Potatoes and Rome

By Luke Perez

A Senior Essay submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.

Rali Christo PhD, Advisor

Saint Mary's College of California

April 30th, 2019

Intro: This paper is a historiographical analysis of Virgil's *Aeneid*, focusing on the creation and transmission of ideology.* In order to analyze the creation and transmission of that ideology, this paper will use 1) Cicero's Letters 2) *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, 3) *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 4) *A Thousand Plateaus*, and of course, 5) the *Aeneid*.

This paper includes technical terminology from Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*. Therefore, when I introduce a technical term, I will signal it with a star (*); the star signifies an entry in the appendix in which I will explain and contextualize my usage. Further, the citations for the *Aeneid* will match the citations in the Mandelbaum translation-when the English is cited. However, when the Latin itself is cited, the line numbers will correspond to the original text as provided by *www.thelatinlibrary.com*.

Focusing on ideology, I have chosen the *Aeneid* specifically because it presents a founding story, a reterritorialization* from the commonly believed histories. The process of reterritorialization works to change the concept of Rome, to put it into new sets of relationalities and concepts: 'new' history and 'new' ideals. The narrative follows a singular character, Aeneas, the narrative bending toward a singular goal, the founding. Further, the *Aeneid's* temporal location, near Augustus and the post senatorial era, cannot be ignored. Virgil, having a patron in Maecenas and by extension Augustus, writes favorably towards the future history of Rome, that is, the time in which the senate has fallen (to be replaced by the Caesars). The fall signifies a need for a new order, one not oriented towards the 'old Rome' but rather towards the idea of the 'new Rome.' He writes at the cusp, from one age to another. It is a time of flux, and in that flux, Virgil can inject ideas helpful to the new order. It is important that Virgil is situated here, both temporally and in relation to the social hierarchy.* Socially, Virgil's relation to Maecenas gives him the positionality at this temporal cusp to be a creator, meaning he has the ability to fully

disseminate his ideas and the motive motive: the recreation of the social order with Augustus (and himself) on top.

Other authors, namely Livy in *Ab Urbe Condita*, are given to similar tastes, that is propaganda. His scope, though, is more broad than Virgil's scope. Livy presents episodes spanning the entire history of Rome, not just the founding event. These episodes have no singular arc, meaning that, unlike Virgil, the actions presented do not bend toward a singular goal. The *Aeneid*'s unity of narrative is important, for, the epic's cohesion of plot allows a more in depth creation. Ideals stemming from a central tenet can be seen, and how they interact with each other, as opposed to vignettes, where ideals are just put forward according to each individual situation, and not contextualized to a grander *telos*.

In terms of temporal situation, Virgil is also prior to Livy, in both the outset of the imperial era (the post senatorial era) and plot. In respect to proximity to the imperial era: Virgil writes prior to Livy. Virgil coming prior means that he begins the process of change, whereas Livy is merely another iteration of the process. It is in those beginnings by which we begin our analysis, that change from one mindset to a wholly new one. In terms of plot, Virgil sets his plot before anything Livy presents; Virgil presents the ancestors (the Trojans) whereas Livy focuses on the descendants. In short, they deal with different aspects of the founding event.

Aeneas and his social relations will be used as the point of major analysis because of his proximal relationship both to Rome and its history. Specifically, Aeneas, in his interactions with Dido, Turnus, and the gods, shows an undying fealty to the concept of Rome. The interactions chosen: those of Dido's suicide, Turnus' death, and the instructions from the gods (Mercury, etc). A unique instance presents itself, that is, the descent into the underworld, specifically the

genealogy culminating in Augustus. The scene culminates with descriptions which place Augustus as the teleological leader, in and of himself, of Rome, rather than as one who grabbed power militarily.

The complex action analyzed will be the colonization of Alba Longa, or equally, the creation for the foundations of a new Roman ideology. The complex action is important (viz colonization) because it sets up the basis by which Rome is able to dominate, ie Roman centrality and superiority in relation to the imperial state and the world, respectively.

Through Deleuze and Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*, this paper will utilize the concepts of (de/re)territoriality,* micropolitics,* strata,* and the state,* among others. These concepts, which are given full flower with D&G's analysis, are vital to understand how Virgil is reshaping Roman ideology. D&G provide the mechanism through which concepts are created, transmitted, internalized, and cast off. That is, they provide methods for understanding and characterizing ideology in the first place. The common understanding of ideology cannot be taken,[1] because it does not take into account 1) the rapid change from one ideology to another, 2) the attempt to leave a given system of ideology, 3) the role of the state or individual actors within a whole system, political morality. Further, the use of symbolism and the creation of an ordered plane,* a specific process described within *TP*, can be seen. This method allows a further analysis than simply what appears in the *Aeneid*, meaning we can extrapolate from the process into historical accounts reasons for certain seemingly unconnected, random, phenomena (insurrections, interregna, etc).

---

[1] The common understanding of ideology: that of commonly held beliefs, also called culture or the zeitgeist

Cicero, as well as various secondary source documents, will be used to provide historical context of the late senatorial era, mainly through the letters *ad Atticum* and *ad Familiares*. Accepting the gossipy, churlish, groveling nature of the letters, they still provide telling insight into unfolding events,[2] the events being the collapse of the authority of the senate, from the collapse of elections, to the bribery of high officials, to growing bouts of insurrection among the commoners and the rich alike. In his letters to Caesar however, much about the political situation can be gleaned, specifically about the collapse of civil authority. Historical context is important for two reasons: 1) to show the collapse of civil society, and how it demands re-articulation in order to retain civil order,[3] and 2) the halt of civil collapse and what it looks like during rearticulation.

History: I begin by enunciating the decline of the Late Republic, in a time characterized as "The Crisis of the Late Republic." A violent era, mob mentality and disruptions to the social order, while not constant, were extremely common. Disruptions to civil society came in multiple forms, from open murder in the streets, to consulting with slaves, to an interregnum, bribery in elections, and slave rebellions.

With the rise of Clodius[4] in 58 BC, four laws were changed. The result of these laws was that "leaders could organize gangs of roughs...who...disrupted order and security."[5] These gangs (as a whole) began to morph, in that they no longer followed the strict rules set out by their

---

[2] As well as one of the only sources written contemporaneously (Gruen 2) with the events

[3] Regardless of the normative connotations, if a state wants to create control, or keep control, or remake control whatever, then it must quell whatever move the citizen is making to become nomad.

[4] He who exiled Cicero

[5] That censors should expel senators when both are in agreement, no magistrates should stop public business by observing ill-omens, corn should be free to citizens, *collegia* should be legalized, Scullard 99

patron. This can be seen in Clodius' group. Clodius ordered his men, the *armatis hominibus,*[6] to burn down the house of his political opponents, Catulus. Cicero, in the account of the events, goes on to say that 'that man,'[7] rather than the group of armed men, acts alone to attack the random people on the street. 'That man,' not only raving,[8] kills indiscriminately. He goes beyond the 'normal' method of controlling political opponents by taking to the streets to cause violence, taking the ingrained social customs and upending them.[9]

Not only does *ille* subvert the social custom of value to life, but he also subverts the socially enforced hierarchy. First, the subversion of a cultural concept of value to life: Cicero uses the concept of *caedes*[10] to imply a moral implication to a death, that the killing is a murder rather than a simple extinguishment of life.[11] By committing a taboo act like murder, a person still operates within the established social parameters, inasmuch as taboos are a part of those parameters. What makes it a unique turn away from social parameters is the state of the man who commits the act. From Cicero's perspective, this man is committing *caedes*, but, if we are again to take Cicero's description, the man is *demens*[12] which implies certain disconnection between

---

[6] "With men armed," *ad Atticum* 4.3.2.1

[7] It should be noted that Cicero often uses ambiguous pronouns in order to obscure the identity of the actor. In this case, the actor, *ille*, is not exempted. However, *ille* can be inferred to be Clodius himself: "[ille] videt…nihilo suam causam difficiliorem quam adhuc sit in iudicio futuram" (*ad Atticum* 4.3.2.16-17). The subject is going through a *causa* which mirrors the one that Clodius is going through at the hands of Milo (*ad Atticum* 4.3.2.10-11).

[8] Ille vel ante demens ruere, post hunc cero furorem nihil nisi caedem inimimocorum cogitare, vicatim ambire (*ad Atticum* 4.3.2.8-9).

[9] In this instance, contingent violence becoming gratuitous would signal a disruption of norms. However, if gratuitous violence was the norm, there would obviously be no disruption of the norms; there would in fact be a continued usage.

[10] Cf 8; "Murder"

[11] Not to say that 'death' as a concept is simple, nor that extinguishment of biological life is death, but rather that there is an ordering to the types of death. There is the forced stoppage of biological life by an extrajudicial actor (ie murder) but there is also execution, suicide, etc., all wrapped up with the the concept of what it means to 'live.'

[12] Cf 8

his actions and his intent, specifically that there is no intent. *Ille* is a pure force, an act only of the body, unattached to the social cues that the *mens* takes up.

I am inclined to believe Cicero's description of Clodius, in that he is *demens*, unattached to social mores for the following reasons. Later, 'the thing that is unattached to social custom' can be seen both consorting with and giving hope to slaves. The social hierarchy places slaves in places to be scorned, unfit to commune with those 'on top;'[13] yet, he still communes with them.[14] This could be excused if *ille*, Clodius, was of the same social position as the slave. But, Clodius himself is a consul, and the 'hope of liberty' could not be given to one from the same social standing as a slave (hope would not have been possible). The venture outside of the social strata, in terms of class, shows how the learned customs of the society have been cast out from the mind of the actor. If the interaction were commonplace, it would not go noticed which suggests that one of Clodius' class would not, in fact, interact with a slave at all. Then, not only was *ille* interacting with *servis*, but he also 'seeks their counsel. That is to say, Clodius subverts the social hierarchy, giving more social power than what was possible for the slave.[15]

Even though Clodius presents only a single instance of the disruption of the social order, he signals the increasing collapse of senatorial power, both over the consuls/triumvirs and over the people. This collapse comes not only in trends, growing acts of disruption (which were manifest), but also in singular moments of breakage. He is but a single instance of these molecular breaks in an otherwise stratified system of thoughts and morals. In molecular-

---

[13] The sister Pomponia (who admittedly is painted in a bad light because of Cicero's hatred for her) is heavily annoyed that a *libertinus*, Statius, has taken her duty as a host. In this annoyance, we can see the established hierarchy between the slave (and one who came from slavery) to the high class. *ad Atticum* 5.1.3-4

[14] Servis aperte spem libertatis ostendere…servorum consiliis utitur…(*ad Atticum* 4.3.2.10,15).

[15] The ability to influence a *causa* at all. This influence was not even reserved for members of the 'middle' class. And so, for one of the lowest social hierarchy to have any influence over matters of the court would be unthinkable, downright deplorable.

becoming-other, *ille* (for he is something different than the man Clodius) is not bound to striated notions of productivity, violence, or even life. The individual relationships between self and other are dissolved; there is no self; thus, there is no other.[16] It is the striation which imposes these hierarchies, these differences between. The slave is no different from the consul; life is no different that death; the concepts begin to bleed into each other; strata have been broken.

Further disruptions can be seen (and thus the collapsing senatorial authority) by the increasing chaos of the consular elections, leading up to the eventual power grab by Julius Caesar in 50 BC. This chaos came in the form of trials and convictions of crimes against the state, bribery, and finally, an interregnum in 54 (from the election of 53).[17] Specifically, the crimes against the state, the bribery were orchestrated by the powers that be themselves. The candidates, C. Memmius and M. Scaurus (supported by Julius Caesar and Pompeius Magnus, respectively), were charged with bribery for bribery in the election, while the other two, Messius and Messalla[18] were pushed back by the support of the better off candidates (in the sense that both Memmius and Scaurus had financial support by political bigwigs). With the two unsupported candidates pushed out, the road was clear for both Memmius and Scaurus, but with the charges of bribery, the office which all four were running for was left empty. All the trouble with the consular elections closely follows the trouble with Clodius, himself a candidate for the consulship.

The physical disruptions signal a top level change in the macropolitical* realm (top level meaning the elite of the society). But, disruptions of this sort are not unique; there are always

---

[16] D&G 234

[17] *ad Atticum* 4.15.4,7 and *ad Familiares* 2.12.1.1-2

[18] Gruen 451 and *ad Atticum* 4.15.7, 9 ("Memmium Caesaris…Pompeius…Scauro studet, Messalla languet…coito consulum et Pompeius obsunt [eum]")

macropolitical disruptions in attempts to grab power (these are the trials, the bribery, etc). What marks this era as unique is the break in the elite coupled with the micro/macro political disruption among the populace. The shift in the molecular (micro) orientations of the people (both elite and vulgar alike) in the form of shifting morality (the move away from the *mos maiorum*), in the shift away from the authority of the senate, causes the shift on the macro level. The previous order contained concepts for societal stability, value to life, stable marriage pacts (ones made to protect the clan), and with their shift came the macropolitical disruptions: erotic marriages in the senate, rebellion, rioting in the streets.

First, the macropolitcal disruptions in the body of the people: coming in the form of revolts, trying to reform the political order, etc. A clear example of this macro level disruption of the dominant social order would be Spartacus' rebellion.[19] Slaves, wishing to get away from their social station, necessarily must take the conception of their social station (the molecular concept of themselves as slave), and cast it out. The breakage in the social strata (the strata which dictated that the role of the slave to be of quiet constant servitude, working as teachers, doctors, gladiators, etc until their eventual emancipation or death)[20] was fundamentally ruptured; in their own eyes, they could no longer stand the conditions of their lives in Rome, and so they rebelled against the state and its method of molecular control: rigid belief of their social station. This could only result in violence.[21]

---

[19] This would not be emblematic of a total rhizome, for even though it is away from the state, the arboreal hierarchies are recreated ie Spartacus is still the leader. This would be a reterritorialization of the populacerather than a pure molecular-becoming other. The desire to cast off the bonds of the oppressor (Gruen 20), while not ideologically motivated, still represented a marked shift away from state strata, that is to say, one must have a clear move away from state belief structures in order to even begin to question those same structures.

[20] Scullard 11

[21] "…[war] is the mode of a social state that wards off and prevents the State" (D&G 357).

Further, there were also disruptions in the micropolitical* strata* of the the elite, signalling a societal shift, not just the lower classes. These can be seen from the shifting customs of the time (the drive to produce fewer Roman babies, differing acceptance of adultery, etc)[22] and in the . Clodius[23] and the aging senators exemplify the Dionysian disruption: a molecular decrease of morality.The formalization of the *mos mairorum* also served the practical purpose of eroding the established privileges of the senators themselves. They broke their former marriages (the old clan pacts) in favor of erotic couplings, and so the implementation of the reforms by Augustus (which supported the former morality and customs of marriage) worked to sap the power of the older, established senators (the powerful base of the senate).The *mos maiorum* works nostalgically. When Augustus puts the moral reforms into place, dressed in the cloak of ancient morality, he works to frame the laws as a return to old values. Augustus is, therefore, able to functionally instil molar control through a molecular method, ie fascism.*

Aeneid Analysis: Seeing how the populous was moving away from the state, Augustus, and to a certain extent Julius, set out to remake the Roman Citizen in a new image, to territorialize the populace. Virgil, by direction of the state (his patron Maecenas and Augustus), wrote the *Aeneid* full of symbols of the ideal Roman, characterized in the body and actions of Aeneas, all these for the purpose of upholding the great age of Rome.[24] These symbols work to

---

[22] The Romans themselves considered reproduction and marriage to be moral concepts (*mos mairorum*) (Scullard 9). Such was the reason for Julius' and Augustus' moral reforms later on; they saw a collapse in the traditional modes of existing, piety, fealty (specifically in the old senators).

[23] Not even taking into account that Clodius is himself one of the elite, the actions taken remove the social markers, disrupting the static category within which he is placed. He is becoming something other, if only for the moment.

[24] The *magnus ordo saeclorum* is to be brought forth by reading of the virtues of hero (loosely interpreted): "At simul heroum laudes et facta parentis iam legere et quae poteris cognoscere virtus" (Ver., *Ecl*., IV, 26-27)

recreate the state apparatus,* recreating the poles in which the Roman Citizen must exist to be part of Rome, peace and war.[25]

The *Aeneid* creates these poles, exemplified through the orientation to the future of Rome. This is done through the way that death is portrayed, ie a resignation of the past for the sake of the future. Death, in the *Aeneid*, is portrayed at the close, almost always at the end of every chapter, leading up to new challenges for Aeneas at the sake of the past: Creusa, Anchises, Dido, Pallas, Turnus, to name but a few of these deaths.[26]

Beginning with Creusa in Book 2: she, being Aeneas' wife, is a political/social connection to the old world. She, as the daughter of Hecuba and Priam, embodies the old way of life, to the old modes of life: to senatorial Rome and the old morality. With this bond come the familial obligations to the clan and the common good, ie the preservation of the clan and the city.[27] To that end, Aeneas, as a public defender and as a husband within the clan, is forced to defend the common good as it relates to the old world, to Troy and the house of Priam. Before the journey and the complex action of the founding of Rome, Aeneas fights the old battles without hope; he is bound to the fate of Troy as much as the death of Troy is assured.[28] In a nutshell, as Troy burns, Aeneas is fated to die.

---

[25] Peace insofar as it relates to the state of pure war, in a sense, the peace and war of the Roman State are always interrelated because there is war born from peace and vice versa (D&G 351).

[26] *Tantae molis erat Romanam condere urbem*, cf 52

[27] And because Aeneas' clan is the house of Priam, that extends to caring for all of Troy. Without her, and without the intervention of the gods, Aeneas (like Odysseus on Calypso's island) is the nomad*, able to move between concept and concept, not beholden to social strata

[28] "…if you want to follow me into my last attempt, you see what fortune follows us. For all the gods on whom this kingdom stood have quit our shrines and altars, gone away. The city you would help is now in flames. Then let us rush to arms and die. The lost have only this one deliverance: to hope for none" (*Aen.*, Bk 2, 472-479).

However, at the command of the mother, Venus, Aeneas is pushed from his bonds to the fate of Troy, both in terms of its ongoing death and also in terms of avenging the death of Priam.[29] In an instant, Aeneas' future is locked solely to his familial bonds, his wife, father, his troops and the household gods. This is presented as the 'only hope;' no future exists otherwise. The fates of Creusa, Iülus (his son), Anchises (his father) are the only things that present themselves to him as the only ties now available to him.[30] It is to be further noted that Venus' command is one of the first instances in which a god orders Aeneas, setting the precedent for gods commanding the proper action.

Because Creusa epitomizes all attachments to Troy, when she dies,[31] so does the attachment to the past. Thus, the possible futures are opened to Aeneas which had been foreclosed by the bond/life from Creusa. She, as a shade, sends Aeneas forth to the land and figure of Rome.[32] In that sense, Virgil, through the mouthpiece of the dead wife, sets up an orientation to the future at the expense of the past. The possibility of the founding of a new kingdom, and also the new 'royal bride,' the bride signaling new alliances and new clans, is now opened up. To that end, Aeneas follows the orders of his former wife, accepting his fate, and accepting his role as the leader of those without a homeland.[33]

The process of making and remaking political/marital bonds parallels the fall of the Roman senate; the senatorial authority wanes, and social chaos reigns; a war ravages and destroys Troy; the king of Troy, Priam, is killed and those without a home are left leaderless

---

[29] *Aen*., Bk 2, 794-812
[30] *Aen*., Bk 2, 756-757
[31] "…fate tears from me my wife Creusa in my misery" (*Aen*., Bk 2, 994).
[32] "Hesperia…there days of gladness lie in wait for you: a kingdom and a royal bride" (*Aen*., Bk 2, 1046-1064)
[33]*Aen*., Bk 2, 1071-1082

until a strong replacement comes, ordained by the gods and fate; disturbance in consular elections creates an interregnum, which is then filled by the singularly effective leaders of Julius (followed, of course, by the fated Augustus). Aeneas is presented as the teleological leader, in the sense that he is the fated by the gods to rule; and, since we are to take parallels between Aeneas and Augustus, in a similar manner, Virgil presents Augustus himself as the telos of political turmoil. Virgil changes the way in which leaders are brought to power, ie they are no longer brought about through the normal process; they are now 'destined to rule.'[34]

Role of the gods in the Aeneid must not be taken likely. Rome was increasingly moving away from belief in deities as ruling their everyday lives, so their textual use to create the manifest right to rule is odd. They again operate on the nostalgic level. By harkening back to a time when Rome was pious (which Aeneas epitomizes), that old service to the gods works to instil an old cultural memory, and thus a molecular method of control, again, fascism. This 'nod to the familiar' grounds an unknown relation to a past that which is known. The grounding is important because it obscures the method control. What is familiar is normal, and because of that normality, it is unquestioned.

The changing concepts (the leader becoming destined and death signalling a future that might be otherwise) is the process of reterritorialization* whereby a concept comes to be placed within a new a new/different set of relationalities. But, Virgil does not just do for single concepts; he does it for a whole set of ideas. He creates a plane of immanence*; the purpose of this plane is to create an orientation to a new mode of government, to a new form of leader, to Augustus and to the imperium. New orientations are necessary for two reasons: 1) the collapse of

---

[34] And, when one forcibly takes power, as with Julius and Augustus later, they are presented not as conquerors, but as a necessity for the glory and greatness of Rome

senatorial power created territories away from the state, 2) that territorialization (had it not occurred) was in reference to the senate and the old ideal of Rome.

The orientation is what D&G refer to as the "poles of the state."[35] Regarding those poles, Virgil is recreating his (and Rome's) plane of immanence from the tension between them. These poles are the hyper-nationalist condition of pure war and a tumultuous status quo(*pax*)[36] born from that condition of war. The poles of the state are in relation to each other; the peace treaty can only be reached when a war is occurring. But, what of the state of pure war? From this signifier* Rome is able to articulate its subjecthood. From that pure singularity,* every other ray* is made. Further, the milieu (the poles of pure war and *pax*) represents all that is possible, in terms of ideas and concepts, for a given group. Thus, to relate it to the Roman state, the creation and transmission of the poles of the state is a method of molecular control by which the state is able to control the regime of signs,* ie what is possible.[37]

---

[35] "This image has two heads, corresponding to the two poles of sovereignty: the *imperium* of true thinking operating by magical capture, seizure or binding, constituting the efficacy of a foundation *(mythos);* a republic of free spirits proceeding by pact or contract, constituting a legislative and juridical organization, carrying the sanction of a ground *(logos)*" (D&G 374-375).

[36] *Pax* is the peace treaty leading to the *otium*; therefore, it is only in relation to war and violence and the state that *otium* is at all possible. While *otium* itself is a state a peace which can (but not always) come from *pax*, my use here is *otium* only ever in relation to a *pax*. When I reference the condition of peace absolutely, I will not use the term. The important notion to pick up from this is that the peace which results from a treaty made in war is only ever in relation to war.

[37] "Content then constitutes bodies…that enter physical systems, organisms…The deeper movement…appears only in the form of respective territorialities…and complementary reterritorializations. All of this culminates in a language stratum that installs an abstract machine on the level of expression and takes the abstraction of content even further, tending to strip it of any form of its own…In short, the strata substantialize diagrammatic matters and separate a formed plane of content from a formed plane of expression. They hold expressions…formalized, in…a double articulation assuring their independence and real distinction and enthroning a dualism that endlessly reproduces and redivides. They shatter the continuums of intensity…They prevent conjunctions of flight from forming and crush the cutting edges of deterritorialization, either by effecting reterritorializations that make these movements merely relative…or again by segmenting them, blocking them…or plunging them into a kind of black hole" (D&G 143).

Virgil creates this state by the brutality with which Aeneas treats his enemies; they are, here, the ones detrimental to the fate of Rome: Dido and Turnus. Dido represents a safety away from Rome, signaling that social stability is not the singular goal, that *stasis*[38] when it comes to Rome, is not ever acceptable. This translates towards another turn towards Rome as the only available option; there are no planes except that of the Roman Imperium. Further, her symbolic meaning (the representation of the war between Rome and Carthage) works to show Roman supremacy, in any and every (military) encounter; Rome is destined to always win, and use any means to do so.[39] Dido signals a *stasis* for Rome, a haven where Aeneas can rest rather than pursue the single ideal of Rome. In the relationship she has with Aeneas, Dido is presented as quiet and smooth, a place for the leader and the tired troops to rest, peace.[40] Juno states that she wishes to join Aeneas to Dido in marriage for the purpose of peace, to create a bond away from the Roman standard, peace through war.[41] Dido represents an obstruction to the founding of

---

[38] Ἡ στάσις implies a stoppage of state apparatuses and abilities. Like the ship, unable to operate on the smooth seas, στάσις connotates the inability to act in almost any capacity. Thus, when Dido works to prevent the Roman state from existing, Roman στάσις is brought about.

[39] The first Punic war (264–241 BC) resulted from Rome's expansion into S. Italy, threatening Carthaginian Interests in the region. The victory for Rome came from a newly gained naval supremacy, and with that victory came Sicily (Scullard 3). The second Punic war (218-213 BC), though, was a major one for Rome. In it, we see the rise of Hannibal and Scipio, coupled with the near defeat of Rome (which becomes later fodder for Livy in his style of propaganda). Nearly 50 years after this war, with Rome now controlling previously Carthaginian land, living with the specter of Carthage, Rome destroys Carthage (Scullard 4). Rome won every war against them, which Virgil turns into an the ideology of hegemony, that Rome can never lose. Thus, when Dido comes up to Aeneas, there is no other option except her destruction.

[40] In this sense, it would be peace, not sprouting from war as the *pax is*. That peace would threaten Aeneas' mission, the teleological founding of Rome (because it would tie him to the idea of Carthage. However, The peace offered by Juno not absolute, for Iarbas threatens war when Aeneas replaces him as Dido's bridegroom.This peace, while not absolute, would lead to war through peace, which still works to create the dichotomous poles of the state. Peace born from war and war born from peace are the ever mixed poles which work to instil the whole plane of possibility; the only possible way to conceive of peace and war are in total relation to each other.

[41] "Let us be done with wrangling. Let us make, instead of war, an everlasting peace and plighted wedding…Both Dido and the Trojan chief will reach their shelter in the same cave. I shall be there…I will unite the two in certain marriage" (*Aen*., Bk 4, 130-132, 164-168).

Rome: Aeneas bound to a different responsibility, to the land of Carthage as opposed to Rome. Like Creusa, she hinders the idea of Rome itself.

In spite of the promise of peace in Carthage, Aeneas is urged to leave by the gods, against whom action is not advisable.[42] The command to Italy, delivered to Aeneas by Mercury, shifts slightly. Aeneas is no longer founding Rome for the glory of Rome itself, but rather for his own son, Iülus, and his son's future.[43] Previously, the bend toward Rome had been solely for the glory, honor, deservingness for Rome as a state; this shift represents a larger shift, a shift such that one may exchange absolute peace and happiness with constant war for the sake of one's offspring. This is the glory of Rome; that it is allowed to dominate and remake the world because that glory brings 'the good life' for posterity.[44] Again, the shift signifies the creations of the apparatuses of the Roman State, ie glory and honor are only upheld for futurity through the notions of colonization and war.[45]

Further, to uphold Roman superiority in war, any greatness that Carthage may achieve is only possible through Aeneas and the Trojans.[46] This signals the inherent, ancestral, superiority (effectiveness during war) in the Trojans-becoming-Romans. The speaker of this sentiment is a typical Carthaginian (the sister of Dido, Anna) which signals that there is an admiration to Rome and its superiority. This view promotes the seeming objectivity of the situation, where the

---

[42] At the reminder of Iarbas (a marriage prospect for Dido whom Aeneas displaced), Iuppiter sends Mercury to bring Aeneas back to his fate (*Aen*., Bk 4, 262-305).

[43] "…remember Ascanius…the hopes you hold for Iülus…" (*Aen*., Bk 4, 366).

[44] In other words; there is a shift in subjectivity, ie preservation of self is changed into preservation of self-as-posterity.

[45] Colonization and war specifically because the realm of Italy and the land of Rome are "owed" to Iülus, who signifies futurity (*Aen*., Bk 4, 369). This implies that the conquests of Rome, ie the 'land of Rome,' are necessarily part of the Roman State, and that it is the duty of the future to uphold those lands, ie to settle the lands which have been colonized, to expand the resources of Rome: "(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem, parcere subiectis et debellare superbos" (*Aen*., Bk 6, 850-853), cf 67, 68

[46] "If you marry Aeneas, what a city and what a kingdom, sister, you will see! With Trojan arms beside us, so much greatness must lie in wait for Punic glory!" (*Aen*., Bk 4, 64-67)

superiority of the Trojans-becoming-Romans is common knowledge, universal. When a standard becomes commonly held, or appears as if it is such, it becomes unquestioned. This unquestioning, standardized, belief is the basis for political stability. If all bodies in the population believe an aspect of life is self-evident, natural, questioning that belief (and therefore questioning the basis for civil life) becomes impossible.

Having, so far only taken Dido as a blockage to the founding of Rome she can also represent Carthage itself (and Rome defeating Carthage in the Punic wars); thus, the creation of the state peace in relation to war takes a new tone. In the process of Aeneas sneaking away into the night, deserting Dido, he defends himself to her.[47] In his defense, he claims that there is no actual bond between the Dardans and the Carthaginians, no marriage pact. The two clans are still separate. The separation works to deepen the nationalism of the Roman people. In the plane of immanence, the central figures are constituted by degrees of difference.[48] Thus, the marriage pact would be removal of degrees of difference, working to make people one, or, in other terms, saying there is not fundamental difference between two different national/ethnic groups, taking away reasons to laud one group while destroying another. This sentiment is further deepened with Dido's final curse upon Aeneas.[49] This bi-directional separation works to show that this divide is not just perceived by one side; thus, it is either innate or so easily recognized that it

---

[47] While the move of sneaking away into the night can be taken as a negative portrayal of Aeneas, it can also be taken as an act of prudence. The logic of 'anything is permissible when it comes to the gods and Rome.' So, a seemingly negative trait is turned positive when put in reference to the telos of Rome (*Aen.*, Bk 4, 449-492).

[48] To contrast the dialectical thought of race/ethnicity/nationality, D&G write about Faciality* in which differences between groups/individuals are based upon degrees of difference once the subject has already been formed. To traverse the void is no longer possible because there is no void to traverse; instead, the subject seeks to create increasingly greater degrees of difference to further themselves from all else. When groups merge, there are differing characteristics which work to territorialize in different ways, thus creating different semiotic orders, in other words, not the Roman order (D&G 115). So, to facialize is not a process of subjectivity creation through other, but rather, the subject gains subjectivity by trying to create the void at all.

[49] "Do not let love or treaty tie our peoples" (*Aen.*, Bk 4, 861).

might as well be. This sentiment is then reiterated by Jove, framing it not as Aeneas being the

cause, but rather that Carthage is filled with hate for Rome. This normalizes the retaliation

against Carthage, and in fact, this demonization allows the total (gratuitous) destruction of

Carthage.[50]

Again, when Dido is taken to signify Carthage, her suicide creates another orientation

towards Rome. When she first makes the decision to act, she is described as a frenzied Pentheus,

or a fleeing Orestes.[51] Rather than blaming the efficient cause of her death on another, the act of

suicide while frenzied works to put the reason for death back onto the performer of the deed, ie

the death is Dido's and not Aeneas' decision. Remembering that Carthage was destroyed by

Rome, the shift in narrative (that Carthage destroyed itself), works to change the historical

metanarrative. The change: Rome destroyed Carthage because of the war, to, Carthage destroyed

itself as a consequence of fate. War and destruction are no longer the logical consequences of

nation building and imperium, but rather the necessary prerequisites for that nation building to

occur. This is the creation of the state total war (one of the poles of the state) where

war/destruction/intrinsic violence is not just a consequence, but a necessary part of life.

Aeneas' interactions with Turnus, as a personal antagonist to Aeneas, work similarly to

create the poles of the state. With the specific lack of *clementia*, Aeneas *condit*[52] his sword into

Turnus.[53] However, these actions, to Aeneas, are justified for the killing of Pallas. Vengeance,

---

[50] "The fitting time for battle will yet come (and soon enough without your hurrying), when savage Carthage will unleash its hate and ruin on the towers of Rome, unlock the Alps against them: then it will be right to rage and fight and ravage everything" (*Aen*., Bk 10, 14-19).

[51] *Aen*., Bk 4, 646, 656

[52] 'Tantae molis erat Romanam condere urbem:' the founding of Rome is built upon a literal 'plunge' of a sword. thus, when Turnus is conditur(cf 52) the founding of Rome is completed. The significance of *condere* cannot be overstated, that through death, buried, the foundation of Roman ideology (and the city itself) is founded.

[53] "Relentless he sinks his sword into the chest of Turnus" (*Aen*., Bk 12, 1268), cf 51

then, in this manner becomes a model. By creating the revenge scenario, whereby Aeneas is obligated to retaliate, the ideology of constant war is created (because war is the only possibility imaginable the milieu must inherently the concept of absolute peace). But it is not the calculated revenge with which Aeneas acts. The cause for the lack of mercy, even as Aeneas is actively forgiving Turnus, is the glimpse of Pallas' belt which Turnus had taken as a prize.[54] This leads Aeneas to act with a total rage, inflamed with emotion.[55] That act, when the Trojans have already won (they have won their battles and made their treaties for the point of staying in Italy), works to legitimize the quality and quantity of violence with which it is permitted to act, ie totally. This legitimacy comes from fate, and thus from gods:[56] the right to conquer, the right to be superior, to *condere*.

Again in regard to marriage, Turnus represents a blockage to the idea of a Roman state. Lavinia represents the bond to the future of Rome. She, as the daughter of King Latinus,[57] is the connection to Italy, the connection to the Latin clans, the destiny of Aeneas. And, Turnus, as a local suitor to Lavinia, would prevent Aeneas from marrying Lavinia, were he to follow through with his plans. So, like Creusa, who by her marriage to Aeneas, would prevent the founding of Rome, so to would Turnus, by his marriage to Lavinia, prevent Rome. Thus, he too must be *conditur*[58] for the teleological bend of Rome.

---

[54] *Aen.*, Bk 12, 1256

[55] Had this not been a signified body, this could be seen as a becoming-animal, a move away from state hierarchies to operate in accordance with pure desire (D&G 283). But, because Aeneas is the signifier, the coder, this cannot be taken as an act of becoming-other. Because Virgil is working to create/unify the Roman people, we must look to see how that unification is taking place, ie the bods between brother/allies is second only to the needs of the state (second because, at the point Turnus is killed, Dardan superiority has already been established.

[56] cf 44

[57] *Aen.*, Bk 6, 1009

[58] cf 51

However, the creation of the Roman milieu viz the poles of the state is not just focused

on the creation of the state of total war. It also includes the opposite pole in relation to war, the

state of peace, the *pax*. Virgil creates the *pax*, a war coupled with possibility of peace under

Roman supremacy. This can be seen in Aeneas' interactions with his defeated enemies, the

Latins of Alba Longa among them. Once Aeneas defeats enemies, they join his fleet, signaling

an end to Trojan aggression at the expense of joining the machine of the state.[59]

This idea is presented more subtly with the Latins. When the Dardans reach the shores of

Italy, they parley with the king, saying that they only wish to settle but a small portion of his

shores.[60] They present gifts to the king, by which he is unmoved; they present lineages, again by

which he is unmoved. What King Latinus does care about is Aeneas' foreignness and skill. The

king was presented with a prophecy whereby Lavinia, coupled to a man from stranger countries,

would spring a race capable of dominating the world.[61] This possibility for peace is betrayed by

Turnus, through Juno (he was hoping to marry Lavinia). Even with the bending of fate complete

(Aeneas has already reached the shores, met Lavinia), Juno wishes to delay.[62] This delay comes

in the form of a war which leads to peace. This peace though, is peace in relation to war. Not

just in the fact that it is born from war;[63] the final action by which final peace is achieved: the

brutal, vengeful, unmerciful destruction of Turnus makes it such. Thus the image of total

violence is stamped upon the face of the resulting peace. By focusing on the total destruction of

---

[59] cf. 67 & *Aen.*, Bk 8, 15-17

[60] *Aen.*, Bk 7, 300-302

[61] It is to be noted that this reference of '*occupet orbem*' links to argument that Rome is destined to control the world through imperium. That strength is a right to seize, a right to control the world (*Aen.*, Bk 7, 327-338).

[62] "But I can still hold off that moment and delay these great events, can still strike down the nations of both kings. Then let the son- and father-in-law pay for peace with their own people's death" (*Aen.*, Bk 7, 416-420).

[63] Absolute peace can follow war temporally but cannot be born from war.

Carthage, of Troy, war itself becomes the aim. So, the *telos* of Rome is intrinsically linked to the destruction of The Other, and so, because they have been made one and the same, 'preservation of Rome at the expense of all else' becomes 'destruction of all else for Rome.'[64]

The creation of the Roman plane can be seen most clearly not in the creation of the poles of the state, but rather in the prophesied future of Rome and the deification of Augustus while Aeneas travels to the underworld. A famous genealogy is presented, linking Aeneas to Augustus, which works to credit the government. Anchises presents prophecies which show Rome to be a conquering machine. Augustus himself is set up to near-god levels. Each of these works to oriented towards a singular national identity, oriented towards loyalty to Augustus (the epitome of the imperium) and existing within the milieu of the state, the poles of war and peace in relation to war.

In the trip the underworld, Aeneas is presented with his future descendants. These anticipated ancestors serve a dual role: orienting Aeneas (and thus the reader) to act towards the idea of the future of Rome and also linking Augustus to Aeneas, thereby legitimizing Augustus. Most easily seen is the direct ancestral linkage from Augustus to Aeneas. Anchises with Aeneas in the underworld, standing before the imprisoned souls of Aeneas sons, lays out Aeneas' famous

---

[64] "In the first place, the distinction between absolute war as Idea and real wars seems to us to be of great importance…The pure Idea is not that of the abstract elimination of the adversary but that of a war machine *that does not have war as its object* and that only entertains a potential or supplementary synthetic relation with war….It is at the same time that the State apparatus *appropriates* the war machine, subordinates it to its "political" *aims,* and gives it war as its direct *object.* And it is one and the same historical tendency that causes State to evolve from a triple point of view: going from figures of encastment to forms of appropriation proper, going from limited war to so-called total war, and transforming the relation between aim and object…Total war is not only a war of annihilation but arises when annihilation takes as its "center" not only the enemy army, or the enemy State, but the entire population and its economy...it is also true that when total war becomes the object of the appropriated war machine, then at this level in the set of all possible conditions, the object and the aim enter into new relations that can reach the point of contradiction (D&G 420)."

descendants,[65] including his late son Silvius,[66] Romulus,[67] Caesar Augustus.[68] The 'right' to rule, then, is passed down. With the mandate of heaven given to Aeneas, this duty falls to all the descendants, therefore, Augustus has the right and duty to rule.

Not only does Augustus have this right and duty, his reign will remake the greatness of Rome. The senate replaced the old kings, usurping the rightful rulers. Here, Augustus is called to 'renew' the 'golden age of Latinum.[69] This nostalgic call, to remember the past as great and to make Rome great again, is the direct operationalization of microfascism* in order to reterritorialize. History is rewritten to create new 'memories;'[70] these memories work to create a consciousness within Rome, that greatness is only attainable through one method, the lineage of Aeneas and, therefore, Augustus. Because nostalgia (microfascism) operates on the molecular, the macro is able to be controlled through this nostalgia (because the molecular structures the molar). So, by instilling these memories, and praying on the nostalgia of Make Rome Great *Again*, Augustus is able to remake the Roman identity compliant, and desirous, of total control by the state imperium, fascism.

Further, the prophecies spouted by Anchises to Aeneas in the underworld work to instill a specific function into the global order, ie the orientation of the populous towards imperium and conquest. Anchises presents arts to Aeneas, arts that are properly the sole domain of Rome and

---

[65] "My tongue will now reveal the fame that is to come from Dardan sons and what Italian children wait for you…" (*Aen.*, Bk 6, 1000).

[66] "…Silvius…will be a king and father kings; through him our race will rule in Alba Longa (*Aen.*, Bk 6, 1010).

[67] If I need a footnote to explain who this is, well then my paper probably isn't for you (*Aen.*, Bk 6, 1026).

[68] *Aen.*, Bk 6, 1045

[69] "Augustus Caesar, song of a god, who will renew a golden age in Latinum…" (*Aen.*, Bk 6 1048).

[70] Memory works arboreally to instill Desire. Desire works molecularly to create structures of macrolevel fascism (D&G 215). And, memory works to instill a stable being (as opposed to the antimemory of becoming), rooted in created orientations, thus, to create social memories (the use of nostalgia) is to instill levels of being and molecular control, ie microfascism (D&G 294).

Roman citizens: peace through conquest, to protect the defeated, and to 'tame the proud.'[71] These domains, these arts, are all in relation to war, specifically wars of conquest. These imply both a moral superiority to the non-Roman, and also the ability to apply those morals onto the world. To bring *mos* implies that those in the *pax*, the conquered, do not have the *morem*, and thus, it must be brought to them. This assumes a moral superiority in the conqueror, that *morem* of non-Romans is not existent or not good enough (by Roman standards). It further exemplifies a reterritorialization, the changing and shaping of morals to be more in line with the ideals of the 'dominant' state. To save those pushed down assumes a dominant power; a state has the right to control if it has the ability to control.[72] The taming of the proud is again oriented towards domination; it gives a reason to go to war with enemies who are 'above their station,' ie above or equal to Rome. Rome is the only state that is allowed to dominate, the only state that is allowed to have valid laws, the only state that is at all moral. And, through the idea of moral superiority, Rome is forged into a single cohesive group.

Conclusion: Regardless of the method, governments and civil society as a whole require stasis, which necessitates a single, cohesive ideology. When a new government takes power, the uniting ideology similarly must also shift, otherwise the state does can not maintain political stability; the disruptions in the micropolitical would work to destabilize the macro level. A reterritorialization (either from a previous deterritorialization or from a different reterritorialization) of the populous thus becomes necessary.

---

[71] "…yours will be the rulership of nations, remember, Roman, these will be your arts: to teach the ways of peace to those you conquer, to spare defeated peoples, tame the proud" (*Aen*., Bk 6, 1135-1137), cf 44

[72] Also interesting to note, *parcere subiectis* has a its agent in *tibi*. This shows that Rome is the one who conquers, as mandated by fate itself. The command/prophecy both normalizes and instantiates the notion of brutal colonization and paternalistic violence.

Before the rise of the Caesars as state leaders, the senate controlled the population (both through laws and ideology). Senatorial authority began to collapse in the final years of the Republic. The collapse of authority looked like years of violence (slave revolts and moments of pure *demens*), the fall of consular authority (the interregnum), civil war--these show a growing move away from molecular and molar civil authority. Regardless whether the growing violence works as an absolute deterritorialization of state centrality, or whether the moves represented a reterritorialization to another plane of being, the people (not yet citizens) were not yet tied to Augustus and the new state.

Enter Virgil as a *cliens* of Augustus and a meaning maker. By creating new planes, new connections, concepts gain new meaning (being put in relation to concepts previously unreached). This new plane works to code the body anew, to put into a new relationality with the state. Virgil does this by recreating the poles of the state, ie total war and peace in relation to war. That war is not the old version of war from left over from senatorial age; it is unique in that this state of war is oriented towards world domination and ultimate Roman superiority. Further, the state of peace is born from pure brutality and violence, indicating that peace was not the end goal, but rather the state of war as the signifier for the whole milieu.

That state of war and state ideology, however, are useless without an orientation towards the state. Thus, Virgil works to centralize and normalize the figure of Augustus as the innate, natural born, rightful leader to Rome. Augustus' geology is tied to Aeneas and the gods; this creates the right to rule as divine, and it then gives that divine right to the emperor.

Further, by hinting at the diminished senatorial greatness and playing with the idea that some form of the Golden Age could be regained by discarding the senate (the idea that the

golden age can be regained from the loss of the senate), Virgil relies on the all pervasive power of memory and nostalgia. This recreation of memory acts on the molecular level to both instil a superiority in the Roman people (that Rome is was greater than the world and will be again only under a certain leader) and also to rearticulate microfascism..

The formation of these striated spaces creates specific orientations both towards the state and Augustus and Augustus' lineage. The sole purpose of these orientations is social stability. That stability comes at the price of social control.

Appendix

1. Body: system containing social hierarchies, these hierarchies are the organs within the body: the strata; the total assemblage of molecular forces; having the capacity to be affected and to affect (D&G 203)
2. Concept: an endless motion of linkages. It is the constant multiplicities of what can be called a thing (D&G xiii). They recognize the fact that concepts create other concepts, that there is no 'form' from which ideas are grabbed.[73] They are based in their creator, the philosopher, the *personnages conceptuels*, meaning that they are influenced by the person who links other concepts together. Significantly, it here matters that the concept is brought into being in the face of other concepts, meaning the ideals which Virgil brings together (*pietas*, *virtus*, *iustitia*, etc), creates the concept of the 'Imperial (post-senatorial) Roman.' From other concepts, Virgil creates.
3. Hierarchy: "organization of territoriality or territorialization" (D&G 33), centralization (D&G 224), it is the structure within the κόσμος, cf *Plane of Immanence*
4. Ideology: D&G reject the common notion of ideology in favor of a set of relationalities which all work simultaneously within a body, yet independent of each other (D&G 4). They go on to define ideology in terms of language: "The only way to define the relation is to revamp the theory of ideology by saying that expressions and statements intervene directly in productivity, in the form of a production of meaning or sign-value" (D&G 90). This can be understood in terms of a creation symbolic order, or in slightly less PoMo terms, 'thought contents (D&G 499).' D&G's example of an ideological form would be mircofacism, ie the internalized affects of repression.
5. Macropolitics: the physical incarnation of thoughts, desire, the micro. It is the visible action that comes from the concepts; the common conception of political action; the result of ideology. For Virgil and Augustus, this would come from the physical effects of the *mos mairoum*, ie taking away the privileges of the established senators
6. (Micro)fascism: "a...supple segmentarity that processes molecular energies and potentially gives desire a...the fascist inside you, the fascist you yourself sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective" (D&G 215); it is the desire to be controlled, structured in the segmented plane. For Virgil, it looks like creating an ideology that one wants to follow, because it places them within a segmented hierarchy.
7. Micropolitics: operating on the plane, the concepts that lead to macrolevel action; the former of a state ideology (D&G 231)
8. Milieu: "In French, *milieu* means "surroundings," "medium" (as in chemistry), and "middle…"milieu" should be read as a technical term combining all three meanings" (D&G xvii); the constituent parts of the plane of the plane of immanence. It is a relationality of constituent parts, not a thing in and of itself. It is the relation of night and day, 'chaosmos' (D&G 313);
9. Molecular: "Every society, and every individual, are thus plied by both segmentarities simultaneously: one molar, the other molecular. If they are distinct, it is because they do not have the same terms or the same relations or the same nature or even the same type of multiplicity. If they are inseparable, it is because they coexist and cross over into each other. The configurations differ, for example, between the primitives and us, but the two

---

[73] *What is Philosophy*, Deleuze and Guattari, 1991, Chap. 1

segmentarities are always in presupposition. In short, everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics" (D&G 213); fundamental concepts (ie mass). For Virgil it would be the concepts themselves of *pax* and war through peace (Iarbas)

10. Plane (of immanence); ὁ κόσμος, the ordering of the knowable, "…univocality, composition, upon which everything is given, upon which unformed elements and materials dance that are distinguished from one another only by there speed and that enter into this or that individuated assemblage depending on their connections, their relations of movement. A fixed plane of life upon which everything stirs, slows down or accelerates. A single abstract Animal for all assemblages that effectuate it... (D&G 255)"

11. Regime of signs: the symbolic order, the relations of meaning that are tied to each other, ideology. In the context of the *Aeneid*, it would be the new relationships he sets up: *clementia* is no longer part of what it means to be Roman (even if was only ever a part conceptually, not really), instead it is replaced with the brutal efficiency of *condere*. Or, to be pious to the gods now translates to being pious to the state for the point of the gods.

12. Rhizomes; a potato; the connection of one concept to any other concept; a free movement; directionless; in relation to the *territory*, it is the free movement that allows destratification (in any direction at any time), not impeded by strata

13. Stability/stasis: It should be noted that throughout the paper, 'stability' and 'stasis' are not used normatively. There can be extremely violent stasis, as in the state of total war. Stasis, then, is used to mean segmented reality, static concepts, arboreality. While D&G note that stability can arise without the state, ie the war machine is peaceful until appropriated by the state

14. State: Rome, the established order, the creators of stability, the single ideal of a society, the telos of desire (D&G xvii)

15. Stratum: ideology, the boundaries of *nomos* (D&G 433). For Virgil, the poles of the state bind what is possible, that peace can only be attained through war or vice versa.

16. (De/re)territoriality: Imagine for this a Cartesian plane (cf plane of immanence), this plane is chunked and furrowed, movement within it is difficult (cf strata), 1) territoriality, this plane represents the total possible connection of differing concepts. The plane progresses through time, thus new concepts can be created from the old-new concepts. Different traditions have differing planes, thus different traditions can have concepts that are inaccessible to another plane. To example this, one can look to the concept of *queer* versus the concept of *two-spirit*. The two concepts have entirely different cultural connotations (even if they are conflated at times). 2) territorializing/reterrotoriality, the concept of creating an entirely new plane in which to create concepts/taking concepts from another plane and enfolding it into a differing web of concepts. An example of the first: Christina Sharpe using a slave ship on the Middle Passage to describe black chattel slavery (slave non-ontology). An example of the second: taking the concept of two-spirt from its historically rich context and enfolding it into the concept of queer, where it has lost much (if not all) preferentiality to other concepts within its original plane. 3) deterritoriality, the concept of rupturing the plane, movement from concept to concept in any direction, cf nomad, cf rhizome, cf Body without Organs.

17. War machine: a move away from state oriented strata; a force exterior to the state (D&G 351 Axiom 1), it pushes towards the existence of the nomad, (D&G 361)

Works Cited

Cicero. *Cicero, Select Letters*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1980

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari, trans. Brian Massumi, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, University of Minnesota Press, London, 1987

Gruen, Erich S, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1974

Scullard, HH, *From the Gracchi to Nero: A history of Rome from 133B.C to A.D. 68*, Routledge Classics, Milton Park, 1959

Virgil, "P. VERGILIVS MARO." *The Latin Library*, www.thelatinlibrary.com/verg.html

Virgil, trans. Allen Mandelbaum, *Aeneid*, Bantam Classics, 1981