

EXEGI MONUMENTUM: ARCHITECTURE IN LATIN EPIC

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Brent Gareth Hannah

May 2007

©2007 Brent Gareth Hannah

EXEGI MONUMENTUM: ARCHITECTURE IN LATIN EPIC

Brent Gareth Hannah, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2007

For the poets of the early empire, architecture and architectural imagery was an important medium through which to explore the relationship between political power and poetic art. Virgil and Horace, and their contemporaries and successors, composed literary monuments to stand beside the physical monuments of their patrons. No less than the palaces and temples of the emperors, these literary monuments participated in the formulation and evolution of imperial ideology. Within those poetic monuments, the description of architecture afforded a space in which to explore the relationship between poetry, monumental and pictorial art, and political power. This study is an attempt to elucidate how Virgil and his successors explore the dynamics of this relationship.

In the proem to *Georgics* 3, Virgil not only draws a programmatic parallel between physical and poetic monuments, but he demands that we address the problem of how the world of poetry is generated out of the phenomenological world of the poet. These questions are explored through a series of close readings of passages from Latin epic that engage closely with concerns raised at the beginning of *Georgics* 3: Hannibal's visit to the temple at Liternum in the sixth book of Silius' *Punica*, the description of temple of Juno in *Aeneid* 1, the description of Daedalus' temple for Apollo and the entrance to the Underworld in *Aeneid* 6, Aeneas' visit to Actium and Buthrotum in *Aeneid* 3, Aeneas' tour of Pallatneum in *Aeneid* 8, and Caesar's visit to the remains of Troy in *Pharsalia* 9.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Brent Gareth Hannah was born in Zürich in 1974. In 1995 he graduated from the University of Melbourne with First Class Honours in Classics. Between 1998 and 2000, having spent two years working in Italy, he earned an MA degree from the University of Melbourne. Between 2000 and 2006 he was a doctoral candidate and a teaching fellow at Cornell University. Since January 2007 he has been employed by the Australian Department of Defence in Canberra.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank Cornell University for generously providing me with the funding necessary to undertake and complete this project. I am very grateful indeed to my academic committee: Jay Reed, Piero Pucci, Dave Mankin, and, above all, Frederick Ahl. I have also benefited from the advice and suggestions offered me by members of the Cornell Classics Department and by audiences at the Hellenic Center in Washington, the University of Virginia, the University of Nottingham. Finally, I should like to thank my wife, Cara Yates, who edited and proofread large portions of the manuscript. Without her assistance and support, this project would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Chapter one	7
Chapter two	31
Chapter three	78
Chapter four	108
Chapter five	144
Conclusions	185
Bibliography	190

Introduction

When Octavian celebrated his triumph in 29 BC, all of his major rivals were dead. His opponents had no significant spokesman; the senatorial class had been devastated. In solidifying his rule, Octavian set about fashioning for his contemporaries, and for posterity, the official image of his regime, overlaying the brick city he found with a veneer, or façade, of marble (Suet., Aug. 28). As a direct result of Octavian's building program, architecture and art became the principal medium through which to propagate and transmit the Augustan version of the Roman past and present. Virgil, charged with the task of giving literary shape to the new Rome, was in his own way one of the chief architects of the regime. Like the new and renovated physical monuments of the city, the *Aeneid*, Virgil's literary monumentum, was commissioned to present, and preserve, the Augustan narrative of Roman history. Like those physical monuments, too, the *Aeneid* was necessarily a selective account of the Roman past. Yet had Virgil been concerned merely to preserve the official version of Octavian's Rome, his monument would have run the risk, after the passing of the regime, of going the way of all monuments. In order that his own monumentum might endure the passing of temporal power and its buildings, Virgil exercised a selectivity of his own.

At the beginning of *Georgics* 3, Virgil proclaims the impending composition of his new *opus* by describing the erection of a massive temple of marble on the river Mincius:

et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam ingens tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.

(*Georgics* 3.13-15)

And, in a verdant field, I will erect a temple made of marble before the water,
where the massive river Mincius meanders with mazy motion and fringes the
banks with its tender reeds. I will put Caesar in the middle and he shall
dominate the temple.

The systematic equation of literary and physical architecture is, of course, a familiar conceit in Augustan poetry. Horace not only equates the act of painting with the creation of poetry (*ut pictura poesis*, *Ars poetica* 361), but he also hails the first three books of his *Odes* as a *monumentum* that would survive the ravages of time (*Exegi monumentum*, *Carm.* 3.30.1). But Virgil goes further: equating architectural and poetic structures at (what would become) the precise center of his corpus, Virgil identifies architecture as the single dominant metaphor for poetic art in Latin epic. The correspondences that Virgil draws between the two media, moreover, are precise. The ivory doors of Virgil's temple will be decorated with representations of the martial heroics of Octavian (26-32), while its accompanying statuary will stand in honor of his Trojan ancestors (34-36). The careful correspondence between Virgil's temple and its decorations on the one hand and, on the other, his poetic *opus* and its subject matter, demand that we afford his metaphor the fullest consideration. It follows that descriptions of physical monuments *within* Latin epic are privileged sites for meditation on the nature of poetic arts and its relationship both to physical art and to the "real" world. This principle is the point of departure for my project.

My methodology shares similarities with previous discussions of epic architecture, most of which fall into two broad categories. One line of approach has been to explore the relationship between epic buildings and the material culture of contemporary Rome. Since architecture was an important medium through which

Octavian and his successors articulated imperial ideology, it is unsurprising that for the poets of the day descriptions of architecture should have been a means through which to reflect upon political power and ideology. In this respect, the seminal studies on the expression of imperial power through art by Zanker, Galinski, and others have provided a point of reference for scholars treating the relationship between poetry and power in ancient Rome.¹

Descriptions of buildings in Latin epic also tend to be considered among the broader class of descriptions commonly referred to as “ecphrasis.”² The use of the term is bedeviled by ambiguity: whereas modern scholars generally take *ecphrasis* to refer to descriptions of man-made artifacts, in antiquity it was used to refer to descriptions of a broader range of visual phenomena, including landscapes.³ The term *ecphrasis* also suggests that such descriptions are somehow not integral to the primary narrative, they are detachable set pieces that may be removed without doing violence to the text. Since the currency that the term enjoys comes only at the expense of imposing an unnatural and misleading categorization upon the text, I have decided to avoid it in what follows. I shall also make a departure by treating descriptions of epic monuments not as an arbitrary subcategory of *ecphrasis*, but rather as uniquely privileged sites for reflecting on the nature of poetic art.

My study begins with a close reading of the proem to *Georgics* 3. Virgil’s description of his marble temple, I suggest, is unique in that it describes an object that does not exist *even according to the fiction of the text itself*. In this respect, it differs

¹ Important examples of this approach include Rowell (1941); Wistrand (1960); Zanker (1983); Kellum (1985); Zarker (1986); Trap (1986); Zanker (1988); Rodriguez (1989); Henry (1986); Elsner (1995); Galinski (1996).

² The literature on *ecphrasis* is enormous. Helpful discussions include Hollander (1988); Webb and James (1991); Laird (1993); Hollander (1995); Fowler (1996), with exhaustive bibliography; Putnam (1998).

³ On the four ancient rhetorical handbooks that deal with ekphrasis, see Webb and James (1991) esp. 4-7.

radically from the common run of what have been termed “notional ecphrases:”⁴ poetic descriptions of objects whose existence is generated by the text in which they stand. Since Virgil insists that we envisage a monument that is insubstantial, we are left with an important question: how do such monuments differ from those that, at least putatively, are not insubstantial? The question is complicated by the obvious similarities between Virgil’s song temple and the temple of Palatine Apollo, the contemporary Augustan building upon which it is “modeled.”⁵ Because he appears to construct his avowedly fantastic vision out of materials available for perusal in contemporary Rome, the poet demands that we address the question of how the fantasy-world of poetry is constructed from the physical reality of the phenomenological world. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the end of book 6 of Silius’ *Punica*, a passage that presses the logic of its Virgilian model to its limit: because Silius represents an artistic scheme that exists within the poem’s narrative juxtaposed with one merely formulated in the mind of one of its protagonists, he demands that the reader consider the substantiality of the former.

In chapter two I discuss how *Aeneid* 1, the first book of Virgil’s literary *monumentum*, treats the question of poetic composition through architectonic, and specifically foundational, imagery. I argue that formalist narrative considerations precipitate deeper questions of interpretation and ideology: the problem of whose narrative – that of Jupiter or of Juno - will prevail is ultimately connected to the central preoccupation of the *Aeneid*: who will build the city destined to rule the world? Chapter three explores related questions of narrative and visualization through a discussion of Daedalus’ temple at Cumae (*Aen.* 6.14-41) and the entrance to the *domus Ditis* (*Aen.* 6.273-94). The description of Daedalus’ temple doors unravels the

⁴ On the idea of “notional ecphrasis,” see esp. Laird (1993); Putnam (1988).

⁵ On the similarities between Virgil’s song-temple and the Palatine temple, see Miles (1980); Kraggerud (1998).

putative hierarchy upon which fictional description depends. As the passage proceeds, it becomes increasingly difficult to posit the existence of a physical monument that precedes its description in the text. The entrance to the Underworld, described later in the same book, questions the ontological status of what is described in the text in a different manner: the overtly Lucretian character of the *uestibulum* of the Underworld demands the substantiality of the entire Underworld vision be called into question.

In chapter four I discuss how the temple(s) described as appearing at Leucas/Actium in *Aeneid* 3 (266-93) not only encapsulate some of the poem's most important thematic preoccupations, but are also highly suggestive of the way the poet creates his poetic word out of the material reality of the world in which he lives. Those structures in turn serve as an introduction to Aeneas' visit to Buthrotum (*Aen.* 3.291-505), which he describes as a city that exists primarily not as a functioning civic entity, but as a three-dimensional representational work of art. Whereas the other civic buildings described in epic are, at least putatively, structures in their own right, the buildings of Buthrotum are utterly unique in ancient literature in being the image of another (no longer existing) city: Troy.

If Aeneas' account of his visit to Buthrotum presents the reader with buildings as representational art, the poet's description of his tour of Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8 (97-269) imposes buildings that have yet to exist upon the "genuinely" existing landscape of Evander's hamlet, a landscape already dotted with the ruins of a failed civilization. In my fifth and final chapter, I discuss the palimpsest vision of Rome in *Aeneid* 8 together with one of the most explicit meditations on the relationship between poetry and physical monuments in ancient literature: Lucan's description of Caesar's visit to Troy in *Pharsalia* 9 (950-99). Not only does Lucan's passage testify to the comparative longevity of poetic art, but it also suggests that such power as physical monuments have to memorialize the past comes from poetry. The site of Troy, whose

very ruins have perished, has become a poetic space whose capacity to evoke the Troy of legend is conferred solely by poetic art.

Architectural imagery in Augustan poetry unites some of the central thematic preoccupations of Roman epic: the relationship of poetic art to physical art, the capacity of poetry to create fictional worlds, and the interaction between art and political power. The programmatic association of architecture and poetry in Virgil's announcement of his epic in the *Georgics*, and the vital role of architecture in articulating the ideology of imperial Rome, suggest that the representation of architecture within Latin epic will be especially suggestive. The purpose of this study is to explore, by way of a close reading of a limited number of key passages, the role that architecture and architectural imagery play in Roman epic.

Chapter one

“The earliest ekphrastic poetry describes what doesn’t exist, save in the poetry’s own fiction.”⁶ John Hollander’s observation is, or ought to be, fundamental to the study of how literary texts represent physical artifacts. To describe an artifact that you have seen with your own eyes is one thing; it is quite another to describe an object that owes its existence purely to the act of describing itself. By the same token, there is only a superficial resemblance between an artifact that exists (or existed) in the phenomenal world and an artifact generated solely by a literary text. It stands to reason these two vastly dissimilar types of literary performance – the verbal representation of real objects and the description of imaginary objects (what Hollander terms “notional ekphrasis”)⁷ - demand correspondingly different interpretative responses.

While scholars are well aware that the artifacts described in ancient poetry are not real,⁸ in their treatment of such descriptions they tend to proceed *as if they were real*. As a result, their methodology is often more appropriate for literary descriptions of objects that genuinely exist in the phenomenal world than for descriptions of those that exist exclusively in the text by which they are generated. In this chapter I should like suggest a potentially more rewarding approach to descriptions of artifacts that appear in poetic narrative: to acknowledge, as a point of departure, the unreal quality of the artifacts that appear in ancient fictional narrative. In most cases, of course, the reality of the artifacts that appear in ancient fictional narrative is corroborated by the authority of the narrator. On occasion, however, the reader is confronted with the

⁶ Hollander (1988) 209. By the “earliest poetry,” Hollander means the poetry of antiquity in general.

On the four ancient rhetorical handbooks that deal with ekphrasis, see Webb and James (1991) esp. 4-7.

⁷ On “notional ekphrasis,” see esp. Hollander (1995) 7-29.

⁸ The problem of “notional ekphrasis” in Latin poetry has been addressed most profitably by Laird (1993) and Fowler (1996). See also Leach (1988) 7-12.

description of an artifact that has no existence *even according to the fiction of the text itself*. Such passages positively demand that we confront the paradoxes precipitated by the representation of an object that, by the admission of the author, has no ontological status outside the words that constitute it. The description of Virgil's "temple of song" in the proem to *Georgics* 3 and Hannibal's description of the temple-art that he will commission at Carthage at the end of book 6 of Silius' *Punica* are the two most striking instances of this phenomenon in Latin hexameter poetry.

***Georgics* 3.1-48**

Virgil begins the third book of the *Georgics* by proclaiming the imminent composition of a sweeping historical epic in honor of Octavian and his Trojan ancestors. That poem Virgil describes not as a literary monument, but as a magnificent marble temple⁹ that he will erect on the banks of the river Mincius, near his hometown of Mantua:¹⁰

primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit.

(3.12-16)

I will be the first to bear Idumaeen palms to you, Mantua, and, in a verdant field, I will erect a temple made of marble before the water, where the massive river Mincius meanders with mazy motion and fringes the banks with

⁹ On the almost exclusive use of the word *templum*, rather than *aedes*, in Virgil and elsewhere, see Gros (1975) 15-16; Corlaita (1990) 80-81.

¹⁰ Cf. Mynors (1990) *ad* 13: "A poet's imaginary temple should be not under his readers' eyes in Rome, but in some place which they had not seen but could imagine without difficulty ... He describes the place with that power to make his reader see what he sees which is one of his most original gifts."

its tender reeds. I will put Caesar in the middle and he shall dominate the temple.

The temple that Virgil vows to build on the river's banks will be made of marble (14) and will feature (a statue of) Caesar as its prime attraction¹¹ (16). By situating his future monument in the verdant Mantuan countryside, Virgil draws an implicit contrast between the features of a preexisting natural landscape and the artificial structure that will – but does not yet - stand in its midst. On closer inspection, however, such a distinction proves impossible to maintain. The description of the river Mincius is lifted almost verbatim from the seventh *Eclogue*, where Daphnis recommends the banks of that river to Meliboeus as an appropriate setting for pastoral song (*hic uiridis tenera praetexit harundine ripas / Mincius, E. 7.12-13*). There is of course no pretence that the scene that Daphnis describes in *Eclogue 7* is a faithful documentary portrait of the Mantuan countryside: on the contrary, Daphnis' idyllic world of peace and song stands in obvious contrast to the troubled, prosaic existence of Melibeus.¹² The implications surrounding the choice of the bucolic landscape of the *Eclogues* as a setting for Virgil's song-temple have been well explored by Buchheit,¹³ but here we need only note the programmatically poetic, non-documentary character of the landscape that Virgil purports to describe in the *Georgics 3* proem.

¹¹ The ultimate precedent for Virgil's *monumentum* is Pindar, *Olympian 6.1-3*: Χρύσεας ὑποστάσαντες εὐτειχεῖ προθύρωι θαλάμου / κίονας, ὡς ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον / πάξομεν. Although Pindar's identification of poem and building is, strictly speaking, a simile, it is clear from its epinician context that it furnished Virgil with the primary model for his own temple of song. The Pindaric influence on Virgil's description is presented most forcibly by Wilkinson (1970) and Balot (1998). According to Thomas (1983), an equally important precedent is Callim., *Aetia* fr. 118Pf., which Thomas suggests may have been part of a representation of two temples (one finished, one unfinished) described in language appropriate for discussing literary art. Cf. also Buchheit (1972) 148-59; Miles (1980) 170-73.

¹² Cf. Buchheit (1972) 105: "Im Gegensatz zu dieser Welt der Ruhe, der Geborgenheit und der Musen lebt Meliboeus in einer Welt der Not und der Sorge. Er darf aber wenigstens für eine Weile an der Welt des andern, die sich als eine paradiesische Heilswelt, als ein Stück der goldenen Zeit erweist ..."

¹³ Buchheit (1972) 103-13.

The language used to describe the river and its surroundings confirms the impression that Virgil's meditation on literature extends beyond the description of his song-temple to include the landscape in which it will stand. In line 14, he refers to the Mincius as "huge" (*ingens*), a curious epithet for a river that, as the relevant Pauly-Wissowa entry reminds us, is the *smallest* of the northern tributaries of the Po ("der östlichste der Zuflüsse, die der Po von Norden her erhält, und der *kleinste*").¹⁴ Since Mantua and its environs will have been intimately familiar to Virgil, his epithet for the Mincius only makes sense if we read it in terms of (possibly Callimachean) poetics: if it seems odd that a huge, swollen river should flow sluggishly through the countryside of Mantua, it is surely a fitting site for a poetic monument concerned with *reges et proelia*.¹⁵ We may further trace the meta-literary quality of the passage into the next line, where the swollen river is described as "fringing" (*praetexit*) its banks with (paradoxically?) "tender reeds" (*tenera ... harundine*).¹⁶ If Virgil's landscape makes sense on the level of poetic allegory, therefore, as part of a description with pretensions to documentary accuracy it subverts the important distinction between a preexisting landscape (whose appearance is nominally independent of the poet's art) and the monumental artifact that – on the admission of the text itself – is purely the product of the poet's mind.

¹⁴ *RE*, s.v. "Mincius" (xxx.1766-67, Stuttgart, 1932).

¹⁵ Ultimately evoked is the famous Callimachean image of the swollen Assyrian river at *Hymn* 2.108-9, but see Cameron's objections to the assumption that these lines refer to epic (Cameron (1995) 403-7). Cf. also the phrase *magnum fluentem*, used below (*G.* 3.28) to describe the Nile as represented on the doors of Virgil's epic temple. Thomas (1988) in his note compares *magnum fluentem* with Callimachus' image (*ad* 3.28), but the connection is not made in the case of the Mincius.

¹⁶ The basic meaning of *praetexo* is "to border or edge (with anything)," but it may also mean "to preface (with)" (literarily or otherwise) (*OLD* s.v. 2b) or "to put forward as a pretext, pretend" (*OLD* s.v. 4). Both of these secondary meanings may be operative here. On the use of *praetexo* as a framing device in connection with the description of Daedalus' temple doors at the beginning of *Aen.* 6 (5), see Fitzgerald (1984) 54. Cf. also *Fasti* 5.567 (of the temple of Mars Ultor: *spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum* "he views too the temple prefaced with the name of Augustus").

¹⁶ *harundo*, of course, is commonly used for "pen;" the adjective *tener* may here have the same metaliterary associations as the more straightforwardly Callimachean *tenuis* (e.g. *siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena* "you meditate the sylvan Muse with a slender oat," *E.* 1.2).

Next, Virgil envisages the lavish festivities that will accompany the inauguration of the temple: dressed in Tyrian purple (*Tyrio ... oestro*, 17), Virgil sees himself as a *triumphator* driving (rather improbably) a hundred four-horse chariots, leading processions, and overseeing sacrifices while “all Greece” participates in sporting contests¹⁷ (18-25). The scene is wonderfully vivid, a fact that can no doubt be attributed in large measure to its resemblance to Octavian’s famous triple triumph of 29 BC.¹⁸ Also instrumental in bringing the scene before the reader’s eyes is the transition in lines 22-23, signaled by the words *iam nunc*, from the future to the present tense, the apparent result of the poet becoming so caught up in his own vision that he behaves as if it were already coming into being:¹⁹

iam nunc solemnis ducere pompas
 ad delubra iuuat caesosque uidere iuuenos
 uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque
 purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Britanni.
 (22-25)

Now, even now, it pleases me to lead solemn processions to the shrines of the gods, and to see the slain bullocks, or to see how the scene retreats when the sets have been rotated,²⁰ or how the inlaid Britons lift the purple stage-curtain.

This description of the *scaena* with which the vision of Virgil’s festivities concludes provides a fascinating commentary on the dynamics of describing the non-existent. In

¹⁷ Balot (1998) 91 notices the Pindaric background of this motif: “Virgil reformulates the [Pindaric] theme of return to one’s homeland and includes details of Pindaric triumphal processions, but he also strengthens the parallelism between poet and victor by emphasizing his own, as well as Octavian’s, victorious return to Rome.”

¹⁸ On the parallels between Virgil’s planned festivities in *Georgics* 3 and events contemporary with the composition of the poem, see Drew (1924) 195-202; Miles (1980) 170-71.

¹⁹ Cf. Kraggerud (1998) 11.

²⁰ On precisely what it is that Virgil is describing here, see Mynors (1990) *ad* 24.

line 25, Virgil represents the purple stage-curtain as if it were being raised by the very figures that appear woven (*intexti*) into its fabric. In partially succumbing to the illusion that the Britons themselves are raising the curtain, Virgil apparently testifies to the amazing verisimilitude of the artwork that decorates it. In describing the Britons as *intexti*, however, he simultaneously concedes that however lifelike they appear, they remain mere images woven into the *textum* of the *aulaea*.²¹ Even as he intimates that the verisimilitude of their representations may, for a moment, make us believe that we are seeing living and breathing human beings, Virgil keeps their artificiality before our eyes.

Of course, the *aulaea* into which Virgil's Britons are woven are invested, as it were, with no more reality than the figures that are said to decorate its fabric, for the *aulaea* are in their turn woven into the *textum* of Virgil's literary fabric. What is remarkable about Virgil's image is that unlike the vast majority of notional ekphrases in hexameter poetry, the poet of the *Georgics* openly concedes the unreality (at least for the time being) of his own vision: on the admission of Virgil himself, the *scaena* and its *aulaea*, like the rest of the festivities that will accompany the inauguration of the temple, do not (yet) exist. Behind the reality of the artificial – if lifelike – quality of the Virgil's Britons lies the deeper reality that the *aulaea* into which they are woven exist only in the imagination of the poet and in the lines we are reading. The image of the theatrical stage – whose business is the definition, or the blurring, of the boundary between real and represented – may in its turn be read as a commentary on the peculiar interaction of reality and representation that characterizes the passage as a whole. It also neatly sets the stage for the vividly represented, but ultimately illusory, vision that follows.

²¹ Cf. Mynors (1990) *ad* 25: "the figures rise as the curtain on which they are depicted rises, and they can be said to raise it, much as poets are said to do what they describe the doing of (e.g. *E.* 6.46 'solatur');" cf. Wilkinson (1969) 168. Thomas (1988) *ad* 24-25 notes that l. 25 is a golden line.

In *Metamorphoses* 3, Ovid adapts Virgil's image in order to describe Cadmus' sown men arising from the soil of Boeotia:

sic ubi tolluntur festis aulaea theatris,
surgere signa solent²² primumque ostendere uultus,
cetera paulatim, placidoque educta tenore
tota patent imoque pedes in margine ponunt.

(3.111-14)

So when on festal days the curtain in the theatre is raised, figures of men rise up, showing first their faces, then little by little all the rest; until at last, drawn up with steady motion, the entire forms stand revealed, and plant their feet upon the curtain's edge.²³

Ovid employs the image of a stage curtain decorated with lifelike figures (*signa*) in order to render more vivid what is really taking place on the ground in Boeotia.

Ovid's simile, however, can itself be read as a commentary on the theatricality of the Theban books of the *Metamorphoses* (books 3-4), which are acknowledged as replete with allusions to tragic adaptations of the Theban saga.²⁴ His theatrical image reminds us that Ovid's Boeotia is a literary artifact, a vivid illusion generated by the text itself.

In the last resort, the figures on the stage *aulaea* and the *Spartoi* of the narrative proper are equally *signa*, verbal signifiers on the page that you are reading.

²² Bömer (1969) ad 3.112 notes the "s" alliteration in *surgere signa solent*. Cf. Virgil's *spirantia signa* "breathing statues."

²³ The translation is that of Miller (1960).

²⁴ On tragedy and the Theban saga in the *Metamorphoses*, see esp. Lafaye (1904) and Hardie (1990).

Immediately after his representation of the *scaena* and its stage-curtain, Virgil returns to his marble temple and provides a detailed description of the artwork that will adorn the temple precinct, beginning with the ivory doors of the temple itself:²⁵

in foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto
Gangaridum faciam uictorisque arma Quirini,
atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem
Nilum ac nauali surgentis aere columnas.
addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
fidentemque fuga Parthum uersisque sagittis;
et duo rapta manu diuerso ex hoste tropaea
bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentis.

(3.26-33)

On the temple doors I will create out of gold and ivory the battle with the Gandaridae and the arms of victorious Quirinus; the Nile surging with war, in full flow, and columns towering with bronze prows. I will add the conquest of the cities of Asia and the casting back of the Niphates, the Parthian trusting in flight and in arrows fired behind his back, a pair of trophies seized from different foes, and races from both shores triumphed over.

Lines 26-33 detail the images that will be carved into the ivory doors of the temple:²⁶ the conquest of the Gandaridae of India (26-27), the recent victory over the Egypt and the Nile, “flowing mightily” (not unlike the “enormous” Mincius at line 14) (28-29),

²⁵ *in foribus* (26): the phrase occurs at *Aen.* 6.20, also at the beginning of the verse, in the description of the doors of Apollo’s temple at Cumae. Thomas (1988) *ad* 26 notes that the phrase links both buildings to the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, whose doors were similarly illustrated. The phrase also turns up at the beginning of the verse *Punica* 3.32, at the start of Silius’ description of temple of Hercules at Gades (*in foribus labor Alcidae* “the labor is Hercules appears on the doors.”).

²⁶ On the distribution of the scenes on the temple doors, see Mynors (1990) *ad* 26; see also Parry (1972).

the conquest of “the cities of Asia” and the Niphates (30), the rout of the Parithans (31), and, finally, unspecified victories over enemies at the far east and west of the world²⁷ (32-33). The series of conquests which Virgil envisages on the doors of his temple also lends a fresh significance to the Britanni described on the stage *aulaea* immediately before the temple proper (24-25), for if the conquered Egyptians and the Indians represent Rome’s eventual sway over the southern and eastern extremities of the *orbis terrarum*, the Britons represent its dominance in the far north.²⁸

The military achievements of Octavian that the poet envisages on the temple doors (and implicitly on the stage *aulaea*) fall into two discrete categories: genuine historical events more or less contemporary with the *Georgics* and imagined future events.²⁹ The conquest of Egypt (28-29) and the eastern consolidation that followed (30) could, at the time of the poem’s composition, legitimately be numbered among Octavian’s *res gestae*. The same cannot be said of the rout of the Parthians (31), since nothing resembling a victory over that people occurred until the recovery (though diplomacy rather than arms) of Crassus’ lost standards in 20 BC, several years after the publication of the *Georgics*. Similarly fanciful is the defeat of the Indians and the (implied) subjection of the Britons, since neither of these peoples fell within Roman jurisdiction at the time of the poem’s composition. To the extent that lines 32-33 can be understood as references to an eventual expansion of Roman power to the ends of the *orbis*, they too must be considered to be dependent upon the course of future events. The fact that imagined future events are included on Virgil’s temple-doors

²⁷ Pace Kraggerud (1998) 11, who sees in these lines specific references to the Morini and the Dahae. Mynor’s interpretation (Mynors (1990) *ad* 32-3) is more representative: “They must be the victories over enemies at the opposite ends of the world, ‘from sea to sea,’ that the Romans of those days were always expecting.”

²⁸ Cf. Buchheit (1972) 121-36: “Der Dichter führt den Leser zunächst an drei Grenzbereiche des *orbis*, beginnend mit den *Britanni* im Norden, dann nach Osten zu den Indern und schließlich nach Süden zu den Ägyptern” (121); Boyle (1979) 72.

²⁹ Cf. Leach (1998) 74: “As architect of the temple, the poet also decorates it with images of Roman victories not yet accomplished.”

thus adds a further dimension to the problems precipitated by the notional character of the poem to *Georgics* 3.

This will be a good place to pause in order to detail systematically the dynamics generated by the fantasy that opens *Georgics* 3. The first thing to note is that the vividness of Virgil's imaginary temple largely derives from its resemblance to contemporary buildings that were available for Virgil's perusal in Augustan Rome.³⁰ Easily the most important of the monuments that influenced Virgil's description is a temple that Octavian built himself and which he dedicated in October 28 in celebration of his victory over Cleopatra and Egypt: the temple of Palatine Apollo.³¹ While Octavian commemorated his military victories by dedicating a magnificent marble temple decorated with ivory doors and assorted statuary, Virgil will mark his poetic triumph with the dedication of a (song-)temple of comparable magnificence.³² That temple will in turn be adorned with artistic representations of the very victories that Octavian commemorated through the dedication of *his* temple.³³ What is more, an integral component of Octavian's new complex³⁴ was a library designed to house the greatest writers of classical antiquity, a fact that cannot have failed to influence Virgil

³⁰ On the resemblance of Virgil's fantasy-temple to contemporary buildings other than the temple of Palatine Apollo, see Kraggerud (1998) 15-16. Thomas (2001) 45-49 draws a comparison with the temple of Zeus at Olympia. As Deuling (1997) 10 suggests, the columns decorated with *rostra* mentioned at 3.29 "are similar to the monuments on which some of the *rostra* taken at Actium were mounted outside the Temple of Divus Iulius in the Forum Romanum."

³¹ Miles (1980) 172 notes the resemblances: "Parallels between the temple of *Georgic* 3 and subsequent descriptions in *Aeneid* 8.675-728 and in Propertius 2.31 of the Palatine Temple of Actian Apollo suggest that that temple, dedicated in 28 BC but well advanced in design and execution by 29 BC, may also have influenced Virgil. Apollo's temple, like the young Caesar's, was notable for the lavish use of marble in its construction; Apollo, like Virgil's Caesar, was represented by a statue that was flanked by other statues of near relatives (mother and sister in the case of Apollo, Trojan ancestors in the case of Caesar). Apollo's great victories were apparently represented in magnificent ivory reliefs on the two leaves of the temple doors, just as victories over India, Egypt, and the nations of Asia will be depicted with gold and ivory on the doors of Caesar's temple."

³² Cf. Gale (2000) 44.

³³ It is instructive to compare the Ovid's temple of Sol, described at *Met.* 2.1-30, also modeled on the temple of Palatine Apollo, as well the epic temples of Homer, Apollonius, and Virgil himself; see esp. Brown (1987).

³⁴ On the *domus Augusta* and its associated buildings, see Deuling (1997) 248-52.

in fashioning of his own “literary” monument.³⁵ It is a tribute to the success of Virgil’s description that scholars tend to treat his future monument as if it were no less real than the marble temple that already stood on the Palatine.³⁶

It is, of course, not real. It is not real because Virgil’s marble temple is an elaborate metaphor for a literary monument,³⁷ an admission that the poet makes implicitly at l. 46, where *ardentis accingar dicere pugnas* (“I shall gird myself to sing (Caesar’s) ardent battles”) stands in apposition to the description of the temple.³⁸ When read as a description of a physical monument, however, Virgil’s building is further distinguished from the common run of so-called “notional ekphrases” by the fact that it does not exist *even according to the fiction of the text itself*, and never will. Our possession of a literary artifact that looks tolerably like the realization of Virgil’s project ought not obscure the fact that from the perspective of *Georgics* 3, our magnificent temple must remain forever a figment of the poet’s imagination.³⁹ It will exist forever in the future, forever unrealized.

The following typology clarifies the dynamics of Virgil’s description. The levels of reality, or unreality, may be summarized as follows:

- 1) The landscape itself, which is ostensibly real, albeit far from Rome and described in such a way to draw attention to its literary, rather than purely documentary, character.

³⁵ Cf. Galinsky (1996) 218.

³⁶ Cf. Miles (1980) 173.

³⁷ The conceit whereby a poem is compared to a magnificent physical monument, not especially common before Virgil, appears to originate with Pindar, who in *Olympian* 6 compares his poem to a *megaron* adorned with golden columns (1-3). See above, n. 6.

³⁸ I leave to one side the question of how closely Virgil’s metaphorical vision corresponds to what we know as the *Aeneid*. It is widely accepted that Virgil’s temple does indeed refer to a *future* poem, but see Lundström (1976) 163-91.

³⁹ Cf. Thomas (1988) *ad* 1-48: “It is tempting to look at the lines as a *recusatio* ..., and to see the reference to a future epic as a traditional Callimachean feature (like the *recusatio* of *E.* 6 or Prop. 2.1), and if the *Aeneid* did not exist, that is how they would doubtless be read.” Cf. Statius’ (unfulfilled) promise to compose an epic in honor of Domitian at *Thebaid* 1.17-33.

- 2) The temple precinct, an artificial architectural complex erected within a “natural” landscape.
- 3) The artistic decorations - depicting people, places, and events - which adorn the monument, of which Virgil identifies a pair of carved doors and a series of statues.⁴⁰
- 4) The people and events that those works of art represent.

We have already observed two respects in which Vergil complicates this hierarchy of (un)reality. We noted first how he confuses the boundary between the “real” topography of the Mantuan countryside (1) and the “artificial” monument that will be erected in its midst (2). Second, he concocts a curious mixture of *res gestae* and prophecy in the scenes that will be represented on the temple doors: if the representation of the conquest of Egypt at lines 28-29 is an imaginary representation of a real event (4), that of the fleeing Parthians at line 31 is an imaginary representation of an imagined future event. Line 31 thus describes a representation (3) of (future) events (4) that are of a different order from the (real) events represented (4) in lines 29-29. We might therefore further distinguish between the envisaged representation of past events (4a) and the envisaged representation of imagined future events (4b).

Finally, Virgil disturbs the boundary between levels 3 and 4 in his description of the statuary that stands before the temple proper:⁴¹

stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Ioue gentis
nomina, Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthus auctor.

⁴⁰ The chief distinction between categories 2 and 3 is that the latter concerns artifacts that represent people, places, and events.

⁴¹ But see Mynors (1990) *ad* 34: “Whether we are to imagine free-standing statues, or reliefs on the walls of the temple or its forecourt, or pedimental sculptures ... is not clear.” That they were free-standing statues is the most likely possibility.

(3.26-36)

Parian stones too will stand – statues that breathe: the descendants of Assaracus, the heroes of the race descended of Jupiter, ancestral Tros, and Cynthus, the builder of Troy.

The statues will represent Octavian's Trojan ancestors (*Assaraci proles*) together with Cynthian Apollo in his capacity as the builder of Troy.⁴² In contrast to his earlier reference to (the statue of) Caesar (*in medio mihi Caesar erit*, 16), which he had neglected explicitly to identify as a statue rather than as the man himself, Virgil appears here to remind us that in this instance we are looking not at real people, but at bits of Parian marble. He needs to remind us because those bits of marble, he assures us, look so lifelike that they may be said to breathe: they are, in the poet's words, *spirantia signa*.⁴³

Virgil, then, appears anxious to keep the artifice before our eyes: what we seem to be seeing are *signa*, not real men accompanied by a living and breathing Apollo. Yet this is plainly disingenuous, for the fact remains that we are no more looking at Virgil's lifelike pieces of marble than we are looking at old Tros himself. The works of art described and the people they portray are equally unreal, existing only in the lines we are reading. Not unlike the Britons who will appear woven into the fabric of Virgil's stage-curtain (24-25), his breathing *signa* turn out not to be physical representations, but *verbal* signifiers. Their marble is purely dactylic. What

⁴² Mynors (1990) *ad* 35-36.

⁴³ *spirantia* also occurs in the celebrated conclusion to Anchises' catalogue of future Roman heroes in *Aeneid* 6: *excudent alii spirantia mollius aera /... uiuos ducent de marmore uultus* "others shall hammer out figures of bronze that will breath more softly ... and draw living likenesses from marble" (*Aen.* 6.847-848). The parallel is an intriguing one, for many commentators have observed the resemblances between Anchises' parade of future heroes and the statuary that would adorn another Augustan monument: the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum, dedicated in 2 BC. See further Rowell (1941); Zarker (1986).

is more, the architectural context in which the statues stand is itself dactylic, a mere mental projection on the part of the poet. Only the landscape upon which Virgil has projected his virtual edifice can be said to correspond in any sense with the phenomenal world. And, as we have seen in the case of the putatively massive river Mincius, the landscape with which we are confronted in *Georgics* 3 is as much the product of the text as it is a faithful replica of the Mantuan countryside.

The novelty of the proem to *Georgics* 3 stands in a clearer light when we compare it to its earliest literary imitation: Propertius 2.31,⁴⁴ which, not coincidentally, contains a detailed description of the temple of Palatine Apollo, the monument that furnishes Virgil's non-temple with its primary model.⁴⁵ No less than Virgil, Propertius is preoccupied with the dynamics of representing physical objects in a literary medium.⁴⁶ This is how he describes the statuary that stood before Apollo's Palatine temple:⁴⁷

atque aram circum steterant armenta Myronis,
quattuor artificis, uiuida signa, boues.

(2.31.5-10)

And around the altar the herd of Myron had taken their stand, the artisan's
four cows: statues that seemed to live.

The kinship of Myron's *uiuida signa* to the *spirantia signa* of the *Georgics* is obvious.⁴⁸ Like the breathing statues of Octavian's Trojan ancestors that (do not)

⁴⁴ E.g. Wilkinson (1969) 169: "Propertius' elegy for the occasion [*sc.* the inauguration of the Danaid portico] has unmistakable echoes of Virgil's proem."

⁴⁵ On the temple of Palatine Apollo, see esp. Zanker (1983); Lefèvre (1989).

⁴⁶ See esp. A. Laird (1996), esp. 83-86: "The 'blurring' of the difference between objects and representations of objects ... is a conspicuous feature of Propertius 2.31 ..." (85).

⁴⁷ The text of that of Goold (Loeb 1990).

⁴⁸ The epigrams describing Myron's oxen in the *Anth. Pal.* (9.713-42; 793-98) are concerned above all with their lifelike qualities. Cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 34.57; Petronius 88.

appear in *Georgics* 3, Myron's cattle *seem* to be just like the real thing, but are, in fact, merely statues.⁴⁹ Yet unlike Virgil's imagined statues, those described by Propertius did indeed once stand within a very real architectural context situated upon a hill whose appearance was familiar to everyone.⁵⁰ The historical accident that the Palatine complex has almost completely disappeared presents us with a final paradox: for today's readers, Octavian's Palatine temple, together with its elaborate statuary, is no less a literary monument than the phantom temple of *Georgics* 3. For the modern reader, Octavian's statues exist solely in the elegiac couplets of Propertius:⁵¹ they no more stand on the Palatine than do the dactylic statues of Virgil on the banks of the Mincius. In this sense, Propertius' description of the temple of Palatine Apollo may be said to have passed into the realm of "notional ekphrasis."⁵²

***Punica* 6.653-715**

Since the proem to *Georgics* 3 makes a programmatic association between tectonic and literary architecture, it is to be expected that in the Latin epic tradition inaugurated by the *Aeneid*, descriptions of architectural artifacts will be privileged sites for meditation on the nature of poetic artifacts. More specifically, the proem to *Georgics* 3

⁴⁹ Laird (1996) 85 notes how the transition from Myron's cattle to the temple proper elides the distinction between representation and reality: "The previous object made of marble was an image of Phoebus (more beautiful than Phoebus himself); this marble object [*sc.* the temple] is dearer to Phoebus than his birthplace. It turns out not to be an image of anything – real temples are made of clear marble as well as toy temples or illusory statues. The word order in the poem, however, communicates to us the narrator's initial confusion. Reality can be disguised as image, just as image can be disguised as reality."

⁵⁰ Cf. Richardson (1976) 302: "As this was the most extravagant and beautiful of all early Augustan buildings, he hardly need describe it for a Roman audience, all of whom must have visited it repeatedly..."

⁵¹ And in those of Ovid, who mentions the Danaid portico adjacent to the temple at *Ars* 1.73-74 and *Tristia* 3.1.61-62.

⁵² Cf. Hollander (1988) 209: "The realm of notional ekphrasis is partially extended to include what are virtually notional – ekphrastic poems or passages in literary works which may or may not describe some actual, but totally lost, work of art. Examples of this would range from the debate over Philostratus' *Eikones* and their actual or notional status to the fact that the great majority of the paintings addressed by poems in Giambattista Martino's *La Galeria* are now lost."

teaches us to expect such passages to put greater than usual strain upon the poet's claim to provide a faithful representation of the phenomenal world. I should like now to explore a descriptive passage that, perhaps more provocatively than any other in Latin epic, engages with the opening of *Georgics* 3: the visit of Hannibal to Liternum at the end of book 6 of Silius' *Punica*.

Hannibal approaches Liternum in the aftermath of the great Punic victory at Trasimene, after he has swept south through Italy and arrived at Campania. Here he encounters a temple⁵³ decorated with scenes from the First Punic War:⁵⁴

hic dum stagnosi spectat templumque domosque
Literni ductor, uaria splendentia cernit
pictura belli patribus monumenta prioris
exhausti; nam porticibus signata manebant,
quis inerat longus rerum et spectabilis ordo.

(6.653-7)

Here, while Hannibal the general views the temple and the homes of marshy Liternum, he sees, painted in various colors on the temple porticoes, the splendid memorials of the prior war that had been fought out by the previous generation. Here was represented a long and spectacular sequence of events.

There follows a forty-line description of the temple's decorative scheme consisting of (probably) nine distinct panels⁵⁵ depicting memorable events from the First Punic War (658-97).⁵⁶ In an extended study of this passage, Don Fowler explores in some depth

⁵³ It happens that there was an important temple at Liternum, "most likely a Capitolium:" see Johannowsky, (1976).

⁵⁴ The text is that of Delz (Teubner 1987).

⁵⁵ On the probable layout of the Liternum murals, see Fowler (1996) 66; Marks (2003) 130.

⁵⁶ Note the possible allusion to Naevius, fr. 19 Morel: *inerant signa expressa* The parallel will be all the more intriguing if this fragment does indeed belong to a description of temple, as many have claimed; see esp. Barchiesi (1962) 274-75; Buchheit (1973) 23-53.

the complex play of focalization that results as the reader's perspective shifts between potential interpreters with conflicting sympathies.⁵⁷ More recently, Raymond Marks has skillfully elucidated the relationship between Silius' ekphrasis and its principal model: Aeneas' reading of the murals on the temple of Juno at Carthage in *Aeneid* 1.⁵⁸ The *reaction* of Hannibal to what he sees, however, owes rather more to the architectural fantasy at the beginning of *Georgics* 3:⁵⁹ having observed an artistic representation of the events of the First Punic War from the Roman perspective, Hannibal unveils his plans for a rival set of temple murals, to be realized in Carthage, which will tell the story of the Second Punic War from the Carthaginian perspective:⁶⁰

quae postquam infesto percensuit omnia uultu
 arridens Poenus, lenta proclamat ab ira:
 “non leuiores dabis nostris inscribere tectis
 acta meae dextrae: captam, Carthago, Saguntum
 da spectare, simul flamma ferroque ruentem;
 perfodiant patres natorum membra. nec Alpes
 exiguus domitas capiet locus; ardua celsis
 persultet iuga uictor equis Garamasque Nomasque.
addes Ticini spumantis sanguine ripas
 et nostrum Trebiam et Thrasymenni litora Tusci
 clausa cadaueribus. ruat ingens corpore et armis

⁵⁷ Fowler (1996) 57-74, esp. 65-71. On the problems of reading ekphrasis, see Fowler's seminal article (Fowler (1991)) with exhaustive bibliography.

⁵⁸ Marks (2003) 128-44. On the description of artwork in Silius, see also Frank (1974) and Augoustakis (2003).

⁵⁹ Some of the parallels between *Punica* 6 and *Georgics* 3 are noted by Fowler (1996) 72-73.

⁶⁰ The probable lexical parallels are highlighted. *domitas* in line 704 and *addes* in line 706 pick up *Georgics* 3.30 (*addam urbes Asiae domitas*). Less secure is the resemblance in sound between *flamma ferroque ruentem* at line 702 and *Georgics* 3.28 (*atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem*). Note too the allusion to the columns adorned with ships' beaks that will appear on the doors of Vergil's temple (*Georgics* 3.29) at *Punica* 6.664: *rostra gerens niuea surgebat mole columna*, noticed by Fowler (note 3 above) 67, n. 37 ("the proem to *Georgics* 3 is 'a significant ekphrastic intertext'").

Flaminius, fugiat consul manante cruore
Scipio et ad socios nati ceruice uehatur.
haec mitte in populos, et adhuc maiora dabuntur.
flagrantem effinges facibus, Carthago, Libyssis
Romam et deiectum Tarpeia rupe Tonantem.
interea uos, ut dignum est, ista, ocius ite,
o iuuenes, quorum dextris mihi tanta geruntur,
in cineres monumenta date atque inuoluite flammis.”

(6.698-716)

After the Carthaginian had critically examined all these pictures with a sneer, he proclaims in deep anger: ‘You, O Carthage, shall permit me to inscribe my own deeds, just as great as these, on a temple of ours: allow me to look upon the capture of Saguntum, overthrown alike by flame and the sword; let fathers stab the limbs of their children; nor shall a small space be reserved for the conquest of the Alps; let the victorious Garamantian and Numidian trample down the lofty peaks with their horses. You shall add to these the banks of the Ticinus foaming with blood, and the Trebia, our river, and, choked with corpses, the shores of Tuscan Trasimene. Let Flaminius, a huge man in huge armor, fall; let the wounded consul Scipio take to flight and let him be borne to his comrades on the shoulders of his own son. Show these things to the world, and there shall be greater sights yet to come. You, Carthage, shall fashion Rome herself aflame with the torches of Libya, and Jupiter the Thunderer cast down from the Tarpeian rock. Meanwhile, you soldiers, by whose hand my great deeds are achieved, make haste to do what is fitting: reduce these memorials to ashes and roll them up in flame.

Hannibal's speech falls into three obvious sections. In the first (700-10), Hannibal envisages an artistic scheme, to be realized on a temple⁶¹ at Carthage, representing his successes to date. In the second section (711-13), he imagines the representation of an event that, so he believes, lies in the near future: the Carthaginian sack of Rome. Finally, he orders his men to "roll up in flame" (*inuoluite flammis*) the *monumenta* that he has just observed at Liternum (714-16).

Before taking a closer look at the speech itself, it is worth the trouble to explore some of the broader thematic parallels that unite the proem of *Georgics* 3 with the conclusion to book 6 of the *Punica*. To begin with, there exist important similarities between Hannibal in his (so far) successful conduct of the Second Punic War and future patron of the arts on the one hand and, on the other, Octavian in his capacity as conqueror of the East, *triumphator*, and architect. Like Hannibal in 217 BC, in the early 20s BC Octavian was fresh from a series of famous military victories over (predominantly) foreign enemies.⁶² In 29, he returned to his native land, celebrated a triple triumph, and built a magnificent marble temple on the Palatine to commemorate his victories in the East. We saw earlier how the heroics of Octavian inspire the poet of *Georgics* 3 on two levels. First, the triumphal celebrations of 29 and the dedication of the temple of Palatine Apollo furnish the implicit blueprint for the metaphorical poetic triumph – complete with games and commemorative temple – that Virgil imagines himself conducting to celebrate his literary prowess; second,

⁶¹ *tecta* (701) needn't refer to a temple, but the implied parallel between the murals that Hannibal sees at Liternum and the murals that he plans for Carthage, not to mention the sustained allusion to the description of Juno's temple at Carthage in *Aen.* 1, suggests that we read it as such. *tectum/tecta* is of course a common synecdoche for temples in epic (e.g. *aurea tecta*, *Aen.* 6.13).

⁶² Cf. Balot (1998) 91: "Octavian's return to Rome is commemorated in the founding of a temple in his honour ..., which is the standard culmination of a successful military campaign. This passage surely looks to the close connection between the triumph of 29 and Augustus' temple of Palatine Apollo."

Octavian's military heroics (both past and imagined) will supply the subject matter for the adornments of that temple.

In contrast to Octavian, who by the early 20s BC has already achieved his key military victories, celebrated a triumph, and initiated his architectural program, Hannibal has yet to achieve the goal for which he came to Italy: the destruction of Rome. Indeed, Silius' reader is only too aware that when Hannibal does return to his native land, he will be in a position neither to enjoy triumphal processions nor to inaugurate building programs. As Marks has convincingly shown, the only triumph that Hannibal ends up predicting is the triumph of Scipio,⁶³ which Silius describes in book 17 (625-54) and in which Hannibal appears as an *imago*. Even the physical setting of the episode reinforces the unreality of Hannibal's dream, for Linternum is the very place to which Hannibal's conqueror will retire upon his exile from Rome in 187 BC.⁶⁴ All these factors contribute to the overriding irony that the conditions that Hannibal's artistic scheme presupposes have not been – and never will be – fulfilled.

The vatic character of Hannibal's speech assimilates him to a second protagonist of the third *Georgic*: Virgil himself. Like the poet of the *Georgics*, who, it will be recalled, imagines himself dressed in "Tyrian purple" (*Tyrio ... ostro*, 3.17) at his poetic triumph, Hannibal reacts to a highly evocative monument by detailing his plans for his own artistic scheme to be realized at an unspecified time in the future. But whereas Virgil's (implicit) model is furnished by a building that we know to have existed in Augustan Rome, the building that inspires Hannibal belongs ultimately to the text of the *Punica*. Silius goes to some lengths to signal the ultimately *literary* nature of Hannibal's imagined monument. At the beginning of his speech, Hannibal

⁶³ Marks (2003) 131-33.

⁶⁴ Cf. Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2549 (n. 43); Marks (2003) 144.

foresees his own deeds being “written into”⁶⁵ the walls of a Carthaginian temple (*nostris inscribere tectis*, 700). Later, when he finishes predicting the representations of his victories in the Second Punic War to date, Hannibal foresees the representation of greater things still: *maiora*⁶⁶ (*et adhuc maiora dabuntur*, 711). The recollection of Virgil’s *maius opus*, prophesized at the center⁶⁷ of the *Aeneid*, the poetic edifice that most commentators identify with the tectonic edifice described in *Georgics* 3, is unmistakable. Silius thus intimates that like Virgil’s song-temple, Hannibal’s temple and its decorations are, for all their vividness, ultimately about poetic art. Fowler notes too that “[t]he resumptive *interea* [714] ... recalls not only the recall to present concerns of *Georgics* 3.40, but also the way that movement became basic to the rhetoric of *recusatio* in Augustan poetry.”⁶⁸ Finally, should we have missed the meta-literary tone of the passage, Hannibal concludes by insisting that the *monumenta* he has just viewed be “rolled up” (*inuoluite*) in flame, a word that suggests to the reader the ultimately literary character of the “real” temple at Liternum.

Let us now take a more detailed look at the scenes that Hannibal envisages being “written” into his Carthaginian temple. In the first section of his speech, Hannibal fantasizes⁶⁹ about representing pictorially what we have just read in the first five books of the *Punica*: the capture of Saguntum (narrated in *Punica* 1 and 2), the passage over the Alps (*Punica* 3), the battles of the Ticinus and the Trebia (*Punica* 4),

⁶⁵ Cf. Aeneas’ incomplete “reading” of the temple-doors at Cumae in *Aeneid* 6: *quin protinus omnia / perlegerent oculis* “they would have read with their gaze the whole story” (6.33-34).

⁶⁶ Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 5.568, of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum: *et uisum lecto Caesare maius opus*. Cf. Fowler (1996) 72; Fowler also notes how “[t]he resumptive *interea*, (‘in the meanwhile, for the present’) recalls not only the recall to present concerns of *Georgics* 3.40, but also the way that movement became basic to the rhetoric of *recusatio* in Augustan poetry...” (72-73).

⁶⁷ As a matter of fact, at the precise center of the *Aeneid* in terms of line numbers stands another *tempus*: the *regia Pici*; see Bleisch (2003) 94-95; Thomas (2004) 130.

⁶⁸ Fowler (1996) 72-73.

⁶⁹ For Silius’ Hannibal, “visualizing success” is something of habit. When he first appears in *Punica* 1, we learn that he is given to lying awake at night fantasizing about storming the Capitol and traversing the Alps (*iamque aut nocturno penetrat Capitolia uisu / aut rapidis fertur per summas passibus Alpes*, 64-65).

and the crushing Punic victory at Lake Trasimene (*Punica* 5). Finally, Hannibal foresees the representation of still greater events (*maiora*, 711) that, he hopes, lie in the future: the sack of Rome, and, rather amusingly, the ejection of Jupiter himself from the Tarpeian Rock.

While the execution of the first part of Hannibal's artistic scheme will prove impossible, there is nothing fantastical about its subject matter. It has all the unimpeachable authority of Silius himself,⁷⁰ whose first five books are effectively the *literary* realization of Hannibal's architectural fantasy. Hannibal never will build the temple of his dreams, but his vision already exists as a literary *monumentum*: the first third of the *Punica* of Silius Italicus. In this sense, his vision stands in roughly the same relationship to the first five books of the already written *Punica* as does Virgil's temple to the envisioned epic of *Georgics* 3, with the important difference that from the perspective of the *Georgics*, no such poem yet exists. Although Hannibal's artwork will never be realized in the form that he anticipates, his vision, at least in part, has already come into being through the hexameters of Silius.

In the next section of his speech (711-713), Hannibal foresees what he considers to be the logical conclusion of his exploits to date: the Carthaginian sack of Rome. If the first part of Hannibal's gallery features real events that will never be represented artistically, the second contains events that, from the perspective of the narrative, exist only potentially in the future. In terms of the typology formulated above for the *Georgics*, the first and second sections of Hannibal's murals belong to categories **4a** and **4b** respectively. Indeed, the curious mixture of *facta atque infecta* that characterizes the proem to *Georgics* 3 is the most important precedent for this aspect of Hannibal's speech. Readers of the *Punica*, however, know from the very fact that they are reading Hannibal's words in Latin that those events will never occur:

⁷⁰ Not to mention Livy, who covers these events in books 21-22 of his history.

they belong to the realm of possible worlds, but not this one. Hannibal thus concludes by fantasizing about an event that will never occur being depicted in an decorative scheme that will never be realized. The logic of Virgil's description in *Georgics* 3, it would appear, has reached its furthest limit.

Let us pause to peel back the successive strata of (un)reality with which Silius has layered his narrative. At the totally fantastical end of the scale, the sack of Rome by Carthage and the ejection of Jupiter from the Capitol, events that will neither happen nor, *a fortiori*, be represented in pictorial art in Carthage. Slightly less fanciful are the events of the Second Punic War up to and including the battle at Lake Trasimene, events which have indeed occurred – and have already been memorialized in the first five books of the poem we are reading – but which will never be represented artistically in Carthage. Both of these imagined arcades stand implicitly in opposition to what Silius assures us is the very solid temple before which Hannibal stands, a building described as containing a fully realized artistic scheme memorializing real events. Yet the ultimate fate of the temple - to be burned by Hannibal's soldiers at the end of book 6 - reminds us that in the first century AD the building and its artistic scheme was not available for Silius' perusal. It has no more basis in reality than does the mental arcade of Hannibal.⁷¹ Indeed, none of our other sources for the Second Punic War so much as mentions Linternum among the towns subjected by Hannibal.⁷² The building that Silius' Hannibal sees there is, in the final analysis, yet another literary temple decorated with an artistic scheme that exists only

⁷¹ As Fowler (1996) 73 observes: "None of these pictures exist [sic]: not only is Hannibal's fantasy unfulfilled, but he will never get to inscribe his juvenilia in Rome or Carthage and we know full well that the Roman pictures he abominates were never around. All this is imaginary, not 'real', ekphrasis." Unfortunately, Fowler doesn't draw out the conclusions of his observation.

⁷² Cf. Ahl, Davis, and Pomerey (1986) 2549 (n. 43): "Not only is the destruction of the paintings unparalleled in any of our other sources; Linternum is not even among the towns Hannibal overran during his occupation of Italy. In short, the story is possibly Silius' invention."

in words: small wonder that Silius should represent Hannibal demanding that it be rolled up like a scroll (*inuoluite*, 716).

Virgil is explicit about the unreality of the building he describes at the beginning of *Georgics* 3. Quite apart from being a metaphor for a literary *monumentum*, it is a building that, on the poet's own admission, does not yet exist. Since there is no pretense that Vergil's temple - any more than the lifelike but ultimately artificial statues that (do not) stand before it - exists in the phenomenal world, readers have little choice but to confront the unreality of what they (do not) see. At the end of *Punica* 6 Silius dramatizes the same dilemma, but in such a way as to render both more complex and more acute the difficulties precipitated by the *Georgics* 3 ekphrasis. He does this in two ways. First, he embeds the structure of the proem to *Georgics* 3 within his own narrative: whereas in the *Georgics* the architectural vision belongs to the narrating voice, in *Punica* 6 Silius dramatizes Hannibal observing one *monumentum* and envisaging another. In so doing, Silius juxtaposes a notional ekphrasis of a building whose substantiality is corroborated by the text with a notional ekphrasis of a building that is expressly the figment of a protagonist's imagination. To this distinction between architecture real and imagined there corresponds an analogous contrast between *res gestae* (the genuinely historical events memorialized in *Punica* 1-5) and deeds that have not - indeed, will never - come to pass. The fact that Hannibal will neither sack Rome nor, *a fortiori*, represent that event on a temple in Carthage puts enormous pressure on the conventions of notional ekphrasis. The vividness with which Hannibal's imaginary gallery, for all its egregious unreality, appears before the reader's imagination calls into question the ontological status of the temple-murals that, Silius assures us, were once available for Hannibal's perusal. In the last resort,

we are left with the text of the *Punica*, a literary *monumentum* that memorializes flights of the imagination alongside buildings of stone.

Chapter two

Aeneid 1

In chapter one, we observed that in the proem to *Georgics 3*, Virgil makes two demands on his readers: 1) that we consider his literary monument as a poetic temple; 2) that we acknowledge architecture as the dominant epic metaphor for poetic art and for art in general. In this chapter I should like to take Virgil at his word and undertake a reading of a single book of the *Aeneid* – book 1, the *fundamentum* of the poem – from two perspectives. I shall examine its role as part of the poetic architecture of the *Aeneid*. I shall also explore the deployment of Virgil’s building/poetry metaphor within the book itself. Such an study will show that there exists in *Aeneid 1* a systematic meditation on the nature of narrative and representative art conducted with the metaphorical framework devised in the proem to *Georgics 3*.

Because the *Aeneid* purports to identify its own narrative with the narrative of (Augustan) history,¹ however, the possibility arises that there exist alternative narratives.² The fact that the only city shown to be under construction in this ktistic poem is Carthage suggests that it is the Punic narrative of Juno,³ rather than the Roman narrative of Jupiter, that is likely to succeed. What appears to be merely a formalist problem of narrative, that is to say, becomes a central *ideological* preoccupation of the poem, one that is explored largely through the question: “Who will build the city destined to rule the world?” In *Aeneid 1*, the success of Dido as a civic architect implies that an alternative narrative of history threatens to impose itself within Virgil’s apparently Augustan epic.

¹ Programmatically in the proem: *genus unde Latinum / Albanique patres atque altae moenia Rome* “from these beginnings arose the Latin race, the fathers of Alba, and the walls of lofty Rome” (1.6-7).

² Cf. Fowler (1997) 259-62.

³ Cf. Fowler (1997) 259: “Scarcely ... has Virgil got going on the story when he is interrupted by Juno, complaining at the idea that she has to give up on *her* tale” (1.37-39).

The unity of the *Aeneid* may be defined as architectural rather than Aristotelian.⁴ It is a highly episodic poem, but one whose episodes are arranged, like corresponding panels on a temple frieze, in such a way as to create an overall impression of coherence and unity.⁵ Commentators have always been aware of the various symmetries that define the poem's structure.⁶ Not only has the poem been usefully divided into halves (books 1-6, 7-12) and thirds (1-4, 5-8, 9-12), but commentators have also noted correspondences between pairs of books from different halves of the poem (e.g. 1 and 7; 2 and 8).⁷ The overall effect is to undermine the linear drive of the narrative and suggest that the reader consider the poem synoptically, as a unified whole whose parts correspond in patterned and meaningful ways.⁸ On a more subjective level, the *Aeneid* is characterized by considerable less "realistic" detail than are the Homeric poems, whether in terms of physical setting or dialogue. The episodes of the *Aeneid* undeniably possess an "artificial," static, pictorial quality that renders them easily conceptualized as artistic tableaux in a way that the *Odyssey*, for example, cannot.

Architectural descriptions and metaphors occur at strategic places within Virgil's epic monument. In the proem that begins the second half of the *Aeneid* (7.37-

⁴ Camps (1969) 58-59. Cf. Doob (1990) 247 ponders: "Perhaps ... Virgil favored ornately pattered structure as a metaphorical defense against and response to the confusions and uncertainties of his world."

⁵ Doob (1990) 246 highlights the specifically *labyrinthine* character of the poem: "Beginning *in medias res*, the poem constantly winds backward and forward in time, not only in narrative chronology but also in the patterns of retold histories, prophecies, and fulfillments. As in a maze, the same ground is retraced time and again, literally and metaphorically, and while there is undoubtedly linear progress, cyclical patterns also emerge."

⁶ For useful summaries of the structural symmetries and correspondences of the *Aeneid* and the Virgilian corpus as a whole, see Otis (1964) 215-18 and *passim*; Crabb (1978-80); Hardie (1998) 86-90.

⁷ Cf. Otis (1964) 217-18: "The deliberate parallelism between 1 and 7, 4 and 10, 5 and 9, 6 and 8 is quite unmistakable: thus 7 reproduces, inversely, the order of 1; 4 and 10 contain the two major tragedies of the poem (Dido, Pallas); 5 and 9 reveal a whole series of correspondences ...; 6 and 8 each culminate in a major revelation of the Roman future."

⁸ Doob (1990) 246 sees this phenomenon in labyrinthine terms: "the poem is highly artificial and labyrinthine in its symmetries, particularly in its use of ring structure, concentric panels (in which the narrative leads to a central point and then retraces its steps outward), and interlace."

45), Virgil announces the onset of a *maius opus* (“a greater work”) to match the more elevated subject matter that he will now be treating (*maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, / maius opus moueo* “a greater series of events is arising now before me; I am undertaking a greater work,” 7.44-45). The architectural resonances of *opus* are obvious, and the conflation of architectural and poetic meanings that the word makes possible here finds many parallels in Augustan poetry.⁹ Virgil’s “proem in the middle”¹⁰ also corresponds to the proem in the middle of *Georgics* 3, which also concerns the erection of a literary monument, albeit one that would not appear in the same poem.

The description of the song-temple itself, however, finds its parallel in the *Aeneid* not in the proem to book 7, but rather in the description of the *regia Pici*, which occurs 170 lines into the book (170-191). Although the literary poem and architectonic monument – one and the same in *Georgics* 3 – are here separated, commentators have noted that in terms of line numbers, the description of Latinus’ palace appears at precise center of the *Aeneid*.¹¹ Since the song-temple of the *Georgics* appears not only in the middle of the *Georgics*, but also at the center of the Virgilian corpus,¹² it is surely more than a curiosity that we find another august temple

⁹ In the first poem of his fourth book, for example, Propertius creates an analogy between the “rising” of his subject matter as he begins to sing of Rome and its origins (*Roma, faue, tibi surgit opus* “Rome, be propitious, for this work rises up in your honor,” 4.1.62) and the founding of a city: immediately after mentioning the growth of the Roman walls, the poet describes his project as *disponere uersu* (“to found in verse,” 4.1.57) the walls of Rome. In the *Fasti* Ovid’s Romulus uses the same words when praying to the gods to assist him in the foundation of Rome (*hoc mihi surgat opus* “may this undertaking of mine rise upwards,” *Fasti* 4.830), as does the poet himself when he announces the growth of his poetic project (*ab Ioue surgat opus* “may my undertaking arise from Jupiter,” *Fasti* 5.111). See Masters (1992) 33-34; Barchiesi (1993) 59.

¹⁰ On the concept of the “proem in the middle,” see Conte (1992).

¹¹ Cf. Bleisch (2003) 94-95: “In fact, the midpoint of the epic (in the edition of Mynors) comes at line 194;” Thomas (1983b) 175-84.

¹² Which is to say, it appears in the center of the second of Virgil’s three canonical poems.

in the precise center of Virgil's epic monument. The nodal points of Virgil's poetic architecture, in other words, are marked by descriptions of physical monuments.¹³

Aeneid 1 is programmatically obsessed with building.¹⁴ The proem (1-7) identifies the goal of the *Aeneid* as the arrival of the poem's eponymous *uir* in Latium, the imposing of his gods, and the construction of his city (*dum conderet urbem* "before he could found a city," 5). From this act of city building arose (*unde*) the Latin race, the kings of Alba Longa, and the walls of the city:¹⁵ Rome herself (6-7). More emphatically still, the proem concludes by explicitly identifying the telos of the poem as the founding (*condere*) of the Roman people (*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* "so great an undertaking was it to lay the foundation of the Roman race," 33). That act of foundation, moreover, is called as *moles*, a word commonly used for massive architectural undertakings.

Due to the military success of Aeneas' venture, and the political success of his descendant, the narrative of Virgil's ktistic poem may be identified with that of Jupiter (or the Fates). In line 12, however, the reader is introduced to an ancient *urbs* (*urbs antiqua fuit* "there was once an ancient city") that is not Rome, but rather a city founded by colonists from Tyre (*Tyrri tenuere coloni* "colonists from Tyre held it"). The introduction of *Karthago* in line 13 is jarring: having introduced itself as a poem about one *urbs*, the *Aeneid* proceeds to narrate the history of another. As the proem continues, it turns out that if Juno were to have her way, the narrative of history (and of the *Aeneid*) would be about the triumph of *her* city. True, she has heard

¹³ Commentators have often noted descriptions of artwork at critical junctures of the *Aeneid*; see e.g. Putnam (1998a) 10: "Virgilian ekphrases always occur at crucial moments of intersection in the text, even on the most literal level, as Aeneas meets Dido, for instance, or prepares to enter the Underworld, or accepts the destiny of Rome as summarized on Vulcan's shield. But the resulting friction, as we pursue the act of criticism through differentiated ways of reading, is vital for our comprehension of the poem as a whole."

¹⁴ On the thematic role of building throughout the *Aeneid*, see Fowler (1997) 260-61.

¹⁵ Mills (1983) 38 observes that in book 3 and elsewhere "city walls become a metonymy for the promised land and a symbol for the continuation of the Trojan line."

(*audierat*, 20) the Trojan narrative,¹⁶ according to which the *arces* of Carthage are fated to be destroyed by its rival city (*Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces* “which will one day topple the citadels of Tyre,” 20), but that only makes her the more determined to see her own narrative prevail (22-32).¹⁷

What is at stake in the *Aeneid*, then, is which race – that of Troy or of Phoenicia – will build the world-city.¹⁸ In the proem, this contest presents itself as a rivalry between two competing narratives: that of Jupiter (or the Fates) and that of Juno. The city that is shown to be under construction in *Aeneid* 1, therefore, is nothing less than the architectonic realization of Dido’s narrative. The question of which narrative prevails is thus closely bound up with the question of who manages to build a city and, ultimately, who governs the world. In *Aeneid* 1, formalist questions of narrative thus prove inseparable from broader questions of history and political ideology.

After Neptune calms the storm with precipitated by Juno, the remnants of the Trojan fleet make for the nearest shore:

est in successu longo locus: insula portum
efficit obiectu laterum, quibus omnis ab alto
frangitur inque sinus scindit sese unda reductos.
hinc atque hinc uastae rupes geminique minantur
in caelum scopuli, quorum sub uertice late

¹⁶ Cf. Fowler (1997) 259: “from the beginning we meet other storytellers within the poem: the Muse who tells [Virgil] the causes of events (1.8), the anonymous narrator who told Juno of the plot before it even began . . . , the script of the Fates (1.260) based – or is it the other way round? – on a treatment by Jupiter himself, the Master Narrator of all.”

¹⁷ Scholars are fond of noting that the first two syllables that Juno utters in the poem (*men(e) incepto*, 1.37) appears to echo the first word of the *Iliad*: μήνιν; see Levitan (1993) 14-15; Fowler (1997) 260.

¹⁸ On Virgil’s presentation of Roman history as an inveterate contest between two races (or genealogical lines), see esp. Kellum (1985); Hannah (2004).

aequora tuta silent; tum siluis scaena coruscis
desuper, horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbra.

(159-66)

There is a place within a deep recess: an island creates a port by the barrier formed by its sides, against which every wave from the deep is broken and divides itself into rebounding ripples. On this side and that massive rocks and twin peaks rise menacingly towards the sky, underneath whose summit far and wide the safe waters keep their peace. Then, above, a stage design of coruscating woods, a black grove threatening with its bristling shade.

Having been blown far off course to the coast of Libya (*Libyae uertuntur ad oras*, 158), the Trojans have the good fortune to come to land at a postcard perfect harbor.

The passage inspired one of Servius' more incisive observations:

topothesia est, id est fictus secundum poeticam licentiam locus. ne autem uideatur penitus a ueritate discedere, Hispaniensis Carthaginis portum descripsit. ceterum hunc locum in Africa nusquam esse constat, nec incongrue propter nominis similitudinem posuit. nam topographia rei uerae descriptio.

(ad *Aen.* 1.159)

This is a τοποθεσία, which is to say, a place fabricated according to the laws of poetic license. Yet lest he appear to stray too far from the truth, he described the port of Carthage in Spain. For the rest, it is clear that this place exists nowhere in Africa, nor, thanks to the similarity of the name, is it inconsistent for him put it there. For τοπογραφία is the description of real things.

Servius distinguishes between two terms, *topothesia* and *topographia*, both of which are used to refer to literary descriptions of places. According to Servius, *topothesia* is a *fictus locus*, a place (or literary passage) fabricated according to the tenants of poetic license (*poetica licentia*). A *topographia*, by contrast, is a verbal description of something real (*rei uerae descriptio*).

Servius is under no illusions as to which category our present passage belongs: it is clear (*constat*), he maintains, that such a place is nowhere to be found in Africa.¹⁹ Which is not to say that Virgil has created the entire scene purely out of his own imagination. On the contrary, Servius insists that Virgil has described the harbor of the other Carthage, namely the New Carthage in Spain (Cartageña). Descriptions of the harbor of Carthago Noua by Polybius and Livy, both of which mention the island that furnishes the city with a calm anchorage, strongly suggest that Servius' claim to be taken seriously.²⁰

Servius implies that Virgil's motivation for describing the harbor of Spanish Carthage in *Aeneid* one was determined by two distinct factors. First, for all that he was unabashed about creating a patently *fictus locus* in describing the Trojans' landfall in Africa, Virgil was reluctant wholly to abandon verisimilitude in his descriptions of topography (*ne uideatur penitus a ueritate discedere*). The second motivation adduced by Servius has to do with the similarity of nomenclature: because of the similarity in the names of the two cities, the incongruity of describing a Spanish city in Africa is somewhat mitigated (*nec incongrue propter nominis similitudinem posuit*). Both of these claims are worth examining in turn.

¹⁹ However, see Austin (1971) *ad* 159 concerning attempts to make Virgil's description fit the Tunisian coast.

²⁰ Polybius 10.10.2; Livy 26.42.7-8: *huius in ostio sinus parua insula obiecta ab alto portum ab omnibus uentis praeterquam Africo tutum facit* "at the entrance of this bay a small island stands before the open sea keeping the port safe from all winds save the south-west."

Servius' observation about Virgil's unwillingness to create the visual world of the poem *ex nihilo* – however open he was about creating a fictional narrative – affords an important insight into how the physical world is represented in the *Aeneid*. Servius does rather more than simply acknowledge the truism that Virgil “has made a ‘literary’ harbour, a compound of Homer and his own poetic insight of what such a place should be.”²¹ In making such an observation, Servius, I suggest, recognizes two vital elements of Virgil's compositional technique. First, like all creators of fictional narrative, Virgil is necessarily obliged to create his fictive world out of the raw material afforded him in the “real” world. More specifically, Servius acknowledges that in contrast to the *Odyssey*, Virgil's mythological narrative is set within a physical world familiar to the poet's readers. The verifiable physical reality of Italy and the western Mediterranean, that is to say, provides the physical theatre within Virgil's drama is staged.

Physical topography therefore provides a vital point of continuity between the vanished world of Virgil's protagonists and that of his Roman readers. The (relatively few) physical buildings described in the *Aeneid* that may, theoretically, be considered still extant in the Augustan age provide another. In *Aeneid* 8, when describing the familiar topography of Rome as an unfamiliar bucolic hamlet, Virgil creates for his readers a synchronic palimpsest of old and new Rome. Servius' observation chimes with a central thesis of my dissertation: that Virgil uses physical topography and man-made monuments in order to problematize the relationship between the world of the poet and the world of his poetry. The fact that this observation was made by an

²¹ Austin (1971) *ad* 159: “He is right: Virgil's harbour is imaginary, Homeric in certain details, but essentially Virgilian. Homer had made harbour-descriptions an ingredient in the epic scene: there is the harbour of the Cyclopes, the Laestrygonian harbour, and the harbour of Phorcys in Ithaca., all three with some features in common. Virgil has made a ‘literary’ harbour, a compound of Homer and his own poetic insight of what such a place should be, a place of peace and protection and beauty for the exhausted Trojans.”

ancient commentator strongly suggests that such considerations were a live concern for the poets of antiquity.

Servius' second claim – that the incongruence of locating a Spanish port in Africa is mitigated by the fact that Carthage lent its name to its European progeny – is rather more startling, and rather less convincing. There is, however, some evidence for Servius' thesis to be found in the text. Scarcely a hundred lines later, when he relates how Mercury was dispatched by Jupiter to sure the Carthaginians receive the Trojans hospitably, Virgil himself will call Dido's new city Cartageña:²² *ut terrae utque nouae pateant Karthaginis arces / hospitio Teucris* (“in order that the region and the citadels of New Carthage lie open to the Teucrians in hospitality,” 298-99). Venus, too, will insist on the newness of Carthage in her account to Aeneas of the founding of the city (*cernes / ... surgentemque nouae Karthaginis arcem* “you will see ... the rising citadel of New Carthage,” 365-66). If we read the text literally, the harbor described in lines 159-69 is indeed the port of Carthago Noua. The assimilation of names between the two Carthages supports Servius' contention and suggests that the striking similarities between Virgil's poetic harbor in *Aeneid* 1 and the Spanish harbor described in book 26 of Livy. The implicit transposition of the harbor of the Nova Carthago to its mother city implies a displacement within space, but also within time: Virgil “models” his Libyan harbor on the port of a city that, at the time of his narrative, does not yet exist.

In this instance, too, whether or not we find Servius' argument about the specific model for Virgil's *portus* is less important than the fact that an ancient commentator recognized such a procedure as a defining characteristic of Virgil's poetic technique. Not only are Virgil's descriptions, Servius suggests, a studied

²² He appears also, as Servius acknowledges, to be alluding the Punic etymology of Carthage: *Carthago enim est lingua Poenorum noua ciuitas* “for according to the Phoenician language, Carthage means ‘New City.’”

mixture of pure fancy, literary (chiefly Homeric) allusion, and the physical reality of the contemporary world, but they also demand reflection on precisely how the world of poetry is generated out of the world of the poet and his readers.

Given the studiedly literary quality of Virgil's Libyan harbor, it is appropriate that he should refer to its sylvan backdrop as a *scaena* (*tum siluis scaena coruscis / desuper horrentisque atrum nemus imminet umbra*, 164-65). The metaphor is a clever one, for a *scaena* is properly a fabricated pictorial representation of real landscape or buildings designed to lend verisimilitude to dramatic productions. Here, the "real" backdrop to Virgil's harbor is so vivid that it looks like an artistic imitation of real landscape. Which, of course, is what it is. The effect of Virgil's bold metaphor – which, as Austin notes,²³ has no parallel in classical Latin – is twofold: to provide an oblique commentary upon the theatrical character of the Aeneas' sojourn in Carthage, and to highlight the problem of how physical objects are represented in fictional narrative. Both problems, I suggest, are treated systematically throughout the first book of the *Aeneid*.

"Scenery" of this sort is explicitly mentioned by Vitruvius as decorating the villas of Virgil's day (*portus, promunturia, litora ... luci* "harbors, promontories, shores ... groves," 7.5.2), a fact that adds a further dimension to the questions of representation and reality that it precipitates.²⁴ If the effect of Virgil's description is indeed to recall the mural decorations familiar to his audience, we are also obliged to consider questions of viewing pictorial art together with that of literary representation. The evocation of wall painting at the start of the Carthaginian episode, too, anticipates

²³ Cf. Austin (1971) *ad* 161: "[Virgil] has transferred *scaena* from its normal use to describe background 'scenery', an original idea which has no parallel in classical Latin. He seems to wish to stress the almost theatrically spectacular appearance of this line of trees on the cliff ..."

²⁴ Cf. Austin (1971) *ad* 164 and Schefold (1952) 162 with pl. 5.

the walls and buildings of “new” Carthage and, specifically, the very literary murals that decorate the principal temple of that city (441-93).

Many critics have noted the theatrical quality of Venus’ apparition before Aeneas when he and Achates explore the hinterland:²⁵ not only is she wearing the buskin (*uirginibus Tyriis mos est ... / purpureoque alte suras uincire cothurno* “‘tis the custom for Tyrian maidens ... to bind their calves high up with the purple buskin,” 336-37), but her narrative of Dido’s adventures is often read as a dramatic prologue in the Euripidean manner to the drama that will shortly unfold in Carthage.²⁶

When she introduces her son to the story of Dido, Venus insists that owing to the labyrinthine character of events in Tyre, her narrative will not be exhaustive. Instead, she says that she will detail merely the essential details of a great mass of material: *longa est iniuria, longae / ambages; sed summa sequar fastigia rerum* (“long is the tale of her wrongs, long its windings; but I shall follow the topmost heights of the events,” 341-42). Venus’ distinction corresponds roughly to the modern narratological distinction between *fabula*, the set of possible events to be narrated, and the *narratio*, the arrangement of those events into a narrative.²⁷ What is most striking, however, is her characterization of the subject matter of her tale as an architectonic structure, identifying her tale with the “topmost heights,” or the “gable,” of a larger structure: the *res* that make up the totality of Dido’s history. There is no parallel in classical Latin for the use of *fastigia* to describe the salient points of a narrative, but Venus’ use of architectonic terminology to characterize her narrative art is wholly in keeping with the metaphorical economy established in the *Georgics* 3 proem.

²⁵ Notably Harrison (1972-73); see also Hardie (1997) 321-22.

²⁶ E.g. Hardie (1997) 322: “it is as if Virgil has rolled into one the opening and closing epiphanies in the *Hippolytus*, Aphrodite in the prologue and Artemis as *dea ex machina*.”

²⁷ The narratological terminology appearing in this chapter broadly follows Genette (1983).

The long and winding *ambages* that characterize Dido's history, moreover, are suggestive of a particular kind of structure: the Cretan Labyrinth, whose *ambages* Daedalus will be said to have unraveled in *Aeneid* 6 (*Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit*, 6.29). The resemblance between Daedalus' Labyrinth and the narrative of Dido's history thus further eases the interchange between the architectonic and narrative structures that so characterizes *Aeneid* 1 as a whole. More specifically, it suggests that the narrative edifice formed by Dido's history be conceived not as a conventional building, but as a textual labyrinth.²⁸ Within that narrative itself (343-68), moreover, there appears another labyrinthine edifice: Venus describes Pygmalion's crime, revealed to Dido by the ghost of her husband Sychaeus "the blind abomination of the house" (*caecumque domus scelus omne retexit*, 536). As Doob has it, "Venus describes Dido's *ambages*, a story involving blind impiety, the concealing and then unweaving (*retexit*) of the blind crime of her house."²⁹

Aeneas betrays a similar preoccupation with excess *materia* in his response to his mother's speech, remarking that if he were to begin his tale from the very beginning, and if she had the leisure to listen to the full chronicle (*annales*) of his labors, the day would end before his story: *si prima repetens ab origine pergam, / et uacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum, / ante diem clauso componet Vesper Olympo* "if I were to set out, beginning from the earliest origins, and there were time to listen to the annals of our labors, the Olympus would first be closed and the evening would lay the day to rest(372-74). Aeneas' chief concern is to communicate the enormity of his *labores* to date, but he too seems preoccupied with the narratological problem of *duration*.³⁰ He betrays, that is to say, a theoretician's concern with the relationship

²⁸ On "textual labyrinths" in ancient literature, see esp. Doob (1990) 68-93.

²⁹ Doob (1990) 230 (n. 8). Doob argues further that the "collocation of blindness, crime, a house, and weaving connotes a labyrinth." On labyrinths and the Cretan myth elsewhere in the *Aeneas*, see Doob (1990) 225-53.

³⁰ I refer to the formulation of Genette; see Genette (1983) esp. 86-112, with Genette (1988).

between the duration of the events to be narrated and the duration of the act of narration itself. In the case of his own sufferings, Aeneas insists that to narrate them exhaustively would be impractical. Like Venus, Aeneas must be selective in what he tells. Accordingly, he makes a distinction between the sum of his *labores*, which are characterized as a master-text (*annales*, 373), and the necessarily restricted oral narrative that he is about to deliver. Should we choose to acknowledge an allusion to the *Annales* of Ennius, we might compare Virgil's synecdochic treatment of Roman history with the strictly chronological format of the former: as with Virgil, Aeneas lets the part tell the whole.

What Aeneas articulates in literary terms, Venus expresses architectonically. The tale that Venus is about to tell will constitute merely the topmost pediment (*summa fastigia*) of a larger structure (*res*). Whereas the unabridged version of Aeneas' adventures is characterized as a long literary work (*annales*), the "complete works" of Dido's history must be envisaged as a monument whose *fastigia* will be described by Venus. However "natural and expressive" Venus' expression may appear, it has, as Austin reminds us, "no classical parallel."³¹ If it seems unobtrusive to Virgil's readers, that is because we have been conditioned to think in terms of the architectonic poetics articulated by the Virgilian corpus itself.

Having finished his story and parted from his mother, Aeneas goes on his way, enveloped in cloud, eventually taking up position on a hill overlooking the Carthage (418-20). From here he observes the construction of the new city:

miratur molem Aeneas, magalia quondam,
miratur portas strepitumque et strata uiarum.

³¹ Austin (1971) *ad* 342: "**fastigia**: 'main points,' 'headings.' This use (very natural and expressive, in view of the literal meaning) has no classical parallel." However, Austin goes on to compare Commodianus, *Apol.* 523: *ego non tota, sed summa fastigia carpo* "I don't undertake the whole, but rather the principal headings."

instant ardentem Tyrii: pars ducere muros,
moliri que arcem manibusque subuoluerunt saxa,
pars optare locum tecto et concludere sulco;
iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum.
hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris
fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
rupibus excudunt, scaenis decora apta futuris
(1.421-29)

Aeneas marvels at the sheer bulk of the buildings that once had been mere huts, he marvels at the gates and the bustle and the streets. The zealous Tyrians press on with their work: while some build lengths of walls, erect the citadel, and roll up rocks from below, others choose a fitting place for buildings and close it in with a furrow; they are passing laws and selecting magistrates and a sacred senate. Here some are digging out the port; there others are putting in place the foundations of a theatre, and cutting enormous columns out from the rock that they might be a fit adornment for the stage that is to be.

Before the middle of the first book of the *Aeneid*, the reader is confronted with a city under construction: not that of the city destined to be founded by Aeneas (*dum conderet urbem*, 1.5), but rather that of the *urbs antiqua* introduced in line 12, the city destined to be Rome's great rival for global supremacy (12-22). We observed above that because the *Aeneid* is a poem about the building of a city, there is a natural correspondence between the *moles* of the Roman mission and the *opus* of the *Aeneid*. Things, however, seem to go awry. Instead of the founding of Rome, we are made to witness the foundation of the city that would become her greatest enemy. We appear

to be reading the wrong poem, a poem whose patron deity is not Jupiter, but rather his consort.³²

For Aeneas, the sight of another set of exiles building *their* city is almost too much to bear: ‘*o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!*’, / *Aeneas ait et fastigia suspicit urbis* “‘How fortunate are those whose city-walls are already rising!’ Aeneas said, and looked up at the pediments of the city” (437-38). The *fastigia urbis* at which Aeneas gazes admiringly, of course, are the pediments of the individual buildings presently under construction.³³ The metonymic shift by which the *urbs* stands for the sum of the individual buildings reinforces the link with the last use of the word *fastigia* a mere hundred lines earlier (*sed summa sequar fastigia rerum*, 342). On that occasion, Venus had used a bold architectonic metaphor to articulate the necessity of narrating only the salient details (*fastigia*) of a larger potential narrative made up of the sum of events experienced by Dido (*res*). The *fastigia* are, literally, the pediments of the buildings that make up the *urbs* that is both the civic project of Dido and the architectonic manifestation of Juno’s narrative of history.³⁴ Whereas Venus compares her monologue to the pediment of a building (or, on the analogy of line 438, a plurality of buildings), the poet refers here to the pediments of the buildings that are the architectonic manifestation of the poem’s alternative narrative. This assimilation of narrative and civic undertakings invests the apparently formalistic questions of narrative with a thematic significance close to the heart of the poem.

³² Cf. Henry (1986) 28: “Part of Aeneas’ duty, if he is to build a city, will be to set up his own monuments, as Dido has done in her city of Carthage. His tears, when he sees the paintings on the temple wall there, are shed not only because their subjects remind him of his own past suffering, but also because he longs to build as Dido has done, and has yet received no divine guidance of a clear or specific kind.”

³³ On the use of *fastigia* in *Aeneid* 1, see esp. Deuling (1997) 106-7.

³⁴ Cf. Deuling (1997) 106.

The sight of the impressive civic buildings that are under construction elicits from the poet (or perhaps, tacitly, from Aeneas himself)³⁵ the observation that those buildings had once upon a time been mere *magalia*, African shepherds huts (*magalia quondam*, 421).³⁶ Like Evander's Ur-Rome, Punic Carthage is not being created *ex nihilo*, but is being constructed upon an earlier, primitive settlement of natives. When Mercury visits Carthage in book 4, however, he said to touch the city's *magalia* with the soles of his feet (*ut primum alatis tetigit magalia plantis* "as soon as he touched the shepherds' huts with his winged feet," 4.259). Since it is clear that at least some *magalia* are still standing, we must either assume that the periphery of Carthage remains rustic, or that certain areas have yet to be "renovated." While the present incarnation of Carthage may indeed be "new," it is clear that the site, like that of Rome, has had a history of settlement prior to the arrival of Dido's Phoenicians.³⁷

The first thing that Mercury sees is Aeneas himself laying the foundations for the new city's fortresses and renovating (*nouantem*) its houses (*Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta nouantem / conspicit*, 4.260-61). When he chides Aeneas for building the wrong city, Mercury echoes the languages of the poet himself in his original description of the city: '*tu nunc Karthaginis altae / fundamenta locas* "now you are laying the foundations of high Carthage" (1.265-66; cf. 1.428: *fundamenta locant alii*, of the theatre). Having taking charge of the city's *fundamenta*, too, Aeneas has presumably made up for the temporary halt in building activity in Carthage that had been brought about by Dido's romantic infatuation³⁸ (*pendent opera interrupta*

³⁵ Cf. Clay (1988) 195: Aeneas "glimpses what he will never be allowed to see – the transformation of Rome from an Arcadian village into the city of Augustus."

³⁶ Cf. Servius *ad* 422: *bene ergo miratur Aeneas, ubi fuerant magalia illic esse legitimam ciuitatem; nam et portas et uias uidebat et mox templum Iunonis ingens* "hence it is with good reason that Aeneas marvels that there was a true civic society where once there had been mere shepherds huts: for he was looking at both gates and streets, and soon the massive temple of Juno as well."

³⁷ Austin (1971) *ad* 421: "It is clear from 4.259 ... that some *magalia* were still to be seen, at least in the outskirts."

³⁸ Cf. Hardie (1986) 271.

minaeque / mororum ingentes aequataque machina caelo “the building works have come to a stop and remain suspended; the huge battlements of the walls, too, and the machines raised up to the heavens,” 4.88-89). More importantly, this is the only building activity in which Aeneas is seen to participate. As promised in the proem, Aeneas does indeed found a city, but that city is not the *urbs* promised in line 5, but rather the *urbs* that Juno loves above all others (1.11-16); not the walls of lofty Rome (*unde / ... altae moenia Romae*, 1.6-7), but the *fundamenta* of lofty Carthage (*Karthaginis altae / fundamenta*, 4. 265-66).

The city that Aeneas observes from on high in *Aeneid* 1, and to whose construction he will eventually contribute, will also have generated a degree of recognition in Virgil’s first readers: in its massive buildings, gates, streets, citadels, artificial port,³⁹ and, most crucially, its theatre, it broadly resembles the Hellenic civic archetype to which Rome itself would conform.⁴⁰ Dido’s *theatrum* in particular is not only a highly anomalous feature in a heroic age city, but it appears to be a specifically Roman theatre:⁴¹ as Austin rightly observes, the *scaena* for which Dido’s columns will provide a fitting adornment “belongs to contemporary Rome, and is an anachronism here.”⁴² The brazen anachronism of locating a Roman theatre in a Punic settlement whose foundation dates to the decade after the Trojan War sharpens the cruel irony of Rome’s founder witnessing the construction of somebody else’s city. Not only is Aeneas watching the successful building activity of another colonist, but he is, in a sense, watching the construction of Rome.⁴³ The presence of a Roman

³⁹ DServius *ad* 427: *ut uere ait: nam Carthaginienses Cothone fossa utuntur, non naturali portu* “he speaks truly, for the Carthaginians use the Cothonian trench rather than a natural port.”

⁴⁰ Cf. Deuling (1997) 31.

⁴¹ See Valerius Maximus 2.4.2 on the Senate’s ban on stone theatres in Rome on moral grounds; see Tacitus, *Annales* 14.20 for moral censure of Pompey for building the first stone theatre within the city. Cf. Warde Fowler (1909) 309-11.

⁴² Austin (1971) *ad* 429.

⁴³ On the various ways in which Virgil’s Carthage recalls Rome, see esp. Branchi (1995) 100-1.

theatre in the heart of Carthage also suggests a subversive aetiology for Roman theatre. Terence, of course, was said to have been born in Carthage: the *theatrum* that appears in Dido's city cheekily alludes to a possible Punic origin for Roman comedy. The Carthaginian *theatrum* creates a curiously Virgilian sort of circularity:⁴⁴ while Dido's *theatrum* is plainly "modeled" on the *theatra* of a Graeco-Roman world that has yet to come into existence, it also provides, according to the conceit of the text, the aetiology for them.

The glaring anachronism presented by Dido's *theatrum* also demands that we confront the broader problem posed by the very existence of Carthage in the decade after the Trojan War. The *Aeneid* makes a concession to the historical record by making a distinction between the *urbs* founded by Aeneas (1.5) and Rome itself, founded hundreds of years after the Trojan War and identified in the proem as one of three later consequences of Aeneas' migration (*unde ... / altae moenia Romae*, 1.6-7). The historical record dates the founding of Carthage to approximately the same time as the founding of Rome.⁴⁵ Servius holds that it had been founded seventy years before its Italian rival (*ante septuaginta annos urbis Romae condita erat* "[Carthage] had been founded seventy years before Rome," ad *Aen.* 1.12). In the *Aeneid*, however, Carthage is fully under construction a mere seven years after the sack of Troy. While there may well have been *literary* precedents for Aeneas sojourn in Carthage, the city that he sees under construction can only be just that: literary. Although he doesn't say so explicitly, Virgil presents us with a civic entity that belongs exclusively to the realm of poetry.

⁴⁴ Cf., for example, the origin of the temple of Palatine Apollo (6.14-19), discussed in chapter three, 97-101.

⁴⁵ According to ancient tradition (Timaeus *FGrH* 566 fr. 60), Carthage was founded from Tyre in 814/13. The archaeological evidence suggests the city was founded in the second half of the eighth century (*OCD* s.v. *Carthage*).

A final complication derives from the fact that in Virgil's day, Carthage was indeed a Roman city: having been destroyed in 146 BC, Carthage was re-founded by the Romans by Julius Caesar.⁴⁶ In 29 BC, when Virgil was undertaking the composition of the *Aeneid*, a further 3,000 colonists were settled there by Octavian. When the *Aeneid* was being composed, therefore, Carthage was indeed a young, bustling Roman city. The *theatrum* arising in Dido's city encourages the suspicion that Virgil has projected modern Carthage back into the heroic age, superimposing it upon the humble huts of the autochthonous inhabitants of the land and identifying its civic buildings with those of Punic Carthage. Both in the explicitly stated contrast between the modest dwellings of the natives and the monumental architecture of the new civilization, and in the co-presence of ancient and contemporary civil architecture, Virgil's description of Dido's Carthage anticipates that of Evander's Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8. Like the site of Rome, the Carthage of the *Aeneid* is not so much a poetic space, as a conflation of the world of poetry and the world of the poet. As in the proem to *Georgics* 3, the description of Carthage in *Aeneid* 1 demands that we question how poetry creates its fictions out of the world of the reader.

Dido's *theatrum* also provides a wry commentary upon the *dramatic* character of books 1 and 4. Virgil's description of the construction of the theatre contains one of only three uses of the word *scaena* in the Virgilian corpus. The first, as we have seen, occurs in the description of the scenic harbor at which the Trojans make their landfall in Africa (1.157-69). The third occurs in the famous simile in book 4 comparing the delirious Dido to famous characters from Attic drama:

Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus
et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas,

⁴⁶ Servius ad *Aen.* 1.12: *et eam [sc. old Carthage] deleuerat Scipio Africanus. quae autem nunc est postea a Romanis est condita* "Scipio Africanus had destroyed that city, which has since however been re-founded by the Romans."

aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes,
armatam facibus matrem et serpentibus atris
cum fugit ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae.

(4.469-73)

Like when mad Pentheus sees the ranks of the Eumenides and a doubled sun and Thebes shows itself double, or when Agamemnon's son Orestes is driven across the stage in flight from his mother, who is armed with torches and black serpents; the avenging Furies sit in the doorway.

The uniqueness of the simile, of course, resides in the comparison of Dido not to Pentheus and Orestes as historical or mythical beings, but to their stage *personae*. Critics have been right to identify the comparison of Dido to the *personae* of Pentheus and Orestes as a wry commentary on the overtly theatrical qualities books 1 and 4. As in the case of Virgil's "scenic" harbor, it also seems probable that the poet's contemporaries would have been reminded of the visual arts at the same time as they well have recognized the poet's engagement with tragedy. As Austin notes, there exists a Pompeian wall-painting showing Pentheus attacked by his mother, with two furies in the background. Pliny (*NH* 35.144) mentions both the slaying of Clytemnestra by Orestes and the madness of Orestes (*Orestis insaniam*) among subjects treated by notable Greek painters.⁴⁷ Since Pliny states explicitly that some of the paintings that he lists were extant in Rome, Austin's assertion that "Virgil's contemporaries would have been familiar with his allusions here from art as well as from reading or from the stage" seems plausible.⁴⁸ Virgil's simile thus not only asks

⁴⁷ Pliny attributes an *ab Oreste matrem et Aegisthum interfici* to one Theorus, and an *Orestis insaniam* to Theon of Samos. Pliny notes that a series of painting by the former were extant in his day in the Porticoes of Philippus in Rome (*quod est Romae in Philippi porticibus*).

⁴⁸ Austin (1955) *ad* 469ff.

that we view the action of his Carthaginian saga as a work of dramatic art: he also encourages us view as a stage production *represented* in visual art. In other words, the reader is encouraged not merely to envision Dido as a stage *persona*, but also to imagine her as a stage *persona* represented in visual art. Virgil facilitates an interchange between poetic, visual, and dramatic art and, at the same time, emphasizes the artificiality of those media.

The only other appearance of the word *scaena* in the Virgilian corpus appears in a passage discussed at length in chapter one: the *proem* to *Georgics* 3.⁴⁹ In that passage Virgil envisages, as part of the celebrations in honor of his poetic triumph, dramatic performances featuring a *scaena* and stage-curtain (*uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque / purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Britanni* “or to see how the scene retreats when the sets have been rotated or how the inlaid Britons lift the purple stage-curtain,” 3.24-25). In my discussion of that passage,⁵⁰ I note the merely imagined quality of Virgil’s stage (it has yet to come into existence) and argue that it provides a commentary on the artificial quality of the temple description that follows. There is, however, an interesting parallel between the implied futurity of the stage envisaged in *Georgics* 3 and the unfinished state of Dido’s theatre in Carthage. When Aeneas makes his observations, the foundations of the theatre are being put in place (*hic alta theatri / fundamenta locant alii*, 427-28) and massive columns are being cut out of the rock (*immanisque columnas / rupibus excidunt scaenis decora apta futuris*, 428-29). The implied futurity of Virgil’s *scaena* in *Georgics* 3 thus anticipates the *scaenae futurae* for which the stone columns will prove a fitting adornment. Like the rest of the city, the *theatrum* itself, its columns only partially hewn out of the rock, is

⁴⁹ One of the very few commentators who notice the association of theatre with temple in both *Georgics* 3 and *Aeneid* 1 is van Essen (1939) 232.

⁵⁰ See chapter one, 11-13.

in a half-realized, half-idealized state.⁵¹ The effect, as we shall see, is typically Virgilian: what the reader sees is an idealized vision of what is not yet there superimposed upon “real” building materials.

Upon arriving at the shady grove in the precise center of the city,⁵² Aeneas and Achates encounter a magnificent temple:

hic templum Iunoni ingens Sidonia Dido
condebat, donis opulentum et numine diuae,
aerea cui gradibus surgebant limina nexaeque
aere trabes, foribus cardo stridebat aenis.

(1.446-49)

Here Sidonian Dido was building for Juno a huge temple, rich in dedications and the divinity’s godhead; the bronze threshold was rising upon the steps, its lintel-beams were bronze-plated, and the bronze doors screeched on their hinge.

Like the rest of the city, the enormous temple that Dido is building for Juno is still under construction (*condebat*, 147). *surgebant* refers in the first instance to the lofty appearance of the temple-threshold at the top of the *gradus*, but it also hints at the unfinished state of the temple itself, which, like the buildings surrounding it, is still rising from the ground. Indeed, the *arx* of Carthage has already been described as *surgens* by Venus (*ubi nunc ingentia cernis / moenia surgentem nouae Karthaginis arcem*, 365-66). A reader fresh from the *Georgics* might note with interest the appearance of a temple that is still under construction at the very beginning of Virgil’s epic song-temple. Such a reader might also note that, like the *scaena* envisaged in

⁵¹ Cf. Clay (1988) 196.

⁵² On the sacral symbolism of physical centers in the *Aeneid*, see Mills (1983); on the central location of historical temples in Rome, see Stambaugh (1978) 562.

Georgics 3, the *theatrum* that appears in *Aeneid* 1 is mentioned immediately before a description of an enormous *templum* together with its magnificent artwork. Like Dido's city, Virgil's ktistic epic is just beginning, but in a way we might never have anticipated.

In a neat example of poetic architecture mirroring the physical architecture described in the narrative, the two lines describing the entrance of the temple are bolted closely together by the (unnecessarily) hypermetric *-que* at the end of line 148.⁵³ The pivot-like quality of *-que* in turn anticipates the noisy *cardo* that appears between the two main caesurae in the precise middle of line 149.⁵⁴ Its prominence as the subject of its clause is striking, for the "natural" subject – as Austin rightly observes – is the *fores* themselves.⁵⁵

Given the prominence of the *fores* on Virgil's song-temple in the *Georgics* 3, it is reasonable expect a meta-literary sense for the *cardo* upon which noisily swing the doors of Dido's temple. Indeed, the lines that immediately follow the description of Juno's threshold speak of a *cardinal* juncture in the fortunes of Aeneas:

hoc primum in luco noua res oblata timorem
leniit, hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem
ausus et adflictis melius confidere rebus
(1.450-52)

In this grove for the first time did a change of fortune soothe his fear; here for the first time did Aeneas dare to hope for salvation and to have greater faith in his troubled circumstances.

⁵³ Austin (1971) *ad* 448 notes that a connective is not necessary here and the two clauses might well have stood in asyndeton.

⁵⁴ Cf. Deuling (1997) 106-7: Virgil "audibly binds the two lines as closely as the bronze is bound to the beams. *Aenis* at the end of 449 reminds us that the creaking of the hinges is caused by the bronze doors."

⁵⁵ Cf. Smolenaars (1994) *ad* 40-63, on Statius' adaptation of this passage at the beginning of *Thebaid* 7 (the palace of Mars).

The authorial voice here goes to unusual lengths to inform its readers that they have reached a major narrative crux: in addition to the novelty signaled by the phrase *noua res*, the repeated *primum* indicates that we are in for something new.⁵⁶ Hitherto the narrative has progressed in a linear fashion, charting Aeneas' adventures sequentially (interrupted only by Venus' dialogue with Jupiter) from the onset of the storm to his arrival in the center of Carthage. At the precise moment we reach the pivot of Juno's temple-doors, however, the narrative changes course and heads back into Aeneas' Trojan past, which in turn is a prelude for a major change in his fortunes precipitated by the arrival of Dido, the builder of the temple.

The suspicion that the proximity of Juno's *cardo* to so cardinal a juncture in the story of Aeneas' fortunes is merely casual must be considered in light of the only other appearance of the word in *Aeneid* 1 (and in the first half of the poem): Venus' speech to Cupid immediately after Aeneas has entered Dido's palace (664-89). That speech comes at another narrative crux programmatically signaled by the narrator, who insists with the repetition of the adjective *nouus* that Venus is plotting something novel: *at Cytherea nouas artes, noua pectore uersat / consilia* "Cytherea, however, ponders in her breast new contrivances and new plots" (657-58). Having resolved to inflame Dido with love for Aeneas by replacing Ascanius with Cupid, Venus summons her son and reveals her plan. In stating her motives for this new course of action, Venus claims to fear Juno's treachery, for she is certain that her rival will not give up at so *cardinal* a juncture: *et uereor quo se Iunonia uertant / hospitia: haud tanto cessabit cardine rerum* "and I fear the purpose of Juno's hospitality: she will hardly give up at such a crucial point in the action" (671-71). The first *cardo* to appear in the narrative - the hinge of Juno's temple doors - was juxtaposed with a

⁵⁶ Cf. Corlaita (1990) 82.

strongly marked juncture in the narrative of Aeneas' wanderings; here Venus uses *cardo* metaphorically⁵⁷ to refer to a new nodal point in the action of the drama that is unfolding in Carthage (*res*).

We left Aeneas standing before the temple-doors, which were swinging noisily on their *cardo*. Now, as he waits for the queen, he examines the details of the huge temple and marvels (*miratur*) at its opulence and workmanship that contributed to its adornment⁵⁸ (453-55). He sees too, allegedly in chronological order, the battles around Ilion represented on the temple walls⁵⁹ (*uidet Iliacas ex ordine pugnas*, 456). These, Virgil explains, have already been made known (*uulgata*) throughout the whole world (*bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem*, 457). Then, after expressing to Achates the confidence he derives from seeing the sufferings of his people represented in Carthage, Aeneas randomly observes a selection of the scenes represented:⁶⁰ the Atridae, Priam, Achilles, random battles around Troy, the slaughter of Rhesus, the murder of Troilus, the supplication of Pallas by the Trojan matrons, the abuse of Hector's body, and its ransom by Priam (458-84). Finally, immediately before the advent of Dido, he notices himself among the Greek leaders (*se quoque principibus permixtum agnouit Achillem*, 488), Memnon, and Penthesilea (489-93).

⁵⁷ The metaphor had some currency in antiquity. According to DServius, the metaphor is *a ianua tractam, quae motu cardinis hac atque illac inPELLI potest* "taken from (the language used to describe) a door, which can be moved this way and that by the motion of the hinge." The proverb *res in cardine est* is quoted by Servius. Austin (1971) *ad* 672 notes the following parallels: Val. Fl. 5.18-20 (*ulla laboris / si nostri te cura mouet, qui cardine summo / uertitur* "if you are moved by any concern for our plight, which hangs in the balance"); Statius, *Theb.* 10.853 (*attoniti fatorum in cardine summo* "astounded, their lives in the balance"); Pliny, *NH* 18.264 (*anni cardo* "the year's hinge" (of the summer solstice)); Quintilian 12.8.2 (*ubi litium cardo uertatur* "where revolves the hinge of arguments" (of careless speakers)).

⁵⁸ For the important similarities between this description and the description of Daedalus' temple in *Aeneid* 6 (14-41) (discussed in chapter three), see Lowenstein (1993) 43.

⁵⁹ On Aeneas' observation of the temple murals, see Clay (1998) 200-2.

⁶⁰ The series of images that Aeneas observes here resembles similar groups of images in Rome, notably the series of episodes from the Trojan War which adorned the Porticus Philippi around the temple of Hercules Musarum in the Campus Martius (Pliny, *NH* 35.40.44); cf. Deuling (1997) 28.

The literary resonances of these famous scenes, which Virgil editorially refers to as *pictura inani* “empty painting” (464), have long been familiar to commentators. Because many of the scenes represented fall outside the scope of the *Iliad*, the murals as a whole have been understood as a pictorial version of the Epic Cycle. Indeed, Virgil appears to make an oblique allusion to the nature of his material in line 457, *orbis* being the standard Latin translation of the Greek *kyklos*.⁶¹ He appears also to allude to its notoriously trite subject matter in referring to the wars of Ilium as being *uulgata per orbem*: “trite by means of the (Epic) Cycle.” All this is uncontroversial, but commentators have failed to note the way that the phrase *iam ... uulgata* in line 457 echoes a famous phrase from the *Georgics* 3 proem: *omnia iam uulgata* “all these themes are now trite” (3.4) claims Virgil as considers the traditional subject of matter of Hellenistic poetry. There is an obvious correlation between the Greek Epic Cycle and the overdone themes of Hellenistic poetry, but the fact that both lines occur in the context of a temple ecphrasis should give us pause. In the case of the *Georgics* 3 proem, the poet runs through a series of possible topics for a future poem before settling on his epic, which he conceives as a magnificent temple. In *Aeneid* 1, Aeneas views a pictorial representation of scenes from the Epic Cycle on a huge temple, scenes in which he plays a *magna pars*. Virgil, of course, will respond to Dido’s *pictorial* narrative with a *verbal* narrative: books 2 and 3 of Virgil’s song-temple.

Before we take a closer look at the description of the temple itself, it will be necessary first to consider the Homeric context for Dido’s temple. As Knauer has observed, Aeneas’ approach to the temple and his reading of its murals corresponds to

⁶¹ Barchiesi (1997) 273: “the events are ‘famous’ through poetry and only secondarily – despite the riches of the Greek figurative tradition – through art. Thus the line could be tendentiously paraphrased ‘wars made known through the whole Epic Cycle’, *orbis* being the Roman equivalent of the Greek ‘kyklos’, and *vulgata* meaning ‘trite’, ‘commonplace’, a frequent judgement in ancient criticism on the quality of the Epic Cycle’s predictable rehearsal of its subject matter.”

two distinct scenes from the Phaeacian episode in the *Odyssey*:⁶² the description of the Alcinous' temple⁶³ (*Od.* 7.3-132) and the first song of Demodocus (*Od.* 8.62-95).⁶⁴ The parallels between the series of events that brings Odysseus through the harbor and city of the Phaeacians to the temple of Alcinous and Aeneas' progress through the nascent city of Carthage to the temple of Dido are thoroughly discussed by Knauer.⁶⁵ The correspondence between Demodocus' verbal narrative of the dispute between Achilles and Odysseus at Troy and Dido's pictorial narrative of the Trojan War is strongly marked by the similar reactions of the two heroes.⁶⁶ Whereas Odysseus reacts to the Demodocus' song by attempting to hide his eyes and weep, Aeneas famously weeps (459) and, towards the climax of the description, lets escape an *ingens gemitum* from deep in his breast (485).⁶⁷ Just as Demodocus' tale features Odysseus as a major protagonists, Aeneas sees the war for his own city and, in what is effectively the climax of the description, sees himself (*se quoque*) intermingled with chiefs of the Achaeans (*se quoque principibus permixtum agnouit Achiuis*, 488).

In light of both the architectonic vocabulary of Augustan poetics and the close relationship between the architectural and the poetic that is so distinctive a feature of *Aeneid* 1, the Odyssean background of the passage demands that we explore the literariness of Juno's temple. If, as I argue above, we are justified in understanding the rising city of Carthage as an architectonic manifestation of Juno's desired narrative, the poetic temple of Juno narrates its first installment. It will be Aeneas' job

⁶² On the correspondences between Virgil's Carthaginian episode and Odysseus' sojourn on Phaeacia, see Knauer (1964) 148-80.

⁶³ Cf. Thiel (1993) 108.

⁶⁴ Knauer (1964) 167: "Palastbesichtigung' aber und '1. Demodokosgesang' sind heir in den Tempelbildern vereinigt, weil Vergil die Handlung straffen mußte: der letztere gehört wie die Wettspiele gerade in den 'Tag' hinein, den Vergil hat ausfallen lassen."

⁶⁵ On Virgil's combination of both Homeric and Apollonian precedents for this scene, see esp. Nelis (2001) 80-82.

⁶⁶ Cf. Corlaita (1990) 83.

⁶⁷ Cf. Clay (1988) 197-98.

both to construct his *own* narrative of the Trojan past⁶⁸ and, once free of Dido and Carthage, to create the architectonic manifestation of the officially sanctioned narrative of the *Aeneid*.

We have already observed the close correlation between temples, programmatic statements of poetics, and *centers* in the Virgilian corpus. It is with some interest, then, that we note that Dido's temple, which we have already located at the approximate center of book 1 and the exact center of Carthage, is itself decorated with the image of a temple:⁶⁹

interea ad templum non aequae Palladis ibant
crinibus Iliades passis peplumque ferebant,
suppliciter tristes et tunsae pectora palmis.
(1.479-81)

Meanwhile, the matrons of Ilium, with loose tresses, were on their way to the temple of unsympathetic Pallas and were bearing her a *peplos*, mourning in suppliant guise and pounding their breasts with their hands.

The temple of Minerva at Troy appears in the *exact* middle of Virgil's description of the decorative scheme of Dido's temple. The three lines quoted above are preceded by thirteen lines and followed by twelve;⁷⁰ Pallas' temple is also the fourth (i.e. the middle) of the seven panels described by the poet.⁷¹ The temple of

⁶⁸ On the rhetorical character of Aeneas' speech, and the care he takes to account for certain details of Dido's temple murals, see esp. Ahl (1989) 24-31. Cf. Putnam (1998) 41: "The ekphrasis ... reaches out in anticipation to what follows, to become "enlivened" in two significant ways: through the association of Dido with Penthesilea and of Aeneas with Achilles, and through Aeneas' narration, which picks up the tale of Troy's fate."

⁶⁹ It also anticipates the supplication of Minerva in book 11 (477-85); see Lowenstein (1993) 40; Corlita (1990) 82.

⁷⁰ Thomas (2004) 131.

⁷¹ Cf. O'Hara (1990) 37: "depending on where one divides, the supplication of Athena can be the fourth of seven, the fifth of eight, or the fifth of nine panels" (n. 37). Both Thomas (1983 (177-80) and Clay (1988) 202 claim that the murals have eight panels.

Pallas may thus be said to appear in the middle of a description of an artwork appearing on a (literary) temple standing within a literary work that is conceived as a temple in the middle of both the *Georgics*, another literary work, and the Virgilian corpus as a whole. What is more, a good case has been made that the *peplum* carried to Minerva's temple evokes the *Io* of Calvus,⁷² who "could well have included, in an account of a religious procession in honour of that goddess, a description of a robe, of a *peplos*, in fact, to be offered for her."⁷³

As we shall see in the case of the temple-doors at Cumae in *Aeneid* 6,⁷⁴ the effect here is to create a dizzying multiple *mise en abyme* effect. The *Aeneid* – a literary monument conceived as a temple in the center of the *Georgics* – contains a (literary, Sidonian) temple on which is represented (yet another) temple containing (yet another) Sidonian artifact with its own pictorial representations (perhaps of *Io* herself, whom Aeschylus calls "the warden of Hera's temple" in Argos). The effect is twofold. First, Virgil further confuses the distinction between poetic and monumental architecture to the point where that distinction becomes all but meaningless. Moreover, the introduction of Hecuba's *peplum* associates poetic architecture with the more familiar poetic metaphor of weaving, an association that recalls the juxtaposition of Virgil's song-temple with the elaborately woven (*intexti*) stage curtain (*aulaea*) in *Georgics* 3 (24-25). Second, the overtly fictive character of the merely represented structures draws attention to equally fictive nature of the poetic monument in which they stand. The *Aeneid*, an early version of which appears as a man-made "construct" in the middle of *Georgics* 3.

⁷² For parallel instances of spoils being offered to Minerva in Homer and elsewhere, see Henry (1986) 41-42.

⁷³ Lyne (1978) 109-10. Lyne's argument depends on the description of the *peplum* in the *Ciris* (21-34), which he believes derives ultimately from a similar ephrasis in Calvus' *Io*.

⁷⁴ See chapter three, 82-92.

The nominally distinct layers of (un)reality created by the description of the temple in *Aeneid* 1 are thrown into further confusion by the transition from descriptive inset to narrative proper. As Aeneas gazes with absorption at the “fictive” figure of Penthesilea on Juno’s temple, the “real” figure of Dido approaches:⁷⁵

haec dum Dardanio Aeneae miranda uidentur,
dum stupet obtutuque haeret defixus in uno,
regina ad templum, forma pulcherrima Dido,
incessit, magna iuuenum stipante caterua.

(1.494-97)

While Dardan Aeneas is gazing in wonder at these things, while he marvels and hangs frozen with a single expression, the queen, most beautiful Dido, makes her way to the temple, thronged by a great crowd of young men.

The similarities between the warrior-maiden Penthesilea and the Carthaginian queen blur the nominal distinction between what the narrative represents as being “represented” and what the narrative represents as being “real.”⁷⁶ The appearance of Dido at her temple, however, has in turn to be read closely with the apparition of Aeneas,⁷⁷ who, upon stepping out of his magic cloud, is miraculously adorned by the hand of his mother:

restitit Aeneas claraque in luce refulsit,

⁷⁵ Cf. Bleisch (2003) 89, on the description of Latinus’ palace in *Aeneid* 7 (152-93): “Picus [an historical figure represented by a statue] and Latinus [a protagonist in the narrative] merge;” and 93: “The *regia* ekphrasis in *Aeneid* 7 closes with a similar transition from the statue of Picus to Latinus himself . . . As Penthesilea is a supplement for Dido, so Picus becomes a kind of supplement for Latinus.”

⁷⁶ Cf. Conte (1984) 107; Lowenstein (1993) 43-44; Lonsdale (1990) 11-12; Anderson (1969) 28; Conte (1986) 194-95; Putnam (1998) 36: “Ekphrasis and narrative begin finally to merge, and with good purpose. The energy only implicit in the inert picture suddenly is activated as it works its way into the epic tale itself.”

⁷⁷ Cf. Putnam (1998) 38: “Aeneas begins to merge with Achilles at a moment in the ekphrasis when the Greek figure becomes a background character and when Aeneas turns from being the immediate viewer of the pictures to “participant” in their action.”

os umerosque deo similis; namque ipsa decoram
caesariem nato genetrix lumenque iuuentae
purpureum et laetos oculis adflarat honores;
quale manus addunt ebori decus, aut ubi flauo
argentum Pariusue lapis circumdatur auro.

(1.588-93)

Aeneas stood forth and shone in the pure light, his face and his shoulders just like a god's; for on behalf of her son his mother herself had shed upon him locks of gorgeous hair, the purple gleam of youth, and a joyous luster in his eyes.

Venus is said to improve the appearance of her son as a workman might adorn a statue of Parian marble.⁷⁸ The phrase *nato genetrix* anticipates in turn Venus' plea to Vulcan in book 8 that he fashion a shield for her son⁷⁹ (*arma rogo, genetrix nato*, 8.383). But whereas in book 8 Venus is asking for an artifact to be manufactured by a third party on behalf of Aeneas, here Venus herself is represented making a work of art out of her son. If Dido has already been partially assimilated to the merely "represented" figure of Penthesilea, Aeneas – as modified by his mother - is overtly compared to a work of art. If Dido seems to "come to life" out of the murals on her temple, the living and breathing Aeneas is rendered effectively artificial: a mere *lapis*.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ On Virgil's reworking of the principal models for the simile (*Od.* 6.229-35 and *Apoll., Arg.* 4.1309-49), see esp. Nelis (2001) 123; Smith (2005) 30-31. Austin (1971) *ad* 592 perceptively observes that "there is noteworthy art in the separation of *flauo* from *auro*, epithet and noun enclosing the silver and marble in their golden setting." Here, as elsewhere, Virgil's hexameters mirror in their form the artwork they describe.

⁷⁹ Smith (2005) 31, however, observes that "the goddess is not specifically compared to an artisan as Athena is in the *Odyssey*."

⁸⁰ On an analogous effect in the Statius' description of the palace of Mars (*Thebaid* 7.1-89), see Smolenaars (1994) *ad* 55ff..

Parius lapis is a striking phrase, not least because it occurs at only one other place in the Virgilian corpus: in the proem to *Georgics* 3. In front of the elaborately decorated temple that Virgil promises to build on the banks of the Mincius will stand a series of Parian stones:

stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
Assarci proles demissaeque ab Ioue gentis
nomina Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthus auctor.

(*Georgics* 3.34-36)

Parian stones too will stand – statues that breathe: the descendants of Assaracus, the heroes of the race descended of Jupiter, ancestral Tros, and Cynthus, the builder of Troy.

We have seen how the confessedly unreal nature of Virgil's artwork puts a unique spin on the commonplace claim that outstanding works of art can successfully imitate nature: Virgil's "breathing" *signa* are no more made of marble than the figures they represent are flesh and blood. When Virgil compares the new and improved Aeneas to a *Parius lapis* in book 1 of the *Aeneid*, he purports to compare something real (Aeneas) to something artificial (a statue of Parian marble). By borrowing his imagery from the proem to *Georgics* 3, however, Virgil subverts the ontological hierarchy on which his narrative rests. The *Aeneas spirans* of *Aeneid* 1, Virgil intimates, is no more real than the statues of Aeneas' Trojan ancestors that stand before a non-existent temple in northern Italy.

The marble Aeneas of book 1, moreover, bears a resemblance in at least one respect to one of those gleaming statues that stand before the poet's song temple. The *decora caesaries* that Venus lends to Aeneas evokes Apollo, whose effigy Virgil describes as standing before his song-temple (*Troiae Cynthus auctor* "and Cynthus

the builder of Troy,” *Georgics* 3.36). Apollo, of course, was the favorite god of Caesar Augustus, whose name is impossible to miss in the noun *CAESARIES*.⁸¹ In the statuesque figure of Aeneas, Virgil implicitly combines the builder of Troy with Aeneas’ descendent, providing a highly condensed version of the series of statues described as standing before Virgil’s temple on the Mincius.

In *Georgics* 3 Virgil promises a magnificent literary temple, before which will stand a series of marble statues representing the Trojan ancestors of his patron. In *Aeneid* 1, Virgil describes a huge literary temple beside which stands a “real” Trojan who is compared to a statue of Parian marble. But whereas Virgil’s temple in the *Georgics* will display the past and future heroics of Octavian, Juno’s will display the defeat of Aeneas’ people by the Greeks, presumably from a perspective unfriendly to the Trojans.⁸² Thus the suspicion grows that in *Aeneid* 1 the only literary temple being erected is the temple of Juno, a temple that is a direct challenger to the Roman, Julian temple promised in the *Georgics*. The Trojan War, which Juno is said to have carried out successfully *pro caris Argis* “on behalf of her dear Argives” (1.24), is immortalized in the temple artwork; the next episode in Juno’s alternative narrative is now being played before the temple-doors by a Trojan (compared by the poet to the sort of statue that might stand before a temple) who will soon be seen laying the foundations not of Rome, but of Carthage (*Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta nouantem*, 4.260). Small wonder that Venus should think the narrative of the *Aeneid* to have reached a cardinal juncture (*haud tanto cessabit cardine rerum*, 1.672).

⁸¹ Cf. Ahl (1986) 80-81: “Aeneas, CAESAR’s ancestor, as he is revealed to Dido in *Aeneid* 1.590, is notable for the beauty of his *CAESARIES*, his hair.” In this context, Ahl notes Servius’ comment on 8.659: *a caedendo dicta caesaries. ergo tantum uirorum est* “*caesaries* is so called because it is derived from slaughtering: thus it is only used of men.”

⁸² The *past* history of the Phoenician race appears on the silverware at Dido’s banquet (1.640-42). See chapter four.

After Dido delivers her magnanimous speech of welcome to Aeneas (615-30), the transition from temple to royal palace occurs within a single line⁸³ (*sic memorat; simul Aenean in regia ducit / tecta, simul diuum templis indicit honorem* “thus she spoke; and she leads Aeneas into the palace at the same time as she decrees solemnities for the temples of the gods,” 631-32), thereby eliding the temporal space that would normally correspond to the physical space traversed.⁸⁴ The close association of the two buildings also reflects that fact that they correspond to a single Homeric model:⁸⁵ the palace of Alcinous. After Dido sends provisions to Aeneas’ fleet, the poet describes the interior of the palace:⁸⁶

at domus interior regali splendida luxu
instruitur, mediisque parant conuiuia tectis:
arte laboratae uestes ostroque superbo,
ingens argentum mensis, caelataque in auro
fortia facta patrum, series longissima rerum
per tot ducta uiros antiqua ab origine gentis.

(1.637-42)

But the magnificent interior of the dwelling is fitted out with regal opulence, and they are preparing a feast in the center of the building: there are coverlets, intricately worked and of haughty purple; a heavy silver plate is there on the tables, and embossed in gold are the

⁸³ Cf. Nelis (2001) 91: “Virgil ... creates close links between the temple and palace. The brief description of the splendour of Dido’s palace and its decorations corresponds to the earlier description of the temple of Juno, so that Aeneas’ entry into the temple is recalled as he enters the palace. The narrative moves on fluently and almost imperceptibly from one location to the other, as is quite fitting given that they both correspond to a similar palace in the *Argonautica*.”

⁸⁴ It is interesting to compare the close physical association between the *domus Augusta* and the temple of Palatine Apollo: “The close connection between Augustus’ house and the temple by means of a ramp is a manifestation in architecture of the confluence between private and public aspects typical of both Augustus’ style of government and Augustan culture” (Galinsky (1996) 215). Cf. also the combined civic and religious functions of Latinus’ palace (7.170-91), well discussed by Rosivach (1980) 148-50.

⁸⁵ On the resemblance of Dido’s palace and other buildings in the *Aeneid* to Roman buildings and, especially, the *domus Augusta*, see Deuling (1997) 226-27.

⁸⁶ On the layout of Dido’s palace, see esp. Corlaita (1984) 686.

heroic deeds of her forefathers, a lengthy chain of events leading though so many heroes from the very origins of the race.

As Austin notes, the dominant model for Virgil's description of the interior of Dido's palace is the palace of Peleus described in Catullus 64 (43-49).⁸⁷ In Catullus' description, the *puluinar geniale*, upon which is spread the coverlet whose description takes up the bulk of the poem (*tincta tegit roseo conchyli purpuro fuco* "a woven purple coverlet is spread over, dipped in a rosy murex dye," 49), is situated in the exact middle of the palace (*sedibus in mediis*, 48).⁸⁸ Similarly, in Virgil's description of Dido's *regia* the feast is said to be prepared *mediis tectis* (638). Two works of art are said to adorn the feast: an intricately woven coverlet of "proud purple" (639) and, on the tables, a heavy silver plate (*ingens argentum*) decorated with the heroic deeds of Dido's ancestors.

The parallel between coverlet in Dido's palace and the work of art described at such length in Catullus 64 is obvious. All we learn about Dido's coverlet, however, is that it is purple and richly embroidered. We get rather more information about the *ingens argentum* displayed on the banqueting tables, which is adorned with a pictorial narrative of the deeds of Dido's forebears from the very origins of her race (*antiqua ab origine gentis*, 1.642). In my discussion of this object, I have argued that Virgil's description is something of a DIY ecphrasis, one that obliges readers to call upon their own store of mythological lore.⁸⁹ I argue too that the ecphrasis helps to situate the Carthaginian episode within the context of the dynastic, genealogical history of the

⁸⁷ In particular, compare *regali splendida luxi* (*Aen.* 1.637) with *tota domus gaudet regali splendida gaza* (Catullus 64.46).

⁸⁸ Cf. Traill (1980-81) 232-41: "In a broad sense it is the coverlet that is at the center of the poem, just as the bed which it covers is in the center of the palace."

⁸⁹ In this respect, it resembles the representations of the myth of Daedalus on the temple at Cumae (6.14-41); see chapter three.

Aeneid, defined in the proem as a geopolitical contest between the Dardan race of Rome and the Inachid race of Dido's ancestors.⁹⁰

In light of the present discussion, the same contest can also be understood in meta-literary terms. If Dido, rather than Aeneas, has begun to monumentalize an anti-Trojan narrative in the temple she is building for the patron goddess of her city, within her palace she displays a monumentalized version the history of the Inachid race that, as the proem of the *Aeneid* tells us, Juno hopes will rule the world instead of the progeny of Venus (*hoc regnum dea gentibus esse*, 1.17). Once again, it is the narrative of Juno, not that of Octavian and his forebears, that is finding expression in the *monumenta* of the *Aeneid*. The monumental narrative of the glorious deeds of Octavian and his ancestors that Virgil promises in the middle of the *Georgics* seems to have been replaced in *Aeneid* 1 by a series of *monumenta* glorifying an alternative, non-Roman dynastic history. Whereas Virgil had promised that his poem would bear Caesar's fame as far into the future as Caesar himself is distant from the earliest origin of Tithonis (*Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar*, *G.* 3.48), in *Aeneid* 1 we find an object representing "the earliest origin of the race" of Dido (*antiqua ab origine gentis*, 643).

Immediately prior to the evening's entertainment, the poet describes the scene in Dido's palace:

fit strepitus tectis uocemque per ampla uolutant
atria; dependent lychni laquearibus aureis
incensi et noctem flammis funalia uincunt.

(1.725-27)

⁹⁰ Hannah (2004) 147-48.

A clamor arises within the palace and the sound rolls about through the spacious atrium. Lighted lamps hang from the golden, fretted ceiling and torches conquer the night with flames.

Like the heavenly bodies, the *lychni*, hanging from Dido's golden, fretted ceiling of her palace (*laquearibus*), conquer the night with their flame.⁹¹ The comparison might be an idle one were Dido's banqueting hall not the setting for the song of Iopas,⁹² whose subject matter includes the movements of the sun, the moon, and the stars (1.740-46). In an adaptation of this passage, Statius insists that the roof of Domitian's palace might be mistaken for the *laquearia* of the gilded sky⁹³ (*auratique putes laquearia caeli*, 30-31). Both Virgil and Statius are drawing in turn upon a long tradition, possibly beginning with a passage from Ennius' *Andromache*, according to which the sky is described through architectonic imagery and vice versa (92 Vahlen).

The only other appearance of *laqueare* in the *Aeneid* occurs at the beginning of book 8: when Aeneas lies asleep on the banks of the Tiber, his troubled thoughts are compared to the light of the heavenly bodies reflected from a pail of water:

sicut aquae tremulum labris ubi lumen aënis
sole repercussum aut radiantis imagine lunae
omnia peruolitat late loca, iamque sub auras
erigitur summique ferit laquearia tecti.

(8.22-25)

⁹¹ Austin (1971) *ad* 727 observes that *incensi* "is a significant word; the *lychni* did not merely hang down, but were lit."

⁹² Otis (1964) 240, however, plausibly maintains that the setting of the banquet is "a preparation for the flame-lit night of Troy's destruction;" cf. Segal (1971) 345-46.

⁹³ Cf. also the palace of Sol at Ovid, *Met.* 2.1-30, with Brown (1987).

Just as when a cauldron of water reflects the trembling light of the sun or the moon's radiant image and it flits about far and wide, and now it rises up into the air and strikes the fretting of the topmost ceiling.

Virgil's comparison reworks a famous simile from book 3 of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, where Medea's fluttering heart is compared to the gleam of the sun reflected from a pail of water and flittering around a house (ἡελίου ὥς τις τε δόμοις ἐνιπάλλεται ἀΐγλη "just as the gleam of the sun is cast about within a house," 3.733-36). The phrase ἡελίου ἀΐγλη, which Apollonius uses to describe the solar gleam that dances about a house (δόμοις), is borrowed from the descriptions of the palaces of Menelaus and Alcinous in the *Odyssey*, both of which are said to gleam with the brilliance of the sun or the moon (ὥς τε γὰρ ἡελίου ἀΐγλη πέλεν ἢ σελήνης "just like the gleam of the sun or the moon," 4.45 = 7.84). The Homeric phrase that Apollonius uses to describe the reflection of celestial light flitting about within a domestic dwelling was originally used not of celestial light itself, but to describe the homes of Homeric characters. Unlike Virgil, however, Apollonius says nothing specific about the house in which his pail of water stands, noting merely that the reflected light flits about here and there (735-36).

The second important point of reference for Virgil's simile comes from one of Lucretius' proofs for the speed of images in book 4 of the *De rerum natura*:

quod simul ac primum sub diu splendor aquai
ponitur, extemplo caelo stellante serena
sidera respondent in aqua radiantia mundi.
iamne uides igitur quam puncto tempore imago
aetheris ex oris in terrarum accidat oras?
(4.211-15)

For as soon as the brightness of water is placed beneath the sky, immediately the serene constellations, shining in the starry sky, are reflected in the water. Now do you not therefore see how in a mere instant of time the image travels from the region of the sky to the region of the earth?

By drawing the reader's attention to the immediacy with which the *imago* of the heavens appears in a pail of water set beneath the starry heavens, Lucretius testifies to the incredible speed at which visual *imagines* travel. There is no mention of a *domus*: merely a pail of water showing the *imago* of the starry heavens.

In *Aeneid* 8 Aeneas is lying, like Lucretius' pail of water, beneath the naked vault of the sky (*gelidique sub aetheris axe*, 28). The celestial light to which his thoughts are compared, however, does not simply *appear* in a pail of water, but it is reflected throughout the interior of a house (24-25). In this respect Aeneas' thoughts are most like the fluttering heart of Medea, which Apollonius compares to a beam of light that flits about within a house (δόμοις). Virgil is nonetheless more specific than Apollonius about the interior of the house around which the celestial light flies: after flitting about here and there throughout the house (*omnia peruolitat late loca*, 24), it eventually strikes fretwork of the ceiling (*summique ferit laquearia tecti*, 25).

Virgil's simile in *Aeneid* 8 unites a number of paradoxes. In his exemplum Lucretius draws our attention to the way in which a pail of water, for example, can instantaneously display an *imago* of real phenomena, in this case the night sky. In Virgil's simile, the reflection of celestial light, if not its exact *imago*, appears flitting about the fretted ceiling of a man-made structure. In other words, the *lumen* of the celestial bodies is prevented from returning to its source by the interposition of a screen that halts and displays the light. As a result, the ceiling of the Virgil's putative

house resembles in the real night sky in its being adorned with celestial light.⁹⁴ In this respect, it recalls the ceiling of Dido's palace, adorned with *lychni* that, like the celestial bodies that feature in Iopas' song, conquer the darkness of night (*noctem ... uincunt*, 1.727). Aeneas himself, however, lies – like the pail in Lucretius' exemplum – beneath the real thing, the *axis* of the night sky.

Aeneid 1, a book full of physical *monumenta*, ends with the first and only musical performance of the poem:⁹⁵ the song of Iopas, who entertains the assembled Tyrian and Trojan dignitaries in Dido's palace:

cithara crinitus Iopas
personat aurata, docuit quem maximus Atlas.
hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores,
unde hominum genus et pecudes, unde imber et ignes,
Arcturum pluuiasque Hyadas geminosque Triones,
quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles
hiberni, uel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet.

(1.740-46)

Long-haired Iopas, whom mighty Atlas instructed, rings-out his song with a golden lyre. He sings the wandering moon and the labors of the sun, where the race of men came from and the flocks, whence rain and fire, he sings Arcturus, and the rainy Hyades, and the twin Bears, why winter suns are so keen to bathe themselves in the Ocean, or what makes the sluggish nights linger.

⁹⁴ Dido's ceiling, and its celestial associations, curiously anticipates that of the palace of Domitian as it is described by the Flavian poets, notably Statius (*Silvae* 4.2) and Martial (7.56; 8.36). See further MacDonald (1965) 54-74. On *Silvae* 4.2, see esp. Coleman (1988); on Martial 7.56, see Vioque (2002); on Martial 8.36, see Schöffel (2002).

⁹⁵ Segal (1971) 342.

Iopas' song of the heavens and the marvels of nature is strongly reminiscent of the didactic tradition, and more specifically of Lucretius and of Virgil's own *Georgics*, from which it lifts two lines (*G.* 2.481-82 = *A.* 1.745-46).⁹⁶ It has no obvious Homeric precedent,⁹⁷ its chief epic model being the song of Orpheus in *Argonautica* 1 (469ff.).⁹⁸

So far as the *Aeneid* itself is concerned, however, Iopas' song has close affinities with a physical monument – or, rather, a pictorial representation of a physical monument:⁹⁹ the Labyrinth of Daedalus that will appear on the doors of the temple of Phoebus at Cumae (*hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error*, 6.27). The lexical parallels are emphatic: 1.742 and 6.27 are the only lines in the poem that contain both *labor* and *erro/error*. There are obvious affinities too between the celestial subject matter of Iopas' song and both the temple of Cumae – which stands in the sanctuary of Phoebus¹⁰⁰ and Trivia (i.e. the Sun and Moon) and the Labyrinth which appears on its doors, which is likely in Virgil's day to have attributed with celestial, cosmic characteristics. Doob's comment on Iopas' song is worth quoting in full:¹⁰¹

Iopas' song, carefully balancing one item against another, is a tightly constructed *labor*, a work of art like Virgil's, though in miniature.¹⁰² Iopas

⁹⁶ Cf. Adler (2003) 13: "The contest between physiologic and political poetry that Virgil sketches in the center of the *Georgics* is represented in the *Aeneid* as a contest between the song that Iopas sings to Dido and the Carthaginians and the song that Virgil sings to Augustus and the Romans."

⁹⁷ Cf. Kranz (1953), who interprets the song as an attempt at local color, citing Libyan and Phoenician religious beliefs supposedly alluded by Iopas. See further Hermann (1967); Quinn (1968) 108; Kinsey (1979). Interpretations of Iopas' song are helpfully summarized by Segal (1971) 336-37.

⁹⁸ Cf. Austin (1971) *ad* 742ff.. The case has been made that the ultimate model for Iopas' song is Demodocus' tale of Ares and Aphrodite in *Odyssey* 8, which in turn was interpreted by the ancient exegetical tradition as being an allegory of the opposing forces of Love and Strife. For a discussion, see Nelis (2001).

⁹⁹ Cf. Segal (1971) 345, who argues, not very convincingly, that Virgil "has chosen to emphasize the irregularities and blemishes in nature rather than its orderliness and harmony."

¹⁰⁰ Brown (1990) 331 notes that Iopas' long hair and golden lyre associate him with Apollo.

¹⁰¹ Doob (1990) 252.

¹⁰² Cf. Segal (1971) 348: "Present and future, individual and cosmic destinies, are ... telescoped into a single moment of poetic vision."

condenses and crystallizes the labyrinthine meanings and cycles of the *Aeneid*: in the beginning were *error* and *labor*, the moon and the sun, the twins Diana and Apollo who guard the double Cumaean doors. In the beginning was the cosmic labyrinth.

A book full of buildings and *monumenta* that are just like poems, it is perhaps appropriate that *Aeneid* 1 should conclude with poem that is just like a building.

We have discussed elsewhere the extent to which the *Aeneid* and very many of its individual episodes lend themselves to being conceived as labyrinthine. *Aeneid* 1 is no exception, and before proceeding further with Iopas' song it will be worthwhile noting the labyrinthine imaginary that has already appeared in the poem. We have already discussed the manner in which Venus, in her theatrical speech to Aeneas, uses architectonic imagery to characterize her story of Dido (*longa est iniuria, longae / ambages; sed summa sequar fastigia rerum*, 341-42). The *longae ambages* that characterize Dido's history bear a resemblance to the *ambages* of the Cretan Labyrinth, which Daedalus himself is said to have unraveled (*Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit*, 6.29).

Venus' other architectonically themed speech in *Aeneid* 1, her address to Cupid at 664-88, has a similarly labyrinthine flavor. Virgil introduces the speech by relating how Venus fears the *domus ambigua* of the queen of Carthage¹⁰³ (661), a phrase that recalls the *ambages* of Daedalus' *domus* on Crete¹⁰⁴ (6.27-30). The same passage includes a number of words that hint at the mutability and deceit that characterizes the Cretan myth. Venus' plan is that Cupid change his physical aspect

¹⁰³ Doob (1990) 234 observes: "Carthage functions like a maze *in malo* by imposing delay on Aeneas's fated *labor*, even if the diversion seems attractive."

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Doob (1990) 234: "Carthage shares some of the dangerous doubleness of mazes: as Venus fears, it is for Aeneas a doubtful house (*domus ambigua*) with inhabitants who, if not *biformes*, are at least *bilingues*, double tongued (1.661)."

(*mutatus*, 657); she fears not just the “ambiguous” house of Dido, but the “fork-tongued” Carthagians too (*Tyriosque bilingis*, 661), a phrase that anticipates Virgil’s description of the Minotaur (*prolesque biformis*, 6.25). In Venus’ speech too, the labyrinthine motifs continue:

uereor quo se Iunonia uertant
hospitia; haud tanto cessabit cardine rerum.
quocirca capere ante dolis et cingere flamma
reginam meditor, ne quo se numine mutet,
sed magno Aeneae mecum teneatur amore.

(6.671-5)

I am afraid of the direction in which Juno’s hospitality might turn; she will hardly give up the fight at so cardinal juncture in the story. Therefore it is my plan first to capture the queen with trickery and wall her about with flame, lest some divinity alter her, but rather that she be held in my power by her lust for Aeneas.

Venus’ use of the verb *uerto* (671) implies both that the hospitality that Juno inspires threatens to transform itself into various shapes and to change direction, phenomena that we might associate with the Daedalus myth. Similarly evocative of the Cretan myth are the *doli* with which Cupid is to ensnare Dido (673) and, more emphatic still, the anticipation in lines 674-5 of Daedalus’ pity for the *magnus amor* of another *regina* (*magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem*, 6.28).

The song of Iopas can thus be seen as the logical culmination of the architectonic and labyrinthine imagery that has been associated with narrative and poetry throughout

Aeneid 1.¹⁰⁵ It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the song of Iopas performs something of a pivotal role in the scene in which it appears. This is the word used by Brown to discuss the position of Iopas' song in the architecture of the book's concluding scene: "The circularity of the sequence, which places the first focus on Dido, shifts to Iopas and returns to Dido, confers a pivotal status on the song of Iopas and dramatizes the change in Dido [*sc.* from responsible ruler to lover]." ¹⁰⁶ If we follow Brown in identifying Iopas' song as a crucial determinant in the change in Dido's fortunes, we might say that the centrality of his performance in the architecture of the scene reflects its *cardinal* role in the plot. In this respect too, the song of Iopas can be read as an exquisite miniature of the thematic preoccupations of *Aeneid* 1.

As well as playing a pivotal role in the structure of the last scene of *Aeneid* 1, the song of Iopas neatly balances the speech of Dido with which the book concludes:¹⁰⁷

nec non et uario noctem sermone trahebat
 infelix Dido longumque bibebat amorem,
 multa super Priamo rogitans, super Hectore multa;
 nunc quibus Aurorae uenisset filius armis,
 nunc quales Diomedis equi, nunc quantus Achilles.
 'immo age et a prima dic, hospes, origine nobis
 insidias' inquit 'Danaum casusque tuorum
 erroresque tuos; nam te iam septima portat

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Doob's observations on the labyrinthine character of the *Aeneid* itself (Doob (1990) 246): "In style and structure, the *Aeneid* employs a labyrinthine aesthetic ... Lexically and syntactically, its style often relies on ambiguity. The poem mimics the infinitely intricate and highly patterned design of the maze in many ways. Aeneas's geographical wanderings trace a pictorial labyrinth of error; moreover, the *Aeneid* is the *locus classicus* of what medieval rhetoricians called artificial order – an order associated with the maze ..."

¹⁰⁶ Brown (1990) 333.

¹⁰⁷ On the balance between the summary of the story of Iopas and the answering description of Dido, see Clausen (1987) 31; Brown (1990) 315.

omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus aestas.’

(1.748-56)

Nor did wretched Dido fail to draw out the night with varied discussion; she drinks in love deeply, asking much about Priam, much about Hector; now she was asking about the arms with which Aurora’s son arrived, now about Diomedes’ horses, how about the size of Achilles. “But come now, my guest,” she says, “tell us from the very beginning of the treachery of the Danaans, of your adventures, or your wanderings; for now is the seventh summer that carries you wandering about the lands and seas.”

Commentators have noted that not only is Virgil’s report of Dido’s speech about the same length his summary of the song of Iopas, but it is characterized by precisely the same style, a combination of direct objects and indirect questions.¹⁰⁸ This is another way of saying that Dido has adopted a style more appropriate to the didactic poetry, the genre to which the song of Iopas most comfortably belongs. Also noteworthy is the demand, in Dido’s own words, that Aeneas tell his story from the very beginning (*a prima dic ... origine*, 753), a request that reflects Iopas’ own didactic preoccupation with origins (*unde hominum genus etc. ...*, 743). Finally, the emphatic repetition of *erro/error* in the final two lines of Dido’s speech (and of the book) creates a very strong link indeed with the *errans luna* of which Iopas sings at the beginning of *his* speech (*hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores*, 742).¹⁰⁹

Yet however great the similarity between the two passages, the fact remains that the subject matter of the song of Iopas and the events of which Dido calls upon

¹⁰⁸ Brown (1990) 320: “Precisely the same style, with its mixture of direct objects and indirect questions, is used by Virgil to report Dido’s questions to Aeneas following the performance of Iopas.” Brown also notes that the Homeric model here is Alcinoos’ questioning of Odysseus at *Od.* 8.572-86.

¹⁰⁹ Brown (1990) 322-23.

Aeneas to sing belong to distinct literary genres: didactic and epic respectively. In easing the transition from the *De rerum natura* of Iopas to the epic tale of Aeneas, Dido adopts the stylistic peculiarities of didactic to introduce epic subject matter. Brown observes another manner in which Virgil puts a non-epic spin on this transitional passage: by reducing Dido's question "to a highly particular, not to say trivial, level."¹¹⁰ I would add that Dido's rather comic concern with the minutiae of the Trojan War has something distinctly Alexandrian about it, as if she were prompting Aeneas to adopt a modern, or perhaps neoteric, approach to the traditional subject matter of the Epic Cycle.

The apparent preoccupation with genre in this passage is an appropriate way to close a book that can be read as an extended meditation on genre. More specifically, the move from the didactic poetry of Iopas to the epic tale of Aeneas repeats the transition from the theatrical atmosphere created by Aeneas' arrival in Africa and Venus' prologue (perhaps programmatically marked by the description of the *scaena* under construction in Carthage) to the epic character of the description of Dido's temple. Since we have already observed how this movement resembles the transition from theatrical stage to epic temple in the proem to *Georgics* 3, it is intriguing that the lines Virgil steals from the *Georgics* for the song of Iopas belong to the proclamation of poetics that towards the end of *Georgics* 2 (475-89). In that passage, Virgil prays that the Muses might teach him the secrets of the physical universe, presumably in order that he might be capable of explicating such wisdom in a didactic poem. Gale has noted the close connection between the generic concerns of this passage at the end of *Georgics* 2 and promise of an epic monument at the very beginning of *Georgics*

¹¹⁰ Brown (1990) 322.

3.¹¹¹ The two passages are united not only by their preoccupation with poetics, but specifically with the generic procession from didactic to epic.¹¹²

A comparison with the *Georgics*, and thereby the poetic *cursus* of Virgil, thus supports the suggestion that “the song of Iopas and the narration of Aeneas elicited by Dido represent contrasting, or even rival, poetic performances.”¹¹³ Just as Virgil announces his own transformation from didactic to epic poet in the center of the *Georgics*, so does Dido’s speech ease the transition from the cosmological concerns of Iopas to the epic narrative of Aeneas. It is, I suggest, the perfect ending to a book all but obsessed with the formalities of storytelling. It is appropriate too that Dido’s last words both generate another narrative and, in so doing, attempt to prescribe its narrative boundaries (*a prima dic, hospes, origine, 753*). Aeneas’ brief is now to create his own (epic) labyrinth, a narrative edifice whose structure is defined not by Iopas’ wandering moon (*errantem lunam*), but by his own *errores* through the Mediterranean.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Cf. Gale (2000).

¹¹² Doob (1990) 232 observes that “the narrative of Aeneas’s *errores* requested by Dido (1.755-56) begins with two disguised manifestations of the labyrinth . . . : the deadly horse as a static parallel to the deceitful house of Daedalus and the serpents as a kinetic mirror of its fatal, convoluted duality, with Laocoon the tragic bridge between them.”

¹¹³ Brown (1990) 322.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Brown (1990) 323: “Thus the obtrusive echo of *errantem* in the last line of Dido’s speech represents a restoration of epic language to its proper sphere and emphasizes her preoccupation with heroic experience as opposed to the celestial realms of Iopas’ song.”

Chapter three

Aeneid 6.1-294

Virgil's description of his fantasy temple at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 generates an interesting paradox: although that building is, on the poet's own admission, pure fantasy, it is a fantasy "modeled" on physical monuments,¹ notably the recently dedicated temple of Palatine Apollo, that were known to Virgil's earliest readers. Virgil's song-temple is a poetic counterpart to Octavian's marble temple on the Palatine, complete with ivory doors and statuary made of Parian marble. The reader is made to imagine a structure very similar to the familiar Palatine temple, standing on the banks of the Mincius and decorated with different motifs. To put it another way, Virgil "relocates" Octavian's temple to the northern Italy, adding decorated temple-doors and statuary of his own design.² The resultant architectonic vision is a curious mixture of poetic fantasy and material reality that precipitates important questions concerning the relationship between the phenomenological world and the world of poetry.

Recognizing this paradox can help us to understand the temple that Virgil describes at Cumae at the beginning of *Aeneid* 6. The area around the ancient Hellenic city, which Virgil imagines his Trojans visiting after their sojourn in Sicily, was the region in which Virgil was reputed to have spent most of his adult life (Donatus, *Vita* 25): if the imagined temple of the *Georgics* is located in the region of

¹ This paradox is noticed, albeit in a different context, by Bleisch (2003) 95: "Virgil's description of the *regia* [*sc.* of Picus, described at *Aen.* 7.170-93] is a 'notional ekphrasis' (to use John Hollander's term adopted by Putnam ...). But Picus' *regia* bears close resemblance to actual palaces in Rome."

² Cf. Mynors (1990) *ad* 13: "A poet's imaginary temple should be not under his readers' eyes in Rome, but in some place which they had not seen but could imagine without difficulty ... He describes the place with that power to make his reader see what he sees which is one of his most original gifts."

Virgil's childhood, the temple of Cumae described in *Aeneid* 6 was set in the landscape of his adulthood. In the years immediately preceding the composition of the *Aeneid*, moreover, the area around Cumae had undergone a dramatic upheaval. Octavian and Agrippa repaired to Cumae in the mid-thirties, when their fortunes in the war with Sextus Pompey had reached their nadir, in order to construct defensible military and naval installations capable of protecting the mainland from Pompey's fleet.³ A famous passage from the *Georgics* describing the transformation of the Lucrinus and Avernus lakes into a massive naval base testifies to the degree to which Agrippa's military preparations had altered the landscape of the area:

an memorem portus Lucrinoque addita claustra
atque indignatum magnis stridoribus aequor,
Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso
Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Avernus?

(2.161-64)

Or should I tell of the ports and the barriers imposed upon Lucrinus and the sea indignant with its great wailings, there where the Julian waters sound from afar when the sea has flowed back and the Tyrrhenus tide has been admitted through the channels of Avernus?

Since the transformation of Lake Avernus and Lake Lucrinus into a naval base for Agrippa's operations against Sextus Pompey appears prominently in the *laudes Italiae*, there can be no question that the massive alteration in the landscape of the region around Cumae made an impression upon the poet himself.

In his discussion of area (5.4.5), Strabo discusses explicitly the contrast between its primeval aspect and the transformation it had undergone in the early

³ Cf. McKay (1973) 62; Leech (1999) 115.

thirties.⁴ Not only does he relate how the shores of Cumae had often been identified with the Land of the Dead visited by the Homeric Odysseus (*Odyssey* 11), but he also mentions the fact the area had, until the arrival of Agrippa, been exceptionally thick with ancient woods.⁵ Although the picture of Cumae and its environs that Virgil creates in the *Aeneid* differs vastly from the Cumae of the 20s BC, the primeval aspect that he aims to revive in his verses must still have been vivid the minds of the local population.⁶

As well as the surrounding landscape, the temple on the lower terrace of the Cumaean acropolis also underwent a significant change in appearance at around the same time. That temple, not to be confused with the temple to Zeus that occupied the upper terrace,⁷ has been securely identified as a temple of Apollo by an Oscan inscription:⁸ APOLLINI CVMANO Q TINEIVS RVFVS “Quintus Tineius Rufus dedicates this temple to Cumaean Apollo.” The original temple dates from the sixth century but, together with the entire citadel, it underwent radical renovations during the Augustan period. These changes were revolutionary,⁹ entailing major restructuring to the interior, which now accommodated three cellae, and to the roofing and entablature.

There are intriguing links between the material remains of the lower terrace on the Cumaean acropolis and what we know about the temple of Palatine Apollo, which

⁴ Cf. Leech (1999) 115: “Strabo though his informative contrast between ancient and contemporary topography helps us to understand the particular effort of imaginative reconstruction by which Vergil restored its primitive aspect to the territory of the Campi Phlegrei.”

⁵ Cf. Leech (1999) 115: “Virgil reconstructs an older Cumae, a city whose long history did indeed begin as a Greek colony, although Virgil is the first to have brought Daedalus to the site.”

⁶ On the geography of Virgil’s Cumae, see esp. Clark (1991).

⁷ Livy (27.23.20) informs us of the temple of Jupiter. See Clark (1991) 61.

⁸ The inscription was found in 1921 by the Italian excavator Amedeo Maiuri. The inscription has never been published and remains lost in the bowels of the Naples Museum. See McKay (1973) 52; Clark (1991) 61-62.

⁹ On the Augustan renovations to the Cumaean temple of Apollo, see the useful summary of McKay (1973) 51-53.

was constructed at the same time as the renovations in Cumae.¹⁰ Marble ornaments with bas-relief work have been found depicting foliage and lyres of various designs, the latter feature offering an obvious parallel to the musical aspect of Apollo celebrated on the Palatine. Moreover, the new tripartite design of the Cumaean temple suggests the same inhabitants as those of the Palatine temple: Apollo, Diana, and Latona. The monumentality of the new construction was such that it must have been worthy of comparison with its sister temple on the Palatine. When the archaeological evidence is considered together with the political circumstances of Cumae in the early thirties and the fact the Augustus himself dates his massive program of building and restoration specifically to 28, it seems overwhelmingly likely that the restoration of the temple on the lower terrace of the Cumaean citadel is to be considered as being contemporary with the completion of Apollo's temple on the Palatine.¹¹

If Actian Apollo, the god to whom the Octavian's Palatine temple was eventually dedicated, was seen to have presided over the crucial naval victory over Antony, it stands to reason that Cumaean Apollo was to be honored for overseeing Agrippa's final victory over Sextus.¹² If so, the new temple of Cumaean Apollo would serve as a neat counterpart not only to the temple that was eventually dedicated to Actian Apollo on the Palatine and duly celebrated in the description of Aeneas' shield in *Aeneid* 8, but also to the temple to Apollo at Actium itself, an earlier incarnation of which appears in *Aeneid* 3.¹³ The temple of Palatine Apollo – vowed for the (Cumaean) campaign against Sextus and dedicated to the god of Actium - may

¹⁰ On the similarities between the renovations to the Cumaean temple and the temple of Palatine Apollo, see esp. McKay (1973) 61-63.

¹¹ Cf. Paschalis (1986) 36 (n. 15): "The legend of the foundation and decoration of Apollo's Cumaean temple is tremendously significant for the early Augustan Age, in the light of the dedication of Octavian's Palatine temple in October 28 BC ... and also of the almost complete reconstruction of the two temples of Apollo on the Acropolis of Cumae undertaken by Augustus probably between 28 and 23 BC."

¹² Cf. McKay (1973) 62: "Actium was obviously and manifestly the supreme victory of Octavian, but Cumae's role in the years of his ascendancy was no less vital."

¹³ Cf. McKay (1973) 61.

thus be understood as the crucial link between two further Apolline temples that celebrated Octavian's key victories in the late 30s and feature prominently in the *Aeneid*.¹⁴

In the proem to *Georgics* 3, Virgil might be said to have relocated the brand new Palatine temple to northern Italy and undertaken some renovations of his own; in the case of the Cumaean temple, a newly renovated temple very much like its analogue on the Palatine – and a building closely associated with the ideologically motivated building program of the Augustan regime – stood in the area where Virgil spent a good part of his adult life. In *Aeneid* 6, Virgil provides the aetiology for that temple, apparently suggesting that the temple that stood on the Cumaean acropolis in his own day was founded in the heroic age by Daedalus.¹⁵

Virgil introduces the aetiology of Daedalus' temple abruptly:¹⁶

iam subeunt Triviae lucos atque aurea tecta.

Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna

praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo

insuetum per iter gelidas enavit ad Arctos,

Chalcidicaque leuis tandem super astitit arce.

redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacrauit

remigium alarum posuitque immania templa.

(6.13-19)

And now they approach the grove of Trivia and the golden temple. Daedalus, or so the story goes, dared to entrusted himself to the sky with his swift wings

¹⁴ The resemblance between the Cumaean temple as it is described by Virgil and the temple of Palatine Apollo is noted by Deuling (1997) 29: "The description of the carved doors ... is realistic and suggests the type of doors found on the temple of Apollo Palatinus and others."

¹⁵ Cf. Smolenaars (1998) 51: "The temple of Cumaean Apollo Vergil has in mind is the one rebuilt by Augustus at the same period."

¹⁶ On the origins of temples in Republican and Imperial Rome, see esp. Stambaugh (1978) 557-67.

when he saw fleeing Minos' kingdom and navigated an unwonted course toward the chilly Bears. He came at last lightly to rest upon the Chalcidian citadel. Having touched down first in this land, he consecrated to you, Phoebus, his oarage of wings and dedicated an enormous temple.

Evidence for the presence of Daedalus on the bay of Naples is as jarring as that of Aeneas himself,¹⁷ for none of the pre-Virgilian sources for the Daedalus myth locates the end of Daedalus' wanderings in Campania.¹⁸ Servius claims that Daedalus arrived at Cumae after first having, "according to Sallust," touched down in Sardinia.¹⁹ As Norden points out, however, Sallust tells only of Daedalus' arrival in Crete, making no mention of a subsequent flight to Cumae (*Hist.*, fr. 2.6-7 Maur.).²⁰ According to Diodorus (4.77-78) and Pausanias (7.4.6), neither of whom mentions Cumae, Daedalus' original destination was Sicily. Whether or not there existed a precedent for Daedalus' destination in a local tradition preserved in the mythological handbooks,²¹ it seems plain that in locating Daedalus in Campania Virgil was taking considerable liberties with the mythic tradition. Hence the poet's assertion that Daedalus landed "first" at Cumae (*redditus his primum terris*, 18) may be read in two ways: 1) Cumae was the first place that Daedalus landed (*primum* being a possible

¹⁷ Cf. Parke (1998) 74: "Even though Cumae was recognized as the oldest Greek colony on the Italian mainland, it was obvious that it did not antedate the Trojan War ... Virgil was also no doubt conscious of this difficulty, but he solved it by another method: he assigned Daedalus as the founder of the temple of Cumae, and overwhelmed his readers with an account of the great aviar-artist and his work, before introducing the Sibyl on the scene. Daedalus, the contemporary of Minos, antedated the Trojan War. So the problem of chronology was solved for Virgil without sacrificing the location of the Sibyl at the Greek colony of Cumae."

¹⁸ Cf. Clark (1991) 61: "Cumae was the most ancient classical city on the mainland of Italy. As though this historical fact attracted a mythological fact, Virgil imagined the site to have been visited by Aeneas in Trojan times."

¹⁹ *Daedalus primo Sardiniam, ut dicit Sallustius, post delatus est Cumas et templo Apollini condito in foribus haec uniuersa depinxit* "Daedalus was borne first to Sardinia, as Sallust says, and then to Cumae, where, upon building a temple to Apollo, he represented all these things on the doors."

²⁰ Norden (1916) *ad* 14ff.: "hierin stammt aber nur die Erwähnung Sardiniens aus Sallust."

²¹ Thus Norden (1916) *ad* 14ff: "In mythographischen Handbüchern werden, wie gewöhnlich, die Varianten gestanden haben, darunter die hier von Vergil befolgte local-patriotische von Kyme."

polemical “correction” of the mythographic tradition),²² and 2) *Aeneid* 6 is the first literary *locus* at which Daedalus was located at Cumae.

Virgil programmatically signals his engagement with a malleable mythic tradition by prefacing his version of Daedalus’ fight with the words *ut fama est* (14).²³ On the most basic level, the phrase *ut fama est* signifies the poet’s passive acceptance of the mythic tradition as he finds it. At the same time, of course, Virgil acknowledges the fact that that tradition is the product of *fama* (“rumor”), a phenomenon that he has already personified as a highly dubious combination of truth and fiction (*pariter facta atque infecta canebat*, 4.173-95). In introducing the Daedalus narrative, then, Virgil claims to be guided by tradition at the same time that he signals the labile credibility of that tradition. As the narrative proceeds, Virgil presents the reader with a tradition that appears, contrary to the poet’s earlier protestations, not even to enjoy the corroboration of “rumor.” As Putnam notes, “[b]y feigning to repeat tradition unemotionally and then significantly varying it, the narrator claims control over the history of his subject.”²⁴

There is a sense, then, that Virgil has created for himself a literary space within which to erect his monument. Yet that space is carved out of the physical reality of Augustan Cumae.²⁵ According to the conceit of Virgil’s text, the temple that Aeneas and his men approach is identical to the one available for the poet’s perusal not far

²² Cf. Norden (1916) *ad* 14ff.: “Durch die Worte 18 *redditus his primum terris* scheint er mit gelehrter Anspielung der abweichenden Sagenversion entgegenzutreten, nach der Daedalus nicht zuerst oder überhaupt nicht nach Kyme gekommen war.”

²³ The most thorough discussion of the phrase *ut fama est* remains Norden (1916) *ad* 14.

²⁴ Cf. Putnam (1998) 78: “By re-creating someone else’s report and not, it would seem, inventing his own version of the Daedalus story, he distances us in time while apparently disclaiming any direct involvement on his part in the telling;” n. 3: “By feigning to repeat tradition unemotionally and then significantly varying it, the narrator claims control over the history of his subject.”

²⁵ It is worthwhile to compare the techniques of contemporary Roman wall painting, where the integration of real and painted architecture was a common motif. See e.g. the discussion of Galinsky (1996) 180-97. Galinsky cites a room in the Casa del Labirinto as a successful example of this technique (180). See further Hales (2003).

from his Campanian estate.²⁶ Thanks largely to the dramatic character of the Augustan renovations, however, there can be no pretence that the artwork that Aeneas sees was still extant at the end of the first century BC. While the structure that Virgil describes as occupying his poetic space at the beginning of *Aeneid* 6 could readily be identified with the building that stood on the Cumaean citadel in the 20s BC, the Daedalan sculptures that Virgil describes must necessarily be the product of his own fantasy.²⁷ Virgil utilizes the poetic space he creates for himself on the temple doors by describing an artwork that narrates, and provides the “proof” for, his own aetiology for the temple.

The way Virgil presents the temple of Daedalus shows some important similarities with his description of his song-temple in *Georgics* 3.²⁸ In the *Georgics*, Virgil describes a temple that looks like the temple of Palatine Apollo, but with a different set of doors. In *Aeneid* 6, he purports to describe a temple that is (putatively) still extant, but whose original doors had long since disappeared. In both cases, the temple doors are creations of the poet implicitly situated within an architectonic context that exists independently of the poem. The appearance of Daedalus’ original doors is known only to Virgil, who presently tells us what they looked like. By describing the only part of the temple that is no longer available for our perusal, however, it is strongly implied that the temple doors described in *Aeneid* 6 are the creation not of Daedalus, but of the poet of the *Aeneid*. Because the artifact he describes narrates its own creation, Virgil is able to “corroborate” his own novel aetiology for the temple.

²⁶ As Clark (1991) 62 notes, however, Virgil puts “poetry ahead of real facts” when he implies that the temple of Apollo – situated on the lower of the two terraces – dominates the citadel. Which is simply to say that, in this instance, the poet departs from the material reality upon which his poetic vision of Cumae is founded.

²⁷ Cf. Parke (1998) 74.

²⁸ Cf. Pavlock (1998) 144.

Whereas the *immania templa* dedicated by Daedalus could be imagined as still standing in the poet's day, the temple doors, precisely because they are no longer extant, are the creation of the poet. Because of the implied contrast between the reality of Augustan Cumae and the long-lost temple-doors of Daedalus, the latter are poetic art only thinly disguised as such. Uniquely for an epic artifact,²⁹ they tell the story of their own creation:

in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas
Cecropidae iussi (miserum!) septena quotannis
corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna.
contra elata mari respondet Cnosia tellus:
hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto
Pasiphae mixtumque genus prolesque biformis
Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae,
hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error;
magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem
Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit,
caeca regens filo uestigia. tu quoque magnam
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,
bis patriae cecidere manus. quin protinus omnia
perlegerent oculis, ni iam praemissus Achates
adforet atque una Phoebi Triuiaie sacerdos.

(6.20-35)

On the temple-doors, the death of Androgeus. Then the sons of Cecrops, commanded (how pitiful!) to pay an annual penalty of seven native sons; the

²⁹ Cf. Putnam (1998) 81-82.

urns stand, the lots drawn. Balancing this on the other side, rising out of the sea, appears the land of Cnosos: here is the cruel passion for a bull – Pasiphae stealthily mated – and the mixed offspring, the two-formed progeny: the Minotaur, the memorial of an unspeakable union. Here is the renowned workmanship of that building and the irresolvable wandering. But, taking pity on the queen’s prodigious love, Daedalus himself undid the tricks of the building and resolved its windings, leading blind steps by a thread. You too would have claimed a leading role in this great work of art, Icarus, had grief permitted it. Twice had he tried to fashion your fall in gold, twice a father’s hands fell. Indeed, they would have read through all these things had not Achates, who had been sent forward, been present, together with the priestess of Phoebus and Trivia.

The poet’s description of the temple doors can be understood in two ways.³⁰ First, they can be read, like Homer’s description of the forging of Achilles’ shield in *Iliad* 18, as an account of Daedalus making the doors. Accordingly, the entire description can be read as a continuation of the story of his arrival in Cumae, an amplification of the poet’s bald statement that Daedalus built the temple (*posuitque immania templa*, 19). The account of Daedalus’ manufacture of the temple doors concludes with the explicit acknowledgement that he had tried, and failed, to fashion the final episode of his narrative: the *casus* of his son Icarus. The dramatic description of a protagonist attempting to create a work of art is unique in Latin literature,³¹ as is

³⁰ On the probably layout of the doors’ decorations, see Deuling (1997) 56-57.

³¹ Noted by Pöschl (1975) 121 (“Es ist, soviel ich sehe, die erste Beschreibung eines Bildwerkes, in dem der Künstler sein eigenes Schicksal darstellt”); Fitzgerald (1984) 53; Putnam (1998) 74: “This is the only occasion in ancient literature where an artist is described as constructed the literal – which in this case is also to say his spiritual – biography.”

the description of the artist failing to finish his creation. By the express admission of the poet, art has failed fully to represent life, or death.

The description of the temple-doors can also be read, like the description of Aeneas' shield in book 8, as an account of what Aeneas sees when he approaches the temple. In this case, we must assume that the narrative of the circumstances behind the erection of the temple concludes with line 19, the abruptness of the transition from the narrative of Daedalus to the description of the temple-doors mirroring the abruptness of the initial introduction of Daedalus into the main narrative³² (*Daedalus, ut fama est*, 14). In this respect, the description less resembles the account of the forging of Achilles' shield in *Iliad* 18 than that of Aeneas uncomprehendingly viewing the shield of Vulcan in *Aeneid* 8 (*talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis, / miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet* "such things does he marvel at on the shield of Vulcan, the gift of his parent, and rejoices in the representation of events he doesn't understand" 729-30). The reader, however, is unaware that the description might be focalized through Aeneas until the poet switches from describing Daedalus' failure to complete his work to the failure of Aeneas and his companions to "read through"³³ the entire narrative³⁴ (*omnia / perlegerent*, 33-34). The parallels between the failure of Icarus to stay aloft, of Daedalus to put the *summa manus* to his artwork, and of Aeneas to finish his viewing conceal violent disjunctures within in the narrative.

³² Cf. Fitzgerald (1984) 52: "The digression that recounts the story of Daedalus, beginning on the fourteenth line of this book, is one of the most abrupt in the *Aeneid*, coming as it does at a moment of considerable expectation and without any transition from the main narrative." Norden (1916) *ad* 14ff. notes that the abrupt transition prompted one editor to posit a lacuna.

³³ On "reading" pictorial art on buildings, cf. Newlands (2002) 127 on Statius, *Silvae* 1.3.

³⁴ Cf. Fitzgerald (1984) 57: "If the original interruption of the main narrative was an abrupt movement to the legend of Daedalus, the transition back to this narrative is so seamless as to suggest almost a single plane."

The uncertainty over the question of how to focalize the description of the temple-doors³⁵ – whether as an account of Daedalus’ craftsmanship or of Aeneas’ viewing a (nearly) completed work of art – strongly contributes to the sense that Virgil’s temple-doors are a poetic rather than a physical artifact.³⁶ Corresponding to the curious “bifocalized” quality of the description there may be identified another disruptive narrative procedure: the slippage from one level of narration to another. Lines 20-27, whether we conceive them as belonging to the account of Daedalus making the doors or the description of how they appear to Aeneas, belong to the primary level of the narrative. Androgeos’ murder, the drawing of lots in Athens, Pasiphae’s mating with the bull, the Minotaur, and the Labyrinth all appear as artistic representations on Daedalus’ doors. Directly after the appearance of the Labyrinth, however, the Cretan saga slips into primary level of the narrative:³⁷ Daedalus’ pity for the great love of the *regina*, the escape of (the unnamed) Theseus from the Labyrinth leap forth from the frame of Daedalus’ artwork and appear as living scenes within the primary narrative.³⁸ As Putnam has observed with respect to these lines, “[n]othing intervenes to prevent the reader from the stated actuality of Daedalus’ experience.”³⁹

³⁵ Cf. with the observations of Bleisch (2003) 89 of the description of the Latinus’ palace in *Aeneid* 7: “In sharp contrast to the ekphrasis of Juno’s temple [in *Aeneid* 1], the *regia* [of Latinus] lacks any internal viewer at all: Virgil’s readers are its viewers.”

³⁶ Cf. Fitzgerald (1984) 56: “at this point the two circles [*sc.* narrative circles] melt into one with the apostrophe to Icarus that both continues the story of Daedalus *and* tells about the production of the work on which it is represented; frame and content can no longer be distinguished.”

³⁷ Cf. Fitzgerald (1984) 54: “The first part of the *ekphrasis*, up to the line describing the labyrinth, conveys the visual medium through a decomposed narrative. Time is spatialized so that the two panels confront each other without any narrative connection being made between the penalty paid by the Athenian youths for the murder of Androgeos and the products of Pasiphae’s cruel love in Crete.”

³⁸ Pöschl (1975) 122 notes that what makes the description of Daedalus temple distinctive is the steadily increasing emotional involvement on the part of the poet: “Für die antiken Bildbeschreibungen, vom Schild des Achill angefangen, ist das durchweg charakteristisch: der Dichter tritt aus der objektiven Beschreibung heraus. Von seiner Phantasie fortgerissen, wendet er sich von der Beschreibung des Kunstwerks den Geschehnissen zu, die es darstellt. Die Beschreibung verwandelt sich in Erzählung ... Hier aber ist – und das ist das virgilisch Besondere – das Heraustreten zum Ausdruck einer sich steigernden Anteilnahme des Dichters und, wie man annehmen möchte, des Beschauers geworden.”

³⁹ Putnam (1998) 80. He continues: “By contrast to the preceding episode, then, this tableau is *vivant*. Frozen re-presentation yields to active experience, as we are made to share directly in the artist’s suffering.”

The manner in which Virgil treats the succeeding episode, however, places the narratological status of the Cretan saga under greater strain. Whereas Virgil allows it to be inferred that the Theseus episode was represented on Daedalus' temple-doors, he states expressly that the death of Icarus does not appear (*tu quoque magnam / partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes*, 30-31). Whereas the direct narration of the Theseus episode is implicitly justified by its (supposedly) having been represented at Cumae, the death of Icarus is present only as an absence. Icarus' *casus* belongs to the implied account of Daedalus' making the doors only insofar as it *failed* to be represented there. The fact remains, however, that the fall of Icarus was neither represented artistically at Cumae and nor was it ever seen by Aeneas.

It is no accident that this point of extreme stress on the poem's narratological framework is marked by, or rather generated by, an apostrophe, the rhetorical figure most at odds with temporal, sequential narrative⁴⁰ (30-31). The transition from the direct narration of Theseus and Ariadne's adventures in Cnosus to the direct address to (the absent and long deceased) Icarus brings about a still closer approximation of the narrator to his *fabula*. If the appearance of the Labyrinth precipitates a move from the description of an artifact to direct narrative, the appeal to Icarus brings the narrator into the very presence of his protagonist. The saga of Crete has progressed from being the subject of an artwork that appears within a literary narrative to an event appearing before the very eyes of the poet. When Virgil apostrophizes Icarus, the Cretan saga has achieved the same degree of reality as the narrator who is telling us his story. The *fabula* of the Cretan saga, that is to say, has attained full autonomy from the media in which it ought to be imbedded.

⁴⁰ See the useful discussion of Culler (1981) 135-54, who identifies apostrophe as one of the two dominant forces of poetic art: "the narrative and the apostrophic" (149).

An instructive parallel to the narrative tricks that Virgil plays at the opening of *Aeneid* 6 occurs in the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the celebrated episode in which Mercury lures the hundred-eyed Argus to sleep in order to slay him and thereby to liberate Io (1.668-723).⁴¹ To make Argus sufficiently drowsy, Mercury tells a tale that will serve as something of a template for so many tales in the *Metamorphoses*: Pan's pursuit of Syrinx and the nymph's eventually transformation into a reed pipe. Unfortunately for Ovid's reader, Argus drops off before Mercury has time to complete the tale (*restabat uerba referre* "some of the story remained to be told," 700). Happily, for our benefit Ovid proceeds to relate in *oratio obliqua* what Mercury was going to say, but never did (*talia dicturus*, 700-13).⁴² The conclusion to the tale of Pan and Syrinx thus find its way into the *Metamorphoses*, but because Mercury never narrates that conclusion, it doesn't belong to any of the formal narrative levels of that poem.⁴³ Few would deny that the Syrinx *fabula* is a prime example of Ovid's engagement in the *Metamorphoses* with the dynamics of narration and the relationship between literary fiction and reality; it is my view that similar questions are at stake in the description of Daedalus' temple doors in *Aeneid* 6.

The fact that Daedalus' story – like Ovid's tale of Pan and Syrinx – exists independently is emphasized by the fact that the narrator's apostrophe brings the Cretan *fabula* up to the point where the story of Daedalus had very abruptly taken off

⁴¹ Cf. Rosati (1994) 19-21.

⁴² Cf. Rosati (1994) 20-21: "Il narratore principale interrompe il *continuum* del racconto, al narratore Mercurio, che nell'economia della propria azione ... non ha più alcun bisogno di portare a termine la storia di Siringa perché ha raggiunto il suo scopo, il sonno totale di Argo, che potrà quindi uccidere. Ma la logica del personaggio Mercurio non è quella dell'autore Ovidio, che non subordina il racconto alle ragioni dinamiche degli eventi narrati: per lui il racconto deve anzitutto soddisfare le attese del suo destinatario, cioè del lettore."

⁴³ Once again, the formulation of Rosati (1994) 21 is enlightening: "egli interrompe la continuità dell'azione ... per salvaguardare quella del racconto ... Mediante uno sfasamento dei livelli narrativi, al narratore Mercurio si sostituisce appunto il narratore esterno, che ne assume le funzioni e ne porta a termine il compito: al destinatario del racconto Argo, preda del sonno, si sostituisce il lettore ...: non è più necessario all'interno dell'universo diegetico, il racconto della storia di Siringa lo resta all'esterno, sul piano del rapporto che lega il poeta al suo pubblico."

at line 14 (*Daedalus, ut fama est ...*).⁴⁴ The fact that Daedalus' doors narrate the circumstances of their own construction sets up a potential circularity that is only broken by the artist's failure to represent the death of his son. Should Daedalus have decided to extend his narrative past his aborted Icarus vignette to include his arrival at Cumae and the erection of his temple, Daedalus' temple doors would have represented artistically their own coming into being. Instead, it is Virgil who creates his own narrative circularity by picking up the story immediately after the death of Icarus in line 14 and describing the artwork that Daedalus creates upon his arrival in Cumae. By describing Daedalus' temple doors, Virgil supports his own improbable etymology for the building he describes at Cumae.⁴⁵ The fact that Daedalus' doors were one part of the Phoebus' temple not extant in the 20s BC (i.e. one poetic fiction is supported by another) only serves the more strongly to vindicate the autonomy of poetic narrative within an architectonic framework.

Let us revisit the point in Virgil's description of the temple doors where Daedalus' scenes step out of their artistic frame and come to life: *hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error* (27).⁴⁶ The *hic* of line 27, answering to that of line 24, situates Daedalus' building somewhere on the second leaf of the temple doors. Daedalus' *domus* is not named, only its famous workmanship (*labor*) and its notorious windings (*inextricabilis error*). Like the (very literary) Trojan temple of Athena that appears among the murals on Juno's temple at Carthage, Daedalus' *domus* is described as a building represented upon another building which is itself described in a literary

⁴⁴ Pöschl (1975) 119 notes that Virgil's description begins and ends with the death of a son.

⁴⁵ Cf. Parke (1998) 74: Virgil "assigned Daedalus as the founder of the temple of Cumae, and overwhelmed his readers with an account of the great aviar-artist and his work, before introducing the Sibyl on the scene. Daedalus, the contemporary of Minos, antedated the Trojan War." See n. 11, above.

⁴⁶ Doob (1990) 237 notes that the phrase *hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error* "effectively paraphrases the whole poem."

narrative. Uniquely, however, the *domus* of Daedalus emerges from its artistic context and occupies the foreground of the narrative. The Labyrinth of Crete is not only the last thing said explicitly to appear on the temple-doors, but it is also the architectonic backdrop for the first event of the Cretan saga which occupies the foreground of the narrative: Daedalus' solving of his own maze (*Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resouit*, 29). It is Daedalus' *domus*, that byword for complex artistry that is also a symbol of poetic art,⁴⁷ which precipitates the jump from one narrative mode to another. Indeed, while the narrative speaks of Daedalus resolving the puzzle of his own maze, it is precisely the Labyrinth that creates the narratological maze that is not resolved until Aeneas is recalled to his senses by Deiphobe.

Daedalus' *domus* is a fitting symbol for the narrative maze Virgil creates in his description of the temple-doors attributed to Daedalus.⁴⁸ The Labyrinth, of course, is a building whose associations with narrative art have long been recognized. For the *Aeneid* in particular, the Labyrinth is a defining symbol.⁴⁹ As Doob observes, the *Aeneid* is "the earliest major example of truly labyrinthine literature: it includes explicit images of the maze and references to its myth, employs a labyrinthine narrative structure, and embodies themes associated with the idea of the labyrinth."⁵⁰ The Labyrinth that Virgil describes Daedalus as having represented at Cumae, and whose description at line 27 makes the reader lose all trace of the poem's narrative

⁴⁷ Cf. Doob (1990) 24: "Any complicated building with many chambers and corridors is potentially labyrinthine; any building or mental process difficult to penetrate or escape without a guide is a kind of maze." On the labyrinth as a symbol of complex poetic artistry, see esp. Doob (1990) 39-91.

⁴⁸ On the importance to Virgil of Daedalus, particularly as an artist, inspired creator, and a mythological prototype for Aeneas, see Rutledge (1967) 309-11; Rutledge (1971-72) 110-12.

⁴⁹ Cf. Pavlock (1998) 144: "The ecphrasis of the temple doors is a kind of emblem for Virgil's epic, for the poet had prophesied in the *Georgics* that he would construct a temple to honour Augustus." Pavlock (1998) 142 also observes that Virgil's labyrinth appears, like that of Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*, in the middle of his poem: "This position mediating between old and new, past and future, lends itself to reflection on the poetics of the *Aeneid*." Cf. Pavlock (1998) 144: "

⁵⁰ Doob (1990) 227.

threads, thus symbolizes and encapsulates Virgil's engagement with the problems of narrative in this passage.

Daedalus' Labyrinth is, however, only once mentioned by name,⁵¹ during the account of the equestrian maneuvers of Ascanius and his friends in book 5:

ut quondam Creta fertur Labyrinthus in alta
parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque
mille uiis habuisse dolum, qua signa sequendi
frangeret indeprentus et inremeabilis error:
haud alio Teucrum nati uestigia cursu
impediunt texuntque fugas et proelia ludo,
delphinum similes qui per maria umida nando
Carpathium Libycumque secant.

(589-95)

Just as long ago the Labyrinth in lofty Crete – or so the story goes – contained a blind path interwoven with walls and slippery deceit with its thousand roads, where the insoluble and intractable maze would break the signs of return. By no different a course did the sons of the Teucrians impede their steps and weave retreats and battle in sport, just like the dolphins which, swimming through the watery seas, cut through the Carpathian and Libyan seas.

The intricate movements of the equestrian Troy game precipitate a comparison to the Labyrinth which Daedalus is said (*fertur*, 589) once to have built in Crete. The comparison seems a natural one, for to the observer the boys' performance is as bewildering in its complexity as is Daedalus' Labyrinth to one trapped inside.

⁵¹ On the curious absence of the word "labyrinth" in Virgil and other writers, see Doob (1990) 31-32.

The pattern created by the Ascanius' troop, however, is an abstract, impermanent one that vanishes as soon as it comes into being.⁵² Yet it achieves another sort of permanence by virtue of being the first of a series of performances that will extend down to the time of the poem's composition.⁵³ This the poet explains in no fewer than seven lines:

hunc morem cursus atque haec certamina primus
Ascanius, Longam muris cum cingeret Albam,
rettulit et priscos docuit celebrare Latinos,
quo puer ipse modo, secum quo Troia pubes;
Albani docuere suos; hinc maxima porro
accepit Roma et patrium seruavit honorem;
Troiaque nunc pueri, Troianum dicitur agmen.

(596-602)

Ascanius was the first, when he was encircling Alba Longa with walls, to transmit the tradition of this ride and these contests and to teach the indigenous Latins to celebrate it in precisely the same way that boy himself had done, together with the Trojan youth. The people of Alba taught their sons; and thus in turn did great Rome herself receive the tradition, and preserved it as national tradition. Now the boys are called "Troy," the contest "Trojan."

Virgil's extraordinary seven-line excursus details with antiquarian zeal the careful reproduction of the labyrinthine pattern performed by Ascanius and his companions

⁵² Cf. Doob (1990) 28: "The comparison of the *lusus Troiae* to the labyrinth is based on the fact that both are complex in pattern, difficult to follow, and interwoven ... This complexity is partly the result of a multicursal design: if the Cretan labyrinth has its thousand ways, the *lusus Troiae* has at least three interlocking paths corresponding to the three troops of riders with their entangled steps."

⁵³ On Virgil's use of aetiology in the *Aeneid*, see esp. Horsfall (1991).

from the present of the narrative to the Augustan present.⁵⁴ When Ascanius was engaged in architectonic activity at Alba Longa (*Longam muris cum cingeret Album*, 597), he “reproduced” the Troy game from an established model (*rettulit*, 598) and taught it to the natives (598). The parallel clauses of line 599 emphasize the care with which the pattern established by Ascanius and the *Troia pubes* was maintained in transmission. Finally, in lines 600-602, Virgil narrates the handing down of the tradition through successive generations before being adopted by Rome, where it is performed still (*nunc*).⁵⁵

Unlike the physical Labyrinth of Daedalus, the labyrinthine pattern of the Troy game exists not as a physical object, but as a tradition of repeated performances. It is, of course, precisely its non-physical character that has ensured its survival down to the present. The original Labyrinth, by contrast, is preserved solely by the literary tradition (*fertur*), by an art form that is itself independent of the physical material required to ensure its transmission.

Virgil’s simile draws upon a tradition, apparently dating back to Homer, associating the Cretan Labyrinth with dance. In his description of Achilles’ shield, Homer compares the dancing floor fashioned by Hephaestus to that which Daedalus made for Ariadne on Crete (*Iliad* 18.590-92). Most commentators agree that there is contained here an allusion to the Cretan saga and the Labyrinth itself.⁵⁶ That assumption is corroborated by Plutarch, who tells how Theseus instituted a dance mimicking – in its complex involutions - the windings of the Cretan Labyrinth on Delos which was said still to be performed by the Delians of his own day (*Theseus* 21).

⁵⁴ On the *lusus Troiae* in historical Rome, see Doob (1990) 27-28: “Noble youths staged these complex equestrian ballet-tournaments at least as early as Sulla’s time (ca. 80 B.C.); the rides contributed to the festivities at Julius Caesar’s triumph in 46 B.C., Augustus favored them, and Nero performed in them.”

⁵⁵ Cf. Doob (1990)

⁵⁶ E.g. Edwards (1991) *ad* 18.590-2.

The second simile which Virgil employs to exemplify the effect of the Troy ride compares the effect of the boys' maneuvers to dolphins swimming playfully through the sea. While the first simile brings to mind the Homeric shield of Achilles, the dolphins of the second simile anticipate a scene on the Virgilian shield of Aeneas: the dolphins in the sea of Actium (*et circum argento clari delphines in orbem / aequora uerrebant caudis aestumque secabant*, 8.673-74). The anticipation of Vulcan's silverwork further strengthens the correspondence between abstract, reiterative patterns and the monumentalizing of those patterns in art and architecture. In Virgil's first simile, the maneuvers of Ascanius' companions are compared to an architectonic structure which both inspired a famous dance whose movements are repeated – like the Troy game – down to the present day and will soon be seen represented pictorially on the temple-doors at Cumae; in the second simile, the game is compared to swimming dolphins whose circular movements (*in orbem*, 8.673) will appear on the shield of Aeneas, an artifact whose literary model represents the dancing floor of Daedalus (*Iliad* 18.590-92). Like the dolphins on Aeneas' shield, the allusive pattern that Virgil weaves is essentially circular, uniting abstract pattern, artifact, and building.

Finally, we should note the relationship between Daedalus' Labyrinth and the river before which Virgil's song-temple will stand nears Mantua. In the *Georgics*, Virgil's Mincius is something of a labyrinthine river: not only is it said "to wander" (*errat*, *Georgics* 3.14; cf. the labyrinthine *errores* of Catullus 64.114; *Aeneid* 5.591; 6.27; *Metamorphoses* 160-61), but it also said to be characterized by *flexibus* "windings" (*Georgics* 3.14), a quality it shares with the Labyrinth of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*flexu*, 8.160). Ovid's use of *flexus* is particularly interesting in light of the fact that he compares the Cretan Labyrinth to the Meander, which, like Virgil's Mincius, is inclined to wander in labyrinthine fashion.

In the previous section I discussed the probable connections between the erection of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine and the radical Augustan remodeling of Apollo's temple at Cumae. There exists a clear textual affirmation of that link shortly after the description of the temple in book 6, after Aeneas has entered the Sibyl's cave:⁵⁷

tuque, o sanctissima uates,
praescia uenturi, da (non indebita posco
regna meis fatis) Latio considerare Teucros
errantisque deos agitataque numina Troiae.
tum Phoebo et Triuiiae solido de marmore templum
instituum festosque dies de nomine Phoebi.
teque magna manent regnis penetralia nostris:
hic ego namque tuas sortis arcanaque fata
dicta meae genti ponam, lectosque sacrabo,
alma, uiros. foliis tantum ne carmina manda,
ne turbata uolent rapidis ludibria uentis;
ipsa canas oro.
(6.65-76)

And you, oh most reverend seer, foreknowing of what is to come, grant (for I do not demand a kingdom that isn't owed me by fate) that the Teucrians might settle in Latium, their wandering gods too and the harassed deities of Troy. Then will I establish a temple, made of solid marble, to Phoebus and Trivia and festive days named after Phoebus. You too can expect a great shrine in my kingdom: for here I will place your oracles and arcane sayings for my people, and, nourishing one, I will consecrate chosen men for you.

⁵⁷ Cf. Deuling (1997) 31.

Only don't commit your songs to writing, lest they become disordered, the playthings of the swift winds. I beg you: sing them yourself.

Aeneas promises the Sibyl that upon the foundation of his kingdom in Italy, he will build her a marble temple, institute festive holidays, and set up a shrine in her honor to preserve her oracles complete with a college of priests to look after them.⁵⁸ Servius (ad 69) catches the implicit reference to the Palatine temple of Apollo:⁵⁹ *ut solet miscet historiam: nam hoc templum in Palatio ab Augusto factum est* "as is his wont, he weaves history into his narrative: for this temple was constructed by Augustus on the Palatine."⁶⁰ The reference is unmistakable:⁶¹ the gleaming Palatine temple was indeed dedicated to Phoebus, was graced by a statue of Diana,⁶² and, not long after the dedication of the temple, it received the Sibylline books,⁶³ which had hitherto been housed on the Capitoline at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and which were now to be housed with the god who inspired them⁶⁴ (Suet., Aug. 31.1).

Before we consider the implications of Aeneas vowing the construction of a building he will not build (but Octavian will),⁶⁵ we have to consider a second important point of reference for this part of Aeneas' speech: the *Georgics*. More specifically, Aeneas words recall that poem's two great programmatic passages, the proems to books 1 and 3. At *Aeneid* 6.64, immediately before he directs his speech

⁵⁸ On the history of the Sibylline books in Rome, see esp. Parke (1988) 71-82.

⁵⁹ Cf. Deuling (1997) 195-96.

⁶⁰ Servius continues: *sed quia Augustus cohaeret Iulo, qui ab Aenea ducit originem, uult Augustum parentum uota soluisse.*

⁶¹ Cf. Corlatta (1990) 84; Miller (1994) 102; Branchi (1995) 102.

⁶² Cf. Parke (1988) 80: "Deiphobe had a double function to Virgil. She was not only the priestess of Apollo, but also a Trivia – that is, Diana in her triple aspect, which included the rule of the Underworld."

⁶³ On the history of the Sibylline books at Rome, see esp. Parke (1988) 190-211; Deuling (1997) 185.

⁶⁴ Cf. Parke (1988) 141: "The transfer of Sibylline books to the Apolline temple on the Palatine both placed them in the precinct of the god who inspired them and also brought them near to the residence of Augustus, the new focal point of the state." See also Branchi (1995) 103.

⁶⁵ Cf. Deuling (1997) 65.

towards the Sibyl, Aeneas calls upon the aid of all the gods by lifting a famous half-line from the *Georgics* 1 proem: *dique deaeque omnes* “all you gods and goddesses” (*G.* 1.21).⁶⁶ Similarly, when he begins his apostrophe to the Sibyl Aeneas echoes the start of Virgil’s address to the soon-to-be-deified Octavian a few lines later (tuque “and you too,” *A.* 6.65; *G.* 1.24).

The allusion to the beginning of *Georgics* 3 is clearer still.⁶⁷ Like Virgil, Aeneas promises to erect a marble temple whose dedication will be accompanied by festive celebrations. The thematic analogies are marked by obvious lexical parallels, not least the word *templum* together with the phrase *de marmore*, which appears in the same metrical sedes (*tum Phoebo et Triuiaie solido de marmore templum / instituam*, *A.* 6.69-70; cf. *templum de marmore ponam*, *G.* 3.13), and the repetition of *ponam* (*G.* 1.13; *A.* 1.73).⁶⁸ There can be no question that there is a systematic analogy between Aeneas’ vow to the Sibyl and Virgil’s own promise of a poetic monument for Octavian at the beginning of *Georgics* 3.⁶⁹

At line 71, when he undertakes to promise the Sibyl a shrine in which to house her oracles, Aeneas uses the expression *te quoque*, a phrase that, in the context of so many references to the *Georgics*, can hardly be neutral (*te quoque magna manent regnis penetralia nostris*). *te quoque*, of course, is the phrase that opens both the third book of the *Georgics* and, with the pronoun in the nominative (*tu quoque*), the seventh book of the *Aeneid*. It is, that is to say, the phrase found at the precise middle of both poems. It is also – and this is something that appears to have escaped the notice of commentators – at the precise middle of Aeneas’ address to the Sibyl (65-76).⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Cf. also the relative *quibus* in both lines, albeit in different *sedes*.

⁶⁷ Cf. Deuling (1997) 6-7: “Virgil’s temple to Caesar in *Georgics* 3 can be linked to the epichoric temple of Apollo at Cumae. Both temples recall the Augustan temple of Apollo Pallatinus with its ivory paneled doors.”

⁶⁸ Note however that in Aeneas’ speech its object is the Sibylline books rather than the temple.

⁶⁹ Cf. Paschalis (1986) 36 (n. 15).

⁷⁰ But not of the speech as a whole, which begins at line 56.

Finally, the words *te quoque magna* (A. 6.71) contain a clear echo of Virgil's apostrophe to Icarus in the description of the doors of the temple that Aeneas and the Sibyl recently entered: *tu quoque magnam / partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes*, 6.30-31. Aeneas' speech thus assimilates him not merely to Virgil the uates, but also to Daedalus, the builder of the temple at Cumae and of the Labyrinth.

The broader situational parallels between the Virgil of the *Georgics* and Aeneas at Cumae are also compelling.⁷¹ Whereas Virgil announces that he will journey from the Greek world to Italy at the start of *Georgics* 3, Aeneas has just arrived in Italy from the east. Like Virgil too, Aeneas promises to build a magnificent marble temple at some time in the future whose dedication will be associated with festivities and games. In making predictions about future building programs, Virgil and, to a lesser extent, Aeneas, are cast in the role of uates. There may be an echo of the mantic nature of the opening of *Georgics* in the geographical location of the proposed temple: MANTua.

The main difference between the respective promises of Virgil and Aeneas to build a marble temple is that, in former case, the building in question is a temple of song. Which makes the poetic quality of Aeneas' speech all the more intriguing. By combining the proems to *Georgics* 1 and 3, and by using Virgilian meta-poetic language to divide up his speech, Aeneas' address to the Sibyl presents itself as a kind of mini-epic or, alternatively, the proem to, or a proclamation of, a new poetic opus. It is perhaps no accident that the building he vows will not only be dedicated (in part) to Apollo Cithareodus, but will also house Rome's definitive library of ancient literature. Aeneas' promise also activates a dizzying circularity: the temple of Palatine Apollo will furnish the principal model for the poetic temple of the *Georgics*, which in its turn

⁷¹ On the widely discussed parallels between Aeneas and Daedalus, see Deuling (1997) 53; Putnam (1998) 75-76.

will stand for the poetic monument in one of whose central panels Aeneas now finds himself represented, prophesying the construction of the architectural model for the poetic monument in which he appears. Like the Virgil of *Georgics* 3, we may well suspect that Aeneas' speech is as much about poetic architecture as it is about structures of stone and marble.

There is a final parallel between the Aeneas' speech and the *Georgics* 3 proem: the futurity of the buildings described. I argue above that the fact that the erection of Virgil's temple lies in the future is not an idle one, but rather raises questions concerning the dynamics of ekphrasis and the relationship of poetic and monumental art. But whereas Virgil's vow of a temple for Octavian may or may not, from the perspective of *Georgics* 3, genuinely be realized on the banks of the Mincius, the reader of the *Aeneid* knows that Aeneas will no more build the Sibyl a temple than he will found Rome. Just as Rome will in fact be founded by Romulus (and re-founded by Octavian), so will his marble temple be founded not by him, but by his Iulian descendant (Servius: *sed quia Augustus cohaeret Iulo, qui ab Aenea ducit originem, uult Augustum parentum uota soluisse*). There is therefore a sense in which Aeneas is more a poet, prophet (uates), and teller of tales than he is a builder of cities and monuments.

When Aeneas and the Sibyl approach the entrance to the Underworld, it is described as an architectonic structure, but without substance:

ibant oscuri sola sub nocte per umbram
perque domos Ditis uacuas et inania regna
(6.268-69)

They made their way through the shadows in the loneliness of night, through the insubstantial house of Dis and his superficial realms.

Like the Underworld visited by the Homeric Odysseus, Virgil's underworld is described as a "house"⁷² (*domos Ditis*; cf. δόμος "Αιδος, e.g. *Od.* 11.150). In Homer, it is never clear whether Hades' δόμος is to be conceived literally as domestic structure or whether the expression is purely metaphorical, although the epithet εὐρυπυλῆς suggests that we are to take it literally.⁷³ The entrance of Virgil's *domus Ditis*, by contrast, is expressly given the attributes of a (specifically Roman) house.⁷⁴ In the "foremost gullet of Orcus" there exists a crowded *uestibulum*. Instead of the rabble of morning callers that customarily throngs the *uestibula* of Roman potentates, here we find the personifications of notable blights upon human existence: diseases, disabilities, afflictions (273-81).

Two adjectives, almost synonyms, are attributed to the "house of Dis": *uacuus* and *inanis* (269). Both words suggest that the *domus* of the Underworld is devoid of inhabitants, which is curious given the multitudes that Aeneas and his guide will find within. One key to the meaning of these puzzling epithets, as some commentators have recognized, is to be found in their evocation of the *uacuum inane* of Epicurean physics⁷⁵ and, more specifically, of Lucretius,⁷⁶ for whom *uacuus* and *inanis* are standard terms for void and empty space.⁷⁷

⁷² On the layout of entrance to Ocrus, see esp. Corlita (1984) 687.

⁷³ Cf. Leach (1999) 120.

⁷⁴ See Wistrand (1960) for a misguided attempt to read Virgil's *domus Ditis* as a manifestation of a Greek house according to the details specified by Vitruvius.

⁷⁵ Cf. Michels (1944) 132: "Much of his vocabulary in his description of Hades indicates that here he was thinking in terms of Epicurean physics, particularly the theory of images, and some of these descriptions have more meaning if one reads them keeping in mind the passages from the *De rerum natura* which they suggest."

⁷⁶ On the Lucretius echoes of beginning of Aeneas' catabasis, see esp. Wigodsky (1972) 132-39; Hardie (1986) 157-240.

⁷⁷ Barigazzi (1982); Michels (1944) 132: "It would be difficult to read the words *uacuas* and *inania* thus juxtaposed without being reminded of the *uacuum inane* of Epicurean physics;" Zetzel (1989) 275:

More allusions to Lucretius follow. After describing the giant elm tree positioned in the midst of the courtyard (282-84), the poet then describes the monsters that have taken up residence in *foribus*:⁷⁸

multaque praeterea uariarum membra ferarum,
Centauri in foribus stabulant Scyllaeque biformes
et centumgeminus Briareus ac belua Lernae
horrendum stridens, flammisque armata Chimaera,
Gorgones Harpyiaequae et forma tricorporis umbrae.
(6.285-89)

And in addition, the bodies of many different beasts: Centaurs stable in the entranceway and hybrid Scyllas and hundred-headed Briareus and the beast of Lerna, screeching fearfully, and the Chimaera, armed with flame, and Gorgons and Harpies and the shape of the three-bodied shade.

Whereas a plurality of Scyllas is not to be found outside the *Aeneid* and the *De rerum natura*,⁷⁹ Lucretius mentions Scyllae together with Centauri on two occasions. In book 4 of the *De rerum natura*, Lucretius uses Centauri and Scyllae as exempla to explain how the insubstantial nature of images allows us to conceive of beings that do not, or no longer, exist:

Centauros itaque et Scyllarum membra uidemus

“The terms make little sense in describing an underworld that is so heavily populated, but they are standard Lucretian terms for void, nothingness, and empty space. Further allusions in the succeeding lines allude to various Lucretian passages in which the existence of the afterlife and of mythical monsters is disproved.”

⁷⁸ On the positioning of this grouping, cf. Austin (1977) *ad* 285ff.: “A new grouping: goblinsque monsters from popular myth ..., such as Lucretius combats and mocks ...; they are stalled (*stabulant* is appropriate for the Centaurs) *in foribus*, which presumably means an outer doorway of the *uestibulum* ... But it must be stressed that throughout this whole passage we are dealing with a poet’s imagination, not with an architect’s designs.”

⁷⁹ Cf. Barigazzi (1982) 220: “I Centauri e le Scille sono menzionati di seguito in ambedue i poeti, ma la derivazione da Lucrezio ... è provata specialmente dal plurale *Scyllae*, che non è documentato, a quel che pare, negli autori greci.”

Cerbereasque canum facies simulacraque eorum
quorum morte obita tellus amplectitur ossa,
omne genus quoniam passim simulacra feruntur
(4.432-35)

Thus do we see Centaurs and the limbs of Scyllas and the heads of Cerberus
and the images of those whose death has come and whose bones the earth
embraces, since images of every kind are being borne about everywhere ...

Because images are being carried about everywhere at random, it is possible for the
mind to see the shapes of those who are no longer living or of creatures that can never
have existed. It is particularly noteworthy, in the context of Virgil's imitation, that
Lucretius associates impossible beings like Centaurs and Scyllas with the simulacra of
those who are dead.⁸⁰ Although the imagines of the dead may be seen by the mind's
eye, Lucretius insists that the dead themselves have no more substance than the
fanciful creatures of myth, a point he had clarified earlier in book 4 (26-44) by
insisting that the *simulacra* of the dead we see in our sleep are not spirits from
Acheron (*ne forte animas Acherunte reamur / effugere aut umbras inter uiuos
uolitare*, 37-38).

Centaurs and Scyllas are also found together in book 5, when Lucretius
provides proofs that such hybrid creatures cannot logically exist (878-900). To his list
of creatures and things that cannot ever have existed, Lucretius adds the Chimaera
(901-6) and the giants (913-15), both of which are found among the creatures residing
in the uestibulum of Dis' house in Aeneid 6⁸¹ (*centumgeminus Briareus .../ ...
flamisque armata Chimaera*, 287-88). We might also note the similarity between

⁸⁰ Cf. Michels (1944) 137.

⁸¹ Cf. Barigazzi (1982) 220.

Virgil's list of the human sins and afflictions that stand before the gates of Hades and Lucretius' explanation of how the fear of death can create a hell on earth⁸² (*turpis enim ferme contemptus et acris egestas / semota ab dulci uita stabilique uidetur / et quasi iam leti portas cunctarier ante* "for indeed rank distain and sharp poverty appear far removed from a sweet and stable life and seem as it were to tarry before the gates of death," 65-67).

For Lucretius, hell is something that men create for themselves in the upper world. The very real afflictions that humans suffer on earth are ultimately the result of the fear of death. By contrast, the shades of the Underworld, no less than the impossible hybrid creatures that appear before our mind's eye, have no existence.⁸³ Virgil, by populating the entrance to his Underworld with precisely the mythical creatures that his predecessor singles out as demonstrably unreal, challenges his readers to confront the unreality of what is presented to them.⁸⁴ He challenges us to accept the figures he describes as mere imagines of the real thing.⁸⁵ As Zetzel notes, "while the underworld which follows these allusions is obviously not a Lucretius one – that would be impossible – their effect is to undercut the literal truth of what it to come, and to alert the reader to the possibility of larger interpretations."⁸⁶

While Zetzel and others are concerned primarily with the literal truth of the visions presented to Aeneas in the Underworld,⁸⁷ our concern here is with the question

⁸² Barigazzi (1982) 221 explains: "Le *cupiditates* procurano le *curae* che agitano la vita degli uomini, spingendoli a compiere delitti di ogni sorta ...; ma le cupidigie sono causate, dice Lucrezio, dalla paura della morte; dunque è la paura della morte che procura l'infelicità agli uomini."

⁸³ Cf. Michels (1944) 137: "The connection with here with visions of the dead is also significant. It establishes firmly the association of these figures with Hades. The Epicurean does not deny the possibility that we may see visions of the dear departed, which are really their *simulacra*. He does deny that the dead *themselves* exist, any more than the mythical beasts."

⁸⁴ Cf. Michels (1944) 140.

⁸⁵ Cf. Bahr-Volk (1974).

⁸⁶ Zetzel (1989) 275.

⁸⁷ On the discrepancies between what Aeneas hears and sees in the Underworld and what we learn elsewhere in the poem, see Zetzel (1989) 272-4.

of how the reader understands the reality of what is presented to him. That problem is dramatized by Aeneas' attempt to assail the creatures as if they were real:

corripit hic subita trepidus formidine ferrum
Aeneas strictamque aciem uenientibus offert,
et ni docta comes tenuis sine corpore uitas
admoneat uolitare caua sub imagine formae,
inruat et frustra ferro diuerberat umbras.

(6.290-94)

Here Aeneas, alarmed with sudden fear, grabs his sword and bares it unsheathed to the on-comers, and, had his learned companion not warned him that those frail beings without bodies were flying about under the mere imitation of substance, he would have charged in and lashed at the shades in vain with his sword.

In drawing his sword and charging at the inhabitants of Virgil's uestibulum, Aeneas allows himself to mistake mere imagines for living beings.⁸⁸ His mistake is analogous to that of the reader, whose receptivity to the text depends upon him accepting the imagines generated by the poet as real. Had it not been for the intervention of his "learned" colleague (*docta comes*, 292), Aeneas might have made the same mistake as an unlearned reader, unversed in the conventions of literary art.

Aeneas' misapprehension implies a contrast between himself, a real person, and the *tenuis uitae* that occupy the uestibulum of the Underworld. When Aeneas leaves the Underworld, however, it is through the gate of ivory, the gate through which the Manes send up not the *uerae umbrae* that pass through the gate of horn, but

⁸⁸ Interestingly, Tarrant (1982) and Zetzel (1989) 275 observe that it is Aeneas, and not his underworld vision, that passes through the gate of false dreams at the end of *Aeneid* 6 (893-99) and that the "falseness" properly refers to him. See also Feeney (1986).

falsa insomnia (altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto, / sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes “the other gate shines, having been wrought from gleaming ivory, but thought the shades send false dreams to the upper world,” 6.895-96).

Without wishing to trouble ourselves with the debate concerning the interpretation of this passage, we may note Tarrent’s observation⁸⁹ that, strictly speaking, Aeneas’ passing through the ivory gate suggests not the unreality of what Aeneas has seen, but of Aeneas himself.⁹⁰ By the time he has reached the exit of the Underworld, it is Aeneas himself, rather than simply the imagines he encounters, whose reality is called into question.

⁸⁹ Tarrent (1982) 52-55.

⁹⁰ Cf. Zetzel (1989) 275: “in strict logic the connotation of “falseness” should apply to Aeneas, who actually passes through the gate (as in Tarrant’s interpretation), but readers almost inevitably apply not to Aeneas himself, but to what he has seen. In some respects, the gate functions as an extended form of enallage, a transferred description which applies with slightly different connotations to both Aeneas and to the underworld. We are left with a sense of the unreality of what we have seen.”

Chapter four

Aeneid 3.268-93

After his account of the Trojans' unhappy stay at the Strophades islands (3.209-67), Aeneas tells Dido how he and his fleet sailed northward along the west coast of Greece. First they sail past the islands surrounding Homer's Ithaca, making a special point of cursing the native island of *dirus Vlixes* (3.270-73). As they continue northward, they approach the southern tip of Leucas:

mox et Leucatae nimbose cacumina montis
et formidatus nautis aperitur Apollo.
hunc petimus fessi et paruae succedimus urbi;
ancora de prora iacitur, stant litore puppes.

(274-77)

And soon the cloudy heights of Mt Leucate and Apollo, feared by seafarers, appear to our view. Exhausted, we head for this landmark and retire to the tiny city. The anchor is cast from the prow, the sterns stand on the shore.

The sequence of events seems clear: the Trojans see (the temple of) Apollo¹ on the southern tip of the Leucate (*aperitur*), make for land (*hunc petimus*), and retire to a small hamlet nearby (*paruae succedimus urbi*). The antecedent of *hunc* in line 276 can only be *Apollo*, a metonym² for the famous temple of Apollo that stood on the Leucate headland.³ As Aeneas continues his narrative, however, it appears that the

¹ Nelis (2001) 62 argues that the apparition of "Apollo" recalls the god's epiphany to the Argonauts at *Argonautica* 2.676. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 275 notes that the latter "appearance proves aetiological ..., but this does not, though Actium soon will."

² As Williams (1962) *ad* 275 notes, "a common metonymy." Cf. *Aen.* 3.552; Hor., *Carm.* 3.5.12.

³ On the temple on Leucas, see Strabo 10.452, *Anth. Graec.* 6.251. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 274 notes the visibility of the Leucas headland: "the mass of Leucas (which rises up to 3750 feet), with cliffs of 220 feet at the S. end visible from a great distance."

Trojans have landed not on Leucas, but rather ten miles to the north of Leucas, on the promontory of Actium:

ergo insperata tandem tellure potiti
lustramurque Ioui uotisque incendimus aras,
Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis.
exercent patrias oleo labente palaestras
nudati socii: iuuat euasisse per urbes
Argolicas mediosque fugas tenuisse per hostis.

(278-83)

Thus, having at last reached a landfall we hadn't dared hope for, we perform a lustration for Jupiter, set the altars aflame with sacrifices, and fill the Actian shore with Trojan games. My comrades disrobe and, pouring oil upon their skin, perform their ancestral wrestling bouts: it is a joy to have come safely through the Argive cities and made our escape through the very middle of our enemies.

Aeneas makes it clear that the Trojans conduct sacrifices and celebrate games not on Leucas, but on the shore of Actium (*Actia ...litora*). But it is not until Aeneas mentions the games that he celebrated at Actium that the reader suspects the scene has changed from the island of Leucas to the Actian headland. Heyne attempted to make Aeneas' words cohere by assuming that the temple identified at line 275 and the *parua urbs* of 276 are located not on Leucas, but on the shore of Actium.⁴ There was, indeed, another ancient and famous temple of Apollo on the promontory on Actium,⁵

⁴ Heyne (1767-75) *ad* 3.275. Servius' efforts to defend Virgil's geography lead him, as Williams (1962) *ad* 274f. notes, "into all sorts of absurdities."

⁵ Thuc. 1.29.3. For its restoration by Augustus, see Suet., *Aug.* 18. For its association with the battle of Actium, see *Aen.* 8.704, Prop. 2.34.61, 4.6.67; Ovid, *Met.* 13.715.

and it is the Actian temple upon which Aeneas will dedicate an Argive shield prior to his departure (286-88, see below). As Horsfall correctly states, however, the city and the temple mentioned at 275-76 must, “on any normal, natural reading of the Latin, as it unrolls ... be on Leucas.”⁶

The merging of Leucas and Actium in *Aeneid* 3 is partly facilitated by the routine conflation of the two sites in Augustan poetry. On Vulcan’s shield in *Aeneid* 8, it is the waters around the Leucate headland that are said to be turbulent with Actian wars (*Actia bella, /cernere erat, totumque instructo Marte uideres /feruere Leucaten* “Actian wars were there to be seen, and you would have seen all Leucate in ferment with marshaled war,” 675-77). Similarly, the god who turned the tide in the battle of Actium is sometimes called *Leucadius* by Virgil’s contemporaries⁷ (Prop. 3.11.69; Ovid *Her.* 15.165-66; cf. Ovid *Tr.* 5.2.76). According to Williams, Virgil’s “confusion” may also be the result of his combining “Leucate and Actium in his mind without realizing the distances involved.”⁸ Horsfall accounts for the problem by surmising that the eye of the poet (“no topographer”), “fixed firmly upon Leucas in the first place, has somehow edged northwards by 280 and the Adriatic *porticciolo* changes identity in the process.”⁹

Possibly. But the curious slippage remains¹⁰: the Trojans make their way towards the temple on Leucas (*hunc petimus*) and, without any overt indication of a change of location, take their leave a year later by making a dedication at the Actian temple of the god:

interea magnum sol circumuoluitur annum

⁶ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 276.

⁷ As Butrica (2001) 300-1 has shown, *Actius* is an independently attested cult title of Apollo *Leucadius*. Horsfall (2006) cites Ael. 11.8; Isid. *Etym.* 15.1.61; Ovid, *Her.* 15.165-66.

⁸ Williams (1962) *ad* 274f.

⁹ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 276.

¹⁰ Cf. Corlaita (1990) 83.

et glacialis hiems Aquilonibus asperat undas.
aere cauo clipeum, magni gestamen Abantis,
postibus aduersis figo et rem carmine signo:
AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIS VICTORIBVS ARMA;
linquere tum portus iubeo et considerare transtris.

(284-89)

“Meanwhile the sun rolls around the great year and icy winter makes the waves rough with the north wind. I affix a shield of concave bronze – the weapon of great Abas – to the doorposts in the entrance and commemorate the deed with a verse: ‘Aeneas dedicates these arms, seized from the victorious Danaans.’ Then I give the order to leave the port and to sit on the cross-benches.”

The temple at Leucate, already identified by a transferred epithet (*Apollo*), transforms before our eyes into another temple of the same god. Just as the temple itself is identified metonymically with the god to whom it is dedicated, Aeneas’ words also merge its identity with that of another building. To the modern reader, Apollo’s temple(s) function(s) rather like the kind of “portal” familiar from science fiction, miraculously transporting the Trojans from one site to another forty miles distant. It also contributes to a phenomenon that we have observed elsewhere: the close association of those Augustan temples identified with Octavian’s naval campaigns of the late thirties.¹¹

According to Aeneas, the Trojans’ stay at Actium is marked by two events. Shortly after their arrival, the Trojans, having performed sacrifices in honor of Jupiter,

¹¹ See esp. chapter 3.

celebrate Trojan games on the Actian shore¹² (280). Some months later,¹³ Aeneas marks the departure of his fleet from Actium by attaching a war trophy to the doorposts of the temple (AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIIS VICTORIBVS ARMA, 288). Aeneas' dedication generates an extraordinarily intricate web of associations linking the present with the distant past and Augustan future.¹⁴ According to Dionysius' retelling of the Aeneas legend, Aeneas and his followers built temples at Zacynthus, Leucas, and Actium (1.50.3-4).¹⁵ At Zacynthus games were instituted, including a δρόμος in honor of Aeneas and Aphrodite, the prize going to the first runner to reach the temple. By contrast, Virgil takes Aeneas past Zacynthus, conflates Leucas with Actium, and transfers the games to Actium. D.Servius, moreover, remarks that Virgil has transferred to Actium a tradition that Aeneas had dedicated a shield in a temple at Samothrace¹⁶ (*sciendum tamen hunc clipeum ab Aenea apud Samothraciam in templo consecratum, quod poeta per transitum tetigit* "note however that this shield was consecrated by Aeneas in the temple at Samothrace, which the poet touches upon in passing," *ad* 3.278). Whereas in the alternative accounts of Aeneas' wanderings the Trojans' route is littered with dedications (at no less than eleven of the Trojans' seventeen stops), in the *Aeneid* it is only at Actium that Aeneas makes such a

¹² See Suet. 18.2; Strabo 7.7.6. On the Actian games and their revival under Octavian, see Lloyd (1954) 297-98; Gurval (1995) 74-81; Paschalis (1987) 64, 68-69; Brigg (1975) 275-76; Bowerstock (1965) 93-94; Horsfall (2006) *ad* 280. Horsfall (2006) xxii further notes: "it is not certain whether V. refers to the commemorative games held in Rome or to the ancient but revived and renamed games at the site ... or indeed to both. It is not quite clear, for that matter, when either of the new series of games was first celebrated; possibly not for three or four years after the battle."

¹³ On the question of precisely how much time the Trojans spent at Actium, see Williams (1962) *ad* 284.

¹⁴ Cf. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 270-93: "A singular concentration of those problems which regularly arise when the *Aeneid* meets the real world, important as showing how V. begins to apply those techniques (soon to become familiar) of evasion and mystification to maintain the necessary barriers between epic and fact."

¹⁵ According to Dionysius, all three temples are dedicated to Ἄφροδιτι Ἀνεΐων.

¹⁶ On Virgil's habit of transferring events from their traditional sites, see Lloyd (1957) 391.

gesture.¹⁷ By transferring the *Iliaci ludi* to the same location, Virgil invests this particular stop on the Trojan itinerary with extraordinary significance.

Aeneas makes it clear that by arriving in Actium, the Trojans have passed outside the Greek sphere of influence: the joy that the Trojans take in the Actian games derives precisely from their having definitively escaped (*euasisse*) their Argive foes (*iuuat euasisse tot urbes / Argolicas mediosque fugam tenuisse per hostis*, 282-83). Against all odds, the Trojans have passed from the hostile territory of the Greeks to the New World.¹⁸ That triumph motivates the dedication of a Greek shield upon the nearby temple and partially qualifies the paradoxical character of the deed, which Aeneas encapsulates in the hexameter he inscribes on the shield's surface: Aeneas' booty has been seized from victorious, not conquered, foes¹⁹ (*DE DANAIS VICTORIBVS*, 288).

Aeneas makes it clear, too, that the shield belonged to a Greek of some renown: "mighty Abas" (*magni gestamen Abantis*, 286). Elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, Virgil never uses the epithet *magnus* to speak of a character that is otherwise unknown.²⁰ DServius identifies the owner of the shield with a prominent figure from Argive legend: Abas, the Argive king who was the son of Lynceus and Hypermnestra and the grandson of Danaus (*ad* 3.286). It so happens that the same Abas was closely identified with a shield with magical properties that saved Argos from its enemies even after his death. According to Hyginus (170; 273), the shield was originally the

¹⁷ Cf. Miller (1993) 447.

¹⁸ Cf. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 282-83: "Trojans celebrating games in almost Greek territory represents a first step in the rewriting of Hom. history." Cf. Miller (1993) 448.

¹⁹ Cf. *Aen.* 2.368 (*uictoresque cadunt Danai* "and the victorious Danaans fall"). As Horsfall (2006) *ad* 388 observes, the "motif of the victor defeated, the defeated victorious [is] of major importance to V.." Cf. Miller (1993) 447: "To offer an enemy weapon, however, also asserts a victory of sorts over that enemy, an assertion that coheres with Aeneas' view of the Trojan War in Book 2."

²⁰ Miller (1993) 445-46. In the *Aeneid*, an Abas is named at 1.121 as one of the Trojan leaders lost in the storm. Another Abas, an Etruscan ally of Aeneas, is mentioned at 10.170 and 427. Cf. also Horsfall (2006) *ad* 286: "Abas is one of those familiar warrior names used rather too often, but the epithet is not one idly sprayed about."

property of Abas' grandfather Danaus, who dedicated it in the Argive Heraeum. That shield in turn was given by Lynceus to Abas, who rededicated it in the same temple. The award of the shield to Abas was also associated with the establishment of games that were still celebrated in the classical period.²¹ It is noteworthy, too, that Abas was also credited with the invention of shield technology in general.²²

In contrast to DServius, Servius identifies *magnus Abas* as belonging to the group of Greeks killed with Androgeus during the sack of Troy (*et hunc Abantem intellegamus occisum cum Androgeo* "let's assume that this Abas had been killed together with Androgeus," *ad* 286). While Servius' identification of Virgil's *magnus Abas* is clearly less convincing than that of the later commentator, the killing of Androgeos and his companions and the appropriation of their weapons on the part of the Trojans (2.370-401) is a plausible explanation of how Aeneas came into possession of Abas' shield in the first place. Certainly Coroebus, who conceives of the idea of bearing the armor with the slain Greeks, expressly encourages his companions to exchange *clipei* with the victims and appropriate the *insignia* of the *Danai* (*mutemus clipeos Danaumque insignia nobis / aptemus* "let us change shields and appropriate for ourselves the insignia of the Danaans," 389-90).

After reporting Coroebus' speech, Aeneas describes him appropriating the helmet of Androgeos, "the fine *insigne* of his shield," and his "Argive" sword (*sic fatus deinde comantem / Androgei galeam clipeique insigne decorum / induitur laterique Argium accommodat ensem* "having said this he proceeds to put on the flowing helmet and the shield with its fine iconography, and he appropriates the Argive sword to his side," 2.391-93). In light of the emphasis which Aeneas and

²¹ Hyginus 273: *quibus ludis qui uicit accipit pro corona clipeum, ideo quod Abas Lyncei et Hypermetrae filius nuntiauit Danaum parentibus perisse, cui Lynceus de templo Iunonis Argiuae detraxit clipeum quod Danaus in iuuenta gesserat et Iunoni sacrauerat, et Abanti filio muneri dedit.*

²² DServius *ad* 447: *quidam sane Abantem inuentorem clipei ferunt.* On Abas' sons Proetus and Acrisius as inventors of shields, see Apollodorus 2.2.1; Pausanias 2.25.7.

Aeneas' Coroebus place upon both the Argive provenience of Androgeos' weaponry and on the iconography of his shield (*insignia, insigne*), Aeneas (or Virgil) appears to imply that Androgeos, or one of his companions, was carrying the legendary shield of Abas on Troy's last night.²³ In epic, after all, significant artifacts have a habit of being passed down through the generations. Even if we are inclined to mistrust Aeneas' account of events in Troy,²⁴ it seems reasonable to include the legendary shield Abas among the noteworthy Greek artifacts – like the bridal veil of Helen and the scepter of Ilione (2.647-55) – which Aeneas has in his possession when he leaves the Hellenic world.²⁵

In case we should miss the specifically Argive background to his dedication, Aeneas names the *uictores* from whom he won the shield as *Danai*, descendents of Abas' grandfather Danaus.²⁶ While *Danai* is one of the names that Aeneas routinely gives to the Greeks as a whole, its epichoric aspect remains potentially present.²⁷ When Aeneas dedicates his Greek shield, his evocation of the *Danai* cannot help but recall Danaus, the grandfather of Abas and the original owner of the shield itself, upon whose surface the name of his descendents has been engraved. It may be relevant,

²³ The idea that Aeneas obtained the shield from a Greek slain at Troy who had borne it as an ancestral emblem was first suggested by Forbiger (1873): “Alludit autem poeta ad celeberrimum illum clipeum, quem Abas, antiquissimus Argivorum rex, Lyncei f. Perseique avus, in Iunonis templo affixit, ut ab eo, qui in ludis Argis instituendis victoriam reportasset, in sollemni pompa praemii loco gestaretur ... Unum igitur ex posteris huius Abantis Maro ab Aenea in bello Troiano occisum armisque spoliatum esse fingit.”

²⁴ On Aeneas' selective presentation of the events of Troy's last night, see esp. Ahl (1989).

²⁵ Miller (1993) 449-50 makes an excellent case that Ovid understood the passage in the same way: at *Met.* 15.163-64, Ovid's Pythagoras claims to have recognized a shield - a *gestamen* (cf. *Aen.* 3.286) of his left arm in a former life - dedicated at the temple of Juno in “Abantean Argos” (*cognoui clipeum, laeuae gestamina nostrae, nuper Abanteis templo Iunonis in Argis* “I recently recognized a shield, the accoutrement of my left arm, in the temple of Juno in Abas' Argos”).

²⁶ On the significance of words used to describe the Greeks in the *Aeneid*, and in book 2 in particular, see Hannah (2004).

²⁷ See Hannah (2004) 151-52.

too, that Aeneas specifies that he and his Trojans have made their escape through “Argive cities”²⁸ (*per urbes / Argolicas*, 282-83).

The more attention we pay to the specifically Argive background to the artifact that Aeneas dedicates, the less it seems a simple appropriation of enemy spoils. Not only does Aeneas appropriate the shield of Abas, but he also reenacts the symbolic gesture for which it was remembered.²⁹ By affixing Abas’ Argive shield, formerly resident in the temple of the Trojans’ main divine antagonist, to a temple of their guiding divinity, and by celebrating games in the vicinity of the temple, Aeneas commandeers a Greek cultural practice and makes it an embodiment of Trojan (and later Roman) success.³⁰

What did Abas’ shield look like? Aeneas says explicitly that it was curved and made of bronze, but he provides no direct commentary on its iconography. On the other hand, Aeneas on two occasions – once through the words of Coroebus (389) and once in his own person (392) – mentions the iconography of the shields which the Trojans took from the bodies of Androgeos and his companions, albeit without specifying precisely what was represented. The dead Greeks and the sword appropriated by Coroebus, moreover, are identified as *Danai* and *Argiuus* respectively (389, 393). The weaponry of Androgeos and his companions, then, is said to be specifically Argive and to display noteworthy iconography (note esp. *insigne decorum*, 392).³¹

²⁸ Pace Horsfall (2006) *ad* 282-83: “Hom. used ‘Argive’ on occasion for the whole of southern Greece ... and that is presumably the sense here.”

²⁹ Cf. Miller (1993) 447: “Aeneas, then, is not simply dedicating enemy spoils; he rather precisely matches the Greek hero in question by affixing this *clipeus* to a deity’s temple. The Trojan hero appropriates the triumphal gesture of the great Argive champion at the same time that he prefigures the dedications of Octavian.”

³⁰ This gesture may be reasonably seen as broadly analogous to the appropriation by Virgil (and others) of various aspects of the Greek poetic tradition (e.g. *Georgics* 3.10-11).

³¹ Cf. the *argumentum ingens* “an important subject” (Io) on the shield of Turnus (7.791) and the *inimicum insigne* “hostile decoration” (12.944).

Whether or not we care to identify the Argive shield that Aeneas dedicates to Apollo's temple with one of the *clipei* appropriated by Androgeos and his Greeks, we may still make an educated guess as to its iconography. One important clue lies before Aeneas' eyes as he tells Dido of his sojourn at Actium: the imposing silverware (*ingens argentum*), decorated with the heroic deeds of Dido's forefathers, which appears on the tables at which the Carthaginians and their guests are feasting:

ingens argentum mensis, caelataque in auro
fortia facta patrum, series longissima rerum
per tot ducta uiros antiqua ab origine gentis.

(1.640-42)

And on the tables, huge silverware with the heroic deeds of forefathers engraved in gold: a lengthy sequence of events comprising heroes going all the way back to the primeval origins of the race.

As Dido herself hints elsewhere, the origins of the Phoenician royal house lie in Argos.³² Since its iconography begins with the *antiqua origo* of Dido's line, the silverware in her palace must necessarily display representations of the Argive progenitors of her line: Inachus and, possibly, his daughter Io.³³

This ancestral artifact in Dido's palace anticipates another object decorated with legendary Argives: the shield of Turnus.³⁴ Virgil describes its iconography towards the climax of the catalogue of Italian forces in *Aeneid 7*:

at leuem clipeum sublatis cornibus Io
auro insignibat, iam saetis obsita, iam bos,

³² Dido mentions an ancestral Belus at 1.730. Belus was the father of Danaus and the great-grandson of Io. She calls her father Belus at 1.621. See Mackie (1993); Hannah (2004) 147-48.

³³ For a useful summary of the myths surrounding Io and her descendants, see Gantz (1983) 198-208.

³⁴ On the relationship between Dido's *ingens argentum* and the *argumentum ingens* represented on the shield of Turnus, see esp. Hannah (2004) 152-54.

argumentum ingens, et custos uirginis Argus,
caelataque amnem fundens pater Inachus urna.

(7.789-92)

But it was golden Io, with horns uplifted, who dignified his smooth shield.
Now she is beset by bristles, now she is a cow - a subject of great significance
– and Argus too, the maiden's keeper, and Inachus, pouring forth his flood
from an engraved urn.

Turnus, out of pride in his Argive lineage,³⁵ bears a shield decorated with figures from the *antiqua origo* of his *gens*: the river-god Inachus and his daughter Io.³⁶ After he kills Pallas in book 10, Turnus acquires yet another piece of armor decorated with a scene from the legends of his ancestors: a baldric adorned with the slaughtered sons of Aegyptus, slain by their Danaid brides in the marriage chamber³⁷ (10.495-500). If Turnus is the descendent of Inachus, Io, and Lynceus (the surviving son of Aegyptus), he is also a descendant of Lynceus' son: Abas.

The Argive shield that Aeneas dedicates at Actium, therefore, is precisely the sort of Argive ancestral artifact elsewhere associated with Aeneas' Inachid enemies. And because Argive artifacts in the *Aeneid* have a pronounced tendency to be decorated with scenes from the legendary prehistory of Argos, it is a fair bet that the *gestamen* of Abas was adorned with images of his Inachid ancestors. It may, indeed, have looked very much like the Argive shield of Turnus that Aeneas will see on the battlefield of Latium. It may even have had a passing resemblance to the silverware

³⁵ The specifically Argive lineage of Turnus in the *Aeneid* is discussed by Buchheit (1963) 113-15; Mackie (1991); Hannah (2004).

³⁶ On the shield of Turnus and its iconography, see esp. Small (1959); Gale (1997).

³⁷ On the genealogical relationship between Turnus and the mythic figures represented on Pallas' swordbelt, see Kellum (1983); Harrison (1998); Hannah (2004). See also the influential discussions of the baldric and its iconography by Conte (1970); Putnam (1994).

that Aeneas has before his eyes as he tells his tale in Dido's palace.³⁸ Aeneas' dedication thus does rather more than merely celebrate the Trojans' escape from the Greek sphere of influence and anticipate the Octavian's triumph in 31 BC: it belongs to a complex web of ideological gestures that delineate in genealogical terms the historical enmity between the Trojan/Roman people and its opponents in Greece, Carthage, and Latium.³⁹

While the Greek, or Argive, background to Aeneas' sojourn at Buthrotum has often been overlooked, its Augustan context has received close attention from commentators.⁴⁰ Octavian's victory over Antony and Cleopatra off Actium in 31 BC was commemorated by series of events "foreshadowed" by Aeneas and his Trojans in *Aeneid* 3: the renovation of the ancient temple of Apollo at Actium,⁴¹ the dedication at that temple of ships' prows captured during the battle, the enlargement of the small settlement that existed on the site into a comparatively large town called Nicopolis, the initiation (at both Rome and Nicopolis) of the Actian games,⁴² and the dedication in 28 of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine.⁴³

The same four measures – dedications, founding of games, enlargement of local settlement, the renovation of the temple of Apollo – are common to both of the extended accounts of aftermath of the battle⁴⁴ (Suet. *Aug.* 18 and Dio 51.1.1-3). In *Aeneid* 3, Aeneas is made to "anticipate" all these measures in such a way as to establish both a ritual and material continuity between the heroic age and the contemporary world of the poet. As Williams observes, the aetiological function of

³⁸ For the significance of the similarities between Dido's *ingens argentum* and the *argumentum ingens* on Turnus' shield, see esp. Hannah (2004) 152-54.

³⁹ Cf. Kellum (1985); Mackie (1993); Hannah (2004).

⁴⁰ On the contemporary, Augustan connotations of Aeneas' dedication, see Miller (1993) 445 (n. 1); Stahl (1998) 67-68; Paschalis (1987) 68-69. As Horsfall (2006) *ad* 287 notes, "[c]omparison of [*Aen.*] 8.721 and Suet.*Aug.* 18.2 shows that this dedication was also to be recognised as Actian and Augustan."

⁴¹ See above, n. 5.

⁴² See above, n. 11.

⁴³ On the circumstances surrounding these events, see Galinsky (1996) 216-18.

⁴⁴ Cf. Miller (1993) 445-46.

the Actian episode is all the more striking in light of the fact that it is the only episode on the route to Italy that neither contains a prophecy nor indicates progress towards a final goal.⁴⁵

Octavian's new city is adumbrated most subtly of all. When the Trojans land at the site that will prove to be Actium, they are said to retire to a tiny city⁴⁶ (*paruaeque succedimus urbi*, 276). As Williams acknowledges, that *parua urbs* is to be identified with "the little town near the promontory of Actium which Augustus had recently enlarged into Nicopolis."⁴⁷ Horsfall is right, however, to point out that the little town in question is "less identifiable the harder you look."⁴⁸ What is more, the *parua urbs* is embroiled in the confusion surrounding the location of the Trojans after they come to shore at the temple of Apollo on Leucas⁴⁹ (274-76). Like the famous temple of Apollo on the Leucate headland (*formidatus nautis ... Apollo*, 275), the *parua urbs* to which the Trojans retire is initially situated on the island of Leucas before its mysterious transferal to the site of the inaugural Actian games (*Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis*, 280). Not only is Aeneas' tiny *urbs* difficult to identify with any single historical town, but it appears to exist at two discrete locations.

The Trojans' visit to the modest settlement at Leucas/Actium both establishes a material continuity from the heroic age to the Augustan present and creates an implicit contrast between the Octavian's brand new city and its humble predecessor. The conceit whereby Aeneas visits a "city" still extant (albeit in a radically altered form) effectively purports to introduce the material reality of the Augustan present into the

⁴⁵ Williams (1962) *ad* 278f.: "The aetiological intention is the more noticeable because this is the only one of the episodes on the way to Italy which does not contain prophecy or some other indication of progressive movement towards the ultimate goal."

⁴⁶ *parua* is used at 3.349 (Buthrotum), 3.402 (Petelia), 6.811 (Cures), 8.554 (Pallanteum: *fama uolat paruam subito uulgata per urbem* "immediately Rumor is spread abroad in flight through the tiny city").

⁴⁷ Williams (1962) *ad* 276.

⁴⁸ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 276.

⁴⁹ On this question see esp. Paschalis (1987) 63 (n. 33).

heroic age. The paltry size of the *urbs* also invites a comparison with the relative opulence of the new city created by Octavian in the aftermath of the battle. In both respects, the Trojans' stay at the tiny hamlet⁵⁰ at Actium anticipates Aeneas' visit to Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8, a site already pregnant with the future grandeur of Rome.⁵¹ Here as in book 8, Virgil posits a material connection, however, tenuous, between the poetic world of the *Aeneid* and the physical reality of the Augustan present.⁵²

Rather less obscure is the aetiology proposed for Octavian's institution of the Actian games: the Trojans' celebration of *Iliaci ludi* after their arrival on the shores of Actium⁵³ (280-83). Like the erection of buildings, the celebration of ritual is a way of perpetuating the past into the future. Virgil draws our attention to the similar role that buildings and ritual play in preserving memory in the comparison in *Aeneid* 5 of the Trojan Ride to the Labyrinth at Crete (5.588-91).⁵⁴ Immediately after that comparison, Virgil spends fully seven lines detailing the careful maintenance of the labyrinthine pattern of the Ride down to the present day (5.596-602). In *Aeneid* 3, too, the establishment of ritual patterns that will continue down to the present of the narrator provides a point of continuity that parallels the re-founding of the ancient settlement on the promontory.

The temple at which Aeneas dedicates his Argive shield constitutes a more specific architectonic link with the Augustan present. Since Octavian's renovation and enlargement of the temple of Apollo at Actium took place in the aftermath of the

⁵⁰ The rather paradoxical designation of the hamlet at Leucas/Actium as an *urbs* anticipates Evander's designation of his humble dwelling on the Palatine as a "palace" (*haec illum regia cepit* "this palace received him [sc. Hercules]," 8.363).

⁵¹ Cf. Williams (1962) *ad* 276: "For elaboration of this sort of effect cf. Aeneas' visit to Evander's simple dwelling on the future site of Rome."

⁵² Cf. Horsfall (1991).

⁵³ On the Actian games, see above, n. 11.

⁵⁴ For a detailed discussion of the Trojan ride, see chapter three. Cf. Williams (1962) *ad* 280: "the extended account in *Aen.* V of the anniversary games for Anchises is clearly associated with the revived interest in this type of athletic competition which Augustan stimulated ... Notice that here, as in *Aeneid* V, the religious associations of the celebration of games are strongly evident."

battle,⁵⁵ it was roughly contemporary with both the dedication of the temple of Palatine Apollo and the major renovations undertaken on Apollo's temple on the Cumaean acropolis.⁵⁶ Together with the temple at Cumae, the Actian temple is the only specific structure to appear in the *Aeneid* that, at least in theory, might be regarded as still extant at the time of the poem's composition. Like the Cumaean temple, too, the temple at Actium was an ancient structure whose appearance had been radically altered at the time of the composition of the *Aeneid*. What Aeneas sees at Actium is thus an archaic predecessor of the temple that was available for the perusal of Virgil's contemporaries.

It has been plausibly suggested that the dedication of Aeneas' shield on the temple doorposts foreshadows Octavian's dedication of ten ships in the vicinity of the temple. There may, in fact, be a closer correspondence still. Since the *clipeus uirtutis*, the golden shield presented to Octavian by the Senate 27 BC and subsequently displayed at the Curia Julia⁵⁷ (*Res gestae* 34.2), is only known to us through a provincial copy from Arles, it has been suggested that the recently renovated temple at Actium would have been a natural repository for another copy.⁵⁸ Whether or not we accept this attractive hypothesis,⁵⁹ the association of Aeneas' shield with the temple at Actium invites comparison with the poem's most celebrated piece of armor: the shield of Aeneas, an artifact often associated in its turn with the *clipeus uirtutis*.

The poet's description of that artifact in book 8 concludes with Vulcan's depiction of the battle of Actium and the triple triumph celebrated in Rome by

⁵⁵ Suet., *Aug.* 18.2; Dio. 51.1.2.

⁵⁶ On the synchronicity of these building programs, see chapter three.

⁵⁷ On the circumstances surrounding the conferment of the *corona ciuica* and the *clipeus uirtutis* upon Octavian, see Rodriguez (1989) 38-41.

⁵⁸ We owe this suggestive hypothesis to the anonymous reader of Miller (1993) 445, n 1.

⁵⁹ The assertion of Horsfall (2006) *ad* 280 that the shield "is rather too late to be relevant to the present text" depends upon Horsfall's own case for the early composition of *Aeneid* 3, which is of course beyond proof or refutation.

Octavian in 28 BC (8.675-728). Like Aeneas' narration to Dido, Vulcan's artwork seems to conflate the Leucate headland with Actium: in the poet's description, the *Actia bella* appear to be located off the shore of Leucate, which is said to be in ferment with ships of war⁶⁰ (*in medio classis aeratas, Actia bella, / cernere erat, totumque instructo Marte uideres / feruere Leucaten*, 675-77). The confusion relating to the promontories of Actium and Leucate parallels the conflation of the temples of Apollo at these locations in Aeneas' narrative in book 3.⁶¹ Since Virgil insists that both the Leucate headland and the battle off Actium are visible on Aeneas' shield, it stands to reason that the temples that distinguished them were visible too. If we assume they are visible to Aeneas, however, they are presumably as difficult to tell apart as they were in Aeneas' own words in book 3.

Because the temple at Actium was still extant at the time of Octavian, Agrippa, Antony, and Cleopatra, there is every reason to assume that Aeneas sees upon his shield a representation of (a later version of) the very temple at which he had dedicated the shield of Abas during his sojourn at Actium. Although no explicit mention is made of a temple on Aeneas' shield, the tide of battle is said to be turned by *Actius Apollo*, who looks down from above as he draws his bowstring⁶² (*Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo* "looking upon these events, Actian Apollo was drawing his bow," 704). In *Aeneid* 3, (what turns out to be) the temple of Actius Apollo is simply called *Apollo* (*et formidatus nautis aperitur Apollo*, 275). Thanks to the metonymy in book 3, the text tells us that Actian/Leucadian Apollo appears to

⁶⁰ Cf. Fordyce (1977) *ad* 8.677: "the geography is not to be taken seriously ... Virgil is here combining the two [promontories] as he has already done at iii.274ff., when Aeneas himself lands at Leucate (274) and is at Actium. Confusion was assisted by the fact that both promontories had temples of Apollo."

⁶¹ Cf. Miller (1994) 101: "Virgil alludes to the site of the naval battle itself but apparently conflates the Apolline temple at Actium (*Actius ... Apollo*) with the more precipitously placed one (*desuper*) some miles to the south at Leucas."

⁶² Fordyce (1977) *ad* 704 implicitly recognizes the connection between Apollo's epiphany on the shield and his famous temple at Actium.

Aeneas twice: during his sojourn at Actium and as a representation upon the shield he views at Caere. The identification of the god with his *aedes* in *Aeneid* 3 thus supports the assumption that the latter was also visible on Aeneas' shield. The temple would, after all, be a natural place for Actian Apollo to observe the battle.⁶³

As he looks upon his own shield, Aeneas presumably fails to see the shield he had dedicated upon the temple doorposts, for while a temple can be understood as surviving intact from the distant past, its votive offerings are rarely so lucky. What he does see, however, is the event that his gesture had unknowingly foreshadowed: the Roman conquest of the eastern half of the Mediterranean. That event, the last great act of Rome's civil wars, is portrayed by Vulcan as the conquest of the East by the Italic West. In light of Aeneas' dedication, however, there may be another way of conceptualizing that conflict. We saw above how the various artifacts associated with Dido and Turnus foreground their Argive, or Inachid, ancestry, thereby suggesting their genealogical bond with both the *Danai* at Troy and with *magnus Abas*. If we care to remind ourselves that both the Lagid ancestors of Cleopatra⁶⁴ and the ancestors of Mark Antony⁶⁵ himself made much of their descent from (the Inachid) Heracles, it seems possible to understand the battle of Actium as the last of a series of conflicts between Troy/Rome and the race of Argos. Together with its temple, the shield of Abas sits at the center of a complex genealogical web that unifies the conflicts narrated and foreshadowed in the *Aeneid* into a single historical enmity.⁶⁶

⁶³ It is interesting to compare the proem to book 2 of *De rerum natura*, where the Epicurean *sapiens* finds it a sweet thing (*dulce*) to observe tempestuous seas and battles from a safe location, but a sweeter thing still to occupy one's *templa serena* (8) and look down upon the vain strivings of men (1-13). Another passage that invites comparison with Lucretius is Tydeus' vow to build a temple to Minerva at the end of *Thebaid* 2: Tydeus promises to build her a golden temple (*aurea templa*) on the acropolis at Pleuron, from where she might find it sweet (*dulce sit*) to look down upon Ionian storms and the mouth of the turbulent Achelous (726-42). On Tydeus' imagined temple, and its literary antecedents, see Mulder (1954) *ad* 704-43.

⁶⁴ E.g. Theocritus 17.16-27.

⁶⁵ Plutarch, *Antonius* 4. See esp. Zanker (1988) 45-47.

⁶⁶ Cf. Kellum (1995); Mackie (1993); Hannah (2004).

The description of Aeneas' shield concludes with the triple triumph of 29 BC and Octavian's review of the tributary nations as they pass in review. As he watches the procession, he sits on the threshold of his gleaming temple of Phoebus and affixes the *dona* of the nations to the temple doorposts (*ipse sedens niueo candentis limine Phoebi / dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis / postibus*, 720-22). The temple in which Octavian is sitting, of course, is the Palatine temple of Actian Apollo, vowed in 36 at the height of the campaign against Sextus Pompey but dedicated in honor of the god who turned the tide at Actium. Because that temple would not be dedicated until a year after the triumph, however, the "picture of the submissive nations marching in a long procession ... before it is a fantasy."⁶⁷ Vulcan's representation of Octavian's triumph cannot, therefore, be a passive rendering of an "historical" scene; the presence of a fully functioning temple of Apollo at Octavian's triumph is an illusion generated by Vulcan's art, not by material reality of Augustan Rome.

While a temple that was incomplete and inaugurated in 29 appears on Vulcan's Palatine, the existence of Apollo's fully functioning temples at Actium and on Leucas is suppressed. Instead, the idealized rendering of the temple on the Palatine might be said to be a synecdoche for the small constellation of temples of Apollo that mark those sites associated with Octavian's naval campaigns.⁶⁸ Like the Actian temple, the temple on the Palatine is identified not specifically as an *aedes*, but by the god that inhabits it:⁶⁹ Octavian is said to be sitting on the threshold of *candens Phoebus* (8.720). When he dedicates the *dona* of the conquered nations on the *postes* of his

⁶⁷ See Williams (1962) *ad* 720ff.; Corlaita (1990) 85 on the temporal unity that Virgil imposes here upon distinct events.

⁶⁸ On the relationship between the temple of Palatine Apollo and Apollo's temple at Cumae in the context of Octavian's campaign against Sextus Pompey, see chapter three.

⁶⁹ As Williams (1962) *ad* 720 observes (duly citing the temple at Leucas/Actium as a parallel): "here the god is, as often, identified with his temple (cf. iii. 275 'aperitur Apollo')." On the words *templum* and *aedes*, see esp. Cipriano (1983) 113-16.

temple, moreover, Octavian repeats the gesture of his ancestor.⁷⁰ Aeneas' dedication of the shield of Abas commemorates the Trojans' escape from Greece and (unwittingly) foreshadows the ultimate triumph of Rome. By affixing the spoils of the peoples rendered subject to Rome at Actium, Vulcan's Octavian neatly signals the fulfillment of the proleptic gesture of his descendant in *Aeneid* 3.

There is one final respect in which Aeneas' dedication constitutes a nodal juncture within the *Aeneid*. When he dedicates Abas' shield upon the temple doorposts, Aeneas marks (*signo*) the occasion with a *carmen*⁷¹ (*aere cauo clipeum ... / postibus aduersis figo et rem carmine signo: / AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIIS VICTORIBVS ARMA*, 3.287-89). Aeneas' hexameter is not simply one of the few references to writing in epic,⁷² it is the only extant fragment from the corpus of Aeneas' poetry: Horsfall perceptively notes the lapidary quality of the *carmen*, and its grandeur: "The plural, the spondaic rhythm, the hyperbaton, the use of the general for the particular lend majesty to the occasion."⁷³

There is also, however, an unmistakable epic flavor to Aeneas' only known literary effort. Like the epic in which it stands, Aeneas' verse proclaims "arms and the man" as its theme (cf. *Arma uirumque cano*, 1.1). Aeneas inverts the order of *Aeneid* 1.1, placing the man (here *Aeneas*) at the start of the verse (like Homer, *Odyssey* 1.1) and his *arma* at the end, the subject and object of the implied verb thereby framing the hexameter.⁷⁴ It is fitting that Aeneas should be responsible for the poem's only extant piece of writing, for Aeneas is the second of the two narrators of the *Aeneid*. In books

⁷⁰ Cf. Miller (1993) 445, of Aeneas' dedication: "the accent on prefiguring the actions of Aeneas' distinguished descendant, Octavian." See also Miller (1993) 447.

⁷¹ Cf. *Ecl.* 5.42 (*et tumulo superaddite carmen* "and add an inscription to his tomb"); Ovid, *Fasti* 3.547; Ovid, *Met.* 9.794.

⁷² Cf. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 287: "V. has Aen. tell Dido of his dedicator inscription, a sign both of the poet's undervalued epigraphic culture ... and of the presence of literacy in epic." On the poet's "epigraphic culture," see Horsfall (1999) *ad* 7.1, with bibliography.

⁷³ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 288.

⁷⁴ The commentators (notably Williams (1962) *ad* 288; Horsfall (2006) *ad* 288) duly note that the absence of a verb is typical of Latin inscriptions.

2 and 3, Virgil surrenders the narrative to his protagonist, whose 1,519 hexameters constitute a sixth of the epic. What is more, by reciting verbatim his *carmen* within Virgil's literary monument, Aeneas ensures its preservation after the inevitable disappearance of the artifact on which it is preserved.

The fact that Aeneas affixes the only recorded *carmen* of the *Aeneid* to a temple invites comparison with the proem of *Georgics* 3, a passage that programmatically identifies poetic and monumental architecture (1-48). To begin with, there are suggestive parallels between Virgil's promise of a poetic monument in *Georgics* 3 (13-15) and the dedication by Aeneas of a written hexameter in a temple setting. While the narrator of the *Georgics* announces his intention to lead the Greek Muses from Helicon to Italy (3.10-11), Aeneas on his journey from Greece to the West has appropriated Greek ritual for a Trojan/Roman setting. Both passages, too, associate literary temples the inauguration of games. And whereas Virgil's song-temple is modeled principally on the temple of Actian Apollo on the Palatine, the temple to which Aeneas affixes his hexameter is Apollo's temple at Actium.

More suggestive still is the analogy established in both passages between poetic activity and the certain propagandistic gestures of Octavian. Whereas the proem to *Georgics* 3 proclaims the narrator as a poetic *triumphator* and architect after the manner of Octavian, Aeneas' account of his dedication "may be thought to look forward to V[irgil]'s, just as his trophy does to Aug[ustus]'s."⁷⁵ Aeneas, that is to say, anticipates the poetic art of Virgil at the same time as he furnishes a political archetype for his descendant. In both passages, there is an evident interdependence of the poetic and the political, and interdependence embodied symbolically by the image of the temple.

⁷⁵ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 288. Cf. Barchiesi (1994) 7.

Before moving on to Buthrotum, it will be worth the trouble to summarize our observations. Aeneas' dedication of the shield of Abas stands at the center of a complex web of associations and addresses some of the main thematic preoccupations of the *Aeneid*. Actium, as Aeneas makes clear, stands just outside boundary of the Hellenic world. It is at precisely this point that the Trojans' descendents will definitively assert their ascendancy over Greece and the East. Aeneas' dedication knowingly commemorates the former triumph and unwittingly anticipates the latter. The shield itself is associated with an elaborate set of Greek, or Argive, rituals which Aeneas, and Octavian after him, appropriate for their own ends. The specifically Argive provenance of the shield invites comparison with the series of Inachid ancestral artifacts that appear throughout the poem associated with the enemies of the Dardan race. This serves to locate the battle of Actium - the climactic act of Roman history - within the context of a genealogically defined contest between the descendents of Dardanus and the Argive descendents of Inachus.

Aeneas' description of the Trojans' sojourn also explores the role of the *realia* of the phenomenological world within fictional narrative. Both the *parua urbs* and Apollo's temple at Leucas/Actium furnish a material link between the heroic past and the Augustan present: in the aftermath of the battle of Actium, the city on the Actian promontory was enlarged and renamed, while the temple underwent extensive renovation. Complementary to the continuity furnished by architecture is the potentially more enduring permanence of ritual: the *Iliaci ludi* that Aeneas founds at Actium, like the Trojan Ride described in book 5, extend down to the Augustan present.

The Actian episode in book 3 finds itself curiously mirrored by the iconography of another shield: that of Aeneas, described at the end of book 8. Vulcan's artwork shows pictorially the event that Aeneas' gestures had unwittingly

anticipated. His representation of that event on the shield he awards Aeneas will necessarily have included the temple at which Aeneas dedicated his Argive shield. The iconography of Aeneas' shield, that is to say, depicts both the event that the dedication of the shield of Abas foreshadows, and the temple at which it was dedicated. Finally, the explicit mention of Phoebus' temple on the Palatine completes – together with the temples at Leucas and Actium - the set of three closely identified with the battle of Actium.

Aeneas' inscription of a hexameter upon the shield he dedicates at Actium introduces an element of literary self-awareness to the episode. It is, I believe, no accident that the only surviving fragment from the corpus of Aeneas' poetry marks (*rem carmine signo*, 3.287) a gesture that unites past, present, and future in a dizzyingly complex network of associations. Virgil gathers those associations around physical artifacts (temple architecture, the *arma* of Abas and Aeneas, civil architecture) and ritual (the Actian games).

Aeneid 3.290-505

The Actian interlude, with its glance towards the Augustan future, contrasts sharply with Trojan's progress through the Homeric world that surrounds it. Immediately prior to arriving in Leucate/Actium, Aeneas describes how the Trojans had passed among the islands surrounding the home of *durus Vlixes* (3.270-73). When the Trojans leave Actium, they return momentarily to the world of the *Odyssey*:

linquere tum portus iubeo et considerare transtris.

certatim socii feriunt mare et aequora uerrunt:

protinus aërias Phaeacum abscondimus arces

litoraque Epiri legimus portuque subimus

Chaonio et celsam Buthroti accedimus urbem.

(289-93)

Then I give the order to abandon the port and to sit at the benches. My companions compete in smiting the sea and sweeping the deep. All at once, having hidden away the misty citadels of the Phaeacians, skimmed the shores of Epirus, and pulled into the Chaonian port, we make our way up to the lofty city of Buthrotum.

In the middle of the five lines Aeneas takes to describe the Trojans' passage from Actium to Buthrotum, he describes how the Trojans passed the "airy peaks (citadels?)" of the Phaeacians. Aeneas is passing Corcyra, the island with which Scheria was explicitly identified in Apollonius' *Argonautica*⁷⁶ (4.991-92). Since it is at the court of the Phaeacian king Alcinous that Odysseus delivers *his* account of wanderings around the Mediterranean (*Odyssey* 9-12), there is an implied correspondence between the *arces* of the Phaeacians and the *arces* of Carthage,⁷⁷ where he is delivering his narrative.

The language of line 291 is striking. As Williams notes, the only uses in ancient literature of *abscondere* in this sense appear to have been influenced by this very passage.⁷⁸ Similarly noteworthy is the use of the very poetic *aerius* to describe

⁷⁶ Also Hellanicus (*FGH* 4F77); Callimachus, *Aetia* (12Pf.). See also Dougherty (2001) 108.

⁷⁷ Programmatically at 1.298, the first mention of Carthage in the narrative proper: *haec ait et Maia genitum demittit ab alto, / ut terrae utque nouae pateant Karthaginis arces / hospitio Teucris* "Having said these things he [sc. Zeus] sends the child of Maia from on high in order that the land and the new citadels of Carthage might hospitably receive the Teucrians." Also 1.420, when Aeneas first spies the city: *aduersasque aspectat [sc. collis] desuper arces* "and looks upon the citadels opposite from above."

⁷⁸ Williams (1962, ad 291) cites Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 70.2 (*quemadmodum in mari, ut ait Vergilius noster, 'terraeque urbesque recedunt', sic in hoc cursu rapidissimi temporis primum pueritiam abscondimus deinde adulescentiam* "just as at sea, as our Virgil says, the lands and cities recede, so too in this race of fleeting time first we put away our childhood, then our adolescence"); Claud. R.P. 3.140; and Prud. Perist. 5.464.

the *arces* of the Phaeacians' island. The mistiness suggested by the adjective⁷⁹ (cf. Homer's ὄρεα σκιόεντα, *Od.* 5.279) compliments the ambiguity surrounding the meaning of *arces*, for it is unclear whether Aeneas sees mountaintops (e.g. *Georgics* 1.240, 4.461) or man-made citadels (e.g. 1.298, 1.420, 3.553).⁸⁰ From a distance, too, the hazy mountaintops of Corcyra might appear to the eye of the observer as the towering fortresses of Alcinous.⁸¹ The ambiguity is perfectly suited to the island of the Phaeacians, a fairyland located nowhere in particular by Homer but securely identified with Corcyra by Apollonius. We recall that upon Odysseus' arrival on Ithaca in *Odyssey* 13, he found himself obliged to lie about the men who had transported him, presumably because the truth would not be credible to an inhabitant of the mundane world of Ithaca. There is every sign, too, that Homer's Phaeacia, "like the Laestrygonians' land, stands on the nebulous border between myth and fiction, rather than the slightly less nebulous border between myth and history."⁸² Virgil's evocation of a confirmed geographical location whose hazy *arces* may, or may not, suggest the fairyland of Homer's Phaeacians perfectly encapsulates the dynamic relationship between the physical world and fiction in the *Aeneid*.

Phaeacia is the last stop of Homer's Odysseus before his arrival home on Ithaca. When he awakes on the shore, he fails to recognize the land that is genuinely his home (οὐδέ μιν ἔγνω, / ἦδη δὴν ἀπεών "having now been so long away, he failed to recognize it," *Od.* 13.187-216). Aeneas' first port of call after passing⁸³ Phaeacia is a land that he will, unlike Odysseus, recognize (*agnosco*, 351) as his own.

⁷⁹ Pace Horsfall (2006) *ad* 291, who asserts that "V.'s adj. suggests skyward height;" given the strong Homeric allusion, however, the sense of "cloudy, misty" can hardly be suppressed. For parallels, see Nelis (2001) 460.

⁸⁰ Cf. Williams (1962) *ad* 291.

⁸¹ Cf. Williams (1962) *ad* 291: "to the eye of fancy the peaks of Corcyra are the turreted walls of the city of King Alcinous." A very keen observation.

⁸² Ahl and Roisman (1996) 47-48. See also Eubeck, West, and Hainsworth (1988) *ad* 54-66.

⁸³ As in 3.275 (*Laertia regna*), Aeneas is passing by a Homeric episode. Nelis (2001) 61 that Apollonius (4.968-69) had deployed the technique at the same point in the Argo's voyage. See also Horsfall (2006) *ad* 291.

As we shall shortly see, however, Aeneas also recognizes the counterfeit quality of a city that merely *looks* like home (302, 349). Whereas Odysseus genuinely arrives home from Phaeacia and fails to recognize it,⁸⁴ at Aeneas' first stop after passing Phaeacia he successfully recognizes in Buthrotum his "home," but knows that (again unlike Odysseus) his true goal lies elsewhere. Buthrotum thus presents itself as the final stage of Aeneas' *nostos* – the Ithaca of the *Aeneid* - but turns out to correspond to a rather different stage in the Odysseus' wanderings.

The true nature of Buthrotum becomes clear when Aeneas, having already heard the marvelous story of how Andromache and Helenus had taken over Pyrrhus rule in Epirus, makes his way up to the city from the shore:

progredior portu classis et litora linquens,
sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona
ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam
libabat cineri Andromache manisque uocabat
Hectoreum ad tumulum, uiridi quem caespite inanem
et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacrauerat aras.

(300-5)

Leaving the fleet and the shoreline, I make my way up from the harbor. It so happened that at that time Andromache, before the city in a grove beside the waters of a fake Simois, was pouring a libation of food and sad gifts to the dead and calling Hector's shade to his tomb, a cenotaph of green turf where she had consecrated twin altars, the cause of her tears.

⁸⁴ Cf. Ahl and Roisman (1996) 152-57.

As it happens,⁸⁵ the first thing Aeneas sees as he makes his way up from the shore is Andromache carrying out rites for the absent body of her dead husband. The funereal atmosphere is aided by the setting for Andromache's rites: they take place in a *lucus* (302), a word which, as Servius remarks on his note to this line, has associations with the spirits of the dead (*lucum ... numquam ponit sine religione, nam in ipsis habitant manes piorum* "lucus, a term which he never uses outside of a religious context, for it is in them that the shades of the just live"). "If we put any stock in the ancient scholiasts," remarks Bettini, "Andromache would be fully justified if she were to see shadows here instead of solid things."⁸⁶

It is while trying to raise the spirit of her dead husband that she sees Aeneas approaching:

ut me conspexit uenientem et Troia circum
 arma amens uidit, magnis exterrita monstribus
 deriguit uisu in medio, calor ossa reliquit,
 labitur, et longo uix tandem tempore fatur:
 'uerane te facies, uerus mihi nuntius adfers,
 nate dea? uiuisne? aut, si lux alma recessit,
 Hector ubi est?'

(306-12)

As she, in a state of frenzy, saw me approaching surrounded by Trojan arms, she took fright at so great an apparition and froze as she looked; the heat left her bones, and she collapsed. Then, after long pause, she finally said, with difficulty, these words: "Son of a goddess, are you a true figure, a true herald

⁸⁵ "A useful coincidence," as Horsfall (2006) *ad* 301 observes. Cf. 8.102-3: *forte die sollemnem illo rex Arcas honorem / ... ferebat* "it so happened that on that very day the Arcadian king was carrying out hallowed rites."

⁸⁶ Bettini (1997) 14.

that approaches? Do you live? Or, if the nourishing light has vanished, where is Hector?"

When she spies Aeneas, Andromache is described in language appropriate for one in the throes of death⁸⁷ (*deriguit uisu in medio, calor ossa reliquit, / labitur*, 308-9).

When she sees Aeneas, however, she can scarcely believe that *he* is alive, which is why Aeneas and his companions appear as *magna monstra*. "Enea non è un *monstrum*," remarks Cova, "ma tale appare a chi vive fuori del reale chi vive nella realtà commune."⁸⁸ Indeed, Andromache appears more inclined to believe that her rites have raised Aeneas and his Trojans from the dead.⁸⁹ Since it is specifically the spirit of her husband that she has been actively trying to summon, it is only natural that she should ask where he is (*Hector ubi est?*, 312).

In apparently conjuring up Aeneas and his companions, Andromache believes that she, a living being, has summoned the dead. The reality, of course, is rather closer to the contrary.⁹⁰ The incredulity with which Andromache greets Aeneas recalls that shown by the shades of Teirisiias (*Odyssey* 11.92-94) and Anticleia (11.155-56) when they see Odysseus in the Underworld. It also anticipates Anchises' reaction to seeing his son when Aeneas visits the "real" Underworld in book 6⁹¹ (*uenisti tandem, tuoque expectata parenti / uicit iter durum pietas?* "Are you come at last, has your devotion, long awaited by your parent, conquered the harsh road?," 687-

⁸⁷ Bright (1981) 43.

⁸⁸ Cova (1998) 307.

⁸⁹ Cf. Bettini (1997) 13: "Andromache is sacrificing to a dead man; the unexpected apparition, therefore, can only have come from the underworld."

⁹⁰ Cf. Grimm (1967) 155: "Andromache seems immediately ready to assume the opposite – that Aeneas is indeed a real shade, representing a more vivid projection of her world than any she has thus far known – and she steps readily into that domain of death to ask Aeneas where her dead Hector is, as though Aeneas could immediately point him out."

⁹¹ Cf. Bright (1981) 43: "This is like the incredulity with which Teiresias ... and Anticleia ... meet Odysseus in the Land of the Dead, and in similar terms Anchises will welcome Aeneas when he actually goes to the Underworld: *uenisti tandem, tuoque expectata parenti / uicit iter durum pietas?*"

88). The parallels with both the Homeric *nekylia* and that of the *Aeneid* suggest that it Andromache and her husband, rather than Aeneas, who most resemble shades.

Andromache continues to fulfill the role of a shade in her second speech.⁹² After relating in some depth her recent history, and the slaying of Neoptolemus at the hands of Orestes, Andromache asks about Ascanius and the extent to which he displays the prowess of the family line:

quid puer Ascanius? superatne et uescitur aura?
quem tibi iam Troia –
ecqua tamen puero est amissae cura parentis?
ecquid in antiquam uirtutem animosque uirilis
et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitat Hector?
(339-43)

And what of the boy Ascanius? Does he survive and breathe the air? Whom Troy now for you ... Does the lad have a care for his lost mother? And do the examples of his father Aeneas and his uncle Hector still arouse in him some of that ancient prowess and manliness of spirit.

In Andromache's concern for the well being and comportment of Ascanius it is impossible not to hear an echo of the various questions asked of Odysseus by the shades when he visits the Underworld in *Odyssey* 11. In particular, Andromache's questions are reminiscent of Agamemnon's asking Odysseus if he has heard anything of his son Orestes (11.458-61). It also recalls Achilles' inquires as to whether Neoptolemus had distinguished himself on the field of battle (11.492-93). This reminiscences might be considered marginal were it not for the fact that Andromache

⁹² Cf. Quint (1982) 33: "Andromache begins to play the role of a shade in the *Aeneid* when she asked whether Ascanius is living and whether he is living up to the valorous examples of Aeneas and Hector."

has just told of the slaying of Neoptolemus by Orestes (*Orestes / excipit incautum patriasque obtruncat ad aras* “Orestes catches him out unawares and slaughters him at the altar,” 330-32). Andromache’s narrative does not merely furnish poetic justice for the slaying of Priam by Neoptolemus (*Aeneid* 2.547-58): it “answers” the questions asked of Odysseus in the Underworld.⁹³

From Andromache’s perspective, her funereal rites have succeeded in bringing a part of the dead Trojan past to life. By the end of her speech, however, it is clear to the audience of Aeneas’ narrative that Buthrotum is a land of the dead⁹⁴ and that Andromache and her husband, for all intents and purposes, are mere shades. That impression is reinforced by one of the poem’s more obvious allusions to the corpus of Catullus.⁹⁵ In narrating her fate after the fall of Troy, Andromache tells how she was borne over the sea from her fatherland: *nos patria incensa diuersa per aequora uectae* (325; cf. also 1.376). It is impossible to miss the echo of Catullus 101.1, the first line of Catullus’ famous poem dramatizing his visit to his brother’s tomb at, of all places, Troy: *Multas per gentes et multa per aequora uectus* “Having traveled through many nations and over many seas.” Critics have also noticed an echo of *tristi munere* in line 8 in *tristia dona* that Andromache brings to Hector’s empty tomb (3.301). The reader cannot escape the impression that Andromache’s ultimate destination after the sack of her homeland is a tomb: the tomb of Troy, the ancient city among whose ruins lies the final resting place of Catullus’ brother. If Andromache and Helenus are shades, it follows that the city in which they dwell is a city of the dead.⁹⁶

⁹³ Quint (1982) 33.

⁹⁴ Pace Horsfall (2006) ad 294-305: “The ‘land of the dead’ is unexpectedly alive when studied with due attention to detail, but no energetic concentration on future greatness is to be expected of the few survivors at Buthrotum.”

⁹⁵ Cf. the discussion of Bright (1981) 43.

⁹⁶ It is of course true that the analogy between Andromache and the narrator of Catullus’ poem casts the former in the role of a living being, contrary to the overall tenor of the passage.

Aeneas concedes as much when, finally taking his leave of the city, he congratulates its inhabitants for having achieved their *quies* (*uobis parta quies*, 495). The *quies* which the citizens of Buthrotum now enjoy, of course, is a deathly one.⁹⁷ Indeed, in the *Aeneid* *quies* refers as frequently to Death as it does to his brother Sleep.⁹⁸ Aeneas' words also recall the plea with which he enters the poem: his wish to have died at Troy with his city (1.94). It also anticipates (chronologically) his exclamation upon seeing the rising walls of the city of Carthage: *o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!* "How blessed by fortune are those whose city walls are now arising."

To the extent that Helenus' city is a mere static representation of another, no longer existent, civic entity, it is a city a shades, an anticipation of the *domus Ditis* that Aeneas will visit in book 6, *after* the conclusion of his narrative. But because it falls within the narrative of Aeneas, it suggests that its strongest Homeric parallel is the *nekyia* of *Odyssey* 11. Whereas Homer's *nekyia* falls just before the end of the first half of the *Odyssey*, Virgil's Buthrotum episode falls just short of the midpoint (*meta*,⁹⁹ 3.714) of the Odyssean first half of the *Aeneid*. And as some commentators have noted, the prophetic speech of Helenus corresponds as much to the prophecy of Teiresias as to that of Phineus in the *Argonautica*. There is, too, the question of the geographical proximity to Buthrotum of the Thesprotian Oracle of the Dead in Cichyrus.¹⁰⁰ It was at Cichyrus that later writers, notably Pausanias (1.17.5), located Homer's Underworld, in much the same way that they identified Corcyra with

⁹⁷ Even Horsfall (2006) *ad* 294-305 concedes this much: "**Quies (495)** is clearly touched by the sense of death, but if we read the story of Andr. and Hel. with a minimum of alert humanity, the wonder is that they exist at all."

⁹⁸ Bright (1981) 45. Bright notes especially the deaths of Oroides (10.745-46) and Alsinus (12.309-10).

⁹⁹ Aeneas uses *meta* at 3.714 to mean the "end point" (so far) of his wanderings (*longarum haec meta uiarum*), but since the word also means "turning post," we are justified in discerning a signpost, as it were, marking the end of the first half of the "Odyssean" part of the poem.

¹⁰⁰ Bright (1981) 44. Horsfall (2006) *ad* 294-305 is dismissive: "the distance is 44 miles, in a straight line over several ranges of mountain." This fact was evidently of small moment to later tradition, which appears to have made the identification independent of Virgil.

Homer's Scheria. In terms of the structural economy of the *Aeneid*, then, the Buthrotum episode is a *nekyia*, an anticipation of the literal katabasis that Aeneas undertakes in book 6.

We noted above that the non-living character of Buthrotum can be put down in part to its status as a representational work of art rather than a living civic entity. Aeneas first mentions the counterfeit quality of Helenus' New Troy in Aeneas' reference to the *falsus Simois* before which Andromache performs her ritual offerings (*falsi Simoentis ad undam*, 302). Aeneas' sense of the imitative quality of Buthrotum is conveyed more emphatically still in his account of his reception by Andromache's new husband Helenus:

procedo et paruum Troiam simulataque magnis
Pergama et arentem Xanthi cognomine riuum
agnosco, Scaeaque amplector limina portae;
nec non et Teucri socia simul urbe fruuntur.
illos porticibus rex accipiebat in amplis:
aulai medio libabant pocula Bacchi
impositis auro dapibus, paterasque tenebant.
(349-55)

As I go on I recognize a miniature Troy, a Pergamum aping its great namesake, and the arid creek going by the name of Xanthus; I embrace the threshold of the Scaean Gate. Nor do the Teucrians at the same time fail to enjoy their twin city. The king received them in his huge porticos: in the middle of the court they poured goblets of Bacchus amid the golden feast, holding ritual dishes.

Aeneas recognizes (*agnosco*, 351) the old Troy in the new, but in so doing he emphasizes its imitative, insubstantial character. Not only does he call Helenus' Troy "small" (*paruam*, 349), but he insists on its being a "counterfeit" copy of its illustrious model¹⁰¹ (*simulataque magnis / Pergama*, 349-50). Similarly, the new Xanthus is an arid creek-bed that has only its name (*cognomine*) in common with its Trojan counterpart (350).

Curiously, Aeneas' careful emphasis on the imitative, seedy character of Helenus' New Troy is combined with references to its opulence.¹⁰² Not only does Aeneas concede that he embraced Helenus' Scaean gate (of whose imitative nature no mention is made), but he relates how he was received by the king within capacious porticos (*porticibus ... amplis*, 353). Similar opulence is apparent in the luxurious setting of the feast (*impositis auro dapibus*, 355) and in the gifts offered the Trojans on their departure (464-72). Paltry though Helenus' counterfeit Troy may be, it still succeeds in evoking some of the glory of the original. So much so, in fact, that Aeneas' words appear to confuse the miniature, model city of Helenus with the glorious city it merely represents. As he wanders among the scale model of Buthrotum, Aeneas is imperceptibly absorbed into the fiction created by Helenus' imitative architecture. Art becomes, for a moment, the real thing.

There is something unique about the way Aeneas views Buthrotum: instead of looking, or marveling, at what is there before his eyes, he "recognizes" (*agnosco*, 351) in that which *is* before his eyes as a representation of that which *is not*. Whereas

¹⁰¹ Horsfall (2006) *ad* 294-305 is not convinced: "Would not just the same critique apply to the US Congress because the Capitol Hill is not in fact in Rome? Or to Harvard, because Cambridge, Mass. is not in the Fen Country?" This objection has already been satisfactorily addressed, however, by Bettini (1997) 19: "It is one thing to imitate a city that nevertheless continues to exist elsewhere; it is something else entirely to rebuild a simulacrum of a city that is no longer in existence."

¹⁰² Cf. Cova 1994.XLIX: "la dimensione regale e' enfatizzata in modo sproporzionato alla realt  di un povero, piccolo e giovane regno ... Tutto ci  fa strano contrasto con la piccolezza della sua citt  ... e l'arido fiumiciattolo che ripete il nome di Xanto."

Aeneas observes the civic buildings of (for example) Carthage as structures in their own right, he sees the buildings of Buthrotum primarily as *representational art*.¹⁰³ The verb *agnosco* is a word one uses to describe a viewer recognizing something represented in pictorial art: Aeneas, for example, is said to “recognize” the tents of Rhesus on Dido’s murals in Carthage (*Rhesi niueis tentoria uelis / agnoscit*, 1.469-70). Just as Aeneas in Carthage acknowledges in the temple murals persons and events connected with the war for Troy, in Buthrotum he acknowledges - in the very buildings of the city – Troy itself. The chief difference between the temple art that Aeneas sees at Carthage and the monumental art that he sees at Buthrotum is that the latter is three-dimensional.

When he takes his leave of Helenus and Andromache, Aeneas uses the language of representational art to describe his hosts’ city: *effigiem Xanthi Troiamque uidetis / quam uestrae fecere manus* “you behold the image of the Xanthus and of Troy, which you made with your own hands” (497-98). The dry river-bed that Helenus and Andromache call Xanthus is a genuinely natural, if unspectacular, feature of the landscape, but incorporated within the artistic scheme of Buthrotum it becomes an *effigies*, an image whose chief significance resides not in itself, but in what it represents. If the *effigies* that stand before Latinus’ palace are lumps of hewn wood that stand for the ancient kings of Latium, the *effigies* to which Aeneas’ refers at Buthrotum is a course of water which – by virtue of the artistic landscape through which it runs – stands for one of the mighty rivers of the Troad.

By definition, an *effigies* is an object that has been fashioned (<*effingo*) by the hand of an artist or fabricator. Aeneas curious choice of vocabulary appears here to be determined by *fecere* in line 498: the river, he implies, is as much a product of

¹⁰³ Cf. Newlands (2002) 41: “The observer of a villa or a temple, unlike the observer of a painting, is part of the landscape in which the building is set, part of the architectural context.”

Helenus' artistry as the new *Troia* itself. But unless we assume that Helenus' Xanthus is an unlikely product of landscape engineering, we must concede that it is a natural part of the landscape rather than the product of human artifice. Purely as a result of its incorporation within the project of Buthortum, however, its status as an integral part of the natural landscape fades before the referential quality it acquired on being incorporated into Helenus' model Troy. *Troia*, the true antecedent of the pronoun that stands the direct object of *fecere*, is, of course, as much an *effigies* as imitation Xanthus. The verb itself is inappropriate for the construction of a city and its buildings, but it is perfectly suited to a work of representational art.

It is not just the civic architecture of Buthrotum that is invested with the referential qualities of art. Even its inhabitants are mere doubles of more substantial beings. Helenus, the man to whom Andromache has passed after her "marriage" with Neoptolemus, is an inferior stand-in for Hector.¹⁰⁴ However much he may be a man of flesh and blood, within the symbolic scheme of Buthrotum he too is an *effigies*, a living part of the real world whose primary existence has been subordinated to a world of art. Andromache's parting speech betrays a similar conception of Ascanius:

accipe et haec, manuum tibi quae monimenta mearum
sint, puer, et longum Andromachae testentur amorem,
coniugis Hectoreae. cape dona extrema tuorum,
o mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago.
sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat;
et nunc aequali tecum pubesceret aevo.

(3.486-91)

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Bettini (1997) 11, who quotes Baudelaire's *Le cygne: veuve d'Hector, hélas, et femme d'Hélénus*.

Take these things too, to be souvenirs, my boy, of my handiwork, and to testify to the enduring love of Andromache, Hector's spouse. Accept these, the last gifts of your people, O you who are for me the sole likeness of my Astyanax. Just so were his very eyes, thus were his hands, his face. And now he would be growing into adulthood with you, the very same age.

For Andromache, Ascanius' chief virtue is presenting an *imago* of her dead son Astyanax. From as early the *Odyssey*, remarking upon a child's bearing the stamp of his parent(s) is a commonplace; it is rather less common to remark upon a child's preserving the likeness of his cousin. As far as Andromache is concerned, however, Ascanius is less a human being than he is a referential work of art. Just as the *monimenta* that Andromache offers to the Trojans are presented less as gifts in their own right than "memorials" of someone who is absent,¹⁰⁵ Ascanius has been fashioned into a mere image that brings to mind a person who is dead.

The sheer novelty of the Buthrotum episode ought to give us pause. For the bereaved of antiquity it was common practice to make an *imago* of one's beloved that might serve to revive the memory of the decease; it is another thing altogether to fashion a living spouse into a double of one's dead spouse, or to characterize one child merely as the *imago* of another. Similarly, while there was nothing novel about colonists building new cities on the model of their mother cities, Buthrotum stands alone in functioning principally as a scale model of a city that no longer exists. Virgil's Buthrotum is an utterly unique creation: a functioning civic entity populated

¹⁰⁵ Bettini (1997) 22: "For Andromache these gifts are not merely gifts: they are *monimenta*. They are meant to "make him remember her"; in putting on these clothes, Ascanius' thoughts will immediately turn elsewhere, just as Andromache's thoughts turn to Hector at every moment."

by living beings that has been reduced to the status of referential work of art inhabited by *imagines* and ghosts.

Buthrotum enjoys a curious double status as a three-dimensional work of art *and* a Land of the Dead. By redefining her fellow inhabitants as referential *imagines* of dead people, Andromache robs them of life and turns them into shades. Because the city they inhabit is less a fully functioning civic entity than it is a stage-set, or a three-dimensional work of representational art, it does not belong to the land of the living. By turning a living city into scale model of a dead city, Andromache has turned her new home into a necropolis. The result is the exact reverse of the illusion produced by the literary artist: instead of bringing a new world into being, Andromache has turned living beings, and the city they inhabit, into artifacts of referential art. To be sure, as a work of art Buthrotum succeeds admirably: as he wanders through the city, Aeneas allows himself to be overcome by its fake splendor, to be seduced by its verisimilitude. But since Hector, Astyanax, and the city they inhabited are no more, Buthrotum is not just a static work of art, but a living tomb.

Chapter five

Aeneid 8.97-269

Amid the splendors of Augustan Rome were preserved archaeological remains from the distant past. On the Capitol stood the *casa Romuli*, a straw-thatched hut scrupulously maintained at the expense of the state.¹ Those writers who mention it insist upon its moral significance. Vitruvius notes that the *casa Romuli* served to remind contemporary Romans of the ancient *mores* of the city (*item in Capitolio commonefacere potest et significare mores uetustatis Romuli casa et in arce sacrorum stramentis tecta* “the hut of Romulus on the Capitol, and shrines roofed with straw on the citadel, can remind us of the same thing and demonstrate the *mores* of antiquity,” 2.1.3). Similarly, the elder Seneca marvels that the race that conquered all the world should bother to maintain a mere hut on the golden Capitol (*colit etiamnunc in Capitolio casam uictor omnium gentium populus* “even today the race that conquered the whole world maintains a hut on the Capitol,” 2.1.5).

Curiously, we know from Dionysius Halicarnassus (1.79.11), Plutarch (*Rom.* 20.4), and Cassius Dio (48.43; 54.29) that another *casa Romuli* stood on the Palatine,² similarly preserved by the regular replacement of damaged or otherwise unsuitable

¹ Remains from three huts dating to the eighth century BC were discovered on the Palatine in 1948, although it is not clear whether any of these is to be identified with the building preserved as the *casa Romuli* in historical times. On the archaeology of the site, see Pensabene (1990) 86-90. Cf. also Eden (1975) *ad* 652: “These huts, whose general shape can be reconstructed from post-holes in the stone flooring and from the imitative shape of the hut-urns used to contain the ashes of the cremated dead, belonged to the Iron Age culture of Latium, essentially the same as the widespread Villanovan type.”

² Cf. Eden (1975) *ad* 652: “the fact that some authorities ... located a *casa Romuli* on the south-west corner of the Palatine [does not] prove that there was not another on the Capitoline ... Both, presumably, were thatched huts kept in trim (*recens*) through religious veneration and restored in the same style whenever damaged.”

thatch.³ It seems plausible that the Palatine structure was the model for the hut on the Capitoline, but there is no positive evidence to suggest that was the case.⁴ The Palatine *casa*, at least, appears to have been maintained with some fervor: it was still intact at least as late as the fourth century AD.⁵

In the *Aeneid*, the Capitoline *casa Romuli* turns up in the description of the shield of Aeneas, appearing in the vicinity of Manlius as he defends the Capitol from the Gauls:

in summo custos Tarpeiae Manlius arcis
stabat pro templo et Capitolia celsa tenebat,
Romuleoque recens horrebat regia culmo.
(8.652-54)

At the top Manlius, the guardian of the Tarpeian citadel, was standing before the temple, holding the heights of the Capitol, while the royal palace of Romulus bristled, fresh with new thatch.

The description of the preserved dwelling of Romulus is riddled with contradictions. Although a king's dwelling is, by definition, a *regia*, there is an unavoidable paradox in using a word evocative of an opulent royal palace to describe a primitive *casa*.⁶ There is a corresponding tension between the purported antiquity of the structure and the newness of the materials of which it is made. *horrebat*, the main verb of the sentence, suggests not simply that the building is bristling with thatch, but also that it is "hoary"

³ The house was maintained "on the south-west corner of the Palatine hill, near the top of the *scalae Caci*, represented by a hut of straw with a thatched roof, that was regarded with great veneration and restored, whenever injured by fire, in the same style" (Platner & Ashby (1929) 101).

⁴ Platner & Ashby (1929) 102.

⁵ The fourth century catalogue known as the *Notitia* lists the hut of Romulus among the buildings on the Palatine.

⁶ Cf. Ovid, *F.* 3.183-84: *quae fuerit nostri, si quaeris, regia nati, / aspice de canna straminibusque domum* "If you inquire as to which is the palace of our son, behold the house made from reed and straw."

with age. But if Romulus' hut bristles with antiquity, it is also described as *recens* "fresh, new."⁷ The ancient building owes its newness to the thatch that must regularly be replaced if the structure is to survive.⁸ That brand new thatch, however, is described as "Romulean," which, if taken literally, is an obvious absurdity: it is of course the hut that is Romulean, not the fresh straw of which it is made.⁹ Virgil thus describes a pictorial representation of a building that is both ancient (*horrebat*) and new (*recens*), made up of regularly replaced thatch that is necessarily fresh, but is nonetheless described as belonging to the age of Romulus (*Romuleoque culmo*).

The displacement of the adjectives *recens* and *Romuleus* from their logical substantives (from *culmo* and *regia* respectively) draws our attention to a paradox inherent in the building itself: that the hut of Romulus is an ancient building composed, at least in part, of materials that are perishable. The ephemeral nature of the materials that compose Romulus' ancient dwelling is worth comparing with the immortal structure dedicated to Hercules at Gades which Silius describes in *Punica* 3:

uulgatum, nec cassa fides, ab origine fani
 impositas durare trabes solasque per aeuum
 condentum nouisse manus. hinc credere gaudent
 consedissee deum seniumque repellere templis.
 (3.17-20)

There is a true story to the effect that the temple's beams have endured from the beginnings of the shrine and that, throughout their entire existence, they

⁷ *recens* can of course also refer to the fact that Vulcan's artifact has only just been completed; cf. Gransden (1976) *ad* 654; Edwards (1996) 36.

⁸ Cf. Eden (1975) *ad* 652: "The *casa* was traditionally supposed to antedate the invasion of the Gauls by three centuries, but *recens* does not contradict this, since it need not and probably ... does not refer to the pristine condition of the *casa*."

⁹ Cf. Fordyce (1977) *ad* 654: "*recens* is difficult: if it means 'new from the maker's hand' (and so bright and sharp in effect), it is awkwardly used of a building which claimed to be a relic of the distant past."

have known only the hands of their builders. Hence they delight in the belief that the god has taken up residence there and expels erosion from the temple.

Silius implies that the enduring quality of Hercules' temple at Gades is what sets it apart from all other temples, whose materials are regularly renewed. Under normal circumstances, the temples of the gods need supernatural powers to endure in their original state. Failing that, they are destined to endure not as physical structures, but rather as a series of copies of an enduring archetype.

The buildings of the Roman world, of course, were routinely subject to fire and other devastations. The Capitoline *casa Romuli*, therefore, is unique not because its material is regularly renewed, but rather for the antiquity of its design. Indeed, the fact that the two *casae Romuli* were made out of reed and straw rendered them especially prone to fire. Dio Cassius explicitly mentions two instances of the Palatine *casa* being destroyed by fire during the lifetime of Octavian, in 38 BC (54.29.8) and 12 BC (48.43.4). What Virgil and Silius appear to imply is that man-made structures are impermanent in themselves; what persists is an idealization of their form. Virgil's description (of Vulcan's representation) of Romulus' hut on the Capitol implies that a building's ontological status inheres less in its physical material than in an abstract perception. In this respect, physical structures have more in common with the insubstantial structures of epic than is normally assumed: there is a sense in which the Augustan *casae Romuli* no more embodied the physical, material reality of the historical Romulus' dwelling than do Virgil's hexameters.

Virgil's description draws our attention to another paradox inherent in the *casae* that stood in his own day on the Capitoline and the Palatine.¹⁰ The authenticity

¹⁰ Cf. the curiously indeterminate status of the palace of Latinus, described at 7.170-91, whose precise relationship to the *regia Pici* is unclear; see esp. Rosivach (1980) 146-47.

of both buildings was qualified not only by the fact that their materials were regularly renewed,¹¹ but also by their rival claims to being the dwelling of Romulus.¹² However carefully the ancient form of Romulus' putative hut was preserved on the Capitol, the fact that its twin was maintained with a similar fastidiousness on the Palatine necessarily dilutes the claim of either to being the sole instantiation of the dwelling of the historical Romulus. In spite of the scrupulous care taken to preserve the supposed primeval integrity of Romulus' huts, the Augustan *casae* necessarily preserved the form rather than the substance of their model.

In Virgil's day both *casae* were extant as standing structures, yet there is a real sense in which they were both ontologically subordinate to an idealized image of the historical *casa Romuli*.¹³ In Virgil's description of Vulcan's representation of the Capitoline *casa*, we are removed still further from that image, for Virgil is not describing the building itself, but rather an artifact upon which that building is represented. What is more, at the time of the manufacture of the shield, neither Romulus nor his hut had come into being.¹⁴ As if that were not enough, at the dramatic date of Vulcan's representation – the invasion of Rome by the Gauls in the fourth century BC – the Capitoline *casa Romuli* will itself be a replica of an earlier building whose form (but not its materials) it will preserve.

Although Virgil's description of Vulcan's representation of a future structure positions itself at several removes from the "real thing," there is a sense in which it is

¹¹ Edwards (1996) 34 notes that the "hut of Romulus, many times rebuilt, was perhaps as much a fiction as the *mores maiorum* – customs of the ancestors – of which it was the physical symbol."

¹² Pace Gransden (1976) ad 654, who believes that "the doubling is of no great importance to Virgil, what matters being the symbolic value of these primitive dwellings as types of pristine Roman simplicity."

¹³ Platner & Ashby (1929) 101 note that although the Palatine *casa Romuli* cannot be identified with any specific remains, it may genuinely have preserved the memory of the ancient huts whose remains have been found by modern archaeologists.

¹⁴ We might compare, on the central panel of the shield (8.720-22), the appearance of a fully functioning temple of Palatine Apollo amid the festivities surrounding Octavian's triple triumph of 29, over a year before the inauguration of the temple. For a discussion, see chapter four.

no less authentic than the physical building that will one day stand on Capitoline. If, as some have argued, the Capitoline hut was an Augustan replica of the more ancient Palatine *casa*,¹⁵ then the building represented by Vulcan cannot have existed in the fourth century BC. If that is indeed the case, then Vulcan's pictorial representation makes no pretense of verisimilitude. At the heart of Virgil's representation labyrinth lies not a physical structure of reed and straw, but an abstraction.

The fact that the *casae Romuli* stood on the two most historically evocative hills in Rome meant that Virgil's contemporaries might observe first-hand the bucolic beginnings of their great city amid the architectonic manifestations of its present greatness.¹⁶ For Virgil and other Augustan poets, these archaeological remains provided a material basis around which to construct their fantasies of a prehistoric, bucolic Rome. In the case of the representation of Evander's Ur-Rome in *Aeneid* 8, Romulus' Palatine hut furnishes the chief model for the modest dwelling of the Arcadian king, which Aeneas enters after his tour of Pallanteum:¹⁷

ut uentum ad sedes, 'haec' inquit 'limina uictor
Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.
aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
finge deo, rebusque ueni non asper egenis.'
dixit, et angusti subter fastigia tecti

¹⁵ According to Balland (1984) 73-74, the construction of the Capitoline *casa Romuli* may have been part of the reconfiguration of the *area Capitolina* in the late 20s BC. If this is the case, it may have been the result of a desire on the part of Octavian not to appear too heavy handed in his appropriation of the Palatine at the expense of the Capitoline or, conversely, an attempt to import elements of the Palatine into the Capitoline (see Edwards (1996) 37).

¹⁶ On the religious and political significance that the Palatine acquired under Octavian, see Deuling (1997) 285-86.

¹⁷ On the location of Evander's hut, see Fordyce (1977) *ad* 361: "Virgil does not say where Evander's quarters are, but *subibant* (359) perhaps suggests climbing and the view of the Forum and Carinae points to a site on the slope of the Palatine. If that is what he means, there is another foreshadowing of the future: for in his own time ... that was the position of Augustus' house (Suet. *Aug.* 72; Ovid, *Tr.* 1.31 ff.)." For a different view, see Rees (1996) 583-84, who locates the Evander's *regia* in the Forum.

ingentem Aenean duxit

(362-67)

When they came to his dwelling, he said: “The victorious Alcides crossed this threshold; him did this royal palace receive. My guest, make bold to despise riches and fashion yourself too as worthy of the god. Come not in contempt of humble circumstances.’ He spoke, and led the massive figure of Aeneas beneath the gable of his not-so-august dwelling.

Like the hut of Romulus on the Capitoline, the humble abode of Evander is described as a *regia*.¹⁸ The paradox inherent in Evander’s mere hut being described as a royal palace derives ultimately from Homer’s description of the hut of Eumaeus (an αὐλή “lofty hall,” *Odyssey* 14.5-22),¹⁹ which in turn is a sustained parody of the Iliadic description of the rather more august palace of Priam (*Iliad* 6.242-49). Evander himself seems aware of the irony, for he draws an implicit contrast between the humble size of his “palace” and the heroic stature of Hercules.²⁰ The poet himself draws the same contrast between Aeneas, who is described as *ingens* (an adjective often applied in the *Aeneid* to imposing edifices such as the *regia Pici*), and the dwelling itself, which is “not august/Augustan”²¹ (*angusti ... tecti*). The palace of Latinus, by contrast, is both *ingens* and *augustum* (*tectum augustum ingens*, 7.170).

The hut of Evander, then, is modeled upon, or anticipates, the Palatine *casa Romuli* in much the same way that the *tectum augustum* of Latinus is the forerunner of

¹⁸ On *regia* used in this context, see Deuling (1997) 234, 239.

¹⁹ Cf. Boyle (1999) 151-2: “In a passage modeled on the traditional theoxeny ... and redolent of Odysseus’ reception by Eumaeus in *Odyssey* 14 (for there is a clear sense in which Aeneas’ arrival at Rome is a homecoming), Evander invites Aeneas into his humble house on the Palatine, a manifest precursor of Augustus’ own self-consciously humble abode on the same hill (Suetonius, *Augustus* 72).”

²⁰ Cf. Corlita (1984) 685, 688.

²¹ Cf. Fordyce (1977) ad 367: “**ingentem** is emphatically placed to contrast with *angusti*.”

the Palatine dwelling of Augustus.²² Indeed, should we miss the typological parallels, the repetition of *regia* from line 363 makes it clear that Evander’s “palace” is of a similar order to that of Romulus.²³ At the same time, Evander’s *regia* serves as a model for the *domus Augusta*,²⁴ for the latter was famously held to embody architectonically the virtues of simplicity and *paupertas*²⁵ (Suet., *Aug.* 72). The last feature to be described in Aeneas’ tour of Pallanteum, the *regia* of Evander is the one architectonic feature that is anchored in the material reality of Augustan Rome.²⁶ As so often in the *Aeneid*, Virgil has deployed a feature of the material culture of the contemporary world in (re)creating the heroic world of his poem.

Because Evander’s *regia* evokes, and is modeled on, the fastidiously preserved *casa* of Romulus still extant on the Palatine at the end of the first century BC, it allows the Roman reader to anchor his vision of primeval Pallanteum in the physical reality of his own day. The appearance of Evander’s proto-Romulean hut at this point of the narrative is apt, for the novelty of Virgil’s description of Pallanteum lies in its synchronic representation of the bucolic scenery of Pallanteum amid the familiar urban spaces of modern Rome. During their tour of Rome Evander, Aeneas, and Pallas encounter the landmarks of Rome amid the primeval scenery of contemporary

²² Cf. Edwards (1996) 36: “The explicit mention of the hut on the Capitol serves to evoke the hut of Romulus on the Palatine, which Evander’s hut, also on the Palatine, might be thought to resemble – both the Capitoline hut and that of Evander (at 363) are referred to by the paradoxical term *regia*, ‘palace’. Thus Evander the proto-founder of Rome and Romulus the actual founder can be seen as resembling one another in their living conditions and therefore in their virtuous lifestyles. The two Romulean huts merge, the associations of their two sites enriching one another.”

²³ Cf. Gransden (1976) *ad* 654.

²⁴ Dio 53.16.5 observes that the house of the *princeps*, eventually to be called a “palace” after the hill on which it stood, gained a degree of fame on account of its having been the location of Romulus’ dwelling. See Galinsky (1996) 215; Deuling (1997) 226.

²⁵ Corlaita (1984) 688 notes Evander’s hut turns out to be rather more elaborate than we might initially have suspected: Evander and his guests observe the celestial apparition of Aeneas’ arms from an internal courtyard (*mediis ... aedibus*, 8.467-68).

²⁶ Cf. Gransden (1976) *ad* 654: “the typological parallel between Romulus’ house and Evander’s is central to *Aen.* VIII.”

Pallanteum:²⁷ the altar and gate of Carmens (337-41), the Asylum of Romulus (342-43), the Lupercal (343-44), the Argiletum (345-46), the Capitoline and the Tarpeian Rock (347-53), the ruins of the ancient cities of Janus and Saturn (355-58), and, last of all, the royal hut of Evander (359-68).

Like Propertius in 4.1, Virgil recreates a bygone bucolic landscape amid the familiar topography of Augustan Rome. Virgil makes a point, however, of keeping the Rome of his own day before our eyes even as he transforms it into a bucolic idyll. As they approach the Palatine hut of Evander, Aeneas and his party notice cows mooing in the Forum Romanum and in the posh suburb of Carinae²⁸ (*passimque armenta uidebant / Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis* “and all over the place they saw cattle mooing in the Roman Forum and grand Carinae,” 360-61). What the protagonists see, of course, is simply cattle grazing in the wilderness bordering the tiny township of Pallanteum. Yet what Virgil describes is what appears before the mind’s eye of his reader: a bucolic landscape paradoxically situated in the center of Augustan Rome.²⁹ Far from effacing the Augustan present, Virgil’s words explicitly locate Evander’s cattle in the center of the world metropolis. Put another way, Virgil superimposes an imaginary bucolic scene upon the topography of Rome as it exists in his day.³⁰

It is worth the trouble to compare Propertius’ adaptation of the same conceit.

The first of the two narrators in Propertius 4.1 draws a systematic contrast between the

²⁷ Cf. the observations of Zetzel (1997) 188: “As Aeneas’ ship comes up the Tiber, the waves themselves marvel at the unfamiliar sight of armed men on an oared ship. Virgil’s readers might have reacted similarly to the novelty of the scene, a view of Rome before historical Rome existed: a small settlement surrounded by forest nears the banks of a river, occupying the place of the buildings and grandeur of Augustan Rome ...”

²⁸ Cf. Edwards (1996) 32: “We are discreetly reminded, by the mention of another fashionable address, ... that the Palatine was to become the most desirable residential area in Rome in later centuries.”

²⁹ Cf. Mack (1978) 51 (on *rara domorum / tecta* “the scattered roofs of houses,” 8.98-99): “While Aeneas sees a scattering of houses ..., the Roman sees the future, but rather as his own present through the future.”

³⁰ Note too that Virgil calls Evander *Romanae conditor arcis* “the builder of the Roman citadel” (8.313), an appellation which, as Mack (1978) 51 observes, encompasses “past, present, and future.”

Rome of his day and the bucolic Rome of Evander. Where now stands the great metropolis of Rome, he insists, there were, before the advent of Aeneas, merely hills and grass (*collis et herba fuit*, 4.1.1-2); similarly, where the Palatine stands consecrated to Actian Apollo, there the cattle of Evander used to lie down (*Euandri profugae concubuerunt boues*, 4.1.3-4). Propertius' narrator simply draws our attention to the contrast. Hard as it is to believe, he suggests, the site of Rome was once a bucolic backwater.

Virgil differs from Propertius in introducing the imaginative effort on the part of his reader into his recreation of Rome's bucolic origins. By collapsing distinct temporal points of reference,³¹ Virgil brings to the fore the power of poetry to create new worlds out of the material reality of the reader.³² There is, in fact, a sleight of hand at play here. He doesn't say so overtly, but the poet implies that Evander's bucolic scene is what genuinely lies before the eyes of the protagonists while the landmarks of modern Rome have been artificially superimposed. The reality, of course, is just the opposite. The Roman Forum and the chic suburb of Carinae are genuine features of Augustan Rome, perfectly familiar to Virgil's readers; it is Evander's lowing cattle that owe their existence to a poet's fancy. The license to create visual phenomena is fundamental to the narrative poet's art; Virgil is unique in foregrounding the relationship between what exists in the phenomenological world and what a poet makes us see.

A slightly different effect is created by the anachronistic reference to Romulus' Asylum, which the poet insists is pointed out by Evander to Aeneas (*hinc lucum ingentem, quem Romulus acer asylum / rettulit, ... monstrat* "Next he points out the

³¹ As Mack (1978) 54 has it, "the experience of "time" has been incorporated into the landscape."

³² Cf. Mack (1978) 54: "Virgil has blended Evander's present and the Roman present to create a sense image which, by its very incongruity, encourages his audience to apprehend how the Roman past is contained in the Roman present and vice versa."

immense grove which harsh Romulus set aside³³ to be the Asylum,” 342-43). No doubt the *lucus ingens* which Evander shows Aeneas is a worthy tourist attraction in its own right, but Evander can have no idea of the resonance it would acquire for his Roman successors.³⁴ The implicit perspective is that of Virgil’s reader, for whom the grove is (always already, as it were) invested with meaning. As in the case of Evander’s mooing cattle, Virgil collapses two distinct levels of time and presents them superimposed to the reader.³⁵ Like Carinae, the Romulean Asylum appears *in propria persona* amid the pre-Roman city of Evander. Like Carinae too, the Asylum anchors Virgil’s landscape in the material reality of contemporary Rome while paradoxically appearing within the narrative as fanciful additions, made possible only by poetic license, to the “real” landscape of Pallanteum.

In the case of the Capitol, by contrast, Virgil makes explicit the gap between then and now:³⁶

hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit
aurea nunc, olim siluestribus horrida dumis.
(8.347-48)

From here he leads them to the seat of Tarpeia and the Capitol, golden now,
but in distant ages bristling with wild bushes.

³³ Fordyce (1977) *ad* 342f. usefully compares 5.596-98: *hunc morem cursus atque haec certamina primus / Ascanius, ... / rettulit* “Ascanius was the first to repeat the custom of this running and these contests.” See my discussion of the Trojan Ride in chapter three. On the meaning of *rettulit* at 343, cf. Eden *ad* 342f.: “*referre* often means ‘to repeat’ in some way or other, and Servius here ... paraphrases *rettulit* ‘created in imitation of the Athenian asylum’, and in view of the Greco-Roman syncretism of 343 f., there may be such an additional meaning here.”

³⁴ Cf. Novara (1986) 41.

³⁵ On the “palimpsestic” vision of Rome presented in Freud’s essay “Civilization and its Discontents,” see esp. Edwards (1996) 27-28. In formulating an analogy to the human mind, Freud imagines Rome in a “synchronous, permanent present” (Barkan (1991) 13), the buildings of its three thousand year history simultaneously present to the mind’s eye.

³⁶ On the comparatively conspicuous role of the narrator in *Aeneid* 8, see Novara (1986) 12-13.

Like Carinae and the Asylum, the names Virgil uses to designate the Capitoline hill (*Tarpeia sedes, Capitolia*) are known to the Roman reader but not to Evander.³⁷ In this instance, the anticipation of the future significance of the locale is dramaturgically justified, and rendered less arbitrary, by the timeless presence of Jupiter's *numen*,³⁸ which Evander insists is already held in awe by the locals³⁹ (*'hoc nemus, hunc' inquit 'frondoso uertice collem / (quis deus incertum est) habitat deus* "this grove," he says, 'and the leafy peak of this hill are inhabited by a god, though by which god is unclear,'" 349-54). The poet, however, explicitly situates the time of narration in the Augustan present: the Capitol is golden now (*nunc*), but in distant ages (*olim*) it bristles with brush and forest.⁴⁰ As Zetzel and others have noted, *olim* may refer to any point distant in time, whether past or future.⁴¹ The implied possibility that the Capitoline may revert to its primeval state *after* the Augustan age complicates the dialectic already established between the (Augustan) present and the past:⁴² Rome's future, Virgil suggests, will look a lot like its humble past.⁴³

The implied symmetry between the past and future of Rome becomes clearer still when Evander directs the attention of his guests to the remains of a past civilization:

³⁷ Cf. Edwards (1996) 31.

³⁸ Bleisch (2003) 96 notices the similarity to the description of the palace of Latinus (*Aen.* 7.170-93): "The dread and awe that Picus' *regia* inspires is very similar to Virgil's subsequent description of the Capitoline."

³⁹ With reference to the iteration of *iam tum* at 349-50 (*iam tum religio pauidos terrebat agrestis / dira loci, iam tum siluam saxumque tremebant* "even then did the dire awe terrify the timid farmers; even then did they tremble at the wood and the rock"), Fordyce (1977) *ad* 349f. observes that "even in these far-off times, before the building of the temples we know, this was a hallowed place." The Capitoline temples, that is to say, may be understood as ephemeral architectonic instantiations of a timeless presence: as in the case of Romulus' hut, material structures cede ontological priority to a preexisting ideal.

⁴⁰ We read in Pliny that the ceiling of the Capitoline temple of Jupiter was first gilded in 142BC; the roof was gilded after the fire of 83 BC. See also Eden (1975) *ad* 348.

⁴¹ Edwards (1996) 31 (n. 11) attributes James Zetzel's observation to the Jackson Knight memorial Lecture, delivered at the University of Exeter on May 6, 1993.

⁴² On Octavian's preoccupation with time and its manipulation, see Newlands (1995) 23-25.

⁴³ Cf. Zetzel (1997) 201: Virgil's is a relativist vision of history: the understanding of what has happened is conditioned by the present, whether of Evander, Virgil, or the reader."

haec duo praeterea disiectis oppida muris,
reliquias ueterumque uides monimenta uirorum.
hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem;
Janiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen.

(8.355-58)

Next, those two settlements there with collapsed walls: they are the remnants and the memorials of ancient men. Janus settled that citadel, Saturn the other. Janiculum had been the name of former, Saturnia the name of the latter.

The appearance of the ruins of the ancient cities of Janus and Saturn comes as a shock. Evander's city has hitherto been represented as a site pregnant with its future greatness, but one which is presently just emerging from a state of nature.⁴⁴ The monumental ruins of Saturnia and Janiculum, however, not only remind us that Evander's Arcadians are not first inhabitants of the area, but they also make it clear that it has already been home to advanced civilizations.⁴⁵ Moreover, the vocabulary used to describe them – they are walled *oppida*⁴⁶ whose remains are still imposing as they lie strewn about (355) – suggests that Saturnia and Janiculum have more in common with the mighty Rome of the future than with the rude settlement of Evander. Indeed, we noted above how the *olim* of line 348 (*olim siluestribus horrida dumis*) might just as well refer to a time in the distant *future* as to the distant past. In their prosperity and might, the walls of Saturn and Janus are the true forerunners of mighty buildings of Rome.

⁴⁴ On the association here of Saturn and Janus, see Deuling (1997) 276.

⁴⁵ Cf. Eden (1975) ad 358 on *fuerat*: “the pluperfect indicative ... is sometimes found in contexts where at first sight a perfect or imperfect might have been expected. The usage seems to originate in a vigorous idiom of ordinary speech to stress that a given action or state in the past *was* well and truly over and done with.” Evander emphasizes the time has already elapsed *before* the supposedly primeval beginnings of Pallanteum.

⁴⁶ Cf. the *oppida* of Italy in the *laudes Italiae* (*Georgics* 2.156, 176).

The ruins of Latium’s primeval cities, however, are both *reliquiae* and *monimenta*. They are, moreover, not simply “memorials” of the men who have long since died, but also “warnings” (*monimenta* < *moneo*) for posterity.⁴⁷ The *monimenta* of Saturnia and Janiculum were presumably built both as material manifestations of the temporal power of their inhabitants and as monuments that would outlast the men who built them. By Evander’s day, however, they have become more admonishments than anything else, reminders that temporal power and the structures it creates are both finite. The warning for Virgil’s Augustan audience is plain: the mighty *monimenta* of Rome too will one day lie in ruins.

Pharsalia 9.950-99

Virgil’s mediation on the ephemeral character of physical monuments – and the temporal regimes whose power and permanence they presume to embody – contributes to the long-standing Roman poetic discourse on the comparative durability of monuments and poetry. Ennius’ epitaph famously contained the boast that the poet’s fame would be preserved on the lips of men (*uolito uiuu’ per ora uirum* “I fly about, alive, on the lips of men,” fr. 18V). The context of Ennius’ verses, however, creates a paradox: his claim to immortality through oral repetition⁴⁸ (*per ora uirum*) is inscribed on a physical monument that, unlike the lines composed to be inscribed upon them, has perished.

⁴⁷ Cf. Eden (1975) *ad* 312: “with *monere* ‘to put someone in mind of something’ are cognate *monimentum* ‘reminder’ (hence ‘memorial’ of the dead, etc.) and *monstrum*, that which puts one in mind of the will of the gods;” Fordyce (1977) *ad* 312: “A *monimentum* is what ‘tells a story’ and reminds (*monet*) those who see it of its associations: so of tokens which carry personal associations, *Aen.* 3.486 (of Andromache’s handiwork) *manuum ... monimenta mearum*; 4.497-8 *abolere nefandi / cuncta uiri monimenta*; 12.945 *saeui monimenta doloris*.”

⁴⁸ Cf. the Greek phrase on which both lines are based: διὰ στόματος εἶναι (Thomas (1988) *ad* 3.9).

The epigraphic context of Ennius' boast in turn provides some insight into Virgil's adaptation of it in his own programmatic bid for immortality conferred by poetry: the proem to *Georgics* 3.⁴⁹ Having run through his list of the trite themes of Hellenistic poetry, Virgil asserts his need to attain poetic immortality by a new path:

temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim
tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora.

(*Georgics* 3.8-9)

I must attempt a road by which I too might be lifted from the earth and,
victorious, fly on the lips of men.

Whereas Ennius' claim to poetic immortality was inscribed *on* a physical monument, Virgil proceeds metaphorically to describe the poetic work that will ensure his immortality *as* a physical monument. As we have already noted, Virgil's proposed monument on the banks of the Mincius is closely associated, on several levels, with Octavian's temple of Palatine Apollo and the historical context within which it was erected. Dedicated in commemoration of Octavian's recent victory at the battle of Actium, the temple of Palatine Apollo stood as an architectonic manifestation of the political power that guaranteed its existence. In the *Georgics* 3 proem, Virgil styles himself as a poetic *uictor* (3.9, 17) who will celebrate his own triumph over the Greek east and build a marble temple modeled on Octavian's Palatine temple.

Virgil, however, is under no illusions about the extent to which his own status as *triumphator* and architect presupposes the political security furnished by the military endeavors of Octavian. The *sphragis* of the *Georgics* juxtaposes the martial

⁴⁹ Cf. Wigodsky (1972) 75: "The echo makes it clear that *victor* in *Georgics* 3.9 is a pun, suggesting a derivation from *vivere* (Ennius' *vivus*) as well as *vincere*."

activities of Caesar in the East (like Virgil in the proem to book 3, he is a *uictor* (6.561; cf. 3.9)) with the *ignobile otium* enjoyed by the poet himself in Naples:

Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello uictorque uolentis
per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.
illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

(4.560-66)

...while the great Caesar thunders war at the deep Eurphrates, gives laws in victory among welcoming peoples, and makes his road to Olympus. At the same time, lovely Parthenope was nursing me, Virgil, flourish with the pursuits of ignoble idleness; it was I that dabbled in the songs of shepherds and, presumptuous in my young, song of you Tityrus, beneath the protection of a wide-branching beech tree.

The fact that Virgil makes his poetic activities coincide in time with Octavian's thundering on the Euphrates (*illo Vergilium me tempore*, 563) strongly implies that the leisure the poet enjoys in Naples could not exist without the political security that Octavian's military activities provide.⁵⁰ The sense of security that Octavian provides the poet is reflected in the world of line 563, where *illo ... tempore* brackets the very emphatic words *Vergilium me* (the name *Vergilius*, too, appears nowhere else in the Virgilian corpus). The neat adaptation of the opening line of the *Eclogues* in the

⁵⁰ Cf. Wigodsky (1972) 75: "the parallel [*sc.* with *uictorque*, 3.9] at the end of the poem (4.561-2) ... may be meant to suggest that it is through Vergil's praise that Augustus will attain that immortality, and that the poet's *otium* is far from *ignobile*."

closing line of the *sphragis* of the *Georgics* reinforces this impression, for it aligns the Vergilius of the *Georgics* with the Tityrus of the *Eclogues*. Just as the patronage of Tityrus' godlike young man has allowed him sing to his heart's content under the protective shade of a beech tree, the martial heroics of "Caesar" have ensured that Virgil has been free playfully (*lusi* (4.565); cf. *ludere quae uellem calamo ... agresti* (*E.* 1.10)) to sing his song of shepherds and flocks.

The conclusion of the *Georgics* provides an important control for how we read the passage which opens the second half of the same poem. The secondary, imitative quality of temple Virgil will build on the Mincius is evident a) in the fact that its appearance is largely modeled on Octavian's Palatine temple; b) in the fact that the doors of the temple represent Octavian's military heroics. We have seen, however, how the proposed site of Virgil's temple calls into question the permanence of physical monuments and, by implication, the regimes for which they stand.⁵¹ The fact that the chances for survival of Virgil's temple on its proposed site on the routinely inundated banks of the Mincius would be marginal begs the question: precisely how long-lived can we expect its architectonic model – and the temporal power that made its erection possible – to be? If Virgil concedes that his poetic *monumentum* presupposes the worldly power embodied by Octavian, by choosing an architectural metaphor for that *monumentum* he also suggests that that power is finite.

Virgil's meditation on the relative longevity of political power and poetic monuments is sustained intermittently in the *Aeneid*. We have seen how the narrative of Aeneas' tour around Pallanteum juxtaposes anticipations of the Augustan *aurea aetas* with the already crumbling remains of Saturnia and Janiculum. In his famous apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus in book 9, however, Virgil sees power of his poetry

⁵¹ See chapter one, 8-21.

to immortalize its protagonists lasting as long as Aeneas' decedents occupy the *immobile saxum* of the Capitol.⁵²

fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
nulla dies umquam memori uos eximet aevo,
dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.

(9.446-49)

O how fortunate, the two of you. If my songs have any power, no day will ever come that will cut you off from mindful posterity, at least for as long as the house of Aeneas resides on the immovable rock of the Capitol and the Roman father will maintain his rule.

Fully one half of Virgil's apostrophe is dedicated to assigning temporal limitations on the extent of his fame. In the account of Aeneas' tour of Pallanteum – the only passage in the poem in which the Capitol itself appears – the site of Rome is characterized by the constant comings and goings of peoples and the rise and fall of successive political regimes.⁵³ Just as Romulus' city was preceded by *both* Evander's settlement and the still more ancient civilizations of Saturn and Janus, so too will Rome give way to later civilizations. There is, that is to say, nothing eternal about the tenancy of the *domus Aeneas* on the Capitol. As in the proem to *Georgics* 3, the longevity of poetic art is dependent upon a temporal power that, despite Jupiter's assurances to Venus in *Aeneid* 1 (278-79), is itself ephemeral.

⁵² Cf. Edwards (1996) 87-88.

⁵³ Which is to say, Evander's recitation of the various people that have settled Latium (8.313-36) is roughly complimented by the remains of the ancient cities of Janus and Saturn that appear to Evander and Aeneas during their tour of Pallanteum (8.355-58).

Later adaptations of the same conceit revolve around a similar interdependence between poetic immortality and the political longevity of the Roman state.⁵⁴ The most famous of all such claims to poetic immortality is the *sphragis* of the first edition of Horace's *Odes*:

Exegi monumentum aere perennius
regalique situ pyramidum altius,
quod non imber edax, non aquilo impotens
possit diruere aut innumerabilis
annorum series et fuga temporum.
non omnis moriar multaue pars mei
uitabit Libitanam: usque ego postera
crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita uirgine pontifex
(*Carmina* 3.30.1-9)

I have raised up a monument more lasting than bronze and taller than the regal structure of the pyramids, which neither corrosive rain nor the intemperate northerly wind, nor yet the innumerable succession of years nor the flight of the times, might succeed in destroying. I shall not wholly die, but a large part of me will elude Libitana: I shall grow ever onwards, always refreshed in the praise of posterity, so long as the *pontifex* climbs the Capitol with the silent maiden.

⁵⁴ Cf. also Propertius' attempt to *disponere uersu* "set up in verse" the walls of Rome in his fourth book of elegies (4.1.57), with similar formulations by Ovid in the *Fasti* (*hoc mihi surgat opus* "may this work of mine arise," 4.830; *ab Ioue surgat opus* "let this work arise from Jupiter," 5.111). See esp. Barchiesi (1994) 59.

After the proem to *Georgics* 3, Horace's ode contains the most sustained meditation on the relationship between poetical and architectonic *monumenta* in Roman poetry.⁵⁵ For Horace, his lyric *monumentum* is destined to outlast bronze, a material commonly used in plastic art.⁵⁶ Bronze was also commonly employed in the Augustan age for the many inscriptions attached to the city's new marble buildings.⁵⁷ Because they exist independently of the physical materials on which they are preserved, Horace's verses will be free from the deleterious effects of wind, rain, and the passing of time itself⁵⁸ (3-5). Precisely like Virgil in his apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus, however, Horace qualifies his boast by equating the temporal limits of his immortality with the longevity of Roman *imperium*.⁵⁹ Like Virgil, too, Horace uses the conjunction *dum* and adopts the Capitol as a symbol of Roman rule.

Ovid's reworking of Horace's poem at the close of the *Metamorphoses* (15.871-79) explores a similar paradox, but with a difference. Upon proclaiming the completion of his *opus* in Horatian fashion⁶⁰ (*iamque opus exegi, quod ...*, 871),

⁵⁵ As in the case of the *Georgics* 3 proem, the ultimate precedent for Horace's *monumentum* is Pindar, *Olympian* 6.1-4. Cf. Nisbet & Rudd (2004) *ad* 30.1-5: "Such imagery suited the Roman admiration for solidly constructed buildings and poems; thus at *georg.* 3.13ff. Virgil describes his future epic as a marble temple. But whereas Pindar had used his architectural image to glorify the *laudandus*, the Roman poets emphasize their own achievement."

⁵⁶ Cf. Prop. 3.2.19; Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.7-8.

⁵⁷ The pillars upon which the *Res gestae* were inscribed stood before the Mausoleum of Augustus. Cf. Nisbet & Rudd (2004) *ad* 30.1: "*monumentum* is commonly used of works of literature that preserve an author's memory ... Horace has given new life to the word by describing poetry as a sepulchral monument (as is shown by the comparison with the pyramids in v. 2 and the reference to death in v. 6)." Cf. also Galinsky (1996) 240: "His claim ... to have 'built a memorial more lasting through the years than bronze' ... can be usefully connected with the pervasive Augustan practice to affix monumental inscriptions, made of bronze letters that were gilded, to the multitude of new marble buildings especially in Rome ..."

⁵⁸ On the implicit rivalry between Horace and Augustus as the rebuilder of Rome, see Jaeger (1990); Galinsky (1996).

⁵⁹ Cf. Nisbet & Rudd (2004) *ad* 8-9: "just as 2.20 describes the extent in space of H's fame, so this poem describes the extent in time; and just as the pyramids are contrasted with H's work, so the Capitol is seen as a parallel to it."

⁶⁰ Cf. Lucan 2.678-79 (of Caesar's barrier in the harbor at Brundisium): *tunc aggere multo / surgit opus longaeque tremunt super aequora turres* "then the work rises up with a great barricade and the tall towers sway over the sea." Masters (1992) 33-34 makes the case that Caesar's structure stands as a poetic metaphor in much the same way as Virgil's temple in the *Georgics*.

Ovid's first concern is to proclaim its imperviousness to the "anger and lightning" of Jupiter (*quod nec Iouis ira nec ignes / ... poterit ... abolere*, 871-72). Given the programmatic association of Jupiter with Augustus in the *Tristia* and elsewhere, Ovid's boast amounts to a declaration of the *princeps*' inability to suppress his poetry. This stands in obvious contrast with the apparent dependence of Virgil's *opera* on the Augustan regime outlined in the *Georgics*. After proceeding to proclaim the immortality of his work and his name, however, Ovid, like Virgil and Horace before him, locates that deathlessness within the framework of Roman *imperium*:⁶¹ *quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris, / ore legar populi* "wherever Roman power extends among the conquered lands, I shall be on the lips of the *populus*," (877-78). Ovid thus appears to assign boundaries to the geographical extent of his renown without imposing limits on its extension in time (*perque omnia saecula fama / ... uiuam*, 878-79). Nonetheless, by confining the extent of his celebrity to the Roman empire, Ovid implies that it will not survive the eventual end of that empire.⁶² If his *opus* will escape *Iouis ira*, it cannot be read outside the spatial and temporal boundaries of the Roman *imperium*.

Like Virgil and Horace, Ovid characterizes his literary *opus* as a *monumentum* that, precisely because it does not require physical materials to be preserved, will be impervious to the effects of weather and time. At the same time that they declare the autonomy of their *opera*, however, all three poets indicate the ultimate dependence of literary art on political power. That political power, in *Aeneid* 8 and elsewhere, is symbolized by the physical *monumenta* built to advertise its authority and permanence. For these poets, the interdependence of political power and poetry remains.

⁶¹ Cf. a similar conceit at *Tristia* 3.7.47-52.

⁶² Cf. Edwards (1996) 88 n. 45.

In the *Pharsalia* of Lucan, the absence of descriptions of (intact) man-made structures is as striking as the absence of the gods.⁶³ The poem begins with a vision of the devastated towns of Italy, the very *oppida* celebrated in the *laudes Italiae* of *Georgics* 2:

at nunc semirutis pendent quod moenia tectis
urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris
saxa iacent nulloque domus custode tenentur
rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat,
horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos
Hesperia est desuntque manus poscentibus aruis,
non tu, Pyrrhe ferox, nec tantis cladibus auctor
Poenus erit: nulli penitus descendere ferro
contigit; alta sedent ciuilis uulnera dextrae.

(1.24-32)

But now, the fact that that the walls of the cities of Italy hang from collapsing roofs, that huge rocks lie among crumbling fortifications, that the homes have no occupants, that only the occasional resident wanders here and there in the ancient cities, that Hesperia is hoary with brambles and has lain unploughed for many years, that there are no hands to tend to the beckoning fields: neither you, violent Pyrrhus, nor the Phoenician will be responsible for such devastation. It will fall to no such person to sink in the sword to the hilt. The wounds of a kindred hand lie deep.

⁶³ I owe this observation to Frederick Ahl. Newlands (2002) 27, on Statius' *Thebaid*: "Whereas the *Thebaid* features ruined palaces and homes, the *Silvae* features magnificent villas and mansions and a prosperous city."

If the *Aeneid* is an epic about the foundation of a civic entity, the *Pharsalia* narrates its demolition.⁶⁴ It is of course no accident that the first masonry to be described in the Lucan's epic lies in ruins. Lucan will shortly, in his apostrophe to Nero (33-66), represent the civil wars as an unpleasant but necessary overture to the Neronian Golden Age.⁶⁵ His description of the state of the civic architecture of contemporary Italy tells rather a different story.

Since the power of a state is embodied by the munificence and grandeur of its civic and domestic buildings, Lucan makes it clear that Hesperia – like the cities named by Anchises in *Aeneid* 6 – is little more than a *nomen*. Like the Janiculum and Saturnia at Pallanteum, they have reverted to a state of nature.⁶⁶ The verbal parallels with *Aeneid* 8 are hard to miss.⁶⁷ Lines 24-26 recall Virgil's evocation of those ancient cities at *Aeneid* 8.355-56 (*haec duo praeterea disiectis oppida muris, / reliquias ueterumque uides monimenta uirorum*). Similarly, Lucan's *rarus habitator* (27) evokes the *rara domorum tecta* that dot the landscape around Pallanteum.⁶⁸ The first half of line 28 puts us in mind of Virgil's comparison of Evander's Capitol with that of his own day (*aurea nunc, olim siluestribus horrida dumis*, 348). At the inception of the *Pharsalia*, Lucan makes it clear that Rome and Italy have effectively returned to the primitive state of Evander's Pallanteum. But whereas Pallanteum, for all its rusticity, is a functioning civic entity, the *rarus habitator* of *Pharsalia* 1 wanders among ruins that, like the ancient cities of Janus and Saturn, are the remnants of an irrevocably lost civilization.

⁶⁴ On the *Pharsalia* as the anti-*Aeneid*, see esp. Fantham (1992) 7-11; Narducci (2002) 75-87.

⁶⁵ Cf. Ahl (1976).

⁶⁶ Cf. Thompson & Bruère (1968): "These years of self-destruction, however, not only prevented – *pace* Virgil – the realization of Jupiter's prophecy but reduced Italy itself to a condition recalling its primitive state at the time of Aeneas' arrival."

⁶⁷ For a discussion of Lucan's adaptation of the Pallanteum episode in *Aeneid* 8, see Thompson & Bruère (1968) 3; see also

⁶⁸ Note too that the next two verses (28-29) combine allusion to the description of the site of Rome in *Aeneid* 8 with a recollection of the poet's evocation of the horrors of civil war at the end of *Georgics* 1.

Lucan paints a very similar picture in the middle of his account of the battle of Pharsalia in book 7:

tunc omne Latium
fabula nomen erit; Gabios Veiosque Coramque
puluere uix tectae poterunt monstrare ruinae
Albanosque lares Laurentinosque penates,
rus uacuum, quod non habitet nisi nocte coacta
inuitus questusque Numam iussisse senator.
non aetas haec carpsit edax monimentaue rerum
putria destituit: crimen ciuile uidemus
tot uacuas urbes.

(7.391-99)

Then will the very name of Latium be but a myth; dust-covered ruins will scarcely be sufficient to identify Gabii, Veii, and Cora, the houses of Alba and the Laurentine dwellings; it will be mere empty countryside, which no one inhabits except the unwilling senator obliged against his will to pass the night there, bitter that Numa should have instituted the custom. It is not devouring time that has destroyed and consigned to decay these memorials of times past: it is the fault of internecine crime that we see so many cities abandoned.

The primary point of reference for Lucan's list of abandoned towns is Anchises' evocation of the future cities of Latium in *Aeneid* 6⁶⁹ (773-76). Upon reciting his list

⁶⁹ On Lucan's adaptation of the Virgilian model, see esp. Narducci (2002) 167-69. As Ahl (1976) 217 and Narducci observe, Lucan's insertion of Veii among the ruined Latin cities also recalls Propertius' lament for the destruction of that city (4.10.27-30): *hei Veii ueteres! et uos tum regna fuistis, / et uestro posita est aurea sella foro: / nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti / cantat, et in uestris ossibus arua metunt* "alas Veii of old, for you too once had an empire, and your golden chair of state once stood in your forum: now within your walls the horn of the sluggish shepherd sings, and they reap the fields among your bones."

of Latian cities (two of which turn up on Lucan's list of three cities), Anchises remarks that while these will indeed one day be their names, they are now but lands without names (*haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae*, 776). Anchises' words are ambiguous: he may simply be making the banal point that these will be the names of the future towns of Latium, or he may also be hinting that there will come a time when these towns will be mere names, and nothing more.⁷⁰ As so often in the *Pharsalia*, Lucan makes explicit what in the *Aeneid* are merely suggestions.⁷¹ As a direct result of the battle of Pharsalia, the ancient towns of Latium will scarcely be identifiable even by their archaeological remains (392-94). Even Latium and its people will pass into the realm of myth (391-92).⁷² As in the proem, here too Lucan makes explicit the latent sense, both in Anchises' speech in *Aeneid* 6 and in the description of Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8, that the site of Rome will once again resemble Evander's Pallanteum, a rustic outpost dotted here and there with the crumbled masonry of fallen civilizations.⁷³

When he ascribes the cause of the desolation to the ruinous effects of the civil wars, however, Lucan unexpectedly deploys the familiar language used by his Augustan predecessors to discuss *literary* monuments (7.397-99). Like the *monumenta* of Horace and Ovid, Lucan insists that the *monimenta rerum* of Latium have not been subject to the workings of *aetas edax* (cf. Horace's *imber edax*; *innumerabilis / series annorum et fuga temporum*, 3.30.3; 4-5); instead, their putrid

⁷⁰ Cf. Ahl (1976) 218: "It is hard to imagine that Vergil's contemporaries would not have found something ironical in Anchises' comment here, knowing as they did that the cities of Latium were dead in their own time."

⁷¹ Cf. Narducci (2002) 169: "come in molti altri casi, l'anti-Virgilio lavora sulle 'incrinature' ... presenti nel testo del suo modello."

⁷² Cf. Salemme (2000) 515-16.

⁷³ Cf. Narducci (2002) 169: "Perciò le parole di Anchise, mentre schiudono a Enea un'indubbia prospettiva di futura grandezza, mettono il lettore dell'età augustea anche di fronte alla vertigine dei cicli del destino: egli è portato a immaginarsi un'epoca remotissima in cui *ancora* non esistevano città che sapeva essere state prospere in un passato lontano, ma che ai suoi tempi di quell'antica gloria conservavano solo il nome. Ancora una volta, la fiducia nell'immortalità degli imperi si intreccia inestricabilmente con l'ansietà per la loro decadenza."

state is due purely to the civil war (*crimen ciuile*, 7.398). In discussing the architectonic remains of Latium, then, Lucan differs from his predecessors' treatment of physical *monumenta* by insisting that they haven't suffered from the ravages of time. In this respect, of course, they resemble the *literary* monuments of his fellow poets.

Lucan's transition to the language of literary metaphor is suggestive on several levels. Rather than talk of a literary *opus* metaphorically in architectonic terms (like Virgil, Horace, and Ovid), Lucan exploits the language of that tradition to describe physical *monumenta*. As in the proem to book 1, the ruined buildings of Latium stand for the ruined temporal power of the Roman state; here in book 7, however, Lucan introduces the language appropriate for thinking about literary *opera* and their longevity. In so doing, he reasserts an equivalence between the durability of literary and architectonic structures that his predecessors had been at pains to undermine. Literary works and buildings are, Lucan implies, equally free from the ravages of *aetas edax*. What has ruined the buildings of Latium, however, is the *crimen ciuile* that his the subject of his poem. In a poem in which all physical monuments are destined for destruction, we can expect poetry to present itself as the principal custodian of memory.⁷⁴

Describing Caesar's itinerary from Pharsalus to Alexandria, Lucan remarks that his protagonist is led on his way by Fama (*fama duce*, 9.953). In the first instance, the phrase refers to intelligence concerning the movements of Pompey towards Egypt. It soon becomes clear, however, that the stopover at Troy, on which the poet

⁷⁴ Later in the same book, Lucan regrets his own capacity as a *uates* to transmit to a future *aetas* the horrors of the what took place at Pharsalus (*hanc fuge, mens, partem belli...*, 7.553-56). Cf. Narducci (2002) 171: "In un mondo dove ogni testimonianza materiale del passato è destinata alla cancellazione, la voce del poeta si pone come importante salvaguardia della memoria."

concentrates at the expense of the journey itself, is motivated by another kind of *fama*: the poetic fame of Troy.⁷⁵ The word is also striking on another level, for Lucan appears to have no authority for bringing his protagonist to the site of Troy after the battle of Pharsalia.⁷⁶ While Caesar is led to the desolate site of Troy by the unquestioned authority of the poets (*fama duce*), Lucan himself is without the slightest authority to lead him there in his own poetic narrative.

Instead, the historical precedent for Caesar's detour is the celebrated visit of Alexander to the tomb of Achilles.⁷⁷ According to an anecdote reported by Cicero in the *Pro Archia*, Alexander paused to lament the fact that unlike him, Achilles had found in Homer a worthy recorder of his deeds:

quam multos scriptores rerum suarum magnus ille Alexander secum
habuisse dicitur! atque is tamen, cum in Sigeo ad Achillis tumulum
astitisset, "o fortunate," inquit, "adulescens, qui tuae uirtutis Homerum
praeconem inueneris." et uere. nam nisi Ilias illa exstitisset, idem
tumulus, qui corpus eius contexerat, nomen etiam obruisset.

(*Pro Archia* 24)

How many recorders of his deeds is Alexander the Great said to have taken along with him! And he, moreover, when he stood at Achilles' tomb in Sigeum, said: "O lucky young man, you who found in Homer a herald for your prowess." And he spoke the truth, for unless the *Iliad* were still extant, the same tomb that had covered his body would have buried his name as well.

⁷⁵ Cf. de Nadai (2000) 323.

⁷⁶ Cf. Zweierlein (1986) 465.

⁷⁷ Caesar's systematic self-identification with Alexander continues at the beginning of *Pharsalia* 10, where Caesar pays a visit to Alexander's tomb at Alexandria (20-52). Cf. Narducci (2002) 177-78. On the parallelism between Caesar and Alexander, see esp. Canfora (1999) 19-25.

In reporting the words of Alexander, Cicero makes a very specific claim about the relative memorializing power of physical monuments and of poetry: were it not for the *Iliad*, he maintains, the monument that covers Achilles' body would also bury his name. Far from preserving the memory of that name, the *tumulus* of Achilles would have concealed it (*nomen etiam obruisset*). This is going rather further than simply asserting the relative durability of poetic *monumenta*. According to Cicero, the physical monument that is supposed to preserve the memory of Achilles itself requires the immortalizing power of the poet in order to perform its function as a preserver of memory. Without poetry to invest it with the significance it enjoys, Achilles' *tumulus*, far from preserving the name of its occupant, would bury it in oblivion.

The phrase *fama duce* is broadly analogous to Virgil's unlikely claim to be following precedent when he locates Daedalus (not to mention Aeneas himself) in Cumae (*ut fama est, Aeneid* 6.14).⁷⁸ As we have seen, Virgil's appeal to the authority of the mythographic tradition has the paradoxical effect of drawing attention to his cavalier treatment of that tradition.⁷⁹ Lucan's self-referential hint that he is taking liberties with tradition is less obvious than that of Virgil, but the effect is similar. Like Virgil in the beginning of *Aeneid* 6, Lucan here creates a poetic space that belongs fully to the world of his poetry. Like Virgil, too, Lucan will use that space to pause to reflect on the nature of poetic art.⁸⁰

Lucan spends fully seven lines in describing the Hellespont (954-60). Two and a half lines are devoted to its association with Hero and Leander and with Helle, four to a geographical excursus (mistakenly) identifying it as the narrowest division between Europe and Asia. The description of its mythic associations is particularly suggestive:

⁷⁸ On the phrase *ut fama est*, see esp. Norden (1916) *ad* 14.

⁷⁹ See chapter three.

⁸⁰ Cf. de Nadai (2000) 315.

Threiciasque legit fauces et amore notatum
aequor et Heroas lacrimoso litore turre,
qua pelago nomen Nepheleias abstulit Helle.

(9.954-56)

He sails along the Thracian strait and the sea noteworthy for its story of love and the tower of Hero standing on the teary shore, where Helle, the daughter of Nephele, deprived the sea of its name.

The strait owes its renown to the myth of Hero and Leander, for its channel is *amore notatum* (954-55). Lucan suggests that even though it is unique in being the narrowest body of water dividing two of the world's continents, it owes its notoriety to its association with myth and poetry.⁸¹ Indeed, Lucan's words suggest that the locale exemplifies the very essence of *amor*, an exemplarity whose transmission is the office of poets.⁸² There is, moreover, nothing descriptive about the epithets *Heroas* and *lacrimoso*. On the contrary, Lucan implies that these are places that hold no interest other than their being the setting for the fables of poets.⁸³ Helle, another figure from the world of myth, succeeded in imposing her name on a body of water that had once gone by a different name (*qua pelago nomen Nepheleias abstulit Helle*, 956). Before Caesar has reached Troy, Lucan already highlights the power of myth and poetry to add resonance to physical topography.

As Caesar approaches Troy, Lucan makes explicit the debt that places and monuments have for their renown to poetry:

Sigeasque petit famae mirator harenas
et Simoentis aquas et Graio nobile busto

⁸¹ Cf. Gagliardi (1997-98) 93.

⁸² Cf. de Nadai (2000) 319.

⁸³ Cf. Palinurus, who has a promontory named after him in *Aeneid* 6 (381-83).

Rhoetion et multum debentes uatibus umbras.

(961-63)

He, an admirer of Fama, heads for the sands of Sigeum and the waters of the Simois and the Rhoetium, ennobled by a Greek tomb, and the shades owing much the poets.

We presume that Caesar heads for Sigeum because it was the site of the Achilles' burial. Similarly, Rhoetium is *nobile* precisely because it is the site of Ajax's tomb. And Ajax's shade, in turn, is noteworthy because, as the poet states explicitly, its occupant was celebrated by *uates*. Achilles' tomb seems to have merged with the sands of Sigeum (*Sigeas harenas*); his life itself appears to have been of too small account to warrant the maintenance of a sepulcher.⁸⁴ Similarly, although Caesar passes by the site of Ajax's tomb, of the monument itself there is no mention. The tomb on account of which Rhoetion is *nobile* is not a physical monument, but a poetic monument imposed on the physical landscape by literary artists.

These introductory lines (961-63) also help to establish two passages from the *Aeneid* as privileged points of reference for the scene as a whole. As an admirer of Fama (*famae mirator*, 961), Lucan's Caesar strongly recalls Aeneas, who "marvels" as he tours the site of Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8 (*miratur facilisque oculos fert omnia circum* "he marvels and casts his willing eyes over the whole scene," 310). The mention of (what's left of) the Simois is also suggestive of Aeneas' visit to another non-Troy: Buthrotum (*falsi Simoentis ad undam* "at the waters of a fake Simois," 3.302). As we shall see presently, both the model-town of Buthrotum and the primitive yet potential-filled site of Pallanteum are the dominant allusive points of reference for Lucan's description of Troy.

⁸⁴ On the relationship of Lucan's Caesar to Achilles, see Gagliardi (1997-98) 91.

Upon arriving at what is left of Troy, Caesar proceeds to tour its archaeological remains:

circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae
magnaque Phoebus quaerit uestigia muri.
iam silvae steriles et putres robore trunci
Assaraci pressere domos et templa deorum
iam lassa radice tenent, ac tota teguntur
Pergama dumetis: etiam periire ruinae.

(9.964-69)

He tours the renowned name of burnt-out Troy and seeks the vestiges of Phoebus' wall. And now sterile woods and trees with rotting trunks have taken over the houses of Assarcus and now they hang on to the temples of the gods with stiff roots, and all Pergamum is covered by brambles: even the ruins have perished.

As in the case of Achilles' tomb, the ruins of Troy owe their notoriety to their literary renown.⁸⁵ Caesar is said to walk around the mere name of a burnt-out city (*circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae*, 964), a hugely evocative phrase that both recalls the pathetic *nomina* of Latium cited by Anchises in *Aeneid* 6 and by Lucan himself in *Pharsalia* 7.⁸⁶ Far from walking around a physical city in a state of decay, Lucan suggests, Caesar is walking around a poetic space that is merely evocative of its physical correspondent. Similarly, Lucan intimates that the vestiges (*uestigia*) of Phoebus' wall are not noteworthy in their own right: Caesar seeks them out (*quaerit*) not because they are intrinsically interesting, but purely because of the literary fame of

⁸⁵ Cf. Ahl (1976) 215: "The picture is brilliantly surrealistic. Troy is an archaeological site, nothing more, as is Scipio's camp in 4."

⁸⁶ As Ahl (1976) notes, it also recalls the rendering of Pompey as *Magni nominis umbra* (215).

the structure of which they were part. The ruins of Troy, however, turn out to be somewhat of a different order from the archaeological remains that exist at, say, Pallanteum. Whereas the common run of ancient ruins consists of once intact buildings in a state of dilapidation, at Lucan's Troy even the ruins themselves have perished (*etiam periire ruinae*, 969). Precisely because archaeological indices are no longer adequate, Troy owes its notoriety purely to the *uates* who have celebrated it.

In these lines too Lucan's engagement with the *Aeneid* remains primary. Caesar's circumambulatory tour of Troy (*circumit*, 964) is reminiscent of Aeneas casting his gaze "around" Pallanteum (*facilisque oculos fert omnia circum*, 8.310). The remains of Phoebus' wall, as well as the *discussa saxa* that will appear in 978-79, recall again the crumbling remains of Janiculum and Saturnia (*dissiectis oppida muris*, 8.355-58). Similarly, the brambles which obscure what's left of the city bring to mind those that are found on the Capitol in the time of Evander (*olim siluestribus horrida dumis*, 8.348).

The mention of the "house of Assarcus" (*Assaraci ... domos*, 976) cannot help but recall the prophecy of Jupiter in *Aeneid* 1, which proclaimed the eventual the rule of the *domus Assaraci* over the cities of Greece (*ueniet ... aetas / cum domus Assaraci Pthiam clarasque Mycenae / seruitio premet ac uictis dominabitur Argis* "there shall come an age when the house of Assaracus will subject Phthia and Mycenae to servitude and rule over conquered Argos," 283-85). Jupiter, of course, uses the word for "domestic structure," *domus*, metaphorically to refer to the descendants of Assaracus and Dardanus: the Julian clan and/or the Roman people as a whole.⁸⁷ Lucan's allusion to Jupiter's speech rather neatly allows him to employ *domus* in its concrete sense and, at the same time, to retain its metaphorical potential. So even if the Julian clan has triumphed at Pharsalus, the wretched condition of the physical

⁸⁷ For some observations on the implications for Rome of Lucan's tour of Troy, see Hardie (1992).

dwellings of Assarcus' progeny at Troy signifies the true state of the Dardan race.⁸⁸

Successful though Caesar has been in the Rome's civil wars, the *domus* of Assaracus has long been in a state of spiritual and moral ruin.⁸⁹

Aside from the domestic dwellings of Troy's long dead citizens, the other set of man-made structures said to have been taken over by barren, rotting woods are the *templa deorum* "temples of the gods" (967). If the ruin of the physical *domus Assaraci* stands for the ruin of the family that once occupied it, the ruin of the temples of Troy implies the twilight of the deities who lived in them. While the collapsed state of the city's civic buildings represents the destruction of the Roman state enacted at Pharsalia, the decay of its *templa deorum* marks the absence of tutelary state deities. The overgrown and ruined temples that the poet describes at Troy may thus be understood as encapsulating Lucan's reaction to the many descriptions of *templa* in the *Aeneid*. As we may gather from Varro and others, a *templum* is strictly speaking not an *aedes* for a deity, but rather a terrestrial copy of heavenly space.⁹⁰ In the *Aeneid*, the comparative ubiquity of *templa* may be loosely understood as an architectonic manifestation of the decisive role that the numinous plays in the affairs of mortals; the conspicuous absence of *templa* in the *Pharsalia* parallels the absence of gods fit to inhabit them. In this respect, too, Lucan's Troy may be seen as an architectonic manifestation of the world of the *Pharsalia*, a manifestation that turns out to be generated by the *nomina* preserved by Lucan and his fellow poets.

As he continues his tour, Caesar now notices topographical features associated with specific Trojan myths:

⁸⁸ Ahl compares the ruined state of Troy to the description of Italy described in the aftermath of Pharsalia described above (7.391-408): "The resemblance between the descriptions of Italy and Troy is too close to be accidental. Lucan is saying that the civil war and, in particular, the battle of Pharsalia, has utterly ruined Italy. It would be truer to say that the civil war had completed the process of destruction already begun" (Ahl (1976) 216).

⁸⁹ Cf. Gagliardi (1997) 91-98.

⁹⁰ On the word *templum*, its meaning, and its application, see the exhaustive study of Cipriano (1983).

aspicit Hesiones scopulos siluaque latentis
Anchisae thalamos; quo iudex sederit antro,
unde puer raptus caelo, quo uertice Nais
luxerit Oenone: nullum est sine nomine saxum.

(9.970-73)

He looks upon the rock of Hesione and the wedding chamber of Anchises,
hidden in the woods; the cave in which the judge sat, the place from which the
boy was taken up to the sky, the speak whence the Naiad Oenone lamented:
no stone is without a name.

The rock to which Hesione was tied, the sylvan site of Anchises' union with Venus,
the cave in which Paris passed his judgment, the place from which Ganymede was
abducted by Jupiter, the peak from which Oenone lamented: Lucan states explicitly
that these objects and places are not of interest in their own right, but because they are
evocative the world of Trojan myth. "No stone is without a name," but it is the name
that renders the object significant and not vice versa. And as Lucan will presently
make clear, the *saxa* of Troy are not sufficient even to evoke the monuments of which
they were part. They are reliant not only upon the poets to keep alive their *nomina*,
but also upon an interpretative community capable of matching the monuments and
landmarks of literature with their putative physical remains.

Lucan illustrates his point with Caesar's unwitting interference with the
Xanthus and the tomb of Hector:

inscius in sicco serpentem puluere riuum
transierat, qui Xanthus erat. securus in alto
gramine ponebat gressus: Phryx incola manes
Hectoreos calcare uetat. discussa iacebant

saxa nec ullius faciem seruantia sacri:

‘Herceas’ monstrator ait ‘non respicis aras?’

(9.974-79)

Unwittingly he had already traversed the stream, which was winding its way in the arid dust that once had been the Xanthus. He was stepping his way carelessly through the deep grass, when a Phrygian local forbade him to trample underfoot the tomb of Hector. Stones, preserving no aura of sanctity, were lying about here and there: “Will you pay no heed,” the tour guide said, “to the altar of Zeus Herceios?”

Whereas Aeneas at Buthrotum recognizes (*agnosco*, 351) a tiny stream going by the name Xanthus (*arentem Xanthi cognomine riuum*, 350), Caesar signally fails to recognize (*inscius ... transierat*, 974-75) a creek winding in the dust that, Lucan assures us, had once been the Xanthus (*qui Xanthus erat*, 975).

In *Aeneid* 3, Aeneas emphasizes the enormous difference between the pathetic rivulet that he sees at Buthrotum and the mighty river of the Troad; it is a Xanthus merely in name (*cognomine*), an *effigies* merely standing in for the real thing.⁹¹ Caesar, by contrast, does indeed see the real thing at the very site of Troy, but Lucan implies that it no longer merits the name of Xanthus (*qui Xanthus erat*). The reality of the Xanthus no more consists in the tiny creek bed Caesar sees at the site of Troy than in its imitation at Buthrotum. In Lucan’s view, the quality of being Homer’s Xanthus has deserted the little stream that, presumably, is its legitimate descendant. A similar observation may be made of Troy as a whole: the “Troyness” of Troy has long since departed. Left to their own devices, the mere physical remnants of the Troy are meaningless rubble, wholly incapable of evoking the Homeric city. It requires the

⁹¹ See chapter four, 130-42.

magic of a *uates* to create a poetic space, to erect the epic Troy upon otherwise meaningless physical space in northwest Anatolia.

There is an important sense in which Lucan's Troy is even less successfully representative of the Troy of the heroic age than Virgil's Buthrotum. However counterfeit that city may be, Aeneas successfully recognizes (*agnoscit*) genuine Trojan landmarks in Helenus' pathetic bits of monumental Lego. As an artistic reproduction of its referent, Buthrotum succeeds admirably. Caesar, by contrast, is unable, for all his genuine interest in Troy and its legends, to identify the famous landmarks of Troy without the help of professional tour guide. Indeed, on his own Caesar is *inscius*, scarcely more competent an interpreter of what he sees than Aeneas before his shield (*rerum ... ignarus imagine gaudet, Aeneid* "he delights in the image, ignorant of the events portrayed," 8.730). Since the ruins themselves have already perished (969), the site of Troy fails even as a representative work of art: even as a set of signifiers, it has no intrinsic value.

The remains of the tomb of Hector (which Virgil's Aeneas claims was successfully duplicated by Andromache at Buthrotum) lie hidden in the overgrown grass: were it not for his Phrygian tour guide, Caesar would be quite unaware that he is desecrating the tomb of Troy's greatest hero. Similarly, the *discussa saxa* that allegedly used to compose the altar of Zeus Herceios preserve, Lucan insists, no sense whatsoever of their sacral character (*nec ullius faciem seruantia sacri*, 978). In this case, too, there is nothing about the object itself that would induce a viewer to attribute to it any further significance. Indeed, even Caesar, the beneficiary of a first-rate literary education, is unable to make the necessary connection between the perished ruins he sees before him and the Ilium of the poets. In so wretched a condition is the site of Troy that not even Homer himself is sufficient to preserve the reverence due to its important landmarks. In order for the site of Troy to resonate fully with even the

most learned of its visitors, there must be present a supplementary interpreter who is familiar with the site itself.⁹²

Before the introduction of the *Phryx incola*, it had appeared as though a thorough grounding in Homer was all that is required to make sense of rubble into which Troy has crumbled. With the appearance of Caesar's tour guide, it becomes clear that an expert in the material culture of the area is required to make the necessary connections between the pathetic ruins of Troy and the august city of Homer. In other words, so profound is Troy's material collapse that a professional interpretative community is now required to attribute *nomina*, and thereby significance, to its *disiecta saxa*. It is hard to imagine a more telling statement of the insignificance to which physical monuments might descend with the passing of time.

It is at precisely this point that Lucan delivers his famous encomium to his protagonists and to the power of poetry to preserve his memory:

o sacer et magnus uatum labor! omnia fato
eripis et populis donas mortalibus aeuum.
inuidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere fama;
nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis,
quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt uatis honores,
uenturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
uiuēt, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo.
(9.980-86)

How holy, how great is the work of the poets! You exempt all things from death and make a gift of eternity to mortal men. Caesar, do not be touched by

⁹² Cf. Ahl (1976) 215: "Though each stone has its tale to tell, one needs the services of a guide to find the stone and tell the tale."

envy for the holy renown of others; for, if it is right for the Muses of Latium to promise anything, posterity will read me and you for as long endures the renown of the singer of Smyrna. Our *Pharsalia* shall live on, and by no age will it be condemned to the shade.

In his little hymn to the power of poetry, Lucan turns from a world of shades to those that have the power to evade them: the *uates*. If Aeneas' journey from the Underworld to the world of the living is conceived by Virgil's Sibyl as a *labor*, so too is the capacity of the *uates* to exempt everything from death (*omnia fato / eripis*). At the opposite pole from the world of shades through which Caesar has just passed stands the *labor* of the *uates*, capable of conferring immortality upon its subjects.

Caesar, Lucan insists, need not echo Alexander's famous lament (at the same site) that Achilles was uniquely blessed in having a Homer to preserve his deeds for posterity.⁹³ Just as Achilles found his Homer, so will Caesar's immortality be ensured through poetic art of Lucan.⁹⁴ The *Pharsalia*, together with its main protagonist, will be read as far into the future as the *Iliad* itself. The *Pharsalia*, as one would expect from a poet dedicated to the composition of *Romana carmina* (1.66), is destined to be the Latin counterpart of the immortal *Iliad*. Unlike Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, however, Lucan does not peg his longevity to the endurance of Rome and its physical monuments, for the *Pharsalia* is precisely the story of her destruction.

There is an important irony in the fact that Lucan's proclamation of a purely Roman epic draws upon a Virgilian verse that celebrates the *oppida* of Italy.⁹⁵ Whereas Virgil boasts in the second book of the *Georgics* of singing an Ascræan song through the "Roman towns" (*Ascræumque cano Romana per oppida carmen*,

⁹³ Cicero, *Pro Archia* 24; see above, 170.

⁹⁴ Cf. Ahl (1976) 219.

⁹⁵ Cf. Gagliardi (1968) 79.

Georgics 2.176), Lucan in his proem renounces Greek inspiration for his Roman poem in favor of (his) Caesar: *tu satis ad uires Romana in carmina dandas* “you provide sufficient inspiration for Roman poems” (*Pharsalia* 1.66). Whereas Roman *oppida* provide the setting for Virgil’s Greek *carmen*, the subject of Lucan’s Roman song will be the destruction of those *oppida*.⁹⁶ Indeed, those *oppida* appear at the very beginning of Roman epic in a state akin to the collapsed cities of Janiculum and Saturnia described in *Aeneid* 8 (*disiectis oppida muris*, *Aeneid* 8.355). Thanks to the events narrated in the *Pharsalia*, there are no Roman *oppida* through which to sing his Roman *carmina*. Like the *Iliad*, Lucan’s *Pharsalia* will survive the collapse of civilizations and its buildings.

The descriptions of Aeneas’ visit to Buthrotum (*Aeneid* 3), his tour of Pallanteum (*Aeneid* 8), and Caesar’s tour of Troy (*Pharsalia* 9) are alike in their use of architectonic space to provide a commentary on the nature of poetic art and its relationship to its subject matter. Aeneas’ account of Buthrotum is unparalleled in ancient literature: it is an account of a civic space that has all the physical manifestations of a human settlement, but whose pretence to legitimacy turns out to be empty. The quality of being a city, we might infer, does not consist in being composed of civic buildings. Buthrotum is, rather, a purely referential space, an elaborate three-dimensional work of art that evokes, but does not constitute, a civic space.

Aeneas’ tour of Pallanteum explores a different set of paradoxes. Rather than simply call our attention to the contrast between the golden Rome of Augustus and bucolic Ur-Rome, Virgil keeps the topography of both times before the eye of the

⁹⁶ Gagliardi, by contrast, notes the contrast between the purely Roman inspiration for the *Pharsalia* and the professedly Greek inspiration for the *Georgics* (*Ascraeum carmen*) (Gagliardi (1968) 79).

reader. Over the primeval rusticity of Evander's kingdom is superimposed the golden splendor of Augustan Rome; or rather, to put it more accurately, a bucolic world born from the poet's imagination is superimposed over the reality of contemporary Rome. Virgil's account of Aeneas' tour of Pallanteum is unique in making explicit the process by which the reader of epic envisions an imaginary topography out of the phenomenological world. As well as providing a visual realization of Virgil's particular concept of time, it highlights the power of the poet to make several planes of reality simultaneously present. This implicit vindication of the potentialities of poetic art contrasts with the comparatively ephemeral character of physical monuments as exemplified by the remains of the once august cities of Saturn and Janus.

These passages explore different facets of the relationship between physical and poetic space, between the phenomenological world and the physical world created by poets. In *Pharsalia* 9, Lucan uses the site of Homer's Troy as a pretext for a sustained meditation on the nature of poetic art. The *Aeneid* is the privileged point of reference throughout. Like Aeneas in *Aeneid* 3, Caesar is conducted around a site that purports to be representative of the site of Troy, but in which the reality of Troy no longer subsists. Lucan's Troy also resembles the future site of Rome, with an important difference: while Evander's city contains both ruins of past civilization *and* the intimations of a great civilization to come, Lucan's Troy is utterly finished: even the ruins, Lucan insists, have perished.

If Buthrotum fails as a civic entity, it is an accomplished work of referential art. However pitiful they are, the buildings and landmarks of Buthortum successfully evoke their models in the Troad. The ruins of Troy described by Lucan, however, fail in and of themselves to evoke the Homeric city. On the contrary, the stones of Troy owe their evocative names to the poetic tradition. The Homeric city of Troy can indeed be conjured out of the city's first century ruins, but only with the aid of Homer.

Given a sufficient state of ruin, physical monuments are not only divested of their power to symbolize temporal power, but even to evoke that power. It even turns out that knowledge of the poets' Troy is insufficient to envisage the ancient city upon its ruins: Caesar requires the aid of an interpreter, a *Phryx incola*, to identify the *dissecta saxa* with the famous monuments of the city of Homer.

Lucan's affirmation of the power of poetry in his apostrophe to Caesar follows naturally from his description of the dying ruins of Troy, the remnants of a once great city now wholly incapable of evoking its great past. While the *Aeneid* narrates the foundation of a civic entity, the *Pharsalia* narrates its utter destruction. If the *Aeneid* lends itself to being viewed as a poetic counterpart to the great architectonic monuments of the Augustan age, the *Pharsalia* is a poem of ruins.

Conclusions

For the poets of the early empire, architecture and architectural imagery was an important medium through which to explore the relationship between political power and poetic art. Virgil and Horace, and their contemporaries and successors, erected literary monuments to stand beside the physical monuments of their patrons. No less than the palaces and temples of the emperors, these literary monuments participated in the formulation and evolution of imperial ideology. Within those poetic monuments, the description of architecture afforded a space in which to explore the relationship between poetry, monumental and pictorial art, and political power. This study has been an attempt to elucidate how Virgil and his successors explore the dynamics of this relationship.

Virgil's unambiguous identification of poetic art with monumental art at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 makes specific demands of readers of Latin epic. First, it asks us to take Virgil's metaphor at face value and to understand poetic art in architectonic terms. I have shown that the first book of the *Aeneid* can be read as a meditation upon the nature of poetry, narrative, and drama conducted primarily through the use of architectonic imagery. Because civic building, together with the political ideologies that building represents, lies at the heart of the thematic economy of the poem, questions of narrative become inextricably bound up with questions of politics and political ideology. The question of who gets to build the city destined to rule the world is thus another facet of the question of whose narrative of world history will prevail. In contrast to Dido's Carthage, the city of Helenus, far from representing a new civic endeavor, succeeds only in creating a three-dimensional representative

work of art. Unlike that of Dido, Helenus' architectonic "narrative" fails to break out of the world of art, and of the past, and into the political realm.

If the *Aeneid* is the narrative of how the world-city came to be built, the *Pharsalia* of Lucan narrates its ruin, which is articulated in architectonic terms by the visit of Caesar to the ruins of Troy. For Lucan, the crumbling remains of Troy represent the collapse not only of Rome, but also of the narrative that justified it. Lucan's disintegrating Troy purports to resolve for all time the question of the relative longevity of physical monuments (and the political forces and ideologies they stand for) and poetic art. The pathetic remains of Troy not only fail to evoke the grandeur of Homer's city, but they are wholly reliant on the power of poetic art to embody any significance whatsoever. Just as Troy owes its longevity to Homer, so too will Caesar be sung together with the undying verses of the *Pharsalia*.

A second important lesson to be drawn from Virgil's description of his imaginary temple at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 has to do with the non-existent nature of the thing described. Virgil's temple is unique in being an artifact that, even according to the fiction of the text itself, exists solely in the mind of the narrator. Whereas it is widely acknowledged that descriptions of artifacts in hexameter poetry are almost exclusively products of the poet's imagination – in the terminology of Laird and others, they are "notional" artifacts – the authorial voice of the *Georgics* explicitly asks us to imagine a building that has yet to be constructed, located in a part of Italy that few of us have visited. The building that he asks us to envisage, however, bears a close resemblance to a structure that will have been familiar the poet's contemporaries, notably the temple of Palatine Apollo, dedicated around the time that the *Georgics* was published. Virgil's vision is therefore fantastical, but it is one whose "building blocks" may be found in the world of the reader. It falls to the careful reader of epic poetry explore what Virgil and his successors have to tell us about the

manner in which literary artists generate the world of poetry out of the world of the poet and his readers.

In his note on Virgil's description of the harbor at Carthage (*Aen.* 1.159-69), Servius claims that the poet, lest he stray too far from reality, has described the modern harbor of New Carthage in Spain, a move implicitly justified by the common name. Whatever we might think about the plausibility of the proposed model for Virgil's epic harbor, Servius' observation reveals a good deal about the manner in which the Latin poets, and Virgil in particular, (re)creates the world of epic. This study has explored a number of passages which explore in some detail the relationship between the fantastical world of poetry and the phenomenological world of the poet.

Unlike the building envisaged by Virgil in the *Georgics*, Daedalus' temple of Apollo at Cumae might reasonably have been thought by Virgil's contemporaries to be still standing. The basis for Virgil's description is therefore a temple that, at least putatively, remains extant. But because the doors of Daedalus were nowhere to be found in the modern Rome, the poet effectively superimposes a fanciful decorative scheme upon a building whose structure was familiar to himself and his contemporaries. In his description of that scheme, moreover, Virgil confuses the thing described and the medium in which it is described to such a degree that the two become indistinguishable. In this respect, too, the description of Daedalus' temple is an important meditation on the nature of poetic art.

In his description of Pallanteum in *Aeneid* 8, Virgil makes most explicit his preoccupation with the manner in which poetic worlds are created. As Evander leads Aeneas through the future site of Rome, Virgil projects the topography and monuments of Augustan Rome superimposed over the humble dwellings of Pallanteum. Yet the Augustan reader, who is made to see cows lowing in the Forum Romanum, effectively sees the rustic city of Evander superimposed upon the

contemporary city with which he is familiar. Not only does the passage draw our attention to the power of poetry to generate images arbitrarily within the fictional world, but, by presenting the contemporary Augustan Rome superimposed upon the Rome of the poet's imagination, it also demands that we consider closely the relationship between the world of the poem and the world of the poet.

Two passages from the later imperial poets provide radical re-readings of those passages in Virgil which test the conventions of fictional narrative and description. At the end of *Punica* 6, Silius Italicus presents an elaborate description of a building that exists within the text juxtaposed with an architectural artistic scheme that exists only in the mind of one of his protagonists. Whereas Virgil does not emphasize the counterfactual quality of his imaginary temple, Silius dramatizes – through the conceit of allowing his protagonist to articulate an artistic program whose realization belongs to the future – the process by which physical artifacts are made visible through words. The parallels with the dynamics of fictional narrative are obvious.

In the ninth book of the *Pharsalia*, Lucan presents the reader with a physical space whose potential to evoke the past is purely dependent upon poetic art. Far from suggesting the grandeur of Homer's city, the crumbling ruins of Troy are evocative only to the extent that they can be identified with the structures immortalized in poetry. The familiar hierarchy of thing described over description has been reversed: the significance of the physical site of Troy lies solely in the fact that it can be imagined as the location of the city of Homer. Thanks to the powers of the epic poet, the physical world derives its symbolic potency, its capacity to move the human spirit, from the world of the song.

This study has shown that descriptions of buildings in Latin epic, far from being a mere subset of "ephrastic" descriptions of artifacts and landscape, are privileged sites for exploring the preoccupations that lie at the heart of epic. In an age

in which architecture was a primary means by which state ideology, and popular culture and taste, were disseminated, the poets of the day explored the various facets of monumentality to examine critically the nature of their own art and its relationship to the society in which it was situated. For students of Virgil and his successors, the description of monuments and monumental imagery is an endlessly rewarding field through which to understand the most profound preoccupations of Roman epic, art, and society.

Bibliography

Ahl, F.M. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca, 1976.

———. *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca and New York, 1985.

———. "Statius' *Thebaid*: A Reconsideration." *ANRW* II 32.5 (1986): 2803-2912.

———. "Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative Structures in Latin Epic: An Essay." *ICS* 14 (1989): 1-31.

Ahl, F.M., M.A. Davis, and A. Pomeroy. "Silius Italicus." *ANRW* II, no. 32.4 (1986): 2492-561.

Ahl, F.M. and H. Roisman, *The Odyssey Re-Formed*. Ithaca and London, 1996.

Anderson, W.S. *The Art of the Aeneid*. Englewood Cliffs, 1969.

Augoustakis, A. "'Rapit infidum victor caput': Ekphrasis and Gender-Role Reversal in Silius Italicus' *Punica* 15." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 88-109. Afton, 2003.

Austin, R.G. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford, 1971.

———. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*. Oxford, 1977.

Bahr-Volk, M.T. "Reality and Non-Reality in Book Six of the *Aeneid*." *PVS* 14 (1974): 16-18.

Balk, C. "Die Gestalt des Latinus in Vergils *Aeneis*." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Heidelberg, 1968.

Balot, R.K. "Pindar, Virgil, and the Proem to *Georgics* 3." *Phoenix* 52 (1998): 83-94.

Barchiesi, A. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Bari, 1994.

———. "Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by C. Martindale. Cambridge, 1997.

Barchiesi, M. *Nevio Epico*. Padua, 1962.

Barigazzi, A. "Il vestibulo infernale di Virgilio e Lucrezio." *Prometheus* 8 (1982): 213-23.

Barkun, L. *Transuming Passion: Ganymede and the Erotics of Heroism*. Stanford, 1991.

Bettini, M. *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*. Translated by J. van Sickle. Baltimore, 1991.

- Bleisch, P. "The *Regia* of Picus: Ekphrasis, Italian Identity, and Artistic Definition in *Aeneid* 7.152-93." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 88-109. Afton, 2003.
- Bömer, F. *Publius Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Kommentar: Buch i-iii*. Heidelberg, 1969.
- Bowerstock, G.W. *Augustan and the Greek World*. Oxford, 1965.
- Boyle, A.J. "In Medio Caesar: Paradox and Politics in Virgil's *Georgics*." *Ramus* 8 (1979): 65-86.
- . *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Bendigo, 2003.
- Briggs, W.W. "Augustan Athletics and the Games of *Aeneid* V." *Stadion* 1 (1975): 267-83.
- Brown, R.D. "The Palace of the Sun in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, edited by M. Whitby, P.R. Hardie and M. Whitby, 211-20. Bristol, 1987.
- . "The Structural Function of the Song of Iopas." *HSCP* 93 (1990): 315-34.
- Buchheit, V. *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgika: Dichtertum und Heilsweg, Impulse der Forschung*. Darmstadt, 1972.

———. *Vergil Über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Punicum und zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg, 1973.

Cameron, A. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton, 1995.

Camps, W.A. *An Introduction to Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford, 1969.

Cartault, A. *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide*. Paris, 1926.

Casali, S. "Aeneas and the Doors of the Temple of Apollo." *CJ* 91 (1995): 1-9.

Catto, B. "The Labyrinth on the Cumaean Gates and Aeneas' Escape from Troy." *Vergilius* 34 (1988): 71-76.

Cipriano, P. *Templum*. Rome, 1983.

Clark, R.L. "Vergil's Poetic Treatment of Cumaean Geography." *Vergilius* 37 (1991): 60-69.

Clausen, W. *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Berkeley, 1987.

Clay, D. "The Archaeology of the Temple to Juno in Carthage (*Aen.* 1.446-93)." *CP* 83 (1988): 195-205.

Coleman, K.M. *Statius: Silvae iv*. Oxford, 1986.

Conte, G.B. "Il balteo di Pallante." *RFIC* 98 (1970): 292-300.

———. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Translated by C.P. Segal, *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*. Ithaca, 1986.

———. "Proems in the Middle." *YCS* 29 (1992): 147-59.

Corlaita, D.S. "Casa/Palazzo." In *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, 684-88. Rome, 1984.

———. "Tempio." In *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, 80-86. Rome, 1990.

Cova, P.V. *Il libro terzo dell'Eneide*. Milan, 1998.

Crabb, A.M. "Georgic 4 and the Aeneid." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 17 (1978-80): 10-31.

Culler, J. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca, 1981.

D'Antò, V. "Il proemio del iii libro delle *Georgiche* di Virgilio." *AFL* 8-10 (1977-80): 211-30.

Deuling, J.K. "Structures and Works of Art in the *Aeneid* : Allusions and Reality." Ph.D Dissertation. University of Iowa, 1997.

- Doob, P.R. *The Idea of the Labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, 1990.
- Drew, D.L. "Virgil's Marble Temple: *Georgics* iii.10-39." *CQ* 18 (1924): 195-202.
- Eden, P.T. *A Commentary of Virgil, Aeneid III*. Leiden, 1975.
- Edgeworth, R.J. "The Ivory Gate and the Threshold of Apollo." *C&M* 37 (1986): 145-60.
- Elsner, J. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Essen, C.C. van. "L'architecture dans l'Énéide de Virgile." *Mnemosyne* 7 (1939): 225-36.
- Eubeck, A.H., S. West, and J.B. Hainsworth. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume 1. Oxford, 1988.
- Farrell, J. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York, 1991.
- . "The Virgilian Intertext." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by C. Martindale. Cambridge, 1997.
- Favro, D. "Reading the Augustan City." In *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, edited

by P. Holliday, 230-57. Cambridge, 1993.

Feeney, D.C. "History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld." *PCPS* (1986): 1-24.

———. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford, 1991.

Fitzgerald, W. "Aeneas, Daedalus and the Labyrinth." *Arethusa* 17 (1984): 51-64.

Fordyce, J.C. *Virgil, Aeneid vii-viii*. Oxford, 1977.

Fowler, D.P. "Deviant Focalization in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *PCPS* 36 (1990): 42-63.

———. "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis." *JRS* 81 (1991): 25-35.

———. "Even Better Than the Real Thing: A Tale of Two Cities." In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by J. Elsner, 57-74. Cambridge, 1996.

———. "Virgilian Narrative: Story-Telling." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by C. Martindale, 259-70. Cambridge, 1997.

Franchi, B. "L'epos virgiliano e l'eziologia." *MD* 34 (1995): 95-103.

Frank, E. "Works of Art in the Epics of Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus." *RIL* 108 (1974): 837-44.

Frank, T. "*Aeneid* 6 and the *Elogia* from the Forum of Augustus." *AJP* 44 (1923):

355-56.

———. “Augustus, Vergil, and the Augustan *Elogia* .” *AJP* 59 (1938): 1-4.

Friedländer, P. *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius. Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1912.

Gagliardi, D. “Cesare tra le rovine della Troade (Lucan, ix.950-986).” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* ser. 3.15-16 (1997-98): 91-98.

Gale, M.R. “The Shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7.283-92).” *G&R* 44 (1997): 176-96.

———. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge, 2000.

Galinsky, G.K. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, 1996.

Genette, G. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Translated by J.E. Lewis. Ithaca, 1988.

———. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by J.E. Lewis. Ithaca, 1983.

Grimal, P. “Le livre vi de l'*Énéide* et son actualité en 23 Av. J.C.” *REA* 56 (1954): 40-60.

Grimm, R.E. “Aeneas and Andromache in *Aeneid* III.” *AJP* 88 (1967): 151-62.

Gros, P. *Aurea templa: recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste*. Rome, 1976.

Gurval, R.A. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor, 1995.

Habinek, T. "Science and Tradition in *Aeneid* 6." *HSCP* 92 (1989): 223-54.

Haight, E.H. "Cumae in Legend and History." *CJ* 13 (1917-18): 565-78.

Hales, S. *The Roman House: A Social Identity*. Cambridge, 2003.

Hannah, B. "Manufacturing Descent: Virgil's Genealogical Engineering." *Arethusa* 37 (2004): 141-64.

Hardie, P.R. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford, 1986.

———. "Ovid's Theban History: The First Anti-*Aeneid*?" *CQ* 40 (1990): 224-35.

———. "Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by A. Powell. Briston, 1992.

———. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge, 1993.

- Harrison, S.J. "The Sword-Belt of Pallas: Moral Symbolism and Political Ideology (*Aeneid* 10. 495-505)." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, edited by H.-P. Stahl. London, 1998.
- Henderson, J. *Morals and Villas in Seneca's Letters: Places to Dwell*. Cambridge, 2004.
- Henry, E. "Virgil and the Monuments." *PVS* 18 (1986): 19-45.
- Herbert-Brown, Geraldine. *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study*. Oxford, 1994.
- Herrmann, L. "Crinitus Iopas (Virgil, *Énéide* I, 740)." *Latomus* 26 (1967): 474-76.
- Hollander, J. *The Gazer's Spirit: Poems Speaking to Silent Works of Art*. Chicago and London, 1995.
- . "The Poetics of *Ekphrasis*." *Word and Image* 4 (1988): 209-19.
- Horsfall, N. "Virgil and the Poetry of Explanations." *G&R* 38 (1991): 203-11.
- . *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden, 1999.
- Johannowsky, W. "Liternum." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, 520. Princeton, 1976.
- Keith, A. "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5." In *Brill's Companion*

to *Ovid*, edited by B.W. Boyd, 235-69. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 2002.

Kellum, B. "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine." In *The Age of Augustus*, edited by R. Winkes, 169-79. Providence, 1985.

Kinsey, T.E. "The Song of Iopas." *Emerita* 47 (1979): 77-86.

Klinger, F. *Vergil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis*. Zürich, 1967.

Knauer, G.N. *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen, 1964.

Kraggerud, E. "Vergil Announcing the *Aeneid*: On *Georgics* 3.1-48." In *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, edited by H.-P. Stahl, 1-20. London, 1998.

Kranz, W. "Das Lied des Katharoden von Jaffa." *RhM* 96 (1953): 30-38.

Labate, M. "Città morta, città futura: un tema della poesia augustea." *Maia* 43 (1991): 167-84.

Lafaye, G. *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*. Paris, 1904.

Laird, A. "Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64." *JRS* 83 (1993): 18-30.

- . “*Vt Pictura Poesis: Writing Art and the Art of Writing in Augustan Poetry.*”
In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by J. Elsner, 75-102. Cambridge,
1996.
- Leach, E.W. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of
Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton, 1988.
- . “Viewing the *Spectacula* of *Aeneid* 6.” In *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An
Interpretive Guide*, edited by C. Perkell, 111-27. Norman, 1999.
- Lefèvre, E. *Das Bild-Programm des Apollo-Tempels auf dem Palatin, Xenia 24*.
Konstanz, 1989.
- Lessing, G.E. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Translated by
E.A. McCormick. Baltimore, [1766] 1984.
- Llewellyn, N. “Virgil and the Visual Arts.” In *Virgil and His Influence*, edited by C.
Martindale, 117-40. Bristol, 1984.
- Lloyd, R.B. “On *Aeneid* III, 270-280.” *AJP* 75 (1954): 292-96.
- Lonsdale, S.H. “Simile and Ecphrasis in Homer and Virgil: The Poet as Craftsman and
Choreographer.” *Vergilius* 36 (1990): 7-30.
- Lowenstein, S. “The Pictures on Juno's Temple in the *Aeneid*.” *CW* 87 (1993): 37-49.

- Lowrie, M. Review of Putnam (1988). In *Vergilius* 45 (1999): 111-120.
- Lundström, S. "Der Eingang des Proömiums zum Dritten Buche der *Georgica*." *Hermes* 104 (1976): 163-91.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries* 20. Cambridge, 1978.
- MacDonald, W.L. *The Architecture of the Roman Empire: An Introductory Study*. New Haven, 1965.
- Mack, S. *Patterns of Time in Vergil*. Hamden, 1978.
- Mackie, C.J. "Turnus and his Ancestors." *CQ* 41 (1991): 261-65.
- . "A Note on Dido's Ancestry in the *Aeneid*." *CJ* 88 (1993): 231-33.
- Marks, R. "Hannibal in Liternum." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 126-44. Afton 2003.
- Masters, J. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge, 1992.
- McKay, A.G. "Apollo Cumanus." *Vergilius* 19 (1973): 51-63.
- Merkelbach, R. "Aeneas in Cumae." *Mus. Helv.* 18 (1961): 83-99.

Michels, . "Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*." *AJP* 65 (1944): 141-44.

Miles, G.B. *Virgil's Georgics: A New Interpretation*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1980.

Miller, J.F. "The Shield of Argive Abas at *Aeneid* 3.286." *CQ* 43 (1993): 445-50.

———. "Virgil, Apollo, and Augustus." In *Apollo: Origins and Influences*, edited by J. Soloman, 99-112. Tuscon and London, 1994.

Miller, P.A. "The Minotaur Within: The Labyrinth and Strategies of Containment in *Aeneid* 5 and 6." *CP* 90 (1995): 225-40.

Mills, D.H. "Sacred Space in Vergil's *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 29 (1983): 34-46.

Mingay, J. "Poetry and the Visual Arts in Virgil." *PVS* 21 (1993): 81-88.

Moorton, R. "The Genealogy of Latinus in Virgil's *Aeneid* ." *TAPA* 118 (1988): 253-59.

Mulder, H.M. *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos Liber Secundus Commentario Exegetico Aestheticoque Instructus*. Gronigen, 1954.

Mynors, R.A.B. *Virgil, Georgics. Edited with a Commentary*. Oxford, 1990.

- Narducci, E. *Lucano: Un'epica control l'impero*. Rome and Bari, 2002.
- Nelis, D. *The Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds, 2001.
- Newlands, C.E. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca, 1995.
- . *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Norden, E. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch vi*. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1916.
- Novara, A. *Poésie virgilienne de la memoire: questions sur l'histoire dans l'Énéide 8*.
Clermont-Ferrand, 1986.
- O'Hara, J.J. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton, 1990.
- . *True Names: The Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann
Arbor, 1996.
- Otis, B. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford, 1964.
- Parke, H.W. *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*. London and New
York, 1988.
- Parry, A. "The Idea of Art in Virgil's *Georgics*." *Arethusa* 5 (1972): 35-52.
- Paschalis, M. "Middles in Catullus 64: The Pivotal *Vestis*." In *Middles in Latin*

Poetry, 51-79. Bari, 2004.

———. “Reading Space: A Re-Examination of Apuleian Ekphrasis.” In *Space in the Ancient Novel*, edited by M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis. Groningen, 2002.

———. “The Unifying Theme of Daedalus' Sculptures on the Temple of Apollo Cumanus (*Aen.* 6.20-33).” *Vergilius* 32 (1986): 33-42.

———. “Virgil's Actium-Nicopolis,” in *Nicopolis I*. Prevenza, 1987.

———. *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*. Oxford, 1997.

Patroni, G. “La porta del tempio che sta edificando Didone.” *Athenaeum* 6 (1927): 77-100.

Pavlock, B. “Daedalus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.” *CW* 92, no. 2 (1998): 141-57.

Pöschl, V. *The Art of Vergil*. Translated by G. Seligson. Ann Arbor, 1962.

———. “Die Tempeltüren des Dädalus in der *Aeneis*.” *WJA* 1 (1975): 119-23.

Putnam, M.C.J. “Dido's Murals and Virgilian Ekphrasis.” *HSCP* 98 (1998): 243-75.

———. “Virgil's Danaid Ekphrasis.” *ICS* 19 (1994): 171-89.

———. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven and London,

1998.

Quinn, K. *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*. London, 1968.

Reckford, K.J. "Latent Tragedy in *Aeneid* vii, 1-285." *AJP* (1961).

Rees, R. "Revisiting Evander at *Aeneid* 8.363." *CQ* 46 (1996): 583-86.

Richardson, L. Jr. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore, 1992.

Rodriguez, C. "Poetry and Power: Studies on Augustan Monuments and the Poets of the Augustan Age." Ph.D. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 1989.

Romeuf, J. "Les peintures du temple de Carthage (*Éneide* 1.466-493)." *ALMArv* 2 (1975): 15-27.

Rosivach, V.J. "Latinus' Genealogy and the Palace of Picus." *CQ* 30 (1980).

Rowell, H. "Vergil and the Forum of Augustus." *AJP* 62 (1941): 261-76.

Rutledge, H.C. "Vergil's Daedalus." *CJ* 62 (1967): 309-11.

———. "The Opening of *Aeneid* 6." *CJ* 67 (1971-72): 110-15.

Salemme, C. "Sul 'senso della storia' nella *Pharsalia* di Lucano." *BStudLat* 70 (2000): 514-29.

Schöffel, C. *Martial, Buch 6*. Stuttgart, 2002.

Segal, C.P. "Aeternum per Saecula Nomen: The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History." *Arion* 4 (1965): 615-57.

———. "The Song of Iopas in the *Aeneid*." *Hermes* 99 (1971): 336-49.

———. "Iopas Revisited (*Aeneid* 1.740ff.)." *Emerita* 49 (1981): 17-25.

Small, S.G.P. "The Arms of Turnus: *Aeneid* 7.783-92." *TAPA* 90 (1959): 243-52.

Smolenaars, J.J.L. *Statius, Thebaid vii: A Commentary*. Leiden, 1994.

———. "The Vergilian Background of Seneca's *Thyestes* 641-82." *Vergilius* 44 (1998): 51-65.

Staley, G.A. "Vergil's Daedalus." *CQ* 79 (2002): 137-43.

Stambaugh, J.E. "The Function of Roman Temples." *ANRW* 2.16.1 (1978): 535-608.

Tarrant, R.J. "Aeneas and the Gates of Sleep." *CP* 77 (1982): 51-55.

———. *Seneca's Thyestes. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by R.J. Tarrant.*

Atlanta, 1985.

Thiel, D. *Erzählung und Beschreibung in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios: ein Beitrag zur Poetik des hellenistischen Epos*. Stuttgart, 1993.

Thomas, R.F. "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices* and Roman Poetry." *CQ* 33 (1983): 92-113.

———. "Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces." *HSCP* 87 (1983): 175-84.

———. *Virgil. Georgics. Volume 2: Books iii-iv*. Cambridge, 1988.

———. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge, 2001.

———. "'Stuck in the Middle with You': Virgilian Middles." In *Middles in Latin Poetry*, edited by S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino, 123-50. Bari, 2004.

Thompson, L., and R.T. Bruère. "Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence." *CPh* 63 (1968): 1-21.

Trapp, J.B. "Virgil and the Monuments." *PVS* 18 (1986): 1-17.

Vioque, G.G. *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary*. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. Leiden, 2002.

Webb, R. "Ekphrasis Ancient and Modern: The Invention of a Genre." *Word and*

Image 15 (1999): 7-18.

Webb, R. and L. James. “‘To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places’: Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium.” *Art History* 14 (1991): 1-17.

Wigodsky, M. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden, 1972.

Wilkinson, L.P. *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey*. Cambridge, 1969.

———. “Pindar and the Proem to the Third Georgic.” In *Forschungen zur Römischen Literatur. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Karl Büchner*, edited by K. Büchner, 286-90. Wiesbaden, 1970.

Williams, R.D. “The Pictures on Dido's Temple.” *CQ* 54 (1960): 145-51.

Wiseman, T.P. “*Conspicui Postes Tectaue Digna Deo*: The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire.” In *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter, 1994.

Wistrand, E. “Virgil's Palaces in the *Aeneid*.” *Klio* 38 (1960): 146-54.

Zanker, G. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. Madison, 2003.

Zanker, P. “Der Apollotempel auf dem Palatin: Ausstattung und Politische Sinnbezüge nach der Schlacht von Actium.” In *Città e Architettura nella Roma Imperiale*,

21-40. Copenhagen, 1983.

———. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor, 1988.

Zarker, J.W. "Aeneas and Theseus in *Aeneid* 6." *CJ* 62 (1967): 220-26.

———. "Augustan Art and Architecture in Vergil's *Aeneid*." In *The Age of Augustus*, edited by R. Winkes, 197-208. Providence, RI, 1986.

Zetzel, J.E.G. "*Romane Memento*: Justice and Judgment in *Aeneid* 6." *TAPA* 119 (1989): 263-84.

———. "Rome and its Traditions." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by C. Martindale. Cambridge, 1997.

Zwierlein, O. "Lucans Caesar in Troja." *Hermes* 114 (1986): 460-78.