Classical Quarterly **49.1** 184–202 (1999) *Printed in Great Britain*

AENEAS AS *HOSPES* IN VERGIL, *AENEID* 1 AND 4*

In the opening section of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 3 the poet, in an attempt to gain favour with his female addressees, lists a number of legends where it is men who are the deceivers. In this list he includes Aeneas, *et famam pietatis habet, tamen hospes et ensem / praebuit et causam mortis, Elissa, tuae* (39–40). The terms in which Aeneas' guilt is cast are striking. Aeneas is criticized not for his lover's faithlessness, but for his shattering of the rules of *hospitium*. At the heart of *hospitium*, in as much as it is friendship between strangers,[1] lay the ideals of duty, loyalty, reciprocity, and the exchange of services. *pietas* (39) includes, in this context, a reference to the guest's sense of, or actual fulfilment of, the duty to pay a proper return on the hospitality received.[2] Aeneas had a reputation for doing his duty as a *hospes*, i.e. as someone who was conscientious about his duty to make an appropriate return. But, according to Ovid, the return which he actually made was diametrically opposed to a proper return, and consisted of a sword and a reason for Dido to kill herself with it. Ovid's decision to frame Aeneas' guilt in terms of *hospitium* reflects an emphasis adopted both in his own earlier epistle from Dido to Aeneas (*Heroides* 7), and (what will concern us more) in the *Aeneid* itself. The erotic relationship between Dido and Aeneas in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* evolves out of the *hospitium* relationship established between them in Book 1. When Aeneas leaves Dido he asserts that their relationship is that of host and guest rather than of husband and wife, and that he has acted and will act well in this *hospitium* relationship (*Aen.* 4.334–9). Dido, for her part, even after she has been forced to drop the argument that she and Aeneas are married (*Aen.* 4.431), continues to attack Aeneas and the Trojans as bad or faithless *hospites* (*Aen.* 4.538–41, 4.596–8), and ends by renouncing *hospitium* with them (*Aen.* 4.622–9).

The couplet quoted from *Ars* 3 above settles this exchange over the rights and duties of *hospitium* firmly in favour Dido: Aeneas failed in his solemn duty to provide Dido with a proper return. In settling the matter thus Ovid is responding, however provocatively, to an invitation in the text of the *Aeneid*. Aeneas and Dido make claims and counter-claims about the nature of their relationship and their behaviour within in it, based on their conception of proper conduct within *hospitium*. The matter is never settled by an explicit editorial comment from the narrator. Vergil thus sets a problem for the reader of the *Aeneid*: how have Aeneas and Dido acted in the light of the values of *hospitium* to which they both appeal?[3] It is this question which the present paper will try to answer. Any answer to the question of behaviour within *hospitium* will carry important implications for the moral character and moral

* Versions of this paper were delivered most recently in St Andrews and to the Virgil Society. My thanks to the audiences on both occasions for helpful suggestions. Thanks are also owed to the following for invaluable help and observations (silently incorporated below): F. Cairns, M. Haslam, P. Hardie, S. Heyworth, C. Kraus, D. Nelis, R. Rees, and the anonymous *CQ* referee. Particular thanks must be offered to John Moles for the rigour of his stimulating observations and criticisms. None of the above should be presumed to agree with the argument.

[1] See D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 36.

[2] R. C. Monti, *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid*, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 66 (Leiden 1981), pp. 11–12.

[3] However, Vergil does issue an editorial comment on the relationship of 'marriage' which evolves out of their *hospitium* relationship, at 4.171–2 *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem:/ coniugium vocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam.*

reputation of the two individuals. Nor would the issue have been without resonance for contemporary readers. Questions of reciprocity were the stuff of Roman social intercourse (not to mention the emotions). In particular, the propaganda war between Octavian and Antony–Cleopatra which preceded Actium revolved around assertions of broken personal and political bonds, and accusations of indebtedness and ingratitude.[4]

Hospitium in the Dido and Aeneas episode has, to my knowledge, been the subject of detailed investigation once before, in Monti's 1981 book *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid*. Monti kept his focus deliberately on Roman sources. In this paper I wish to complicate the picture by invoking Homer.[5] The reception of guest by host is perhaps the most common type scene of all in the *Odyssey*, and the proper conduct of host and guest or *ξένοι* is an important and complex issue for the characters in the poem.[6] These repeated *ξενία*-type scenes, often recalled by Vergil, provide a respected source of comments on actions done in the name of guest-friendship, and offer another framework within which to view the relationship of Dido and Aeneas.[7] With this material I hope to bring out the tension, hitherto unacknowledged, that exists between Aeneas and Dido in the first book of the *Aeneid*. This tension will be seen to revolve around the issues of relative status, reciprocity, and the state of being dependent on another. Tension erupts into hostility over the very same issues in the fourth book—in addition to the new hostility and tension generated by the issue of 'marriage'. (We shall, however, deliberately neglect the issue of marriage.) An organic connection between the two parts of the narrative is thus provided. Furthermore I want to investigate whether we can answer the questions which Vergil sets the reader about the behaviour of Dido and Aeneas to one another as host and guest. Here I will focus on the nature of the claims made by the two characters.

HOSPITALITY SCENES IN HOMER AND THE *AENEID*

In his recent work on hospitality scenes in Homer, *The Stranger's Welcome*, Reece identifies eighteen major examples in the 'Homeric' corpus: twelve in the *Odyssey*;[8] four in the *Iliad*;[9] and two in the *Hymns*.[10] In the *Aeneid* Vergil includes five major

[4] Cf. e.g. Plut. *Ant.* 53–5.

[5] Although my emphases and conclusions differ from those of Monti, my debt to his work is obvious.

[6] Of course guest-friendship is an issue outside the *Odyssey* too, and is often seized upon by abandoned women as a way of publicly expressing their sense of betrayal, for example by Medea and Ariadne; see further S. Farron, *Vergil's Aeneid: a Poem of Grief and Love*, *Mnemosyne Supplement* 122 (Leiden 1993), pp. 97–9. Cf. also the only surviving fragment of Callimachus' treatment of the myth of Phyllis and Demophoon, fr. 556 Pfeiffer *νυμφίε Δημοφόων, ἄδικε ξένε* (compare Ov. *Epist.* 2.1). For the latter myth, see especially F. della Corte, '*Perfidus hospes*', in *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (*Collections Latomus* 101, 1969) 1.312–21 = *Opuscula* IV (Genova, 1973), pp. 29–38.

[7] The obvious danger here is that Vergil's scenes and characters have so many Homeric and other forebears and parallels as to threaten to frustrate the possibility of coherent reading; see R. Hexter, 'Sidonian Dido', in R. Hexter and D. Selden (edd.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (London, 1993), pp. 332–84, at pp. 338–42.

[8] Athene-Mentes in Ithaca; Telemachus in Pylos; Telemachus in Sparta; Hermes and Calypso; Odysseus and the Phaeacians; Odysseus and Polyphemus; Odysseus and Aeolus; Odysseus and the Laestrygonians; Odysseus and Circe; Odysseus and Eumaeus; Telemachus and Eumaeus; and Odysseus' homecoming.

[9] The embassy to Achilles; Nestor and Odysseus in Phthia; Thetis and Hephaestus; and Priam and Achilles.

[10] Demeter in the home of Celeos, and Aphrodite and Anchises.

hospitality scenes: Dido and the Trojans; Aeneas and Helenus in Epirus; Aeneas and Acestes in Sicily; Latinus and the Trojans; Aeneas and Evander. To this may be added a number of minor episodes, such as Anchises and Anius on Delos and the Trojans and Achaemenides.[11]

The Homeric scenes include a number of repeated conventional elements, such as arrival at the destination, description of the surroundings, the offer of a seat to the guest by the host, a feast, identification of the guest, exchange of information, entertainment, offer of a bed, the detainment of the guest by the host, and finally bestowal of gifts by the host and departure of the guest. The Homeric poems gain much internal complexity from the repetition, variation and omission of these elements in individual hospitality scenes. The ancient commentators were apparently aware of this phenomenon. The scholia to, for example, *Od.* 4.69, in commenting on the complexity of the process of the identification of Telemachus in the Spartan episode, contrast the 'novel' (καινός) pattern in Sparta with the 'common' (κοινός) pattern of identification, as in the episode at Pylos. As a student of both the Homeric poems and their commentators,[12] Vergil will have been aware of the status of the hospitality episode in Homer as a type scene with conventional elements. As we shall see, his *Aeneid*, particularly in the Dido episode, gains complexity and a rich framework for judgement from the repetition, variation, and omission of the conventional elements which go to make up the Homeric hospitality scene. Nevertheless, it ought to be said in advance that the Homeric material should not blind us to the fact that there is something profoundly disturbing about the very existence of a *hospitium* relationship between Aeneas and Dido. The future enmity of Rome and Carthage, the Roman conception of *Punica fides*,[13] and the historic enmity between Aeneas' mother and Dido's father, Venus and Belus (1.621f.),[14] all give grounds for disquiet here. The whole question of *hospitium* between Carthaginian and Trojan is in fact pushed forward as an issue at 1.297–300 when Jupiter sends his messenger to earth, *haec ait et Maia genitum demittit ab alto, / ut terrae utque novae pateant Karthaginis arces / hospitio Teucris, ne fati nescia Dido / finibus arceret.* It is only as a result of Mercury's intervention that Dido and the Carthaginians put aside their instinctive *ferocia corda* (1.302–3) and adopt a *mentem benignam* (1.304).[15]

THE ARRIVAL OF THE TROJANS IN AFRICA

The initial stages of the Trojans' reception in Carthage include many of the conventional elements of Homeric reception scenes. Aeneas meets a woman who shows him the way to Dido's palace (*Aen.* 1.314ff.), just as Odysseus meets young women who show him the way to the palaces of Alcinous and the Laestrygonian king (*Od.* 6.110–32, 7.18–81, 10.103–11; cf. 15.415–84). Aeneas' journey later includes other conventional elements, such as description of the surroundings and the

[11] For a brief review of the major hospitality episodes in the *Aeneid*, see S. F. Wiltshire, *Public and Private in Vergil's Aeneid* (Amherst, 1989), pp. 83–105.

[12] See e.g. R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid* (Ann Arbor, 1974).

[13] See N. Horsfall, *PVS* 13 (1973–4), 4–6.

[14] See J. Foster, *PVS* 13 (1973–4), 29–30.

[15] See Horsfall (n. 13), p. 4 and cf. Venus' references to her fear of *Iunonia hospitia* (1.671–2). The uncertainty which Vergil manages to create here about the Carthaginians as hosts may be compared to the doubt cast in the *Odyssey* on just how willing the Phaeacians will turn out to be to help Odysseus (for which see G. Most, 'The structure and function of Odysseus' *apologoi*', *TAPA* 119 [1989], 15–30, at 27).

awe of the viewer (1.421f., 1.455f., 1.494), description of the activities of the person sought (1.496–508), and the waiting of the visitor at the threshold (1.453f.).

Dido finally appears, but she cannot suddenly notice the visitor and approach him to offer hospitality (in contrast to a common pattern in Homer), as Aeneas is concealed from human sight in a cloud, from which he does not emerge. Instead it is Ilioneus who, as leader of the surviving Trojans, is the first to engage with Dido as host. Aeneas and Achates meanwhile stay concealed in their cloud (1.516f. *dissimulant et nube cava speculantur amicti / quae fortuna viris*). In the scene which follows they see Dido acting as a generous host towards the Trojans (1.562–78). That Aeneas is, through this device of concealment in a cloud, being allowed to watch on in judgement of Dido, is a suggestion to which we shall later return.

THE SPEECH OF ILIONEUS: 1.522–58

In three scenes in Homer, the visitor is so vulnerable (or resourceless) that he is forced to approach his host not as guest but as suppliant.[16] This is the situation in which Ilioneus, as representative of the surviving Trojans, finds himself. He avoids the traditional Homeric and Greek custom of clasping the knees of his host. Nevertheless the position of the Trojans is that of suppliants (1.518f. *cuncti nam lecti navibus ibant / orantes veniam*) and the language which Ilioneus uses is that of supplication (1.524f. *Troes te miseri . . . / oramus*; 526 *parce pio generi et propius res aspice nostras*). The speech which Ilioneus makes as suppliant to Dido may be divided into three sections. Each is designed to put pressure on Dido with regard to the conventions of *hospitium* in a different way.

(i) Ilioneus straightaway provides information which a guest, according to Homeric convention, might reasonably delay providing until his material needs had been catered for. Whereas a visitor can expect a good host to reserve questions about identity and business until after the host has offered him a seat and a place at table, Ilioneus feels constrained to volunteer such traditional information as his identity (1.524), business (1.525f.; cf. 1.551f.), an assurance that the Trojans are not pirates (1.527ff.), his destination (1.530ff.; cf. 1.553ff.) and transport (1.534ff.). This is a striking deviation from Homeric convention. It is of course appropriate to his suppliant status, but it is noticeable that even in his suppliant state Odysseus reveals nothing about himself to Arete, but merely requests his passage home (7.146ff.).[17] It is perhaps to be viewed as a deliberate attempt to secure in advance a reciprocal gesture of goodwill from Dido. So far the Carthaginians have proved hostile to the Trojans.[18] Ilioneus must accordingly attempt to claim the goodwill of the Carthaginians—here by the voluntary breaking of convention.

(ii) Ilioneus then makes a further attempt to shame the hostile Carthaginians into receiving the Trojans peaceably. His words in this first meeting between Carthaginian

[16] Odysseus and Arete and Alcinous; Odysseus and Polyphemus; and Priam and Achilles.

[17] But information is revealed by Odysseus to Nausicaa at 6.170ff. It might be objected here that circumstances force Ilioneus to be more open. He has arrived as the spokesman of shiploads of warriors, whereas the arrival of, for example, the unaccompanied Odysseus is considerably less threatening, and so requires less explanation. Note, however, the 'Homeric' reception given to Jason and his men at Colchis, at Ap. *Arg.* 3.299ff.

[18] The victory scenes on Juno's temple, which depict Trojan suffering, also signal potential hostility. The interpretation of this episode is, however, controversial. For other views, see most recently S. Lowenstan, 'The pictures on Juno's temple in the *Aeneid*', *CW* 87 (1993), 37–49, at 48–9, also Hexter (n. 7), pp. 353–7.

and (future) Roman are of ill omen for their future relations: *quod genus hoc hominum? quaeve hunc tam barbara morem / permittit patria? hospitio prohibemur harenae; / bella cient primaque vetant consistere terra. / si genus humanum et mortalia temnitis arma, / at sperate deos memores fandi atque nefandi* (1.539–43). Ilioneus and the Trojans could not as of right expect to be welcomed as a guest-friends. There was an expectation that strangers be welcomed hospitably, but the courtesy was not obligatory.[19] Hence Ilioneus, as we have already seen, adopts the position of suppliant, and furthermore now focuses his complaint on the Carthaginians' denial of what he asserts *is* their basic right, namely *hospitium harenae* or the right to come ashore.[20] The complaint is one intended to shame Dido. Two incidents in the *Odyssey* are illuminating here. In *Od.* 4, Telemachus and Pisistratus arrive in Sparta and a herald approaches Menelaus with the question whether they should be offered hospitality. Menelaus is properly horrified at this delay in receiving the visitors and vigorously upbraids his herald before commanding that the visitors be brought in immediately (4.31ff.). Similarly in Scheria the Phaeacian elder Echeneus upbraids Alcinous and Arete with their stunned surprise at the appearance of Odysseus, and failure to respond immediately to his suppliant's plea (7.159ff.). Good hosts, according to the paradigm of the *Odyssey*, do not fail to offer hospitality or to respond to a suppliant's plea. But in Carthage the suppliant Trojans may not even come ashore.

The pressure which Ilioneus' speech applies is appropriate in view of both the explicit and implicit signals of the Carthaginians' hostility. Dido responds graciously, but under the circumstances someone who wished to appear as a good host might have little choice. Nevertheless, as in Sparta and Scheria, there are extenuating circumstances for the initial hesitation in the extending of hospitality. As the scholiast to *Od.* 4.26 points out, Telemachus arrives during the exceptional circumstances of a wedding celebration, and the Spartans had suffered grieviously at the hands of a previous guest, Paris. As for the Phaeacians, they were destined to be punished for their custom of escorting strangers home (13.170–83). Similarly, the circumstances of the flight from Sidon and the founding of the new city oblige Dido to be careful: *res dura et regni novitas me talia cogunt / moliri et late finis custode tueri* (*Aen.* 1.563f.).

(iii) Finally Ilioneus mentions Aeneas (1.544–52):

> rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter
> nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis.
> quem si fata virum servant, si vescitur aura
> aetheria neque adhuc crudelibus occubat umbris,
> non metus, officio nec te certasse priorem
> paeniteat. sunt et Siculis regionibus urbes
> armaque Troianoque a sanguine clarus Acestes.
> quassatam ventis liceat subducere classem
> et silvis aptare trabes et stringere remos . . .

In this speech there is the implied threat of an armed response to the Carthaginians (545; cf. 542; 549f.).[21] More relevant to our theme, however, is the attempt Ilioneus makes here to have the Trojans raised from the status of suppliant to the status of

[19] Konstan (n. 1), p. 36.

[20] Ilioneus is no doubt depending on Dido accepting the viewpoint reported by D. Servius, *litus enim iure gentium commune omnibus fuit.*

[21] This threat is later validated rhetorically by Ilioneus through the implicit contrast between the *pius* and *iustus* race of the Trojans and their king (1.526, 543–4), and the Carthaginians with their *infandi ignes* (1.525).

guest-friends. Suppliants are often resourceless, and so are ill-prepared to enter into the exchange of services which is characteristic of guest–host relationships. But Ilioneus now makes it clear that the Trojans are equipped to enter into such an exchange relationship. As we saw above, a guest is not properly asked to reveal his name until after he has been given a seat and a place at his host's table. The revelation by the guest of his name and other relevant information then acts as a kind of counter-gift for the host's hospitality, as for example in the case of Odysseus on Scheria. The guest's revelation of his name also allows the host the possibility of claiming reciprocal hospitality from the guest at some point in the future. Here Ilioneus volunteers not his own name but (a more powerful card) that of his king. This is a guarantee, in advance of any hospitality received, of reciprocal favours should Dido receive the Trojans as *hospites* on African soil. This implicit guarantee is backed by more explicit promises of reciprocity. Aeneas has no equal for his *pietas* (545). That is to say, Aeneas is a man steadfast in the duty of observing his obligations and of making returns on services received.[22] Also, the Carthaginians would not regret taking the lead in a contest of *officia* (548). That is to say, if Dido were to perform the kind service (*officium*) of allowing the Trojans access to material assistance (1.551f.), she would be guaranteed a perhaps greater return on it from Aeneas her grateful guest.[23] Furthermore the Trojans have the resources to make a return on services received, as they have kin in nearby Sicily (1.549f.).[24] (Again there is an ominous note in this last remark.)

Pressure is applied to Dido here by the coercive implication that the Carthaginians are unwilling to receive resourceless strangers from the sea as guest-friends, because they fear that no return will be made. This alleged 'fear' is dispelled by the unsolicited revelation of Aeneas' name, promises of the reciprocity proper from a guest, and a naming of the resources from which a return can be made. Under such pressure a host who wished to appear generous and conscientious might have little option but to respond warmly. And, as we shall see, Dido does respond generously—perhaps overly so, as if in response to this potential challenge to her reputation as a good host. It is also significant that we hear Aeneas' reputation as a good *hospes* established for the first time. This is an impression which will be confirmed by his own behaviour in the rest of Book 1, lent further support by his own account of the Trojans' travels in Book 3, before being set before the reader as an issue for judgement in Book 4.

DIDO'S REPLY TO ILIONEUS: 1.562–578

Dido explains to the Trojans the extenuating circumstances behind their ill-treatment at the hands of her people, and assures them that the fate of Troy and Aeneas' brave band of men is well known to the Carthaginians,[25] who are not barbarians on the world's edge, before adding (1.569–76):

[22] Monti (n. 2), pp. 11–12.

[23] For *officium* and its place in the vocabulary of reciprocity, see R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 15–17. The striking use of this vocabulary in an epic poem such as the *Aeneid* will receive further comment below.

[24] Ilioneus implies that the Trojans are worthy guests also because Aeneas is the equal, if not the superior of Dido in the matter of *iustitia* (contrast 4.523–4 and 544–5).

[25] However, Dido's knowledge of the Trojans, as reflected on the walls of the temple of Juno, may be read as disquieting.

seu vos Hesperiam magnam Saturniaque arva
sive Erycis finis regemque optatis Acesten,
auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo.
vultis et his mecum pariter considere regnis?
urbem quam statuo, vestra est; subducite navis;
Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.
atque utinam rex ipse Noto compulso eodem
adforet Aeneas!

Here Dido gives the first evidence to the Trojans of her friendly intentions, by responding to the request that the Trojans be raised from suppliant to guest-friend status. Ilioneus had merely asked that the Trojans be allowed access to material to refit their fleet (1.551f.). Dido, however, offers her more active assistance (1.571 *auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuvabo*) and even a place in her new city (1.572ff.). In the Homeric poems, Alcinous and Achilles demonstrate similar generosity by lifting their visitors from the status of suppliant to guest. They do this through raising the visitor by the hand and offering him a seat of honour (*Od.* 7.168f.; *Il.* 24.515, 24.522). Trojan suppliants, like Roman suppliants, do not prostrate themselves or accept actual seats. But Vergil demonstrates his awareness of the Homeric convention that the offer of a seat signifies an elevation in status from suppliant to guest, by having Dido use the language of seating metaphorically (1.572 *vultis et his mecum pariter considere regnis*?).

Meanwhile, Aeneas has been standing by and observing Dido's treatment of the Trojans. Now it has been made clear that the Trojans are to be guests rather than suppliants, this is the appropriate moment for the kingly Aeneas to reveal himself and begin his *hospitium* relationship with his equal, queen Dido.[26] However, before we examine Aeneas's reply to Dido, we need to look in more detail at Dido's offers of help and assistance to the Trojans. The first, her offer of active material assistance, is relatively straightforward. This is the mark of a good host not only in the *Odyssey* but also in more prosaic discussions of the ethics of conferring *beneficia*. In his *de Beneficiis*, Seneca frequently uses the example of saving people from shipwreck, refitting their ships, and sending them on their way as a classic instance of a *beneficium* or 'kind service'.[27] The second offer, however, at first appears startling. For she holds out to the Trojans the possibility of partnership in Carthage: *vultis et his mecum pariter considere regnis?/ urbem quam statuo, vestra est; subducite navis;/ Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur* (1.572–4). Previous commentators have tended to stress the *humanitas* of this offer. However, acts of humanity need not always be straightforward in either their motivations or their implications. Certainly an offer of incorporation, made on a first encounter with a deeply offended foreign people, can hardly be accounted for by simple altruism. As Herman has shown, the start of Greek ξενία relationships are often characterized by spectacular acts of εὐεργεσία.[28] These acts are not only lavish demonstrations of non-hostility, but also often part of a deliberate strategy to place the recipient in such a state of indebtedness that he can only redeem himself by a display of submission and loyalty towards the donor. Can

[26] Later, at the end of the relationship, Dido claims to be reduced herself to the level of suppliant, whether towards her former African suitors or the departing Trojans, at 4.534ff.

[27] This relationship established by such active assistance is distinguished from the one that exists, for example, between innkeeper and guest. The latter is a commercial relationship and not *hospitium*, as money changes hands instead of *gratia* and *officia*. Cf. e.g. Sen. *Ben.* 1.5.4f., 1.14.1, 3.9.3, 3.35.4, 4.11.3, 4.37f.

[28] G. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 47ff., 122.

something of this be detected in Dido's offer of an equal share in her kingdom? The vigorous and proud queen of Carthage (1.496–508) needs to recover her position with the offended Trojans. Dido's Carthaginian subjects did all they could to keep the Trojans from coming ashore, and this has placed her in an embarassing and (as the Trojans muttered threats of an armed response suggest) potentially violent situation. In order to recover from this, some expansive gesture of non-hostility and acknowledgement of the good status of the visitors is needed. An offer of an equal place in her kingdom is, however, not only an expression of non-hostility and recognition of status. It is also so overly-generous in proportion to the situation that it may be thought to compensate the Trojans for their ill-treatment. And, in advance of any services received, it puts the Trojans firmly in her debt for making such a generous offer. It appears that they can now redeem themselves only by a display of submission. Dido thus skilfully recovers her position. She is transformed from barbarian (1.539f.) to commanding host.

THE REPLY OF AENEAS TO DIDO: 1.595–610

Aeneas is now revealed, and steps forth from his cloud *os umerosque deo similis* (1.589ff.). The pattern here resembles 'theoxenic' hospitality, whereby a disguised god or sometimes hero tests the hospitality of an individual. The pattern is a very common one in ancient literature, and in fact the first reception scene in the *Odyssey*, that of Athena-Mentes in Ithaca, is a form of theoxeny.[29] Aeneas, of course, does not test the hospitality of Dido personally, but theoxenic overtones can be detected in the fact that Aeneas is not revealed until after Dido has proved herself a receptive host, and that at the moment of his revelation he is compared to a god.[30] Vergil's choice of the theoxenic form has two complementary purposes. First of all it preserves Aeneas' kingly dignity. Odysseus may be forced to adopt the role of suppliant towards Arete, but Aeneas is allowed to observe while others supplicate. Secondly the theoxenic overtones implant in the text the notion of the judgement of another's behaviour as *hospes*, for gods come to test and pass judgement on the hospitality of mortals.

Aeneas' revelation to human sight (presumably by his mother[31]) has also arguably come not a moment too soon. How might Ilioneus have responded to the startling offer of the queen of Carthage?[32] The kingly Aeneas enters to retrieve the position for the Trojans (1.595ff.). He makes no direct reply to Dido's offer of a place for them in her kingdom. He only describes her offer (1.598–600), and adds a tactfully oblique hint that circumstances will find him moving on from Carthage (1.610 *quae me cumque vocant terrae*). This is neither clear acceptance nor firm rejection of her offer. This shows that Aeneas understands the nature of Dido's offer: it is a demonstration of non-hostility (albeit one which has the potential to undermine the hero's mission). The obvious model for the making of such a socially significant offer is found in the *Odyssey*. In the seventh book Alcinous wishes that he could grant Odysseus a place in his kingdom—this time as his son-in-law. This offer again is designed to compensate

[29] On theoxeny, see further A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 341–54.

[30] A bath, from which the visitor often rises with enhanced appearance, is another standard element of Homeric reception scenes; see S. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome* (Ann Arbor, 1993), pp. 33–4. Echoes of it can be detected here.

[31] 1.585ff. (Achates) '. . . *dictis respondent cetera matris.'| vix ea fatus erat cum circumfusa repente | scindit se nubes et in aethera purgat apertum.*

[32] Cf. 7.212ff. (Ilioneus in the embassy to Latinus); 9.501 (Ilioneus' high position in the camp during the absence of Aeneas).

Odysseus for the ill-treatment he suffered in making his way to Alcinous' palace alone, and to acknowledge his status as a hero. Again Odysseus displays his understanding of the fundamentally symbolic nature of the offer by omitting to reply directly to it. But perhaps Aeneas and Odysseus make no direct reply also because they understand that such extravagant offers threaten to reduce recipients to a state of submissive dependence on the donor. In the *Aeneid*, Ilioneus arguably may not have the status or necessary authority to avoid this fate. The effect of Dido's offer is achieved partly by the implication of its content. Dido (like Alcinous) is offering her addressees a subordinate place in her kingdom. Trojans may be treated equally with Carthaginians, but both will owe obedience to their ruler, Dido.[33] Similarly Odysseus may enter Alcinous' kingdom as son-in-law, but he will now take his identity from his wife's family and owe allegiance to Alcinous as his king. Accordingly Aeneas will have to use the utmost tact in replying to an offer which (ultimately) holds out to the Trojans the status of subordinates.[34]

Aeneas manages to preserve the status of the Trojans here by omitting to reply directly to Dido's offer (as we have already seen), by espousing the correct sentiments of gratitude, and by framing the whole in extravagant terms designed to match the extravagance of Dido's offer. First of all, Aeneas voluntarily identifies himself (1.595f.). This acts to demonstrate his own willingness to return the hospitality of his host.[35] He then hails Dido as the only woman to take pity on the Trojans (1.597)—an expression of gratitude which is strengthened for the reader by the implicit contrast with Aeneas' accusation of his mother at 1.407ff. Aeneas subsequently acknowledges that Dido's offer obliges him to show gratitude, but that he cannot make a proper return (1.600f.). Hence he appeals to the *gods* to recompense Dido properly (1.603ff.).[36] The only requital which Aeneas himself can offer is the manifestation of his gratitude in words (1.609f.).[37] He cannot make any worthy material return, but he can promise to publicize Dido's *beneficia*, as the properly grateful recipient was often said to be obliged to do.[38] To these expressions of gratitude are added a series of extravagant sentiments and compliments. The whole Trojan race could not repay Dido (1.601f.). It is hoped that the gods have a regard for goodness, justice, and have a sense of right (1.603–5). The happy age which brought Dido to life, and her parents are acclaimed (1.605f.). Aeneas ends with the high-flown sentiment that while rivers run to the sea and there are stars in the sky, he will praise and honour her (1.607ff.). It could

[33] Despite the apparent egalitarianism of 1.572 *mecum pariter*, this is the implication of 1.574 *Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur*. I am conscious of a debt in my discussion to S. Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey* (Princeton, 1987), pp. 91–103.

[34] For the reader who knows Homer, it is also significant that such offers are characteristic of hosts who turn out to be obstructive. In the Spartan episode in the *Odyssey*, Menelaus' affectionate wish to resettle a returned Odysseus in the Peloponnese (in return for all the services performed by the latter for Menelaus) eventually turns into a desire to detain Telemachus for as long as possible in Sparta. Similarly the offer of Nausicaa's hand eventually becomes an obstacle to Odysseus' return home, from which the hero must contrive to extricate himself (cf. Most [n. 15], pp. 27–9). Such offers once made, even when their nature is apparently understood by all parties, become increasingly difficult to ignore. In the *Aeneid*, Dido's offer of a place in her kingdom ominously foreshadows Aeneas' apparent acceptance of a role as consort to Dido.

[35] See Reece (n. 30), p. 25. The issue of the guest's willingness to return the hospitality appears explicitly later at *Aen.* 4.537ff.

[36] Cf. Sen. *Ben.* 4.11.3.

[37] Cf. Sen. *Ben.* 2.22 *qui grate beneficium accipit, primam eius pensionem solvit.*

[38] Cf. Sen. *Ben.* 2.22 *quam grate* [sc. *beneficium*] *ad nos pervenisse indicemus effusis adfectibus, quos non ipso tantum audiente sed ubique testemur.*

be said here that while Dido makes serious offers of partnership and material assistance, Aeneas, whose words and actions are destined to destroy Dido, replies with empty and overblown sentiments. However, that would be to misunderstand the nature of the exchange between the two. An overly generous offer of help is met with an extravagant expression of thanks. An offer which promises too much is met with gratitude which is too profuse.[39] Aeneas skilfully recovers his footing with Dido, just as Dido had recovered hers with Ilioneus. As we shall see, a further attempt is made to recover status with the Trojans' gifts to Dido.

THE END OF *AENEID* 1

The following scenes contain further standard elements from Homer. Dido escorts her guest inside her palace, as is common in many Homeric reception scenes. Dido also then provides for Aeneas' men and ships (1.633ff.), much as Menelaus provides for Telemachus' horses in Sparta (*Od.* 4.39ff.). The fact that she provides for the Trojans simultaneously with Aeneas, rather than tending first or solely to the needs of her most important visitor demonstrates her intention to be a good host. A feast is then prepared for the visitors (1.637ff.), followed by the after-dinner drink (1.723ff.), the sharing of a libation (1.728ff.), entertainment from a bard (1.740ff.), and finally the exchange of information between host and guest (1.748ff.).[40] The Homeric pattern is not followed to the letter, nor in order, but the resemblance is close and demonstrates to the reader that proper and traditional hospitality is being offered.[41]

The closing section of *Aeneid* 1, however, does contain another striking deviation from Homeric convention. In the *Odyssey*, gifts are routinely bestowed on the guest by the host. In return, the host expects that he will be remembered by the guest, as for example when Menelaus hopes that his gift of a horse and chariot will cause Telemachus to be mindful of him all the days of his life (4.592). Elsewhere it is acknowledged that the receipt of a gift obliges the guest to make a return on it, should the host ever one day visit the home of his present guest.[42] In the *Aeneid*, Dido not only provides 'gifts' in the form of material provisions for Aeneas' men (1.633ff.), but later in the epic we learn of her particular guest-gifts to the Trojans, such as an ancient mixing-bowl (9.266), tunics embroidered with gold and purple (11.72–5), and a horse to Ascanius (5.571f.). At the feast given to welcome the Trojans, she requests remembrance (1.733). Later, in *Aeneid* 4, Aeneas repeats his promise to remember Dido (4.333ff.; cf. 1.607ff.).[43]

However, convention is broken at *Aeneid* 1.647ff., when Aeneas sends Achates to bring gifts for Dido, namely a cloak and a dress which had once belonged to Helen, the sceptre of Priam's eldest daughter (Ilione), and a crown and necklace. In Homer

[39] However Roger Rees points out to me that, even in the Augustan era, the distinction between *grates* and *laudes* was rather hazy, and it was conventional for the *gratiarum actio* to be panegyrical in nature (cf. e.g. Ov. *Pont.* 4.4.35–9). As a result, in offering enthusiastic thanks, Aeneas may also be acting as a proto-Roman.

[40] For these standard elements in Homer, see Reece (n. 30), pp. 20–31, 51–3, 62.

[41] For the similarity also to Greek initiation rituals surrounding ξενία, see Herman (n. 28), pp. 22–3, 58–69, 69ff.

[42] Cf. Athene-Mentes at *Od.* 1.318; Laertes at 24.283ff.

[43] Dido doubts whether the Trojans will remember all her gifts and services to them, at 4.537ff. This is of course a serious attack on the Trojans' reputation for returning services.

gifts are never offered by guest to host, but only by host to guest.[44] Later in the *Aeneid*, during the embassy to Latinus, gifts are in fact bestowed by the Trojans on a potential ally (7.243ff.). Parallels suggest that it was a Roman custom to presents gifts to foreign dignitaries recognized as worthy friends and allies.[45] In Book 1, however, the Trojans are seeking temporary hospitality rather than requesting alliance, and the atmosphere is more obviously Homeric. Compare the observation of the convention in the similarly Homeric atmosphere of Book 3. In the Epirus episode, Helenus bestows gold, ivory, silver, etc., on the departing Trojans (3.463ff.). The Trojans do not bestow guest-gifts on the Epiriots. The breaking of Homeric convention in Book 1 is thus striking. What is the reader supposed to make of it? One obvious motivation for the breaking of convention must be the desire on Vergil's part to introduce bad omens for the relationship between Aeneas and Dido. In particular the gift of Helen's dress (1.650ff. *ornatus Argivae Helenae, quos illa Mycenis,/ Pergama cum peteret inconcessosque hymenaeos,/ extulerat*) appears sinister in the light of subsequent events. But I suggest that one further reason for the transgression lies in the concern with relative status and reciprocity that is clear in the preceeding narrative. Ilioneus advertised his king, in Aeneas' hearing, as a man conspicuous for his sense of duty (1.545), and one with whom Dido would have 'nothing to fear or regret by taking the lead in a contest of *officia*' (1.548f.). In addition, Aeneas has made clear his inability (or that of the whole Trojan race for that matter) to make a proper return. He can offer only verbal manifestations of his gratitude (1.600ff.)—that is to say accept and acknowledge his inferior position. Nevertheless, Aeneas does now have something with which to recompense Dido. As the Homeric poems show, special value was attached to gifts with a history (e.g. Menelaus gives Telemachus a mixing bowl which he had been given by the king of the Sidonians, at *Od.* 4.613ff.[46]). The gifts which Aeneas gives to Dido are unique and irreplaceable, and arouse suitable feelings of wonder and admiration in Dido and the Carthaginians (1.709ff.). They make clear the pedigree of the Trojan guests, and demonstrate a willingness to make a return on services received. Aeneas might be criticized for making a return so quickly. Such behaviour is characteristic of those who do not wish to be in debt to anyone, and so make a return which breaks the socially cohesive bond of obligation between donor and recipient. But Aeneas has already made clear that no fully adequate return can be made. In addition, how is one to reckon up the value of Dido's help and offers of help, relative to the value of Aeneas' gifts to Dido?[47] The gifts recover status for the Trojans, but they do not break the bond of obligation between host and guest. However, there is a clear concern with relative status and reciprocity—concerns which will return with greater force in the narrative of Book 4.[48]

I trust I have now brought out the implicit tension which exists between Aeneas and

[44] See Reece (n. 30), p. 35 and S. West on Hom. *Od.* 1.318 (Oxford, 1988).

[45] Cf. Liv. 30.15.11 (Scipio and Massinissa); Tac. *Ann.* 4.26 (the Senate and King Ptolemy of Mauretania). On the immediate exchange of gifts within ritualized friendship in the Greek world, see Herman (n. 28), pp. 60–3.

[46] Reece (n. 30), p. 36.

[47] For the issue in ancient society of the relative values of services, see Saller (n. 23), pp. 16–17.

[48] Other elements in the final sections of *Aeneid* 1 evince a similar concern with reciprocity. According to Homeric convention, news and information from the guest might act as a form of recompense for the host's hospitality; see Reece (n. 30), pp. 28, 55–6. Information is asked of Aeneas at 1.748ff. and provided by him in the form of the second and third books of the poem. Dido's demands for information become importunate later at 4.78f. Alcinous is a similarly over-demanding host in the *Odyssey*.

Dido in the first book of the *Aeneid*. As we move into Book 4 we shall see how the hostility which erupts between them returns to the same issues which fed the tension in Book 1, namely reciprocity and relative status. We shall also start looking more closely at the standards of behaviour within *hospitium* to which Aeneas and Dido both appeal and which they seek to justify.

AENEID 4

In Aeneas' narrative of his wanderings in Book 3, he shows himself to be a good and conscientious *hospes*.[49] At Epirus, for example, Helenus and Anromache refit and resupply his fleet, and shower him with guest-gifts. Aeneas makes a conscientious return on this by promising that the peoples of Hesperia and Epirus will one day be united (3.502ff.). This scene in particular acts as a paradigm of proper hospitality followed by the happy departure of the guest. The function of *Aeneid* 3 here may be compared to the function of Odysseus' narrative to the Phaeacians, which is in part designed to warn the Phaeacians to act as good hosts and send him on his way.[50]

When we return to the main narrative in Book 4, Dido has of course fallen in love with Aeneas. It is here that the expected forward movement of correspondences with the typical Homeric hospitality scene comes to a halt. We find no bestowal of guest-gifts by Dido on Aeneas in anticipation of departure (although guest-gifts are mentioned incidentally in the later books of the epic). Nor is there a departure meal, libation and farewell blessing, etc. Instead the guest is detained by the host. There are, however, clear parallels for this in Homeric hospitality scenes. In the *Odyssey*, Nestor is a famously over-zealous host, and Telemachus must ask his son to assist him in avoiding a meeting with Nestor on his return journey past Pylos.[51] Menelaus in Sparta also appears to wish to detain Telemachus. Nevertheless on the latter's departure he makes a speech on the blameworthiness of hosts who detain guests who wish to leave.[52] Dido's detainment of Aeneas corresponds to these Homeric scenes, but with one important difference. She explicitly wishes to detain her guest—or she is encouraged to do so by her sister Anna, *indulge hospitio causasque innecte morandi, / dum pelago desaevit hiems et aquosus Orion, / quassataeque rates, dum non tractabile caelum* (4.51ff.).[53]

It is soon after this point that the theme of *hospitium*, which has been the focus of this paper, loses its dominance in Vergil's text. After the scene in the cave (4.166ff.) Dido feels sure that she has other claims on Aeneas in addition to those of *hospitium*. As stated at the beginning of the paper, the much (and inconclusively) discussed issue of 'marriage' is one I intend to leave aside, in favour of a continued focus on the neglected issue of *hospitium*.[54] Such a focus may be justified by the fact that Dido is ultimately forced to rely on the issue of *hospitium* alone in her attempt to establish

[49] For the Trojans as good *hospites* in *Aeneid* 3, even when under pressure or provocation, see H. A. Khan, 'The Harpies episode in *Aeneid* 3', *Prometheus* 22 (1996), 131–44.

[50] See Most (n. 15). [51] Reece (n. 30), pp. 67–9.

[52] Hom. *Od.* 15.68ff. The scenes where Menalaus detains Telemachus in Sparta in fact provide a rich context for the interpretation of *Aeneid* 4.1–330. On Menelaus' hospitality, see further Reece (n. 30), pp. 88–98.

[53] For the relationship between Anna and Dido, see further D. P. Nelis, *The Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (forthcoming).

[54] On the issue of the 'marriage', however, see especially R. Green, '*Conubium* in the *Aeneid*', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 4 (*Collections Latomus* 196, 1986), 393–421.

public claims on Aeneas. She drops the claim to marriage, and although she continues to appeal to Aeneas' emotions, Dido ends on a defiant note of the renunciation of *hospitium* (4.622ff.). She is effectively forced, as we shall see, to have recourse to the one area, *hospitium,* where she can make public assertions about her relationship with Aeneas without being told that she has no right to make such claims.

DIDO'S FIRST SPEECH TO THE DEPARTING AENEAS: 4.305–30

In Dido's first encounter with Aeneas after she has heard that he is planning to leave, she makes a long speech in which she pleads with him on three levels. The first plea is made on the emotional level (307 *noster amor*; 314 *lacrimas*, etc.). The second plea revolves around the duties of the *hospes*. She refers at 307 and 314 to his 'right hand'. The right hand has many significances, including that of marriage. But the one I wish to focus on here is that of the clasping of the right hand to signify the initiation of a host–guest relationship.[55] This is allied with the plea at 317, *si bene quid de te merui.* Here an appeal is made to the obligation on the guest to reciprocate, by implying that Dido has performed services for Aeneas which deserve a return, such as rescuing him from shipwreck and receiving him as her guest.[56] A third plea is found at 316 with the reference to their marriage. The latter two appeals are combined at 323f., when Dido witheringly remarks that *hospes* is obviously the only name she can now give the man who used to be her husband. All three are designed to place pressure on Aeneas; each is intended to oblige him to stay by reminding him of his duties to her as (respectively) lover, guest, and husband.

THE DEPARTING AENEAS' REPLY TO DIDO: 4.333–61

Where Dido had appealed to Aeneas on the levels of emotion, *hospitium*, and marriage, Aeneas avoids broaching the emotional aspects directly (although 4.335f. and 361 hint at the depth of the emotions within him) and concentrates on the latter two claims.[57] He deals first with his duties as a guest (4.333–36):

> 'ego te, quae plurima fando
> enumerare vales, numquam, regina, negabo
> promeritam, nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae
> dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus.'

Aeneas asserts that he does not deny that she deserves a return on her services to him as host. He will give her the only adequate return that he can by remembering her (i.e. he will spread abroad her fame and reputation and be ready to make a return should

[55] For the right hand of *hospitium,* cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.* 1.121; Verg. *Aen.* 2.83 (Anius on Delos) *iungimus hospitio dextras et tecta subimus*; Monti (n. 2), 3–8; Reece (n. 30), p. 20. It is interesting to note that when Aeneas and Dido meet, host and guest do not take one another by the hand, as is often the case in the Homeric poems (e.g. Telemachus grasps the right hand of Athene-Mentes at 1.121). Reece (p. 20) suggests that for a man and woman to clasp hands suggests seduction, where the man is about to lead the woman off to bed. Vergil instead shows us Aeneas grasping the hands of Ilioneus and his fellow Trojans (1.610ff.).

[56] Monti (n. 2), pp. 41–2.

[57] On this speech, see especially D. Feeney, 'The taciturnity of Aeneas', *CQ* 33 (1983), 204–19. Feeney sums up well the implication of Aeneas' speech for the issue of the rhetorical appeal to the emotions in public discourse: 'What Aeneas is telling Dido here is that her words are a reckless incitement of passion, by which both of them are being made to suffer for no purpose: with remonstration and passionate protest alone nothing can be achieved but torture' (p. 210).

an appropriate occasion ever arise).[58] The implication is that, if Dido thinks that part of the guest's return on services received involves the obligation on him to stay, then she is mistaken. The claims of marriage are then dealt with in one and a half lines: *pro re pauca loquar. neque ego hanc abscondere furto / speravi (ne finge) fugam, nec coniugis umquam / praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera veni* (4.337–9). Aeneas claims that he never offered her marriage or entered into that contract with her. Dido, he implies, has no claim on him here and cannot oblige him to stay with this assertion. The overall message is that their only relationship is that of host and guest, and here he has fulfilled and will continue to fulfil his obligations.

DIDO'S FINAL SPEECH TO AENEAS: 4.365–87

In her reply, Dido drops any appeal to the marriage bond between them. Instead Dido concentrates on the appeal to the emotions and especially on the obligations of *hospitium*—a relationship which was consummated openly in view of Carthaginian and Trojan and could not be denied (4.370–8):

> num lacrimas victus dedit aut miseratus amantem est?
> quae quibus anteferam? iam iam nec maxima Iuno
> nec Saturnius haec oculis pater aspicit aequis.
> nusquam tuta fides. eiectum litore, egentem
> excepi et regni demens in parte locavi.
> amissam classem, socios a morte reduxi
> (heu furiis incensa feror!): nunc augur Apollo,
> nunc Lyciae sortes, nunc et Iove missus ab ipso
> interpres divum fert horrida iussa per auras.

After the appeal to the emotions (370), Dido returns to the issues of status, reciprocity, and dependence on another which fuelled the tension between her and Aeneas in the first book. It is stated that two divinities associated with *hospitium*, namely Juno and Jupiter, cannot look at this scene with the eyes of justice (371f.).[59] Next it is stated that *fides* is nowhere to be found (373). *Fides* is naturally a quality essential for friendship between strangers and one that ensures the return of services.[60] This is followed by a list of all the services she has performed for Aeneas, such as providing for Aeneas' troubled fleet and companions (375). As for Aeneas himself, she took him in (resourceless as he was) and settled him *regni . . . in parte* (374). In fact, these are the services on which Aeneas does not deny that Dido deserves a return (4.333ff.). Of the services listed, the most striking is the assertion that Aeneas has actually taken up the spectacular offer of a place in her kingdom which initiated their relationship. A relevant parallel for understanding this scene is the ability of Roman emperors to bestow favours which subjects were quite unable to repay (of which the obvious forerunner is the exercise by Julius Caesar of his notorious *clementia*). As Saller remarks, 'Subjects . . . are left to acknowledge their gratitude and inability to repay in kind—in other words, to accept and acknowledge their inferior position.'[61] No doubt this is what Dido now desires from Aeneas—an

[58] For *memor* and *mereo* and cognates as part of the language of reciprocity and obligation, see Monti (n. 2), p. 44, also Saller (n. 23), pp. 20–1.

[59] For Juno, Jupiter, and *hospitium*, see L. J. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of its Humanising Force* (Chicago, 1977), p. 27.

[60] See Monti (n. 2), pp. 39–40, 57; Saller (n. 23), p. 15.

[61] Saller (n. 23), p. 70. For the tension which could arise in such situations, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.18

acknowledgement of his dependent position in relation to her. Here we may compare the (fictitious) story which Odysseus tells Eumaeus in *Odyssey* 14.257–86 about his adventures in Egypt. There Odysseus claims to have been involved in a raid on Egypt. However, when they were met by a superior force, Odysseus, in order to avoid death or enslavement, supplicated the enemy king. The king raised him from the status of suppliant to ξένος and protected him from assault. Odysseus subsequently stayed on in Egypt with the king for seven years—no doubt as a form of recompense to the king for the 'unrepayable' service of saving his life when the king might have killed Odysseus with impunity.[62] It is clear that Dido expects a similar recompense from Aeneas.

ISSUES OF STATUS AND RECIPROCITY

What are we to make of these claims and counterclaims? Can Dido assert that her services to Aeneas place him in a position which makes him obliged to, and dependent on, her? Are her services equivalent to those of the Egyptian king towards Odysseus, who by rights had the power of life and death over Odysseus?[63] As for Aeneas, can he walk away with a simple acknowledgement that Dido deserves a return, that he will give her the best return he is currently in a position to give, and with an assurance of spreading her reputation abroad and of making a more adequate return should the opportunity ever arise? These questions are important in as much as a person's whole moral personality and reputation were publicly at stake in relationships of this type.[64] Furthermore we may be sure that these questions are being explicitly formulated, in as much as the very appearance of the proper vocabulary of *hospitium* in the *Aeneid* (e.g. *pietas*, *officium*, *memor* and cognates, *mereo* and cognates, *hospitium*, *fides*, *gratus* and cognates) is so striking. Catullus and the Roman love-elegists use the concepts of reciprocity associated with the analogous relationship of *amicitia* in their relationships with their beloveds, but the elegists in particular avoid a widespread use of its technical vocabulary and often substitute synonyms or metaphors. This in part derives from concerns with genre and the low stylistic value of the vocabulary of *amicitia*.[65] But Vergil, in the genre of epic, uses the technical vocabulary of *hospitium* consistently and precisely.

In a society where ingratitude was frequently asserted to be the greatest social crime, there will have been a keen awareness of the need to be seen to fulfil obligations. This applies both to daily social relations, and to relationships between important public figures, where accusations of ingratitude and bad faith were common and undoubtedly carried weight in public discourse. In the second *Philippic*, Cicero is obliged to take seriously Antony's accusations of ingratitude and ruptured friendship.[66] The *beneficium* for which he is supposed to be obliged to Antony consists in the latter's having saved or spared Cicero's life at Brindisium. Cicero replies (*Phil.* 2.5f.):

nam beneficia eo usque laeta sunt dum videntur exsolvi posse: ubi multum antevenere, pro gratia odium redditur.

[62] For such 'unrepayable' debts, see also Herman (n. 28), p. 122.

[63] Furthermore is she confusing her personal *hospitium* relationship with Aeneas, with the political and more statutory relationship of alliances between states?

[64] Herman (n. 28), p. 126.

[65] See R. K. Gibson, 'How to win girlfriends and influence them: *amicitia* in Roman love elegy', *PCPS* 41 (1995), 62–82, at 72–3.

[66] *Phil.* 2.3 . . . *de amicitia quam a me violatam esse criminatus est, quod gravissimum crimen iudico, pauca dicam.*

at beneficio sum tuo usus. quo? quamquam illud ipsum quod commemoras semper prae me tuli: malui me tibi debere confiteri quam cuiquam minus prudenti non satis gratus videri. sed quo beneficio? quod me Brundisi non occideris? . . . quod est aliud, patres conscripti, beneficium latronum nisi ut commemorare possint eis se dedisse vitam quibus non ademerint? quod si esset beneficium, numquam qui illum interfecerunt a quo erant conservati, quos tu ipse clarissimos viros soles appellare, tantam essent gloriam consecuti. quale autem beneficium est quod te abstinueris nefario scelere? . . . sed sit beneficium, quando quidem maius accipi a latrone nullum potuit: in quo potes me dicere ingratum? an de interitu rei publicae queri non debui, ne in te ingratus viderer?

Cicero questions the quality of the service without, however, denying outright that it was a *beneficium*. Finally he overrules ties of personal obligation with the patriot's duty to the Republic.[67] As Konstan comments, 'Cicero is . . . at pains to be seen neither as defaulting on a moral debt . . . nor as terminating an amicable association, however superficial, by a gratuitously hostile gesture that might count as *iniuria*.'[68] The passage is thus witness to the seriousness with which issues of reciprocity and gratitude were taken.[69] (In addition the aggression and rhetorical dexterity of Cicero's defence make an interesting contrast with Aeneas' rather repressed reply to Dido.)

One factor, however, which complicates (or enriches) the issue here is that *hospitium* depends on moral principles of duty and reciprocity which everyone is implicitly supposed to share, rather than on explicitly drafted regulations. There is no written code and little evidence for a systematic attempt to codify the exact duties of host and guest, to define the limits of loyalty, or to lay down the exact values of services exchanged so that a recipient might know when a donor had received commensurate return. As a result *hospitium*, very much like *amicitia*, consists essentially of actions in the name of *hospitium* and comments made on those actions.[70] It is a discursive practice rather than a formal and tightly regulated institution. This may suggest that when Vergil poses us his question about the behaviour of his characters within *hospitium*, it may be a question designed to provoke moral debate, rather than one which is designed to be answered without equivocation.[71]

Even after Aeneas and Dido have seen one another for the last time, the issue recurs. At 4.424 she casts herself in the role of suppliant on her own soil (when originally it was the resourceless Trojans who were forced to come as suppliants to her). Aeneas is transformed from *hospes* to *hostis*: *i, soror, atque hostem supplex adfare superbum*.[72] Dido's reduction to the state of suppliant returns with greater force to her when she is alone at night (4.534–39):

> en quid ago? rursusne procos inrisa priores
> experiar, Nomadumque petam conubia supplex,

[67] This is also an excuse (retrospectively) for Aeneas.

[68] Konstan (n. 1), p. 127. Similar accusations were made in the propaganda war between Octavian and Antony–Cleopatra.

[69] Cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.59 *haec igitur et talia circumspicienda sunt in omni officio, ut boni ratiocinatores officiorum esse possimus et addendo deducendoque videre, quae reliqui summa fiat, ex quo, quantum cuique debeatur, intellegas.* In practical terms this is unrealistic, in as much as the services exchanged in Roman society were often different in kind and their relative value could not easily be reckoned (see Saller [n. 23], pp. 15–17). Nevertheless, the passage is witness to the pressure exerted on participants in social relationships to be seen to reciprocate services adequately.

[70] In my formulation here I follow closely Herman (n. 28), p. 118. See also Konstan (n. 1), pp. 36–7.

[71] However, note that the narrator calls Aeneas *pius* directly following Dido's last speech to him (4.393).

quos ego sim totiens iam dedignata maritos?
Iliacas igitur classis atque ultima Teucrum
iussa sequar? quiane auxilio iuvat ante levatos
et bene apud memores veteris stat gratia facti?

She also here doubts whether the Trojans would take her with them to Italy. Despite the promises of Aeneas (1.609f.; 4.335f. *nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae / dum memor ipse mei*), she doubts whether the Trojans will remember (4.539 *memores*) her services to them and their obligation to repay. Nor, Dido asserts, is there likely any sign of *gratia* (4.539)—the quality which guarantees and anticipates a return on services rendered.[73] This is a serious attack on the moral reputation of the Trojans and their willingness to observe the cardinal principle of reciprocity. Finally, while Dido watches the Trojans leaving, she makes her last attacks on the Trojans as *hospites*: *infelix Dido, nunc te facta impia tangunt? / tum decuit, cum sceptra dabas. en dextra fidesque* (4.596f.). *Hospitium* is then finally renounced (4.624 *nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto*). But we are not allowed to forget the issue as we proceed through the epic, when we are reminded of Dido's services to the Trojans as host through references to her guest-gifts to Ascanius (5.571f.) and Aeneas (9.266, 11.72–5).

To return to our question, what are we to make of these claims and counterclaims about Dido and Aeneas' duties and behaviour to one another as host and guest? As suggested above, since *hospitium* is not a legal code, it may be that Vergil's questions are designed principally to provoke moral debate. But this needs qualification. It may be that it is only through taking sides that we learn more about the *Aeneid*. The sophistication and depth of the reader's engagement with the text are advanced by trying to answer the questions which Vergil sets. However, trying to answer Vergil's questions is perhaps, ultimately, to be valued more as an exercise which makes us think harder about the question, rather than as one which is likely to lead to a solution.

ANCIENT RESPONSES

A start here can be made by looking at some ancient responses to the problem. One we have already seen, namely Ovid's assertion *et famam pietatis habet, tamen hospes et ensem / praebuit et causam mortis, Elissa, tuae* (*Ars* 3.39f.). Here Aeneas is said not to have lived up to his reputation for being conscientious in his duties as a *hospes*—by providing an unworthy return to Dido. He caused her death. This blunt assertion is of course designed specifically to please his female addressees. In context they are about to be denied Ovid's erotodidaxis on the grounds that women are already faithless enough towards men without being given yet more encouragement from the poet. But this 'pessimistic' reading of the *Aeneid* is anticipated in *Heroides* 7 where Ovid carries on the argument over the rights and duties of host and guest in the persona of Dido.[74] According to the Ovidian view, which instinctively sides with the

[72] On the ancient etymological relation of *hospes* and *hostis*, see Bolchazy (n. 59), pp. 19–20, and Reece (n. 30), p. 19.

[73] For *gratia*, see Saller (n. 23), pp. 21–2 and Monti (n. 2), pp. 57–8.

[74] Cf. esp. 7.27f. *ille quidem male gratus et ad mea munera surdus, / et quo, si non sim stulta, carere velim*; 89ff. *fluctibus eiectum tuta statione recepi / vixque bene audito nomine regna dedi. / his tamen officis utinam contenta fuissem, / et mihi concubitus fama sepulta foret*; 167f. *si pudet uxoris, non nupta, sed hospita dicar, / dum tua sit, Dido quidlibet esse feret*; 177f. *pro meritis et siqua tibi debebimus ultra, / pro spe coniugii tempora parva peto*. On the 'pessimistic' reading of the *Aeneid*

suffering lover, Aeneas the faithless guest betrayed Dido who took him in. How common this view was we have no way of knowing, but it cannot have been a response unique to Ovid. However, readers who are drawn, like Ovid, to sympathize with the suffering lover must acknowledge the emotional and consciously provocative nature of the poet's response.[75]

A passage from Seneca's work on reciprocal services (*de Beneficiis*) provides a different perspective on the issue. At 4.11.3 Seneca discusses the giving of benefits in the sure knowledge that one will not receive a return, such as for example when the recipient is about to depart for a foreign country never to return, or the donor is ill without hope of recovery. He insists that giving at such times is desirable, and uses the scene of saving someone from shipwreck as an illustration of this principle:

> atqui ut scias rem per se expetendam esse bene facere, advenis modo in nostrum delatis portum, statim abituris, succurrimus; ignoto naufrago navem, qua revehatur, et damus et struimus. discedit ille vix satis noto salutis auctore et numquam amplius in conspectum nostrum reversurus debitores nobis deos delegat precaturque, illi pro se gratiam referant; interim nos iuvat sterilis beneficii conscientia.

This is a viewpoint which readers might choose to apply to the problems set for them by Vergil, in a situation where the debts incurred are by ordinary standards 'unrepayable'.[76] Dido ought to take pleasure in her 'consciousness of having given a benefit that will yield no fruit'. Aeneas, for his part, does more than 'depute the gods to be the debtors, and pray that they may repay the favour in his stead'. He departs with a promise to spread abroad her fame as a benefactor—as the properly grateful recipient was supposed to do: *quam grate* [sc. *beneficium*] *ad nos pervenisse indicemus effusis adfectibus, quos non ipso tantum audiente sed ubique testemur* (*Ben.* 2.22). With these sentiments in mind the reader might choose to believe that Aeneas can depart with impunity and without further obligation. Similar points of view, which may be used to defend Aeneas' conduct, are expressed in Aristotle.[77] Furthermore, it could be pointed out that the situation of Dido and Aeneas is hardly parallel to that of Odysseus and the Egyptian king above, where Odysseus is by implication obliged to stay with the king for an indefinite period. Dido, unlike the Egyptian king, did not by rights have power of life and death over her guest, because Aeneas and the Trojans (as Ilioneus is careful to emphasize) come not as invaders or pirates but as refugees bound for another destination. The Egyptian king's right of directly granting life or taking it away gave him immense power over Odysseus. What power do Dido's services to the Trojans grant her over Aeneas? But the adoption of the viewpoint encouraged by these reflections demands that the reader sympathize with Aeneas'

implicit in the epistle, see, briefly, P. E. Knox, *Ovid, Heroides: Select Epistles* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 201–2.

[75] In a more public and national poem, the *Fasti*, Ovid may adopt a less incriminatory view of Aeneas. See C. Newlands, 'Ovid's narrator in the *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 33–54, at 42.

[76] Cf. also the famous discussion at *Ben.* 7.25 of Dido's appeal to her favours to Aeneas (*Aen.* 4.317–18) and of her later accusing list of services (*Aen.* 4.373–4).

[77] Cf. e.g. *N.E.* 1164a22ff. 'But which has the better right to assess the value of the service, the man who proffers it, or the one who has actually received it? The latter, because the man who makes the offer virtually leaves the decision to him'; 1164a33ff. 'When no contract for service is made . . . the return should be made in proportion to the intention of the benefactor (for it is the intention that counts both in friendship and in virtue) . . . for the value of this is not measurable in money, nor could such a service be balanced by a gift of honour. Presumably it is enough if (as in the case of the gods or one's parents) the beneficiary makes such a return as lies in his power' (trans. J. A. K. Thomson).

severe attitude towards his relationship with Dido. For Aeneas, as we saw above, implicitly asserts that the only relationship between them is that of host and guest. That is to say, their relationship may have deepened, but has not altered in essence, since they first met in *Aeneid* 1. But what of the emotional claims that Dido makes on Aeneas, her appeals to love, pity, and tears (4.307ff., 4.370ff.)? Such claims have traditionally moved readers.[78] To sympathize with Aeneas' refusal to let his emotions enter the scene would involve the adoption of the austere conventional view that love has no place in the public sphere. Traditionally love may not enter public discourse.[79] It is an area set apart, where, as Ovid makes clear in the *Ars Amatoria*, the rules which govern conventional social intercourse do not apply. Here promises count for nothing. (Ovid even encourages the lover to swear false oaths and use deception—with impunity and with divine sanction.[80]) Emotions can establish no automatic or unquestionable claims.[81] No doubt this is why Dido eventually drops even the appeal to the emotions to concentrate on the claims of *hospitium*. She is forced, as we saw above, to have recourse to the one area where she can argue publicly with Aeneas without risking being told that she cannot make any claims. However, to sympathize with Aeneas then involves acknowledgement of the inadmissibility of the emotions to public discourse and the severe reduction of his relationship with Dido to that of host and guest. As with the Ovidian response, readers have a price to pay. To take the Ovidian view of Dido the reader must sacrifice much to the emotions. To respond to Aeneas involves the refusal to admit those same emotions.

In conclusion, we have seen the importance of the *hospitium* theme in Books 1 and 4 of the *Aeneid*. The tension between Aeneas and Dido in Book 1 revolves around the issues of reciprocity, relative status, and dependency which a *hospitium* relationship necessarily raises. In the fourth book, when hostility erupts between Aeneas and Dido, claims and counterclaims are made partly on the basis of their roles as host and guest, and eventually reduced to being made for the most part, because most effectively, on the basis of those roles. These claims and counterclaims are then set before the reader as an issue for judgement. Whichever way the individual reader reacts, it should be clear that it is at least possible for readers to resist the claims of Dido here—if at an obvious cost.

University of Manchester ROY K. GIBSON
mffsrkg@fs1.art.man.ac.uk

[78] Cf. the famous passage in the *Confessions*: *cogebar . . . et plorare Didonem mortuam, quia se occidit ob amorem . . . quid enim miserius misero non miserante se ipsum et flente Didonis mortem, quae fiebat amando Aeneam . . .?* (Aug. *Conf.* 1.13).

[79] This issue is sensitively raised and discussed by Vergil, in passages where Aeneas attempts to control the emotions within himself or avoid them when they are of no use to either party; cf. 4.293f., 4.331f., 4.393–5, 4.438ff., 4.447ff.; also Vergil's editorial comment on Dido's emotions at 4.412ff.

[80] *Ars* 1.631–58, where the exceptional nature of the lovers' ethical world is strongly and explicitly marked.

[81] This makes the writing of Roman love poetry possible. The love elegists, conditioned to the expectation of reciprocity in their civic relationships with men, are denied this in their erotic relationships with women. The writing of love elegy—in the mode of complaint—is the result.