60</sup> When they attack the Trojan ramparts, the "bold Rutulians" (*audaces Rutuli*, 9.519) attack again and again despite being repulsed by Trojan forces.<sup>61</sup> It is first evident, though, in Evander's assumption when he meets with Aeneas that the Rutulians (*gens...Daunia*)<sup>62</sup> have started the war, and that they will pursue domination over all Italy if left unchecked:

gens eadem, quae te, crudeli Daunia bello

---

<sup>57</sup> As seen in subsections V.C and V.F. See also Camps, 96.

<sup>58</sup> This view of the Latins, or "Aborigines" is borne out by Sallust: *Urbem Romam...condidere atque habuere initio Troiani qui Aenea duce profugi sedibus incertis vagabantur, cumque iis Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum. Hi postquam in una moenia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili lingua, alius alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint; ita brevi multitudo divorsa atque vaga concordia civitas facta erat* (*Bellum Cat.* 6.1-2).

<sup>59</sup> As the war breaks out in Latium in Book 7, for example, Turnus rouses his men, and they "vie in exhorting one another to arms" (*certatim*, 7.472), but Turnus also fills them with "daring courage" (*audacibus*, 7.475). See subsection V.C.2.

<sup>60</sup> Servius (on 4.615, Dido's curse) identifies the *audax populus* by whom Aeneas will be "harassed in war" (*bello audacis populi vexatus et armis*) as the Rutulians. 7.409, 9.3, 126, 10.276, and 9.519 all identify Rutulians with *audacia* (Pease on 4.615).

<sup>61</sup> Hardie on 9.519. Cf. also 4.615 and 7.475. Hardie notes sarcasm in this line, however, because the Rutulians are firing arrows from a safe distance rather fighting hand to hand.

<sup>62</sup> From Turnus' father Daunus, king of Apulia (12.723).

insequitur; nos si pellant nihil afore credunt  
quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant,  
et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra. (8.146-149)

The same Daunian race pursues us, as you, in cruel war; if they drive us forth, they deem that nothing will keep them from laying all Hesperia utterly beneath their yoke, and from holding the seas that wash her above and below.

The Rutulians interest in putting all of Italy “beneath their yoke” (*sub iuga*, 148) puts the notion of conquest in far starker terms than the Trojans do.<sup>63</sup> In any case, the Rutulians are portrayed as the primary aggressors.

More problematic than a warlike nature alone, is the Rutulian tendency toward anger and pride. After the deaths of Nisus and Euryalus (who, to be fair, had done their fair share of decapitating enemies, but without glorying in the activity), Turnus gathers the Rutulian forces. His men use the heads as a means of stirring up the emotions of the crowd:

Turnus in arma viros armis circumdatus ipse  
suscitat: aeratasque acies in proelia cogunt,  
quisque suos, variisque acuunt rumoribus iras.  
quin ipsa arrectis (visu miserabile) in hastis  
praefigunt capita et multo clamore sequuntur  
Euryali et Nisi. (9.462-67)

Turnus, himself in armor clad, summons his men to arms; the leaders marshal the mailed lines to battle, each his own men, and whet their anger with divers tales. On uplifted spears (piteous sight!) they affix and follow with loud clamor the heads, the very heads, of Euryalus and Nisus.

To an extent, the Rutulians bear less of the blame for their behavior than their leaders, who resort to a propagandistic use of rumor to rile them up; *ira* alone in the context of battle is not necessarily a negative trait. But the men’s reaction to the (intrinsically horrible) deed reveals their harsh character. While the Rutulians are engaged in battle before the Trojan ramparts, they do show some collective initiative in storming the gates when an opening appears (*inrumpunt aditus Rutuli ut videre patentis*, 9.683), but they also exhibit anger: “wrath waxes fiercer in their battling souls” (*tum magis increscunt animis discordibus irae*, 9.688). Venus takes note of their

---

<sup>63</sup> At least not until they are driven to attack the city of the Latins (12.554ff.).

behavior, complaining in despair to Jupiter, “Do you see how insolent the Rutulians are?” (*cernis ut insultent Rutuli*, 10.20),<sup>64</sup> and “how Turnus is borne conspicuous through the crowd upon his chariot, and rushes in swollen pride along the tide of war?” (10.20-22). The behavior of the leader in this case is not separable from that of his people.

The Rutulian devotion to spoils is also made clear during the same battle, when they are described as victorious “masters of plunder and spoils” (*praeda...spoliisque potiti*, 9.450). When they return to their own camp following the massacre perpetrated by Nisus and Euryalus, they recognize not the faces but the *spolia* of the dead chiefs (9.457). This obsession is set in the starkest terms when Turnus perishes because he is wearing the spoils of Pallas. It is tempting to draw a parallel with Euryalus, in that Euryalus perishes because of the helmet he had taken from Messapus (9.365-6). However, Euryalus is never shown rejoicing in his spoils, whereas Turnus, of course, fatally does.<sup>65</sup>

The Rutulians also show their overdependence on Turnus on several occasions, their self-determination in 9.683 (discussed above) is the exception. There are frequent references to the manner in which the Rutulians imitate or follow the lead of Turnus in battle. As seen in subsection V.C.2, the Rutulians’ emulousness at 7.472-4 seems commendable, but it is in the service of a poor leader. Likewise, Turnus’ *socii* give the battle cry at his bidding to attack the Trojans (9.54-5). When they “marvel at the Teucrians’ craven hearts” (*Teucrum mirantur inertia*

---

<sup>64</sup> Harrison notes the prior appearance of *insultare* in the work: 2.329-30 (Sinon) “*incendia miscet/insultans*” (Harrison on 10.20).

<sup>65</sup> Turnus is associated with spoils in a more “neutral” sense in that he is famous for taking them (11.224, 385), and prays to take them from Aeneas (12.97-8); the problematic scene is when he glorifies in taking spoils from Pallas (10.495-505) and then makes the same mistake of Euryalus in wearing them (12.946-7). Though Euryalus does seem to have taken too much (9.384), his actual despoiling does not make reference to his emotional state, and the poet mentions that Euryalus’ spoils are in fact spoils that the Rutulians had previously taken from Remulus of Tibur (9.359-366); Euryalus despoils the despoilers.

*corda*, 9.55), their words, reported in indirect discourse, reveal the extent to which they have misunderstood the Trojans' obedience to Aeneas' commands:

non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre  
arma viros, sed castra fovere...(9.56-7)

They cannot trust themselves to a fair field, or face the foe in arms, but hug the camp.

Though they respond naturally to the portent of the divine voice when the ships are turned into nymphs (*obstipuerunt animis Rutuli*, 9.123), Turnus misinterprets the portent to mean that the gods have abandoned the Trojans, and rouses the Rutulians with a long speech. The Rutulians respond, however, more to the language of heroic bravado than to speeches or explicit commands. When Turnus picks up a torch to raze the Trojan ramparts, so do they, "spurred on by Turnus' presence" (*urget praesentia Turni*, 9.73). Turnus' comrades obey his orders to fall back when he is about to fight Pallas (*socii cesserunt aequore iussi*, 10.444), but Pallas marvels at his foe's "haughty command" (*iussa superba*, 10.445).<sup>66</sup> When Juno tricks Turnus into following the apparition of Aeneas, he worries that he has abandoned his men to death (10.672-5), yet he soon reveals that he is more concerned about his own reputation, and the fact that the *Rutuli* and *fama* cannot follow him in death (10.679), than he is about the Rutulians themselves.

Finally, the Rutulians often show that they are a less than dependable group. Before they follow Turnus in the battle cry, they are a "tardy column" (*tardum...agmen*, 9.47) over which Turnus has to take the lead. More notable as indicative of outright laziness on the part of the Rutulians is their preparation for the defense of the city. While the Trojans are depicted as vigilant and efficient (9.168-175), the Rutulians, who also come off as rather showy,<sup>67</sup> are

---

<sup>66</sup> Harrison (on 10.445-6) asserts that Turnus actually calls off Lausus and his Etruscans.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. the Italians in general at 9.26.

drinking, playing games, or sleeping, a “picnic atmosphere,” Hardie remarks, “hardly suitable for the time and place”.<sup>68</sup>

bis septem Rutuli muros qui milite servent  
delecti, ast illos centeni quemque sequuntur  
purpurei cristis iuvenes auroque corusci.  
discurrunt variantque vices, fusique per herbam  
indulgent vino et vertunt crateras aënos.  
conlucent ignes, noctem custodia ducit  
insomnem ludo. (9.161-7)

Twice seven Rutulians are chosen to guard the walls with soldiers; on each attend a hundred men, purple-plumed and sparkling with gold. Back and forth they rush, and take their turns on watch, or, stretched along the grass, drink their fill of wine and upturn bowls of bronze. The fires burn bright, and the guards spend the sleepless night in games.

Nisus and Euryalus notice that “they lie prone, relaxed with wine and slumber” (*somno vinoque soluti procubuere*, 189-190).<sup>69</sup> The scene that Nisus and Euryalus find in the camp further heightens the sense of disorder:

...passim somno vinoque per herbam  
corpora fusa vident, arrectos litore currus,  
inter lora rotasque viros, simul arma iacere,  
vina simul...(9.316-319)

Everywhere they see bodies stretched along the grass in drunken sleep, chariots atilt on the shore, men lying among wheels and harness, their arms and flagons all about.

The Rutulians clearly mix their business with pleasure; it is not that they have been disobedient, they are simply not up to taking their task seriously, like the Trojans. When Nisus and Euryalus slaughter them, then, they are “the vast unnamed multitude” (*multam...sine nomine plebem*, 9.343). In all-out battle they are similarly unpredictable. At the death of Camilla they flee (*turbati fugiunt Rutuli*, 11.869), and – more ominously – their leaders desert them: “scattered

---

<sup>68</sup> Hardie on 9.146. See also Horsfall 1995, 173-4 for a justification of the raid perpetrated on the drunk Rutulians by Nisus and Euryalus.

<sup>69</sup> Later reported by Nisus as “buried in sleep and wine, the Rutulians lie silent” (*Rutulii somno vinoque sepulti conticuere*) (9.236-237), an echo of the fall of Troy: *conticuere* (2.253) and *urbem somno vinoque sepultam* (2.265). Hardie notes: “in the historians such nocturnal drunkenness in the field is typically the mark of barbarian enemies (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 4.48.1).



captains and troops left leaderless” (*disiectique duces desolatique manipuli*, 11.870) run for safety. It is no surprise when the Rutulians flee in the final battle, again shamefully turning their backs:

tollitur in caelum clamor, versique vicissim  
pulverulenta fuga Rutuli dant terga per agros. (12.462-3)

A shout rises to heaven, and in turn the routed Rutulians turn their backs in clouds of dust, in flight across the fields.

No one attempts to stop them, and Aeneas does not bother to give pursuit, because he is only after Turnus (12.464-7). In the end, the Rutulians represent not only a concrete faction whom the Trojans must defeat, but also the characteristics that they must defeat symbolically. The Rutulians serve as a reminder in many ways of what the Trojans must try not to become.

**c. Volscians.** The Volscians are a less uniformly negative group, and one certainly worthy of some admiration by the Trojans. They are characterized, like the Rutulians, by their overwhelming attachment to their leader, Camilla, and this becomes almost their defining characteristic, for good or ill. It carries with it a more sinister tone when the background of Camilla’s father as a tyrant is taken into account,<sup>70</sup> but it is to the Volscians’ credit that they have driven him out, and there is no reason to believe that Camilla herself is tyrant, though her leadership qualities may be questionable.<sup>71</sup> The Volscians come across for the most part as very well organized in battle:

At tuba terribilem sonitum procul aere canoro  
inrepuuit, sequitur clamor caelumque remugit.  
accelerant acta pariter testudine Volsci  
et fossas implere parant ac vellere vallum;  
quaerunt pars aditum et scalis ascendere muros,  
qua rara est acies interlucetque corona  
non tam spissa viris...(9.503-509)

---

<sup>70</sup> 11.539-540, 567-9. See subsection V.D.

<sup>71</sup> See above under the Latins, 11.684-9 (subsection VI.B.1.a).

But the trumpet with brazen song rang out afar its fearful call; a shout follows and the sky re-echoes. Forth the Volscians speed in even line, driving on their roof of shields, and prepare to fill the moat and pull down the palisade. Some seek an entrance, and try to scale the walls with ladders, where the line is thin and light gleams through a less dense ring of men.

Not only are the references to Roman battle clear (*tuba*, *testudo*, *fossa*, *vallum*, etc.); the actions of the Volscians are collective, orderly, and intelligent. The impression is that they do not need a leader to tell them to do everything because their training and discipline have prepared them to act without commands. On the other hand, the Volscians are extremely devoted to Camilla to a fault. Her troops dismount at her example (*tota cohors imitata*, 11.500) when she speaks to Turnus (11.500-501). When she is cut down, all the Volscians (*cuncti... Volsci*) stop to watch (11.800-801),<sup>72</sup> and, more problematically, both her own troops and the Rutulians are put to flight by the Teucrians, Etruscans, and Arcadians (11.834-5) when they see that she has been killed: “Their mistress lost, Camilla’s light squadron flees first” (*prima fugit domina amissa levis ala Camillae*, 11.868). By all accounts then, the Volscians are good fighters, but they are too tied to their leader.

**d. Etruscans.** The picture of the Etruscans, like that of the Volscians, is nuanced in terms of good and bad qualities, and also complex inasmuch as while most of the Etruscans fight on Aeneas’ side, some (namely, the troops who accompany Mezentius as his own personal guard) do not. The Etruscans have a far more peaceful reputation than the Latins, Rutulians, or Volscians, though they are far from weak. Likewise, they are more pious than the others, and more capable of collective action. Their evident strong stance against tyrants, as discussed in CHAPTER V, speaks well of their capacity for political virtue. Essentially, they are the perfect allies for the Trojans.

---

<sup>72</sup> See subsection IV.B-B1.

Evander helps to bring about this alliance when he proposes to link “mighty peoples” (*ingentis populos*, 8.475) to Aeneas in making him their “chief” (*ductorem*, 8.496). The Etruscans are bound by a prophecy that they must seek “leaders from abroad” (*externos duces*, 8.503) because they themselves – so a seer tells them – are the “chosen warriors of Maeonia, flower and chivalry of an ancient race” (*Maeoniae delecta iuventus, flos veterum virtusque virum*, 8.499-500) and because “it is not right that an Italian should control such a race” (*nulli fas Italo tantam subiungere gentem*, 8.502). Evander addresses Aeneas as the “most valiant leader of Trojans and Italians both” (*o Teucrum atque Italum fortissime ductor*, 8.513), making it clear that the unification of the Trojan and Etruscan races is to be tied inextricably to the person of Aeneas, and also pointing to the irony that Aeneas is about to engage in warfare against other tribes of Italians. Upon joining Aeneas and the Trojans, the Etruscans – themselves a people of foreign origin<sup>73</sup> – are actually “freed from fate” (*libera fati*, 10.154); it is only under foreign leadership that they are able to reach their full potential.

There are a few suggestions that the Etruscans do not possess as warlike a temperament as many of the other peoples of Italy.<sup>74</sup> Juno, for instance, asks Jupiter whether it was she who had caused Aeneas to “stir up” (*agitare*) Etruscan faith and “peaceful peoples” (*gentis...quietas*, 10.71). The matter of “Etruscan faith” (*Tyrrhenamque fidem*, 10.71) is somewhat unfair, as Juno refers here to the Etruscans’ dismissal of Mezentius,<sup>75</sup> an event that speaks well of their political virtue in not abiding tyrants. Another passage – and one that illuminates somewhat the taunts of

---

<sup>73</sup> The frequent referencing of the Etruscans using Maeonia and Lydia seems a striking analogy to the Trojans’ connection to Troy and Phrygia.

<sup>74</sup> This is not to say that the Etruscans do not possess this trait, though it is certainly not their primary characteristic. In the catalogue of Etruscan warriors, Mantua’s “strength” is “from Tuscan blood” (*Tusco de sanguine vires*, 10.203). Also, the fact that the Etruscan mothers admire Camilla, hoping for her as a daughter in law (11.581-2), suggests that strength and martial prowess are still important cultural values.

<sup>75</sup> See subsection V.D.

Numanus Remulus against the Trojans – is Tarchon’s speech to the Etruscans exhorting them to fight more bravely. They are harsh words, but spoken as they are by a fellow Etruscan, they may contain some truth, though no concrete proof of it is to be found in the poem.<sup>76</sup>

quis metus, o numquam dolituri, o semper inertes  
Tyrrheni, quae tanta animis ignavia venit?  
femina palantis agit atque haec agmina vertit!  
quo ferrum quidve haec gerimus tela inrita dextris?  
at non in Venerem segnes nocturnaue bella,  
aut ubi curva choros indixit tibia Bacchi.  
exspectate dapes et plenae pocula mensae  
(hic amor, hoc studium) dum sacra secundus haruspex  
nuntiet ac lucos vocet hostia pinguis in altos! (11.732-740)

You Tuscans, who will never be stung by shame, sluggards always, what fear, what utter cowardice has fallen on your hearts? Does a woman drive you in disorder and rout your ranks? For what reason do we bear swords, why these idle weapons, in our hands? But you are not laggard for love and nightly frays, or when the curved flute proclaims the Bacchic dance. Wait for the feasts and the cups on the loaded board (this is your passion, this your delight!) till the favoring seer announces the sacrifice, and the fat victim calls you to the deep groves!

Ultimately, the speech (or, more precisely, an *exemplum* set by Tarchon subsequently)<sup>77</sup> exerts its desired effect, and the Etruscans do follow Tarchon into battle, thus largely disproving his taunts. We may, however, form a picture of a people who are not quite as obsessed with *duritia* as some of the other peoples of Italy.<sup>78</sup>

Instead, the end of the passage (11.738-40) gives insight into the more pious side of the Etruscan people. Tarchon has taken Etruscan piety (as Numanus Remulus had taken Trojan obedience) and misconstrued it (though almost certainly intentionally) as an excuse for *luxuria*. The reference to the well-known Etruscan specialty of *haruspicium*, of which the reader is already aware thanks to Evander’s words to Aeneas, draws this piety into the round. The

---

<sup>76</sup> Heinze reminds us that Tarchon’s description only reflects the Roman idea of the Etruscans, and suggests that the purpose of the speech is “to offer an explanation of the maiden Camilla’s military successes as being due to the inefficiency of the enemy” (Heinze, 222).

<sup>77</sup> See subsection IV.B.

<sup>78</sup> The Etruscans of the *Aeneid*, moreover, are consistent with the historical (and archaeological) picture of the Etruscans.

Etruscans have not gotten involved in the war until Aeneas invites them, because prior to that they had been “awed by heaven’s warning” (*monitis exterrita divum*, 8.504) to follow the prophecy of a *haruspex* (8.498) in waiting for their foreign leader. When the Etruscans set out under Aeneas’ command, then, they do so “under heaven’s ordinance” (*iussis...divum*, 10.155).<sup>79</sup>

One more positive Etruscan quality may be noted, namely their capacity for collective action. This appears early on; Iris notifies Turnus that Aeneas “is mustering the Lydian country folk in armed bands” (*Lydorumque manum, collectos armat agrestis*, 9.11). The past participle *collectos* indicates that the Etruscans have gathered on their own prior to any command from Aeneas. In the catalogue of Etruscans they are described as “all of one mind to follow” (*mens omnibus una sequendi*, 10.182).<sup>80</sup> Here they serve as an ideal ally for the Trojans, who have just demonstrated a similar capacity for collectivity in Turnus’ assault on the Trojan battlements in Book 9.

For the most part they display good order in battle, a necessary trait considering that their participation in the war is militarily necessary to help the outnumbered Trojans defeat the Latins.<sup>81</sup> While fighting against Mezentius, they show outstanding courage and the ability to coordinate an attack (although it arises out of their resentment against their former tyrant) when the Trojans fail to take action:

concurrunt Tyrrhenae acies atque omnibus uni,  
uni odiisque viro telisque frequentibus instant. (10.691-2)

The Tyrrhene ranks rush together, and press on him alone with all their hatred, on him alone with all their ceaseless weapons.

---

<sup>79</sup> See Heinze, 240: The Etruscans “piously submit themselves to the directives of destiny” where the Latins allow themselves to be led astray and eventually into disaster.

<sup>80</sup> Harrison on 10.202-3 notes that the description of the *gens...triplex* of the city of Mantua also expresses “both racial diversity and political unity.” See Basson, 185 for a more detailed treatment of Mantua’s ethnic makeup and societal structure.

<sup>81</sup> Harrison on 163-214: “...even with the addition of 400 Arcadian cavalry (8.518-19), Aeneas’ forces are too small to face the thousands listed in the Latin Catalogue...”

Later, though, they too will falter before Mezentius, and “from a distance they provoke him with missiles and far-echoing shouts” (*missilibus longe et vasto clamore lacesunt*, 10.716). In the battle before the walls, they are singled out for their superior organization:

at manus interea muris Troiana propinquat,  
Etruscique duces equitumque exercitus omnis  
compositi numero in turmas...(11.597-9)

But meanwhile the Trojan band draws near the walls, with the Etruscan chiefs and all their mounted array, marshalled by number into squadrons.

Even when they have been making a less than impressive showing and Tarchon (himself roused by Jupiter, 11.727-728) has given them a talking-to, they do not react so much to his words, as to his *exemplum*: “Following their chief’s example and success, Maeonia’s sons attack” (*ducis exemplum eventumque secuti Maeonidae incurrunt*, 11.758-9). In this case, they have needed a little urging, but their essential quality is that they have been able to recognize Tarchon’s good leadership – they have followed the man, not his words.

A remark must be made concerning the comrades of Mezentius, who are also Etruscans, if Etruscans fighting on the wrong side of fate. These thousand men, as they are introduced in the catalogue of Italians, have followed Mezentius “in vain” from Caere (7.652-3). They are primarily in the background of Mezentius’ deeds; they “join their shouts with his, taking up the joyous cry of triumph” (*conclamant socii laetum paeana secuti*, 10.738) when he kills an opponent,<sup>82</sup> and they “follow with loud cries” (*socii magno clamore sequuntur*, 10.799) when Lausus steps in to protect his father from Aeneas. A miniature spectator event results from the

---

<sup>82</sup> The precedent at *Il.* 22.391, Achilles’ exhorting his men to sing the paeon after Hector’s death (Harrison on 10.738), is more appropriately removed from the immediacy of battle.

duel between Mezentius and Aeneas that follows,<sup>83</sup> but the *socii* of Mezentius are nowhere to be found. This group thus constitutes a diminished branch of the Etruscans, who are otherwise a people of excellent political virtue and capacity for collectivity.<sup>84</sup>

**e. Arcadians.** Because they are not characterized in great detail (we hear far more of their city, the future site of Rome, than of the people themselves) the Arcadians come across as ciphers among the peoples of Italy. Most prominent among their characteristics is their piety, as well as their willingness to cooperate with the Trojans, though often in the background. In spite of their good qualities, they are unremarkable in battle – even poor fighters, with the exception of Pallas, and they fade rather unnoticeably from the story following his funeral – perhaps appropriately because of their Greekness and their identification more with an ideal Golden Age than a realistic present.

Father Tiber gives Aeneas his first introduction to the Arcadians, whom Aeneas is to join to himself as “allies” (*socii*) in a “league” (*foedera*, 8.56), but of the people themselves he reveals only that they are “a race sprung from Pallas” (*genus a Pallante profectum*, 8.51) who as *comites* of Evander “followed his banner” (*qui signa secuti*, 52), and that “they wage war ceaselessly with the Latin race” (*hi bellum adsidue ducunt cum gente Latina*, 8.55), but the Arcadians will not come across as primarily warlike; contrast the military exercises of the Latin youth. In fact, they will be somewhat disappointing in battle.

Aeneas’ first glimpse of the Arcadians highlights their piety, but also characterizes them as though they were skittish forest animals who start at the sight of Aeneas’ ships:

una omnes iuvenum primi pauperque senatus

---

<sup>83</sup> See 10.895ff. (Subsection IV.B.3).

<sup>84</sup> Heinze connects the cruelty of Mezentius himself (8.483ff.) to stories of the cruelty of Etruscan pirates told by Aristotle and Cicero (Heinze, 168 and 222). Vergil’s Etruscans, even those fighting on Mezentius’ side, do not exhibit this trait.

tura dabant, tepidusque cruor fumabat ad aras.  
ut celsas videre rates atque inter opacum  
adlabi nemus et tacitos incumbere remis,  
terrentur visu subito cunctique relictis  
consurgunt mensis...(8.105-110)

...with him (Evander) all the foremost of his people and his humble senate were offering incense, and the warm blood smoked at the altars. When they saw the high ships, saw them gliding up between the shady woods and noiselessly plying their oars, they are alarmed by the sudden sight and rise up as one, quitting the feast.

Only Pallas prevents them from breaking off the rites entirely (110-111).<sup>85</sup> Once Aeneas has exchanged friendly words with the Arcadians, Evander offers his aid and invites the Trojans to “graciously solemnize” (*celebrate faventes*, 173) the festival with them, and to share in the feast (174), proof of the Arcadians’ inclusive nature. After the meal, Evander explains to Aeneas that the rites are no mere superstition. It is perhaps important that he clarifies this point up front; later, when he shows Aeneas the Capitol, he explains the sense of religious awe (*religio...dira*, 349-350) that had impressed the rustic people (*pavidos...agrestis*, 349), and the Arcadian belief that Jove himself had appeared there (*Arcades ipsum credunt se vidisse Iovem*, 353). Not that Evander is embarrassed by any of this, but it is as though he wants his guest to be certain that the Arcadians do not merely worship out of “idle superstition” (*vana superstitio*, 187), but because they believe that worship is due to the gods:

...periclis  
servati facimus meritosque novamus honores. (8.188-9)

...saved from cruel perils, we celebrate the rites, and repeat the worship due.

At the close of his account of the story of Heracles and Cacus, Evander begins to point more towards the present rites celebrated by his people and even to the Roman future:

ex illo celebratus honos laetique minores  
servavere diem...(8.268-9)

---

<sup>85</sup> Gransden notes the parallel between this episode and 10.362ff. when Pallas “chides the Arcadians for the fear” in battle (Gransden on 8.109-11).



From that time has this rite been solemnized and joyous posterity has kept the day.

He goes on to speak more specifically of the Potitii and Pinarii, the rites of Heracles and the Ara Maxima, and the Salii (269-305), but the reference to the *laeti minores* has already given a nod to the piety of the future Romans.<sup>86</sup> For the time being, though, the piety of the Arcadians helps to carry them into the war. When the Arcadians and Trojans set off together for Etruria, *Fama* makes an appearance, but the results are interesting:

Fama volat parvam subito vulgata per urbem  
ocius ire equites Tyrrheni ad limina regis.  
vota metu duplicant matres, propriusque periclo  
it timor et maior Martis iam apparet imago. (8.554-557)

Suddenly, spreading through the little town, flies a rumor that horsemen are speeding to the threshold of the Etruscan king. In alarm mothers redouble their vows; fear comes closer because of the danger, and the War God's image now looms larger.

The Arcadian mothers do not respond with the naked fear of the Latin mothers in Book 7, nor are their prayers vindictive, as in the case of the Latin mothers in Book 11.<sup>87</sup> Fear, quite naturally, is present, but it does not overwhelm the piety of the Arcadian women, who maintain a dignified silence even as they watch their men departing from Pallanteum.<sup>88</sup>

In battle the Arcadians are unimpressive. Pallas watches helplessly as his men (inexperienced in infantry charges) desert him after dismissing their horses. The worst of it is that Pallas is reduced to begging:

Arcadas insuetos acies inferre pedestris  
ut vidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci,  
aspera aquis natura loci dimittere quando  
suasit equos, unum quod rebus restat egenis,  
nunc prece, nunc dictis virtutem accendit amaris; (10.364-8)

...when Pallas saw his Arcadians, unused to charge on foot, turn to flight before pursuing Latium – for the nature of the ground, roughened by the waters, persuaded them for once to dismiss their horses – then, as the one hope in such straits, now with entreaties, now with bitter words, he fires their courage.

---

<sup>86</sup> See subsection I.C.

<sup>87</sup> See subsection V.E

<sup>88</sup> See also subsection IV.B.1.

Unfortunately, there is no indication that Pallas is successful, at least not immediately. All we are told is that after delivering a speech in which he reminds the Arcadians of the wars they had won (*devictaque bella*, 370) and of his own wish for glory to match his father's (*patriae...aemula laudi*, 371) – not exactly the most motivating of arguments for the average soldier – Pallas himself charges into the midst of the enemy (379). It is only after they have seen Pallas' glorious deeds of slaying several Rutulians rather impressively that the Arcadians are inspired to reenter the battle:

Arcadas accensos monitu et praeclara tuentis  
facta viri mixtus dolor et pudor armat in hostis. (10.397-8)

Fired by his chiding and beholding his glorious deeds, the Arcadians are armed by mingled wrath and shame to face the foe.

The Etruscans at 11.732ff. have no cause for shame when they follow Tarchon's lead.<sup>89</sup> In contrast, it is as though the poet has to show Pallas that his Arcadians have returned:

non aliter socium virtus coit omnis in unum  
teque iuvat, Palla. (10.410-411)

...just so all your comrades' virtue rallies to one point in aid of you, Pallas...

It is to little effect, though. A few of Pallas' men are cut down promptly by Halaesus, whom Pallas slays, bringing Pallas into conflict with Lausus and eventually with Turnus, who inspires the Arcadians with fear (*frigidus Arcadibus coit in praecordia sanguis*, 10.452). The Arcadians fade out of the picture as Turnus slays Pallas. They are left only with Turnus' harsh words for Evander, (*Arcades... qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto*, 491-2), and to grieve as they bear Pallas back to his father:

...at socii multo gemitu lacrimisque  
impositum scuto referunt Pallanta frequentes (10.505-506).

...But with many moans and tears his friends throng round Pallas and bear him back lying on his shield.

---

<sup>89</sup> See above subsection VI.B.d and subsection IV.B.

We will see more of the Arcadians in concert with the Trojans during the funeral itself, but at this point, the Arcadians are largely out of the picture as an independent political or military force.

## 2. Trojans

The Trojans in Italy display all of their previously demonstrated qualities, but with some important nuances. The Trojans for one (as will be explored in the following chapter) will begin to welcome alliances and join the Arcadians and Etruscans in various activities in the context of both war and peace. This goes beyond “inclusivity” in that the Trojans will begin to be subsumed into the other Italian peoples. The Trojans will have to contend with a prejudice (at least among the Rutulians) that they do not possess the same degree of *duritia* as do the Italian tribes.<sup>90</sup> More importantly, the Trojans will begin to navigate their new political position as the ruling tribe of Italy. They already know how to follow Aeneas as their destined leader, but they must also learn the far more difficult and necessary task of operating collectively as a political and military unit independent of Aeneas, and this is a test they face early in their Italian trials.<sup>91</sup>

**a. Trojan *Duritia*.** Aeneas and the Trojans have already been characterized by Iarbas – notably, an enemy in that he is Dido’s rejected suitor – as “that Paris with his eunuch train” (*ille Paris cum semiviro comitatu*, 4.215). To Iarbas, as to the other the tribes of North Africa, the

---

<sup>90</sup> On this basis, Newman and Newman (39) find it difficult “to trace a clear line between the *stirps* of the Trojans and the Romans of Vergil’s day” due to the “eastern decadence” with which the Trojans are associated in contrast with the “sturdy virtues of the Italian farmer” which are exalted in most Augustan literature (e.g. *Geo.* 11.136-76, Propertius 11.22, etc.). This conclusion neglects the actual behavior of the Trojans in the epic.

<sup>91</sup> Quinn finds that a function of Book 9 is to “make us feel how much the *Aeneadae* depend on Aeneas” (1968, 212). They may depend upon him for wise leadership, but their ability to carry out his orders and function in his absence is as much a compliment to them as to him.

Gaetulians, a “race invincible in war” (*genus insuperabile bello*, 4.40) and the “unbridled Numidians” (*Numidae infreni*, 41), the Trojans might seem weak, especially if they only know them as a vaguely “Eastern” race who had lost the war at Troy.

In Italy too, the rumor of weakness persists, and it is expressed in colorful terms by Numanus Remulus. To him the Trojans are the “twice captured Phrygians” (*bis capti Phryges*, 9.599) who should feel shame to cower behind their walls (598-99). Heinze claims that the insistence on the term “Phrygians” is reflective of how the Romans envisioned the Trojans,<sup>92</sup> but to what extent does the poet actually support this vision? After Numanus provides a description of the vigor and hardness of Italian life, he offers the following of the Trojans:

vobis picta croco et fulgenti murice vestis,  
desidiae cordi, iuvat indulgere choreis,  
et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitrae.  
o vere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta  
Dindyma, ubi adsuetis biformem dat tibia cantum.  
tympa vos buxusque vocat Berecynthia Matris  
Idaearum; sinite arma viris et cedite ferro. (9.614-620)

But you wear embroidered saffron and gleaming purple; sloth is your joy, your delight is to enjoy the dance; your tunics have sleeves and your turbans ribbons. Phrygian women, indeed! – for Phrygian men you are not – go over the heights of Dindymus, where to accustomed ears the pipe utters music from double mouths! The timbrels call you, and the Berecynthia boxwood of the mother of Ida: leave arms to men, and quit the sword.

Too many critics have become overly concerned that these words might have serious truth in them,<sup>93</sup> but three things must be taken into account. First is the source. Granted, Numanus Remulus is an enemy, but this is not enough in itself to discount his words; it is more revelatory that he is characterized as boastful and proud of his newly won royalty (9.596-7), an indication that he is speaking as a bully, and has exaggerated the truth about the Trojans. Second, the poet tells us that he utters things “meet and unmeet to utter” (*digna atque indigna relatu*, 9.595).

---

<sup>92</sup> Heinze, 222.

<sup>93</sup> Namely Thomas, for whom potential Trojan weakness poses serious questions in regard to Rome’s future (1982, 98-100).

Thus we might take his praise of the Italians (9.603-613) as *digna*, legitimate things to say in the context of battle, but the unfair characterization of the Trojans that follows as *indigna*.<sup>94</sup> The poet's treatment of the scene, as well as the Trojans' successes in battle as the story progresses,<sup>95</sup> thus exonerates the Trojans of weakness. His assessment of the scene should be given far more weight than the shadowy ethnographical tradition of Trojan weakness. Third, is the situation itself. The Trojans are within the walls because of Aeneas' commands. Numanus Remulus has either misconstrued the Trojan political virtue of obedience as simple cowardice, or he simply exploits their feelings of shame for strategic purposes: it is to the advantage of their enemies to "entice" the Trojans outside the walls.<sup>96</sup>

When Turnus calls the Trojans a "twice conquered people" (*gentis bis victae*, 11.402) and "cowardly" (*ignavi*) *Aeneadae* (12.12) – on neither occasion to the Trojans' faces! – it is because he, like Numanus, has misinterpreted something. In this case, it is the fact that the Trojans are working to promote a peace treaty. The Italians seem to have a consistent bias towards construing peace overtures as an indication of weakness;<sup>97</sup> Ilioneus must warn Latinus against underestimating the Trojans on this account:

multi nos populi, multae (ne temne, quod ultro  
praeferrimus manibus vittas ac verba precantia)  
et petiere sibi et voluere adiungere gentes; (7.236-8)

---

<sup>94</sup> Margaret Taylor, 271. Hardie (on 9.595) compares *Fama*'s activities in Book 4 and the "credulous Iarbas" (4.190).

<sup>95</sup> Horsfall 1990 "Numanus," 313. Horsfall admits that "In practice, the Trojans lack none of the Italians' virtues, but some trace of traditional Graeco-Roman contempt for the East seems uneradicable." See also Horsfall's comments (1995, 174-5) on the raid perpetrated by Nisus and Euryalus as an effective rebuttal of Numanus.

<sup>96</sup> For this suggestion, see Highet, 326.

<sup>97</sup> Anderson suggests that it is in the Trojans' best interests that their enemies underestimate them so frequently – it allows the "Italians at first to construct a false pattern of hopes based on the Trojan War" (Anderson 1990, 245).

...many are the peoples, many the nations – scorn us not, that of ourselves we proffer garlands with our hands and address to you words of supplication – who have sought us for themselves and craved our alliance...

It is a very clever means of presenting the Trojans – peaceful, yet not to be trifled with.<sup>98</sup> The subtext also implies that these other nations have sought to join the Trojans for a reason, that is, because they are strong allies. Weakness cannot be one of their attributes. Aeneas introduces the Trojans to Evander as having “hearts valiant in war, high souls, and manhood tried in action” (*sunt nobis fortia bello pectora, sunt animi et rebus spectata iuventus*, 8.150-1). Later, Diomedes will confirm the strength of the Trojans to the Latin council by musing that the Trojans would have taken Greece had the fates been reversed and there had been two others like Aeneas (11.285-7).<sup>99</sup> Diomedes’ understanding of Troy as “enduring” (*durae...Troiae*, 11.288)<sup>100</sup> points to an important aspect of Trojan strength. It is not merely a bare physical strength, but the strength of mind that is necessary for long endurance of physical trials. Latinus seems to understand this about the Trojans:

bellum importunum, cives, cum gente deorum  
invictisque viris gerimus, quos nulla fatigant  
proelia nec victi possunt absistere ferro. (11.305-7)

My countrymen, we are waging an ill-omened war with a race divine, with men unconquered; no battles weary them and even in defeat they cannot let go the sword.

---

<sup>98</sup> Horsfall on 7.236 lists various scornful reactions to what looks very close to a lie on the part of the Trojans, but approves Donatus’ concentration on the Trojans’ concern to appear impressive.

<sup>99</sup> From *Il.* 2.371ff. (Williams on 11.285).

<sup>100</sup> Horsfall remarks (on 11.288) that this is part of “a radical and systematic rehabilitation” of the Trojans. But see Kristol, 14 and subsection III.A.5; the Trojans have been identified consistently as enduring.

Though some have remarked that, strictly speaking, the Trojans are not “unconquered,” in another sense they are, because they do not give up – this is an idea borne out by many different sources.<sup>101</sup>

And yet it might be said that the Trojans have many reasons for wanting to give up, even once they have arrived in Italy. Father Tiber assures Aeneas (albeit in what may be a dubious line) that Aeneas will found the city of Lavinium: “Here shall be the city’s site, here a sure rest from your toils” (*hic locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum*, 8.46).<sup>102</sup> This may mean only a rest for Aeneas’ own labors, but by extension, it also refers to the Trojans who certainly do not find rest in the context of the poem itself. Venus even has cause to complain to Jupiter about the ongoing sufferings of the Trojans (10.55-62).

During the war the Trojans suffer primarily from fear and sorrow (natural emotions in wartime), but no longer from weariness, uncertainty, or demoralization as they did during their travels.<sup>103</sup> Fear, as was the case then, is expressed with reserve, and mostly in the context of the Trojans being left to guard the ramparts of their new city. First, Iris urges Turnus to take advantage of Aeneas’ absence and “seize the bewildered camp” (*turbata arripe castra*, 9.13). Turnus complies, and though the Trojans do experience some fear, it does not affect their preparations, e.g. “in anxious haste” (*nec non trepidi formidine*, 169) “they test the gates and build gangways...” (9.170). They do not express real fear until their safety is threatened more palpably when Turnus hurls a torch upon the walls:

*turbati trepidare intus frustra malorum*

---

<sup>101</sup> Williams remarks that “unconquered” is “paradoxically explained in 11.307 – they are unconquerable because when conquered they fight on.” Further, Servius quotes Ennius (*Ann.* 493) *qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur* on this line. Also, cf. *Ann.* 359, Horace, *Odes* 4.4.53-68 and Livy 27.14.1 (Hannibal’s comment on the Romans – *seu victus est, instraurat cum victoribus certamen*) (Williams on 11.305-6).

<sup>102</sup> Only to be found in R, om. MP.

<sup>103</sup> See subsection III.A.5.

velle fugam. dum se glomerant retroque residunt  
in partem quae peste caret, tum pondere turris  
procubuit subito et caelum tonat omne fragore. (9.538-541)

Within, troubled and terrified, men vainly seek escape from disaster. While they huddle close and retreat to the side free from ruin, under the sudden weight the tower fell, and all the sky thunders with the crash.

There is no faulting the Trojans here; their behavior is perfectly natural under the circumstances.<sup>104</sup> As the siege continues, Mars himself interferes to give strength to the Latins (as seen above) and “let slip Flight and dark Terror among the Teucrians” (*immisitque Fugam Teucris atrumque Timorem*, 9.719). The Trojans only show this fear (*turbati subito Aeneadae*, 735), though, when they “recognize” (*agnoscunt*, 734) Turnus inside their walls, and they scatter in fear after he slays Pandarus (*Diffugiunt versi trepida formidine Troes*, 756). The *legio Aeneadum* and a group of Trojan princes are described just before the arrival of Aeneas on the scene to save the day:

at legio Aeneadum vallis obsessa tenetur  
nec spes ulla fugae. miseri stant turribus altis  
nequiquam et rara muros cinxere corona  
Asius Imbrasides Hicetaoniusque Thymoetes... (10.120-123)

But the army of the Aeneadae is held pent up inside the palisades, and there is no hope of escape. Forlorn and helpless they stand on the high towers, and girdle the walls with scanty ring. Asius, son of Imbrasmus, and Thymoetes, son of Hicetaon...

This is the closest they come to despair, but it is not to last long.

The sorrow suffered by the Trojans during the course of the war manifests itself primarily over the tragedy of Nisus and Euryalus. The Dardanian chiefs shed tears for the bravery of the two (*percussa mente dedere Dardanidae lacrimas*, 9.292-3), but all of the Trojans collectively (the *Aenadae duri*, 9.468) grieve upon seeing the cruelty with which their corpses have been treated by the Rutulians:

---

<sup>104</sup> Saylor remarks here on the complexity of Vergil’s portrayal of group action (described by *globus* and *glomerare*): “It is done wisely and unwisely, by design and by instinct, and in fails as often as it succeeds” (92).



Aeneadae duri murorum in parte sinistra  
opposuere aciem (nam dextera cingula amni),  
ingentisque tenent fossas et turribus altis  
stant maesti; simul ora virum praefixa movebant  
nota nimis miseris atroque fluentia tabo, (9.468-472)

On the rampart's left side – for the right is girded by the river – the hardy sons of Aeneas have set their opposing line, hold the broad trenches, and on the high towers stand sorrowing, moved by those uplifted heads that they know too well, now dripping with dark gore.

The scene is horrific, yet touching. The Trojans do not desert their posts despite their grief, although this danger is present. Once Euryalus' mother has delivered her lament, they lose heart.<sup>105</sup>

hoc fletu concussi animi, maestusque per omnis  
it gemitus, torpent infractae ad proelia vires. (9.498-9)

At that wailing their spirits were shaken, and a groan of sorrow passed through all; their strength for battle is numbed and crushed.

Ilioneus and Iulus act quickly in ordering her to be taken indoors before she can damage morale any further. The Trojans are holding up well under the psychological warfare that the Rutulians are inflicting upon them. The reason for this may be in part their *duritia*, but also their distinct political virtue and capacity for collective action even when under duress, especially now that they are assured of their destined homecoming.

**b. Political Virtue and Collectivity.** The Trojans demonstrate their ability to work together as a collective early in their experiences in Italy. When the Tiber stops the current so that the Trojans may sail upriver to Pallanteum, they react with joy to events finally going their way: “with cheering cries they speed the voyage they have begun” (*iter inceptum celerant rumore secundo*, 8.90). So great is their zeal that they row all day and night without ceasing (*olli remigio noctemque diemque fatigant*, 8.94). Upon sighting the town, they hurry to land (*ocius*

---

<sup>105</sup> Nugent views her presence “like the women’s burning the ships,” as “an effective catalyst for the reassertion and reaffirmation of authoritative power,” until she, like the women who burn the ships, “is physically removed from the epic stage” (Nugent, 273).

*advertunt proras urbiue propinquant*, 8.101). No command needs to be given; the Trojans seem to understand exactly what must be done.

The siege of the Trojans' ramparts provides some of the best evidence of this, in spite of their aforementioned fear and sorrow. It is crucial to note that the Trojans want to fight but hold back due to their obedience to Aeneas' commands and those of the chieftain Caicus, who addresses them as *cives* (9.36) as he orders them to man the walls, an "appeal to communal solidarity."<sup>106</sup> The poet gives much insight into the Trojans' psychology:

...ingenti clamore per omnis  
condunt se Teucris portas et moenia complent.  
namque ita discedens praeceperat optimus armis  
Aeneas: si qua interea fortuna fuisset,  
neu struere auderent aciem neu credere campo;  
castra modo et tutos servarent aggere muros.  
ergo etsi conferre manum pudor iraque monstrat,  
obiciunt portas tamen et praecepta facessunt,  
armatique cavis exspectant turribus hostem. (9.38-46)<sup>107</sup>

With mighty clamor the Teucrians seek shelter through all the gates and man the ramparts. For so at his departure Aeneas, best of warriors, had charged: were anything to happen meanwhile, they should not dare to form their line or entrust themselves to the field; let them only guard camp and walls, secure behind their mound. Therefore, though shame and wrath prompt them to conflict, yet they bar the gates and do his bidding, awaiting the foe under arms and inside the hollow towers.

This obedience is not necessarily easy for the Trojans to maintain, as is evidenced by the anger and shame they experience.<sup>108</sup> These same emotions will be the death of the son of the consul Titus Manlius Torquatus in 340 BC during the Latin War, when the young man defies his

---

<sup>106</sup> Hardie on 9.36.

<sup>107</sup> Hardie on 9.45: "The choice of verbs in this line indicates the whole-heartedness with which the Trojans initially throw themselves into Aeneas' defense strategy."

<sup>108</sup> Hardie acknowledges that it is "particularly difficult when unity demands abstention from action rather than counter-attack" because "the temptation to division, either through panic or through misguided attempts to save the situation single-handedly, is ever present" (Hardie on 9.12). Otis points to the actual strategic wisdom of the Trojans' obeying Aeneas: their disregard of his orders, "would, in fact, have been quite disastrous if Latin folly had not come to their aid" (Otis, 351).

father's orders on account of *ira* and *pudor* (Livy 8.7.8).<sup>109</sup> The Trojan behavior here, then affirms the sentiments of Manlius that military discipline is the basis for Rome's future, but also acknowledges that it often goes against what seems natural in any given circumstance.

During the siege on the ramparts the Trojans are able to function politically in the absence of the leader, though they may not enjoy the experience. They are watchful, and sight the approach of the Rutulian forces, which is compared to the Ganges or the Nile (*prospiciunt Teucris*, 9.34).<sup>110</sup> It is clear that they are well organized and that their leaders are well chosen; thus they work with alacrity (in contrast to the lazy, drunk Rutulians 164-167) in spite of their fear:

Haec super e vallo prospectant Troes et armis  
alta tenent, nec non trepidi formidine portas  
explorant pontisque et propugnacula iungent,  
tela gerunt. instat Mnestheus acerque Serestus,  
quos pater Aeneas, si quando adversa vocarent,  
rectores iuvenum et rerum dedit esse magistros.  
omnis per muros legio sortita periculum  
excubat exercetque vices, quod cuique tuendum est. (9.168-175)

On this scene the Trojans look forth from the rampart above, as in arms they hold the summit; in anxious haste they test the gates and build joining gangways and bastions, bring up weapons. Mnestheus and valiant Serestus urge on the work, whom father Aeneas, should adversity ever require, appointed as leaders of the warriors and rulers of the state. Along the walls the whole host, sharing the peril, keeps watch, and serves in turns, each man at his allotted task.

The passage reveals the extent of Trojan organization, especially the last two lines which give the impression of a Roman army (especially with the use of *legio*) on watch. And yet the Trojans are not only passively following orders. When Nisus and Euryalus come up with their plan, Nisus reveals an important rationale for their deed:

Aenean acciri omnes, populusque patresque

---

<sup>109</sup> The father orders his own son to be put to death on account of his disobedience and disregard for military discipline, in spite of the son's proven *virtus* in battle (8.7.15-22).

<sup>110</sup> Cf. *Il.* 3.8 and 4.431 where the Achaeans also advance in silence, but "it is striking to find an Italian army compared to Oriental rivers" a possible echo of Antony's troops at Actium (Hardie on 9.30-2).

exposcunt, mittique viros qui certa reportent. (9.192-3)<sup>111</sup>

People and senate – all demand that Aeneas be summoned, and men be sent to bring him sure tidings.

They decide to act, then, because of popular determination, not just hope of heroism. That they first bring their plan to the council of Trojan chiefs, a “council on the highest matters of the kingdom” (*consilium summis regni de rebus*, 227) is a sign of the Trojans’ high level of organization and sophistication.

The leaders of the Trojans prove to be a strong factor in their success in warding off the Rutulians.<sup>112</sup> They obey Apollo in keeping Ascanius from battle (an intelligent decision in any case in order to preserve his leadership for the future) and then fight bravely themselves, providing an example for the rest of the Trojans:

ergo avidum pugnae dictis ac numine Phoebi  
Ascanium prohibent, ipsi in certamina rursus  
succedunt animasque in aperta pericula mittunt.  
it clamor totis per propugnacula muris,  
intendunt acris arcus amentaque torquent. (9.661-665)

Therefore, at the behest and will of Phoebus, they check Ascanius, eager though he is for the fray, they themselves go back into the fight and fling their lives into upon dangers. The shout runs from tower to tower, all along the walls; they bend their eager bows and whirl their thongs.

Trojan obedience fails on only one occasion during the siege. After Pandarus and Bitias open the gates, they “rally and swarm to the spot” (*collecti...glomerantur eodem*, 9.689),<sup>113</sup> but then, under the influence of wrath (*irae*) increasing in their already “discordant souls” (*animis discordibus*, 9.688),<sup>114</sup> make the mistake of heading outside the walls: they “venture to close hand to hand and to sally further out” (*conferre manum et procurrere longius audent*, 9.690),

---

<sup>111</sup> “Irresistibly suggests the Roman ‘senate and people’” (Hardie on 9.192).

<sup>112</sup> They have been effective “surrogates for Aeneas as leader” (Saylor, 93).

<sup>113</sup> Saylor comments that this proves to be a “bad strategy” (93, also above n.104) but the failure does not occur until the Trojans actually leave the safety of the walls.

<sup>114</sup> This discord should be read as an internal one between the Trojans’ natural fighting spirit and Aeneas’ orders.

thus disobeying Aeneas' orders.<sup>115</sup> This causes a reverse for the Trojans – Turnus kills Pandarus, and “the Trojans turn and scatter in hasty terror” (*Diffugiunt versi trepida formidine Troes*, 9.756).<sup>116</sup> Mnestheus and Serestus soon restore order, calling the Trojans cowards (*segnes*, 9.787) and reminding them of their sense of shame and pity for the gods, their country, and Aeneas (9.786-7). The speech takes immediate effect:<sup>117</sup>

talibus accensi firmantur et agmine denso  
 consistunt...(9.788-789)  
 ...  
 acrius hoc Teucrici clamore incumbere magno  
 et glomerare manum, ceu saevum turba leonem  
 cum telis premit infensis...(9.791-793)

Kindled by such words, they take heart and halt in dense array...All the more fearlessly the Teucrians press on him (Turnus) with loud shouts and mass their ranks – as when a crowd with leveled spears beset a savage lion...

Though Turnus manages to drive the Trojan force back twice (9.799-800), they manage to reorganize, “the whole host hastily gathers into a body from the camp” (*sed manus e castris propere coit omnis in unum*, 9.801) and drive Turnus to make his escape into the river. As Saylor comments, the Trojans have in this episode proven that “the group is now the model for the whole Trojan community acting together against danger.”<sup>118</sup> After Aeneas arrives to put an end to the siege, there is little more to be said of the Trojans until Book 12.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> See, e.g. Hardie's comments (on 9.13) for more on the private/public implications of the Nisus and Euryalus and Pandarus and Bitias episodes.

<sup>116</sup> As to the matter of Pandarus and Bitias, their story seems to present a cautionary tale in itself of leaving too much responsibility in the hands of too few people. After Pandarus and Bitias open the gate to the Rutulians (9.672-6), Pandarus loses nerve and leaves some of the Trojans outside the walls (9.725-6).

<sup>117</sup> Hardie remarks (on 9.788-9) that “mental firmness leads to closed ranks.”

<sup>118</sup> Saylor, 93. He also observes the important contrast drawn in the poem as a whole” between group and individual action” (94).

<sup>119</sup> When Mezentius attacks the victorious Trojans (*Teucrosque...ovantis*, 10.690), it is the Etruscans who actually coordinate the attack against him (10.691-2), and after the death of Pallas, Aeneas goes to their aid when he gets word that Trojans are “are but a hair's breadth removed from death” (*tenui discrimine leti esse suos*, 10.511-12).

The Trojans do, however, take on a great significance both as a military and political force near the end of the poem.<sup>120</sup> Aeneas, with a “vision of greater battle” (*pugnae...maioris imago*, 12.560), has called together the chiefs, but the rest of the army comes to hear him unbidden:

...tumulumque capit quo cetera Teucrum  
concurrit legio, nec scuta aut spicula densi  
deponunt...(12.562-4)

(Aeneas) plants himself on a mound, where the rest of the Teucrian host throng thickly around without laying down shield or spear.

The fact that they are again called a *legio*, and that they do not put down their weapons, suggests a still active, militarily powerful force. They will set them aside for the battle between Aeneas and Turnus, but that moment has not yet come. Trojan collective action is still necessary to bring the war to its conclusion. Addressing the Trojans as *cives* (572), Aeneas reminds them of the broken treaty, and orders them to bring brands and reclaim it with fire (12.565-573). The overall effect seems almost brutal. The men respond eagerly:

dixerat, atque animis pariter certantibus omnes  
dant cuneum densaque ad muros mole feruntur;  
scalae improvise subitusque apparuit ignis.  
discurrunt alii ad portas primosque trucidant,  
ferrum alii torquent et obumbrant aethera telis. (12.574-578)

He ceased, and with hearts equally emulous all form a wedge and advance in serried mass to the walls. In a moment ladders and sudden flames are seen. Some rush to the several gates and cut down the foremost guards; others hurl their steel and darken the sky with javelins.

This attack on the part of the Trojans – a coordinated, single-minded assault upon the city in which Trojan morale and competitiveness is at its height – sets in motion the final fall of the Latin state (12.583, *exoritur trepidos inter discordia civis*) discussed in CHAPTER V. The order

---

<sup>120</sup> See subsection IV.B.4 for their actions during the duel between Aeneas and Turnus.

and discipline of the Trojans is set in direct juxtaposition to Latin sedition and disorder.<sup>121</sup> It is through this disorder, however, that the ultimate unity between the Trojan and Italian crowds will take place.

---

<sup>121</sup> Pöschl, 124.

## VII. THE ROMAN CROWD EMERGES

As the end of the poem approaches, it is increasingly clear that the Trojans and the various Italian groups cannot be treated in total isolation from one another. The entire *maius opus* can be read as a series of “opening ceremonies” for the coming Trojan and Italian unity.<sup>1</sup> Prophecies and forebodings have already made it eminently clear to the reader that Trojans are destined to clash with “proud peoples” in Italy (e.g. 1.263). This is an incontrovertible fact that should serve to exempt both Trojans and Italians (collectively if not individually) from blame for their participation in the war. Venus brings up a valid point to Jupiter in Book 10:

si sine pace tua atque invito numine Troes  
Italiam petiere, luant peccata neque illos  
iuveris auxilio; sin tot responsa secuti  
quae superi manesque dabant, cur nunc tua quisquam  
vertere iussa potest aut cur nova condere fata? (10.31-35)

If without your leave and despite your deity the Trojans have sought Italy, let them expiate their sin, and do not aid them with succor. But if they have followed all the oracles given by the gods above and gods below, why is anyone now able to overthrow your bidding or build the fates anew?

The Trojans have been following the oracles of the gods,<sup>2</sup> but the additional incontrovertible fact of divine *Discordia* (10.106) – evident even through the end of the poem – should make it clear

---

<sup>1</sup> See the poet’s own remark: “the prelude of the opening strife will I recall” (*primae revocabo exordia pugnae*, 7.40).

<sup>2</sup> Venus’ statement at 1.229-253, reminding Jupiter of his own promise, defends the Trojans against Juno’s attempts to discredit the oracles (10.65-8) (Heinze, 75). Otis points out that the Trojans’ (and the Romans’) piety ensures that Fate is on their side (Otis, 230).



that while *Concordia* (in its most general sense of complete civil harmony)<sup>3</sup> is not the norm for the Trojans, Romans, or any people, but rather a happy exception, it should nevertheless serve as their end goal. Juno may complain that the Trojans proffer peace but prepare for war (10.79-80), but they only do so because of their divine instructions. More importantly, war, both at this stage and later in Roman history, will not ultimately serve as a divisive factor for Rome and her peoples, but as the necessary catalyst for their union. As Otis remarks, the notion of war as “only permissible as an instrument of pacification, of universal good government” is a Roman concept, “thoroughly un-Homeric.”<sup>4</sup>

The prophecies of war discussed in the previous chapter were concerned primarily with war. Only the prophecy of Anchises near the end of Book 3 in interpretation of the omen of the horses, provides a guide for interpreting these wars as leading eventually to peace:

...bellum, o terra hospita, portas:  
 bello armantur equi, bellum haec armenta minantur.  
 sed tamen idem olim curru succedere sueti  
 quadripedes et frena iugo concordia ferre:  
 spes et pacis... (3.539-543)

Tis war you bring, land of our reception; for war are the horses armed, war these herds portend. But yet, those same steeds at times are wont to come under the chariot and beneath the yoke to bear the bit concord; there is hope also of peace!

The grim fighting, the communal mourning in the funerals that the war brings about, and the treaties (*foedera*) that gradually unite the various peoples all have roles to play in the unification of the Trojans and Italians. This unity, finally, will consist primarily in the commission of Aeneas (and to the historical Romans who came after him) by the gods to bring *leges* (4.231) and *mores* (1.264, 6.852) to Italians and Trojans alike.

---

<sup>3</sup> Gottlieb remarks that *consensus* (*omnium ordinum* and *populi Romani*) both “among all people under the Roman rule” and “within a nation or society and among the leading persons (cf. *concordia ordinum*) is a precondition for rise and success” in society, and an important aspect of the reign of Augustus (Gottlieb, 23).

<sup>4</sup> Otis, 314.

## A. UNITY IN WAR

The very idea of unity through war seems entirely counterintuitive; the poet interjects during some of the poem's fiercest fighting:

...tanton placuit concurrere motu,  
Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras? (12.503-4)

Was it your will, Jupiter, that in so vast a shock nations should clash that thereafter would dwell in everlasting peace?

The answer is complicated. Although Jupiter had ostensibly forbidden war between the Italians and Trojans (*abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teucris*, 10.8), and tries in vain to encourage Juno and Venus to put aside their differences, “now let be and cheerfully assent to the covenant I ordain” (*nunc sinite et placitum laeti componite foedus*, 10.15), conflict had broken out, as seen in CHAPTER V, because of Juno's ability to prey upon the latent disunity of the Italian peoples. Indeed, from Juno's perspective, the maintenance of equipoise in the fighting is almost a more important point of contention than the fact of the Trojans' (inevitable) eventual settling in Italy; her complaint during the Book 10 divine council is that if the Trojans have a right to plunder the Latins' territory and found their city, the Italians have a right to fight back (10.74-80). It is too easy to dismiss Juno's interference prior to this and afterwards as a malevolent game of power politics with her husband, but whatever her motives, she brings up legitimate points about the rights of the Italians.

After Venus' and Juno's complaints at the council of the gods, Jupiter makes a cryptic remark stating his supposed impartiality – and it hinges upon divine *Discordia*:

quandoquidem Ausonios coniungi foedere Teucris  
haud licitum, nec vestra capit discordia finem,  
quae cuique est fortuna hodie, quam quisque secat spem,  
Tros Rutulusne fuat, nullo discrimine habebo,  
seu fatis Italum castra obsidione tenentur  
sive errore malo Troiae monitisque sinistris.

nec Rutulos solve. sua cuique exorsa laborem  
fortunamque ferent. rex Iuppiter omnibus idem.  
fata viam invenient...(10.105-113)

Since it may not be that Ausonians and Teucrians join alliance, and your disunion admits no end, whatever the fortune of each today, whatever the hope each pursues, be he Trojan or be he Rutulian, no distinction shall I make, whether it be Italy's fortune that holds the camp in siege, or Troy's baneful error and misleading prophecies. Nor do I exempt the Rutulians. Each one's own course shall bring him his suffering or success. Jupiter is king over all alike; the fates shall find their way.

Williams remarks here that "Jupiter is not prepared to reveal whether the Italian success is due to fate temporarily supporting them, or the human folly of the Trojans,"<sup>5</sup> but he also suggests that the ultimate Trojan destiny is not only contingent upon the fates; Aeneas and the Trojans "must themselves achieve their destiny."<sup>6</sup> They can do so only by waging an inevitable war<sup>7</sup> under circumstances in which the gods presumably make no distinction (*nullo discrimine*) between themselves and their enemies. For both sides, these are not easy prospects.

## 1. Fighting

A physical unification of the Trojans and Italians takes place largely in military contexts, some of which, as has been seen, allow the participants a brief pause during battle in order to watch an important duel, much like the spectators at a gladiatorial combat.<sup>8</sup> More important are scenes in which the Trojans and Latins themselves act in a collective sense as the "gladiators." Vergil's battle scenes are often dismissed as less than orderly or even impossibly confusing,<sup>9</sup> but there are numerous occasions in which battle is equally matched or the fighters are mingled. These scenes

---

<sup>5</sup> Williams on 10.109-10.

<sup>6</sup> The scene is based on *Il.* 8.10ff., but there is a "more positive part played by Jupiter in the destiny of man" (Williams on 10.111-113).

<sup>7</sup> Nisbet cites Aristotle (N.E. 1177b) in his assertion that "unlike modern ideologists, the more rational ancient imperialists know that the aim of war was peace...that is to say, an advantageous political settlement" (Nisbet, 388).

<sup>8</sup> The spectator scenes (discussed in subsection IV.B) that punctuate the battles are relatively few in number.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Willcock, 97.

do not only serve a dramatic function; they provide proof that the Trojans and Italians are destined to become one.<sup>10</sup>

In the fight that takes place before the Trojan camp upon the return of Aeneas, the battle comes to a standstill because the Trojans and Latins are matched so equally:

...expellere tendunt  
nunc hi, nunc illi: certatur limine in ipso  
Ausoniae. magno discordes aethere venti  
proelia ceu tollunt animis et viribus aequis;  
non ipsi inter se, non nubila, non mare cedit;  
anceps pugna diu, stant obnixa omnia contra:  
haud aliter Troianae acies aciesque Latinae  
concurrunt, haeret pede pes densusque viro vir. (10.354-61)

Now these, now those, strain to thrust back the foe; on Ausonia's very threshold is the struggle. As in wide heaven warring winds rise to battle, matched in spirit and strength; they yield not to one another – not winds, not clouds, not sea; long is the battle doubtful; all things stand locked in struggle; just so clash the ranks of Troy and the ranks of Latium, foot against foot, and man pressed close against man.

First, the use of the impersonal passive (*certatur*, 355) removes the distinction between the two sides, as well as drawing attention to the competitive striving involved.<sup>11</sup> Harrison points out that the common usage of similes of warring winds in epic usually evokes confusion; instead, Vergil's simile here shows the "equipoise between opposing forces."<sup>12</sup> Even at a verbal level, they are matched.<sup>13</sup> This is stressed again in the battle: "The armies close, matched in captains as in might" (*agmina concurrunt ducibusque et viribus aequis*, 10.431).

---

<sup>10</sup> Willcock suggests as much, though apparently out of frustration that Vergil's battle scenes demand "painstaking research" to learn "the particular affiliations of victors and victims" (97).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the striving (*certamina/certatur*) and mingled nature (*inter sese/inter se*) of the fighting also evident the night before: *Illi inter sese duri certamina belli contulerant* (10.146-7).

<sup>12</sup> Harrison on 10.356-61: *Il.* 9.4ff., 16.756ff., *Enn. Ann.* 432-4 Skutsch. Also 2.416-19 of the "confused fighting in Troy."

<sup>13</sup> The chiasmic-word order, *Troianae acies aciesque Latinae*, as well as the double polyptoton describing a "military close encounter" contribute to this sense; the latter is a common trope: *Il.* 13.131, Tyrtaeus 11.31-3, *Enn. Ann.* 585, Furius Bibaculus, *Poet.* 10 (Harrison on 10.360). See also Harrison's detailed appendix (1991, 288-290) for the use of verbal juxtapositions expressing opposition, e.g. 10.360-1.

After a somewhat uncharacteristic complete rout of the Latin forces,<sup>14</sup> the Rutulians and Etruscans seem to be perfectly matched, until the encounter degenerates into mingled slaughter:

bis Tusci Rutulos egere ad moenia versos,  
bis reiecti armis respectant terga tegentes  
tertia sed postquam congressi in proelia totas  
implicuere inter se acies legitque virum vir,  
tum vero et gemitus morientum et sanguine in alto  
armaque corporaque et permixti caede virorum  
semianimes volvuntur equi, pugna aspera surgit. (11.629-635)<sup>15</sup>

Twice the Etruscans drove the routed Rutulians to the city; twice, repulsed, they (the Etruscans) glance backwards as they sling behind them their protecting shields. But when, clashing in the third encounter, the lines stood interlocked along their whole length, and man marked man, then in truth there were groans of the dying, and arms and bodies and horses, dying and mingled with slaughtered riders, all weltering deep in blood: the fight swells fiercely.

During the battle before the walls the Rutulians are initially repulsed twice by the Etruscans (11.629-30), but the battle eventually becomes mingled after the third clash. Here it is not only the Etruscans and Rutulians or the Trojans and Latins who are mingled, but also the living and the dead. Later, Venus hears the sound of indiscriminate slaughter, the clamor “of men that fight and men that fall beneath the stern War God’s hand” (*bellantum iuvenum et duro sub Marte cadentum*, 12.410) after Aeneas is wounded and removed from the fray. Before the final assault on Latinus’ city, the sense of universal fighting increases with the ferocity with which all the fighters without distinction devote themselves to battle:

totae adeo conversae acies omnesque Latini,  
omnes Dardanidae, Mnestheus acerque Serestus  
et Messapus equum domitor et fortis Asilas  
Tuscorumque phalanx Evandrique Arcades alae,  
pro se quisque viri summa nituntur opum vi;  
nec mora nec requies, vasto certamine tendunt. (12.548-553)

The whole lines turned to the fray – all the Latins and all the Trojans: Mnestheus and valiant Serestus; Messapus, tamer of horses, and brave Asilas; the Tuscan battalion and Evander’s Arcadian squadrons –

---

<sup>14</sup> See the discussion of the beginning of this encounter (a rout of the Latins) at 11.618-23 in subsection VI.B.1.a.

<sup>15</sup> Gransden remarks (on 11.632) that “Vergil was perhaps thinking here of *Il.* 15.328: ἔνθα δ’ ἀνὴρ ἔλεν ἄνδρα, “there man killed man.”

each doing his all, the men strain with utmost force of strength; there is no rest nor respite as they struggle in measureless conflict.

The poet has been careful to take note of the leaders as well as the groups themselves: Mnestheus and Serestus for the Trojans, Messapus for the Latins, and Asilas for the Etruscans; the groups involved in the fighting are here all showing a degree of organized collectivity that they have not all shown consistently throughout the war. More important is the overall structure of the passage. It starts out with references only to Latins (*omnesque Latini*) and Trojans (*omnes Dardanidae, Mnestheus, Serestus*), moves on to mention of all the main groups who are involved in the fighting (*Messapus, Asilas, Tuscorum phalanx, Arcades*), and ends with both sides showing endurance and efficiency as well as a highly competitive nature (*certamine*)<sup>16</sup> in a conflict in which they are so often evenly matched.

Even the gods (or at least the uninvolved gods) grieve for the toils of both sides – again, matched in strength – and in accord with Jupiter’s earlier statement, no distinction is made between the sufferings of either side:

Iam gravis aequabat luctus et mutua Mavors  
funera; caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant  
victores victique, neque his fuga nota neque illis.  
di Iovis in tectis iram miserantur inanem  
amborum et tantos mortalibus esse labores;  
hinc Venus, hinc contra spectat Saturnia Iuno.  
Pallida Tisiphone media inter milia saevit. (10.755-761)<sup>17</sup>

Now the heavy hand of Mars was dealing out equal woe and mutual death. Alike they slew and alike they fell – victors and vanquished, and neither these nor those knew flight. The gods in Jove’s halls pity the useless rage of both armies, and grieve that mortals should endure such toils. Here Venus looks on, there, facing her, Saturnian Juno; pale Tisiphone rages among the thousands of men.

Turnus himself during the council of the Latins refers to the cause of the Trojan casualties as the

---

<sup>16</sup> See above n. 11.

<sup>17</sup> The precedent for these lines is *Il.* 11.756-83 (Harrison on 10.756-7).

“storm” that “swept over all alike” (*parque per omnis tempestas*, 11.422-3). In the exertions of war, the Trojans and Italians are becoming less distinct. The same will be true of how both sides cope with the casualties they have incurred.

## 2. Funerals

Mourning can serve to cement the internal bonds within a crowd, and even unite opposing parties in a common grief. It has also been observed earlier that when it gets out of hand, mourning can precede states of civil discord as well as outright sedition.<sup>18</sup> On a practical level, the formal funerals in Book 11 (after Turnus has slain Pallas and Aeneas has slain Lausus and Mezentius) provide a lull in the fighting, but they also allow the reader an opportunity to observe some important differences between the sides. The Trojan and Latin funerals are demonstrative of the two very different ways in which death can impact crowds, but they also have the important function of drawing the two opposing sides together. The Trojan funerals are remarkably more orderly and restrained, albeit confident in their coming victory, than those of the Latins. By the fact of their inclusion of the Arcadian and Etruscan allies, the Trojan funerals also move towards a greater unity between the peoples of Italy. The Latin funerals, conversely, are discordant in tone, and so they not surprisingly lead the Latins further down the road to sedition. Both funerals bring a brief sense of closure for both sides by providing a break in the fighting. The poet expresses his sense of grief for both sides in referring to them as “pitiful mortals” (*miseris mortalibus*, 11.182).<sup>19</sup> There is thus a promise of the coming peace between the two sides in their literary unification, which becomes at one point in the ceremonies also a literal unification.

---

<sup>18</sup> See subsections V.B for the Trojan women, II.C.2 for the Latin assembly, and V.F.4 for the disorder following the deaths of Amata and Dido.

<sup>19</sup> The line borrows Homer’s *δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι* (e.g. *Il.* 22.31) (Horsfall on 11.182).

The address of Aeneas to his men at the opening of Book 11 certainly contains a great deal of complex, yet suppressed emotion on the part both of Aeneas and his men. The occasion is joyful in that Aeneas is dedicating a *tropaeum* in honor of his victory over Mezentius, but there is also great sorrow due to the deaths occasioned by the war. It seems evident that Aeneas feels the brunt of this sorrow, especially, we presume, for Pallas, though he assumes that his men are equally sorrowful, “his sorrows urge him to give time to his comrades’ burial” (*sociis dare tempus humandis praecipitant curae*, 11.2-3).<sup>20</sup> His impulse to allow his comrades to bury the dead first, although the vows for victory take priority, reflects the difficult rift between Trojan/Roman duty and the “natural” human impulse – it is the same kind of situation his men had faced on the ramparts. The description of the *socii* gathering to hear him speak is revelatory:

tum socios (namque omnis eum stipata tegabat  
turba ducum) sic incipiens hortatur ovantis: (11.12-13)

Then his triumphant comrades – for the whole band of chieftains thronged close about him – he thus begins to exhort.

This is not, to be clear, all of the Trojans, but only the chiefs. Even they, we presume, do not feel the same responsibility as Aeneas does for the death of Pallas. Fratantuono suggests here that they might be “less than confident in the wake of Pallas’ death,” hence Aeneas’ admonition of “away with all fear” (*timor omnis abesto*, 11.14). It is more likely, however, that Aeneas himself “does not share in the celebratory mood of his men – *ovantis*, after all, has “echoes of Roman triumphal processions.”<sup>21</sup> The manner in which the men have gathered, too (*stipata*) is

---

<sup>20</sup> This is borne out by the concern Aeneas expresses in his speech that “no delay (*segnisve*) may impede us, or faltering purpose retard us through fear” (11.21-2).

<sup>21</sup> Fratantuono on 11.12.



noteworthy. Fratantuono finds anxiety in it, which is a possibility, especially considering that several other occurrences of the word occur in crowd contexts of heightened emotion.<sup>22</sup>

The actual commencement of mourning proper begins with the Trojan women,<sup>23</sup> and the Trojan crowd in general:

circum omnis famulumque manus Troianaque turba  
et maestum Iliades crinem de more solutae. (11.34-5)

Around stood all the attendant train and the Trojan throng, with the Ilian women, their hair unbound for mourning according to custom.

They appear to be mostly silent, until Aeneas comes on the scene, at which point, they send up a wail:

ingentem gemitum tunsis ad sidera tollunt  
pectoribus, maestoque immugit regia luctu. (11.37-8)<sup>24</sup>

They smote their breasts and raised a mighty wail to the stars, and the royal dwelling rang with their sorrowful lamentation.

Aeneas delivers his eulogy, but the task remains of taking Pallas back to his father in Pallanteum.

This is done with great honor, and Aeneas' men are well organized in spite of the emotionally charged nature of their task.<sup>25</sup>

...et toto lectos ex agmine mittit  
mille viros qui supremum comitentur honorem  
intersintque patris lacrimis...(11.60-2)

---

<sup>22</sup> E.g. The followers of Laocoön (1.497), Dido (4.136, 4.544), and the brothers of Clytius (10.328). At the very least, the men are “curious as to what will be done next and how Pallas’ death has impacted their leader” (Fratantuono on 11.12).

<sup>23</sup> Zarker (19-20) detects unification “in their function of lamentation” in the various *matres* of Italy, but the mourning of the Trojans, Arcadians, et al. is very different from that of the Latins in its immediate outcome in spite of the temporary state of unity it brings about.

<sup>24</sup> Gransden on 11.38 notes that *immugit* is not found before Vergil, who uses it only here and at 3.674 (of Mt. Etna).

<sup>25</sup> M has “*ex agmine*,” but PR read “*ex ordine*.” “A very difficult choice between equally plausible options; *ex agmine* however conveys nicely the alert state of Aeneas’ forces...” *mille* is likely “poetic license for a large group of people.” Virgil is notably silent on the number of people who set out from Troy in the first place and how many are still around at this point (Fratantuono on 11.60 and 11.61). Horsfall remarks here (on 11.61) that the subjunctive *comitentur* “reflects Aeneas’ thoughts and intentions” in echoing 11.52: *comitamur*.

...(Aeneas) sends a thousand men chosen from his whole army to attend the last rite and share the father's tears...

While, presumably, this group prepares to ride to Evander, "others" (*alii*) "in haste" (*haud segnes*, 11.64) prepare a bier and lay Pallas on it. The recurrence of *segnes* echoes Aeneas' speech (11.21), where his use of the word reflects his concern for efficiency and courage in his men during the ceremonies to come; they have responded here to that concern.

The procession is prepared with great care, complete with spoils and prisoners designated for sacrifice, more in the manner of a triumph than a funeral (11.80-84).<sup>26</sup> The poet takes care to mention the various peoples who are included in the procession:

...tum maesta phalanx Teucrique sequuntur  
Tyrrhenique omnes et versis Arcades armis. (11.92-3)

...then follows a mournful host – the Teucrians, and all the Etruscans and the Arcadians with arms reversed.

The allies – previously united by treaties – are now united in their common sorrow. Pallas, after all, with his Arcadian father and Sabine mother (8.510), "represents the fusion of Greek and Italian stock."<sup>27</sup>

The arrival of the funeral procession in Pallanteum marks the next stage in the funeral. Some of the Arcadians had been with Aeneas, and now accompany Pallas back to the city. This is the group – as will be discussed below– who had set out with Pallas so hopefully in Book 8. *Fama* (139) has reached the city first with the news, but unlike in most other scenarios, she does

---

<sup>26</sup> Gransden detects here (11.81-4) a "covert reference" to the "human sacrifice reported to having been undertaken by Octavian in honor of Julius Caesar" (Suetonius, *Aug.* 15). Additionally though, reversed arms were featured in Roman military funerals (Gransden on 11.93).

<sup>27</sup> Heinze, 146.

not here cause total civil breakdown.<sup>28</sup> The Arcadians respond to the arrival of the procession by immediately taking thought of their funeral customs and forming a line of torches:

Arcades ad portas ruere et de more vetusto  
funereas rapuere faces; lucet via longo  
ordine flammaram et late discriminat agros.  
contra turba Phrygum veniens plangentia iungit  
agmina. quae postquam matres succedere tectis  
viderunt, maestam incendunt clamoribus urbem. (11.142-7)

The Arcadians hurry to the gates, having after ancient custom snatched up torches for the funeral. The road gleams with a long procession of flames, which stretches like a broad boundary line across the fields. Meeting them, the Trojan column unites with theirs its company of mourners. When the women saw them approach their homes, their shrieks set the city ablaze with grief.

The joining of the Arcadian and Trojan lines demonstrates that the allies are equal partners in mourning.<sup>29</sup> The specifically “Arcadian” funeral custom of using torches is implicitly co-opted by the Trojans.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, the funeral customs of both the Trojans and the Etruscans take center stage. Evander, attentive to Aeneas’ concerns about potential delays, does not want to keep the Trojans from battle (11.175). The scene in which Aeneas and Tarchon set up the pyres of their men, as Fratantuono puts it, highlights the “stately glory” of the Trojan funerals that “stands in stark contrast to the miserable Latin funerals”.<sup>31</sup>

...huc corpora quisque suorum  
more tulere patrum, subiectisque ignibus atris  
conditur in tenebras altum caligine caelum.  
ter circum accensos cincti fulgentibus armis  
decurrere rogos, ter maestum funeris ignem  
lustravere in equis ululatusque ore dedere.  
spargitur et tellus lacrimis, sparguntur et arma,  
it caelo clamorque virum clangorque tubarum.  
hic alii spolia occisis derepta Latinis

---

<sup>28</sup> The Arcadian women had also responded well to *Fama* at 8.554-7 (See subsection VII.B.1.e).

<sup>29</sup> Contra. Horsfall who considers this detail “irrelevant,” because the Arcadian tragedy is paramount at this point in the narrative (on 11.145).

<sup>30</sup> The custom, of course is more famously attributed to the Romans. See, e.g. Servius on these lines (Gransden on 11.142).

<sup>31</sup> Fratantuono on 11.192: “a line of alliterative resonance and stately power.”

coniciunt igni, galeas ensisque decoros  
frenaque ferventisque rotas; pars munera nota,  
ipsorum clipeos et non felicia tela.  
multa boum circa mactantur corpora Morti,  
saetigerosque sues raptasque ex omnibus agris  
in flammam iugulant pecudes. tum litore toto  
ardentis spectant socios semustaque servant  
busta, neque avelli possunt, nox umida donec  
invertit caelum stellis ardentibus aptum. (11.185-202)<sup>32</sup>

Here, after the fashion of their fathers, they each brought the bodies of their kin, and as the murky fires are lit beneath, high heaven is veiled in the gloom of darkness. Thrice, girt in glittering armor, they ran their course round the blazing piles; thrice on horseback they circled the mournful funeral fire and uttered the cries of wailing. Tears stream on earth, and stream on armor; cries of men and blare of trumpets mount to heaven. And now some fling on the fire spoils stripped from slain Latins, helmets and handsome swords, bridles and scorching wheels; others offerings familiar to the dead – their own shields and luckless weapons. Around, many cattle are sacrificed to Death; bristly swine and animals seized from all the country are slaughtered over the flames. Then, all along the shore, they watch their comrades burning, and keep guard above the charred pyres, and they cannot tear themselves away till dewy night rolls round the heaven, inset with burning stars.

Fratantuono remarks of 11.202: “Both the stars and the dead bodies burn: horrible imagery, but also implicit tribute to the undying fame of the slain warriors.”<sup>33</sup> Some might object to the use of spoils and stolen animal sacrifices (not to mention human sacrifices),<sup>34</sup> but the focus in the passage is not upon these things for their own sake, but for the sake of the dead. The activities, too, of the mourners are eerily beautiful and almost distant from the suffering at hand. In a sense, the reference to the stars lends to the Trojan funeral a universalizing scope whereby a greater meaning can be found in the sufferings and deaths of the war.<sup>35</sup>

The Latin funerals have an entirely different tone. They are gruesome, almost “Lucretian in their horrors,” where the Trojan funerals had been “stately and Homeric”:<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> See Gransden on these lines for further notes on the specific Roman rituals evoked.

<sup>33</sup> Fratantuono on 11.202.

<sup>34</sup> 11.78-82.

<sup>35</sup> Gransden’s remarks on 11.201-2: “We move from the blazing corpses to the blazing stars, from man-made fires to the fires of heaven; the camera tricks away to form a magnificent close.”

<sup>36</sup> Fratantuono on 11.211: See *De Rerum Natura*, 6.1278-1286. Stahl claims that in their funerals, the Latins “receive more of the readers sympathy” (184), but see Horsfall on 11.203-224.

Nec minus et miseri diversa in parte Latini  
innumeras struxere pyras, et corpora partim  
multa virum terrae infodiunt, avectaque partim  
finitimos tollunt in agros urbique remittunt.  
cetera confusaeque ingentem caedis acervum  
nec numero nec honore cremant; tunc undique vasti  
certatim crebris conlucent ignibus agri.  
tertia lux gelidam caelo dimoverat umbram:  
maerentes altum cinerem et confusa ruebant  
ossa focus tepidoque onerabant aggere terrae. (11.203-212)

No less, elsewhere, do the pitiful Latins build pyres innumerable. Of their many dead, some they bury in the earth, some they lift up and carry to the neighboring fields or send home to the city; the rest, a mighty mass of indistinguishable slaughter, they burn uncounted and unhonored: then on all sides the broad fields compete with their clusters of fire. The third dawn had withdrawn chill darkness from the sky; mournfully they stirred from the pyres the bones mingled with thick ash, and heaped above them a warm mound of earth.

Whereas the Trojan and Etruscan dead are honored with personal tributes by the *socii* who survive them, the Latin dead are treated in a manner that dehumanizes them as they are dumped here and there (*partim* – 204, 205) in an indistinguishable manner. The fires take over for the human mourners - they “compete” (*certatim*, 209), while the humans can only (reactively) rake up the ash and cover it with (unsettlingly) warm earth. It is no accident that the Latin assembly – that follows immediately after the Latin funerals – erupts into sedition.

Arguably the most significant aspect of the Trojan and Latin funerals is the description of the brief truce that results from Aeneas’ meeting with the Latin ambassadors. It is a strange scene that unites Trojans and Latins in the common labor of preparing the funerals:

bis senos pepigere dies, et pace sequestra  
per silvas Teucri mixtique impune Latini  
erravere iugis...(11.133-5)

For twice six days they made truce, and, with peace interposing, Teucrians and Latins roamed unharmed over the forest heights together.

The lines that follow (135-8) make reference only to the sounds of axes on falling trees and the wagons that carry the timber. The men are silent, absorbed in their grim task. And yet, absent is

---

the sense of tension and watchfulness in *Iliad* 24 during the preparations for Hector's funeral, where the Trojans have to keep watch for Greek raids. The earlier truce in *Iliad* 7 presents another Homeric model. The Greeks and Trojans there, however, are depicted in parallel, but notably separate activity.<sup>37</sup> In the funerals of *Aeneid* 11, the participants know that the fighting is not over, but both sides are able to pause from the fighting without incident. The sense of coming unity is strangely assured, if still subliminal. The context of labor provides a glimpse at unity here, and it will do so with even more significance towards the end of the poem. The Trojan and Latin funerals thus provide a background for potential unity, but the *foedera* provide the concrete means for achieving that unity.

### 3. *Foedera*

Of course, much of the trouble experienced by the Latins and Rutulians could have been avoided by staying true to the treaties (*foedera*) between themselves and the Trojans. The divine *Discordia*, as mentioned above, in a large part rendered this tragically impossible for both sides; Jupiter himself chides the gods for not allowing the treaty to stand: “now let be and cheerfully assent to the treaty already decided” (10.15). The manner in which treaties are formed and kept between the Trojans and their allies, as well as formed and dissolved between the Trojans and Latins, serves as another step in the process towards Trojan and Italian unity in the sense of laying the ground for the Trojans and others to demonstrate their political virtue.<sup>38</sup>

It is easy, during the tumult of the war, to lose sight of the fact that the Latins were the first people in Italy with whom Aeneas sought alliance, by sending Ilioneus to “crave peace for

---

<sup>37</sup> *Il.* 7.414-420, 424-432. The placement of Vergil's funerals near the end of the poem also associates them with impending unity rather than a pause from a still ongoing war.

<sup>38</sup> Schauer discusses the role of Aeneas specifically as one of mediation, “Vermittlung” (260-1).

the Trojans” (*pacemque exposcere Teucris*, 7.155). Unfortunately for the Trojans (and for modern critical discussion of the treaty) Aeneas does not fulfill Latinus’ terms of meeting the king in person and clasping hands with him (7.263-266); he does not have a chance to do so due to the turmoil caused by Allecto. Her actions, as she herself boasts to Juno, turn *discordia* into war (7.545) and prevent the formation of a treaty between the peoples: “Bid them unite in friendship and join alliance” (*dic in amicitiam coeant et foedera iungant*, 7.546).<sup>39</sup> But the actions of Allecto are only delaying tactics to a unity that is destined to take place. The first treaty the Trojans make in Italy is with the people with whom they are to become the most inextricably linked.

The overturning of the Latin treaty serves as the hinge upon which the war begins, and the foundation for bad blood between the Latins and Trojans, but there are other “treaties” between the Trojans and other nations who join them with immediate success, proving that the Trojans are at heart an inclusive people.<sup>40</sup> Father Tiber tells Aeneas to seek alliance with the Arcadians: “them you must take to your camp as allies, and join with them in league” (*hos castris adhibe socios et foedera iunge*, 8.56). Evander accepts the Trojan offering of alliance, “the hand you seek I join with you in league,” (*quam petitis iuncta est mihi foedere dextra*, 8.169) and sacrifices “alike” with the Trojan youth (*Evandrus pariter, pariter Troiana iuventus*, 8.545) in a show of unity that will carry them together out of Pallanteum and into battle in an arrayed column (*agmine facto*, 8.595) that is primarily under the command of Pallas (*ipse agmine Pallas it medio*, 8.587-588). The Trojans thus prove that they are not set on being the sole leaders of the war that they undertake. When things go poorly for the Arcadians, though,

---

<sup>39</sup> See Heinze, 149.

<sup>40</sup> Cf., though, the possibility of *foedera* with the Carthaginians that Venus had inquired of Jupiter (4.112). For more on the political background of this, see Horsfall 1989, 19-20.

and they lose their young commander, Evander does not regret his alliance with the Trojans, as he points out even under the duress of his son's funeral:

nec vos arguerim, Teucri, nec foedera nec quas  
iunximus hospitio dextras...(11.164-5)

Yet I would not blame you, Trojans, nor our covenant, nor the hands we clasped in friendship.

Pallas' death, as Evander affirms, was respected by all the Trojans and Etruscans, not only Aeneas (11.169-171). The Arcadian/Trojan treaty, then, is strong enough to withstand even the most difficult of circumstances.<sup>41</sup> The addition of the Etruscans to the equation here points to another treaty into which the Trojans enter, one for which Evander had given Aeneas the idea.

Upon the death of Pallas, Aeneas laments that he had been embraced and sent forth by Evander "to win great empire" (*mitteret in magnum imperium*, 11.47).<sup>42</sup> Part of this "empire" is realized by the Trojans' alliance with the Etruscans:

sed tibi ego ingentis populos opulentaque regnis  
iungere castra paro, quam fors inopina salutem  
ostentat...(8.475-477)

But I purpose to link mighty peoples with you and a camp rich in kingdoms – the salvation that unforeseen chance reveals...

Evander himself orchestrates this alliance, or rather, this submission to Trojan leadership on the part of the Etruscans: "of these thousands, Aeneas, I will make you chief" (*his ego te, Aenea, ductorem milibus addam*, 8.496).<sup>43</sup> Once Aeneas arrives at the Etruscan camp, the treaty is almost instantaneously drawn up: "without delay Tarchon joins forces and strikes a treaty" (*haud*

---

<sup>41</sup> Horsfall praises Evander's "towering magnanimity" in the face of "the Latins' railing against destiny" (on 11.164). Schauer remarks that the emphasis on communal feeling in war is expressed most strongly between the Trojans and Arcadians, but not the Italians and Latins (71).

<sup>42</sup> Gransden remarks here that there is no need to rule out the meanings of either "command" or "empire," as Henry and Conington do (Gransden on 11.470).

<sup>43</sup> Nisbet finds this "interference in the stasis of neighbors" to be "characteristic of Rome," and that "justification is naturally found in the misgovernment of Mezentius" (Nisbet, 385), but the point that the poet stresses is more properly the unification of the Trojans and Etruscans, and the eager complicity of the Etruscans in this unity.



*fit mora, Tarchon iungit opes foedusque ferit*, 10.153-4). This action, as mentioned in the previous chapter, allows the Etruscans to be “freed from fate” (*libera fati*, 154), and though they have ostensibly submitted to foreign leadership, they are freer than they had been in the past. What is more, the union of the Trojans (here, standing in for the Romans) and the Etruscans presages the “situation which was only to come about in reality after hard struggles throughout many centuries, the subordination of Etruria to the control of the descendants of Aeneas.”<sup>44</sup> Both of these primary groups of Trojan allies, the Arcadians and the Etruscans, are immediately loyal and useful to the Trojans; Cymodocea reports that “already the Arcadian cavalry, joined with brave Etruscans, hold the appointed place” (*iam loca iussa tenet forti permixtus Etrusco Arcas eques*, 10.238-9). Both groups, then, are enduring and brave as well as obedient.

To return to the treaty that is behind the entire war, namely the (twice) broken treaty with the Latins, Aeneas does not treat the Rutulian breach of the treaty with much alarm. Nisbet perceives in the Trojans “a Roman assurance in the sanctity of their *foedus*,”<sup>45</sup> and in fact, after seeing the portent of the arms in the sky, Aeneas is confident of the carnage that awaits the “hapless Laurentines” (*miseris...Laurentibus*, 8.537), even going so far as to “dare” the Latins and Rutulians to break the treaty: “let them call for battle and break their covenants” (*poscant acies et foedera rumpant*, 8.540).<sup>46</sup>

Aeneas will welcome, much to Turnus’ chagrin, we may suppose (12.75-6), the opportunity for a peace treaty in Book 12. Upon hearing Turnus’ terms, Aeneas reacts by

---

<sup>44</sup> Heinze, 146.

<sup>45</sup> Nisbet, 384. See also Otis, 315.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson remarks that “The Italians, in their guilty retention of Lavinia, in their near-successful attack on the encampment, in their violation of the truce, and finally in the loss of their leader have consistently played the very part which they impute to Aeneas and his men” (Anderson, 1990, 252).

“rejoicing that the war is being settled by the compact offered” (*oblato gaudens componi foedere bellum*, 12.109):

non Teucros agat in Rutulos, Teucrum arma quiescant  
et Rutuli; nostro dirimamus sanguine bellum, (12.78-9)

...let him not lead Teucrians against Rutulians – let Teucrian arms and Rutulians have rest – with our own blood let us settle the war...

The prospect alone of a treaty has a brief but powerful effect: for the first time in the poem the Trojans and Rutulians work together toward a common end, preparing the field for battle<sup>47</sup> and completing the appropriate rituals:

campum ad certamen magnae sub moenibus urbis  
dimensi Rutulique viri Teucrique parabant  
in medioque focos et dis communibus aras  
gramineas. alii fontemque ignemque ferebant  
velati limo et verbena tempora vincti.  
procedit legio Ausonidum, pilataque plenis  
agmina se fundunt portis. hinc Troius omnis  
Tyrrenusque ruit variis exercitus armis,  
haud secus instructi ferro quam si aspera Martis  
pugna vocet...(12.116-125)

Rutulians and Teucrians had measured the field for the combat under the great city's walls, and in the middle were preparing hearths and grassy altars to their common deities. Others were bringing fountain water and fire, draped in aprons, and their brows bound with vervain. The Ausonian host comes forth, and the troops, close ranked, pour from the crowded gates. On this side streams forth all the Trojan and Tyrrhene host in diverse accoutrements, armed in steel as if the harsh battle strife called them...

It is a scene filled with rustic piety, but it has the effect of uniting both Rutulian and Trojan elements in the worship of their “common deities.” There is a placid sense of order on both

---

<sup>47</sup> It must be imagined that during this scene, the Trojans had removed the sacred stock of Faunus “making no distinction” (*nullo discrimine*, 12.770). The Trojans have been much maligned by critics for their impiety at this point, but even as a pious race, they cannot be expected to give due to every god. Besides, they are more concerned at this point with the reestablishment of the *foedus*, which the Latins are about to (impiously) break. The Trojans are absolved at least in part by the intervention of Venus, who at 12.786-7 gets Aeneas' spear unstuck for him. We need not assume that Trojan gods are better than Italian gods, but that the result of the natural divine *Discordia* is that even the most pious group of people is bound to offend someone under such circumstances.

sides. And yet, in a foreboding sense of the fighting still to come, the Trojans and Etruscans are armed, and their sense of order and discipline has not been relaxed.

The treaty itself is explicit in its terms, whereby the Trojans, if they are defeated, are to “withdraw to Evander’s city” (12.184) while Iulus is to leave Italy entirely, and, most importantly, they are never to attack Italy again:

...nec post arma ulla rebelles  
Aeneadae referent ferrove haec regna lacescent. (12.185-6)

never in after time shall the sons of Aeneas return for renewed war, or attack this realm with the sword.

The victory of the Trojans, on the other hand, will result not in subjugation by any means, but in more treaties and mutual terms in which both nations remain “unconquered”:

non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo  
nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae  
invictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant. (12.189-191)

I will not bid the Italians be subject to Teucrians, nor do I seek the realm for mine; under equal terms let both nations, unconquered, enter upon an everlasting compact.

Latinus, for his part, swears by the gods “no time shall break this peace and truce for Italy”

(*nulla dies pacem hanc Italis nec foedera rumpet*, 12.202), and the treaty is sealed in the presence of the chiefs:

talibus inter se firmabant foedera dictis  
conspectu in medio procerum...(12.212-13)

With such words they sealed the treaty between them, in full view of the leaders.

Sacrifices are even made (213-215), but while the scene that follows starts off as a spectator scene in preparation for the duel, it will end in sedition.<sup>48</sup>

The Trojans now bear the responsibility for acting (in character if not degree) like the Romans of the future. They have attempted thus far “to set the stamp of civilized order upon

---

<sup>48</sup> See subsections V.F.1-2 for discussion of 12.216ff.

peace”<sup>49</sup> (*paci imponere morem*, 6.852) to little effect, and so what happens next is merely the next stage in the process: they must now “crush the proud” (*debellare superbos*, 853). What might appear, then, to be an extreme reaction on the part of Aeneas is in fact the natural one. As Roman precursors, Aeneas and the Trojans do what their descendants would have done under similar circumstances of rebellion against the ideals of law and order that the treaty represents. The city of Laurentum, protected by Turnus, is the *causa belli* (12.567) because sedition and disorder on the part of the Latins have taken away Aeneas’ chance to end the war decisively by dueling with Turnus. He addresses his men as *cives*, “identifying his Trojans” as the city’s true citizens,<sup>50</sup> but also pointing to their political sensibility:

hoc caput, o cives, haec belli summa nefandi.  
ferre faces prope foedusque reprecite flammis. (12.572-3)

This, fellow citizens, is the head, this is the sum, of the accursed war. Bring brands with speed, and with fire reclaim the treaty.

Aeneas’ men respond enthusiastically,<sup>51</sup> and Aeneas himself calls the gods to witness, “that he is being forced into battle again, that the Italians have now twice become his foes, that this treaty is the second broken” (*iterum se ad proelia cogi, bis iam Italos hostis, haec altera foedera rumpi*, 12.581-2). The time has come for Aeneas and the Trojans to bring that treaty back into effect, and thus to put an end to *discordia*.

Everything seems to have gone horribly wrong for Aeneas and the Trojans by this point in the action – and at least for the present, it has. But what is important is not so much the past as the promise of the future of the Roman skill in the suggestion of *leges* in the terms of the

---

<sup>49</sup> See CHAPTER I n. 29.

<sup>50</sup> DiCesare, 222.

<sup>51</sup> See subsection VI.B.2

treaty. Even though peace has been broken, and it will continue to be broken on occasion after occasion in Rome's future, the constant that is supplied by law, an institution that the Latins had not possessed prior to the arrival of the Trojans,<sup>52</sup> heralds the possibility of peace and unity.

## B. *LEGES AND MORES*: THE ROMAN CROWD EMERGES

The extent to which the Italians have overturned any hopes that Aeneas may have for peace without further bloodshed seems to beg the question of why the Trojans would even want to unite with these people at all. The answer has to do with the ramifications of the “peoples and wars” prophecies treated in the previous chapter: Aeneas will not only “wage a great war in Italy” (*bellum ingens geret Italia*, 1.263), and “crush proud peoples” (*populosque ferocis contundet*, 263-4); he will also “for his people set up laws and city walls” (*moresque viris et moenia ponet*, 264). The Italians as well as the Trojans are to become Aeneas' people, and by extension all of the peoples whom the Romans will conquer as well. The ultimate destiny of Aeneas is not only to rule Italy, the “land teeming with empire and clamorous with war” (*gravidam imperiis belloque frementem*, 4.229), but through his progeny the Romans will “bring all the world beneath his laws” (*totum sub leges mitteret orbem*, 4.231).

That the Latins do not immediately submit does not by any means disqualify them from being a part of this future empire, but it does give the Trojans, failing in the immediate effort “to rule the peoples” (*regere imperio populos*, 6.851) and “to set the stamp of civilized order upon

---

<sup>52</sup> Thomas sensibly recognizes the fact that the Trojans and Italians by the time of the events of Books 6-12 “are part of an age in which peace and spontaneous lawfulness no longer have a place” (Thomas 1982, 102). See Latinus' boast that the Latins live “not by bound or law” (*haud vincolo nec legibus*, 7.203) and the further discussion in subsection VI.B.1.a.

peace” (*pacique imponere morem*, 6.852), *carte blanche* to “crush the proud” (*debellare superbos*, 6.853), followed by the opportunity to “spare the vanquished” (*parcere subiectis*, 6.853).<sup>53</sup> It would seem, with all of this apparent conquest, that the Trojans would be imposing themselves upon the Italians, but as we know from the final order of things, this is not how it works out. The terms in the event of Aeneas’ victory (12.189-91) are absolutely clear in this regard. In addition, the “civilizing” mission of Rome is not, as Camps observes, “corresponding to that of Manifest Destiny or of the White Man’s Burden or to the supposition that ‘God has called us to civilize the world.’” Rather, the “the prevalence of law and order in the Roman empire...are facts” to the poet and to history.<sup>54</sup> If the poem is to be read as an endorsement of a Trojan imperialism, it is an imperialism of a strange sort.

Although Aeneas himself may not initially “realize the final ethnic disposition of the new land...an Italian, not a Trojan Rome,”<sup>55</sup> Juno’s plea to Jupiter (which he grants) makes the final disposition very clear:

illud te, nulla fati quod lege tenetur,  
 pro Latio obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:  
 cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)  
 component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,  
 ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos  
 neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari  
 aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem.  
 sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,  
 sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago:  
 occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia. (12.819-828)

This boon, banned by no law of fate, I beg of you for Latium’s sake, for your own kin’s greatness; when anon with happy bridal rites – so be it! – they plight peace, when anon they join in laws and treaties, do not command the native Latins to change their ancient name, nor to become Trojans and be called

---

<sup>53</sup> Harrison reads these lines as referring primarily to Aeneas: “Aeneas overcomes the peoples of Italy who oppose him and will succeed Latinus as ruler (*regere imperio populos*), the dynastic marriage to Lavinia will ensure a peaceful settlement (*pacique imponere morem*)...” (1991, xxii), thus unfairly (but typically) attributing the actions of an entire people to their ruler alone.

<sup>54</sup> Camps, 19. The final quote is taken from a speech of Emperor Wilhelm II at Bremen in 1902.

<sup>55</sup> Fratantuono on 11.25. See also Horsfall (*contra*) and Conington.

Teucrians, nor to change their language, and alter their attire: let Latium be, let Alban kings endure through ages, let be a Roman stock, strong in Italian valor: Troy is fallen, and fallen let her be, together with her name!

Jupiter's pronouncement provides an additional point of interest for the peoples:

sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt  
utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum  
subsident Teucri. morem ritusque sacrorum  
adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.  
hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,  
supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,  
nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores. (12.834-840)

Ausonia's sons shall keep their fathers' speech and ways, and as it is now, so shall their name be: the Teucrians shall but sink down, merged in the mass. I will give them their sacred laws and rites and make them all Latins of one tongue. From them shall arise a race, blended with Ausonian blood, whom you shall see overpass men, overpass gods in loyalty, and no nation will celebrate your worship with equal zeal.

The Trojans have arguably lost some of their original preeminence along with their language, name, and clothing,<sup>56</sup> but in this case the end result – the Romans – will be greater than the sum of their parts (their “civil warring” Trojan and Italian forebears<sup>57</sup>) because now not only are the races mixed, but Jupiter is to give them their “sacred laws and rites,” and the Romans will surpass all others in piety.<sup>58</sup>

The last we hear of the Rutulians is that they stand and groan when their leader first falls (12.928-9), soon to fall for the last time in death. One wonders what the aftermath of the scene

---

<sup>56</sup> Newman and Newman suggest that the Trojans by this agreement become little more than “breeding stock to ensure Latin glory” (38, See also 251, 279), but this view neglects Jupiter's earlier prophecies that grant Aeneas and the Trojans the claim to rule, or at least to bequeath laws to the Italians (1.261-4, 4.299-231), as well as the persistent references throughout the poem to the memory of Troy and Trojan institutions that will be carried on by the Romans (e.g. the *Lusus Troiae* 5.600-3). See subsection I.A, especially n.8 and the opening of CHAPTER VI.

<sup>57</sup> Newman and Newman, 263. They mention only the Trojans in this description.

<sup>58</sup> Though Horsfall (1989, 22-24) connects the Trojans settlement to Greek *ktisis* accounts, he also acknowledges that Trojan piety (consistent as it is with Roman piety) does not involve imposing Trojan gods in Italy, but bringing them to Italy in order to save them (*inferretque deos Latia*, 1.5).

looked like.<sup>59</sup> A modern film would likely show police and reporters interviewing witnesses while the dead man is taken away in a body bag and the hero walks off in a daze as the camera pans out. After the ending of the poem, we might expect a stunned silence while the people take in the gravity of what has just happened, and any factious intent that might have existed is mysteriously diffused by the realization that neither side may claim fairly the status of “conqueror” or must bear that of “conquered.”<sup>60</sup> Doubtless, Aeneas, who has now “achieved the status of that figure in the first simile of the poem,”<sup>61</sup> would have found words to address his new people and the valor of their fallen hero, and the long, tiring work of building a new nation founded on *Concordia*<sup>62</sup> would have been taken up by the Trojans and Latins.<sup>63</sup> The peoples within Italy do have hope for concord, as Anchises expressed in his prophecy in Book 3. At the present the horses are armed for war, but “there is hope also of peace” (*spes et pacis*, 3.543).

It is this latter aspect of the scene that holds the key to the Trojan and Italian evolution into the Romans. In Cairns’ words, “Vergil chose to end the *Aeneid* with the death of Turnus and to leave the implementation of concord for the future. For the Roman poet, concord belonged to a larger time scale: it was a goal initially achieved in the union of the Trojan and

---

<sup>59</sup> Rossi imagines the “jubilant Roman crowd” congratulating the victorious Horatii over the Curiatii and the Albans “saddened by their newly acquired servitude” (161). See subsection I.D and IV.B.4. This sort of ending, though, would not match with what the reader knows of Aeneas’ interpretation of the treaty (12.189-91). Livy’s Romans, unlike Vergil’s Trojans, are *imperio...aucti* (1.25.13).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Thomas 1998, 283 who interprets the ending as “nobody wins.” See also Chapter IV.

<sup>61</sup> “...who, imposing in his pietas and his achievements, controls the unruly mob.” (DiCesare, 238). Feeney calls his tone here “the harsh and authentic tone of the Roman commander.” (Feeney, 215). But the “terseness and tenseness” that characterize his speeches, especially towards the end of the poem, where his role is “restricted to the business of leading armies and killing Latins” (Feeney, 217), also highlights the role and the destiny of the Trojan and Italian crowds.

<sup>62</sup> In the broad sense in which it is treated in the poem: 3.542 and 6.827.

<sup>63</sup> Newman and Newman bewail a perceived neglect by the poet of a depiction of the “*Aeneadae* settling down in Italy” or the “first birth on Italian soil from Trojan stock” (251), but such an ending could only have been anticlimactic at best and downright cloying at worst.



Latin, but ultimately and finally only in Vergil's own lifetime."<sup>64</sup> The only problem with this statement is its participation in the common habit among critics of setting up the Augustan era as a culmination of "the momentum set rolling by Aeneas' mission...an end rather than as a beginning."<sup>65</sup> The prophecy of Jupiter does not limit the Romans to any physical time or space: *his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono, imperium sine fine dedi* (1.278-9), and to that end, the poet has shown that his primary interest is not so much in Augustus or his family as in the Roman people.<sup>66</sup> To that end, the *Concordia* or *consensus* found among their Trojan (and sometimes Italian) predecessors may serve as a useful model for the Romans,<sup>67</sup> whatever the degree to which *Discordia* had intruded upon their previous history.

All of the fighting that has taken place up to now, all the funerals, all the treaties broken and resolved have brought the Trojans and Italians to a crucial point where their combined strengths and weaknesses can be seen for what they are and then refined or discarded as needed to the end of becoming a new people, a new crowd – that of Rome. The common bastardization of the Oliver Hazard Perry quote, "we have met the enemy and they are us,"<sup>68</sup> is the perfect summation of the Trojan/Italian amalgamation. This is a union of peoples who are destined to achieve great things, but at the same time to suffer terrible setbacks from war and sedition –

---

<sup>64</sup> Cairns, 214. See also Newman and Newman, 263: Augustus "picks up *parcere* with *peperci* in *Res Gestae* 3," Otis, 389: Vergil really saw "in Roman *pietas*, *virtus*, and *concilium* the only hope of peace and social order, of humane behavior associated with strong government," with Augustus as the "kind of man who could bring peace out of fratricidal war."

<sup>65</sup> Toll 1991, 7 and Rossi, 168. See also Schauer, 267-8 for a discussion of the *consensus* of the people under Augustus as similar to that of the Trojans at 2.799ff. and Augustus as an interim-figure ("Interimgestalt") similar to Aeneas (272).

<sup>66</sup> "Diese Stelle zeigt erneut, daß Vergil im Grunde weniger an Augustus als an den Römern als Volk interessiert ist: In der Aeneas geht es nicht nur um die Geschichte des Aeneas und seiner Familie, sondern letztlich um das troische Volk und seine Verschmelzung mit den Latinern" (Schauer, 272).

<sup>67</sup> Schauer, 279.

<sup>68</sup> The original being "...and they are ours."

often internally – throughout their history.<sup>69</sup> Aeneas himself will be faced with the task of leading them “into the complex confusion of a more socially responsible way of life” that will bring them closer to the “constant problems” of the Roman way of life,<sup>70</sup> but also to its great rewards.

In the final estimation, the Romans are a people whose unique character has been forged from the beginning of the poem. The Trojans – and Italians now, for there is no separating them – have proven their inclusivity to the ultimate extent by unifying with one another, their political virtue in submitting (at long last) to their destined leader and finally quelling any latent seditious tendencies, their piety (now given especial potency by Jupiter), their competitiveness not only in watching the duels of the war but in striving in it themselves to the utmost, their endurance in their holding out in the war to this extent, and their collectivity in working toward this final unity. By the end of the poem, at least in terms of all of these characteristics, the Trojans and the peoples of Italy can no longer be viewed as separate, warring tribes (even though many of the groups will still be fighting amongst themselves centuries hence) but as Romans.<sup>71</sup> Their journey to becoming Romans in character may have come to an end, but that of their descendants, in which the actual Roman crowd emerges into history, has only just begun.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Zetzel, 200-2 provides a balanced view of the “achievement of peace” that comes “through brutality and violence.”

<sup>70</sup> Williams, 1990, 28. See Schauer, 89ff. for Aeneas’ role as a mediating figure (“Vermittlerfigur”).

<sup>71</sup> Heinze, 240: “It is over innumerable corpses that *fatum* leads the rebellious ones back to join those who had followed it willingly. That is how the foundation stone is laid upon which the eternal structure of the *imperium Romanum* shall rise.”

<sup>72</sup> “The *Aeneid* is...presented as the first chapter in a story which is still continuing” (Camps, 16).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Texts and Commentaries:*

- Adams, Michael. ed. 1966. *C. Suetonius Tranquillus Divi Augusti Vita, ed. With Introductions, Analysis of the Text, Notes, Appendices and Index.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Allen, T.W. and David Monro. eds. 1966. *Homeri Opera.* 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Austin, R.G. ed. 1955. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus. With a Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Austin, R.G. ed. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus. With a Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Austin, R.G. ed. 1970. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus. With a Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Austin, R.G. ed. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus. With a Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Butler, H.E. and M. Cary. eds. 1970. *C. Suetonius Tranquilli Divus Iulius, With an Introduction and Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Clark, A.C. ed. 1962. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes.* 6 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Cooley, Alison E. ed. 2009. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti Text, Translation, and Commentary.* Cambridge: UP.
- Conington, John and Henry Nettleship, Rev. F. Haverfield. eds. 1963. *The Works of Vergil With a Commentary.* 3 Vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Du Pontet, Renatus. ed. 1966. *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarium.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Edwards, H.J. trans. 1922. *Caesar, The Gallic War.* Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Fairclough, H. Rushton and G.P. Goold. eds. and trans. 1999. *Virgil, Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI.* Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.

- Fairclough, H. Rushton and G.P. Goold. eds. and trans. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid VII-XII, Appendix Vergiliana*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Fisher, C.D. ed. 1966. *Cornelii Taciti Annalium*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fordyce, C.J. ed. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII-VIII, With a Commentary*. Oxford: UP.
- Foster, B.O. trans. 1975. *Livy, Books 8-10*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Foster, B.O. trans. 1976. *Livy, Books 1-2*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Fratantuono, Lee. ed. 2009. *A Commentary on Virgil, Aeneid XI*. Brussels: Latomus.
- Gardner, M.C. trans. 1966. *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Sestio and In Vatinius*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Gransden, K.W. ed. 1976. *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge: UP.
- Gransden, K.W. ed. 1991. *Virgil Aeneid Book XI*. Cambridge: UP.
- Greenwood, L.H.G. trans. 1976. *Cicero, The Verrine Orations*. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Hardie, Philip. ed. 1994. *Virgil Aeneid Book IX*. Cambridge: UP.
- Harrison, S.J. ed. 1991. *Vergil Aeneid 10, With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. ed. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7, A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. ed. 2003. *Virgil, Aeneid 11, A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. ed. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3, A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. ed. 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2, A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jackson, John. trans. 1969. *Tacitus, Annals Books 1-3*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Ker, Walter C.A. trans. 1969. *Cicero, Philippics*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.

- MacDonald, C. trans. 1977. *Cicero, In Catilinam I-IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Maclennan, Keith. ed. 2003. *Virgil Aeneid VI*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- McDonald, Alexander Hugh. 1965. *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita 31-35*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Murray, A.T. trans. 1978. *Homer, The Iliad*. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP
- Murray, A.T. trans. 1980. *Homer, The Odyssey*. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Mynors, R.A.B. ed. 1969. *Vergili Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ogilvie, R.M. ed. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ogilvie, R.M. ed. 1974. *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita 1-4*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Page, T.E. ed. 1964. *The Aeneid of Vergil. With Introduction and Notes*. 2 Vols. London: Macmillan.
- Pease, Arthur Stanley. ed. 1967. *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Race, William H. trans. 2008. *Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Reynolds, L.D. ed. 1991. *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallustiana*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rolfe, J.C. trans. 1971. *Sallust*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Rolfe, J.C. trans. 1964. *Suetonius*. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Sage, Evan T. trans. 1967. *Livy Books 31-34*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Scheid, John. ed. 2007. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Thilo, Georg and Hermann Hagen. eds. 1986. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. 3 Vols. Hildesheim: Geor Olms Verlag.
- Thomas, Richard. ed. 1988. *Virgil, Georgics*. 2 Vols. Cambridge: UP.

- Walter, Charles and Robert Conway. eds. 1965. *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita 6-10*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Warwick, Henriette Holm. 1975. With the technical assistance of Richard L. Hotchkiss. *Vergil Concordance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Watts, N.H. trans. 1979. *Cicero*. 23 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- West, D. ed. 2002. *Horace Odes III*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wetmore, Nichols. 1961. *Index Verborum Vergilianus*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- White, Horace. trans. 1972. *Appian's Roman History*. 4 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Williams, R.D. ed. 1972. *Virgil Aeneid I-VI Edited with Introduction and Notes*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Williams, R.D. ed. 1973. *Virgil Aeneid VII-XII Edited with Introduction and Notes*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

#### *Secondary Sources*

- Abbott, F.F. 1907. "The Theater as a Factor in Roman Politics Under the Republic." *TAPhA* 38: 49-56.
- Anderson, William S. 1968. "Pastor Aeneas: On Pastoral Themes in the *Aeneid*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 99:1-17.
- Anderson, William S. 1990. "Vergil's Second *Iliad*." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Ed. S.J. Harrison, 239-252. Oxford: UP.
- Barker, Elton T. E. 2009. *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography, and Tragedy*. Oxford: UP.
- Basson, W.P. 1975. *Pivotal Catalogues in the Aeneid*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Boas, George. 1969. *Vox Populi: Essays in the History of an Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Botsford, George Willis. 1909. *The Roman Assemblies from their Origin to the End of the Republic*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bowra, C.M. 1933. "Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal." *Greece and Rome* 3.7:8-21.

- Burke, Paul. 1978. "Drances Infensus: A Study in Vergilian Character Portrayal." *TAPA* 108: 15-20.
- Cameron, Alan. 1976. *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Camps, W.A. 1969. *An Introduction to Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: UP.
- Cairns, Francis. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge: UP.
- De Jong, I.J.F. 1987. "The Voice of Anonymity: tis-Speeches in the Iliad." *Eranos* 85: 69-84.
- Di Cesare, Mario A. 1974. *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's Aeneid*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Dunkle, Roger. 2008. *Gladiators: Violence and Spectacle in Ancient Rome*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fantham, Elaine. 1998. "Allecto's 1<sup>st</sup> Victim: A Study of Vergil's Amata." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 135-153. London: Duckworth.
- Feeney, D.C. 1983. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *CQ New Series* 33.1: 204-219.
- Feldherr, Andrew. 1995. "Ships of State: *Aeneid* 5 and Augustan Circus Spectacle." *Classical Antiquity* 14.2: 245-265.
- Feldherr, Andrew. 1998. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Fowler, D. 1990. "Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *PCPS* 216: 42-63.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1990. "Aspects of the Structure of *Aeneid* Seven." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 253-276. Oxford: UP.
- Galinsky, Karl. 1969. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton: UP.
- Gottlieb, Gunther. 1998. "Religion and the Politics of the *Aeneid*." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 21-36. London: Duckworth.
- Gransden, K.W. 1984. *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*. Cambridge: UP.
- Hammer, Dean. 2002. *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford: UP.

- Hardie, Philip. 1998. *Virgil: New Surveys in the Classics*, No. 28. Oxford: UP.
- Hardie, Philip. 1998. "Fame and Defamation in the *Aeneid*: The Council of the Latins. *Aeneid*. 11.225-467." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 243-270. London: Duckworth.
- Harrison, S.J. 1988. "Vergil on Kingship: The First Simile of the *Aeneid*" *PCPS* 34: 55-9.
- Harrison, S.J. 1990. "Some View of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 1-20. Oxford: UP.
- Haubold, Johannes. 2000. *Homer's People: Homeric Poetry and Social Formation*. Cambridge: UP.
- Heinze, Richard. 1993. *Vergil's Epic Technique*. trans. Hazel and David Harvey and Fred Robinson. Berkeley: UCLA Press.
- Hight, Gilbert. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: UP.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1987. "Non Viribus Aequis: Some Problems in Virgil's Battle-Scene." *G & R* 34.1: 48-55.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1989. "Aeneas the Colonist." *Vergilius* 35: 8-27.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1990. "The *Aeneid* and the Social Structures of Primitive Italy." *Athenaeum* 78: 523-527.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1990. "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 305-315. Oxford: UP.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1991. "Externi duces." *RFIC* 119:188-192.
- Horsfall, N.M., Ed. 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. New York: Brill.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 2003. *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*. London: Duckworth.
- Johnson, W.R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: UCLA Press.
- Knauer, Geort. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kristol, Susan Scheinberg. 1990. *Labor and Fortuna in Vergil's Aeneid*. New York: Garland Publishing.



- Laird, Andrew. 1999. *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature*. Oxford: University Press.
- LaPenna, Antonio. 1971. "Spunti sociologici per l'interpretazione dell' Eneide." In *Vergiliana: Recherches sur Virgile*, eds. H. Bardon and R. Verdère, 283-93. Leiden: Brill.
- Lefèvre, Eckard. 1998. "Vergil as a Republican. *Aen.* 6.815-35." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 101-118. London: Duckworth.
- Lipscombe, Herbert C. 1909. "Aspects of Speech in Vergil and the Later Roman Epic." *The Classical Weekly*. 2.15: 114-117.
- Lynch, John P. 1980. "Laocoön and Sinon: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.40-198." *G & R*, Second Series 27: 170-179.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1989. *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Mackie, Hilary. 1996. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Martin, R.P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca, NY.
- McGlew, James F. 1989. "Royal Power and the Achaean Assembly at 'Iliad' 2.84-393." *Classical Antiquity*. 8.2: 282-295.
- McGushin, P. 1964. "Virgil and the Spirit of Endurance." *The American Journal of Philology*. 85.3: 225-253.
- Millar, Fergus. 1998. *The Crowd in Rome and the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mitchell, Richard E. 1990. *Patricians and Plebeians: The Origin of the Roman State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.
- Monti, Richard C. 1981. *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid: Roman social and Political Values in the Epic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Morwood, James. 1991. "Aeneas, Augustus, and the Theme of the City." *G & R*, Second Series 38.2: 212-223.

- Morwood, James. 1998. "Virgil's Pious Man and Menenius Agrippa: A Note on *Aeneid* 1.148-53." *G & R*, Second Series 45:195-198.
- Mourtsin, Henrik. 2001. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: UP.
- Newman, John and Frances Newman. 2005. *Troy's Children: Lost Generations in Virgil's Aeneid*. New York: Georg Olms.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1990. "Aeneas Imperator: Roman Generalship in an Epic Context." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 378-389. Oxford: UP.
- Nugent, S.G. 1992. "Vergil's "Voice of the Women" in *Aeneid* V." *Arethusa* 25.2: 255-92.
- O'Hara, James J. 1994. "They Might Be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil's War in Italy." In *Studies in Roman Epic*, eds. H. Roisman and J. Roisman. *Colby Quarterly* 30: 206-32.
- O'Neill, Peter. 2003. "Going Round in Circles: Popular Speech in Ancient Rome." *Classical Antiquity* 22.1: 135-165.
- Otis, Brooks. 1963. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Papaioannou, S. 2003. "Founder, Civilizer and Leader: Vergil's Evander and his Role in the Origins of Rome." *Mnemosyne* 56.6: 680-702.
- Parry, Adam. 1963. "The Two Voices of Vergil's *Aeneid*." *Arion* 2: 266-80.
- Pöschl, Viktor. 1966. Trans. by Gerda Seligson. *Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Powell, Anton. 2008. *Virgil the Partisan: A Study in the Re-Integration of Classics*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Putnam, Michael. 1970. "*Aeneid* VII and the *Aeneid*." *The American Journal of Philology*. 91.4: 408-430.
- Putnam, Michael. 1980. "The Third Book of the *Aeneid*: From Homer to Rome." *Ramus* 9: 1-21.
- Quinn, Kenneth. 1963. *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Quinn, Kenneth. 1968. *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Reed, J.D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton: UP.

- Rose, P.W. 1988. "Thersites and the Plural Voices of Homer." *Arethusa* 21: 5-25.
- Rosivach, V.J. 1980. "Latinus' Genealogy and the Palace of Picus (*Aeneid* 7.45-9, 170-91)." *CQ* 30.1: 140-52.
- Rossi, Andreola. 2004. *Contexts of War: Manipulation of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Saylor, C. 1990. "Group vs. Individual in Vergil *Aeneid* IX." *Latomus* 49: 88-94.
- Schauer, Markus. 2007. *Aeneas dux in Vergils Aeneis: Eine literarische Fiktion in augusteischer Zeit*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Stahl, H.P. 1990. "Augustan Vergil and the Political Rival." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, eds. Raaflaub and Toher, 174-211. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Syed, Yasmin. 2005. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self: Subject and Nation in Literary Discourse*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: UP.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. 1966. *Roman Voting Assemblies: From the Hannibalic War to The Dictatorship of Caesar*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Taylor, Margaret E. 1955. "Primitivism in Virgil." *The American Journal of Philology*. 76.3: 261-278.
- Thomas, Richard. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge: UP.
- Thomas, Richard. 1998. "The Isolation of Turnus: *Aeneid* Book 12" In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 271-302. London: Duckworth.
- Thomas, Richard. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Toll, Katherine. 1991. "The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam Laeto Socii Clamore Salutant*." *Helios* 18.1: 3-14.
- Toll, Katherine. 1997. "Making Roman-ness and the '*Aeneid*.'" *Classical Antiquity* 16.1: 34-56.
- Toner, Jerry. 2009. *Popular Culture in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Vanderbroeck, Paul. 1987. *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca. 80-50 BC)*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben Publisher.
- West, D. A. 1969. "Multiple-correspondence similes in the *Aeneid*." *JRS*. 59.1/2:40- 49.
- West, D. A. 1990. "*Cernere Erat*, the Shield of Aeneas." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 429-444. Oxford: UP.
- West, David. 1998. "The End and the Meaning: *Aeneid* 12.791-842." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl, 303-318. London: Duckworth.
- Willcock, M. M. 1983. "Battle Scenes in the *Aeneid*." *PCPS* 29: 87-99.
- Williams, R.D. 1990. "The Purpose of the *Aeneid*." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, 21-36. Oxford: UP.
- Wiltshire, Susan Ford. 1989. *Public and Private in Vergil's Aeneid*. Amherst: UP.
- Wiseman, T.P. 2009. *Remembering the Roman People: Essays on Late Republican Politics and Literature*. Oxford: UP.
- Yavetz, Zvi. 1969. *Plebs and Princeps*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Zarker, J.W. 1978. "Vergil's Trojan and Italian *Matres*." *Vergilius* 24: 15-24.
- Zetzel, James E. G. 1997. "Rome and its Traditions." In *The Cambridge Companion to Vergil*, ed. Charles Martindale, 188-203. Cambridge: UP.