compel him to speak: “We urge him to state what trust there is for a captive” (hortamur... |... memoret quae sit fiducia capto, 2.74-5). The primary meaning of memoret is surely the significance felt most strongly here, as Sinon is ordered by his captors to reveal specific pieces of information. Yet, when Sinon spins a false but believable story of his escape from the Greeks and the Trojans are convinced that he experienced what he says he had, the seemingly personal nature of Sinon’s story combines with the secondary meaning of memorare to situate his words as a memory.47 Having been deceived by this false tale that masqueraded as a personal experience, Aeneas now selects memorare to introduce Sinon’s story to Dido, a choice that hints that he sees memory as closely linked with the Trojans’ deception. These two uses of memorare in Aeneid 2 associate the concept of memory with a character’s representation of his past, and similar examples occur six other times in the epic.48 This association elaborates on the characterization of memory outlined by the Aeneid’s core vocabulary of memory and allows for the possibility that when characters speak or think about their personal past, even when no word from the core or secondary vocabulary of memory appears, they do so through the process of memory.

Context

A consideration of the Aeneid’s literary and historical context reveals the singular depth and relevance of its engagement with memory. Written at a moment when Romans were gravely concerned about a loss of regard for their history and standing as the culmination of a poetic corpus that explores the interplay between past and future, the Aeneid presents a complex portrait of memory’s role in a time of transition for individuals and societies alike. In comparison with earlier epics, the poem is remarkable for its awareness of the complexities of remembering and forgetting; its engagement of its audience in the experience of a vast social memory; and its vivid depiction of characters driven by their past and deeply concerned with how future generations will remember them.

47 Servius ad loc. entertains the possibility that memoris indicates an act of memory, although in his understanding memoris signals the recollections of a non-temporal obligation as much as it does an accurate recollection of one’s past: “Or surely ‘let him say’ means ‘let him remember,’ so that it means that he remember that there is faith for a captive in speaking truly of his life. From this there is such a response as ‘I will tell true things’” (aut cetera ‘memorat’ est meminerit, ut significet, meminerit in captivo per verilogium vitae est fiduciam. unde et responsio tallis est ‘fatebor vera’). Also, see pp. 11-13 on the meaning of memorare.

48 These instances are 1.631, 3.182, 5.392, 5.641, 6.699, and 8.332.
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When any epic is considered as an act of communication between narrator and audience, memory holds an important function for both parties. As Philip Hardie writes, "Memory is the ground and goal of the epic, a narrative received as a gift from the daughters of Memory by the human poet who in turn offers it to posterity as a memorialization of great deeds."49 The Aeneid makes significant innovations within these generic conventions. While Homer and Vergil's poems alike memorialize great deeds for posterity, only the Aeneid's audience listens to events that account for its very existence.50 Since the narrator imagines his audience as the Romans to whom Aeneas' actions lead, the foundation story he tells becomes a recollection of their communal origins.51 A Trojan victory in the Iliad or Odysseus' death in the Odyssey would result in a different Greece and Ithaca,52 but neither epic depicts the sequence of events necessary for its audience's existence and neither records a social memory of its audience's origins.

Along with the Aeneid's aetiological character, the particular nature of the Trojans' mission likewise emphasizes memory. Self-consciously journeying between past and future, Aeneas and his followers interact with memory from two temporal perspectives. The Trojans are compelled time and time again to consider both how they remember their earlier home now and how generations to come will remember them in the future. In contrast, the characters in the Iliad and the Odyssey generally take up only one of these two perspectives. Exceptions exist,53 but the Iliad's heroes chiefly concern themselves with how they will be remembered in the future.

49 Hardie 1990, 263. See also Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 117–22 on the relationship between epic and memory.
50 The Aeneid's narrator consistently links his hero's actions with the existence of Rome and the epic's audience. This begins in the proem, where Aeneas' journey from Troy to Italy culminates in "the Latin Race and the Alban fathers and the walls of high Rome" (genus... Latium [Albanique patres atque alae moenia Romae, 1.6–7]), and it continues throughout the poem, such as when Anchises addresses Aeneas as "Roman" (Romanae, 6.85) and when Aeneas receives a shield from his mother emblazoned with Rome's future history (8.624–728). Horsfall 1991 notes that "The whole poem... is a meditation on Roman history from 1.3–7... onwards" (203–4) and argues that "Historical continuity... is a fundamental theme of the poem, integrated deeply into its structure and very being" (205). See also Mack 1978, 85–6 on this point and Rea 2007, 13–14 on how Vergil makes his audience's "encounter with the past personal."
52 Dougherty 2001, 161–76, makes the argument that Odysseus' return to Ithaca is characterized as a colonial settlement of that island, but this theme is nowhere as overt as the Aeneid's focus on the foundation of Rome and the Odyssey's audience is nowhere figured exclusively as Ithacans.
53 Examples include Achilles' remembrance of his father at 24.456–7 and 507–12 and his dedication to not forgetting Patroclus after his death (e.g., 22.385–90), yet even with Patroclus, there is an emphasis on how Patroclus will be commemorated for the future, and, in particular, on how Achilles' bones will one day be buried alongside his (23.80–92, 23.125–6).
Achilles’ choice lies between a short life with eternal fame and a lengthy, but anonymous, existence, and Hector is preoccupied with what men will one day say of him.54 The Odyssey, meanwhile, largely explores how the past is remembered in the present. Odysseus’ memories of his family motivate his desire to return home, and this orientation persists even after his arrival in Ithaca. When Penelope tests her husband’s identity by claiming that she moved their marriage bed, she plays upon Odysseus’ remembrance of his long-ago construction of that bed around a tree.55

Beyond these factors that distinguish the Aeneid from other examples of its genre, the poem also provides a remarkably detailed exploration of some of the most fundamental qualities of remembering. A glance at memory’s emotional resonance in several scenes shows the range of effects that occur when a character thinks of the past and, particularly, of his or her own experiences. Andromache, for instance, remembers her dead husband and son with a mixture of mournful pain and wistful yearning,56 while Aeneas, in a speech given shortly after he and his men escape death, holds out future recollection as a potential balm, even though he doubts his own words.57 The narrator, too, is bound up in this process: he displays anger, pride, and astonishment as he transforms the story of Rome’s origins into a social memory for his audience to share.58

At the same time as the Aeneid shows the emotional reactions characters have to their recollections, the epic questions the link between a character’s representation of the past and the events he experienced. The characters’ remembrances rarely show a straightforward relationship with what actually occurred. Many times when a character recollects a past deed, the narrator hints at the possibility of manipulation. He describes, for instance, how Juno will not let certain past events be forgotten, and the tenacity of her memory implies that she tendentiously reconstructs those events as grievous wrongs in order to fuel her rage.59 And, when Aeneas attributes a certain prophecy to Anchises in Aeneid 7, it is impossible to miss the discrepancy between this recollection and Aeneas’ narration of Celaeno’s nearly identical prophecy in Aeneid 3.60 As will be discussed in greater detail below, such representations share many features with the process of memory elucidated in modern scholarship.

54 Martin 1980, 150–45.
55 23.174–204. For commentary on other episodes in the Odyssey where forgetting the past is a central concern, see Weinrich 2004, 13–16.
58 See pp. 125–35 and 167–7 for examples and discussion of this range of emotions.
59 See 1.4–29 and pp. 67–15 for discussion.
60 See 3.255–7 and 7.120–34 and pp. 28–31 and 41–6 for discussion.
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Beyond its singularity within its genre and its challenging depiction of memory’s nature, the place of the *Aeneid* in both Vergil’s career and late Republican Rome draws attention to its depiction of recollection and commemoration. The *Aeneid* stands as the capstone to a body of poetry deeply concerned with temporal boundaries. Several scholars have shown the significance of memory in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, works where Vergil explores the remembrance of songs, the relationship between politics and memory, and the results of devotion to the past. Because of the *Aeneid’s* genre and subject, it offers the poet his most ample opportunity to contemplate the nature of memory and, in truth, demands that he do so.

Vergil took up this exploration of memory in a society where remembrance and commemoration were central to people’s beliefs and identity. Memory was an integral part of the Romans’ everyday life, cultural expression, and political maneuvering, from funeral processions and reverence for the *mos maiorum* to citations of *exempla* and construction of monuments. Alongside this regard for the past, Romans were also extraordinarily concerned with how the future would remember the present. There was a general belief that men wished not to “pass through life in obscurity” (*vitam silentio transeant*, Sal. *Cat.* 1.1), an attitude evident in Roman literature as well as in the aim of the punitive memory sanctions (*damnatio memoriae*) intended to excise the memory of those who had offended Roman power. Alongside their speeches and actions, the Romans also viewed buildings and images as closely connected with memory. A variety of constructions designed to commemorate specific events and people, Rome’s monuments sought to define the past and ensure that it be remembered in the future in a particular way.

---

63 See Earl 1961, 28–40 for more on this topic in regard to literature (and for more examples of this attitude in Sallust, see *Cat.* 1.3, 2.9, 9.2 and B.J. 2.1–2). On memory sanctions in Roman culture, see Flower 2006.
64 See Zanker 1988 on Roman buildings and images and Bergmann 1994 for a more narrowly focused study of the memories prompted by a particular series of paintings. Larmour and Spencer 2007, 1–22 comment in general about the endurance and dynamism of the past in Rome’s urban space. See Earl 1961, 18–27 and Flower 2006, 44–55 on the goal of the Roman aristocracy to control how the past is remembered in the future through monuments and other means. Rodgers 1992 provides examples of such an orientation in grave engravings and literature, and Häusle 1980, 29–40 and Hölscher 2006 write on the relationship between memory, monuments, and inscriptions.
Roman etymological beliefs reflect the idea that memory serves as a conduit both from the past to the present as well as from the present to the future. Varro’s etymologies depict memory as something that can both move back to the past from the present and also look toward a future where the present is remembered. According to Varro, “memory” (memoria) comes from “remaining” (manendo, L. 6.49), a derivation indicating that events both remain in one’s memory from the past and remain to be remembered by others in the future. This implication is borne out by two other related Varonian etymologies. The forward-looking aspect of memory is visible in the etymology of the words “to remind” (monere) and “monument” (monimentum):

ab eodem monere, quod is qui monet, proinde sit ac memoria; sic monimenta quae in sepulcris, et ideo secundum viam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis. Ab eo cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa monimenta dicta. Varro L. 6.49

“To remind” is derived from the same word [i.e., “memory”], because he who reminds is just like a memory; the same is true for monuments, which are on graves and, for this reason, along streets, so that they might remind those going by that they themselves were mortal and so are the readers. For this reason, the other things which are written and done to preserve their memory are called monuments.

If these explanations consider how a recollection can carry information to the future or how someone or something can remind a person about an obligation or a potentially uncomfortable fact of life, the complement to this is visible in the etymology for the verb “to remember” (meminisse). Varro derives “to remember” (meminisse) from “memory” (memoria), since “there is a motion again toward that which remained in the mind” (id quod remansit in mente rursus movetur, 6.49). Here, the backward-looking aspect of memory is expressed, as the mind moves back to what remained from before.

To put it broadly, as shown by the Romans’ etymologies as well as by their everyday activities, cultural practices, and physical constructions, they conceived of memory as a central link between past and future, one that was of crucial importance to themselves and their society. More specifically, memory was a vehicle to preserve both themselves and the state. As Alain Gowing writes, the “Romans viewed memory as an essential means of

---

65 See Maltby 1991 for more on the following etymologies.
66 Translations of Varro are adapted from Kent 1938.
67 Feldherr 2000, 219 discusses the implications of Varro’s etymology of monimentum.
connecting with the past, and thereby of preserving their sense of self
and identity.” 68 Underpinning this idea was the notion that recollection
performed a vital function within Roman society: it preserved the past as a
means to achieve stability and prosperity in the present. 69 Some of Rome’s
earliest literature associates memory with the city’s success. Ennius asserted
that “Rome rests upon its ancient customs and men” (moribus antiquis
res stat Romana virisque, Skutsch 156), 70 and Cicero, Polybius, and Livy
all followed him by pointing out the necessity of building the present on
memories of the past. 71

In Vergil’s lifetime the Romans increasingly worried that their link with
the past was dangerously frayed. During periods of general upheaval, soci-
eties tend to become concerned with their connections with earlier times,
and the Romans were no exception. 72 Cicero, Sallust, and Livy all lamented
that a breakdown in memory was both a cause and result of Rome’s
turmoil. 73 In a passage that hearkens back to Ennius, Cicero marked the
current failure to remember as an instance of moral decline:

quid enim manet ex antiquis moribus, quibus ille dixit rem stare Romanam?
quos ita oblivione obsoletos videmus, ut non modo non colantur, sed iam
ignorentur. Rep. 5.1.2

For what remains from the ancient customs upon which Ennius said Rome
stands? We see that they have fallen into such oblivion that not only are
they no longer cultivated, but they are already unknown.

Ironically remembering Ennius at the same time as he wonders at the failure
of Rome’s tradition of drawing upon the past, Cicero offers a dispiriting
picture of the present. His final two clauses emphasize the depth of the

68 Gowing 2005, 152.
69 See Melson 2009, 101, who notes the connection that Romans made “between smoothly functioning
memory and social and political success.”
70 While the hypothetical context for this verse (the consul Manlius Torquatus’ speech justifying
the execution of his son) may not be the most sanguine, this statement can nevertheless stand as
evidence for the existence of a belief espoused by some part of Rome’s population. On this
fragment’s context, see Skutsch 1985, 316–18.
71 Cicero Rep. 5.1.1, Polybius 6.54.3, and Liv. praef. See Meban 2009, 101–2 for discussion of Cicero
and Polybius, and Galinsky 1996, 38–9 for discussion of Ennius and Cicero as well as of Livy, which
(19) “link the ineffectiveness of republican government to a lack of adherence to the old principles
and mores.”
72 See Fentress and Wickham 1992, 122–3 and Meban 2009, 102. Nora 1989, 7 explores “sites of
memory” (“lieux de mémoire”), namely places “where memory crystallizes and secretes itself” when
there is a sense that society’s relationship with the past has been ruptured and its memory of earlier
times lost.
73 These texts are Cic. Brut., Cicero Rep. 5.1.2, Sal. Jug. 3.1, and Liv. praef. (Meban 2009, 103–6 discusses
the last three works; Stem 2007, 435–6 comments on Livy and Gowing 2000 treats Cic. Brut.)
Romans’ forgetfulness. If past customs are “not cultivated” (non colantur), the chance still remains for them to be reinvigorated. Yet if ancient customs “are already unknown” (iam ignorantur), that reflects a deeper state of oblivion from which they may never be recovered. Cicero’s emphasis on the totality of this forgetfulness hints at a concern that Rome’s future, which relies on its link with the past, may be similarly imperiled.

Seeking to gain and consolidate power in the midst of this turmoil, Augustus presented both himself and Rome as holding a consequential and far-reaching relationship with the past. Whether through his extensive reconstruction of physical monuments or, later on, his Res Gestae, Augustus influenced how Rome’s past was remembered and what those memories signified. Geoffrey Sumi has shown how Augustus’ manipulation of Roman monuments set his ideology as the “filter” through which memories of the past “were communicated to the Roman people,” an argument that echoes Eric Orlin’s claim that Augustus used buildings to “reshape Roman memory” and identity alike. Taking advantage of the opportunities at hand in a culture where the past was prized, Augustus turned to the memory tradition to construct his own and Rome’s values.

There is no shortage of specific examples illustrating this behavior. Augustus’ rededication of the Temple of Castor in the names of Tiberius and Drusus, for instance, turned early national history into part of his family’s story. This same tendency is apparent in the unbroken lines of statues of Julian ancestors and Roman heroes in the exedrae of the Temple of Mars Ultor, an arrangement that melded Augustus’ lineage with Rome’s. Aeneas figured prominently in this series of Augustus’ forefathers, and the inclusion of his statue vividly advertised Augustus’ personal connection with Rome’s illustrious history and the myth of its Trojan foundation. By reaching back to earlier times and presenting a cohesive image of the past which overcame competing mnemonic narratives, Augustus constructed a

---

74 Favro 1996, 218 remarks that Augustus’ monuments and buildings generally portray him as continuing the Republic’s “traditional morality and beliefs” even as they imply that the current time surpasses the past. See Favro 1996, 79–142 and Norden 1901 for a broad overview of Augustus’ cultural activity along with a bibliography on this subject; Zanker 1988, 101–263 on imagery in Augustan Rome and its ties to the city’s past; and Rea 2007, 21–63 on Augustus’ attempts to manipulate memory via monuments on the Palatine and Capitoline.

75 See Galinsky 1996, 49 on Augustus’ “conscious appeal to an earlier tradition and precedents” in the Res Gestae.

76 On this topic, see Gowing 2005, 18–19, 152–3, 156; Flower 2006, 115–32; Orlin 2007; and Meban 2009, 106–7.


80 Horstfall 1987, 23–4 and Erskine 2001, 18, and see Erskine 2001, 15–43 for a detailed discussion of the place of the Trojan myth in Late Republican and Augustan Rome.
compelling story in which he and his rule were shown to be preserving Rome’s intrinsic values and mores, carried over from the Republic’s glory days.\textsuperscript{82} Augustus’ manipulation of memory and society’s concern about its connection with the past form part of the larger dialogue about memory in which the \textit{Aeneid} participated.\textsuperscript{83} Scholars such as Denis Feeney and David Wray have offered productive ways to consider Roman literature as an active participant in a cultural conversation, rather than as a passive product of its context.\textsuperscript{84} From this perspective, we may regard the importance of memory in Roman culture not as a phenomenon mandated by Augustus, but rather as something that arose out of consideration between a number of different people with unique points of view.\textsuperscript{85} With this in mind, it can be useful to evaluate the \textit{Aeneid} within its cultural context, especially since certain aspects of Vergil’s epic so easily map onto its surroundings. The \textit{Aeneid}’s characters and Vergil’s countrymen, for instance, both find themselves struggling with their relationship with the past in the midst of vast upheaval, and Aeneas and Augustus both play a sizeable role in a societal transition.\textsuperscript{86} These similarities, however, exact as they may appear at times, ought not to turn the poem into a political allegory or a veiled endorsement or critique of Augustus’ mnemonic policy.

\textsuperscript{82} Flower 2006, 131 notes how Augustus “new constructions of the past . . . logically also reinforced the new politics of the present. At the same time, he tended to remove the gaps and scars of these erasures by celebrating his own magnificent constructions and status rituals.” Rea 2007, 4–7 comments specifically on how Augustus showed the strength of the community and its values by restoring ancient sites and evoking the memories attached to them. As other scholars have shown, though, different memories can stand alongside and contend with those that a new ruler promotes. Alcock 2002, 16, writing in regard to memory in Greece, argues that “subversive ‘counter-memories’ can co-exist and even ‘forcibly challenge master narratives.’”

\textsuperscript{83} The \textit{Aeneid} was published in 19 BCE, before the construction of the memorials mentioned above (Temple of Mars Ultor, 2 BCE; Temple of Castor, 6 CE) and the publication of the \textit{Res Gestae} (14 CE), yet the gap between Vergil’s epic and Augustus’ commemorative acts is not so great that they cannot be considered as part of the same political and cultural milieu.


\textsuperscript{85} Lowrie 2009, 21 writes that the very term “Augustan program” could lead to a false conclusion, since it “makes it appear the message came from the top and that there was cohesion,” even though univocality is not found among the various artists of the time. J. Miller 2009, 5 offers a useful model in lieu of a program or ideology. Pointing out the experimental nature of Augustus’ initiatives, Miller moves away from envisioning an “utterly fixed ideology” to thinking of an “Augustan discourse” which challenges the poets and invites their participation. See also White 1993 on the relationships between Augustus and the poets; Galinsky 1996, 8, 37, 57, 71, 73, 225 on the substantial role of the individual artist in Augustan culture; and Beard 2007, 4 on the possibility, shown by their consideration of the triumph, for the Romans to critically consider some of their society’s central values.

\textsuperscript{86} Barchiesi 2002, 1 notes that Augustus “minds and controls ... a double temporal boundary: he is the one who stands between the old Republic and a new order, and between the present and a potential return of civil wars.”
Instead, they offer an opportunity to regard the *Aeneid* as actively engaging in the ongoing discussion of memory’s role in individual life and societal development.

**Methodology**

In this work, I augment a philological approach to the *Aeneid* with recent critical work on memory as well as with aspects of narratology suited to a consideration of personal stories about the past. Recent work in the humanities and social sciences offers insight into the processes of recollection and commemoration. As mentioned above, this scholarship broadly argues that people reconstruct memories of the past under the influence of their present surroundings and concerns. These general findings, along with some specific terminology and ideas concerning trauma and identity, are of assistance to this project. Indeed, the outlines of many of these theoretical constructions are already visible in the action of the *Aeneid*. Three of these concepts are especially useful: individual memory, social memory, and oikotype.

The categories of individual memory and social memory help to broadly characterize different sorts of recollection in the *Aeneid*. It is only individuals who can perform the mental action of remembering the past; however, in the twentieth century, scholars increasingly began to explore how memories are impacted by and “attached to membership of social groups.”

While a variety of names have been applied to this type of memory, James Fentress and Chris Wickham’s term “social memory” is particularly well suited to describe the memory an individual shares with a larger group.

---

87 I use the term philology to signify a detailed attention to the text, perhaps best encapsulated in Calvert Watkins’ phrase “the art of reading slowly” (Watkins 1990, 25, who attributes the phrase to Roman Jakobson). This is more in the European sense of the word, namely to indicate a commitment to literary criticism and close reading, than in the American sense, which signifies an engagement with textual criticism. For three relatively recent explorations of the question “What is philology?” see Hexter and Selden 1992; Fowler and Fowler 1996, 871; and Edmunds 2005, 1-13.

88 Fentress and Wickham 1992, ix. See also Rea 2007, 8-9 for a brief overview of the topic. For a description of the various areas of research involving social memory, see Kirk 2005. A. Assmann 2001 offers an extensive introduction to the concept.

89 Maurice Halbwachs, who initiated the study of such memory, described it by the term “collective memory.” By its name alone, though, “collective memory” divorces memory from the individual to an extreme extent and, in Halbwachs’ conception is associated with a near complete dismissal of the individual’s relationship with memory (for examples, see Halbwachs 1992, 38, 49, and 51). For a critique of the term “collective memory” on account of its use as a catch-all to stand for many other ideas related to history, see Gedi and Elam 1996; for a less hostile consideration of some repercussions of using the term, see Olick 1999 and Alcock 2002, 15.
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In this book, the term "social memory" designates a memory that is spoken aloud by an individual member of a group, is relevant to and shared by the group, and is in some way influenced by the individual's place within his or her social framework. An individual memory, on the other hand, may be thought of as a recollection mainly concerned with an individual's life, which the person who remembers reflects on himself, sharing it with no other.

With this having been said, as useful and necessary as the terms "individual memory" and "social memory" are for evaluating the recollections of characters in a variety of social settings, the clear categorization their names imply is slightly misleading. Research has shown the influence that group membership exercises on a person's remembrance, and there is a constant tension within the Aeneid between the memories that individuals voice and the mnemonic needs of the group to which they belong. Within the Aeneid, any character's memory is influenced by his membership in a larger group, and any social memory is likewise shaped by the singular nature of the person who remembers. The two terms are best thought of as descriptions of a recollection's general character rather than as closed-off categories whose members never approach one another. Juno shares her memories of the Trojans' wrongs with no other, for instance, and they represent an example of individual memory even though they are powerfully influenced by the goddess' knowledge that she belongs to the society of immortals; and Aeneas' two-book-long narration of Troy's destruction and the Trojans' wandering represents an example of social memory, even though he narrates substantial portions of those events from his own perspective.

For the Trojans in particular, remembering and commemorating the past are often interpersonal experiences, as they speak about and act upon their memories of past traumas and hopes of future commemoration. The present continually reminds them of their past, and they seek to ensure that they and Troy are remembered in the future. These challenges raise

---

90 These characteristics contain elements of what Olick 1999 identifies as the "individualistic" and "collectivistic" perspectives on social memory.
92 Irwin-Zareka 1994, 4 captures well the tension between an individual's memory and larger cultural forces when he writes that every memory is produced by an individual who, even though he is capable "of making sense of the past on his own," is nonetheless influenced, consciously or not, by the larger group to which he belongs. Fentress and Wickham 1992, 7; Olick 1999, 346; and J. Assmann 2006, 2–3 also remark upon the mixed individual and social nature of every memory.
the question of how individuals reconstruct a version of the past that enables them to engage with the present, and Aeneas in particular faces this issue head on in his interactions with his fellow Trojans. The concept of a standardized version of the past helps to evaluate the goals, failures, and frustrations of these sorts of interpersonal interactions. Referred to by anthropologists as an oikotype, a standardized version of the past arises out of a community's decisions about which account of the past "is acceptable and which is not."93

Over the course of the *Aeneid*, various characters aspire to make their representation of the past an oikotype for the group at large. This process verges between unconscious action and conscious intention and arises from a complex set of interactions among individuals as part of a larger group. Aeneas, for instance, often attempts to form the Trojans' oikotype, such as when he promises his men that they will one day look back with pleasure upon their current trials.94 Other characters make similar efforts in their commemorations of the dead. The narrator, too, takes part in this process; his entire song is an attempt to influence the oikotype his audience possesses.95 What all of these oikotypes, or attempts at oikotypes, share is an engagement in selective remembering, a representation of the past that leaves certain aspects behind to be forgotten and brings others forward to be remembered.

Through this combination of remembering and forgetting, an oikotype can offer a palatable story about the past, and a great deal of the process of remembering involves fashioning stories about the past or imagining stories that the future will tell about the present. In light of this, narratology - through its focus on the construction and narration of a story - productively supplements these critical approaches to memory.96 It offers assistance both in evaluating specific acts of memory and in demarcating the epic's

93 Fentress and Wickham 1992, 74. R. Thomas 1992, 109, writing on the transmission and evolution of oral traditions, shows that this process shares similarities with the formation of a community's memories. Traditions "do not get passed on accidentally: the reasons for remembering them and passing on are fundamental. [The people involved] select the tradition and may well change it in the process: the reasons for change can be cultural, social, political, or ideological." See also Yerushalmi 1982, 95, who notes that social memory "is drastically selective. Certain memories live on; the rest are winnowed out, repressed, or simply discarded by a process of natural selection." See Confino 1997, 1390 for more on this topic.

94 See 1.203 and p. 80 for discussion.

95 See pp. 135–54 for discussion of the other characters and the narrator.

96 I am most interested in applying some of the work done by those who focus "on the narrow core of narratology," namely "the intermediary structures of story construction and narration" (Oege and Landa, 1996, 28). Wheeler 1999 illustrates the benefits of combining philological analysis with a narratological approach.
discourse levels so as to allow for an analysis of memory’s role within each level.\textsuperscript{97}

While not all memories appear in narrative forms, characters often present their recollections as stories from the past. A character’s remembrance is supposedly grounded in actual experience,\textsuperscript{98} and narratology offers a productive way to evaluate the relationship between representation (a voiced remembrance) and reality (past experience).\textsuperscript{99} The narratological term “fabula” describes the sequence of events represented by a story.\textsuperscript{100}

When, for instance, Aeneas remembers his father telling him a prophecy, his narrative represents a fabula of Anchises’ speaking to the Trojans in the past.\textsuperscript{101} Yet, as Jonathan Culler notes, it is possible to question whether a fabula necessarily comprises actions that the actors experienced. Culler argues that there are two mutually contradictory ways of regarding a fabula: either it is “a sequence of events which is prior to and independent of the given perspective on the events [i.e., the narrator’s story]” (in this case, Aeneas really did hear his father deliver a prophecy) or “the events [of the fabula] are justified by their appropriateness to a thematic structure [i.e., the narrator’s story]” (in this case, Aeneas constructs a story, based on his current needs, that represents something that never actually occurred).\textsuperscript{102}

The former belief holds that the events of the fabula “are prior to their narrative representation,” while the latter regards the fabula as “a tropological product of narrative requirements.”\textsuperscript{103} In this instance, the speaker’s story represents the fabula as something that happened, yet one may suspect that the fabula is merely a scheme of events that the speaker fashions for reasons of his own. In other words, the speaker may use his story to represent a fabula that he never experienced.

It is not always possible to ascertain whether a fabula did or did not happen. For instance, when Sinon first tells the Trojans how Odysseus tried to kill him, they believe that the fabula his story represents was something Sinon experienced: Odysseus truly attempted to have Sinon killed. It is only later, after the Greeks’ treachery comes to light, that Aeneas realizes

\textsuperscript{97} For an overview of narratological approaches to the Aeneid, see Fowler 1997b.

\textsuperscript{98} Irwin-Zarecka 1994, 18.

\textsuperscript{99} Bal 1997, 147 considers the relation between narrative and memory: “Memory is an act of ‘vision’ of the past, but, as an act, situated in the present of the memory. It is often a narrative act: loose elements come to cohere into a story, so that they can be remembered and eventually told. But as is well known, memories are unreliable . . . and when put into words, they are rhetorically overworked so that they can connect to an audience . . . Hence the ‘story’ the person remembers is not identical to the one she experienced.”

\textsuperscript{100} See Fludernik 2003, 4 on the history of this term.

\textsuperscript{101} See 7.120–34 and pp. 28–31 and 43–6 for discussion.

\textsuperscript{102} Culler 1980, 32.

\textsuperscript{103} Culler 1980, 31.
that Sinon constructed a fabula that fitted his mission’s requirements. When Aeneas narrates the story of Troy’s fall in *Aeneid* 2, his discourse presents Sinon’s story as false, since he knows that Sinon never experienced the fabula his story implied. From a mnemonic perspective, Sinon’s story represented something as a memory that he never experienced.\(^{104}\)

Just as the Trojans, when they were in the midst of listening to Sinon’s story, lacked the evidence necessary to assay the veracity of the fabula it represented, the *Aeneids* audience is often unable to judge the fabula seemingly at the root of a character’s memory. For instance, it is difficult to say with certainty whether Dido’s memory of Teucer’s visit to Phoenicia represents a event she experienced or is something she invented in order to secure the Trojans’ goodwill and trust.\(^{105}\) No other account of this visit exists for the sake of comparison.\(^{106}\) There is even another option: namely that Dido’s story revolves around a visit that actually did occur, but that she embroiders it with details to fit her present purposes, emphasizing certain aspects of it, leaving others forgotten. A great portion of characters’ interactions with memory comes in the form of stories, and narratology helps to describe and analyze the relationship these stories construct between representation and reality.

The communication of a memory, along with representing a particular past as having been experienced, sets that past event as having been experienced from a particular perspective. Here, the narratological concept of focalization may be of particular use. As defined by Mieke Bal, the “focalizer” in a particular stretch of narrative is “the point from which elements are viewed.”\(^{107}\) By differentiating the one who tells (the narrator) from the one who sees an event or feels its impact (the focalizer), it becomes possible to notice moments in the *Aeneid* where the two diverge.\(^{108}\) Vergil frequently illuminates the same event from multiple perspectives, and the concept of focalization allows for a comparison of how two characters create varying memories of the same event. Euryalus’ death prompts one such moment.

---

\(^{104}\) For discussion of the story of Sinon, see pp. 44, 96–7, and 107–11.

\(^{105}\) See 1.619–26 and p. 98 for discussion.

\(^{106}\) Beard 2007, 171, writing in regard to evidence about ancient Rome, notes how “Nothing can contradict a single account; more often than not two accounts of the same events prove incompatible or at least different in significant details.”

\(^{107}\) Bal 1997, 146.

\(^{108}\) Although Lyne 1987 does not use a narratological approach, his work shows many moments in the *Aeneid* when different perspectives are offered on events. See Galinsky 2003, 277 on this technique of illuminating a single event from different and often conflicting points of view and its connection with Greek tragedy.

Fowler 2000, 40–63 offers a very “open” view of focalization in the *Aeneid*, claiming that the reader decides the answer to the question “Who sees?” largely depending on his own interpretive goals.
Immediately after the boy is killed, the narrator calls the dead Nisus and Euryalus “a fortunate pair” (fortunati ambo, 9.446) whose memory will be kept alive by song. In contrast, the narrator's subsequent description of Euryalus’ mother occurs from her point of view, and it reveals the excruciating pain she feels in remembering her earlier relationship with him. This exploration of two views of the same event affords insight into the different purposes memory is used for and the different ways in which an event can be remembered and commemorated for the future.

Along with its assistance in analyzing individual examples of memory, narratology also aids in understanding what role memory plays on each of the epic's discourse levels. Narratological concepts, in particular those advanced by Wayne C. Booth and Gérard Genette, offer a productive framework for separating a text's discourse levels. From the perspective of the text's production, the levels move from the author (Vergil) to the implied author (he who creates the Aeneid, “an implicit picture of an author who stands behind the scenes”) to the narrator (the “I” of “I sing” (cando) in the epic’s first line). There are corresponding levels of discourse from the vantage point of the text’s recipient: the actual audience (anyone who reads the Aeneid), the implied audience (the audience figured in the text), and the narrative audience (those who listen to the narrator sing). Since this book is largely centered on literary questions and, even when considering the Aeneid within its historical setting, focuses on the ideas advanced by Vergil the Aeneid's author, not Vergil the historical figure, I collapse the distinction between the terms “author” and “implied author.” Thus, I only differentiate between Vergil and the narrator, a separation that leaves the narrator as a distinct figure and enables the consideration of how Vergil constructs the narrator's relationship with

---

109 See pp. 142-5 for more discussion of these two reactions to Nisus and Euryalus' deaths.
110 Booth 1961, 131. On the same page Booth further defines the implied author: He “is always distinct from the ‘real man’ – whatever we may take him to be – who creates a superior version of himself, a ‘second self,’ as he creates his work.” Chatman 1978, 148 writes on the same concept: The implied author “is not the narrator, but rather the principle that invented the narrator, along with everything else in the narrative, that stacked the cards in this particular way, had these things happen to these characters, in these words or images. Unlike the narrator, the implied author can tell us nothing” (emphasis original).
111 I follow terms pointed out by Booth 1961, 73 and use “narrator” to mean “the speaker in the work who is . . . created by the implied author and who may be separated from him by large ironies.”
112 For more on these concepts (although with slightly different terminology), see Booth 1961, 138; Genette 1980, 259–60; and Fludernik 2009, 26.
113 Alongside this reason, since the ancient biographical tradition was quick to construct a life for an author based on his work, it can also be debated what we securely know about Vergil the historical figure and how that knowledge would differentiate him from the Aeneid’s implied author (see Horsfall 1995 on Vergil’s life and Lefkowitz 1991 on the Greek biographical tradition).
memory. From the perspective of the text's reception, I focus mainly on
the Aeneid's implied audience, whose origins spring from Aeneas' actions.
This discourse framework also proves useful for elucidating the char-
acteristics of further narrators within the Aeneid. Numerous characters
tell stories in the epic, spinning tales that range from several lines to two
books. The contents of such stories occupy another discourse level within
the Aeneid's narrative framework. As Genette notes, "any event a narrative
recounts is at" a new discourse level, separate from "the level at which the
narrating act producing the narrative is placed." When Aeneas tells Dido
his story in Aeneid 2 and 3, he acts as the narrator and she as the narrative
audience, and the content of his story occupies a new level of discourse in
the epic. By separating these levels of discourse, it is possible to evaluate
how memory functions on each level of the epic and what influence, if any,
one level has on another. At the same time, this delineation helps to reveal
the variety of voices, beliefs, and attitudes present within and between
these levels and, in doing so, shifts the interpretation of the Aeneid away
from unsubtle binarisms and toward a view of the sum of these parts as
an intentional construction that presents complex and challenging views
about memory.

114 Genette 1980, 228. See Fludernik 2009, 28 for an overview of various terms used to describe these
"embedded narrative acts."