'Dido in the light of history'

A paper read to the Virgil Society, November, 1973,
by Dr. N. Horsfall, M.A.

Inhumana crudelitas, perfidia plus quam Punica, nihil veri, nihil sancti, nullus deum metus, nullum ius iurandum, nulla religio (Liv.xxi.4.9). That, of course, is Livy on Hannibal, and though Romans *did* admire Hannibal for his generalship and achievements (de Jong, *Mnem.* 1928, 186ff.), Livy's charges are repeated by his contemporaries both against Hannibal himself and against the Carthaginians in general.[1] Three wars had left an ineradicable legacy of fear and hate; Seneca writes of the *timor qui Hannibale post Cannas moenia circumsidente lectoris percurrit animos (de ira* ii.5.2), and Horace of Hannibal as *parentibus abominatus (Epodes* 16.8): his very name was a bogey to be averted by Roman parents (Horsfall, *Philol.* 1973, 138). Twice, no, probably three times (H.*Od* iii.6.36, iv.4.42, and ? ii.12.2) Horace calls Hannibal *dirus,* and the adjective is noted by Quintilian as a peculiarly appropriate epithet (viii.2.9). There are two main charges: Cathaginian cruelty – from the *barbarus tortor* awaiting Regulus (H.*Od.*iii.5.49f.; cf. Cic.*Off.* i.39, *Sen.*75) to Hannibal himself, whom *propter crudelitatem semper haec civitas oderit* (Cic.*Am* 28; cf. *Off.*i.38, *Sen.*75, VM.ix.2.2); and Carthaginian perfidy – the ironic and proverbial *fides Punica* (Otto, *Sprichwörter,* 291), familiar from Plautus' *Poenulus* (113, 1125; cf. fr.33W) on, exemplified again by Hannibal, whom Cicero calls *callidus (Off.*i.108; cf. i.38 *Poeni foedifragi)* and Horace *perfidus (Od* iv. 4.49; cf. iii.5.33). The *incendia Karthaginis impiae (Od.*iv.8.17) were her just deserts, and the behaviour of Regulus a *documentum fidei* developed in deliberate ideological contrast (Sen.*Dial* i.3.9, Gell.vi.18). And one might add Carthaginian wealth, luxury, and arrogance – Horace writes of the *superbas invidae Karthaginis arces (Epod* 7.5f.; cf. *Od* ii.2.10f.) and the theme may be illustrated from the historians and Virgil alike. Time and again Horace returns to Carthage's threat to Rome – the climax of his list of Rome's perils in *Epode* 16 (3ff.) – and to Rome's slow bloody elimination of that threat: her victories symbolised the martial virtues of earlier generations: *non his iuventus orta parentibus infecit aequor sanguine Punico (Od.*iii.6.33ff.; cf. *Epod* 7.5f.); they were a worthy theme for epic commemoration *(Od.*ii.12.2f., iv.8.16f.); the Metaurus could still be claimed as a turning-point in the defeat of Hannibal to the undying glory of the Claudii Nerones *(Od.*iv.4.37ff.) and only Octavian's own victory at Actium could rival the younger Scipio's achievement in destroying Carthage in 146 *(Epod.*9.25). Yet Horace's obsession with the Punic peril is surpassed by Virgil's.

It has been noticed (e.g. by Brisson l.c.) that neither in Jupiter's great prophecy, nor on Aeneas' shield is there any allusion to Rome's conflict with Carthage. But these are not significant silences: Jupiter predicts universal rule for Rome: *imperium sine fine dedi* (i.279); that assumes the defeat of all Rome's enemies, and the selection of Greece – rather than Carthage – for mention is aimed at consoling Venus for the defeat of Troy by the Greeks; to describe the naval victories of the Aegates Islands or Ecnomus, Zama, or the burning of Carthage on the Shield would have been to duplicate the historical allusions of the Parade of Heroes – something which Virgil is at pains to avoid doing (cf. J.G. Griffith,

PVS 1967-8, 54ff.): Anchises points out to Aeneas Regulus – that is Serranus (844), the *duo fulmina belli Scipiadas cladem Libyae* (842f.), Quintus Fabius Maximus *unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem* (846), and the victories (858) of M. Claudius Marcellus, five times consul during the second Punic war. Nor is that by any means all: for Virgil, Carthage is *studiis asperrima belli* (i.14), and the omen of a horse's head discovered at her foundation portended that she would be *bello egregiam et victu facilem per saecula gentem* (i.444; cf. Buchheit, *Gymn.* 1964, 429ff.). To Dido's curse, invoking the vengeance of Hannibal upon Rome I shall return (iv.622ff.). In its solemn declaration of hostilities a Roman reader could well have seen prefigured Hannibal's famous vow, made at the age of nine, that *cum primum posset, hostem fore populo Romano* (Liv.xxi.1.4; cf. Pease on iv.425ff.) Jupiter predicts that there will come a proper time (x.11ff.) for battle, hatred, strife, and rapine *cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim exitium magnum atque Alpes immittet apertas,* to which Venus' response in ironic submission is that Jupiter may as well bid Carthage crush Ausonia *magna dicione;* from that quarter there will be no opposition to the Tyrian cities (53ff.): a wish which Virgil's readers knew came all too near fulfilment. There is also an elaborate typological anticipation of Hannibal's descent on Rome to be found in Virgil's narrative of Turnus' attack on the Trojan camp in bk. ix. Rather more clearly, Juno's acquiescence in the plan of destiny (xii.816ff.) is meant to convey an allusion to the ritual of placating Juno practised in 207, during the second Punic war, as Servius on xii. 841 observes. This was an occasion of great *literary* moment too: Livius Andronicus composed a *carmen* for it, and Ennius apparently commemorated the ritual in the *Annales: placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis.* [2] Virgil, finally, looks forward to the defeat of Carthage in 146: as Eduard Fraenkel pointed out *(Glotta* 1954, 157f.), Dido's offer to Ilioneus at i.573 is ambiguous: *urbem quam statuo vestra est* can mean not only the obvious "is at your service" but also, quite legitimately, "is yours – i.e. in your hands or possession" – the inevitable and familiar outcome of generations of hostility induced by Dido's curse. The effect of Dido's suicide brings Carthage's fall more sharply to our notice, for the lamentation throughout the city as Fama spreads the news is *non aliter quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis Karthago aut antiqua Tyros flammaeque furentes culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum* (iv.669ff.) – a passage which we perhaps recall when Aeneas, bound for Sicily, looks back at Carthage and sees the walls aglow with flames (v.3f.).

But the place in the *Aeneid* assigned to relations between Rome and Carthage is far more important than this rapid survey of historical allusions might suggest: when Virgil asks the Muse *quo numine laeso quidve dolens* Juno has driven Aeneas, for all his piety, to suffer so (i 8ff.), the answer is twofold, in historical terms and in mythological the link is ingeniously wrought at i.23f. *id metuens* – summarising the historical explanation which stands first and prominent – *veterisque memor Saturnia belli prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis* – but I shall be only incidentally concerned with Juno's mythological *gravamina,* however legitimate. Argive Hera's hostility to Troy was a truth handed down from Homer; Juno's connexions with Rome's great enemies, Veii, Falerii and Carthage – where she was identified with Tanit (Pease on iv.91) were matters of history. There was in ancient times a city – of Tyrian foundation, rich and warlike – explains Virgil, *Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe ostia* (i.13f.): the sharp juxtaposition of *Karthago* and *Italiam,* and the ambiguity of *contra* – geographically "facing", and historically "against" underline the importance *for the epic* of Rome's *actual* hostility towards Carthage. This

city Juno loved even more than Argos, second only, indeed, to Samos: *hoc regnum dea gentibus esse, si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque.* But against this love expressed in expansionist political ambitions, and military success, for this was where (1.16f.) Juno kept her chariot and arms, and against Carthage's intended sway over the nations, Juno had heard that a race of Trojan descent was arising *Tyrias olim quae verteret arces:* from this stock *populum late regem belloque superbum venturum excidio Libyae; sic volvere Parcas.* Unmistakably, in the prooemium, we are confronted with the Punic wars: Romans *bello superbi* face Carthage *studiis asperrima belli;* a Roman empire *late regem* confronts Juno's ambitions for Carthage, *regnum..gentibus esse.* Her plans are qualified by *si qua fata sinant;* Rome's eventual destruction of Carthage is confirmed by *sic volvere Parcas.* Juno's struggle to ensure that *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* is from the very first characterised as a struggle against the fated order of things, against the destinies of Aeneas and Rome. She knows she cannot keep Aeneas from Italy – *quippe vetor fatis* (i.39), but her attempts to do so, notwithstanding, are massively symbolic of Rome's historic struggles towards empire.

Juno's anger against Troy and fear for Carthage drive her to unleash Aeolus against Aeneas, revealing her as the enemy of all order – of the order through which Aeolus rules the madly-raging winds (i.51ff.), and Neptune controls the mad, swirling Ocean (107, 127, 141f.), of the ordered calm with which Aeneas comforts his people and reminds them of their glorious future (205ff.), of the order which Jupiter imposes on the universe (255), and of the order which Augustus will impose upon a world long harried by *furor impius* (291ff.). The political implications of the storm which Juno raises are confirmed by the famous simile of i.148ff., where Neptune's calming of the waves is compared to a riotous mob, inspired by *furor,* falling silent at the sight of a statesman *pietate gravem ac meritis.* Virgil has in mind both internal and external aspects of Rome's struggles towards greatness and stability: the simile and the conventional symbolic correspondence of the storm with internal strife point one way, the explanation of Juno's hostility in terms of the historic opposition of Rome and Carthage the other. But the essentially immoral and disorderly character of Juno's support for Carthage, fundamentally opposed to Troy, Aeneas, Jupiter, Italy, Rome and Fate is left unambiguous and clearly drawn at the moment of Aeneas' arrival on Carthaginian territory: Venus reiterates to Jupiter that Juno's opposition is keeping the Trojans not merely from Italy (i.250f.), but also from their historical destiny, for Jupiter had already promised that the Trojans would have descendants *qui mare, qui terras omnis dicione tenerent* (236). Jupiter's response, anticipating the reconciliation scene in xii which I have already mentioned is that *aspera Iuno..consilia in melius referet mecumque fovebit Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam* (279ff.): national pride balances international dominion. This promise stands between the undertaking *imperium sine fine dedi* and the assurance that a time will come when Trojan stock will reconquer Greece: that is to say, as Servius on i.281 suggests, that Juno's reconciliation in 207 B.C. is a necessary prelude to the defeat of Carthage, the first great obstacle to *imperium sine fine* encountered by Rome overseas and to the great wave of foreign conquests she undertook in the sixty years after the second Punic war – including, of course, *Pthiam clarasque Mycenas.*

But that is all in the future. Here and now, the second great threat to his mission that Aeneas faces – Dido – closely recalls the first – the storm – in respect of Juno's intervention, of the role of *furor*, and of the anticipation of Rome's historical struggles. Upon the first two elements of parallelism I shall only touch: it is fear of what Juno may intend in the circumstances of Aeneas remaining at Carthage that drives Venus to fire Dido with love for Aeneas (i.661ff.; cf.iv.96f.); it is Juno, goddess of marriage, to whom, above all, the love-struck Dido prays (iv.59); it is Juno who proposes to Venus a joint Trojan-Carthaginian people – which will have the effect of keeping the Trojans from Italy (102ff., 105f.); it is Juno who pretends that she will get Jupiter to approve this proposal (115); it is Juno who watches over the scene in the cave (166). And under this patronage Dido is struck with *furor*, with an explicitly and violently irrational passion for Aeneas (iv.65; cf. 101, 298ff., 465ff., etc.). This combination of Juno and madness recurs again in the burning of the ships in v , in the Allecto-scenes in vii. and in the burning of the ships in ix.: each time it stands opposed to Aeneas and Rome. Thus in terms of theology and psychology, as well as historically, the reader is alerted to Dido's function as a dark and terrible threat to Rome's future greatness.

When we read at i.297ff. that Jupiter sends Mercury to ensure *ut terrae utque novae pateant Karthaginis arces hospitio Teucris, ne fati nescia Dido finibus arceret,* we cannot but recall Virgil's powerful initial development of the historical theme of hostility between Rome and Carthage. Is there not something badly wrong, unnatural and out of character here? Is a relationship of *hospitium* between Rome's ancestors and the Cathaginians really credible or tolerable in the long run? And that scepticism and hesitation are the correct reaction is confirmed by the effect of Mercury's arrival: *ponuntque ferocia Poeni corda volente deo; in primis regina quietum accipit in Teucros animum mentemque benignam* (303ff) – that is to say, *ferocia* would be their natural reaction to the Trojans, and *benignitas* – is what Mercury's presence secures. Ilioneus' experience is illuminating: he complains (525) that the natives have tried to fire his ships and as he gains in confidence bursts out: *quod genus hoc hominum, quaeve hunc tam barbara morem permittit patria? hospitio prohibemur harenae; bella cient primaque vetant consistere terra* (539ff) That would appear typically brutish Punic behaviour; – but when Ilioneus protests that he has not come to plunder the penates of Libya or to carry off stolen booty to the shore (526f.) we know that his descendants in 204 and 146 will do just that. Dido protests that circumstances force her to a hostile reaction (563-4); she offers her help – or *voltis et his mecum pariter considere regnis? urbem quam statuo vestra est; subducite navis; Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur* (572ff.). Juno makes a similar proposal to Venus at the beginning of iv. to which I shall come shortly. Dido's offer has political advantages for her in terms of protection against Tyre and the Nomades (iv.320f., 535f.) and is normally described as kind and generous. But I wonder whether that would have been quite a Roman's reaction: it is, after all, in direct conflict with what has already been said in the poem of relations between Carthage and Rome and with the Roman historical experience. We should remember that only Mercury's intervention prevented the premature outbreak of the first Punic war. And looking ahead, we recognise that the final outcome of Dido's proffered *hospitium* is her curse: *litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas imprecor, arma armis; pugnent ipsique nepotesque* (iv.628f.). But there, in *nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto* (624) and in Jupiter's description of the Carthaginians as a

gens inimica (iv.235) we recognise a ring of historical truth, which is more than can be said of Dido's offer in i. The same goes for Aeneas' ingenuous response to Dido's offer to Ilioneus (which he had heard from within his cloud): *semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt, quae me cumque vocant terrae* (609f.): how could Roman feelings stay favourable towards the foundress of Carthage? In the Underworld, Aeneas' feelings of love for Dido remain unaltered (vi.455), but she goes off to rejoin Sychaeus, her first husband, returning decisively to her Phoenician origins, and rejecting any link between Carthage and Rome. In passing, I would observe that in the Underworld we are strongly reminded once again of the national, political, if you prefer, character of the threat which Dido presented to Aeneas by the phrasing of Anchises' remark to Aeneas: *quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent* Not "Dido" or "the queen" or "Libya", but the *Libyae regna,* the *regna* which Juno intended should hold sway over the nations (i.18).

To return to Bk. i: Venus at least is not deceived by Dido's friendliness and plans to send Cupid to fire Dido with love for Aeneas: *quippe domum timet ambiguam Tyriosque bilinguis; urit atrox Iuno et sub noctem cura recursat* (661f.); she makes her fears even more explicit when addressing Cupid (671f.): *nunc Phoenissa tenet Dido blandisque moratur vocibus; et vereor quo se Iunonia vertant hospitia; haud tanto cessabit cardine rerum* In just what sense, we must ask, are Dido's *hospitia* to be described as *Iunonia* here? This hospitality rests, of course, upon Jupiter's instructions to Mercury but it is "inspired by Juno" in as much as it is hospitality from Juno's city, hospitality which must be seen in terms of Juno's plans for Carthage against Rome, hospitality which must turn out to reflect its true origins and character. Venus must use tricks – *doli* (673) – to ensure that Dido *ne quo se numine mutet* (674). *Ambiguam, bilinguis, mutet* all hint at the characteristic conception of *Punica fides,* and the importance of this conception becomes clearer if we look on to iv.: there Juno says to Venus *nec me adeo fallit veritam te moenia nostra suspectas habuisse domos Karthaginis altae* 96f.): Juno is quite right: Venus' attitude of wary concern has not changed since i.670ff. and her anticipation of Junonian or Punic treachery is immediately justified: for Juno suggests that since Dido is now in love with Aeneas thanks to Venus, they may as well – recalling Dido's offer to Ilioneus – bring about *pacem aeternam pactosque hymenaeos* – a joint people with a Trojan ruler. We recall Virgil's emphasis on the fundamental opposition of Rome and Carthage and share in Venus' tepid response: would Jupiter want there to be a joint people? *sensit enim simulata mente locutam quo regnum Italiae Libycas averteret oras* (iv.105f.). Such an alliance would mean an end to conflict, but an end to Rome too. Contrast the alliance between Trojans and Italians agreed by Jupiter and Juno in xii: that is in accordance with destiny, a true fusion of compatible peoples with a glorious future; just as we may also contrast the Trojans' dark and lowering anchorage on the African coast (i.162ff.) with their sunny, bright and pleasant arrival at the Tiber mouth in vii(25ff.). No reader aware from the first of Aeneas' Italian destiny and the opposition of Carthage to that destiny can anticipate anything but tragedy as the outcome of Dido's love and *hospitium.* A formal, though perhaps unnatural relationship of *hospitium* has – as we have seen – been established between Trojans and Carthaginians (cf. i.299, 540, 731, 753, iv.10, 51, 323), and Dido's reaction against this solemn pledge, however justifiably outraged we may feel her to have been by Aeneas' actions, is no better than a Roman would expect of a *Punica* and her *fides:* Mercury warns Aeneas (560ff.) that Dido will set fire to his fleet if dawn finds him

still at Carthage and this warning is confirmed by Dido's waking reactions (592ff.): *non arma expedient totaque ex urbe sequentur diripientque rates navalibus? ite, ferte citi flammas.* Her charges of *dissimulatio* and *perfidia* against Aeneas (iv.305f.) do not carry great weight. Her own *perfidia* intended against an *hospes* aside, she lapses from *fides* in deceiving old Barce to get her away from the pyre (632ff.), and in deceiving Anna when planning her suicide (476-7; cf. 500, 675, 679). But these are minor peccadilloes in comparison with *non servata fides cineri promissa Sychaeo* (552), as she says herself. Her vows to remain *univira,* loyal to Sychaeus' memory, were unambiguous (i.720, iv.15ff.) and her breach of them shocking to herself and to a Roman, more familiar than us with the moral and religious status of the *univira.*[3] Virgil mixes sympathy for her moral lapse with censure; that a breach of *fides* is involved is ironically fitting for the first queen of Carthage.

It is a commonplace to say that Dido and Aeneas would have fallen in love anyway, even without divine intervention: they are portrayed as resembling each other, but the apparent similarities between them are rich in historical ambiguities and ironic undertones, Dido claims (i.630) that *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco* because *me quoque per multos similis fortuna labores iactatam hac demum voluit consistere terra* (i.628ff.). But has their fortune been really and essentially *similis?* Granted that they are both leaders of a group of involuntary exiles, trying to found a new city, that both have recently lost a well-loved spouse, that the death of Sychaeus *ante aras* (i.349) is reminiscent of that of Priam, and that the vision of Sychaeus warning Dido to leave Tyre is reminiscent of Hector warning Aeneas to leave Troy, the differences are every bit as striking as the similarities: Dido has to leave Tyre because of the characteristically Punic impiety and treachery of Pygmalion (i.350f.), whereas the Trojans are forced to leave by eventual military defeat. There is a tremendous emphasis on the role of *money* in Dido's story: Sychaeus was *ditissimus auri* if Huet's emendation for *agri* at i.343 is right (I am not convinced), he was killed by the *avarus* Pygmalion *auri caecus amore;* Sychaeus tells Dido of an *ignotum argenti pondus et auri* for her travels, whereas Hector tells Aeneas of the Penates; the Tyrian exiles load their ships with gold, whereas the Trojans are *omnium egeni* (599); Dido's people buy land to settle, as much as an ox-hide will cover – an oxhide which, as the story goes, they craftily cut into strips, whereas Latinus offers the Trojans land (vii.260f., xi.316ff.). Dido's story suits the origins of a great merchant people, with an unpleasant reputation for sharp dealing which goes back to the kidnapping of Eumaeas and the kidnapping of Io in Herodotus i.1. By contrast with the Trojans' sufferings, the story told by the disguised Venus can hardly be intended to evoke unqualified sympathy.

There is effective dramatic irony in Aeneas' arrival at Carthage, aware of, but not disturbed by Carthage's murky origins, but quite unaware – for there is no word of it in the oracles and visions he had encountered – of Carthage's threat to the Aeneadae, which Virgil has impressed upon his readers from the very beginning of the poem. This irony is increased by Aeneas' first reactions to Carthage (421f.): *miratur molem Aeneas, magalia quondam, miratur portas strepitumque et strata viarum.* This splendid, glowing description of the city's construction reaches its climax in *o fortunati quorum iam moenia surgunt* (437): but we should still be astonished at the ancestor of Rome casting blessings upon the foundation of Carthage. Aeneas is far from founding his own city and discouraged by repeated failures *en route;* his first sight of Dido is as a great beauty – and a great leader,

legislator, and works supervisor: *iura dabat legesque viris operumque laborem partibus aequabat iustis aut sorte trahebat* (i.507f.). Aeneas is captivated by Punic luxury (i.637ff., 699ff., iv.193, 215ff., 261ff.), and after a winter of idleness – *non coeptae adsurgunt turres* (iv.86) – actually participates in the building of Carthage (iv.260, 265f.), forgetful of his own *regnum* and that due to Ascanius (iv.194, 275, 355, 432), with its glorious future (iv.299ff.). His actions threaten Rome's destinies and help Rome's enemies. However much we (and Aeneas) admire Dido's activity as foundress – and we are clearly expected to do so (cf. iv.347f., 591, and particularly 655ff.) – we must react differently to its historical outcome. History is prefigured by Dido's threat to pursue Aeneas *atris ignibus* (iv.384) as Juno symbolically does in Bks. v, vii and ix (v.604ff., 641, vii.445ff., etc., ix.1ff., 69ff.), and by her curse bringing down upon Aeneas suffering and delay in the fulfilment of his destiny, again exactly in Juno's manner (i.12ff., etc., iv.612ff.); history is brought vividly before the reader when her curse reaches its climax, invoking the horrors of war awaiting Rome at the hands of the city which Dido founded and built. Our view of Dido should therefore, as we read, be open to continuous adjustment and correction.

There remain two further passages towards which the possible reaction of a Roman reader must be evaluated with care: first Dido's exercise of magic: this does occupy a lot of space – 478-519 – more, really, than the magic's importance *for the plot* requires (Pichon, *RPh.* 1909, 247ff.) and enough to have suggested an element of poetic self-indulgence, following the lavish descriptions of Apollonius and Theocritus. The only actual *function* of Dido's magic – regardless of its pretended *intention* to bind Aeneas to Dido or to loose Dido from him – is to blind Anna to her sister's intended suicide while securing the provision of a pyre. Eitrem's detailed analysis of Dido's magic (summarised by Austin p.149) shows convincingly that the ritual as described could not have worked within the terms of ancient magic, and his inference that it was not meant to work is legitimate. The importance of Dido's resort to magic for our reaction to her cannot rest simply upon (492f.) *testor, cara, deos, et te, germana, tuumque dulce caput magicas invitam accingier artis.* Granted that she is innocent of serious belief in magic – both Anna and the old nurse Barce are clearly more committed than she is – the fact remains that her appeals to orthodox divinities (56ff.) for their blessing on her liaison have failed, and that despite her protestation of non-involvement, she is prepared to make use of these murky rituals for her convenience. Her use of magic hardly "estranges" the reader (cf. Pease p.407), but though the description may rouse "pity and terror" (Austin p.150) at Dido's plight, may it not also be meant to lower her in our esteem? Servius sensibly comments *quia multa sacra Romani susciperent semper magica damnarunt: ideo excusat* – referring to 493, and it is unnecessary to reinforce his statement by reference to (for instance) Horace and Roman Law. Medea keeps a fine store of magic charms in a box in her bedroom (A.R.iii.812, 844) whereas Dido is informed secretly by a priestess from the westernmost ends of the earth: the action in her case must be strange, abnormal and therefore discreditable.

Secondly, the pictures in the temple in Bk. i: Aeneas sees in them sympathy for his plight and an earnest for the future: *hoc primum in luco nova res oblata timorem leniit, hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem ausus et afflictis melius confidere rebus* (450ff.; cf. 463). But the reader will question whether any true *salus* can come from Carthage, whether the

cruel and grasping Carthaginians are really the people to express lasting sympathy for the exile and the vanquished, and whether, above all, in a temple dedicated to Juno (and Aeneas can hardly be aware of its dedication, or after his experiences of Junonian persecution he could hardly be so ready to seek consolation from such a quarter) there could be any valid testimony to pro-Trojan sympathy and humanity. The irony of Aeneas' warm reactions, when Carthage is to bring him and his people nothing but suffering and disaster has often been recognised.[4] Dido of course knows all about the war from Salaminian Teucer, (i.619ff.) – and, we may feel, Troy can have had few bitterer enemies, if we recall just who this Teucer was – a son of Priam's sister Hesione; Hesione was given to Teucer's father Telamon as a reward for Telamon's help to Heracles when Heracles captured Troy, having been cheated of *his* reward for saving Troy from a monster to whom Hesione was about to be sacrificed; this monster had been sent by Neptune who had himself been cheated of *his* reward for helping to build Troy: thus Telamon had not merely his ten years of siege, but a rich family experience of Trojan misconduct. This may help us to answer the question of why these pictures occur in a temple dedicated to Juno, who had supported the Argives, and of why Dido should be interested in just these scenes. I doubt whether it will do to dismiss the problem of why Virgil selects the scenes he does for so prominent an ecphrasis by reference simply to variety, or pictorial quality, or the desire for balance and contrast. Rhesus is shown exhausted on arrival in his tent, betrayed by Dolon, and slaughtered by a bloodthirsty Diomedes: *primo quae prodita somno Tydides multa vastabat caede cruentus* (470f.). Troilus' death is described next: the brutality of this event is stressed – the boy is ambushed by Achilles when unarmed – *infelix puer atque impar congressus Achilli;* he is dragged dangling backwards by his chariot. The women of Troy are shown going in supplication *ad templum non aequae Palladis;* like Juno, Pallas fought steadily *against* the Trojans: *omnis spes Danaum et coepti fiducia belli Palladis auxiliis semper stetit* (ii.162f.). Achilles is shown towing Hector's body not merely round the tomb of Patroclus, as in the *Iliad,* but three times right round the city, before the pathetic figure of Priam begs for its return, again not as in Homer, but against reward: *exanimumque auro corpus vendebat Achilles* (484). Only in Aeneas' sighting of himself, and in the finale of Memnon and Penthesilea is there no explicit brutality, though we may recall that both these allies of Troy were, like Troilus and Hector, killed by Achilles. There is minimal evidence of Trojan victory and heroism; not one of their great feats of arms is specifically mentioned. Just as one would expect in a temple of Juno, the choice of pictures illustrates the success of her favourites; while Aeneas is delighted to see that Troy is not forgotten, he quite fails to observe, as we must do, that the attitude to Troy shown in these pictures is neither friendly nor sympathetic.. They illustrate just those qualities which Carthaginians might admire in the victorious Greeks – greed and brutality, for which they themselves had such a fine reputation.

Now if it is indeed the case that in the creation of Virgil's Dido we can see at work a tradition which has nothing to do with the heroines of Greek literature, or with Catullus' Ariadne, but which has its roots in Roman history and Roman prejudice, then we may be able to advance a step further and see if this tradition can be identified. In investigating the legend of Dido before Virgil, there is one fundamental point of which we must never lose sight: that is the ancient tradition about Virgil's originality, one so strong that it cannot legitimately be questioned.[5] Macrobius refers to the *fabula lascivientis*

Didonis (v.17.5), *quam falsam novit universitas* – but which through so many ages has acquired the *specimen veritatis* so as to become a favourite theme for painters and sculptors What does Macrobius mean by *falsam?* An epigram of the Planudean appendix, of which there is a Latin translation attributed to Ausonius, explains further *(A.P* xvi.151; Aus. *Epigr.* 118; early Empire – Maas, *Herm.* 1914, p.517, n.l.): "Neither did I ever set eyes on Aeneas nor did I reach Libya at the time of the sack of Troy, but to escape a forced marriage with Iarbas I plunged the two-edged sword into my heart. Ye Muses, why did ye arm chaste Virgil against me to slander thus falsely my virtue?"
Christian writers – Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Jerome – come hotly to Dido's defence (Pease, 66 n.498) as an exemplar of chastity and praise her courage in preferring death to a second marriage. Augustine's point is different *(Conf.* i.13.21): on the question *utrum verum sit quod Aenean aliquando Karthaginem venisse poeta dicit,* he differentiates: *indoctiores nescire se respondebunt* while *doctiores autem etiam negabunt verum esse* Here the dispute must turn on chronology: we note the *aliquando* and recall that the Planudean epigram suggested that this was a problem; Carthage was not yet founded at the time of the Trojan War, being assigned by most authorities to the ninth century.[6] But it is clear from Augustine too that it is Virgil's version of the story of Dido that is peculiar and open to criticism because it conflicts with the established tradition: in the case of Dido, the tradition – that in exile in Africa she committed suicide to avoid remarriage to a local prince – goes back clearly and firmly to Timaeus (Pease, 16f., etc.). But the only point of which we can be *quite* certain is that no author before Virgil had Dido commit suicide for love of *Aeneas:* that in some earlier account they *met* cannot yet be ruled out. The argument from chronology is not decisive against such a meeting: Virgil may be casual in his synchronising of minor legends, but the foundations of Rome and Carthage are *not* minor events, and the gap of three hundred years and more which he ignores would be a great deal less disquieting to the critic if we could suppose that he had some substantial literary precedent for ignoring the conventional chronology. Have we therefore, any account which places the foundation of Carthage about the time of Troy's fall, or which places Aeneas' exile around the time of the conventional date of the foundation of Carthage? The answer to the former question is, simply, no; to the latter, yes: the earliest Greek historians to recount the foundation of Rome – with the exception of Antiochus of Syracuse – placed it at most three, and often two generations after the fall of Troy [7]; that implies either an early date for the foundation of Rome, or a late date for the fall of Troy, which would involve Aeneas' journey to the West taking place at the precise date of the foundation of Carthage. Both Ennius and Naevius made Romulus a grandson of Aeneas (SDan, *Aen.* i.273) and the possibility that Naevius could have synchronised Dido and Aeneas is therefore a very real one. So we come face to face with the question of whether Naevius, in the *Bellum Punicum,* related an encounter between Dido and Aeneas. What we have established so far is first, that there is no chronological obstacle to his having done so, and secondly, that if he did so, the meeting cannot have been of the same character as Virgil's: to this second point we shall have shortly to return.

In the *Bellum Punicum,* Naevius referred to the fall of Troy and the departure of Aeneas, Anchises, and their wives (frr.4,4,5Mo.) in his first book *Venus Troianis*

tempestate laborantibus cum Iove queritun et secuntur verba Iovis filiam consolantis spe futurorum (fr.13): the influence of these scenes on *Aeneid* i is stressed by Macrobius (vi.2.31). We cannot be quite certain (cf. Buchheit, 39) that the storm occurred in the same place – i.e. off north Africa – as it does in the *Aeneid,* but when Servius Danielis observes on i.198 that *totus hic locus de Naevio Belli Punici libro translatus est,* the case in favour of its having done so, despite the vagueness and conventionality of the scholiast's form of expression (cf. Serv. iv.1, Macr.v.2.4, 17.4), becomes somewhat stronger. That Naevius mentioned Dido is certain: Servius Danielis on iv.9 comments *cuius filiae fuerint Anna et Dido Naevius dicit;* it is also inevitable that sailing from Troy to the west coast of Italy Aeneas had to pass fairly near Carthage. But this is of course not proof that they met, and we shall not find watertight proof, for all that is left is a reference to *Bellum Punicum* ii: *blande et docte percontat* (asks) *Aenea quo pacto Troiam urbem liquisset* (fr.23). Who was the subject of *percontat?* The bibliography on this topic is huge (most recently, E. Paratore, *Festschr. K. Büchner,* 224ff.), and scholars are divided (unevenly) between Dido and an *hospes Italicus,* probably Latinus, possibly Evander. In favour of Dido are the following: first, the question reminds us strikingly of the situation at the end of *Aeneid* i, as shown in *nunc Phoenissa tenet Dido blandisque moratur vocibus* (670f.) and also in '*immo age et a prima, dic hospes, origine nobis insidias' inquit 'Danaum casusque tuorum erroresque tuos'* (753ff.). Secondly, the adjective *docte* would suit Dido's interrogation as presented in the *Aeneid* (i.750ff.), where she is repeatedly shown as knowing a great deal about Troy (i.459ff., 561ff., 613f.), and though it would not be true to claim that *blande* could only be used of a female questioner[8], it is equally not easy – on the basis of our many accounts of Aeneas' landing in Italy – to conceive of a situation in which an Italian ruler could put questions 'in an ingratiating and well-informed manner' (Paratore, 236ff.). Thirdly, the attribution of this question is, in *B.P.*ii, more appropriate to Dido than to an *hospes Italicus:* the episode containing the question will not have taken up much space (Mariotti, 38); the fragments (4,5) actually recounting Aeneas' departure from Troy belong to Bk. i, and are in the third person, so we must infer either (intolerably) that Aeneas' adventures were related twice, or (inescapably) that in some way the request went unanswered (Richter, *NGG* 1960, 45, Paratore 233f.). But even a short dialogue between Aeneas and an *hospes Italicus* in *BP* ii would mean – so far as we can tell, for we have no other relevant information about *BP* ii – that at least part of bk. ii, as well as part of bk. iii – when Anchises is still alive on Italian soil (Strzelecki, *RF* 1963, 451, fr.3) – would be concerned with Aeneas' arrival in Italy, and that very great weight of emphasis would be extraordinarily hard to explain in a mythological excursus inserted into an epic about the first war between Rome and Carthage.[9] The only obstacle to the attribution of our question to Dido which actually rests on a numbered fragment of the *BP* is that Prochyta, an island in the Bay of Naples, named after a relative of Aeneas, was mentioned in *BP* i (fr.17), from which the strong – though not conclusive – inference[10] is that Aeneas reached Italy at some point in bk. i. But there is no evidence that he reached *Latium,* and it is quite permissible to suppose – for instance – that he was blown back to Dido from Campania just as Aeneas was blown back from Sicily.[11]

If then the balance of argument is somewhat in favour – and at least this much I hope to have shown – of Naevius having brought Aeneas and Dido together in *BP* ii, then some scraps of information probably all belonging to the period between Naevius and Virgil

assume great significance (cf. Klingner, *Virgil*, 382, Perret, 92ff.). We are informed that Ateius Philologus *'librum suum sic edidit inscriptum' an amaverit Didun Aeneas'* (Charis., *Gramm.* i.127.17f.); this Ateius was born in B.C. 100 at the latest (Perret l.c.) and would therefore have been a very old man by the time the *Aeneid* appeared; we cannot rule out the possibility that he wrote about the story of Dido as recounted by Virgil, but the issue in the *Aeneid* is utterly unrewarding – Aeneas explicitly did love Dido, iv.395 – and undeserving of enquiry by an elderly and distinguished scholar. If, however, Ateius approached the topic before Virgil, then the problem of chronology, as presented by Naevisu, and the role of Anna as portrayed by Varro – to which I shall now turn – could form the basis for a valid and interesting investigation. Varro is attested as saying that Aeneas was loved by Anna (Serv. *ad Aen.*v.4), and that 'not Dido but Anna was driven by love of Aeneas to kill herself on the pyre' (Serv.Dan.iv.682). Does this mean that in Varro Anna was in love with Aeneas behind Dido's back, as Virgil's Dido once seems to imply? (iv.420ff.). Or that Varro refused to link Dido and Aeneas either because of chronological difficulties or because such a story conflicted with the version in Timaeus, but nevertheless accepted Aeneas' sojourn at Carthage with one Anna, his contemporary? Or even, hypercritically (Dessau, *Herm.*1914, 520f.) that Varro made Anna the foundress of Carthage, and had her commit suicide on a pyre, but never connected her with Aeneas, whatever the scholiasts in their muddled way may have thought? Ovid (*F.*iii.543ff.) tells an aetiological story about the goddess Anna Perenna which has Anna flee from Iarbas after Dido's death and fall in love with Aeneas in Italy: this version seems to combine Virgil (love of Dido and Aeneas), Timaeus (lecherous Tunisian) and Varro (love of Aeneas and Anna).[12] But what matters is Varro: why should he have troubled to set up Anna as a paramour of Aeneas if there were not already a version in existence which linked him with Dido? There would have been no need to introduce Anna into the story if all he had before him was Timaeus' version of Dido and the African prince, with no Aeneas. Varro's Anna looks as if she may have been intended as a criticism of Naevius' Dido!

But are we in a position to say anything about the function and character of Dido in the *BP*? Or about the influence of Naevius' Dido on Virgil's? Any reconstruction is a mere house of cards: fr.20- "it came into his (or her) mind (that) the fortunes of men..; *ei venit in mentem hominum fortunas* – has been compared to Dido's "compassionate" remarks to the Trojans in *Aeneid* i:[13] *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco* (630; cf. 562f., 615ff.). Fr. 10 – "clothing of gold clean and lovely and citrus-scented" – *puram pulchramque ex auro vestem citrosam* – could describe presents given by Aeneas to Dido, like those in i.647ff.[14] Fr. 7 – "they carry beautiful bowls and golden goblets"; *ferunt pulcras creterras aureas lepistas* – might refer to a banquet given by Dido for Aeneas, as in *Aeneid* i. 723ff.[15] There is only one fragment actually attributed to *BP* ii that might help – no.22: "and by now fortune had rendered his (or her) mind quiet" – *iamque eius mentem Fortuna fecerat quietam,* which has recently – and perhaps with some plausibility – been compared with Aeneas' complacent behaviour when comfortably established at Carthage (iv.232ff., Richter p.50f.). Now of one thing we may be certain: since Naevius wrote the *BP* as an old man (Cic.*Sen.*49) during the closing years of the second Punic war, about the first Punic war, in which he had himself served (Gell.xvii.21.45), a favourable or sympathetic portrait of the foundress of Carthage will have been unthinkable (Paratore 228, cf. Pichon 252f., Perret 97). What then was she? Evil, treacherous, insidious, a magician,

having the worst qualities of Circe and Calypso, who had recently been presented to Roman readers in Livius Andronicus' *Odissia?* That is not unlikely – and that characterisation is not incompatible with her having welcomed Aeneas in the first place: after all, a welcome followed by a rupture – as we have in Virgil – is allegorical of the centuries of peace between Rome and Carthage which preceded the first Punic war (Strzelecki (1963) 442, Richter 47, Buchheit 49f., arguing from the strength of the *hospitium*-motif in V.). Given such a Dido, another Naevian problem may be removed (Paratore 228f.): it is, as I have said, pretty well certain that in the *BP* Anchises survived till the Trojans reached Italy (Strzelecki (1963) 450ff.); in Virgil, this elderly, pious and austere figure dies before Aeneas reaches Carthage – *ne parum decoro amori intersit* (Serv. *ad Aen.*iii.711, Buchheit 37), and in the Virgilian morality it is necessary that he should do so. But in Naevius, with quite conceivably a very differently characterised Anchises – he had, after all been Venus' lover (cf. fr.13a, Paratore 229) – the paternal presence may simply not have constituted an embarrassment, not least if Dido was portrayed either as asexual or not as attractive and romantic in her role as seductress but as vicious and untrustworthy. But we should also recall that in Naevius both Anchises and Aeneas left Troy with their wives (fr.4; cf. Buchheit 38), and unless they both died *en route* for Carthage, *their* presence will certainly have affected the action, possibly involving Dido as a would-be adulteress. But I conclude that a full-scale romantic entanglement, portrayed with rich Hellenistic sensibility – as in *Aeneid* iv – cannot have occurred in Naevius. The function of Dido in the *BP* cannot, however, have been merely incidental: she did found the city opposed to Rome, she did, most probably, meet Aeneas, the grandfather of Rome's founder. The hypothesis, first made by Niebuhr [16], that in some way the relations of Aeneas and Dido served as an *aition* for the first Punic war is highly persuasive. Whereas Herodotus used the myths at the beginning of bk. i as an example of the trivialising of historical causation, Naevius introduced *his* myth to elevate the subject matter of his historical poem (Richter 48f.). Exactly how Naevius linked myth and history is not clear, but Dido's great curse upon Aeneas and his descendants in *Aen.* iv suggests a way (iv.622ff., cf. 384ff., Brisson 162, Richter 53). In the *BP* the *libros futura continentes* (fr.13a) which Venus gave Anchises, and better, the *verba Iovis filiam* (i.e. Venus) *consolantis spe futurorum* (fr.13) during the storm in bk. i of the *BP* – which may have brought the Trojans to Carthage – could have pointed towards the ultimate Roman victory, reaching out from the mythical excursus into the main narrative, as Virgil's Dido, introducing Hannibal into her curse, reaches out from myth into history.

The violence, greed, duplicity and hatred which Dido displays in the *Aeneid* are, I hope to have shown, characteristics linked by Virgil and his contemporaries with the old hatreds of the Punic wars: this unromantic historical element in the *Aeneid,* so alien to what Virgil derives from Apollonius in particular, is precisely appropriate to the Dido of the *BP*; the influence of Naevius' Dido on Virgil's in character and function was, I suspect, vastly greater than can now be plausibly guessed, let alone proved.

University College
London

NOTES

1. Cf. E. Burck in J. Vogt, *Rom u. Karthago* (1943), 336ff., Brisson, *Hommages Renard* i, 1969, 162ff.
2. Enn.*Ann.*29IV; cf. Liv.xxvii.37.7, Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms,* 144f., Lieberg, *AR* 1966, 162ff.
3. G. Williams, *JRS* 1958, 23, *Tradition and Originality,* 378ff.; cf. Phinney, *CJ* 1964-5, 356f.
4. Otis, *Virgil,* 238, K. Stanley, *AJP* 1965, 273f., etc.
5. Cf. Dessau, *Herm.* 1914, 517, Perret, *Les Origines de la légende Troyenne,* 91.
6. Pease p.58, n.468, de Graff, *Naevian Studies,* 23ff., etc.
7. De Graff, 26ff., Pease, 17, Sanders, *CPh.* 1908, 317ff., Jacoby Comm. *FGH* 566 F 59-61.
8. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms,* 34, Büchner, *Humanitas Romana,* 332f, n.18, 19, Haffter, *DLZ* 1937, 660, Mariotti, *Il Bellum Poenicum,* 30f., Serrao, *Helikon,* 1965, 526ff.
9. Rowell, *AJP* 1966, 214, Marmorale, *Naevius Poeta,* 242ff., Richter 65, Strzelecki, *RF* 1960, 441ff., etc., Buchheit 34ff.
10. Büchner, 332 n.15, Marmorale *ad loc.*, Serrao 517f., Barchiesi, *Nevio Epico* 521.
11. L. Ferrero, *RF* 1948, 117, *BP* ed. Strzelecki, Wroclaw 1959, 67.
12. Cf. Paratore 225, Dessau, *Herm.* 1917, 470ff., Strzelecki, *RF* 1963, 449f, *de Naeviano BP carmine* 1935, 21f.
13. Büchner 27f., Richter 46, Barchiesi 471.
14. Strzelecki (1959) 69, Barchiesi 515.
15. Richter 45ff., Klussmann *ad loc.*, Barchiesi 365.
16. *Hist. of Rome,* Eng.tr., iv 1844, p.25; cf. Oppermann, *RM* 1939 213f., Strzelecki (1959) 70f., (1963) 442.