

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **Repetition and Ideology in the Aeneid**

Name of Author: **Quint, D.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic
From Virgil to Milton. Quint, D.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Princeton University**

Pages scanned: **50 - 96**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Muses' Playground CLCS5001**

Name of Designated Person

authorising scanning: **E. L. Harris**

Date authorised: 05.04.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

TWO

REPETITION AND IDEOLOGY IN THE AENEID

THE POLITICALLY loaded narrative opposition that appears in emblematic form in Virgil's Actium—between the victors' epic teleology and the romance aimlessness and circularity of the vanquished—is repeated and written large in the *Aeneid*. The poem falls into two halves, and these correspond to two narrative forms. The first, modeled on the *Odyssey*, recounts the romance wanderings that detain Aeneas and his defeated Trojan compatriots on their way to Italy. The second, modeled on the *Iliad*, tells of the epic warfare from which they emerge victorious and gain the foothold in Latium that will eventually lead to the foundation and history of Rome. The process by which the Trojans go from being losers to winners thus matches the movement in the poem from one narrative form to another, from romance to epic.¹

The Trojans' successive unsuccessful attempts to settle outside of Italy in the first six books of the epic constitute a pattern of repetition that threatens to keep them in continual wandering and blocks their progress to their destined future. These failed settlements all look back nostalgically to Troy and so conform to the model of the *Odyssey*, which stages a return to the homeland and to the father. But Troy has been destroyed for good, as Book 2 graphically demonstrates, and the *Aeneid* shows the repeated attempts of the survivors to found new versions and replicas of their city to be regressive—an obsessive circular return to a traumatic past that Book 3 will place under the rule of Aeneas's father, Anchises. The first half of the *Aeneid* describes the experience of the losers of the Trojan War who must rid themselves of their past, of their sense of loss and victimization—a process that involves as well the eventual removal of the father from the poem.

But in the second six books of the epic, Aeneas and the Trojans find themselves caught precisely in a repetition of the Trojan War—the war against the native Latins that seems uncannily to evoke and reproduce the events of the fighting before Troy. Here, Virgil's imitation of Homer becomes part of the thematic subject matter of the poem, for while Aeneas and the Trojans were not along on the voyage of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, they were very much present in the action of the *Iliad*, fighting on the losing side. Thus the new *Iliad* of the second half of the *Aeneid* forces the Trojans to repeat their past struggle, but they will repeat it *with a difference*: this time they will be the winners.

The two ways of repeating the past in the two halves of the *Aeneid* and the alternative romance and epic narratives they respectively produce—the

regressive repetition of the Odyssean wanderings, the successful repetition-as-reversal of the Iliadic war—conform to the two modes of psychic behavior that, for Freud in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, comprise the *repetition compulsion*. The victim of an earlier trauma may neurotically reenact his victimization over and over again. Alternatively, he may replay the original traumatic situation in order to create a new version of it, a situation of which he is now master, rather than victim, thereby “undoing” the past and gaining some control over his psychic history. The latter instance creates a teleologically structured narrative, a repetition that links the two events but demonstrates their difference and the overcoming of the first by the second. In a searching analysis of Freud's essay, Peter Brooks has argued that narrative itself is intimately linked to such plots of psychic mastery and empowerment. But Brooks points out an essential doubleness in repetition that potentially subverts mastery and unsettles any notion of narrative beginnings and ends.

Narrative, we have seen, must ever present itself as a repetition of events that have already happened, and within this postulate of a generalized repetition it must make use of specific, perceptible repetition in order to create plot, that is, to show us a significant interconnection of events. An event gains meaning by its repetition, which is both the recall of an earlier moment and a variation of it: the concept of repetition hovers ambiguously between the idea of reproduction and that of change, forward and backward movement. . . . Repetition creates a *return* in the text, a doubling back. We cannot say whether this is a return to or a return of, for instance, a return to origins or a return of the repressed. Repetition through this ambiguity appears to suspend temporal process, or rather, to subject it to an indeterminable shuttling or oscillation that binds different moments together as a middle that might turn forward or back. This inescapable middle is suggestive of the demonic: repetition and return are perverse and difficult, interrupting simple movement forward.²

If narrative is built by repetition, Brooks notes, the risk is that its plotted events will become “merely”—regressively or endlessly—repetitious. Narrative emplotment requires a middle constituted by repetition that, because of the dual nature of repetition itself, may short-circuit and collapse upon itself rather than proceed to a desired ending from which, retrospectively, progress and mastery may be claimed: from which, we might say, the narrative may recognize itself *as* narrative.

The *Aeneid* plots out just such a struggle for empowerment and for a narrative that is both the result and the means of empowerment; but it is the struggle not of the individual psyche but of a collective political nation. The Trojans, obsessed with their fallen city in the first half of the poem, are condemned to a futile repetition and to a narrative of romance wandering that describes their experience of defeat as virtually nonnarratable. It is their victory in the epic contest of the last six books that produces a “posi-

tive" repetition of their tragic past and creates a narrative teleology. It is the first in the continuing series of victories that will constitute the narrative of Roman history. The two-part *Aeneid* thus identifies epic teleology with narrative itself—the winners' story made possible by conquest—and contrasts this story with the romance odyssey it supersedes: the losers' aimless course, their lack of story, their falling out of history. But this supersession of romance by epic represents the Trojans' victory not so much over defeated external foes as over themselves.

If Virgil casts the *Aeneid*'s narrative of political foundation—what is also the story of the political foundation of narrative—in terms of a repetition compulsion, he does so not only as a Freudian *avant la lettre*, but also in response to specific, opposing strains in the ideology of Augustus. In a kind of political allegory, the Trojans' story foreshadows the recent historical experience of the poet's Roman contemporaries. The negative and positive forms of repetition in the two halves of the epic correspond to the double message of Augustan propaganda: the injunction to forget a past of civil war (so as to stop repeating it), and the demand that this past be remembered and avenged (and so be repeated and mastered). These two ideological imperatives can be respectively assimilated to the personal virtues that Augustus claimed for himself—*clementia* and *pietas*—virtues that commentators on the *Aeneid* have long seen informing its fictions.³ Virgil thus appears to dramatize the psychological implications, even the psychological basis of the workings of politics and of political ideology; at the same time we may begin to wonder whether Freud's model of the psyche empowered by narrative does not derive from influential political narratives like the *Aeneid* in the first place. These are not necessarily alternatives between which we must choose—the political or the psychic—for the displacement of repetition and narrative may oscillate between the two. But the political context of Virgil's poem should make us aware that its psychological depth may already be doing ideological work: it universalizes the historically particular, and, in what is one of ideology's central operations, it makes a given political and social arrangement appear to be *the* given, as if it were inevitable and somehow predetermined.⁴

Yet the *Aeneid* also uncovers the contradictions in the Augustan ideology that shapes it, the mutual incompatibility of *clementia* and *pietas*: precisely the contradiction between the admonition against history repeating itself and the call to repeat past history, if only to put that history finally in the past. This ambiguity haunts the repetition compulsion that the *Aeneid* locates at the heart of Roman experience—Brooks notes that regressive and progressive forms of repetition may not be easy to tell apart—and it accounts for the celebrated pessimism of the *Aeneid*. It is unfashionable at present, at least in this country, to read Virgil as the spokesman of the new imperial propaganda; it smacks of T. S. Eliot's blandly reactionary appropriation of the *Aeneid* for Church and Empire.⁵ Yet Eliot is best countered by

taking the poem's ideology seriously, by seeing the *Aeneid* questioning the Augustan regime and its party line *from the inside* and in its own terms. Playing these contradictory terms off against one another, the poem asks whether the new political foundation that the regime promises will be an escape from or merely a repetition of Rome's history of civil war. And in the process Virgil questions the therapeutic narrative of losers becoming winners—of "good" repetition replacing bad—that his epic presents as the founding model of Roman history.

The Return of the Past in *Aeneid* 3

The experience of Aeneas and his Trojan followers in Book 3 is reflected in the book's symbolic geography. On their wanderings from the fallen Troy, the Trojans stop to consult the oracle at Delos, the island that once floated and wandered upon the sea.

sacra mari colitur medio gratissima tellus
Nereidum matri et Neptuno Aegaeo,
quam pius arquite nens oras et litora circum
errantem Myconoe celsa Gyaroque reuinxit,
immotamque coli dedit et contemnere uentos.

(3.73–77)

(In the middle of the sea lies a holy island, most cherished by the mother of the Nereids and Aegean Neptune, which, as it wandered about the coasts and shores, was fastened by the grateful archer-god Apollo to lofty Myconos and Gyaros: he allowed it to lie immovable and to scorn the winds.)

Apollo repaid Delos, his birthplace, by fixing it in place and turning it into his shrine. Another story of a wandering island brought to rest is invoked when Aeneas subsequently makes a landfall in the Strophades, the islands of the Harpies.

seruatum ex undis Strophadum me litora primum
excipiunt. Strophades Graio stant nomine dictae
insulae Ionio in magno.

(209–11)

(The shores of the Strophades first take me and grant me safety from the sea. Strophades is the Greek name of islands in the great Ionian sea.)

Virgil calls attention to the name of the Strophades—"the islands of turning"—and asks that his reader remember how the islands first got this name, a story recounted in the *Argonautica* (2.296–97) of Apollonius Rhodius. Chasing the Harpies, the heroes Zetes and Calais reached these islands and then turned back to rejoin Jason and the Argo. The islands received their

new name from this event, for before they had been called the Plotai (285, 297): the "floating islands." Like Delos, the Strophades were islands that once floated before they were fixed, and they seem to be related to the wandering Cyanean rocks that the Argonauts confront on the next leg of their journey (2.549f.); once the Argo successfully negotiates them, the rocks are rooted forever in place (2.604–6). Islands, like dangerous rocks and reefs, float and wander until sailors navigate, name, and chart them. They then become landmarks. For Aeneas and his men, the formerly wandering Delos and Strophades suggest the familiarity and stability of the eastern Greek Mediterranean. This had been their known world, the world of their past and, so they had thought, of their roots.

Italy, their eventual destination, is by contrast the world of the unknown. Its unfixed geography is described to Aeneas by the seer Helenus.

haec loca ui quondam et uasta conuulsa ruina
(tantum aeui longinqua ualet mutare uetustas)
dissiluisse ferunt, cum protinus utraque tellus
una foret: uenit medio ui pontus et undis
Hesperium Siculo latus abscidit, aruaque et urbes
litore diductas angusto interluit aestu.

(414–19)

(These lands, they say, once burst asunder, rent by force and a great cataclysm [so great changes can be wrought by the hoary length of time] when the two were once one continuous stretch of land. The sea entered in by force between them and with its waves cut off the Italian from the Sicilian shore, and with its narrow tidal channel washes fields and cities severed by the shore.)

The tearing of Sicily away from the Italian mainland reverses the pattern of floating islands fastened in place. Sicily seems to have slipped its mooring and, as Etna shakes its foundation, to be on the move.

fama est Enceladi semustum fulmine corpus
urgeri mole hac, ingentemque insuper Aetnam
impositam ruptis flammam exspirare caminis,
et fessum quotiens mutet latus, intremere omnem
murmure Trinacriam et caelum subtexere fumo.

(578–582)

(It is storied that the body of Enceladus, half-scorched by Jove's thunderbolt, is weighed down underneath that mass, and huge Etna, placed above him breathes forth fire through its broken furnaces, and whenever he changes his weary side, all Sicily trembles with a groan and veils the sky with smoke.)

The island quakes beneath the Trojans' feet and suggests their own experience of uprootedness. They are themselves wandering, wrenched from their familiar past by the destruction of Troy and of the collective history it repre-

sented, a history now pervaded by defeat. Their future lies in the brave-new world of Italy, which, precisely because it is new, initially appears unfixed and fluctuating.

The future is always uncertain, and it is little wonder that the Trojans prefer charted waters and recognizable landmarks. If the action of Book 3 describes their journey to Italy from their destroyed past of Troy, it also describes the pathos of their longing to find their past again in the course of their wanderings. Hence the paradox that the Trojans are most truly wandering when they feel they are on firm ground: when they think they have found the stability and security of a familiar past. And the Italy that seems to be breaking apart and wandering is their true destination and journey's end. It is because Italy is a terra incognita, lying outside their past experience, that it can be a virgin territory for the defeated Trojans, a site for a new and fresh beginning.

The emphasis which the whole first half of the *Aeneid* places upon the Trojans' need to break with their past, to stop looking backwards to Troy and to begin anew in Italy, is directly linked to the poem's political and ideological context. After the catastrophe of Rome's civil wars, the victorious Augustan party claimed to give the state a new foundation. Augustus was a second Romulus, and Virgil depicts a still earlier foundation of Rome before its foundation, with Aeneas as a shadowy antitype of Augustus.⁶ The new regime dictated that Virgil's contemporary Romans were to put behind them the national trauma of civil strife in order to start over again, and the *Aeneid* is itself implicated in a program of Augustan propaganda that seeks to suppress and rewrite Rome's political memory. There is an evident analogy to be drawn between the defeated, war-weary Trojan remnant in search of a new beginning and Virgil's readers, the survivors of the recent civil wars, who are offered a fresh start in the new Augustan state; and we need to keep this analogy before us to construct a political reading of the *Aeneid*. The first six books of the poem describe the negative consequences of the Trojans' repeating or seeking to go back to their past—what for Rome would mean slipping back into its internecine conflicts. This is particularly the case in Book 3, which presents itself as a kind of condensed version of the first half of the poem, and whose dominant figure, Anchises, the hero's father and living reminder of the Trojan past, is also specifically tied to Julius Caesar, the adoptive father of Augustus and a major protagonist of the civil wars. But the same ideology is felt in the book's general depiction of the harmful effects of memory upon the Trojans' mission; and this has its counterpart at the end of the first half of the *Aeneid* in a depiction of the universal benefits of forgetting.

The Trojans' voyage in Book 3 is a miniature version of the wanderings of the *Odyssey* set within the Odyssean first half of the *Aeneid*; as such, the book performs in little and may be said to epitomize the action of Books 1–6.⁷ In Book 3 the Trojans go from Troy to within a glimpse of the shores

of Italy (519), the destination that they will finally reach at the beginning of Book 6. The *Odyssey* similarly delivers its hero from his wanderings, but while Odysseus *returns* to Ithaca, Aeneas and his followers have lost their homeland, and it is in pursuit of a new one that they are thrust out on an Odyssean voyage. It may be for this reason that the imitations of the Great Wanderings of the *Odyssey* in *Aeneid* 3 reverse Homer's narrative sequence, starting with the eating of the cattle on the Harpies' island that recalls the eating of the cattle of Helios in Book 12 of the *Odyssey* and ending with the visit to the coast of the Cyclopes that rewrites Book 9 of Homer's poem. Like its character Achaemenides (690–91), Virgil's book retraces backwards the wanderings of Odysseus.

Book 3 is also related to the larger first half of the *Aeneid* by the two storms that strike Aeneas's ships (192–208, 555–69) and drive them to the shores of the Harpies and the Cyclopes, respectively. These squalls, which are the plot device and emblem par excellence of the aimless and digressive wanderings of Odyssean romance, are smaller versions of the two great storms that send the Trojans into and away from Carthage at the beginnings of Books 1 and 5. For if, after a series of digressive episodes, Book 3 brings the Trojans within sight of Italy, the book is itself embedded within the narrative that Aeneas recounts to Dido at Carthage—in the most extended episode of his digressive wanderings. In the chronological sequence of the poem, the Trojans' arrival in Italian waters at the end of Book 3 is followed by their being blown off course to Africa in the very opening of the poem as Juno conspires with the wind-god Aeolus. The Homeric model lies in *Odyssey* 10 where, within sight of Ithaca, Odysseus's men release the winds of Aeolus from their bag (28f.) and the hero's ship is blown all the way back to the wind-god's realm from which it set out.

The *Aeneid* thus opens by evoking a pattern not only of narrative digression but also of narrative circularity: of romance wandering that brings the Trojans back to where they started, no closer to their destination. Their progress in Book 3 may only be apparent, and Book 3 also features a series of failed settlements that repeatedly force the Trojans to start all over again. They seem, in fact, to be caught in a vicious circle, and a regressive one at that, for in these settlements they build or find miragelike replicas of Troy. It is the Trojans' nostalgic attempts to repeat or relive their past that constitute their wanderings, steering them off course and away from the epic goal of Italy. The romance circularity that characterizes the narrative of the Odyssean first half of the *Aeneid* is thus assimilated thematically with an obsessive return to—and of—the past.

The problem of the past is directly raised in the third feature by which Book 3 stands as a smaller model of the first half of the poem. At the end of the book Anchises, the father of Aeneas, dies. But Anchises only disappears as a living character, and his influence upon the events of the poem is not

over until the end of Book 6, where he leads his son through the underworld. The whole first half of the *Aeneid* may be read as an attempt to deal with the father and the past that he represents. Anchises plays a particularly prominent role in Book 3, a major surprise for the reader of the *Aeneid* who, at the end of Book 2, has seen Aeneas carry his apparently helpless father, a heavy and inert burden, out of the burning city of Troy, in probably the single most famous pictorial image of Virgil's poem. But in the ninth verse of Book 3 the suddenly recovered Anchises is found giving the Trojan fleet its orders to sail, and throughout the book he will share the leadership of the Trojan expedition with Aeneas. Aeneas defers to his father with the exemplary piety for which he is renowned, and it is difficult at times to determine just which of the two men is in charge.⁸

This collaboration begins to resemble a competition between father and son, between Trojan past and Trojan present, that lasts until Anchises' death at Drepanum (708–15) at the close of Book 3. Anchises' misreading of the oracle of Delos, which leads to the short-lived settlement on Crete, and the ways in which this episode is linked to others in the book, indicate how a fixation upon the former Troy threatens the Trojans' effort to make a new beginning. This thematic argument culminates in the book's central episode of Buthrotum. Through a series of Odyssean allusions and parallels, Virgil depicts the mimic Troy where Andromache and Helenus cling to their remembered past as a kind of underworld, inhabited by the living dead.

The oracle at Delos appears to be a dead giveaway. After having been addressed as "Dardanidae" (94), only a willful Trojan interpreter would not instruct his countrymen to head for the birthplace of Dardanus. Anchises' glaring mistake calls attention to itself. Perhaps swayed by the injunction to seek out his ancient motherland—"antiquam exquirite matrem" (96)—his thoughts about Crete turn to the cult of the mother goddess Cybele, imported from that island to Troy. His association of ideas thus parallels the first error that the Trojans commit in Book 3, the choice of Thrace for the site of their new city, a choice that seems to be influenced by the allied gods—"sociique Penates" (15)—of the Thracians. In both cases the Trojans are reassured by discovering that religious rites in the alien lands are identical to their own. In the episode of Thrace, Virgil reinforces this identity with a replication in the verse itself. The phrase "sociique Penates" echoes the one three lines earlier: "cum sociisque natoque, penatibus et magnis dis" (12; "with my companions and son, and the Penates and the great gods"). A similar repetition occurs in Anchises' interpretation of the words of the Delian oracle. His description of Mount Ida on Crete—"mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae" (105; "where Mount Ida is, the cradle of our people")—is followed by a reference to the Phrygian Ida that overlooks Troy: "hinc Mater cultrix Cybeli Corybantiaque aera / Idaeumque nemus" (111–12; "hence came the Mother who inhabits Mount Cybelus, her Cory-

bantian cymbals, her Idaean grove"). Anchises is, in fact, saying that the Trojan Ida received its name from the Cretan mountain. But here, too, the repetition "Idaeus/Idaeumque" reflects the Trojans' attempt to repeat their past by finding its likeness in alien lands, a likeness that now extends beyond common religious practices to a dim physical resemblance between Crete and Troy. Anchises' application of the oracle to Crete suggests a desire for what is familiar and recognizable—landmarks from the old Troy—rather than a willingness to confront a new and unknown future.

Aeneas is himself easily drawn to this frame of mind. He asks the gods to preserve another Trojan Pergamum—"altera Troiae / Pergama" (86–87)—and names his Cretan settlement "Pergamum" (133), suggesting that it is a kind of reconstruction of the old city. As late as Book 5 he creates an "Ilium" and Troy (756) for his weary countrymen who elect to stay behind in Sicily. Most notoriously, he infuriates the love-stricken Dido in Book 4 by telling her that, did his destiny not call him to Italy and were he free to choose, he would—and at this point Dido and the reader certainly expect him to say that he would remain beside her in Carthage—instead return to rebuild Troy and a restored—"recidiva"—Pergamum (4.344). The regressive implications can be heard in the adjective.

But to live in the past is to inhabit a state of death, and death haunts the Trojans' first attempted settlements. At Thrace they begin to build a city, but end up building the tomb of Polydorus; the verb "condimus" in the final verse of the episode (68) transforms the activity of city founding into one of burial. The fertile realm that Anchises expects to find in Crete turns out instead to be a wasteland in the grip of plague (137–42).

If Anchises directs the Trojans to Crete at least partly because he conceives of Idaean Crete as both an earlier model and a present replica of Idaean Troy, his reading of the oracle at Delos anticipates the focal episode of Book 3, the visit to Buthrotum and its miniature, mimic Troy. Here Aeneas finds a "simulataque . . . Pergama" (349–50); this other Troy is a factitious copy, as false and empty as the tomb of Hector at which Andromache offers her sacrifice. This "tumulum" (303) also recalls the opening episode of Polydorus: here again, the nexus city/tomb describes a habitation of death. Moreover, a series of literary reminiscences links the episode at Epirus to Book 11 of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus consults the shades of Hades. Reliving a dead past, Buthrotum's scale-model Troy is a kind of underworld.

At Buthrotum Helenus makes a prophecy to Aeneas of the white sow he will see in Italy, marking the site of the Trojans' first city, Alba Longa, and the end of their journey. The scene and his words verbally recall the moment in the *Odyssey* where the shade of the prophet Tiresias, summoned up from Hades, tells Odysseus that the wanderings of his second voyage will end when he finds a traveler who mistakes his oar for a winnowing fan (*Odyssey* 11.126–31). The man ignorant of ships is the sign that Tiresias prom-

ises for Odysseus, "σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω μάλ' ἀριφραδές, οὐδέ σε λήσει" (126), a phrase that is repeated in Helenus's words, "signa tibi dicam" (388).⁹ The Homeric model is appropriate enough; with the sign of the sow, Helenus similarly predicts a restful end to the Trojans' wanderings. David Bright has pointed out, moreover, the proximity of Buthrotum to the site of the Thesprotian Oracle of the Dead at Cichyrus, which Pausanias (1.17.5) had proposed as Homer's model for the landscape of the *Odyssey's* underworld.¹⁰ Thus, while Virgil's principal imitation of the Homeric episode of the dead is in Book 6, here, through allusion, he presents a second, ironic version. And if Book 6 occupies the same relative position—just short of the midway point—in the larger *Aeneid* that the underworld episode occupies in the twenty-four book *Odyssey*, the visit to Buthrotum is placed in the same position in the *Aeneid's* Odyssean first half.

Beyond these verbal and structural parallels, the action of Virgil's episode contains further recollections of the underworld scene of the *Odyssey*. As he first arrives at Buthrotum, Aeneas encounters Andromache, who is performing a kind of necromancy, making sacrificial offerings and summoning the shade of Hector to his empty tomb (300–305). In her confusion at Aeneas's appearance, she seems to think that he may himself be a shade, coming in response to her invocation (310–12).¹¹ This initial meeting establishes the thematic argument of the Buthrotum episode: the dead Trojan past of Hector cannot be brought back to life; the Roman future of Aeneas has taken its place. The scene also evokes the situation of *Odyssey* 11, where Odysseus sacrifices and calls up the shades of the dead (23f.). But an ironic reversal of roles has taken place here. Andromache mistakes Aeneas for one of the shades she is trying to raise, but the Odyssean parallel suggests that it is she and Helenus who are, in fact, the dead shades with whom the living hero is to speak and consult.

Andromache begins to play the role of a shade in the *Odyssey* when she asks whether Ascanius is living and whether he is living up to the valorous examples of Aeneas and Hector (339–43). Her questions and her concern for the surviving child who carries on the family line recall the moments in *Odyssey* 11 when Agamemnon asks whether Orestes is still alive (458) and when Achilles inquires if Neoptolemus has grown up to be a warrior in the family mold (492–93). The pathetic situations are similar: the dead Homeric heroes and the past-obsessed Andromache inquire after offspring who embody their hopes in a future they cannot share. This similarity might appear to be merely coincidental had not Andromache only seven lines earlier described the fates of the same Orestes and Neoptolemus.

ast illum ereptae magno flammatus amore
coniugis et scelerum furiis agitatus Orestes
excipit incautum patriasque obtruncat ad aras.

(But Orestes, inflamed by his great love for his stolen bride and stirred by the furies of his crime, catches him [Neoptolemus] unawares and cuts him down at his father's altars.)

Both of these sons have come to bad ends. Orestes, himself pursued by the Furies of matricide, has killed Neoptolemus. The death of Neoptolemus at his father's altar may thus be understood not only as a kind of poetic justice for having cut down Polites before Priam's eyes in Book 2 (525–32), but also, in this context, as a final answer to the questions of Agamemnon and Achilles about their sons in the *Odyssey*.

The *Aeneid* thus repeats the *Odyssey's* own gesture toward the *Iliad*; by assigning the two heroes of the earlier poem to the underworld, the *Odyssey* clears the epic field for its own hero—while it improves on that gesture. Not only are Achilles and Agamemnon dead, but cut off, too, is the futurity of their heroic lineages for which the *Odyssey* had still allowed them to hope. Moreover, the visit to Buthrotum, haunted by the memory if not by the shade of Hector, reminds us of the end of another heroic line of the *Iliad*, this time on the Trojan side. It is Ascanius, not her own child, after whom Andromache asks, an Ascanius whom she sees as a kind of surrogate for Astyanax—"o mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago" (489)—thereby evoking the fate of a third hero's son. The mantle that she bestows upon Ascanius (484) parallels the gift of Neoptolemus's armor that Helenus makes to Aeneas (467–69): the heroic line of the *Aeneid* receives a double legacy from Hector and Achilles, the adversaries of the *Iliad*, whose heroism and lineage are now part of an extinguished past. The episode is one in a series of Virgil's melancholy variations on the theme of the death of a son and the end of a genealogical line that stand for the end of a whole people and civilization.¹² The demise of Homeric Greece and Troy in the first half of the *Aeneid* will be matched in its last six books by the extinction or absorption of the native peoples of Italy and by the deaths of the Etruscan Lausus, the Arcadian Pallas, and the Latin Turnus. All of these sons die, of course, so that Rome may live and take over their inheritances, a Rome to which the future belongs and whose empire is a new amalgam built out of the past civilizations that the processes of history have brought to expiration and left behind. (The question of Rome's own future is addressed by the prophesied death of one more son, Marcellus, at the middle of the poem (6.860–86), a death that raises questions about the imperial succession and the stability of Augustus's political achievement.)

After the deaths of sons described at Buthrotum and in the opening episode of Polydorus, Book 3 closes with the loss of the father, Anchises, and his replacement by Aeneas, who is called by the title of "pater" as he ends his narration (716). However wrenching the death of Anchises may be for Aeneas, it provides in its context a reassuring image of generational continuity: the Roman stock will succeed to a future where other heroic lines have

failed. And with its parade of replica Troys—each successively and more explicitly revealed to be a place of death—the fiction of Book 3 insists that this future can only be reached if the Trojans relinquish their past and its memories, if they can escape from a pattern of traumatic repetition. Anchises appears to embody that past, as the representative of an older generation too much part of a former Troy to begin anew. In Book 2, he stubbornly refuses to leave the fallen city (634f.), and, for all his surprising revitalization in Book 3, he still may be a deadweight for his son to shoulder: his misdirection of the Trojan expedition to Crete suggests the drag that the past can exert on Aeneas's historical mission. Anchises' death and the Trojans' first arrival in Italy complete the symbolic action of Book 3, which appears to accomplish both a physical and a psychological separation from the old Troy.

Once Anchises is dead, moreover, he increasingly becomes a source of aid and inspiration to Aeneas. He appears in dreams in Book 4 (351–53), urging his son to leave Dido's Carthage—still another, and the most insidious, version of a Troy doomed by history¹³—and again in Book 5 (722–40), when he directs the Trojans to set out from Sicily to Italy. The snake that emerges from Anchises' tomb in Book 5 (84–96) suggests his divinization, and in Book 6 he greets Aeneas as one of the elect of Elysium (744f.) and as the official spokesman for the glorious future of Rome.¹⁴

This transformation of Anchises from an emblem of the burden of the Trojan past to divine prophet and sponsor of the Roman future is hardly less surprising than his recovery between Books 2 and 3. This change might be explained in terms of the psychology of Aeneas: the dead father returns in idealized form to the hero as a kind of introjected superego. But, in fact, Anchises' transformation seems determined by the *Aeneid's* loose-fitting historical allegory in which he plays the role of Julius Caesar, the adoptive father of Augustus.¹⁵

Julius Caesar was a problem for the Augustan propagandists. While Augustus claimed power as Caesar's heir, he also claimed to restore the senatorial authority and republican rule that had been destroyed by the same Caesar, the fomenter of civil war—and in this respect an embarrassment and political liability for his son. Ronald Syme has described this contradiction in the party line.

Seeking to establish continuity with a legitimate government, Caesar's heir forswore the memory of Caesar: in the official conception, the Dictatorship and the Triumvirate were blotted from the record.¹⁶

As Syme points out, the *Aeneid* mentions the historical Caesar only once, without directly naming him, and then only in order to deplore his taking up the arms of civil war against the Pompeian defenders of the republic (6.834–35). But the deified Caesar whose temple was dedicated in 29 B.C., and from whom Octavian took his title as the "Divi filius"—or, in the words of the

Aeneid, "Augustus Caesar, Divi genus" (6.792)—appears at several moments in the poem (1.299; 6.790) as a kind of attribute of his adopted son, most notably, as we have seen, as the Julian comet shining above Augustus's head in the depiction of Actium (8.681) on Aeneas's shield.¹⁷ The career of the living Caesar is a scandal for Augustus and his poets, but the dead and apotheosized Caesar is a source of divine authorization and guidance to his heir.

There is an apparent correspondence between this ambivalent Caesar and the *Aeneid*'s portrait of Anchises. Like that Caesar, Anchises is in life a burden and a liability. After his death and deification—one sign of which appears during the funeral games in his honor in Book 5, when the arrow of Acestes bursts into flames like a comet (522–28)—Anchises becomes in Book 6 part of the mythological apparatus that sanctions the wars that Aeneas will fight in Italy and that authorizes Rome's future mission in history. This identification of Anchises and Caesar, moreover, reinforces the topical analogy between the wandering Trojans and Virgil's Roman contemporaries and spells out the present-day political implications of the Trojans' adverse attempts to repeat their past in the first half of the *Aeneid*, and in Book 3 in particular. Following the lead of Anchises, their regressive return to versions of Troy indicate the dangers of Rome's falling back into its calamitous past of Caesarism and civil war.

This past must be both buried and forgotten, and then reinvented in the "memory" of the present, in the double process that characterizes Anchises' career in the *Aeneid*. Throughout its propaganda, the Augustan regime sought to rewrite the history of its own rise to power, passing over in silence its origins in triumviral strife and discovering instead its earlier republican roots. As part of this propaganda, the *Aeneid* rewrites Roman history even more radically, placing the origins that legitimate Augustan rule farther and farther back in time, beyond history to prehistory. According to the poem's fiction, the future advent of Augustus is built into Aeneas's original founding of the Roman people—a link that is confirmed by Augustus's descent, through the *elder* Julian line, from the Trojan hero.¹⁸

The action of Book 3 may comment upon and even allegorize the *Aeneid*'s larger strategy. The oracle at Delos directs the Trojans to make their new start at the place of their hoary ancestral origins in Italy, to return to a past that has been all but forgotten. The *Aeneid*'s readers are transported back to Rome's first beginnings, to a similarly mythical past that the poem offers as the propagandistic foundation for the Augustan national program. The Trojans sail by and must reject versions of their recent past. Virgil leaves out of his poem recent events that the present regime would prefer to suppress while he presents analogues to those events set in a distant, legendary past. The immemorial past, like the virgin territory of Italy, has the advantage of being a virtual blank where the poet, guided by the Muse of memory, can

find whatever he wishes. Like the figure of Anchises that reveals the benefits that a mythological father can confer in place of a living one, the Trojans' journey back to their ancient homeland in Book 3 suggests the new sources of strength that the present can find in a past that it continually re-creates to serve its needs.

While the *Aeneid* offers its mythic fictions in place of historical memory, it also elevates the therapeutic effects of forgetting into one of its explicit themes. The Trojans' need to forget Troy and escape from a debilitating cycle of repetition in Book 3 is superseded at the end of the epic by the agreement reached by Jupiter and Juno (12.819–940), a passage to which we shall have occasion to return. By its terms, the Trojans and Latins will forget their differences and merge together until the very Trojan name will be no more.

occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia. (12.828)

(Troy has fallen; let her perish along with her name.)

The divine decree that Rome's Trojan origins will be lost in the processes of history raises some interesting questions about the *Aeneid*'s own account of Rome's earliest past; here, too, the poem may comment self-consciously on its own procedures and acknowledge the purely fictional status of its founding narrative.¹⁹ But the reconciliation of Latins and Trojans that the gods sanction also has unmistakable bearing upon the current political situation of Virgil's Rome. The old foes of the civil wars are similarly to be reconciled and to become one people again under Augustus; their former enmities and party allegiances are to be forgotten. Virgil's fiction may even represent a case of special pleading: the poet may have in mind an *amnesty*, a specific judicial act by which both the government and the former opponents and victims of the government agree to forget their mutual wrongs and grievances. Cicero had had such an amnesty enacted after the assassination of Julius Caesar, borrowing, as he was later to boast, a Greek word and the political wisdom of the Athenian democracy in order to restore the national peace (*Phil.* 1.1.1).

What is a political solution at the end of the *Aeneid* is revealed at the end of its first half to be a universal principle built into human existence itself. When, in the underworld of Book 6, Aeneas asks Anchises just why the souls of men would return to earth to live new lives after their experience of human suffering—Why, Aeneas asks, do they madly desire the light of day? (6.721)—his father responds with a famous disquisition on the transmigration of souls that draws attention away from his ultimate answer to the question: the returning souls have drunk from the river Lethe.

has omnis, ubi mille rotam uoluere per annos,
Lethaeum ad fluuium deus euocat agmine magno

scilicet immemores supera ut conuexa reuisant
rursus, et incipiant in corpora uelle reuerti.

(6.748–51)

(When these souls have rolled the wheel through a thousand years, the god summons them all in a great troop to the Lethean river in order, you see, that without any memory they may see again the vault of heaven and begin to desire to return to their bodies.)

When the souls have forgotten the past, they will wish to live in bodies once again. Forgetting is the prerequisite for the very continuity of the species, and the juxtaposition of the two moments of forgetting, each at the climax of its respective half of the *Aeneid*, suggests that the need for the survivors of the Trojan war and later of the poem's Italian wars—and for the survivors of Rome's own civil wars—to forget the tragic memories of their past is as deep-seated as life itself, part of the basic processes of the psyche. Both a fresh start in Italy under Aeneas and the national revival fostered by Augustus require the same collective act of oblivion that the souls undergo in order to be reborn.

This analogy may be extended further. The souls in the underworld roll on the wheel of time for a thousand years before they are led to the river Lethe. This circular turning—by which they are slowly cleansed of their former earthly existence—corresponds to, and may gloss, the circularity of the Trojans' Odyssean wanderings and the romance narrative form that this takes. The purgatorial process, which breaks the hold of the past upon the soul, assumes the same cyclical pattern as the Trojans' repeated doubling back to various versions of Troy that each time seems to return them to where they started. At the same time, this psychic analogy leaves open the question whether the succession of adventures the Trojans undergo in their romance wanderings may not constitute a cumulative process of purgation of their doomed past, rather than being merely the compulsive playing out over and over again of that past. The Trojans do, after all, finally reach their Italian destination in Book 6, where through the individual symbolic agency of Aeneas they experience death and are reborn. This symbolism carries over into the opening lines of Book 7 and the beginning of the second half of the poem with the death of Caieta, the old nurse of Aeneas. Their revisiting of their past in the first half of the poem may be read as a gradual exorcism of that past—as well as a form of debilitating regression, a regression that has its narrative counterpart in episodic romance digression. The Trojans may be thought of as taking two steps back for every three steps forward; their narrative is a kind of spiral. In this sense the traumatic repetition that constitutes the Odyssean romance narrative of Books 1–6 may already contain within it a “working-through” that points the way out of this

narrative to the teleological epic narrative of the second half of the poem. The escape from this repetition still hinges on a repression or forgetting of the past (of the Trojans' forgetting their past as losers), and the narrative process, whether the Trojans' wanderings or the underworld souls' wheeling through purgatorial time, merely acts out at length what is symbolized in the single draught from the waters of Lethe. It is only when the past has been successfully repressed—when it ceases to repeat itself in its former version—that it can be repeated *with a difference* in order to be reversed and undone. The Trojans now become winners, and so Augustan Rome is restored to national health after the years of internal strife. At this point the *Aeneid* moves from romance to epic.

Undoing the Past in *Aeneid* 12

The first indication that the Trojans' fortunes are undergoing a process of reversal, the process that becomes the dominant pattern of the second half of the *Aeneid*, is already found earlier in the poem and concerns gift horses. The Trojans, who ignored Laocoön's warning against Greeks bearing gifts (48–49) and received the fatal wooden horse into their city, now become gift givers themselves as they journey into new lands. The presents they offer in friendship to their hosts are hardly less fatal than the Trojan horse itself. In parallel scenes, Dido in Book 1 receives the veil of Helen and the scepter of Ilione (647–55), Latinus in Book 7, a libation bowl of Anchises and the scepter and robes of Priam (244–48). These Trojan spoils carry with them a kind of curse, and their new possessors are condemned to play out the tragic roles for which the costumes fit them. Their cities now become new versions of the fallen Troy: Carthage's walls seem to be on fire with the flames of Dido's pyre (5.3–4); Laurentium's walls are literally burnt down (12.574f.). (Evander, we learn in Book 8, had already received Trojan gifts from Anchises on the latter's earlier visit to Arcadia: the pair of golden bridles that he has passed on to Pallas [166–68] similarly mark out the young hero for destruction.)

What do the Trojans receive in return, as Homeric *xenia*, guest-gifts? Horses. Dido gives Ascanius the horse (571) that he parades in the funeral games of Book 5; Helenus gives Anchises and the Trojan expedition horses (470) in Book 3; Latinus gives three hundred horses (274–85) to Aeneas in exchange for Priam's finery in Book 7; Evander gives horses to Aeneas and his companions (551–53) as they set out to join the Etruscans in Book 8. The Trojans, of course, need horses, since they can have taken few along with them on their storm-tossed voyages. But they need them for waging war, as Anchises indicates in his interpretation of the omen of the four horses sighted from off the coast of Italy (3.537–43), and the emphasis on

cavalry fighting, particularly the light-horse combat involving Camilla in Book 11, is an intrusion of contemporary Roman battle tactics upon Homeric models of battle. There is an obvious irony when the Trojans are given horses—especially in the case of Latinus—that can be used in war against the giver. There is also an obvious reversal that the symbolic reciprocity in the gift exchange only underscores: the Trojans, victims of a gift horse, the most famous gift horse in history, now victimize others with their gifts while they become the beneficiaries of the gifts of horses.

The Trojans become winners by exchanging their past roles as losers with others. This is Virgil's poetic method in the second *Iliad*, the new Trojan war in Italy that takes up the last six books of the *Aeneid*. The scenario of the Italian war has already been prophesied by the Cumaean sibyl.

non Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra
defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
natus et ipse dea; nec Teucris addita Iuno
usquam aberit, cum tu supplex in rebus egenis
quas gentis Italum aut quas non oraueris urbes!
causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris
externique iterum thalami.
tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito,
qua tua te Fortuna sinet.

(6.88–96)

(You will find lacking neither a Simois, nor a Xanthus, nor a Greek camp: another Achilles has now been born in Latium, and he, too, the son of a goddess; nor will Juno anywhere be absent, pursuing the Trojans with hatred, while you, a suppliant in dire need, what peoples, what cities of Italy will you not beseech for aid! The cause of such great evil to the Trojans will again be a bride taken from foreign hosts, again an alien marriage. Do not give in to these hardships, but oppose them the more boldly, by means that your Fortune ordains you.)

"Iterum . . . iterum": the sibyl predicts that the Trojans will have to fight the Trojan War all over again. Thus, the second half of Virgil's epic, no less than the first, is shaped by repetition of the Trojans' tragic past. But the sibyl also predicts a change in their fortunes: it is a Trojan War that they will win. In a classic article on Virgil's second *Iliad*, W. S. Anderson demonstrated in detail how the Trojans thus play the parts of Homer's victorious Greeks while their own former roles are assumed by their defeated Italian foes.²⁰ If, in the first half of the poem, the Trojans actively sought to return to versions of Troy and consequently fell into a traumatic, obstructing repetition of their past history as losers, here, in the second half, the past seems to reappear unbidden—through Virgil's Homeric imitations—and the Iliadic war in Italy allows them to reexperience that past as winners and to move for-

ward to found the future Rome, history's big winner. The Trojans now reach their new beginning not simply by forgetting and repressing, but by reversing and "undoing" the past as they repeat it. And this kind of repetition-as-mastery does not thwart narrative progress by circling back on itself in the pattern of Odyssean romance; it rather describes a teleological epic narrative that moves linearly to its final goal of victory. This narrative "sense of an ending," moreover, has its counterpart in an imperial ideology that wished to close off past conflict by finally settling old scores—at the very same time that it claimed to cast them into healing oblivion. Augustus's mastery of Roman history has a deadly finality about it.

At first, however, it is not quite clear that the Trojans have turned the tables on their past as they fight their new *Iliad* in Latium. The sibyl had predicted the appearance of another Achilles, and, as Anderson points out, the Italian Turnus will first attempt to appropriate this role for himself.²¹ "hic etiam inuentum Priamo narrabis Achillem" (9.742; "you will bring word to Priam that here, too, an Achilles has been found"). So he taunts Pandarus in Book 9 before he kills him in his *aristeia* within the Trojan camp. Inside this camp, the Trojans once again play the roles of besieged defenders, and Turnus has earlier compared their earthworks to the walls of Troy (144–45); there, too, he compared himself to an Achilles who does not need the arms of Vulcan—"non armis mihi Volcani" (148)—to defeat the Trojans. Turnus is the victim of the irony of his own words, for in the preceding Book 8 the reader has just seen Aeneas receive his divine armor and shield from Vulcan and Venus and thus be confirmed in his identity as the new Achilles. Moreover, the Trojans' camp is just that, a camp, not a city, and it thus recalls not Troy but the Greek camp in the *Iliad*, the fortifications that protected the fleet of Agamemnon. Turnus has just unsuccessfully attempted to burn the Trojans' ships (69–122), and the action cast him in the role of Hector, who in *Iliad* 15–16 launched the counterattack that barely failed to destroy the Greek ships. And it is Hector whom Turnus will be doomed to play at the end of the *Aeneid*. Hector's exploits at Troy were only possible because of Achilles' withdrawal from battle, and it is similarly the absence of Aeneas—who is off seeking allies in Etruria—that permits Turnus and the Latins to hold the field in Book 9. When Aeneas reappears in Book 10, the tide of battle turns, and in Books 11 and 12 the site of the fighting shifts to before the walls of Laurentum. It is the Latins' own city that becomes the new Troy, besieged by Aeneas and his troops. Turnus now seems to concede that Aeneas is indeed the new and greater Achilles, Vulcanic armor and all.

ibo animis contra, uel magnum praestet Achillem
factaque Volcani manibus paria induat arma
ille licet.

(11.438–40)

(I will boldly face him, even if he excels great Achilles, and wears similar arms made by the hands of Vulcan.)

The initial uncertainty about who is playing what role in the new *Iliad*—what corresponds to the uncertainty of battle—is gradually dispelled by the playing out of the Italian war and by the movement from the first three to the last three books of the second half of the poem, which thus hinges in its middle upon Aeneas's return to battle in Book 10. The confusion created by Turnus's rhetoric, in fact, emphasizes the reversal that has taken place: Aeneas and his Trojans go from being besieged to being besiegers, Trojans to "Greeks," losers to winners.

There is a second important, but little-noted pattern of Iliadic repetition and reversal enacted at the very end of the *Aeneid*, in the final events of the duel between Aeneas and Turnus.²² It is a moment, however, that has been carefully prepared by the epic from its beginning in what is, I shall argue, the single, most extended network of Homeric allusion and perhaps the most significant symbolic nucleus in the poem. Anderson's study focused on the central characters of the *Iliad*, particularly Achilles and Hector, Menelaus and Paris, and the ways in which their roles are disputed between Aeneas and Turnus. But there was a minor player in Homer's epic, Aeneas himself, whose Iliadic career is remembered over and over again by the new poem that bears his name. And it is the way that this career is replayed in remarkably compressed form at the close of the *Aeneid* that measures the extent of the mastery that Aeneas—and the Trojans for whom this collective hero stands—have achieved over a past that they appear compulsively to repeat.

After the prolonged suspense of their combat—the loss and retrieval of Aeneas's spear and Turnus's sword, the flight of Turnus, the council of Jupiter and Juno, the apparition of the Dira, and Juturna's desertion of her brother—the two warriors face one another once again. Turnus makes the first move, his last offensive gesture in the poem.

nec plura effatus saxum circumspicit ingens,
saxum antiquum ingens, campo quod forte iacebat,
limes agro positus litem ut discernet aruis.
uix illum lecti bis sex ceruice subirent,
qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus;
ille manu raptum trepida torquebat in hostem
altior insurgens et cursu concitus heros.

(12.896–902)

(Having said no more, he looked around and saw a huge stone, a huge ancient stone, which happened to be lying on the plain, placed as a marker in the countryside in order to settle disputes over the boundaries of fields; scarcely could twice six chosen men raise it on their shoulders, men with such bodies as

the earth now produces: the hero hurriedly seized it and was throwing it at his foe, rising to his full height and running at full speed.)

The reader who comes to the *Aeneid* from the *Iliad* experiences a moment of *déjà vu*, one that Aeneas himself presumably shares. The scene recalls and echoes Aeneas's confrontation with the Greek hero Diomedes, the son of Tydeus, in the fifth book of the *Iliad*.

But Tydeus's son in his hand caught
up a stone, a huge thing which no two men could carry
such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it.
He threw, and caught Aeneas in the hip, in the place where the hip bone
turns inside the thigh, the place men call the cup socket.
It smashed the cup socket and broke the tendons both sides of it,
and the rugged stone tore the skin backward, so that the fighter
dropping to one knee stayed leaning on the ground with his heavy
hand, and a covering of black night came over both eyes.

(*Iliad* 5.302–10)

Virgil's hyperbolic imitation of Homer—the stone that no two men could carry in the *Iliad* is now too much for twelve—increases the heroic awe and perhaps the desperation of Turnus's last martial act. But the scene is recognizably the same: once again Aeneas is faced by a stone-throwing enemy, and both he and the reader hold their breath. Will history repeat itself? In the *Iliad* Aeneas was saved from the hands of Diomedes only through the intervention of Aphrodite and Apollo; the latter covered the wounded hero with a dark mist (5.345). The scene was earlier recalled by Juno at the council of the gods in Book 10, when she angrily counters Venus's pleadings on the Trojans' behalf.

tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium
proque uiro nebulam et uentos obtendere inanis.

(10.81–82)

(You were able to remove Aeneas from the hands of the Greeks and to present them with mist and empty air in place of the man.)

And Turnus himself alludes to this episode at the opening of Book 12, when he boasting seeks single combat with Aeneas to resolve the war.

longe illi dea mater erit, quae nube fugacem
feminea tegat et uanis sese occulat umbris.

(12.52–53)

(Far away will be his goddess mother to cover the fugitive in womanish guise with a cloud and to conceal herself in empty shadows.)

We should recall, too, that Diomedes is the hero who is conspicuous by his absence in the *Aeneid*. The envoy Venulus, sent out at the beginning of Book 8 (9–17) to summon Diomedes from his new city of Arpi in order to fight the Trojans a second time, returns empty-handed in Book 11 (225–95) with the discouraging news that the Greek hero has declined to come to the Italians' aid. Diomedes is himself haunted by the episode of *Iliad* 5, where he wounded Venus as she came to her son's aid—"et Veneris uiolau iulnere dextram" (277). The boasting Turnus thus proposes to take Diomedes' place in Book 12, and in one incident in the battle appears to be doing just that: at verses 346–61 he kills Eumedes, the son of Dolon whom, we are reminded (351), Diomedes had slain in the *Iliad* (10.454–57). The poem has thus carefully set the stage for Turnus's casting of the stone, but at the moment when he appears about to duplicate Diomedes' feat and bring Aeneas down once again, Turnus falls short.

sed neque currentem se nec cognoscit euntem
tollentemue manu saxumue immane mouentem;
genua labant, gelidus concreuit frigore sanguis.
tum lapis ipse uiri uacuum per inane uolutus
nec spatium euasit totum neque pertulit ictum.
ac uelut in somnis, oculos ubi languida pressit
nocte quies, nequiquam auidos extendere cursus
uelle uidemur et in mediis conatibus aegri
succidimus; non lingua ualet, non corpore notae
sufficiunt uires nec uox aut uerba sequuntur:
sic Turno, quacumque uiam uirtute petiuit,
successum dea dira negat.

(12.903–14)

(But he knows himself neither running, nor moving, nor as he raises his hands, nor when he is throwing the huge stone: his knees waver, and his blood congeals frozen with cold; his stone itself spins through the empty void, and it neither passed through all the intervening space nor brought the blow home. But as in dreams, when the languid repose of night weighs down upon the eyes, we seem to wish in vain to continue on eagerly running and, infirm, sink down in the midst of our efforts: our tongue is powerless, our usual strength does not imbue our body, neither voice nor words come out: so, to Turnus, by whatever powers he sought to win his way, the dire goddess denies success.)

Thwarted by the gods, Turnus cannot fill Diomedes' shoes, and the scene from *Iliad* 5 does not repeat itself. Aeneas instead enacts what seems to be a therapeutic reversal of his earlier victimization: this time he faces a stone-throwing Diomedes and defeats him. Moreover, when Aeneas subsequently wounds Turnus, the action and language recall his own wounding by Di-

omedes. Aeneas's flying spear is compared to stones—"saxa"—launched by a siege machine (921–22). The deliberately anachronistic simile balances the Homeric sense of modern distance from archaic heroism, expressed a few lines earlier; both the machine and the hero are able to do the stone throwing of many men, "such as men are now." The simile not only identifies Aeneas with future Roman power but suggests that it is *he* who will emerge as the new Diomedes when his weapon finds its mark.

per medium stridens transit femur. incidit ictus
ingens ad terram duplicato poplite Turnus.

(12.926–27)

(Whistling, it passes through the middle of the thigh. Struck down, huge Turnus falls to earth on bended knee.)

In the *Iliad* Diomedes struck Aeneas in the thigh, and the Trojan hero fell to one knee; the scene is repeated and echoed here.²³ Aeneas appears to undo his past defeat at Troy, inflicting it upon another. But this is just what is disturbing in the reciprocity that transforms repetition into mastery: if Turnus fails to become a new Diomedes, he succeeds in becoming a second Aeneas.

And, in fact, the stone-throwing Turnus is *already* assimilated with the Aeneas of the *Iliad*: from the moment that he casts the stone in vain and fails to ward off the onrushing Trojan hero. He recalls the Aeneas who in *Iliad* 20 similarly picked up a stone to defend himself.

Now Achilles

drew his tearing sword and swept in upon him
crying a terrible cry, but Aeneas now in his hand caught
up a stone, a huge thing which no two men could carry
such as men are now, but by himself he lightly hefted it.
And there Aeneas would have hit him with the stone as he swept in
on helm or shield, which would have fended the bitter death from him,
and Peleus' son would have closed with the sword and stripped the life from him
had not the shaker of the earth Poseidon sharply perceived all.

(Iliad 20.283–91)

The same Homeric formula used to describe Diomedes' combat with Aeneas recurs as Aeneas faces Achilles during the latter's great *aristeia*, the killing spree of *Iliad* 20–22 that climaxes with the death of Hector. Thus the Iliadic Aeneas could neither avoid the stone thrown by Diomedes nor bring down Achilles with a stone of his own. Once again, the gods intervene to save him; Poseidon puts a mist before Achilles' eyes and carries Aeneas off to the edge of the battlefield, safely out of range (318–39). The scene is a crucial one for the whole fiction of the *Aeneid*, for it is here that the god

asserts that Aeneas is fated to survive the war and preserve the race of Dardanos (303–8), the Homeric basis for the Aeneas legend itself. Virgil's Neptune recalls the episode in his conversation with Venus at the end of Book 5.

cum Troia Achilles

exanimata sequens impingeret agmina muris,
 milia multa daret leto, gemerentque repleti
 amnes nec reperire uiam atque euoluere posset
 in mare se Xanthus, Pelidae tunc ego forti
 congressum Aenean nec dis nec uiribus aquis
 nube caua rapui.

(5.804–10)

(When at Troy Achilles drove the terrified Trojan troops to their walls and sent many thousands to death, and the rivers, choked with bodies, groaned, nor could Xanthus find a way to roll its waters to the sea, then I stole away Aeneas in a hollow cloud, as he, with neither equal strength nor equal favor of the gods, was contending with the powerful son of Peleus.)

The poem has thus foreshadowed its replaying of Aeneas's encounter with Achilles in the same way that its various allusions prepared the reader for a new version of his combat with Diomedes. With astonishing artistry, Virgil combines the two Iliadic episodes almost simultaneously in the final duel between Aeneas and the stone-throwing Turnus. He puts together the two most extended appearances of Aeneas in the *Iliad*, passages that the *Iliad* itself links by the motif of the stone. In both, Aeneas is shown about to be defeated by stronger Greek warriors, but rescued by favoring gods. At the end of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas is allowed to reverse both scenes and play the roles of Diomedes and Achilles, victorious over an Aeneas now played by Turnus.

As Aeneas's two most important and nearly fatal enemies, moreover, Diomedes and Achilles are linked together from the very beginning of the *Aeneid*, from Aeneas's first despairing words as the storm of Juno and Aeolus strikes his ships.

o terque quaterque beati,

quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis
 contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis
 Tydide! mene Iliacis occumbere campis
 non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra,
 saeuus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens
 Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis
 scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uoluit!

(Oh, three and four times blessed were those who were fated to fall beneath the high walls of Troy before the eyes of their fathers! Oh Diomedes, strongest of the Greeks, that I had poured out my soul by your right hand and fallen on the fields of Ilium, where fierce Hector and huge Sarpedon lie beneath the spear of Achilles, where the Simois seizes and rolls beneath its waves so many shields, helmets, and bodies of mighty men!)

This famous speech imitates the outcries of Achilles in the *Iliad* (21.273–83) and Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (5.299–312) when both heroes are faced with a watery death. Achilles exclaims:

I wish now Hektor had killed me, the greatest man grown in this place
 A brave man would have been the slayer, as the slain was a brave man.

(*Iliad* 21.279–80)

Achilles imagines a death by his nemesis Hector. Aeneas, in a similar situation, thinks of the Diomedes who almost did kill him at Troy, and his thoughts turn immediately to Achilles as well, the Achilles from whom he had a no less narrow escape. Both Greek warriors are clearly on Aeneas's mind; they are the emblems of his traumatic victimization and powerlessness at Troy. Aeneas begins the epic by wishing that they had finished the job, and the trajectory that the *Aeneid* charts from its opening scene to the duel with Turnus at its end is to overcome this regressive death wish by restaging Aeneas's experience in the *Iliad* so that he can exorcise the demons of his past.

But from the first book to the close of the poem Aeneas and Diomedes keep returning as a pair, in what becomes an obsessive motif. In Book 1 Diomedes appears in the bas-reliefs on the temple of Juno in Dido's Carthage (1.471), amid scenes otherwise devoted to Achilles and his victims. At the end of the book, Dido is asking Aeneas about the Trojan War, first about the nature of Diomedes' horses, then about the size of Achilles.

nunc quales Diomedis equi, nunc quantus Achilles (1.752)

In Book 2 the Trojans are taken in and destroyed by the wiles of Sinon, they whom neither Diomedes nor Achilles could overthrow.

quos neque Tydides nec Larisaeus Achilles (2.197)

In Book 10 the doomed Liger tauntingly declares that in Italy Aeneas will find neither the horses of Diomedes nor the chariot of Achilles.

non Diomedis equos nec currum cernis Achilli (10.581)

In Book 11 Turnus responds to Drances by reminding the Italians that the Trojans have twice been defeated; he sarcastically urges the Myrmidons to

tremble now before the arms of Troy, and with them should tremble Diomedes and Achilles as well.

nunc et Tydides et Larisaeus Achilles²⁴ (11.404)

In Book 12, when the poem recalls the story of Dolon, the father of Eumedes, whom Diomedes killed as Turnus now kills the son, it also pointedly recalls that Dolon had dared to ask for the horses of Achilles as a reward for his spying upon the Greeks. Diomedes paid him in a different kind.

ausus Pelidae pretium sibi poscere currus;
illum Tydides alio pro talibus ausis
adfecit pretio nec equis aspirat Achilli.

(12.350–52)

Where the four preceding instances linked Diomedes and Achilles together in one line of verse, this last one sandwiches Diomedes between two verses in which the name of Achilles appears. This pairing of the two Greek heroes who were Aeneas's worst nightmares forms part of what now can be seen as a sustained verbal and symbolic chain running through the entire *Aeneid*. It gives the sensation of a textual tic, as if the poem experienced a repetition compulsion of its own.

The function of these insistent recollections of Aeneas's experience in the *Iliad* is to converge and focus attention upon the *Aeneid*'s final duel: upon the moment when Turnus casts the giant stone at the poem's hero. The double Homeric allusion creates a truly uncanny reading experience. In the one and the same motion of Turnus we see one episode of Aeneas's past history on the verge of repeating itself—only to turn into a reversal of another episode of that history. The moment of the overcoming of Aeneas's Trojan past comes at dizzying speed, and the reader cannot locate just when it takes place: just when his opponent Turnus exchanges Iliadic identities—from that of Diomedes, the successful wounder of Aeneas, to that of Aeneas, the failed assailant of Achilles. And Aeneas himself becomes both the new Achilles and—as he casts his own weapon—the new Diomedes as well. His assumption of the role of Achilles, claimed earlier in the poem by Turnus, is, of course, confirmed by the duel's primary Homeric model, Achilles' killing of Hector in *Iliad* 22. The simile of the dream that immediately follows the throwing of Turnus's stone (12.908–12) recalls *Iliad* 22.195–201, and assimilates Turnus once again with the victim Hector. But the *Aeneid* insists that Aeneas reenact and reverse not only Homer's central Trojan tragedy of Hector, but also his *own* failures at Troy before Diomedes and Achilles. His victory over Turnus is a vindication both for himself and for his defeated Trojan nation.

This vindication and the reciprocity of doing unto others what has been

done to oneself amount to a taking of vengeance upon the past. Freud describes in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* the child who masters his experience of powerlessness by repeating it in play.

As the child passes over from the passivity of the experience to the activity of the game, he hands on the disagreeable experience to one of his playmates and in this way revenges himself on a substitute.²⁵

The games of war and politics depicted by the *Aeneid* have more serious consequences. Revenge is, of course, a central Iliadic theme; Achilles' killing of Hector is a private act of vengeance for the death of Patroclus that also ensures the conquest of Troy: the city as well as the hero is mourned in the *Iliad*'s final lines. The *Aeneid* has its own version of this revenge plot in Aeneas's duty and desire to avenge Pallas: in the poem's final scene the sight of the baldric of Pallas on the fallen Turnus overcomes the inclination toward mercy that Aeneas momentarily shows for his enemy. But here, private vengeance seems secondary, almost tacked on to the historical plot of the poem, the conquest of Italy that leads to the foundation of Rome. Readers have often felt that Aeneas's feelings for Pallas cannot be compared to Achilles' grief for Patroclus.²⁶ But the conquest of Italy is itself presented, through the poem's pattern of Iliadic repetition, as the Trojan's reversal of, and (unconscious) vengeance for, the injuries of their past defeat. The theme of revenge is thus doubled in Virgil's second *Iliad*, and its imperative of revenge—to repeat the past in the name of retribution—speaks against the notion that the past can be forgotten so that the present can begin anew: the notion expressed in the Augustan ideology of a new national foundation that, we have seen, shapes the Odyssean first half of the *Aeneid*. That notion is enunciated again, only a few verses before Aeneas defeats and kills Turnus, in the settlement that Jupiter reaches with Juno.

The conference of Jupiter and Juno, in fact, represents an irruption into the Iliadic scenario of Book 12 of the sensibility and Odyssean models of the first half of the poem. Critics have noted Virgil's imitations of the dialogue of Zeus and Hera in Book 15.14–77 of the *Iliad*, where the king of the gods overcomes the obstructing designs of his wife, and of the exchange between Zeus and Athena that licenses her to seal the fate of Hector in *Iliad* 22.167–87.²⁷ One does expect Iliadic parallels in a book that so carefully plays itself off against *Iliad* 22. But the passage evokes another Homeric colloquy between Zeus and Athena, the one that ends the *Odyssey* (24.472–88).²⁸ Looking down at the civil strife that has arisen in Ithaca between Odysseus and the relatives of the slain suitors, Athena implores Zeus to intervene. Zeus sends her to earth to break up the fighting (529–32) and casts down his own thunderbolt to stop the raging Odysseus (539–40). But first he declares the terms of the future peace.

Now that noble Odysseus has punished the suitors, let them make their oaths of faith and friendship, and let him be king always; and let us make them forget the death of their brothers and sons, and let them be friends with each other, as in the time past, and let them have prosperity and peace in abundance.²⁹

(24.482–86)

The *Odyssey* ends with the reconciliation between warring sides, and it is such an act that Virgil's Jupiter ordains as a melding of Italian and Trojan identities into the future Roman people (12.834–40). The Odyssean model contains an act of forgetting—"ἐκλῆσιν" (24.485)—of burying the past. It also reinforces the sense that the fighting in the *Aeneid* between two peoples destined to live in eternal peace (12.504) is a form of civil war, and draws a topical analogy to the civil wars of Rome's recent history. The Odyssean *Aeneid* saw the Trojans escaping their past by a process of forgetting, and here this new intrusion of Odyssean elements into Virgil's second *Iliad* also indicates a policy of forget and forgive. The Augustan ideology that animated the first half of the poem—with its insistence on a new beginning and a fresh slate—can now be seen as an extension of the vaunted *clementia* of the new ruler. Augustus himself laconically claimed in his *Res Gestae* (1.3): "I spared all citizens who sought pardon."

He was, of course, lying. Victims of the proscriptions knew better, including Cicero, the proposer of an amnesty that never went into effect. And another cornerstone of Augustan propaganda as important as the promise of clemency was the call to revenge, specifically the obligation of *pietas*: Augustus's obligation to avenge the assassinated Julius Caesar, the same Caesar whose triumphal career his heir preferred to forget. Augustan poets celebrated the new *princeps* as the revenger—"ultor"—of his adoptive father, and Augustus's filial piety became a screen behind which to eliminate his enemies.³⁰

At the end, and as the climax of, the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid retells the story of Julius Caesar's death and apotheosis. Venus sees the assassination coming and thinks back on the trials of her Trojans and of the precious Julian line, beginning with her wounding by Diomedes at Troy (15.769). As the swords are drawn, she tries to shield Caesar by concealing him in a cloud, as Aeneas had once been rescued from Diomedes (803–5). But she is consoled by Jupiter, who tells her of the future feats of Augustus

qui nominis heres
inpositum feret unus onus caesique parentis
nos in bella suos fortissimus ultor habebit.
illius auspiciis obsessae moenia pacem
victa petent Mutinae, Pharsalia sentiet illum,
Emathique iterum maeffient caede Philippi,

et magnum Siculis nomen superabitur undis,
Romanique ducis coniunx Aegyptia taedae
non bene fisa cadet, frustra erit illa minata,
servitura suo Capitolia nostra Canopo.
quid tibi barbariem gentesque ab utroque iacentes
oceano numerem? quodcumque habitabile tellus
sustinet, huius erit: pontus quoque serviet illi!³¹

(15.819–31)

(who, heir to the name of Caesar, will bear alone the burden imposed on him, and as the most dauntless avenger of his father's murder will have us on his side in his wars. Under his command the defeated walls of besieged Mutina will sue for peace; Pharsalia will feel his presence, and Emathian Philippi will once again be soaked with blood; the great name of Pompey will be defeated in Sicilian waters, and the Egyptian consort of the Roman general, counting unwisely on her "marriage," will fall and in vain will she have threatened that our Capitol should serve her Canopus. Why should I enumerate to you barbarian lands and peoples lying on either side of the ocean? Whatever habitable land the earth supports will be his: even the sea will serve him.)

There is something peculiar about the way that this passage moves from the avenging of Julius Caesar to the prospect of world conquest. The reason is that while the wars against the assassins of Caesar and the surviving Pompeians may be justified by *pietas*, the struggle with Antony pitted two Caesarian factions against one another, each of whom could claim true heirship, Antony through the child Caesarion that Cleopatra had born to Julius. And so, following the same logic as the scene of Actium on the shield of Aeneas, this Roman civil war is transformed into a foreign war, a war against Cleopatra rather than Antony—although it, too, is nominally sanctioned by the duty of revenge.

Ovid is not above irony, and his narrator has earlier declared with a straight face that Caesar had to be killed and made into a god in order that his son would not be born of mortal seed (760–61). In addition to its flippancy, the passage forgets that Augustus was only the adopted son of the slain dictator. It is small wonder that Augustus sent the poet packing into exile.³² Here Ovid is having fun, particularly with the *Aeneid* and the whole apparatus of the Troy legend: the scene imitates the exchange between Venus and Jupiter in *Aeneid* 1. We may even read it as a kind of political gloss on the *Aeneid*'s reversal of the Trojans' fortunes at Troy, of which Aeneas's personal reversal of his defeat by Diomedes is an emblem. Here Diomedes is assimilated with the assassins of Caesar/political enemies of Augustus whose past successes against Venus and her Julian line will be reversed and revenged by the civil wars.

Even if Ovid's passage is sending up the party line, it demonstrates how

central to that official line was the cry for vengeance. Augustus built the temple of Mars Ultor in his new forum, as well as the temple to the Deified Julius in the old one. The idea of vengeance was represented in a third propagandistic building project, the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, dedicated in 28 B.C.—the temple where the emperor is depicted sitting in triumph on Aeneas's shield (8.720–22). Its porticoes were decorated with the statues of the fifty Danaids killing their bridegrooms.³³ This is the scene portrayed on the baldrick of Pallas (10.497–98), the sight of which produces Aeneas's final vindictive fury. The act of vengeance that concludes the poem thus seems to possess an imperial sanction.³⁴

In fact we can now see how the final choice of Aeneas—whether to spare or kill the suppliant Turnus—corresponds in little to the larger division of the *Aeneid* into its Odyssean and Iliadic halves, each informed by the alternative ideological messages of *clementia* and *pietas* sent out by the new regime. Clemency and revenge are both strategies for overcoming the past, the first by forgetting, the second by undoing; the first sees repetition of the past as regressive, the second sees in such repetition the possibility of mastery, and these negative and positive types of repetition produce the opposing romance and epic narratives of the two halves of the poem. They are matched at the very end of the *Aeneid* in the moment of Aeneas's hesitation over the defeated Turnus, with the possibility of clemency and reconciliation it contains, and in the welling up of memory and vengeance at the sight of the fatal baldrick. And the killing of Turnus is itself contrasted in Book 12 with the settlement reached shortly before by Juno and Jupiter to let bygones be bygones. The poem, like the regime, has it both ways, but in the process it discloses the contradictions in the regime's ideology: its promise to pardon and avenge at the same time.

And in the end, because it happens at the end of the poem, vengeance seems to win out. Yet Aeneas's revenge has been overdetermined from the beginning of the *Aeneid*, for he is the hero outstanding for his *pietas*—"insignem pietate" (1.10)—and it is in his final act that the full meaning is revealed of the virtue that links him with his descendant, Augustus. The entreating Turnus calls upon Aeneas to remember Anchises (9.33–34), and Alessandro Barchiesi has brilliantly studied how his words echo Priam's speech to Achilles in their sublime reconciliation scene in the last book of the *Iliad*.³⁵ We have seen how the first half of the *Aeneid* labored to get rid of the father, transforming Anchises as a figure of Julius Caesar from an emblem of the burden of the past into a divine source of strength, the blessed spirit of the underworld who famously instructs Aeneas to spare the defeated (6.853). But the evocation of filial piety in its second half may only bring the father back in the tragic role of a ghost crying for vengeance.³⁶

The conquering of *clementia* by *pietas* at the end of the poem, moreover,

follows the *narrative* sequence from its first to its second half. Within the poem's fiction and the psychological development it maps out for its hero and his people, this sequence may rationalize the contradiction in its double message. It describes a two-step process by which the Trojans may escape the hold of their past: they must first repress a compulsive repetition that returns them in the course of their wanderings to the scene and experience of their earlier loss; then, and only then, will they be able to repeat that experience therapeutically—if with no less compulsion—with a different outcome of victory. The Trojans' history, and the *Aeneid* itself, thus assume the shape of a teleological narrative in which the Trojans' past defeat can be treated as a closed chapter. But in the topical, ideological terms that inform the *Aeneid*, the same sequence suggests the supersession of a policy of clemency by one of revenge: the Augustan regime will put the past of civil war behind it not simply by (white)washing away its memory, but by settling accounts. The narrative logic of the epic thus seems to make inevitable its final moment: the killing of Turnus.

But will this revenge in fact be final, the last death demanded by a tragic past that Rome's history will now get over and go beyond? Augustus's pious revenge that claimed to put an end to the civil wars was itself a part and continuation of those wars. And in the killing of Turnus the *Aeneid* concludes with nothing less than *an image of civil war*, an ending that calls its own closure into question. For the repetition and reversal of Aeneas's Iliadic career in the final duel with Turnus not only constitutes the hero's personal revenge upon his own past, but it also makes the Turnus whom Aeneas defeats and kills a mirror image of Aeneas himself, the Aeneas who barely escaped Diomedes and Achilles at Troy.³⁷ This doubling effect is reinforced by Virgil's use of internal echoes. When Jupiter's fury assumes the shape of a bird of evil omen and beats its wings before Turnus's face, he is terrified.

illi membra nouis soluit formidine torpor,
arrectaeque horrore comae et uox faucibus haesit.

(12.867–68)

(An unwonted numbness unknits his limbs with fear, his hair stood up on end with horror and his voice stuck in his throat.)

The bristling hair and voicelessness are traits that the reader has learned to associate with Aeneas in the early books of the poem (2.773; 3.48; 4.280). The numbness slackening Turnus's limbs prefigures the chill of death that fills his body in the penultimate verse—"ast illi soluuntur frigore membra" (12.951)—a phrase that, with stunning poetic virtuosity, recalls the very first appearance of Aeneas in the poem—"extemplo Aeneae soluuntur frigore membra" (1.92)—during the opening storm episode.³⁸ Turnus has

completely assumed Aeneas's role as victim in the first half of the poem, and Aeneas thus kills his own double. A meliorative reading would see Aeneas overcoming a former self that he has now outgrown. But the scene is unmistakably one of civil war. No less than the fratricidal twins Romulus and Remus, this is a figure of Rome turning a sword upon herself in the act of foundation—"condit" (12.950). The burying of the hero's sword in Turnus's breast—"sub pectore" (950)—recalls Dido's self-inflicted wound (4.689), and this image may be equally suicidal.

In fact, the end of the *Aeneid* inverts the ideological project of the depiction of the battle of Actium on the shield of Aeneas—the project shared by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* 15—that transformed the civil war with Antony into a war of imperial, foreign conquest. Here the conquest of Italy by the Trojan foreign power contains a scenario of civil war. Like Cleopatra on the shield, the woman Dido represented the otherness of the foreigner in the first half of the poem, as it explored Rome's relationship with Carthage and the East. But Turnus, Aeneas's antagonist in the second half, possesses the same gender as the hero, and the war in Latium is one of like against like; the Trojans, in fact, enter into a preexisting conflict of Italians against Italians. The sequence of the poem here follows the progress of Rome's history: first the Punic Wars and her rise to world domination, then her fall into internecine strife. What might have seemed a straightforward teleological plot of epic conquest, where a historically destined Rome creates narrative and history by defeating an external enemy who embodies a demonic, nonnarratable repetition—the never-say-die Turnus who is inspired by the infernal Fury Allecto—can now also be read as Rome wrestling with her own inner demons, the demons of a national repetition compulsion.

For the collapse of difference in civil war also introduces an ambiguity into the pattern of repetition-as-reversal that is the other teleological principle of Virgil's second *Iliad*. This is the ambiguity that Brooks sees already inhabiting the nature of repetition itself: "We cannot say whether this is a return to or a return of"—whether it is progress or regress. Once Turnus and Aeneas become interchangeable—both Romans—Aeneas seems to be victimizing himself even as he undoes his former victimization. What can be seen in one light as a therapeutic narrative mastering a traumatic past is in another only the perpetuation of that past, a mere repetition that cannot be narrated. Augustus repeats the violence of civil war that he seeks to end. His revenge may be part of a larger cycle of reciprocity rather than a final settlement. Or it may be both at once.

In a famous passage of the *Annals* (1.8–10), Tacitus describes the funeral of Augustus and the verdicts delivered upon the career of the first emperor. Intelligent persons—"prudentes"—differed, he says, in their praise and criticism.

One opinion was as follows. Filial duty and a national emergency, in which there was no place for law-abiding conduct, had driven him to civil war—and this can be neither initiated nor maintained by decent methods.³⁹ (1.9)

If Augustus had no choice in his methods, the results had been nonetheless impressive.

The empire's frontiers were on the ocean, or distant rivers. Armies, provinces, fleets, the whole system was interrelated. Roman citizens were protected by the law. Provincials were decently treated. Rome itself had been lavishly beautified. Force had been sparingly used—merely to preserve peace for the majority. (1.9)

But Tacitus reports a counter opinion as well.

The opposite view went like this. Filial duty and national crisis had been merely pretexts ("obtentui"). In actual fact, the motive of Octavian, the future Augustus, was lust for power. . . . His judicial murders and land distributions were distasteful even to those who carried them out. True, Cassius and Brutus died because he had inherited a feud against them; nevertheless, personal enmities ought to be sacrificed to the public interest. . . . After that there had certainly been peace, but it was a bloodstained peace. (1.10)

And the passage goes on to list Augustus's most notable victims.

It is apparent that Tacitus adheres to the second opinion, politically realistic, if not downright cynical.⁴⁰ But it is the first opinion that is more interesting here, for it seems very close to the perspective of the *Aeneid*. It was impossible for Augustus to refound Rome except through the base instrument of civil war. The violence of war makes the two contending sides look alike; it brutalizes even those whose cause is just. But the end of the *Aeneid* goes beyond the idea that warfare confuses its combatants. It does not let Augustus off so easily, for this is a special kind of war, a civil war in which the two sides were indistinguishable in the first place: where, Tacitus remarks, to take up arms at all is unjust. Virgil's hopes in the Augustan settlement may have been real enough, hopes that one-man rule might put an end to warring faction and institute good government, that the new regime might make good its general promise to provide clemency despite local exceptions, that it would thus offer a departure and escape from the calamities of recent history; but the end of the *Aeneid* does not disguise the part that the regime played in that history, nor the possible continuity with that history of its present policies.

It is impossible, however, to know where the poet's own convictions leave off and where the party line begins. The political contradictions of the *Aeneid* are those of an ideology that preached both forgiveness and revenge, that repetition of the past is disaster, that repetition is a way to overcome

the past. The poem, in this sense, is never less than ideology. But this double ideology both plots out and unravels the narrative by which the *Aeneid*—and Augustus, too—would master and impose an ending on cyclical repetition. For the *princeps*, this is the cycle of retaliatory violence produced by civil war. The confusion of positive and negative repetition suggests that the poem's narrative of Roman foundation may collapse back upon itself as easily as it may achieve closure in a timeless imperial destiny, the empire without end. And thus the poem's progress from the Trojans' aimless, non-narratable wanderings of its little Odyssey to the teleological narrative of its second Iliad—its achievement of narrative itself—may be no progress at all. If we are to try to locate the poet behind the ideological terms that he negotiates into poetic form, we might say that to the extent that the *Aeneid* works toward and projects narrative completion, even as it calls the possibility of closure and narrative into question, Virgil seems to want to believe in the first opinion of Tacitus's *prudentes*; that questioning, however, contains a darker fear that their second opinion may be closer to the truth.

If that fear were to be confirmed, the *Aeneid* would look different; just how different may be seen in one of the first critical rewritings of the poem. Ovid's relationship to Virgil is rarely less than sardonic; his relationship to the Augustan regime earned him banishment. In Book 14 of the *Metamorphoses* he includes a version of the *Aeneid* itself in a miniaturized, literally belittling form. Here is his summary description of the war in Italy.

perstat, habetque deos pars utraque, quodque deorum est
instar, habent animos; nec iam dotalia regna,
nec sceptrum soceri, nec te, Lavinia virgo,
sed vicisse petunt deponendique pudore
bella gerunt, tandemque Venus victricia nati
arma videt, Turnusque cadit.

(14.568–73)

(the war goes on, and each side has its gods, and what is equivalent to gods, they had spirits filled with animosity; and now neither the dowry of a kingdom, nor the sceptre of a father-in-law, nor you, Lavinian maiden, do they seek, but only to have conquered, and they wage war on account of the shame of yielding, until at length Venus sees her son's arms victorious and Turnus fell.)

This is a worst-case scenario of the *Aeneid* and of the Roman history that it seeks symbolically to represent. The later Augustan poet depicts the epic struggle as a contest of sheer power and will. The divinely sanctioned historical plan of the *Aeneid* is meaningless, not only because both Trojans and Latins have gods on their side, but also because the gods—through an ironic version of the proverbial "*audentes deus ipse iuvat*" (*Met.* 10.586)—are interchangeable with the animosity of the warriors. The ostensible causes, just

or unjust, that might distinguish the belligerents are swept aside as the war progresses and is fought solely for the sake of domination. One cannot construct a narrative out of naked violence, and Ovid does not even try.

Palinurus and the Sacrifice of the Hero

When Aeneas appears to kill his alter ego in the duel with Turnus, the final scene of the epic also suggests the fate of heroic selfhood in the *Aeneid*. Virgil sings of arms and the man, but the man may not count for much: Aeneas himself may be reduced to one more piece of weaponry, the instrument of his historical destiny. What has been described as the hero's overcoming of his past identity—symbolized by the deaths of his wife and father at the endings of Books 2 and 3, respectively—is given an *ethical* construction by the poem as a process of self-sacrifice whose leading instance is the hero's renunciation of his love for Dido, the Dido who dies at the end of Book 4. The two forms of self-abnegation are as continuous as this formal pattern suggests them to be: the lost past persists into the present as memory, and present desire is an attempt to recover past losses; Dido and Carthage are another version of Troy. Aeneas is not allowed to transfer affective ties except to a collective Roman future; he is asked to give up the ties that constitute individual personality and will. The result is the lackluster, depersonalized hero for which readers have praised and (mostly) blamed Virgil, a hero stolid to the point of passivity—especially when Aeneas is compared to his Homeric prototypes, the passionate and willful characters of Odysseus and Achilles.⁴¹ But individuality and selfhood may be beside the point so long as Aeneas has history on his side. The *Aeneid* thus redefines the epic hero, whose heroic virtue now consists in the sacrifice of his own independent will—a will independent from his national mission. It makes a virtue of historical necessity.

The *Aeneid* doubles its themes so that the imperative to escape the past is also the demand for the sacrifice of the individual. Here, too, it conforms closely to the prevailing ideological climate. The past that must be put behind in the poem refers topically to Rome's disastrous recent past of civil wars: and this had been an age of great individuals. After years of strife dominated by mighty warlords, Virgil's fellow Romans might have agreed with Brecht's dictum that a great man is a national calamity. The Augustan regime in any event declared an end to this personal style of politics. Syme describes its new moral program.

It was not merely the vices of the *principes* that barred them from recognition. Their virtues had been pernicious. Pompeius's pursuit of *gloria*, Caesar's jealous cult of his *dignitas* and his *magnitudo animi*, the candour and chivalry of

Antonius—all these qualities had to be eradicated from the *principes* of the New State. If anything remained in the Commonwealth, it was to be monopolized by the Princeps, along with *clementia*. The governing class was left with the satisfaction of the less decorative virtues: if it lacked them, it must learn them.⁴²

Where all power converged on the emperor, the supporting cast became faceless. Yet Augustus, too, projected a propagandistic image of selflessness. Not only did his clemency forbear personal enmities, but Augustus had publicly relinquished all power in 27 B.C. to the Roman Senate and People, and was ostensibly but the first among equals. The emperor set an example for others. Responsibility for the common good was to outweigh, though it could not dispense with, the cultivation of individual honor that was the traditional goal of Roman political life. There was to be little room, however, for great personalities and for the factions that might grow up around them. The suppression of a politically suspect individuality was thus fitted into an ethos of self-sacrifice. And in the *Aeneid* this ethos becomes heroic.

The *Aeneid* explicitly takes up the idea of sacrifice in the celebrated episode of the helmsman Palinurus, the single individual whom Neptune demands in sacrifice to ensure the arrival of Aeneas's fleet at its Italian destination. Placed at the end of Book 5, the death of Palinurus is thus the fourth in the series of deaths—following those of Creusa, Anchises, and Dido—that have stripped Aeneas of personal ties and identity, and it stands, I shall argue, for the sacrifice that Aeneas, in his role as leader of the Trojan mission, must make of his own individuality, even of his heroic agency in the poem. The self-sacrificing heroism of the *Aeneid* is defined in marked contrast to the model of the *Odyssey* and its individualistic hero, a model that Virgil's episode inverts and rejects. The random wanderings of Odyssean romance—which finally come to an end for Aeneas when he and his ships reach Italy at the beginning of Book 6—can thus characterize an errant individuality that the epic plot must overcome, just as it overcomes the Trojans' obsessive repetition of their past. Here, then, is another dimension of the *Aeneid*'s narrative opposition between epic and romance. As it distinguishes the experience of Iliadic victors and Odyssean losers, this opposition places the individual with the losers, for it is individuality—whether on the winning or losing side—that loses out in the larger epic scheme of Roman history. There is a further analogy to this opposition, in the Palinurus episode and elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, in the poem's use of the vocabulary of Fate and Fortune. The epic of the new imperial order places individuality in the domain of chance, at odds with the national plan that is preordained by destiny: as individual, even the poem's hero is expendable.

Just how little Aeneas may count in the historical scheme of things is revealed by Venus. The goddess is the hero's mother and special patron. Yet

when the war in Italy seems to go against the Trojans in Book 9, she is ready with a fallback plan in which Aeneas will have no part. So she pleads at the divine council at the beginning of Book 10:

liceat dimittere ab armis
incolumem Ascanium, liceat superesse nepotem.
Aeneas sane ignotis iactetur in undis
et, quamcumque uiam dederit Fortuna, sequatur:
hunc tegere et dirae ualeam subducere pugnae.
est Amathus, est celsa mihi Paphus atque Cythera
Idaliaeque domus: positus inglorius armis
exigat hic aeuum. magna dicione iubeto
Karthago premat Ausoniam: nihil urbibus inde
obstabit Tyriis. quid pestem euadere belli
iuiuit et Argolicos medium fugisse per ignis,
totque maris uastaeque exhausta pericula terrae,
dum Latium Teucris recidiuaque Pergama quaerunt?
non satius, cineres patriae insedissem supremos
atque solum quo Troia fuit? Xanthum et Simoenta
redde, oro, miseris iterumque reuoluere casus
da, pater, Iliacos Teucris.

(10.46–62)

(Let it be lawful for me to remove Ascanius safely from the clash of arms, let my grandson survive. Let Aeneas be tossed upon unknown seas, and let him follow whatever path Fortune will give him: let me avail to shield and withdraw Ascanius from the dire combat. I possess Amathus, lofty Paphus and Cythera, and the Idalian precinct: here, having put aside arms, let him live out his days inglorious. Bid Carthage in her great power to press down Ausonia: no opposition to the Punic cities will arise from Italy. What has it availed to have escaped the plague of war and to have fled through the midst of Greek fires, to have exhausted all the dangers of the sea and of desolate lands, while the Trojans seek Latium and a rebuilt Pergamum? Would it not have been more than enough to have settled on the last ashes of their country and on the soil where Troy once was? I beseech you, father, give back to the wretched Trojans the Xanthus and Simois and let them again repeat the lot of Troy.)

Venus's initial willingness to abandon Aeneas to Fortune and to the chance of the waves and winds is balanced by her final urging that the Trojans be brought back to Troy. In the poem's terms, these are identical fates: her speech spells out the equation that the first half of the *Aeneid* had made between the wanderings of the Trojans in the uncharted realm ("ignotis . . . undis") of Odyssean romance and a regressive ("recidiuaque Pergamaque"), circular ("reuoluere") repetition of their past. For Ascanius she requests a

third alternative that, at first glance, is no less generically identified with romance. At the end of Book 1, Venus had substituted Cupid for Ascanius on the lap of Dido and carried away the sleeping boy for one night to her flowery Idalian grove (1.691–94). Now she is prepared to keep Ascanius permanently in her shrine, where he will lead an undoubtedly pleasant, but inglorious life. We are reminded of the choice that Achilles has in the *Iliad* to return to Phthia and live to a ripe old age in obscurity (9.414–16). We are also reminded of the pleasure gardens of Calypso and Circe that detain Odysseus and that are the models that lie behind Dido's Carthage. The temptation to forsake epic glory in order to dwell in a *locus amoenus*, a venereal garden of love, will become in the epic tradition that follows Virgil the romance alternative par excellence.⁴³

But Venus's special pleading for Ascanius has its ulterior motive that belies her apparent attempt to isolate him from history. Ascanius-Iulus is the founder of the Julian line, the line of Augustus. Despite Venus's earlier disclaiming of empire (42), it is this Roman imperial future that the goddess is determined to safeguard. Venus knows that this future is destined by Fate—she has been told so by Jupiter back in Book 1—and her whole speech, with its specter of a historically victorious Carthage, is not to be taken altogether seriously; she is trying to sway opinion at the divine council. But Venus reveals her priorities nonetheless. The future Rome is to be founded with Aeneas or without him. As long as Ascanius survives unharmed, she is content to leave her son to the mercy of Fortune and the sea—"quamcumque uiam dederit Fortuna, sequatur."

Venus's words recall those of Palinurus when he and the Trojan fleet are caught in the storm that rises at the opening of Book 5:

superat quoniam Fortuna, sequamur,
quoque uocat, uertamus iter.
(5.22–23)

(Since Fortune prevails, let us follow, and where she calls let us turn our course.)

The figure of Palinurus frames Book 5, and this turning before the storm of Fortune at its beginning will correspond at its end with his death, the random death of one for many arranged by Venus and Neptune (779–815). Palinurus confers during the storm with Aeneas, who agrees with the helmsman's decision to let the ships run off course before the winds toward Sicily (17–31); after Palinurus is swept overboard, Aeneas takes his place at the helm and laments the pilot's death (867–71).

Palinurus is, in fact, a surrogate for Aeneas in the hero's capacity as leader, as head of the ship of state. The episode of his death is the *Aeneid's* symbolic substitution for that complete sacrifice of the hero that Venus will later

offer to make for the sake of Ascanius and the Roman future. Palinurus is the logical—if apparently fortuitous—choice for sacrificial victim once Neptune agrees to guarantee the Trojan fleet's arrival in Italy. The helmsman becomes expendable. And, in fact, the opening storm has already shown his ineffectiveness. In contrast to the smooth sailing of divine purpose, the attempts of human beings to guide and control their destiny ultimately yield to Fortune and the wayward play of chance. And this may be Aeneas's situation as well as that of his pilot.

The episode of Palinurus has long posed an interpretative crux because of the discrepancies between the poem's third-person narration of his death at the end of Book 5 (835f.) and the first-person account that his shade itself gives to Aeneas in the underworld in Book 6 (337–83). Critics have viewed these discrepancies as evidence of the unfinished state of the *Aeneid* at Virgil's death.⁴⁴ In Book 5 Palinurus rejects the invitation of the god of sleep to rest from his vigilant labors; the god makes him drowsy by sprinkling the dew of Lethe upon his head, and casts him into the waters that Neptune has calmed. As he falls, Palinurus tears away the helm and stern with him. Aeneas takes over the drifting ship and, ironically, laments over what he takes to be an accident—"casu" (869). He complains that Palinurus had been too trusting in the sea and sky (870), whereas the pilot had resolutely refused to trust in the monstrous deep (849). But in Book 6 Aeneas asks Palinurus what god had been responsible for his death, and it is the helmsman who describes what happened to him as an accident: by chance—"forte" (349)—the helm was torn away by the rough seas, and the loyal helmsman was dragged along with it. After three nights clinging to the rudder on the stormy waters, Palinurus on the fourth dawn reached Italy, where the hostile inhabitants killed him. This story does not fit the time scheme of the poem, for only one day appears to go by between the death of Palinurus at the end of Book 5 and the visit to the underworld in Book 6.

Some of the discrepancies in the two versions of the episode—particularly those involving the perspectives of Aeneas and Palinurus—can be taken to be deliberate and not the product of changed plans that the poet did not live to revise and make consistent. Part of the pathos of the helmsman's story consists in the inability of mortals to perceive the workings of the gods upon them, in the story's own wavering between the sacrificial design of Neptune and the naturalistic explanation that Palinurus, for all his vigilance, fell asleep and was washed overboard: between divine plot and sheer accident. This uncertainty already suggests an opposition between Fate and Fortune: the course of destiny is experienced by human beings as chance contingency—the very randomness that casts on Palinurus the lot of sacrificial victim. Furthermore, many—though not all—of the discrepancies introduced in Book 6 can be explained as efforts to bring the episode closer to the Odyssean model that it both imitates and inverts.

The meeting with Palinurus in the underworld, where the helmsman complains that he has been left unburied and cannot enter the realm of the dead, has been rightly seen as an imitation of Odysseus's meeting with the unburied shade of Elpenor in the *Odyssey's* underworld scene (11.51–63); Elpenor had fallen to his death from Circe's roof at the end of the preceding book (10.551–60) of Homer's epic. In each case the hero meets a companion who does not survive the trip and who is in need of burial. But the resemblance does not appear to go much farther: the slow-witted, drunken Elpenor—whose death really is an accident—is hardly at all like the responsible steersman of Aeneas's fleet. And exclusive attention to this Odyssean model has obscured a more significant pattern of imitation of the *Odyssey* that runs through and structures the entire story of Palinurus.

We should remember that Odysseus, too, loses his pilot.

And at the stern of the ship the mast pole
crashed down on the steersman's head and pounded to pieces
all the bones of his head, so that he like a diver
dropped from the high deck, and the proud life left his bones there.
Zeus with thunder and lightning together crashed on our vessel,
and struck by the thunderbolt of Zeus, she spun in a circle,
and all was full of brimstone. My men were thrown in the water,
and bobbing like sea crows they were washed away on the running
waves all around the black ship, and the god took away their homecoming.
But I went on my way through the vessel, to where the high seas
had worked the keel free out of the hull, and the bare keel floated
on the swell, which had broken the mast off at the keel; yet
still there was a backstay made out of oxhide fastened
to it. With this I lashed together both keel and mast, then
rode the two of them, while the deadly stormwinds carried me.

(12.411–25)

This is the storm of *Odyssey* 12 that not only kills the steersman of Odysseus's ship, but his entire crew as well, guilty as they are of eating the cattle of Helios. It is placed in the same position in the *Odyssey* that the episode of Palinurus occupies in the *Aeneid*: the last trial by sea that the poem narrates before the hero reaches his destination. For in the next book the Phaeacians bring Odysseus to Ithaca in their magic ship (*Od.* 13.70f.), while he falls asleep: "the sweetest kind of sleep with no wakening, most like / death" (13.80–81). This final Odyssean storm, moreover, has been recalled at the opening of Book 5 in the storm before which Palinurus turns his sails.

ut pelagus tenuere rates nec iam amplius ulla
occurrit tellus, maria undique et undique caelum,

olli caeruleus supra caput astitit imber,
noctem hiememque ferens, et inhorruit unda tenebris.
ipse gubernator puppi Palinurus ab alta:
"heu! quianam tanti cinxerunt aethera nimbi?
quidue, pater Neptune, paras?"

(5.8–14)

(As the ships reached the deep and no land at all is any longer in sight, but sea and sky on all sides, then there loomed a blue raincloud overhead, bearing night and storm, and the waves grew dark beneath its shadows. The helmsman Palinurus himself cries from the lofty stern: "Alas! Why have so many clouds encircled the heavens? What are you preparing, Father Neptune?")

The passage is clearly modeled upon and virtually translates the rising of the storm of *Odyssey* 12.

But after we had left the island and there was no more
land in sight, but only the sky and sea, then Kronian
Zeus drew on a blue-black cloud, and settled it over
the hollow ship, and the open sea was darkened beneath it.

(12.403–6)

Book 5 thus evokes twice—at its beginning and end, and around the figure of Palinurus—the storm that wrecks the ship of Odysseus. The storm that opens the book, moreover, looks back to the great storm that inaugurates the action of the *Aeneid* in Book 1; the two tempests frame the Carthage episode. Here, too, Aeneas lost a helmsman, Orontes, shaken headlong from his ship (1.113–16), who, like Palinurus, seems to be the only casualty—"unus abest" (584). To make the analogy clear, Virgil has the same Orontes show up among the unburied shades in the underworld of Book 6 in the four verses immediately preceding the appearance of Palinurus (333–36).⁴⁵ Aeneas and his companions are thus *twice* saved from storms that threaten them with the fate of Odysseus's men, and in both cases a helmsman dies. But although in Book 1 the pilot Orontes is a victim of the storm—like Odysseus's own steersman in *Odyssey* 12—Book 5 emphasizes the sacrificial substitution that is taking place by splitting off the death of Palinurus into a separate episode at the book's end.

This substitution is also a carefully patterned inversion. For while his helmsman and crew died, Odysseus survived by clinging to his ship's broken mast: in the *Aeneid* Neptune demands one death for the larger collectivity—"unum pro multis dabitur caput" (815)—and he calms the sea instead of stirring it up. It is only in Palinurus's own account in Book 6 that the *Odyssey's* storm scenario is reinvoked, although again with inversion. Pali-

nurus clings to the broken rudder and after three nights and four days at sea reaches Italy (6.355–57). It takes Odysseus longer to reach land after he escapes from Charybdis.

From there I was carried along nine days, and on the tenth night
the gods brought me to the island Ogygia, home of Kalypso.

(12.447–48)

Virgil reverses night and day in the Homeric formula. Palinurus arrives at dawn in Italy, his destination, but there, ironically, he is killed; Odysseus arrives at night at the island of Calypso, as far from Ithaca as possible, but he survives. Nonetheless, by describing Palinurus's ordeal at sea holding on to a piece of the broken ship, Virgil, in the second, discrepant version of Palinurus's death in Book 6, brings his story into closer alignment with *Odyssey* 12. The contrast with the version told at the end of Book 5 further underscores the ways in which the episode turns its Odyssean model inside out.

The polemical relationship of the Palinurus episode to the *Odyssey* concerns the rugged individualism of the Homeric poem. Odysseus survives while his crewmen die. Just as in the episode of the sirens that opens *Odyssey* 12, where Odysseus alone may hear the sirens' song while his men stop up their ears—an episode fleetingly recalled by Virgil at the end of Book 5 (864–66)—the hero's companions are so many supernumerary, supporting players. And even when Odysseus returns to Ithaca to recover his kingship, he is pitted against the rest of the island—the suitors whom he kills and their relatives who seek revenge. As leader, Odysseus is fatal to his countrymen, but his antagonism with his community is just what defines the hero as individual. His individuality is not distinct from individualism: Odysseus is out for himself, and all others are expendable.

The reverse is true in the *Aeneid*. It is the collectivity of the Trojan remnant and the future Roman nation who count. They confer identity upon the hero as their leader and representative, and it is their survival for which he is responsible. The duties of leadership also preclude for Aeneas the other great model of Homeric individualism, that of Achilles, the chief warrior at odds with his commander and the rest of his army—although, interestingly enough, the Aeneas of the *Iliad* is on one occasion depicted as just such a sulking malingering hero,

at the uttermost edge of battle
standing, since he was forever angry with brilliant Priam
because great as he was he did him no honour among his people.

(II. 13.459–61)

Homer suggests that Aeneas is a Trojan version of Achilles, angered by Priam as Achilles is angered by Agamemnon. But by the time of the *Aeneid* Priam and his ruling house are gone, and Aeneas has taken their place: he moves from periphery to controlling center of the action. His individualistic role of single combatant merges, to the point of being submerged, with the corporate role of king (1.544) and commander in chief. This emphasis on what Thomas M. Greene has called the “deliberative” as opposed to the “executive” function of epic heroism defines the communal, national ethos of the *Aeneid*.⁴⁶ It also has a basis in Roman warfare that—as distinct from archaic Homeric battle—brought into prominence the general, the leader and tactician, rather than the individual warrior. The model of Roman heroism described by the *Aeneid* is the *general*, in both senses of the word: leader and collectivity.

The sacrifice of Palinurus, of the individual for the community, defines this heroism in opposition to the Homeric ethos that individuates the hero at the expense of others. It is now clear why the surrogate figure of Palinurus is necessary. The logic of the *Aeneid*'s inversion of the model of the *Odyssey*, where the hero lives while the companions die, would require the death of its own hero. The “death” of Aeneas can instead be performed symbolically through that of his helmsman, and Palinurus's account of his fate in Book 6 indicates that this death is a figure of the self-sacrifice that the hero undergoes for his followers. Even as he was tossed upon the stormy waves, Palinurus declares, his thoughts turned not to himself but to his imperiled ship (351–54).

The Palinurus episode follows Aeneas's own major act of self-sacrifice, his parting from Dido in Book 4, and it precedes and overlaps with his visit to the underworld in Book 6, another symbolic death of the self where the hero is also incorporated with his Roman descendants. As a bridge between these two key moments in the hero's career, the sacrificial death of the loyal pilot suggests the peculiarly political and social dimension of Aeneas's heroic self-denial: his renunciation of his love for Dido is part of a larger surrender of personality and will demanded of the leader for the sake of community and nation. In fact, once he is identified with the community he leads—and with its future Roman destiny—the actions of Aeneas as individual may seem relatively unimportant. For if he was compelled to forsake his Carthaginian love affair because it went against the predetermined plan of Fate, neither is he permitted to do much to carry that plan forward. Neither he nor Palinurus were able to steer the Trojan fleet to Italy through the storm that opens Book 5, and when, at the book's close, Aeneas takes the place of the lost pilot and guides the ship—“rexit in undis” (868)—he is, as Michael Putnam has pointed out, steering a rudderless vessel.⁴⁷ It is Neptune who brings the fleet to Italy. The hero's individual agency is illusory, at

best greatly diminished, even when he appears to promote his destiny. Thus the sacrifice of individuality that Aeneas makes as leader paradoxically includes his leadership initiative: he goes with the flow of a historical necessity that will not allow him independent action, either positive or negative. What is left is endurance, and the passivity that readers have found objectionable in Virgil's hero. He sits at a useless helm at the end of Book 5; in Book 10 (156–59) he is initially placed beside the *figurehead* of his ship.

The heroic individuality and agency that Aeneas gives up are associated with Fortune: the Fortune whose call Palinurus must finally allow the storm-tossed Trojan fleet to follow, the Fortune that Venus would permit to give a wandering course to Aeneas and his companions. The *Aeneid* doubles the motif of Fortune's guidance and, in both cases, links it to the epic loser. The ship at the mercy of the winds of chance—the virtual emblem of Odyssean romance—is the vessel of the defeated Cleopatra fleeing from Actium on the shield of Aeneas and of the defeated Trojans themselves as they wander through the Mediterranean in the first half of the poem. At the same time, the two great losers of the *Aeneid* will see their lives shaped by Fortune. Turnus echoes Palinurus's speech as he goes to his final showdown with Aeneas:

iam iam fata, soror, superant, absiste morari;
quo deus et quo dura uocat Fortuna sequamur.

(12.676–77)

(Now, sister, now Fate conquers; cease to delay; where the god and where harsh Fortune call, let us follow.)

And Dido's last great pronouncement shares the same vocabulary, anticipating Venus's words:

uixi, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi. (4.653)

(I have lived, and completed the course which Fortune gave.)

The enemies of Aeneas and Rome are condemned to a purely chance existence. By resisting the course of Roman destiny, they fall out of history itself, like the past-obsessed Helenus and Andromache to whom Aeneas bids farewell as he leaves them behind in their miniature Troy at Buthrotum.

uiuete felices, quibus est fortuna peracta
iam sua: nos alia ex aliis in fata uocamur.

(3.493–94)

(Live happy, you whose fortune is now completed; we are called from one fate to another.)

Dido's subsequent echo of this passage—"Fortuna peregi"—suggests how she, too, as the representative of Carthage—the city that, even as it is being built, is doomed to fall—suffers the fate of historical supersession. Once the epic losers are denied a futurity in the history written by the victor, they have no coherent or meaningful story of their own, and their lives are prey to Fortune. The buried maritime figures in the words of Turnus and Dido make these lives into individual odysseys, the romance wanderings that epic assigns to the defeated as the deviant alternative to its plot of historical destiny. The *Aeneid* here already suggests the link between Fortune and romance that we shall see developed in later epic. But the Palinurus episode has also shown that the hero Aeneas *as individual* may be in the same figurative boat—a shipwrecked Odyssean boat, prey to Fortune—as the poem's losers, no less than they a victim of his epic destiny.

The imperative of that destiny is spelled out to Aeneas by the seer Nautes in Book 5, just before the episode of the sacrifice of Palinurus begins.

nate dea, quo fata trahunt retrahuntque sequamur;
quidquid erit, superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est.

(5.709–10)

(Son of a goddess, where Fate drags us and drags us back, let us follow; whatever will be, all fortune is to be overcome by bearing its burden.)

This passage, too, echoes and is meant to be read in relation to the others I have cited. Aeneas, too, must follow the force that pulls him back and forth—but this force is not Fortune, but Fate; similarly, Aeneas tells Andromache and Helenus whose fortunes are played out that he is called from one fate to the next. While Turnus acknowledges that Fate has prevailed—"fata, soror, superant"—Nautes encourages Aeneas to prevail over Fortune by endurance. The language of this adage is, of course, Stoic; it is hard not to compare it with the celebrated dictum of the philosopher Cleanthes that Seneca (*Ep.* 107.11) translates: "ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt" ("Fate leads the willing, drags the unwilling along"). But Stoic, too, is the language of Dido and Turnus; Seneca would cite with admiration her dying words about completing the course of Fortune.⁴⁸ In Stoic vocabulary, Fate and Fortune are notoriously hard to tell apart: Lucan will deliberately confuse the two, in no small part in reaction to Virgilian usage. For while we can see that Virgil himself plays with the tendency of the two terms to slide into one another, he nevertheless makes a distinction: Fortune denotes short-term contingency as opposed to the historical long run that is Fate.⁴⁹ History's losers only have the short term and must make the most of it. Their fortunes become personalized, allowing for the assertion of selfhood and the willfulness that make Dido and Turnus the most vivid characters in the poem.

The victors' lives can be seen in the larger teleological perspective of Fate, in which they individually count for much less. In this perspective, as Nautes' maxim suggests, Fortune takes the form of immediate vicissitudes—one damned thing after another, Aeneas may feel. The knowledge that he is fulfilling the plan of destiny thus may not bring much consolation to Aeneas, for he is still subject to outrageous Fortune—and to a Fate that, described in a plural form as dragging back and forth or going from one to another, seems to have lost any visible teleological drive. Again, Aeneas's experience as individual caught in history does not seem very different from that of the poem's losers who are driven by Fortune; and they, at least, indulge in personality and will. But, as Nautes tells Aeneas, it is precisely the hero's passivity, his simply bearing up, that allows him to withstand Fortune: the prospect of a fated future permits him to roll with present punches, to exercise a self-effacing *virtus* that may be the virtue of self-sacrifice itself.

This is the gist of Aeneas's famous words of farewell to Ascanius as he sets out for battle in Book 12:

disce, puer, uirtutem ex me uerumque laborem,
fortunam ex aliis.

(12.435–36)

(Learn, my boy, virtue and true labor from me, fortune from others.)

"Some guys have all the luck," Aeneas seems to say bitterly, "I've only had hardship and hard work." Earlier in Book 10, when Jupiter leaves the battle between the Trojans and Italians open to Fate (113), "labor" had been directly opposed to "fortuna"—"sui cuique exorsa laborem / fortuna ferent" (111–12)—and given the sense of "misfortune": some will prosper and some will suffer in the fighting. It retains something of that former connotation in Aeneas's words, but it also indicates his heroic endurance. This, he tells Ascanius, is the true work of *virtus*. Hardship builds character—if not individual, literary character—and that, in turn, builds empire. The fortune, perhaps unearned, that others enjoy—with its alluring, but deadly individualism—is just what Aeneas and Rome must give up and resist in order to reach the national greatness promised by Fate.

This disavowal of fortune may contain a polemic against recent history: the warlords of the late Roman republic associated themselves with the goddess Fortuna. Both Sulla and Pompey styled themselves as "felix"—"lucky"—and Sulla rebuilt and refurbished the great temple of Fortuna at Praeneste. Caesar crossed the Rubicon declaring that the dice had been cast.⁵⁰ We are brought back to the ideological context discussed at the beginning of this section, to the Augustan state's distrust of great individuals and their propensity to faction and civil strife. Whether it is specifically

topical or not, the politically repressive nature of the *Aeneid*'s either/or of Fate and Fortune is sufficiently clear. Allegiance to a destiny vested in nation and state requires an overcoming of fortune: of those chance human differences that constitute the individual. The hero of the *Aeneid* may not act by or for himself unless he also acts for the community.

The second half of the epic, through the subplot of Pallas that imitates Achilles and Patroclus, may try to give Aeneas a personal stake in the war against the Latins. But even as the hero's anger wells up and he plunges his sword into Turnus, his words curiously distance him from his deed.

tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripare mihi? Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.

(12.947–49)

(Are you, clad in the spoils of my own, to be seized from me? Pallas, Pallas immolates you with this wound and exacts satisfaction from your guilty blood.)

The shifting of agency, not once but twice, to the dead Pallas and the language of religious sacrifice and legal punishment make the taking of private revenge ("meorum . . . mihi") indistinguishable from the impersonal, public act.⁵¹ Once again, we cannot tell whether Aeneas has a will of his own.

The problem of the hero's volition, however, admits more than one construction. For if we are inclined to read this uncertainty about individual agency and will as a reflection of the *effects* of a repressive political order, we should remember that it was also an enabling fiction of that order: Augustus exercised personal rule by working through the senate and institutions of legitimate government to which he claimed to have given up all power. This suggests still another, quite different reading of the end of the *Aeneid*: private vengeance cloaking itself in legality, an act of judicial murder. Tasso, in the age of the Counter-reformation, may have committed no anachronism when he looked back and justified the killing of Turnus in terms of a Machiavellian "ragion di stato."⁵²

For the subsequent literary tradition to which Tasso belonged, the *Aeneid* would decisively reshape the epic hero. Virgil's politicization of epic for the ends of empire demanded a curbing of the Homeric heroic will, and the flatness and passivity of Aeneas became the virtuous traits of other hero-leaders of the imperial epic: of Tasso's own Goffredo and Camões' Vasco da Gama. As opposed to the wandering Odysseus and the rebellious Achilles, the hero of empire became an executive type who places duty over individual desire, the goals of history over the present moment. The reaches of political power would thus extend not merely over space and time, but over the inner man. Heroic identity in this perspective seems a matter of chance, and in the epic struggle between imperial destiny and Fortune, even this

residue of individuality becomes contested ground. For the poets of lost political causes, a Lucan or a Milton, this inner realm of identity is indeed the last line where a successful resistance can be waged. But even the heroes of their anti-Virgilian poems—the stoic Cato of the *Pharsalia* or the sacrificial Jesus of *Paradise Regained*—maintain their freedom from external power by practicing a repression that seems no less austere than the discipline that power seeks to exert upon them.