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EDITOR’S NOTE

GUEST EDITORS: CAMWS COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Established by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in 2010, the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion directs attention to the importance and complexity of bringing the languages, literatures, and peoples of the ancient Mediterranean to increasingly diverse audiences.

Central to the CAMWS mission, of course, the committee’s efforts aim to provide a service to teachers and scholars in schools and colleges. In this way, the Committee seeks to assist other CAMWS committees and members in their responsibilities and opportunities. Hence, we quickly said “yes” when Yasuko Taoka invited our Committee to join in preparation of an issue of Teaching Classical Languages that focusses on curricular materials, pedagogical strategies, and the challenges for making classics and its languages available to and accessible by new and increasingly more diverse audiences.

A single issue can only scratch the surface. We attempt here to offer a sample of what “diversity” and inclusion allows: the courage of working with specific populations (e.g., students at all levels with special needs), the importance of looking again and anew at canonical authors (e.g., Vergil) as well as authors themselves examples of the diverse nature of the Roman world (Prudentius). And how the ancients looked at the concept of “race” has significance for all of us who teach the past in an increasingly complex present. Both personal reflective essays and more scholarly approaches have a place in our work. And referees from a wide range of institutions have assisted us in preparation of this issue. We thank the many colleagues whose good will and good judgement we have mined.

We believe that the richness of “diversity” and “inclusion” is itself showcased in this way. Further, with panels and round tables at CAMWS’ annual meetings, and with a careful but important social media presence, the Committee hopes to make our profession’s commitment to each of the segments in the well-known definition offered by writer/illustrator Liz Fosslien:

“Diversity is having a seat at the table, inclusion is having a voice, and belonging is having that voice be heard”
Vergil’s Aeneid and 21st-Century Immigration

CHRISTOPHER NAPPA
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Increasingly, it has become clear that the texts on Greece and Rome, whatever they have meant to people in the past and however they have been used, still speak to many people and that their reach need not be limited to those interested in, or who feel that they themselves exemplify, a western tradition largely based in and on what Europeans have thought and done.¹ This realization takes numerous forms, from the growing acknowledgement that the texts of the Ancient Near East are more than illuminating footnotes to developments in Europe to the important acknowledgment that the many voices present in Classical texts speak not only to and for a particular ethnic, social, and often religious demographic but represent experiences and points of view from the much fuller human spectrum. Moreover, complex ancient texts are not necessarily any simpler than those from recent history: they contest as many truths as they champion, pose as many questions as they answer, and celebrate as much as decry the messiness of the human condition.

Recent years have begun to look at Vergil’s Aeneid with a variety of concerns that differ, sometimes dramatically, from traditional matters of interest. The ways in which the poem explores or even creates Roman identity are now of paramount importance to critics.² This broad area can be resolved into a number of separate questions. One of these is ethnicity, since the story of the Aeneid is in part one about the combination of different ethnic groups. Conversely, it is also an examination of
the historical strands that readers of Vergil’s day understood to constitute their own ethnic background.\(^3\) Ethnicity cannot be disentangled from race, for, then as now, racism and racial rhetoric is deeply implicated in understandings of ethnic identity.\(^4\) The *Aeneid* shows the biases of Romans of the Augustan period toward the different groups that make up the political power structure of their empire: Italians, Greeks, Etruscans, and the elusive Trojans.\(^5\) Studying ethnicity and race as they are teased out in the *Aeneid* raises questions of how later readers and artists have used the poem in their own projects of self-construction.\(^6\) Questions of race and ethnicity cannot—for the Romans or for Americans—be divorced from questions of immigration, colonization and colonialism, and, increasingly, postcolonial approaches are being applied to classical texts.\(^7\)

Moreover, for the *Aeneid* “colonization” conflates two related but different concepts. One involves colonialism as it is understood by students of modern imperial powers and their effects on their former subjects; the other is the specific Greek practice of city-founding, whereby a polis sent out colonists with explicit understanding that they would found a new polis, loyal to the mother city perhaps, but ultimately independent.\(^8\) Neither of these is identical to what Aeneas does in the *Aeneid*, but both are relevant to our understanding of (and teaching about) the text.

My topic is Vergil’s *Aeneid*, but this kind of discussion can be extended to other texts from the ancient world, such as Aeschylus’ *Persians* and *Suppliants* and Euripides’ *Medea*.\(^9\) Here I attempt to use rhetoric about immigrants and foreigners in the *Aeneid* to point to ways that teaching the poem in the 21st century can invite and encourage students to see the contemporary relevance of ancient texts and to
bring to those texts their own experience of the world in which they live. My goal here is more to produce something useful for teachers of the *Aeneid* at all levels than to advance the cutting edge of Vergil scholarship and, accordingly, I have deemphasized scholarship on both antiquity and immigration in the modern world in order to make this discussion as immediate and useful as possible. There are many important differences between modern and ancient experience that show in the rhetoric about immigrants and foreigners, but there are profound similarities as well. The *Aeneid* provides a prime example of an ancient text that participates in the negative stereotyping that characterizes anti-immigrant sentiment across the centuries. At the same time, the *Aeneid* also displays the complexity of such texts, for the *Aeneid* is more than an anti-immigrant manifesto. The poem’s rhetorical treatment of Roman identity encompasses both positive and negative portrayals of immigrant and putative native alike. In fact, the status of major characters and factions—Aeneas and his followers, Dido, or Evander, for example—is one of the things the *Aeneid* most intently scrutinizes. Categories like foreigner, refugee, and immigrant are held in constant tension with those like native, colonist, and invader. Yet this is not the tension between different individuals or groups but instead a tension at the heart of the concepts themselves. In an American context, we might rephrase this in terms of indigeneity—should land be held by the oldest group of inhabitants on it or by those who form a political and ethnic majority? Does it matter how the later people came to possess it?

Rome and the contemporary United States share several relevant similarities regarding immigration. Still, perhaps the largest is the fact that each society
possesses a rhetoric of cultural uniformity and stability despite a known history of growth from multiple cultural strains. The *Aeneid* contains numerous passages which touch on the intertwined experiences of the immigrant and the refugee, on the one hand, and, on the other, the perceptions of the prior inhabitants of the lands they enter.

Here, I treat only a few examples, but each can be used to open up discussion of the poem’s major themes or the realities of human migration. We start with the speech of Iarbas at 4.211-18, in which he addresses his father Jupiter.¹¹

```
‘femina, quae nostris errans in finibus urbem
exiguam pretio posuit, cui litus arandum
cuique loci leges dedimus, conubia nostra
reppulit ac dominum Aenean in regna recepit.
et nunc ille Paris cum semi uiro comitatu,
Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem
subnexus, rapto potitur: nos munera templis
quippe tuis ferimus famamque fouemus inanem.’
```

“The woman, who, a wanderer in our territory, founded a meager city (at a price), the one to whom we gave some shoreland to be plowed and gave conditions, she rejected marriage with me and welcomed Aeneas as lord in her kingdom. And now that Paris with his band of half-men, a Maeonian bonnet tied around his chin, his dripping hair tied up, is master of what was stolen. We are the ones bearing gifts, of course, to your temples, the ones who burnish your meaningless reputation.”

Here both Dido and Aeneas are targets: she, because as a needy immigrant she both lives on native largesse and shows scorn for native culture; he, because he is yet another foreigner—and one who shows the effeminacy so often attributed by one culture to another.¹² He has arrived both to underscore Dido’s disdain for Iarbas and his Africans and as a continued reminder that some foreigners prosper as thieves.
This rhetoric of the criminality of newcomers is not only based on ancient ideas of the pirate, well known from both the *Odyssey* and Thucydides’ earliest chapters, but it is also a mainstay of anti-immigrant rhetoric in much of the world today. According to research accessible through the “Reimagining Migration” project at the University of California, Los Angeles, the word “immigrant” prompts a significant number of Americans to associate the word “illegal” automatically.\(^\text{13}\)

This is striking when one realizes that very few American citizens are not descended from immigrants.

Each of the three topoi of Iarbas’ speech—the immigrant as haughty, the immigrant as thief, and the foreign man as unmanly—will recur in the *Aeneid*. Each shows depressing resonances that would appear to transcend history, as Nancy Shumate has traced in her book on classical and nationalist rhetorics and as even a cursory search of the internet amply attests. Foreigners are prone to not only criminality, but to an effeminacy that demonstrates a liability to the passions.\(^\text{14}\)

In Book 7, Latinus issues a greeting that pronounces the Trojans worthy, even tracing their lineage to Italy. Latinus’ wife Amata, however, has different ideas.

\begin{verbatim}
'exsulibusne datur ducenda Lauinia Teucris,
o genitor, nec te miseret nataeque tuique?
nec matris miseret, quam primo Aquilone relinquet
perfidus alta petens abducta uirgine praedo?
at non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor,
Ledaeamque Helenam Troianas uexit ad urbes?
quid tua sancta fides? quid cura antiqua tuorum
et consanguineo totiens data dextera Turno?
si gener externa petitur de gente Latinis,
idque sedet, Faunique premunt te iussa parentis,
\end{verbatim}
omnem equidem sceptris terram quae libera nostris
dissidet externam reor et sic dicere diuos.
et Turno, si prima domus repetatur origo,
Inachus Acrisiusque patres mediaeque Mycenae.’

[7.359-72]
“To exiles from Troy Lavinia must be given to marry? Oh, and, a
father, you have no pity for your daughter or yourself? And do you
not pity her mother whom, with the first North Wind, the treacherous
pirate will abandon, heading for the high sea, our maiden daughter
taken off? But didn’t the Phrygian pirate insert himself into Sparta
in this way and carry off Leda’s Helen to Trojan cities? What has
become of your sacred trustworthiness? Your old concern for your
people? Your right hand pledged so often to Turnus, of your own
blood? If, for the Latins, a son-in-law is wanted from foreign stock,
if that is fixed, and the commands of Faunus your father hem you in,
then I think that every land which rests free of our control is foreign
and that this is what the gods are saying! And for Turnus, if the
earliest origins of his house are investigated, Inachus and Acrisius—
pure Greece—[15]—are his forefathers!”

Amata’s speech is very rich in its implications and its rhetoric. Embrace of the
immigrant is rooted, perhaps, in a loss of self-respect, for, unlike her husband,
she is embarrassed by having her daughter marry a foreigner. [16] Once again, the
immigrant is criminal in nature: Aeneas will abandon his new ties in Latium as soon
as it is convenient and thereby repeat the crime of Paris when he violated the home
of Menelaus and took Helen back to Troy. There is an implication here, too, that
foreign predation leads both to personal disgrace and civic disorder.

Yet Amata wants to have her cake and eat it too. If there is no escape from
marriage to a foreigner, Turnus—the local choice—can serve as foreign if need
be. Yet he is no Trojan; his ancestry is Greek (“Mycenae to the core!” in Fagles’
translation; “pure Greece” in mine). Not only is this a classic attempt to find a
loophole within prophecy, but it also divides “the foreign” into two camps: Turnus
is the better foreigner, close in culture and upbringing and characterized by the victories of the past, whereas Aeneas is not only of bad character, a more foreign foreigner, but also the remnant of the losing side.

Amata’s argument contains the seeds of its own undoing in any case. She begins by championing Turnus as related by blood, *consanguineus* (7.366), but then refigures him as coming *externa de gente* (7.367), “from a foreign people.” Moreover, the foreign people in question, the Argives, have been chosen to stand in for the Greeks generally and thus for the victors over Aeneas and his people at Troy. Yet the Argives fit this role only with difficulty. Inachus is one of Turnus’ ancestors in Amata’s rhetoric, but one of his chief claims to fame is that he is the father of Io, who will become an Egyptian goddess.17 Turnus’ other named ancestor, Acrisius, is a descendant of one of the Aegyptids (Lynceus). He himself is best known perhaps as the grandather of Perseus, who was not raised as an Argive, who returned to the Argolid with a foreign princess as a wife, and who ultimately killed Acrisius himself. If the Italians are an amalgam of peoples and lineages, so too are the Greeks. Amata’s attempt at establishing pedigree is no more secure than Anchises in Book 3.

*Penetrat* (7.363) is a suggestive verb in this context. As a general verb of motion or travel, it means to go within a territory or place, but the verb would also seem to have sexual overtones.18 Paris here invades Sparta in a way that prefigures his adulterous relationship with his host’s wife. The intimacy of both Paris’ entrance into Sparta and betrayal of his host animates Amata’s denunciation of Aeneas. What is worse is that all of this will happens with Latinus’ collusion: Amata fears that the just response of the Greeks will not take place this time.
Other characters will also link Aeneas’ impending marriage to Lavinia to Paris and the Greek response in the Trojan War, but they will do so in a way different from Amata’s championing of the Greeks. Contemporary rhetorics of foreignness make use of this same sort of distinction: refugees and immigrants are not all the same. They come from different places, some stronger—more like us—and some weaker. So, the overlay of individual character and the problems it may be thought to entail sits atop a rhetoric or an ideology of weakness and strength. In modern terms, for example, the distinction between American and European can give way to one of race or religion: white and not, Christian and not.

Recent years have seen a version of Amata’s rhetorical positioning of Greek over against Trojan in an American context. For example, in July 2013, Representative Steve King characterized children who would have been covered by the DREAM Act as a mix of valedictorians, brought in to the United States by their parents, and more numerous “weed-lifters,” who have “calves the size of cantaloupes because they’re hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.” In a series of notorious remarks, President Trump questioned the need for immigrants from “shithole countries”; the countries in question seem to have been Haiti and various undifferentiated African countries (Hirschfeld, Stolberg, and Kaplan). In similar conversations, he opposed such nations from the global south specifically to Norway, a nation with a predominantly white population; the perception among at least some Americans was that the specific attraction of Norway was its whiteness, although that was not specifically stated by Trump (Davis, Stolberg, and Kaplan; Baltimore Sun Editorial Board). In July of 2015, as a candidate for the presidency,
Trump tried to defend remarks made multiple times linking Latin American immigrants, especially Mexicans, to crime; rape was one of the crimes highlighted. The *Washington Post*, in a fact-checking analysis, found almost no evidence for these claims in general or for a propensity for sexual assault in particular (Lee 2015). What the accusation of rape does in this context is activate fears of the foreign man as hypermasculine.\(^{20}\)

Yet negative characterizations of immigrants are not always coherent.\(^{21}\) Amata relies on a trope by which the Trojans are not only foreign but the worst of foreigners. In her speech, the Greeks are to be preferred. Others also invoke the Greeks but for a different reason. For Turnus and Numanus Remulus, for example, the weakness of the also foreign Greeks serves to emphasize the strength of the Italians. When Turnus approaches the Trojan camp in Book 9, he sees that their ships are being rescued from fire by divine intervention, saving the nymphs from whose trees they had been made but also stranding the Trojans.\(^{22}\) As often in mythic contexts, Turnus interprets what should be an obvious sign that the Trojans enjoy divine favor into a confirmation of his own desire for victory.\(^{23}\) What concerns us here is his characterization of the Trojans:

\[
'sunt et mea contra
\]
\[
fata mihi, ferro sceleratam exscindere gentem
\]
\[
coniuge praerepta; nec solos tangit Atridas
\]
\[
iste dolor, solisque licet capere arma Mycenis.
\]
\[
"sed periisse semel satis est": peccare fuisset
\]
\[
ante satis, penitus modo non genus omne perosos
\]
\[
femineum. quibus haec medii fiducia ualli
\]
\[
fossarumque morae, leti discrimina parua,
\]
\[
dant animos; at non uidemt moenia Troiae
\]
\[
Neptuni fabricata manu considere in ignis?
\]
sed uos, o lecti, ferro qui scindere uallum
apparat et mecum inuadit trepidantia castra?
non armis mihi Volcani, non mille carinis
est opus in Teucros. addant se protinus omnes
Etruscii socios. tenebras et inertia furta
Palladii caesis late custodibus arcis
ne timeant, nec equi caeca condemur in aluo:
luce palam certum est igni circumdare muros.
haud sibi cum Danais rem faxo et pube Pelasga
esse ferant, decimum quos distulit Hector in annum.
nunc adeo, melior quoniam pars acta diei,
quod superest, laeti bene gestis corpora rebus
procurate, uiri, et pugnam sperate parari.’

[9.136-58]
“I have destiny on my side too:
to cut down the wicked race with the sword since my bride was
snatched away—that pain has not touched only the sons of Atreus,
nor is Mycenae alone allowed to take up arms! ‘But it’s enough
that they fell once!’ It would have been enough that they did wrong
before, if they did not thoroughly hate (except for the whole race of
women)! Their faith in the rampart in between, the hindrance of a
ditch—meager separation from death—gives them courage! But did
they not see Troy’s wall, built by Neptune’s hands, sink in flames?

But you, chosen men, who stands ready to cut down the
rampart with the sword, to invade with me the trembling camp? I
don’t need Vulcan’s armor, a thousand ships against the Teucrians.
Immediately let all the Etruscans join up as their allies. Let them
have no fear of darkness and the unwarlike theft of their Palladium,
the citadel’s guards slaughtered all about, and we will not hide in
the dark belly of a horse: openly, in daylight, I’ve decided to invest
their walls with fire! Let me bring it to pass that they say that this is
not their dealings with the Greeks and Pelasgian youth that Hector
kept at bay for ten years. Right now, since the better part of the day
has passed, for what is left, happy in deeds well done, tend to your
bodies, men, and expect preparation for battle.”

Turnus, having just witnessed divine intervention on the Trojans’ behalf, both
downplays the significance of these events for his enemy and asserts his own
hoped-for countervailing destiny. He too casts Aeneas in the role of a new Paris,
but his exaggeration is even greater, for despite his claim *coniuge praerepta* (“since my bride was snatched away”), Lavinia is neither his wife nor even his fiancée. Nevertheless, Turnus rhetorically stakes out a position both parallel and superior to that of the Greeks in the Trojan War. Like the sons of Atreus and the Greeks, he and the Italians have been wronged by the theft of a woman and have the right to respond. Turnus then invents an objection that the Trojans have paid sufficiently for Paris’ actions. He then attempts to refute this objection: it would also have been enough for the Trojans to give up their habit of stealing other men’s wives, but they have not. He then mocks the paltry defenses they believe will protect them against his forces. This last point, however valid it may be, leads Turnus into an exhortation to his men, and here his characterization of the situation falters quite badly. He is dismissive of divine aid (Aeneas’ armor), the alliance with the bulk of the Etruscans (another non-Italian people), and the Greeks, both in their specific heroes and deeds (Ulysses and Diomedes, who stole the Palladium; the ploy of the Trojan horse) and their overall strength (a thousand ships, the Pelasgian youth). The Greeks at Troy, in fact, were barely superior to the Trojans, with Hector alone holding them off for ten years. Amata’s stronger, superior foreigners are nowhere to be found.

Numanus Remulus will also contrast Trojan and Italian by, among other things, discounting the force and resourcefulness of the Greeks. He also reminds the reader and Ascanius of Paris’ crime, and adds a gendered dimension to his attack as well.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{‘non pudet obsidione iterum ualloque teneri,} \\
\text{bis capti Phryges, et morti praetendere muros?} \\
\text{en qui nostra sibi bello conubia poscunt!} \\
\text{quis deus Italiam, quae uos dementia adegit?}
\end{align*}\]
nnon hic Atridae nec fandi fector Vlixes:
durum a stirpe genus natos ad flumina primum
deferimus saeuoque gelu duramus et undis;
uenatu in uigilant pueri siluasque fatigant,
flectere ludus equos et spicula tendere cornu.
at patiens operum paruoque adsueta iuuentus
aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello.
onme aeum ferro teritur, uersaque iuuncum
terga fatigamus hasta, nec tarda senectus
debilitat uiris animi mutatque uigorem:
canitiem galea premimus, semperque recentis
comportare iuuat praedas et iuuere rapto.
ubis picta croco et fulgenti murice uestis,
desidiae cordi, iuuat indulgere choreis,
et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitrae.
o uere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta
Dindyma, ubi adsuetis bifoirem dat tibia cantum.
tympana uos buxusque uocat Berecyntia Matris
Idaee; sinite arma uiris et cedite ferro.’

[9.598-620]
“Are you not ashamed, twice-captured Phrygians, to be penned in
again by siege and ramparts, to stave off death with walls? Behold
the ones who demand our wives for themselves with war! What god
drove you to Italy? What madness drove you to us? There are no
sons of Atreus here, no storyteller Ulysses. A hard race at root, first
thing we take our newborn sons to the rivers and harden them with
the savage cold of the currents. As boys, they stay up hunting, and
they tire out the woods. They make a game of breaking horses and
shooting darts from the bow. Moreover, as young men, tolerant of
work and accustomed to little, they either subdue the earth with rakes
or shake towns with battle. Every age is inured to the sword, and we
tire the backs of bullocks with the spear-butt—and sluggish old age
does not weaken the force of mind and alter our strength: we weigh
down white hair with a helmet, and it always pleases us to carry off
fresh prey and live off what we’ve stolen. Dear to you is clothing
hued with yellow and gleaming purple, lounging about—dancing
pleases you. Your tunics have sleeves; your headdress has ribbons.
Really Phrygian women (you’re not Phrygian men after all!), go
across lofty Dindyma, where the flute plays the two-piped song to
the accustomed throng. The drum and the Berecyntian boxwood
flute of the mother of Ida summon you. Leave arms to men and
yield to the sword.”
Unlike Amata, Numanus Remulus does not carve out an exception for the Greeks. For him, the distinction that matters is Trojan and Italian. The binary associations are clear: as at Troy itself, the Trojans are cowards who hide behind walls; their desire to steal Italian women is undone by their lack of fighting strength. The Italians are accustomed to hard work and danger from childhood until old age; they are, even in Roman terms, closely associated with manly excellence. The Trojans, by contrast, are effeminate; their exotic style of clothing amounts to cross-dressing, so that they are in reality women—not men—of Phrygia. Even religion pushes them toward effeminacy, for they are Cybele worshippers—and here Vergil recalls Catullus’ famous Attis poem, about a young man who castrates himself in the rites of that goddess, forever losing his claim to manhood. The Trojans may as well put down their swords—fighting is for men, says Numanus Remulus with a confidence that quite soon will kill him.

Numanus’ language deserves further unpacking. Like much inflammatory rhetoric on the difference between the undesirable foreign immigrant and the native it is not free from internal contradictions, and some of the precise mechanisms by which it works are worth noting. The belittling reference to the sons of Atreus—Greece’s most powerful king and the son-in-law of Jupiter—and Ulysses, described derisively as a storyteller, is intended to assert Italian superiority. This time the Trojans will not fight such paltry kings and a teller of tall tales. Yet the claim also highlights to those who are aware another possibility, namely that the Italians, with Latinus and Turnus in place of the sons of Atreus, lack the caliber of leadership the Trojans are used to facing; they also lack a Ulysses, perhaps a weaver of tales, but
also the architect of the Greeks’ winning strategy. In place of these dismissed Greek strengths, Numanus offers instead a portrait of the Italians as naturally rugged and suited to victory. His description of the life of Italian men from infancy until old age draws heavily from the *Georgics*, both the *laudes uitae rusticae* (2.458-542) but also the famous *laudes Italiae* (2.136-76), a rhetorical set piece that, despite a once common reading as entirely laudatory, contains its own problems and contradictions.\(^3\) The *laudes Italiae*, like Numanus’ speech to Ascanius, may easily be read as an example of a rhetorical type—here the poetry of praise—that draws attention to its own rhetorical nature, a statement that—no matter how sincerely its speaker means it—emphasizes its nature as a verbal structure fitted to the needs of a particular moment.\(^3\)

Gendered rhetoric intersects with fears of the foreign and the immigrant in ways that are not always clear. In current descriptions of undocumented immigrants from Latin America, there is a tendency, perhaps, to attribute a kind of grotesque hypermasculinity to men that support fears of them as menacing criminals and specifically as rapists. This, of course, has a long history in rhetoric about African-American men as well. Such groups, like the Trojans in the formulations of Iarbas and Amata, have come for our women. Yet alongside this rhetoric of the hypermasculine we find other ethnicities depicted as naturally effeminate. This is all well illustrated by the 2018 stand-up routine by the comedian Louis C. K., who, after recycling tired jokes about the endowments of African-American men, moved on to Asians.\(^3\) The cleanest part of the joke sums up the rhetorical point perfectly. For he says of Asians, lumped for his purposes into one homogeneous group:
“they’re women. They’re not dudes. They’re all women. All Asians are women.”

My examples conclude with a famous speech by Juno, the queen of the gods and prime divine enemy of the Trojans. Juno has admitted defeat; she acknowledges the truth, that Rome will rise despite her wishes. Yet she demands a price.

‘illud te, nulla fati quod lege tenetur,
pro Latio obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:
cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)
component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,
ne uetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
neu Troas fieri iubebas Teucrosque uocari
aut uocem mutare uiros aut uertere uestem.
sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago:
occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia.’
[12.818-28]

“This I beseech you—I think constrained by no rule of fate—on Latium’s behalf and on behalf of the greatness of your people: once they settle a peace with prosperous marriage—so be it—once they join laws and compacts: do not order the indigenous Latins to change their ancient name or become Trojans and be called Teucrians—or that the men change their language and their clothing. But let Latium, let Alban kings throughout the ages exist; let Roman offspring hold power through Italian manliness. Troy is dead, and let it stay dead along with its name.”

Juno will cease her opposition if outward signs of Trojan identity are erased. Immigration and the changes it will bring can be accepted, if the old order can feel itself preserved. In many ways, the Aeneid challenges the truth of such preservation, and both traditional stories of hostilities resuming after the death of Turnus and the history of Rome’s eventual wars with Juno’s peoples argue that such notions of a fossilized ethnic and national identity are imagined rather than real.

It is easy to lose sight of the logic here because of the understandable desire
to focus on questions of Roman destiny or divine behavior. The speech is especially notable for what Juno does not say: her reasons for the sublimation of Troy into a new Italian people, the Romans, is not given in terms of advantages, of strength, of sacrifice, or of anything we might hope a divine being might choose to promote in human affairs. Instead, Juno wants the erasure of foreignness in an Italian context, whereby language and clothing are given up in an act of assimilation. Most of all, perhaps, she wants to preserve her sense of victory at Troy. The rise of Rome and the expanded identity of the Italians is not a problem if she maintains her identity as the divine persecutor and ultimately destroyer of the city of Troy. It is worth noting that even (or especially?) Jupiter obfuscates the issues of which identity will endure; the poem itself takes no final stand.

Assimilation holds a crucial place in the rhetoric of immigration and resistance to it. It can be held up—even by immigrants—as a virtue and act of good faith. In the face of that paradigm, a desire to retain ancestral markers of identity, one’s heritage, can be recast as unwillingness to cooperate, as assertions of cultural superiority, even as a form of invasion. Again, the UCLA-affiliated “Reimagining Immigration” project has helpful remarks on this, as does a recent piece in *The Atlantic* about the portrayal of immigrants in recent tv shows.

In many ways, this brief survey has oversimplified even if it has shown that certain ways of talking—negatively, in this case—about immigrants persist over time. It may be useful to conclude by looking briefly not at Vergil’s characters but at his own lived reality. We too often speak of Rome as a changeless monolith, but the Roman empire as Vergil knew it was a multiethnic meta-state, that is, a
state comprising numerous quasi-independent communities. Even Italy was not, in any simple way, a cultural or social unity. There were Romans, other Italians of various kinds, Etruscans, Greeks, and even some—like Vergil himself—who were identified as “nearer Gauls.” Political unity was still a work in progress, and Vergil’s own hometown received full citizen rights only in 49 BCE under Julius Caesar. Like virtually all important Classical Latin authors except for Caesar, Vergil was not from the city of Rome, and his persistent use of different rhetorics of immigration as a feature of his hero’s struggle bespeaks an awareness of what it is like to negotiate the transition from outsider to insider—from Trojan refugee to founding father of the Roman people, or from provincial schoolboy to one of the central figures in Roman education and culture.
Endnotes

1 The main argument of this article was originally made in a paper for “Teaching Rome at Home,” a conference at the University of Maryland College Park in May of 2019. I am grateful for comments received from audience members and fellow speakers on that occasion. Stephen C. Smith has provided much helpful commentary and other help as well. Finally, I would like to thank the editors (along with the editorial staff) of Teaching Classical Languages for organizing this special issue.


3 For an overview, see Dench 2014. Her definition is useful: ethnicity “generally refers to a people’s own expression of belonging to a group that shares descent and/or culture.”

4 A number of scholars have explored the way nationalist or ethnic rhetoric involves characteristics of race and racism. See, for example, Cairns 1989, 109-28 and Dench 2014.


6 Vasunia 2009 explores the ways in which the Aeneid was used by British authors to discuss various aspects of the imperial project. The poem could be used as support for notions of the civilizing mission of colonial empire, but it might also show a more complicated and troubling vision of empire (84): “In the mid-eighteenth century, writers such as Edward Gibbon turned to Virgil not to promote monarchical imperialism but to evaluate the workings of empire, to question its durability, and to explore its limits and contradictions.” This stands in contrast to Victorian uses of the poem when prominent writers (84) “...highlighted the prophetic and providential interpretation of Virgil and speculated about an empire that was divinely ordained and had no limit.”

Ronnick 2014 is a helpful introduction to the ways in which the Aeneid played a role in the cultural lives of black Americans as well as to the problems of doing work in reception among traditionally marginalized populations and the fact that it was largely left unexamined until the twenty-first century.
For a brief but helpful overview of postcolonial theory and the *Aeneid*, see Syed 2014. On colonization and the thorny issues surrounding both concept and the words *colonus* in the poem, see Pogorzelski 2014.

On the ways in which Aeneas himself fits the role of colonist/ktistes, see Horsfall 1989. This form of colonization, and Aeneas’ role in it, is central to two important discussions: Reed 2007 and Fletcher 2014.

See, for one example, Bakewell 2013, who sees in Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women* an exploration of Athenian constructions of identity. Bakewell links the play, despite its Argive setting, to the creation and expansion of the formal system of resident foreigners, metics, at Athens. His discussion is particularly useful on the way (national) identity is created and maintained through exclusion.

I have therefore emphasized especially important or helpful works and those in English.

The text of Vergil is that of Mynors’ 1969 Oxford Classical Text; all translations are my own. On Iarbas’ speech here, see Hightet 1972, 117-18.

On gender and ethnicity as intertwined categories, see especially Syed 2005; this is a major theme of her study overall. On the way the categories of gender and ethnicity are intertwined in the text, see 136-76.


Syed 2005, 136-76 outlines the ways in which the emotions, which are generally associated with the feminine, are used to categorize even foreign men as ethnic others (137): “the link between gender and ethnicity in these figures often involves another such link, that between passion and ethnicity. This second link deserves more attention, because two ways of defining identity come together here, the personal one in which the self is defined by its constituent elements, such as its gaze, its emotions, and its voice, and the communal one in which the individual self is defined as part of a group and by its role or standing within that group, be it a nation, a tribe, or the body of citizens of a city-state, groups which themselves in turn are defined by their opposition to other such groups. While the link of passion
to ethnicity combines these two modes of defining the self in the *Aeneid*, the link between gender and ethnicity is a combination of two communal modes of defining identity. Nevertheless, this link, too, implicates the personal mode of defining identity, because ethnic others are figured as female here because of their passion and because the link itself introduces the possibility of erotic narrative into stories about colonization and imperialist conquest....”

15 For this use of *medius*, see Lewis and Short, s.v., 1B7.

16 It has long been recognized that Amata has an unusually personal stake in the affairs of state here, with some even arguing that her preference for Turnus masks an erotic desire of her own; see Zarker 1969 and Lyne 1987, 14-19. The wording of the Latin suggests that Aeneas will not only take Lavinia but also abandon Amata.

17 On the way *Io* is used to characterize Turnus in the *Aeneid*, see O’Hara 1990, 78-81.

18 According to Adams 1982, 151 *penetrare* “does not occur in a sexual sense” in Classical Latin, but this seems perhaps simplistic. The verb may not be used as either a primary obscenity or a common euphemism, but its basic meaning is “to cause to go into the interior of anything or to a place, etc., situated in the interior” Oxford Latin Dictionary s.v. 1. It can be used of the insertion of objects (broadly construed to include emotions and ideas) into a place, building, or body, and uses like that here with a human subject and a place as object are often found with a reflexive pronoun “to put oneself into a place,” see *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v. 1a. Paris here has not only gone into the heart of Spartan territory, but he has committed adultery with its queen. The verb need not denote a specific sex act to have sexual connotations.

19 See Reeve 2013 with further references.

20 A convenient way into the topic of hypermasculinity is the current Wikipedia article.

21 For ways in which hostile characterizations of foreign “others,” above all the Trojans, are contradicted by the poem itself, see Winnington-Ingram 1971-72, Cairns 1989, 121-22, and Syed 2005, 195-99.

22 On Turnus’ speech here, see O’Hara 1990, 75-78.
Turnus’ speech here is a *cohortatio*, a commander’s speech rousing his troops before battle; in addition to the attempt to reinterpret signs of divine favor, Turnus’ speech falls short of the demands of the situation in a number of ways. See Highet 1972, 87-88.

Hardie 1994, 100 (on 9.138).

Cf. 2.642-43, where Anchises says *satis una superque / uidimus excidia et captae superauimus urbi*, “once—enough and more!—have we seen destruction and survived the city captured.”

9.140-42 present difficulties, and it is difficult to know exactly what Turnus is trying to say; the text may be corrupt. Turnus imagines an interlocutor who suggests that the Trojans have already paid sufficiently for Paris’ crime. Turnus’ response, assuming the Latin we have, presents different possibilities, all of which seem to be unsatisfactory. The alternatives would seem to be that Turnus is saying (1) it would have been enough to have paid the price once if they had learned from their mistake *instead of* (*modo non*) remaining hostile (*perosos*) to all women, tracing what he sees as a tendency to steal other men’s wives and fiancées to a kind of misogyny, which seems to make little sense here; (2) the same except that *modo non* must mean something like “provided that” and *perosos* mean “averse” or, in other words, after the Trojan War, they had lost all interest in women; or (3), with Hardie, following Fordyce’s unpublished commentary on Book 9, something along the lines of “if they didn’t thoroughly hate all but the whole of womankind.” The chief difficulties lie in the phrase *modo non* and the case of *perosos*, for which *perosis* might be expected.

Turnus must mean the armor of Achilles rather than either Aeneas’ original armor or that made by Vulcan, since this scene must occur before Aeneas has received that armor (and, because Books 8 and 9 occur at the same time, the characters around the Trojan camp can have no knowledge of what transpires for Aeneas on his journey). His point is simply that, unlike the great Greek warrior, he does not need the protection of magical armor.

On Numanus’ speech, see Horsfall 1971; Highet 1972, 89-90; and Lyne 1987, 200-205. Casali 2009, 313-17 analyzes the speech not for the truth or falsity of its rhetoric but for the way it is actually the more typically Augustan view of Roman identity than Ascanius’ reaction would suggest. See also Miller 2009, 156-58.
A fact not always noted in Vergilian scholarship is the history of slurs of the type “not x-men but x-women” goes back to Homeric precedent, when Thersites uses it of other Greeks at Iliad 2.235; see Highet 1972, 258. On the intertextual background and effects of the episodes of Numanus and Turnus in Book 9, see Farrell 2021, 258-63.

Here Numanus Remulus echoes what Turnus had said to the disguised Allecto 7.440-44: war is for men.

The classic English-language discussion is Horsfall 1971 where antecedents and cultural associations of Numanus’ speech are collected.

On this aspect of Numanus’ speech—and the way it is contradicted by the reality of the poem, see Winnington-Ingram 1971-72, especially 63.

On the laudes Italiae, their internal contradictions, and the way they function as self-conscious rhetoric, see Thomas 1988, 179-90 and Nappa 2005, 78-85.

When this paper was originally composed, the comedian was in some disgrace; shows were cancelled, and many spoke against his history of misbehavior. By the time of this version, however, he seems to have made up some of the ground that he lost.

On Juno’s deal with Jupiter, see Feeney 1984. On the importance placed by individual actors—here, above all, by Juno and Venus—on the ethnic components of national identity see O’Hara 1990, 137-51. See also Highet 1972, 128-31 on the rhetoric of her speech.

See Feeney 1984 and Farrell 2021, 284-86.

In her brief overview of postcolonialism, Syed presents an Aeneid that elides rather than champions distinctions that might outweigh or override the category of Roman in Augustan times. See Syed 2014, 1032-33: “However, far from depicting ethnic identities as essentialist categories, A. draws attention to the ways in which they are discursively constructed. The poem articulates a Roman cultural identity distinct from these various ethnicities, conceptualizing it as an inclusive category that allows readers of every ethnicity to identify as Roman... A. did the cultural work of articulating this inclusive concept in which descent from Aeneas is symbolic and being Roman can be learned.” She builds here on her earlier work (Syed 2005) in
talking about the way the poem offers a usefully capacious vision of what it meant to be a Roman. Her arguments are especially useful antidotes to the reading of the poem and its place in history advanced by Waswo 1997. On the way the poem might be used to advance a kind of civilizing colonialism, see Vasunia 2009, 114 on the idea of imperial “trusteeship” and the British notion that they were needed as imperial rulers since native populations were not able to govern themselves, a concept not unlike the American idea of a “manifest destiny” that authorized a colonialist enterprise.

38 J. C. Chan 2018; see also Fattal 2018.

39 Scholars have linked the sensitivity to issues of Roman identity in the first century BCE to the expansion of Roman citizenship—a central element of defining Roman identity—after the Gracchi and especially after the Social Wars; see Toll 1991; Ando 2002; Dench, 2005, 152-217; Syed 2005, 218; and Fletcher 2014, throughout, but especially 1-4. Similar arguments about maintaining a sense of identity as communities expanded underlie Bakewell’s reading (Bakewell 2013) of Aeschylus’ *Suppliants* as an exploration of *metoikia*; see, for example, 3: “at fifth-century Athenians became increasingly conscious of their collective identity, their ongoing attempts at self-definition invoked the exclusion of others.” Similarly, Vasunia 2009 describes the uses of the *Aeneid* by those concerned with the expansive size of the British Empire under Queen Victoria.
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