

ANDROGEOS IN BOOK TWO OF THE *AENEID*

JOHN RAUK

Michigan State University

The first Greek to die in Aeneas' account of the fall of Troy in Book Two of the *Aeneid* is a certain Androgeos:

Primus se Danaum magna comitante caterva
Androgeos offert nobis, socia agmina credens (*Aen.* 2.370–71)

These lines echo the earlier appearance of Laocoon:

Primus ibi ante omnis magna comitante caterva
Laocoon ardens summa decurrit ab arce (*Aen.* 2.40–41)

The similarity of phrasing here is striking, and yet commentators who discuss these lines typically restrict themselves to the observation that “magna comitante caterva” indicates only that Laocoon and Androgeos stand out from their retinue, or, more generally, that they are men of importance.¹ Indeed, repetition of “magna comitante caterva” by itself would not be particularly significant, since this phrase and variations of it are common in the *Aeneid*.² Lines 370–71 and 40–41, however, stand out as the only cases in the *Aeneid* in which “magna comitante caterva” appears in conjunction with “primus.” In addition the names of both Androgeos and Laocoon follow in the same metrical position at the beginning of the next line, *Andrōgēōs* / *Lāōcōōn*. All of this places an unusual emphasis on the apparently minor figure of Androgeos, so much so that the parallel cannot be dismissed as an epic formula. Instead, it strongly suggests that Laocoon and Androgeos are somehow counterparts, and we accordingly might expect that themes presented in the portrayal of Laocoon are developed or reflected in the episode of Androgeos.³

¹ See, for example, J. Conington and H. Nettleship, *The Works of Virgil*⁴ vol 2 (London 1884, repr. Hildesheim, 1963), on *Aen.* 40 and 370; R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*³ (Leipzig and Berlin 1915, repr. Darmstadt 1965), 15 n. 1, and R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford 1966), on *Aen.* 40 and 370.

² The other examples are: “magna medius comitante caterva” (*Aen.* 5.76); “magna iuvenum stipante caterva” (*Aen.* 1.497); “magna stipante caterva” (*Aen.* 4.136); “magna matrum regina caterva” (*Aen.* 11.478); and “magna propius iam urgente caterva” (*Aen.* 11.564).

³ Bernard Knox in his article, “The Serpent and the Flame: The Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*,” *AJP* 71 (1950) 391–92, is apparently alone in seeing *Aen.* 2.40–41 and *Aen.* 2.370–71 as a significant parallel. Knox notes the unique repetition of phrasing that is outlined above, and argues further that Laocoon and Androgeos are linked by snake imagery, the snakes that kill Laocoon being echoed by the snake simile that is used of Androgeos later at *Aen.* 2.378–81 (see below, 290).

This paper attempts to show that Androgeos does indeed play an important role in connection with Laocoon. Far from being an insignificant character, Androgeos is at the center of a gradual confusion of Greek and Trojan identities that qualifies our sympathy for the Trojans and makes moral judgments much more difficult. This function of Androgeos hinges on the two roles that he plays in the book, that of leader and that of first victim. As a leader, Androgeos is compared and contrasted to Laocoon in ways that identify him with the Trojans who make the fatal mistake of accepting the horse. As a first victim, Androgeos, in turn, contributes to a role reversal in which the Trojans who kill him, led by their ally, Coroebus, become identified with the Greeks.

Aeneas, who narrates this episode, is oblivious to this shifting portrayal of Greek and Trojan. He presents a much starker interpretation of events. Aeneas asserts firm dichotomies between Greek and Trojan, enemy and victim, deceiver and deceived. He sees the Trojans as innocent victims who have fallen to the deceitfulness of the Greeks. But the blurring of the distinctions between Greek and Trojan that is brought about through the character of Androgeos has the effect of undermining Aeneas' authority as a heroic narrator. As a storyteller, Aeneas has failed to master events—in a sense to “get them right,”—and this failure can be seen as symptomatic of his general inability to comprehend his own destiny.

I. Androgeos as Leader: Androgeos and Laocoon

Laocoon is one of the most exhaustively studied figures in the *Aeneid*,⁴ and yet various details of his story remain puzzling. It is odd, for example, that Laocoon should run from the citadel as though the presence of the horse had just been announced.⁵ Odd too is the use of “primus” (*Aen.* 2.40), for it was Thymoetes, not Laocoon, who first gave an opinion on the horse, “primusque Thymoetes....” (*Aen.* 2.32–34). Nor was Laocoon even the first to urge its destruction, for in this he was anticipated by Capys at lines 35–38. The use of “primus” does not so much mark a chronological ordering of events as highlight the role of Laocoon as leader for the indecisive mob—“scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus” (*Aen.* 2.39). Laocoon alone understands the danger of the horse. He senses that the Trojans are about to act on their belief that their fortune is as good as it seems, and he accordingly warns them against the dangers

⁴ A convenient list of principal works on Laocoon through 1964 is given by Austin (above, note 1) 97–98. To this one might add: H. Steinmeyer, “Die Laokoonszene in Vergils Aeneis (Aeneis II, 40–66 und 199–233),” *AU* 10, 1 (1967) 5–28; A. De Marino, “La fine di Laocoonte e l’uccisione di Priamo nell’Eneide,” *Vichiana* 4 (1967) 92–94; G. Mir, “Laocoontis embolium,” *Aen.* 2, 40–50 199–227,” *Latinitas* 17 (1969) 96–112; G. Dumézil, “La lance de Laocoon (Énéide, II, 50–53),” in *Hommages a Marie Delcourt, Collection Latomus* 114 (Bruxelles 1970) 196–206; E. Paratore, “Sull’episodio di Laocoonte in Virgilio,” *Studi di poesia latine in onore di Antonio Traglia*, Storia e lett. Racc. di Studi testi 141–42 (1979) 405–30; J. P. Lynch, “Laocoon and Sinon: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2. 40–198,” *G&R* 27 (1980) 170–79; P. Krafft, “Nachmals Vergils Laokoon,” in *Kontinuität und Wandel*, ed. Stache, Maaz, and Wagner (Hildesheim 1986) 43–62, and S. V. Tracy, “Laocoon’s Guilt,” *AJP* 108 (1987) 451–454.

⁵ This observation is made by Heinze (above, note 1) 14.

of believing the enemy and of trusting in appearances: "O miseri, quae tanta insania, cives? / creditis avectos hostis" (*Aen.* 2.42–43). And later (*Aen.* 2.48), "equo ne credite, Teucri," and the famous concluding line, "quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentis" (*Aen.* 2.49).

Androgeos, like Laocoon, is presented as a leader; he too is made "primus," and is implicitly compared to Laocoon by the parallel in lines 370–71 noted above. As a leader, Androgeos, like Laocoon, is ready to castigate his followers. This is shown by his behavior when he mistakes Aeneas and his comrades for fellow Greeks who have been slow to reach the city from the ships and gives them a spirited dressing-down for their tardiness:

Primus se Danaum magna comitante caterva
 Androgeos offert nobis, socia agmina credens
 inscius, atque ultro verbis compellat amicis:
 'festinate, viri ! nam quae tam sera moratur
 segnities? alii rapiunt incensa feruntque
 Pergama: vos celsis nunc primum a navibus itis?'
 (*Aen.* 2.370–75)

On one level this is a military rebuke of the kind that appears frequently in the *Iliad*,⁶ but it also reinforces the link between Androgeos and Laocoon made at lines 370–71, for the forthright, prosaic tone of Androgeos' speech (i.e., *segnities*, *Aen.* 2.374) is similar to the unadorned, archaic style of Laocoon himself.⁷

Despite these similarities, the content of Androgeos' speech emphasizes themes of belief and disbelief in a way that makes a telling contrast to Laocoon and that identifies him with the Trojans who reject Laocoon's advice. Laocoon immediately sees through the fraud of the horse, "creditis?" (*Aen.* 2.43); "ne credite" (*Aen.* 2.48). Androgeos, however, like the Trojans addressed by Laocoon, is completely gullible, "credens, / inscius" (*Aen.* 2.71–72). Both give advice to their comrades, but while Laocoon recommends caution—"ne credite," again—Androgeos, in his own enthusiasm, urges haste, "festinate, viri" (*Aen.* 2.373), exhorting men who he believes are faltering in time of crisis, "quae tam sera moratur / segnities" (*Aen.* 2.373–74)—a phrase that in turn echoes Laocoon's criticism of the Trojans, "quae tanta insania, cives" (*Aen.* 2.42).

Yet another link between Androgeos and Laocoon, and one which again emphasizes the differences between them, is found in the simile that describes the moment when Androgeos recognizes that he has fallen into the midst of the enemy:

dixit, et extemplo (neque enim responsa dabantur
 fida satis) sensit medios delapsus in hostis.
 obstipuit retroque pedem cum voce repressit.
 improvisum aspris veluti qui sentibus anguem
 pressit humi nitens trepidusque repente refugit

⁶ E.g., *Il.* 2.188–206 (Odysseus marshalling the Achaeans); *Il.* 6.325–341 (Hector to Paris); *Il.* 17.140–168 (Glaucus to Hector).

⁷ On the diction of Androgeos see Austin's commentary (above, note 1) 158–59. For a rhetorical analysis of Laocoon's speech showing its affinities to archaic Roman oratory see Lynch (above, note 4).

attolentem iras et caerula colla tumentem,
 haud secus Androgeos visu tremefactus abibat. (*Aen.* 2.376–82)

The snake imagery here recalls the actual snakes that killed Laocoon and his sons.⁸ But like the other parallels observed above, this one serves to contrast Androgeos with Laocoon and to identify him more and more with the Trojans. When the serpents suddenly appear and attack his sons, Laocoon bravely rushes forward and struggles alone against the snakes, while the rest of the Trojans flee (*Aen.* 2.216–24). Androgeos' reaction to the figurative snake that he encounters is the opposite of Laocoon's: he recoils in fear, "obstipuit retroque pedem cum voce repressit...visu tremefactus abibat" (*Aen.* 2.378–382). And in his terror and surprise he resembles the Trojans who witness the serpents that attack Laocoon, "tum vero tremefacta novus per pectora cunctis / insinuat pavor" (*Aen.* 2.228–29).⁹

Like Laocoon, Androgeos is a leader, but he embodies qualities that are the opposite of Laocoon's. This contrast emphasizes an essential identity between Androgeos and the Trojans. Androgeos is caught off guard by Aeneas and his men because of his eagerness to believe in appearances and his haste to act on those appearances. These are qualities that he shares with the Trojans who were deceived by the Greeks and who eagerly accepted the horse, contrary to Laocoon's advice. In these respects, and in the circumstances of Androgeos' death itself, we thus find a Greek who is made to experience the fate of his victims.¹⁰

II. Androgeos as First Victim: Androgeos and Coroebus

The equation of Greek with Trojan that is implied by Androgeos' treatment as a leader is carried a step further through the second role he plays, that of first victim. The Trojans who surprise Androgeos and slay him unwittingly assume the role of deceivers, a role that they then embrace. By this unheroic act, however, the Trojans lose their identity and become indistinguishable from their enemies, the Greeks. Furthermore, their attempt at deceit is self-destructive, for by killing this man named Androgeos, the Trojans involve themselves in an inescapable retribution.

Androgeos could not have been the first Greek to die during the sack of Troy, since the fighting had begun long before Aeneas arrived on the scene (*Aen.* 2.298–317), and yet he is singled out as first in Aeneas' narrative, "primus se...Androgeos offert nobis" (*Aen.* 2.370–71). This remark casts Androgeos in the role of first victim, the warrior whose name begins the catalogue of enemies slain by a hero during his *aristeia*. In Homer, for example, Iphidamas is identified as the first man killed by Agamemnon,

⁸ See Knox (above, note 3) 391–92.

⁹ The connection between Androgeos and the Trojans is also reinforced by the snake imagery of line 229, "...*insinuat pavor*." For the function of this line in connection with Laocoon, see Knox (above, note 3) 384.

¹⁰ One might note that the "Trojanization" of Androgeos is further underlined by the snake simile itself, which, in its original form (*Il.* 3.33–38), is applied to Paris.

Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
 ὃς τις δὴ πρῶτος, Ἀγαμέμνωνος ἀντίον ἦλθεν
 ἢ αὐτῶν Τρώων, ἥ ἐκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων.
 Ἰφιδάμας Ἀντηνορίδης, ἡὺς τε μέγας τε (*Il.* 11.218–21)

and in the *Aeneid*, Antiphates was the first to fall to Turnus,

et primum Antiphaten (is enim se primus agebat)¹¹
 Thebana de matre nothum Sarpedonis alti,
 coniecto sternit iaculo (*Aen.* 9.696–98)

The singling out of Androgeos suggests that Aeneas conceives of his story in terms of heroic narrative; he assumes that the question, “Who was first?” is an important one for his audience, even though it is not exactly appropriate to the circumstances of his story.

Identifying Androgeos as first victim, however, raises some problems. He is not a hero known to us from any other ancient source. Nor is there any indication that the identity of the first Greek victim was a theme in traditional accounts of the fall of Troy. The first Greek to die as recorded by Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 5.20) was the minor figure of Echion, the son of Portheus, who perished when he tried to jump down from the horse. Tryphiodorus (475–82) and Tzetzes (*Post Homerica*, 647) both mention Anticlus as the first Greek to die, killed not by the Trojans, but by Odysseus to keep him from crying out while still in the horse (cf. *Od.* 4.286–88). Both stories, however, are qualitatively different from the account of Androgeos in the *Aeneid*. Echion and Portheus do not die during the sack of the city, as does Androgeos; their deaths are instead associated with the ambush itself, and relate thematically to the episode of the horse.

These considerations suggest that Androgeos and his role as first victim are the inventions of Virgil. But why should Virgil create such a character, and why name him Androgeos?¹² In answering this question it is important to remember that Androgeos has a namesake elsewhere in the *Aeneid*. Virgil sometimes seems rather cavalier in his repeated use of names,¹³ but Androgeos is unique in being the only character whose counterpart is an important figure in myth,

¹¹ Cf. *Aen.* 2.370–71, “*Primus se Danaum magna comitante caterva/ Androgeos offert nobis.*”

¹² The name Androgeos does not seem to have any etymological significance. The meaning, “man/earth,” which might suggest itself, seems arbitrary in context. Another possibility, that of reading *Androgeos* against *Laocoon*, although attractive, leaves the second element of each name unexplained. Finally, we might note that Mørland (“Zu den Namen in der Aeneis,” *SO* 36 [1960] 25), has proposed *inscius/ἄγνοέων*, which is not an etymology proper, but rather a metrically equivalent gloss (i.e. Androgeos is *ἄγνοέων*).

¹³ The Greeks Sthenelus and Thoas, for example, who descend from the horse at *Aen.* 2.261–62, reappear as Trojans at *Aen.* 12.341 and *Aen.* 10.415 respectively. Servius’ remarks on the second Cretheus at *Aen.* 12.538 show that Virgil’s repetition of names had become an issue in critical discourse: “et quidam reprehendunt poetam hoc loco, quod in nominum inventionem deficitur; iam enim in ix (774–75) Crethea a Turno occisum induxit, ut ‘Crethea musarum comitem;’ sed et Homerus et Pylaemen et Adrastum bis ponit et alios conplures.” See also similar remarks by Macrobius at *Saturnalia* 15.10–14. There are thirty-six such multiples in the *Aeneid*.

namely Androgeos the son of Minos, who appears on Daedalus' decoration for the temple of Apollo at Cumae in *Aeneid* Book Six:

redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacravit
remigium alarum posuitque immania templa.
in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas
Cecropidae iussi (miserum!) septem quotannis
corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna. (*Aen.* 6.18–22)

According to the more popular version of his story, Androgeos competed successfully in the panatheniac games and was on his way to the funeral games of Laius when he was ambushed and killed by jealous Athenians.¹⁴ Virgil here ignores this history and concentrates instead on the death of Androgeos itself and on the consequent grief (miserum, *Aen.* 6.21) of the Athenians, whose guilt now requires that they pay (poenas, *Aen.* 6.20) for his death with the lives of their own children.

In a similar way, every other appearance of Androgeos in Roman poetry emphasizes his lamentable death and the deaths of the Athenian youths that followed as the price for his loss. Thus Catullus introduces the story of Theseus in poem 64:

Nam perhibent olim crudeli peste coactam
Androgeoneae poenas exsolvere caedis
electos iuvenes simul et decus innumptarum
Cecropiam solitam esse dapem dare Minotauro. (64.76–79)

And later, Ovid, in the *Metamorphoses*:

bella parat Minos; qui quamquam milite, quamquam
classe valet, patria tamen est firmissimus ira
Androgeique necem iustis ulciscitur armis... (*Met.* 7.456–58)

and in *Heroides* 10 (Ariadne to Theseus):

Viveret Androgeos utinam! nec facta luisses
in pia funeribus, Cecropi terra, tuis. (*Her.* 10.99–100)

It appears that for Virgil and the other Augustan poets the figure of Androgeos was divorced from other details of his story (perhaps under the influence of some Hellenistic epyllion), and that he had become solely emblematic of a death that demands another death and of the excessive grief that makes such a demand.¹⁵ This idea is important for understanding the implications of Androgeos' death in Book Two. Like his mythic counterpart, Androgeos embodies an inescapable retribution. Aeneas gives Androgeos the role of first victim, but his death is not a heroic one, nor do his slayers behave heroically.

¹⁴ He is also said to have died when sent by Aegeus to battle the Marathon bull; see Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.15.17, and Frazer's references ad loc, *Apollodorus The Library*, Vol. II, Loeb Classical Library no. 122 (Cambridge, Mass. 1921) 116–17.

¹⁵ Propertius, 2.1.62, is alone in having Androgeos restored to the grieving Minos through the agency of Asclepius, perhaps confusing Androgeos with his brother Glaucus, as suggested by Camps, *Propertius Elegies Book II* (Cambridge 1966) 76 (on Propertius 2.1.61).

By being named 'Androgeos,' this otherwise unknown Greek partakes in the mythic and emblematic dimensions of the Cretan Androgeos. His death will beget more death, and the Trojans who surprise him, like the Athenians who ambushed Minos' son, will pay back in kind.

After Aeneas and his comrades slay Androgeos, Coroebus, the son of King Mygdon, a Trojan ally, proposes that they don his armor and fight disguised among the unsuspecting Greeks,

aspirat primo Fortuna labori,
atque hic successu exsultans animisque Coroebus
'o socii, qua prima,' inquit 'Fortuna salutis
monstrat iter, quaque ostendit se dextra, sequamur:
mutemus clipeos Danaumque insignia nobis
aptemus. dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?
arma dabunt ipsi.' sic fatus deinde comantem
Androgei galeam clipeique insigne decorum
induitur laterique Argivum accommodat ensem. (*Aen.* 2.385–93)

The key here is the phrase "dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?" (*Aen.* 2.390). Coroebus persuades the Trojans to turn the practice of deceit back on the enemy, a plan in which Aeneas himself participates (e. g., *Aen.* 2.396).¹⁶ Just as Androgeos becomes like the Trojans by sharing their fate, so too Coroebus and his comrades become like the Greeks, not just by wearing their armor, but more fundamentally by assuming their character. Coroebus' *dolus* in line 390 is no different than the *dolus* of the horse or the masquerade of Sinon, who is bitterly characterized by Aeneas as "dolis instructus et arte Pelasga" (*Aen.* 2.152). Not only is there a physical ambiguity between Greek and Trojan, there is now a moral ambiguity as well.¹⁷

But Androgeos' death has its price, and the first one to pay is Coroebus himself,

primi clipeos mentitaque tela
agnoscunt atque ora sono discordia signant.
ilicet obruimur numero, primusque Coroebus
Penelei dextra divae armipotentis ad aram
procumbit. (*Aen.* 2. 422–26)

Two points are worth noting here. First, Coroebus does not simply die fighting, but is slain at the altar of Minerva, "divae armipotentis ad aram procumbit" (*Aen.* 2.425–26). His death is presented as a sacrifice, and suggests his role as a reciprocal victim whose life is demanded by the death of Androgeos. Second, Coroebus' traditional role has here been altered to emphasize this connection with Androgeos. In earlier accounts of the fall of Troy, Coroebus died later in the battle, at the hands of either Diomedes or Neoptolemus, and he is not con-

¹⁶ For the controversy over Aeneas' participation see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1987) 212 n. 10.

¹⁷ This aspect of the Androgeos episode is thoroughly discussed by Lyne (above, note 16) 211–12, who argues further that the simile at *Aen.* 2.378–81 associates the Trojans with unTrojan symbols and is an imputation of Trojan deceitfulness. For the Trojans' use of *dolus* here, see also Knox (above, note 3) 392.

spicuous as the first casualty.¹⁸ Like Androgeos, Coroebus has been made “first,” the first to die on the Trojan side. His death is not only a direct consequence of the death of Androgeos, but in a real sense he and his Greek victim become identified as one, and come to share in the mutual fate of deceiver and deceived.

III Androgeos and Aeneas’ Narration¹⁹

Coroebus’ attempt to practice the Greek art of deceit not only results in his own death, but also creates a horrifying confusion in which the Trojans are no longer able to distinguish themselves from their Greek enemies, and unwittingly kill their own comrades:

cadit et Rhipeus, iustissimus unus
qui fuit in Teucris et servantissimus aequi
(dis aliter visum); pereunt Hypanisque Dymasque
confixi a sociis; nec te tua plurima, Panthu,
labentem pietas nec Apollonis infula texit. (*Aen.* 2.426–30)

The real significance of this confusion between Trojan and Greek, however, is lost on Aeneas. His comments on Rhipeus are especially revealing: he laments Rhipeus as the most just of the Trojans (“iustissimus unus / qui fuit in Teucris,” *Aen.* 2.426–27) and the one most observant of fairness (“servantissimus aequi,” *Aen.* 2.427), but it was Rhipeus who took the lead with Coroebus in adopting the Greeks’ art of deceit (see *Aen.* 2.394). In the case of Panthus, Aeneas similarly invites us to blame the gods for the unfair treatment of piety, but the deaths of Androgeos, and of Coroebus and his comrades, show that the Trojans are no less culpable than the Greeks. By rejecting *virtus* in favor of *dolus*, the Trojans seriously weaken any claim that they might have as innocent victims.

Aeneas’ untenable assertions of Trojan virtue reveal his inability to understand his own story and to see the message that is conveyed in the figure of Androgeos. As a storyteller, Aeneas is modelled on Odysseus, who recounted his adventures to the Phaeacians in the *Odyssey*. Like Odysseus, Aeneas claims the authority of experience (*Aen.* 2.5–6; cf. *Od.* 9.1–38), and, like Odysseus, he is able to cast a spell over his audience (*Aen.* 2.1, cf. *Od.* 11.333ff., and *Od.* 13.1–2). The sympathy that he arouses and the great sorrow that he himself feels are authentic qualities of Aeneas’ character and a touchstone for our interpretation of his actions throughout the epic. It would seem that as a narrator Aeneas’ voice merges with that of Virgil, just as Odysseus can be said to be indistinguishable from Homer while narrating his own adventures. But the situation in the *Aeneid* is actually much different.

¹⁸ Pausanias, 10.27.1, and Servius, on *Aen.* 2.341. Servius, unable to leave well enough alone, conflates the hero with Coroebus the archetypical fool, “one of the traditional ‘sillies’ of antiquity,” to quote Austin (above, note 1) 151. The two figures are clearly separate.

¹⁹ My remarks here generally complement Lyne’s discussion (above, note 16) 211–12, which treats the Androgeos passage as an example of dramatic irony.

Odysseus, in a sense, completes himself as a hero, achieving greater self-awareness, if not moral stature, when he assumes the authorial role (e.g. *Od.* 9.224–30 and *Od.* 9.491–501). But Aeneas' story does not enable him to achieve the same sort of heroic completion. The death of Androgeos shows that Aeneas and the Trojans no longer live in a simple world that is clearly defined by heroic values. In such a scheme the Greeks should all be like Sinon (see *Aen.* 2.65–66), but the figure of Androgeos shows—paradoxically by Aeneas' standards—that they are in fact no different than the Trojans. This is more than simple irony—the conflict between two voices in the poem—it is part of a far-reaching aspect of the portrayal of Aeneas. Just as the shield of Aeneas reveals him as not comprehending his own role in events and the implications of what he is about to undertake, despite all that had been revealed to him in the underworld (“rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet,” *Aen.* 8.730), so too his account of Androgeos reveals the limits of his understanding of the fall of Troy. By thus using Aeneas' own narrative to comment on the inadequacies of his strictly anti-Greek interpretation of the fall of Troy, Virgil also suggests the fundamental inability of Aeneas to understand his own experience and the nature of his own destiny.

In conclusion, the apparently minor figure of Androgeos, whose importance is first hinted at by the parallel between lines 2.40–41 and 2.370–71, emerges as a sort of Everyman whose fate reflects the interchanging roles of Trojan and Greek. His death is not just that of an inconspicuous soldier, but in a sense it is the death of the Trojans themselves and of the world that Aeneas, as a hero, would still vainly seek to preserve.²⁰

²⁰ I want to thank my colleagues, Carl Anderson and Wm. Blake Tyrrell, for encouraging me to pursue this project. I also thank my two anonymous referees and the editor of *TAPA* for their useful suggestions.