My Enemy's Enemy is my Enemy: Virgil's illogical Use of *Metus Hostilis*

Anyone willing to undertake a quick bibliographical search for 'Rationality in Greek and Roman thought' will hit upon a thoroughly unsurprising result. There is, of course, no volume such as *Rationality in Roman Thought*,[1] nor do we find a *Rationalism in Roman Philosophy*.[2] It is true that we could not possibly expect to see an *Entdeckung des Geistes* ('The Discovery of the Mind') applied to Rome, but there is not even an *Entwicklung des Geistes* ('The Development of the Mind') to act as a sequel to Bruno Snell's fundamental 1946 monograph.[3] The searcher not trained in classics might then logically imagine the Romans to be fairly irrational in comparison to the Greeks. But classicists know all too well that this is not entirely accurate. In actual fact, Latin scholarship has produced no *Romans and the Irrational* to match Dodds' famous lectures.[4] The superiority of Greece in philosophical as well as in scientific matters is accompanied by the recognition of the Greeks' far deeper understanding of the inexplicable and dark regions of the human mind. The Romans, it would seem, are not rational enough to match Greek philosophy, but also not irrational enough to compete with Greek poetry and religion. The shallowness of their understanding of irrational matters equals the superficiality and ignorance with which authors such as Vitruvius and Pliny seem to approach the overtly complicated subjects treated by the Hellenistic *Forgotten Revolution*.[5] Such a view is wonderfully epitomised by Dodds himself, in a statement which cannot but strongly discourage Latin scholars from the study of the Dionysiac irrational in Rome:

> It was the Alexandrines, and above all the Romans – with their tidy functionalism and their cheerful obtuseness in all matters of the spirit – who departmentalized Dionysus as 'jolly Bacchus' the wine-god with his riotous crew of nymphs and satyrs…
> (Dodds 1944: x)

This is just a small example of how the curse of the Latin inferiority complex[6] towards Greece has been transferred to the whole discipline of classics and never properly worked through. One

---

[1] Cf. Frede – Striker 1996.

[2] Cf. Boas 1961.

[3] Snell 1953.

[4] Dodds 1951.

[5] See Russo 2004.

[6] Or 'cultural cringe,' with Burton 2013: 111.

obvious way to overcome this situation would be to emphasise the Romans' original contribution to both rational and irrational themes. This is a just and necessary approach, but it is nonetheless destined to fail from the start if the goal is to prove the Romans' superiority in these matters. As regards Virgil, for instance, notwithstanding Heinze's enormous contribution to the understanding and the evaluation of the more emotional sides of his poetry, the Romantic belief in the supremacy of Homer's genius still remains quite deep-rooted.[7]

Despite Dodds' lapidary statement on the obtuseness of Latin poetry, I am convinced that there is actually room to discuss both rationality and irrationality in Virgil's *Aeneid* precisely with the hermeneutical tools employed by Dodds himself.[8] However, this is not the path followed by this paper. For once, I would like to pretend to endorse Dodds' verdict and suggest a different way of addressing the matter, which could be no less fruitful in detecting continuity and difference from Greek thought, and perhaps even more gratifying for those Latinists whose aim is to alleviate the Romans from their Greek cultural burden.

We have seen that the Romans are neither thought of as profound philosophers, nor do they apparently offer fascinating ground for anthropological or psychoanalytical studies on the irrational sides of the human mind. In fact, comparative anthropology seems to have left out the Roman world quite intentionally in comparison to the Greek one. The 'tidy functionalism' and 'obtuseness in all matters of the spirit' to which Dodds is referring reminds readers of the popular view, still current of the Romans, as rough and coarse warriors. Which is a stereotype of course, but stereotypes can hide important truths. Rome was indeed what Max Weber defined 'a guild of warriors'.[9] It was an army, and the only field in which it undoubtedly excelled was the military. We could say, to make it more appealing, that Rome excelled in the art of war. To accept this stereotypical image of Rome means to turn our attention to its historical superiority in military strategy. And, since war requires politics, such superiority also pertains to the more sophisticated fields of law and political theory.

In view of the topic of this paper, Carthage in Virgil's *Aeneid*, the claim that the specific characteristic of Augustan literature is an ongoing concern with the political naturally brings to mind the identification of the political with a friend-enemy distinction. Already Hegel, in his *Philosophy of Right*, claimed that 'the state is an individual, and negation is an essential component of individuality. Thus, even if a number of states join together as a family, this league, in its

---

[7] See Conte 2007 on Heinze 1993.

[8] See Mac Góráin 2012-13.

[9] M. Weber 1978: 1359 referring to the *poleis*.

individuality, *must generate opposition and create an enemy*'.[10] Following in Hegel's footsteps, Carl Schmitt in 1932 went as far as to affirm that the distinction between friend and enemy is 'the specific political distinction to which political actions and motives can be reduced,' and the sketch he drew of 'The Enemy' is thoroughly based on negative terms in contrast to the specific individuality of the subject.[11] According to Schmitt, the Enemy implies the Political, and the Political implies the State. The reflection on the Enemy must necessarily accompany any reflection on collective identity.

The principle on which Schmitt is drawing here, like Machiavelli, Bodin, Hegel and Hobbes before him, is that of 'negative association,' also commonly known as *metus hostilis* or 'Sallust's Theorem'.[12] The theorem goes back to Sallust's view, expressed in all his extant works, that Carthage's destruction in 146 BC caused the disappearance of that 'fear of the enemy' which is a necessary element of national cohesion, and thus brought about the crisis of the Roman Republic which ultimately resulted in the shedding of brotherly rather than foreign blood.[13] A corollary of this implies that the Punic wars not only led to the abolition of Rome's archenemy, but also triggered the civil conflict which resulted from that very abolition, a consequence that Scipio Nasica had apparently predicted when he advised that, against Cato's judgment, *Carthago seruanda esset*.[14] *Metus hostilis*, although traceable back to Greek historical thought, is one of Rome's greatest contributions to political theory. It is true that it opens Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian war, that it is commonly recognised as the basis of the creation of a Hellenic identity against the danger of the Persian enemy, that it is present in Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle and was perhaps introduced in Rome by Posidonius,[15] but it is nonetheless still known in political theory as *metus hostilis* rather than ἔξωθεν φόβος, as 'Sallust's theorem,' rather than Thucydides' or Posidonius'. Negative association appears like a specifically Roman legacy which begins with Sallust's reflections on Rome's decline after Carthage's destruction and reaches the political situation of the Cold War, or the aftermath of 9/11. Both in Sallust's Rome and in the 20th and 21st

---

[10] Hegel 1991: 324, my emphasis.

[11] See Schmitt 1996: 26-7: 'The political enemy… is… the other, the stranger; and it is sufficient for his nature that he is, in a specifically intense way, existentially something different and alien…'

[12] On negative association in modern political theory see Wood 1995 and Evrigenis 2008.

[13] Sall. *BC* 10.1-2, *BJ* 41.2, *Hist*. fr. 1.11 McGushin. The theorem was thought by some to have been derived from Posidonius but was actually something of a commonplace among ancient historians: see Earl 1961: 41-59, McGushin 1992: 77-9, Wood 1995, Evrigenis 2008 and Jacobs 2010.

[14] Diod. 34/35.33.4-6, Plut. *Cato Maior* 27, Flor. 1.31.5, App. *Pun*. 69. The debate between Scipio Nasica and Cato must have occupied a long section of Livy 49, according to its *Periocha*: see Mineo 2011: 123.

[15] For a survey of the instances of *metus hostilis* in authors other than Sallust see Wood 1995 and Evrigenis 2008.

century USA, the identification of the Enemy proved essential for constructing and bolstering a common feeling of national identity.

If one wants to examine Virgil's Carthage from a properly Roman perspective, *metus hostilis* is the obvious way to go for it. In this paper I will thus attempt to give back to Caesar what is Caesar's in reading the Bacchic features of Dido in *Aeneid* 4 (the comparison between Dido and a maddened Maenad at *Aen.* 4.300-3 and her dream of being Pentheus at *Aen.* 4.469-70)[16] from a purely political point of view. My aim is not to investigate the religious, ritual or psychoanalytical implications of the Dionysian in *Aeneid* 4, but rather to stress the equation of Carthaginians and Bacchic Phoenicians, an equation which initially seems to emphasise Virgil's presentation of Carthage as a barbarian enemy and sheds light on, to quote Edith Hall's famous phrase *The Invention of the Barbarian*,[17] the Augustan (re-)invention of the Carthaginian. The first section of this paper will thus analyse the portrait of Virgil's Carthaginians as Persian barbarians, focussing on the *Aeneid*'s reception of Aeschylus' *Persae* and on Atossa as a possible model for Dido. However, the second section will be dedicated to the deconstruction of the barbarian polarisations that I have previously set up, and will investigate the dissolution of the West *vs* East polarisation in the *Aeneid*, where both Carthaginians and Romans are simultaneously represented as Greeks *and* Barbarians, and are also equated to each other. On the one hand, I shall stress the traditional traits of such an equation, emphasising Virgil's debt to Euripides' *Bacchae* as a text that had already staged the dissolution of the Greek *vs* Barbarian polarity. On the other hand, I shall be careful not to underestimate the specific resonance of this collapse of the polarity in the Augustan age, in which analogies between Carthaginians and Romans are also to be linked with that traumatic loss of a national and cultural identity that had been recently experienced in the friends/enemies confusion that ensued after the civil wars.

Persian Carthaginians

Persians are present, paradigmatically speaking, from the very beginning of the *Aeneid*'s narrative. At *Aen.* 1.13-4 (*Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe / ostia*), the archenmity and military opposition between Carthage and Rome is concealed in the form of a geographic observation which is uncannily similar to that which describes the Persian expedition against Europe at the beginning of Aeschylus' *Persae*, 'the neighbouring land on the opposite side of the

---

[16] On which see especially Krummen 2004.

[17] Hall 1989.

strait' (*Pers.* 66 εἰς ἀντίπορον γείτονα χώραν[18]), and seems to associate Punic and Persian wars through the image of a huge clash of continents, which are on the opposite side of one another (*contra*)[19] but at a significant geographical and ideological distance (*longe*). In addition, the deceitful application of antiquity (1.12 *urbs antiqua fuit*) to a city whose name actually means 'new city,'[20] drags Carthage close to Western representations of the East, first of all Troy, the ancient city *par excellence*[21] and that which is 'no more' at the time of the narrative,[22] but also 'the ancient ramparts of Kissia' (*Pers.* 17 τὸ παλαιὸν Κίσσιον ἕρκος), a detail that contributes to emphasise the antiquity of the Persian empire in the *parodos* of *Persae*.[23] Carthage is occupied by eastern *coloni* (1.12 *Tyrii tenuere coloni*) whose origin from Tyre makes it an anti-Roman construction which is a double for the anti-Athenian Thebes, founded by Tyrian (or Sidonian) Cadmus[24] and the customary locus for tragedy, otherness and barbarism in terms that are made by Euripides strongly reminiscent of the Persian wars.[25]

The following epigrammatic description of the city (1.14 *diues opum studiisque asperrima belli*) matches directly the barbarian pairing of luxury and military aggressiveness found in Xerxes' 'golden army' from the beginning of *Persae*: πολυχρύσου στρατιᾶς (*Pers.* 9). The importance of the adjective πολύχρυσος is emphasised by its constant repetition in the *parodos* (3-4 ἀφνεῶν καὶ πολυχρύσων / ἑδράνων, 45 πολύχρυσοι Σάρδεις, 52-3 Βαβυλὼν δ' / ἡ πολύχρυσος, noticeably the only instances of the term in Aeschylus' work). The Persian empire is wealthy, and gold is the material symbol of this wealth, which 'glitters even in the ancestry of Xerxes'[26] (80 χρυσογόνου[27] γενεᾶς) through the figure of Perseus, born from Danae and Zeus as golden-shower. Xerxes' royal status is emphasised from the *parodos* (5 ἄναξ Ξέρξης βασιλεὺς, 24 βασιλῆς

---

[18] Cf. Eur. *Med.* 210 Ἑλλάδ' ἐς ἀντίπορον.

[19] This encapsulates archenmity (see already DServius *ad* 1.13) but the conviction that Rome geographically faced Carthage should not be underestimated: see Korenjak 2004.

[20] Phoenician *Kart hadašt*, an etymology hinted at at 1.298 and 366 *nouae Karthaginis* (see Servius *ad* 1.366 = Liv. fr. 6 W-M).

[21] See *Aen.* 1.375 *Troia antiqua*, 1.626 *antiqua Teucrorum a stirpe*, 2.137 *patriam antiquam*.

[22] Cf. *Aen.* 1.12 and 2.363 *urbs antiqua ruit*, 3.11 *campos ubi Troia fuit*, 4.311-2 *si… Troia antiqua maneret*.

[23] Cf. the reference to Egyptian Thebes (37-8 ὠγυγίους Θήβας), with Garvie 2009: 45. According to Herodotus (Hdt. 3.91.4, 5.49.7), Kissia is not a city, but a region of Susiana within which Susa was situated. Aeschylus might here refer to Susa itself (according to Strabo 15.3.2, he described Kissia as the founder of Susa), but see *contra* Hall 1996: 108 and Garvie 2009: 55.

[24] See Hardie 1990: 228-9.

[25] See Saïd 2002: 96-7, especially on Cadmus sharing the gigantomachic traits of Aeschylus' Xerxes.

[26] Saïd 2007: 74.

[27] *u.l.* χρυσονόμου.

βασιλέως ὕποχοι μεγάλου) and repeatedly recalled throughout a play whose main aim is to set up a polarisation between Greek democracy and barbarian tyranny.[28] As a corollary to this emphasis on eastern luxury, Edith Hall has emphasised how Aeschylus' *Persae* strongly contributes to display 'the feminisation of Asia in the Greek imagination' and 'the metaphorical means by which Athenian thought conceptualised its victory over the Persians as an analogue of the male domination of women,'[29] not only through the decision to make Atossa the protagonist of the play, allowing 'defeated, distant Asia to speak in a female voice,'[30] but also through the repeated lamentation on Susa's *kenandria*, 'emptiness of men'[31] (*Pers.* 118, 166, 289, 730; see also 298, 349, 920-1). Such polarisations of the Greek *vs* Barbarian ideology – democracy *vs* tyranny, *andreia vs* femininity, sobriety *vs* luxury (χλιδή, ἀβρότης) – which aim at providing natural, genetic reasons[32] for the victory of Greece in the Persian wars, are simultaneously counterbalanced by the apparently opposite attitude of elevating the enemy and its dangerousness in order to extol the victory of the West: hence the long and threatening overview of the Persian army at the opening of Aeschylus' play (1-64). Here, accompanied by the rhythm of marching anapaests, which contribute to create the effect of a real military expedition on stage, the contingents and commanders who followed Xerxes' expedition are presented with constant emphasis on the fear that they inspire: they are 'terrifying to look upon and formidable in battle' (27 φοβεροὶ μὲν ἰδεῖν, δεινοὶ δὲ μάχην), 'a fearsome incalculable horde' (40 δεινοὶ πλῆθός τ' ἀνάριθμοι), 'a terrifying sight to behold' (48 φοβερὰν ὄψιν προσιδέσθαι); their nature as 'annihilators of cities' is even inscribed in their name (65-6 περσέπτολις… βασίλειος στρατός[33]).

This same blend of passive luxurious amenability and male military aggressiveness is also found in the two symbols with which Carthage is associated at Aeneas' arrival. The bee simile of *Aen.* 1.430-6, also possibly reminiscent of the first of only three similes in *Persae*, where we find the feminised Persians-μέλισσαι under their king-bee ὄρχαμος, Xerxes (*Pers.* 126-9), hides some ominous military references, one in particular reminiscent of Aeolus' winds (1.434 *agmine facto* taking up 1.82 *ac uenti uelut agmine facto*) in an overall erotic and alluring atmosphere.[34] The next

---

[28] See Podlecki 1986: 78-9, Goldhill 1988, Hall 1989: 2, 16, 97, T. Harrison 2000: 76-91.

[29] Hall 1993: 109-10.

[30] Hall 1993: 121.

[31] Hall 1993: 117-8, T. Harrison 2000: 66-75.

[32] Cf. Aristotle (*Politics* 1327^{b}29-32) or Hippocrates (*Airs Waters Places* ch.16) with Cartledge 1993: 39-40.

[33] The pun on πέρθω ('to sack') and Πέρσαι is recommended by Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 3.1412^{b}2).

[34] On the military and threatening connotations of the bee simile see Giusti 2014.

image of the horse (*Aen*. 1.441-5), a recurrent animal in Aeschylus' play,[35] seems to realign readers with the commonly warlike nature of this soil. Horses, however, as Atossa also knows in her dreams,[36] can be subjugated.[37] Therefore the possible ambiguity of the phrase *facilem uictu* applied to the Carthaginian soil: 'rich in substance,' for sure, but also maybe 'easy to conquer'.[38]

In the presentation of Carthage, the feminisation of a city subjected to an Asiatic queen is already hinted at in its presentation under the domain of a female goddess, Juno, who is first of all *regina* (9 *regina deum*, 46 *diuum… regina*, 443 *regia Iuno*), and only then *soror* and *coniunx* (47) of her Trojan-supporter male counterpart, Jupiter. Dido's royal status is continuously stressed throughout Book 1,[39] and several times explicitly emphasised in its luxury,[40] making her a double not only of Cleopatra[41] but also of Atossa, a 'paradigmatic' Asiatic queen. Atossa, as protagonist of *Persae*, embodies the figure of the woman 'yoked alone and left behind' (*Pers*. 137 λείπεται μονόζυξ) which is representative of entire Persia: death separates her from her husband, and the encounter with her son will never be staged. The prologue to Dido's tragedy (*Aen*. 1.335-71), where Venus tells the story of the murder of Sychaeus, is reminiscent of the murderuous intrigues of ancient royal houses such as those in which Atossa featured, especially the gruesome deeds of Cambyses II. Even though the venal motivation of Pygmalion's action is explicitly clear, the story's

[35] Horses are constantly present in the *parodos* of *Persae* (14, 18, 26, 29, 32, 105, 126) and implicit in the yoke metaphor, the first (50) and 'dominant metaphor of the play' (Garvie 2009: 66), which finds its concreteness in Atossa's narration of her dream of the two women/horses (181-99). Horses also connect to the defining role of Darius' horse in his election to the kingship (Hdt. 3.84-8) and to the Persians' worship of the Sun, with the Horse as its sacred animal (see Just. 1.10.5).

[36] While one of the two women/horses rebels to the yoke (*Pers*. 194-6), the first one 'keeps her jaw submissively to the bit' (*Pers*. 193-4). The symbol of the horse, with which the Persian army is associated in the *parodos* for its aggressive and warlike nature, and which is there supposed to bolster their confidence in the success of the expedition, is here used – paradoxically – to represent the slavish nature that is at the root of their failure.

[37] Legend had it (Servius *ad loc*., Justinus 18.5.15-6, Eust. *ad Dion. Per*. 195) that the Tyrians first dug up the head of an ox, symbolising the fertility of the land but also subjugation, and therefore decided to dig somewhere else, until they found a horse's head, a positive sign, since 'this animal, even though it can be subjugated, is nonetheless warlike' (Serv. *ad loc*: 'hoc animal licet subiugetur, bellicosum tamen est').

[38] The ambiguity of the phrase *facilem uictu* (445) has been read by Kraggerud 1963 as an indirect hint at Carthage's ultimate military failure (taking *uictu* as passive supine of *uincere* rather than ablative of *uictus*): see Egan 1998 and *contra* E. L. Harrison 1984: 134.

[39] 303 *regina*, 340 *regit*, 389 *reginae*, 454 *reginam*, 496 *regina*, 522 *regina*, 594 *reginam*, 631-2 *regia… tecta*, 660 *reginam*, 674 *reginam*, 686 *regalis… mensas*, 697 *regina*, 717 *reginam*, 728 *regina*.

[40] 1.496-7, 697-8, 728-9.

[41] See Bertman 2000, Syed 2005: 184-93, Hardie 2006 and 2014: 55-7.

emphasis on love (344 *amore*, 350 *amorum*, 352 *amantem*) alongside gold (343 *auri*,[42] 359 *auri*, 363 *auro*), and their reunion in the motive of the crime (349 *auri… amore*) seems to suggest that Pygmalion's tragic action might have been set in motion by more than one impulse: he kills Sychaeus 'indifferent of his sister's loves,'[43] (350-1 *securus amorum / germanae*) but he is also 'confident'[44] of them – or that, at least, they will be more than one, and that the 'yoking to'[45] (345 *iugarat*) Sychaeus was just 'the first' (345-6 *primis… ominibus*).

This eastern palace tragedy matches closely the nightmares that Atossa suffered through. Like the Persian queen, Dido will later understand, trapped in her nightmares, that she is also a woman 'yoked alone' and abandoned in her empty, κένανδρον, Asiatic land (4.466-8 *semperque relinqui / sola sibi, semper longam incomitata uidetur / ire uiam et Tyrios deserta quaerere terra*), and not even the ghost of her dead husband, recalled through rituals at his tomb like Darius by Atossa, will suffice to console her (cf. *Aen.* 4.457-61 and *Pers.* 598-851). The nightmares that trouble her sleep follow the recognition of Aeneas' preference for her sister Anna (420-3): an acknowledgement that surely involves feelings similar to those of Atossa, whose sister, Artystone, was 'the wife that Darius loved most' (Hdt. 7.69). Dido's story presents itself as a variation of explicitly incestuous murder tales such as those in which Atossa featured: Atossa's first husband and brother, Cambyses II, had killed their brother Smerdis for fear that he would replace him in kingship (Hdt. 3.30) and married both their sisters (Hdt. 3.31), one of whom was later murdered for remembering the dead brother to him (Hdt. 3.32). Like Dido, Atossa seems to have been deceived for a while about the death of Smerdis, since she was married to a man, 'the fake Smerdis,' who pretended to be him – although, since she 'surely knew her own brother' (Hdt. 3.68), she was probably privy to the truth. As the wife of Darius, Atossa was already a woman turned into a *dux* by the vicissitudes of life, but she was also to become a second Helen,[46] ready to carry the *aition* of the breakout of the Persian wars (Hdt. 3.134). Both Atossa's and Dido's assimilation to Helen[47] point to the recognition of their stories as aetiological *fabulae* for the outbreak of international conflicts which are envisaged in the form of a huge clash of continents, and represent these women as the pivot around which myth, history and politics rotate.

---

[42] *u.l. agri.*

[43] *securus* recurs in a similar sense at 10.326; see Austin 1971: 128-9.

[44] OLD *s.u. securus* 3.

[45] The verb is so metaphorically exploited in Latin Literature only from Catullus 64.21 onwards.

[46] Asheri 1990: 344.

[47] Hinted at in the Diana simile through the mention of the Eurotas (*Aen.* 1.498), on whose shores Helen was kidnapped, and made explicit by Iarbas in his identification of Aeneas with Paris (4.215); see Krummen 2004: 33-42.

The connections established with Carthaginians and Persians, Atossa and Dido, situate Dido in direct continuity with the 'Helen Model' and suggest that the ideology of the Punic Wars might have developed in continuity with the Athenian ideology of the Persian Wars. In the Augustan age, however, the Persian features of Dido and Carthage, as well as the echoes of Euripides' *Bacchae* – a play which, according to Plutarch (*Crass*. 33), the Parthians had staged after the battle of Carrhae using Crassus' severed head as the severed head of Pentheus – also bring the Parthians into the picture, reminding us of the wars that Augustus should wage against foreign enemies and warding off the danger of further civil war through the evocation of *metus hostilis*. Thus, the Persian-Carthaginian parallel bolsters a sense of Roman national identity *in continuity with* the Greeks, not without a certain recognition of the Romans' superior military achievements, because the Romans have managed to conquer and destroy Carthage, and must eventually conquer and destroy the new Persians, the Parthians.

Trojan/Roman-Greek Carthaginians

> 'Mere difference is uninteresting;
> what is interesting is difference disguised as sameness.'
>
> Jay Reed 2007: 3

I have so far shown how Virgil seems to make use of negative association in keeping with Sallust's theorem and with the Greek *Invention of the Barbarian*. However, this apparently rational handling of negative association betrays an inherent illogicality which lies at the basis of the whole *Aeneid* and reproduces the paradoxes of an Augustan/Imperial 'Republic'. In fact, no matter how far we manage to stress their barbaric features, Virgil's portrait of the Carthaginians is never as polarised as we might expect it to be. This is arguably not a specific characteristic of the Carthaginian enemy, since even the portrait of Aeschylus' Persians is after all 'not as negative as we might have expected,'[48] and the mirroring between Persians and Greeks in the play is best exemplified by the notion that the two women who embody Greece and Persia in Atossa's dream are explicitly 'sisters of the same stock' (*Pers*. 185-6 κασιγνήτα γένους / ταὐτοῦ), since the Persians descend from Perseus, a Greek hero (*Pers*. 73-80) or, alternatively, from Medus, son of Medea and Aegeus.[49] Thus, Aeschylus' Persian wars are not only a πόλεμος but surprisingly a στάσις, an 'internal strife' (*Pers*. 188).

---

[48] Griffith 2007: 101. Cf. Gruen 2011: 10-11.

[49] See Garvie 2009: 117, Gruen 2011: 19-20.

It is true that a degree of mirroring is found in any presentation of 'The Enemy,' as an object which can be defined as other from the self only in relation to the previous definition of the self.[50] However, the case of Rome's creation of the Carthaginian enemy is peculiar within this usual pattern, specifically because of the intrusion of Greece into the picture: a sort of 'cultural other' which competes with the 'military other' embodied by Carthage. So far I have analysed how Virgil seems to borrow the 'strategies of polarisation' from Greece in order to construct a stereotyped portrait of the Carthaginians in cultural continuity with that of the Persians in fifth-century Athens. Yet the modelling is nowhere near so simple, since the Roman process of assimilation of Greek culture clearly coexists with an opposite process of differentiation from that same culture that the Romans were struggling to emulate: thus, as is well known, the Greeks rather than the Carthaginians figure the luxurious, lascivious, soft and effeminised easterners in comparison to the rough military prowess of Roman Republican culture. It is such a 'desire to be part of the Greek world and yet simultaneously distinct'[51] that plausibly pushed the Romans to assume a Trojan rather than a Greek identity, by picking Aeneas rather than Odysseus as their mythical ancestor.[52] The fact that Rome fastened on the Trojans as their national ancestors, precisely the symbol of the defeated Persians in fifth-century Athenian discourse, indicates a strong degree of discontinuity and differentiation from that culture which they also apparently struggled to emulate. In simple terms, the Romans accepted the status of 'barbarians of the West' which Pyrrhus among other Greeks had assigned to them: a status that Rome had to share with the equally sophisticated and equally barbarian *polis* of Carthage. In the Greek imagination, assimilation between the two cities was already operative: Timaeus had synchronised the respective dates of their foundations in 814/3 BC,[53] and Erathostenes had juxtaposed and compared their two political systems.[54]

The *Aeneid* is one of the many Latin texts to endorse this assimilation between Carthage and Rome. At its first apparition (1.418-29), Dido's city betrays uncanny signs of similarity to Rome

---

[50] See especially Hartog 1988; on the 'Mirror of the Enemy' in Reinassance Italian literature see Moudarres 2011.

[51] Erskine 2001: 145; cf. Gruen 1992: 23-31.

[52] On alternative traditions, see Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.72.2 and 1.72.5. One of the first attestations of Rome's Trojan origins is attributed to Greek rather than Roman propaganda: see Gruen 1992: 44 on Pyrrhus in Paus. 1.12.1. The episode of the Segestans' plea for help from Rome during the first Punic war on the basis of their common Trojan origin attests the conjunction and concomitance of the first military conflict against Rome's yet-to-be national enemy with the simultaneous shaping of a national identity (Zon. 8.9.12; Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.72; 2.5.83, 125; Diod. 23.5; Plut. *Nic.* 1.3): see Gruen 1992: 45 and Erskine 2001: 31, 40.

[53] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.74.1 = *FGrH* 566 F 60. See Feeney 2007: 53-4.

[54] Strabo 1.4.9.

and to the Augustan recolonisation of Carthage, *Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago*.[55] In addition, the specification that the temple of Juno in Carthage was founded where a horse's head had been dug up (1.441-5) invites a direct link with the temple of Jupiter in Rome,[56] which was also founded at the slope of a hill where a human head had been dug up, the *caput humanum* which gave the Capitoline hill its hallowed name.[57] Also the similarities between Dido and Aeneas are famously explicit.[58] As Dido herself notices (1.628-9), her exile story is a direct match for Aeneas', since they are both *duces* of their people (1.364 *dux femina facti*) who have been forced, under different circumstances, to depart from the East in order to found a western colony destined to outlast its mother-city. The mirroring similes of Dido-Diana at 1.498-504 and of Aeneas-Apollo at 4.143-50 invite readers, already in DServius' view, to register these two characters as twin siblings, thus emphasising the impossibility of their marriage.[59] Their meeting in the cave, at 4.165-6 (*speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem / deueniunt*), where *dux* initially consorts with Dido before finding correct assignment to Aeneas, finally renders, with a 'linguistic double-take,' 'this allusive merging into one of the two individuals'.[60]

The riddle of identities created by this mirroring is well reflected in Virgil's handling of the Romans' and Carthaginians' relationship to the Greeks. If, on the one hand, Carthaginians are inevitably treated as barbarians, the sense of their belonging to the same party of the hostile Greeks is explicitly stressed after Aeneas' arrival at the city. Juno is their supporting goddess, in whose honour they have erected a temple which evidently celebrates the Achaeans' success over eastern foes in terms very closely reminiscent of fifth-century Athenian propaganda, with the Phrygians symbolising the defeated Persians.[61] From this perspective, it is noteworthy that one of the few plausible verbal reminiscences of Aeschylus' *Persae* in the *Aeneid* is related to the Trojan war. In Aeneas' words, the island to which the Greeks sail off before the finding of the Horse, may ominously recall Psyttaleia (cf. *Aen*. 2.21-3 *Est in conspectu Tenedos, notissima fama / insula… nunc tantum sinus et statio male fida carinis* and *Pers*. 447-8 νῆσός τις ἔστι πρόσθε Σαλαμῖνος τόπων, / βαιά, δύσορμος ναυσίν).[62] Aeneas, aligning himself with the Persian messenger,[63]

[55] See especially E. L. Harrison 1984.

[56] On the parallel between the Carthaginian grove and Romulus' *asylum* see Giusti 2014: 8 n. 31.

[57] Liv. 1.55.5, Pl. *NH* 28.15, Serv. *ad A.* 8.345. See Giusti 2014: 8 n. 31.

[58] See especially Van Nortwick 1992: 89-124, Hardie 2006, Reed 2007: 73-100.

[59] DServ. *ad A*. 4.144 'quomodo germanorum nuptiae esse non possunt,' see Hardie 2006.

[60] Hardie 2006: 29.

[61] See Horsfall 1973-74.

[62] The similarities are noted by Austin 1964: 39 but are nonetheless very slight.

seems to be aware of the link between the Trojan and Persian wars as famously expressed by the Persians themselves at the beginning of Herodotus' narrative (Hdt. 1.5). Noticeably, the same orientalistic connotation of wealth applied to Carthage at the beginning of the previous book (1.14 *dives opum*) has now been transferred to Priam's kingdom (2.22 *dives opum*), partly in response to the already established equation of Carthage and Troy, partly in transferral of barbaric traits to these orientalised pre-Romans. As a common thread in this transfer of barbarian traits, the 'barbaric gold' of the doors of Priam's palace (2.504 *barbarico postes auro*), reminiscent of Ennius' *Andromacha* (94 J *ope barbarica*) will appear again, this time in its Ennian phrasing, in the description of Antony's forces at 8.685 (*ope barbarica*), symbol of the civil wars' inseparable blending of West and East, Romans and Barbarians.[64]

Within this intricate triangle of Trojans, Carthaginians and Greeks, it is Telamonian Ajax, Salamis' hero,[65] who supplies a privileged viewpoint to explore the intersections and similarities between Carthaginians and Trojans. Not only is Ajax an intertextual model for both Dido and Aeneas in the course of the poem,[66] but it is actually his half-brother Teucer, the founder of Cypriot Salamis,[67] who provides the mythical point of contact between Troy and Sidon, since it is thanks to him that Dido is informed of the Trojans' misfortunes (*Aen*. 1.619-22). If Carthaginians and Romans are both pulled on to the Greek side by Ajax's model, the figure of Teucer can be singled out as embodying this continuous shift of eastern paradigms. Indeed, the mediator between Carthaginians and Romans is emphatically a character who, as son of Telamon and of Priam's sister Hesione, is both Greek and Trojan. Teucer was inside the wooden horse, but his expulsion from Salamis pointed to his responsibility for the death of Salamis' hero; he is connected to Athens' expansionist propaganda, though at the same the founder of an eastern city, a bulwark of Phoenicia; furthermore, his homonymy with another Teucer, the legendary ancestor of the Trojan kings, previously mentioned by Venus (1.235), who will be the cause of the Trojans' misunderstanding of

---

[63] For other points of contact between Aeneas and the messenger in *Persae*, see Rossi 2004: 52.

[64] See Wigodsky 1972: 78, Bowie 1990: 480 n. 79.

[65] On Salamis as 'Ajax's island' (νῆσος Αἴαντος), see *Pers*. 307, 368, 596.

[66] For Dido in *Aeneid* 4 and 6 (the encounter between Dido and Aeneas in the underworld being modelled on *Od*. 11.543-67) and for Aeneas in 12. See Lefèvre 1978, Lyne 1987: 9-12, Barchiesi 1999: 324, Panoussi 2002 and 2009: 177-217.

[67] The myth of Teucer, who founded another Salamis in Cyprus after being repudiated by his father Telamon on the grounds that he had not avenged Ajax's death, was probably created as part of the propaganda of Athenian expansion in the East right after the Persian wars (Nilsson 1951: 64-5) and it is presented as such both in Pindar's fourth *Nemean* (*Nem*. 4.46) and in Aeschylus' *Persae* (895), see Garvie 2009: 335.

their western origins in Book 3, must reinforce this eastern-western ambiguity.[68] In terms of oriental identities, Dido's proximity to the Greek hero of the Persian wars, together with the 'invention'[69] that her father had helped Teucer in founding a second Salamis, would seem to dismantle the barbarian orientalising theatre that had been set up for Carthage, revealing instead the similarities between Greeks and Carthaginians – eastern foes of the Romans, or western foes of the Trojans. However, the identification of Aeneas with Odysseus in *Aeneid* 6 (needless to say, an identification which runs throughout the poem) and, even more telling, with Ajax in *Aeneid* 12,[70] should put into question even this model. In addition, as regards the use of the Ajax model in the Augustan age, it may be telling that Ajax was after all the victim of a sort of internal conflict. Unfortunately, we are unable to assess whether Virgil also had in mind Ennius' *Ajax* or Pacuvius' *Armorum Iudicium* when using Ajax for the representation of his Dido, but an interesting anecdote preserved by Suetonius might prompt further investigation of the political and Roman use of Ajax in the *Aeneid*. Suetonius claims that a line of Pacuvius' *Armorum Iudicium* was sung at the funeral games of Julius Caesar 'to rouse pity and indignation at his death' (*ad miserationem et inuidiam caedis eius*):

"Men seruasse, ut essent qui me perderent" ?
(Suet. *Iul*. 84.2 = Pacuv. *Armorum Iudicium* fr. XV Klotz)

"Saved I these men so that they could murder me?"

This line, probably taken from Aeschylus' Ὅπλων κρίσις, was delivered by Ajax against Ulixes[71] in a line of reasoning strikingly similar to Dido's complaints to Aeneas, when she reminds him of his ingratitude in return to her saving of the fleet (*Aen*. 4.373-8). Even though it is impossible to trace the political significance of Ajax in early Roman theatre (supposing he had any), the model of the Ajax-Odysseus dispute as a strife between compatriots was evidently central to the reception of its myth in view of the treacherous murder of Caesar. Paradoxically even in the Greek myth, the hero of the wars against barbarians was one whose death had been caused by an internal conflict.

---

[68] See Barchiesi 1999: 337.

[69] Austin 1971: 191.

[70] See *Aen*. 12.435-40 with Tarrant 2012: 202-3; on Aeneas as Ajax, see Lyne 1987: 8-12, 113-4, Panoussi 2009: 214-6, Barchiesi 1999: 324. It may be significant that Aeneas' identification with the Greek hero becomes explicit towards the end of a poem which can also be considered as a journey to shake off the burden of his oriental Trojan identity: see Schmitz 2013: 100-2.

[71] See the *Scholia in Suetonii Vitas Caesarum*.

Bacchic conclusions

Therefore, it is from the point of view of the dissolution of the strict polarities set up when equating Carthaginians and Persians that the intertext of Euripides' *Bacchae* in *Aeneid* 4 should be analysed. On the one hand, Carthage is presented as the home of the Dionysian as early as Aeneas' arrival: the Nymphs sitting in the harbour's *antrum* (1.168) and the *Oreades* of the Dido-Diana simile (1.500) look forward to those who will witness Aeneas' and Dido's union in the cave with ritual howling (4.168 *ulularunt uertice Nymphae*). These latter Nymphs are assimilated to the Maenads of Dionysiac all-nighters[72] to which Dido and the women of the city (4.667 *femineo ululatu*) will be later more explicitly compared (4.300-3). On the other hand, however, as Clifford Weber has convincingly shown, the strong similarities between Aeneas and Bacchus in the Aeneas-Apollo simile (4.143-150) and the parallels between the hunting scene of Book 4 and Pentheus' mountain hunt in Euripides' *Bacchae* point to the recognition of Aeneas as 'the Virgilian counterpart of Euripides' Dionysus, as both the hunter who survives the hunt and a stranger newly arrived from Asia. His advent, like that of Dionysus, leads to the death of the reigning monarch. Dido corresponds to one of Euripides' Maenads… even more salient, however, are the affinities between Dido and Pentheus.'[73] Dido's anguished dream of actually *being* Pentheus (4.469-70 *Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus / et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas*) would therefore point to the recognition of Aeneas as the foreign eastern deity come to destroy her realm.

As recently examined by Mac Góráin, the profusion of Dionysiac references in the second half of the *Aeneid*, and particularly in Book 7,[74] can be interpreted in terms of a structuring of *Aeneid* 7-12 after the plot of Euripides' *Bacchae*, which creates a parallel between Dionysus' return to his own land in the form of a *xenos* and Aeneas' arrival at the land of his ancestors.[75] Euripides' *Bacchae* would then provide 'the most important tragic model for the *Aeneid*'s substratum of civil war thematics in the context of the foundation of a city… which reflects on recent and contemporary history'.[76] The fact that the same tragic model also structures the plot of the Carthaginian episode serves to emphasise not only the strong thematic correspondences between the

---

[72] Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 689 ἡ σὴ δὲ μήτηρ ὠλόλυξεν and 1133 αἱ δ' ὀλόλυζον; *Aen.* 4.168 is also strongly reminiscent of Hecate's apparition to Jason in Apollonius' *Argonautica* 3.1218-9 αἱ δ' ὀλόλυξαν / Νύμφαι. Cf. Bocciolini Palagi 2007: 35 n.70.

[73] C. Weber 2002: 334.

[74] On which see Bocciolini Palagi 2007.

[75] See Mac Góráin 2009 and 2013.

[76] Mac Góráin 2009: 80.

two halves of the poem, but also the presentation of Carthage as one of Aeneas' possible homes, a 'paradoxically foreign "motherland"'[77] which is intratextually equated both to Troy and to the site of future Rome, and intertextually reminiscent of Ithaca by use of the harbour of Phorcys (*Od*. 13.96-112) as the ecphrastic model for the Carthaginian, a harbour which noticeably also featured a cave of Nymphs (cf. *Aen*. 1.166-8 and *Od*. 13.103-4 ἀγχόθι δ᾽ αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἠεροειδές, / ἱρὸν νυμφάων αἳ νηϊάδες καλέονται). The interactions with Ithaca exploited in the Carthaginian harbour, if analysed together with the Dionysiac features of Aeneas in Carthage, set up the frame of a *nostos* which is not only strongly suggested by the similarities between Aeneas and Dido, but even craved by the queen herself, whose agony lies at the edge between her desire to play a second Penelope and the sensation of acting as a second Pentheus instead. But there is also another famously recognised model which is similarly at work in the construction and dissolution of polarities: if Aeneas' acting as Dionysus could strengthen Dido's confidence that he has come to rescue her from her perilous neighbours as Dionysus came to rescue Ariadne, it will soon be clear that he is also no less a veritable Theseus. Treacherous, cruel, cold-blooded perhaps, and an Athenian hero – the Greek national slayer of monsters and barbarians alike.

In the *Aeneid*, it is significant that the primary model for the Carthaginian episode is that of the Phaeacians, whose striking similarity to the Phoenicians goes far beyond a merely phonetic assonance, to the point that an identification between the two has often been proposed in the past.[78] But what is peculiar about the Carthaginian land is that, whereas in Homer there is no direct hint at an identification between Phoenicians and Phaeacians, these people are authentic Tyrians only disguised as Phaeacians. The atmosphere of a wonderland and fantasy realm that the Carthaginians retain from the Greek model is undermined by the construction of a city which, as a Phoenician colony in the West, is inevitably compared to Thebes, and was also called Καδμεία.[79] The activation of the tragic model of Thebes, 'the obverse side of Athens,'[80] drags Aeneas into a world of 'ill-defined boundaries, incestuous tensions, blurred gender identities, a household (and a land) *ambigua*'.[81] Thebes, and especially Euripides' Thebes, is the theatrical site where the Greek *vs* Barbarian polarisations eventually collapse. Like Teucer's new Salamis, like Carthage and like Rome, it is a city that layers of myth and history have gradually built up as a hybrid, belonging

---

[77] Oliensis 2001: 49.

[78] See Leask 1888, Winter 1995, Dougherty 2001: 102-21. On Phaeacia and Virgil's Carthage, see Giusti 2014.

[79] Steph. Byz. *s.u. Καρχηδών*. On Carthage and Thebes, see Svenbro – Scheid 1985, Hardie 1990.

[80] Zeitlin 1986: 117.

[81] Schiesaro 2008: 97.

neither to East nor West: if its national deity, Dionysus, 'is equally "at home" among Greeks and Barbarians, it is because he belongs to both worlds.'[82]

The mirrorings between Carthage and Rome, when analysed together with the polarisation of Carthage as a barbarian city, create a blurring of boundaries and identities which is particularly suitable not only to the tragic genre,[83] but to the Dionysiac elements inherent in Virgil's Carthage, which are echoed through the conspicuous intertext of Thebes and Euripides' *Bacchae*.[84] If the tragedy of Pentheus is a prominent model for Dido, this is not only because their cities share the same Phoenician ancestry: as with Euripides' *Bacchae*, one can see the Carthaginian episode 'simultaneously telescoping polarity and identity,'[85] marking 'the abolition of the frontier that normally separates the Greek[/Roman] man from the effeminate Barbarian'.[86] However, unlike the *Bacchae*, the assimilation of Western and Barbarian in the *Aeneid* is made even more cogent and inevitably puzzling by the fact that we are no longer dealing with a two-fold relationship: a Greek identity is inserted between Carthaginians and Romans, counting simultaneously as West and East, foreigner and ancestor, continuously shifting between opposites according to the perspective one adopts on the Trojans – whether they should be considered Phrygians or western Dardanians.

It is perhaps no suprise then that in an epic poem whose protagonist can be Trojan and Greek, Dionysus and Theseus at the very same time, the antagonistic city must be envisaged as a second Thebes in a whirlwind of shifting western-eastern paradigms. The safe and rationalising principle of *metus hostilis*, a principle which is, or has become, properly Roman, ends up collapsing under the burden of Virgil's exploitation of the tragic genre. This fall opens up a crack in Rome's security of a strong national identity which is filled by the nightmare of Rome's being its own barbarian enemy, the threatening ghost of the recent civil wars. This irrational riddle of identities, the interactions between Trojans/Romans, Phoenicians/Carthaginians and Greeks, cannot but give a new, irrational – or at least illogical – phrasing to the proverb which exemplified the principle of Negative Association: no more is 'the Enemy of my Enemy my Friend,' but the Enemy of my Enemy has now become… my Enemy.

---

[82] Saïd 2002: 98.

[83] See Segal 1986: 38-41.

[84] For a similar Dionysiac blurring in relation to Carthage, Rome and civil war, see my reading of Horace's *Epode* 9: Giusti (forthcoming, 2015).

[85] Segal 1986: 38.

[86] Saïd 2002: 67.

Works Cited

Asheri, D. (1990) *Erodoto Le Storie Volume III Libro III: La Persia*. Milano.

Austin, R. G. (1964) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.

    (1971) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford.

Barchiesi, A. (1999) 'Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*', in *Virgil. Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, ed. P.R. Hardie. London: 324-44. Orig. Barchiesi, A. (1994) 'Rappresentazioni del dolore e interpretazione nell'Eneide', *A&A* 40: 109-24.

Bertman, S. (2000) 'Cleopatra and Antony as Models for Dido and Aeneas', *EMC* N. S. 19: 395-8.

Boas, G. (1961) *Rationalism in Greek Philosophy*. Baltimore.

Bocciolini Palagi, L. (2007) *La Trottola di Dioniso. Motivi dionisiaci nel VII libro dell'*Eneide. Bologna.

Bowie, A. M. (1990) 'The Death of Priam: Allegory and History in the *Aeneid*', *CQ* 40: 470-81.

Burton, P. (2013) 'Enter the Muse: Literary Responses to Roman Imperialism (240-100 BC)', in *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*, ed. D. Hoyos. Leiden and Boston: 99-112.

Cartledge, P. (1993) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford.

Conte, G. B. (2007) '*Defensor Vergilii:* Richard Heinze on Virgil's Epic Technique', in Conte, G. B. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*, ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford: 170-83. Orig. Conte, G. B. (1996) '*Defensor Vergilii*: la tecnica epica dell'*Eneide* secondo Richard Heinze', introduction to R. Heinze (tr. M. Martina), *La tecnica epica di Virgilio*. Bologna: 9-23.

Dodds, E. R. (1944) *Bacchae, Euripides*. Oxford.

    (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.

Dougherty, C. (2001) *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's* Odyssey. Oxford.

Earl, D. C. (1961) *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge.

Egan, R. B. (1998) 'The Signs of the Horse's Head: *Aeneid* 1.442-5', *PVS* 23: 193-207.

Erskine, A. (2001) *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.

Evrigenis, I. D. (2008) *Fear of Enemies and Collective Action*. Cambridge.

Feeney, D. (2007) *Caesar's Calendar. Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.

Frede, M. and Striker, G. (eds.) (1996) *Rationality in Greek Thought*. Oxford.

Garvie, A. F. (2009) *Aeschylus Persae*. Oxford.

Giusti, E. (2014) 'Virgil's Carthaginians at *Aen*. 1.430-6: Cyclopes in Bees' Clothing', *CCJ* 60, FirstView: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9250299&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1750270514000013

(forthcoming, 2015) 'Dithyrambic Iambics: Epode 9 and its General(s') Con*fusion*,' in *Horace* Epodes: *Literary Traditions and Contexts*, eds. C. Stocks and P. Bather. Oxford.

Goldhill, S. (1988) 'Battle Narrative and Politics in Aeschylus' *Persae*', *JHS* 108: 128-93, reprinted in *Greeks and Barbarians*, ed. T. Harrison. Edinburgh: 50-61.

Griffith, M. (2007) 'The Rule of the Father in *Persians*', in *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Aeschylus*, ed. M. Lloyd. Oxford: 93-140.

Gruen, E. S. (1992) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca.

(2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton and Oxford.

Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.

(1993) 'Asia unmanned: images of victory in classical Athens', in *War and Society in the Greek World*, eds. J. Rich and G. Shipley. London and New York: 108-33.

(1996) *Aeschylus Persians*. Warminster.

Hardie, P. R. (1990) 'Ovid's Theban History: the first Anti-*Aeneid*?', *CQ* 40: 224-35.

(2006) 'Virgil's Ptolemaic Relations', *JRS* 96: 25-41.

(2014) *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's* Aeneid. London and New York.

Harrison, E. L. (1984) 'The *Aeneid* and Carthage', in *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus*, eds. T. Woodman and D. West. Cambridge: 95-115.

Harrison, T. (2000) *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus'* Persians *and the History of the fifth century*. London.

Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus. The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1991) *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, ed. A. W. Wood, transl. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge.

Heinze, R. (1993) *Virgil's Epic Technique*, transl. H. Harvey, D. Harvey and F. Robertson. Bristol.

Horsfall, N. M. (1973-74) 'Dido in the Light of History', *PVS* 13: 1-13, reprinted in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford: 127-44.

Jacobs, J. (2010) 'From Sallust to Silius Italicus: *Metus Hostilis* and the Fall of Rome in the *Punica*', in *Latin Historiography and Poetry in the Early Empire*, eds. J. F. Miller and A. J. Woodman. Leiden and Boston: 123-39.

Korenjak, M. (2004) '*Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe/ ostia*: Virgil's Carthago and Eratosthenian Geography', *CQ* 54.2: 646-9.

Kraggerud, E. (1963) 'Vergil über die Gründung Karthagos', *SO* 38: 32-7.

Krummen, E. (2004) 'Dido als Mänade und tragische Heroine. Dionysische Thematik und Tragödientradition in Vergils Didoerzählung', *Poetica* 36: 25-69.

Leask, W. K. (1888) 'The Homeric Phaeacians', *The English Historical Review* 3.10: 292-4.

Lefèvre, E. (1978) *Dido und Aias. Ein Beitrag zur römischen Tragödie*, *AAWM* 1978.2. Wiesbaden.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1987) *Further voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Mac Góráin, F. (2009) *Tragedy and the Dionysiac in Virgil's* Aeneid. DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.

(2012-13) 'Apollo and Dionysus in Virgil', *ITFC* 12: 191-238

(2013) 'Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic', in *Augustan Poetry and The Roman Republic*, eds. D. Nelis and J. A. Farrell. Oxford: 124-45.

McGushin, P. (1992) *Sallust, The Histories, Volume I: Books i-ii*. Oxford.

Mineo, B. (2011) 'Principal Literary Sources for the Punic Wars (apart from Polybius)', in *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, ed. D. Hoyos. Oxford: 111-28.

Moudarres, A. (2011) *The Mirror of the Enemy: Boundaries of Power in the Italian Renaissance*. Ph.D. diss. University of Yale.

Nilsson, M. P. (1951) *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece*. Göteborg.

Oliensis, E. (2001) 'Freud's *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 47: 39-63.

Panoussi, V. (2002) 'Vergil's Ajax: Allusion, Tragedy and Heroic Identity in the *Aeneid*', *ClAnt* 21: 95-134.

(2009) *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's "Aeneid". Ritual, Empire and Intertext*. Cambridge.

Podlecki, A. J. (1986) '*Polis* and Monarch in Early Attic Tragedy', in *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, ed. J. P. Euben. Berkeley: 76-100.

Reed, J. D. (2007) *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the* Aeneid. Princeton and Oxford.

Rossi, A. (2004) *Contexts of War: Manipulation of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative*. Ann Arbor.

Russo, L. (2004) *The Forgotten Revolution: how science was born in 300 BC and why it had to be reborn*, transl. S. Levy. Berlin and New York.

Saïd, S. (2002) 'Greeks and Barbarians in Euripides' Tragedies: The End of Differences?' in *Greeks and Barbarians*, ed. T. Harrison. Edinburgh: 62-100. Orig. Saïd, S. (1984) 'Grecs et Barbares dans les tragédies d'Euripide: le fin des différences', *Ktema* 9: 27-53.

(2007) 'Tragedy and Reversal: The Example of the *Persians*', in *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Aeschylus*, ed. M. Lloyd. Oxford: 71-92.

Schiesaro, A. (2008) 'Furthest Voices in Virgil's Dido', *SIFC* 100: 60-109 and 194-245.

Schmitt, C. (1996) *The Concept of the Political*, transl. and with an introduction by G. Schwab, with a foreword by T. B. Strong. Chicago and London.

Schmitz, C. (2013) 'Der Orientalismusdiskurs als Intertext in Vergils *Aeneis*', in *Innovation aus Tradition: Literaturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven der Vergilforschung. BAC – Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* Band 93, eds. M. Baumbach and W. Polleichtner. Trier: 97-137.

Segal, C. (1986) *Interpreting Greek Tragedy: Myth, Poetry, Text*. Ithaca and London.

Snell, B. (1953) *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek origins of European Thought*, transl. T. G. Rosenmeyer. Oxford.

Svenbro, J. and Scheid, J. (1985) 'Byrsa. La ruse d'Élissa et la fondation de Carthage', *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 40.2: 328-42.

Syed, Y. (2005) *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the Roman Self: Subject and Nation in Literary Discourse*. Ann Arbor.

Tarrant, R. J. (2012) *Virgil Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge.

Van Nortwick, T. (1992) *Somewhere I have never Travelled. The Second Self and the Hero's Journey in Ancient Epic*. New York and Oxford.

Weber, C. (2002) 'The Dionysus in Aeneas', *CPh* 97: 322-43.

Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.

Wigodsky, M. (1972) *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 24. Wiesbaden.

Winter, I. J. (1995) 'Homer's Phoenicians: History, Ethnography, or Literary Trope? [A Perspective on Early Orientalism]', in *The Ages of Homer*, eds. J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris. Austin: 247-71.

Wood, N. (1995) 'Sallust's Theorem: A Comment on 'Fear' in Western Political Thought,' *History of Politcal Thought* 16.2: 174-89.

Zeitlin, F. I. (1986) 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama', in *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, ed. J. P. Euben. Berkeley: 101-41.