

**ROMAN ARCHITECTURE: THE IDEA OF THE MONUMENT IN THE ROMAN  
IMAGINATION OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE**

by

Nicholas James Geller

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Classical Studies)  
in the University of Michigan  
2015

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Basil J. Dufallo, Chair  
Associate Professor Ruth Rothaus Caston  
Professor Bruce W. Frier  
Associate Professor Achim Timmermann

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of many people both within and outside of academia. I would first of all like to thank all those on my committee for reading drafts of my work and providing constructive feedback, especially Basil Dufallo and Ruth R. Caston, both of who read my chapters at early stages and pushed me to find what I wanted to say – and say it well. I also cannot thank enough all the graduate students in the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Michigan for their support and friendship over the years, without either of which I would have never made it this far. Marin Turk in Slavic Languages and Literature deserves my gratitude, as well, for reading over drafts of my chapters and providing insightful commentary from a non-classicist perspective. And I of course must thank the Department of Classical Studies and Rackham Graduate School for all the financial support that I have received over the years which gave me time and the peace of mind to develop my ideas and write the dissertation that follows.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction: Roman Architecture.....	1
II. Reading Rome Architecturally: Structure, Memory, and Monuments in the Roman Imagination.....	12
III. Horace’s Lyric <i>Monumentum</i> : the Augustan Architecture of “Refusal”.....	48
IV. The Cracks in Vergil’s Epic Architecture I: Constructed Caves and Deceptive Labyrinths in the <i>Aeneid</i> .....	90
V. The Cracks in Vergil’s Epic Architecture II: The “Failure” of <i>Monumenta</i> in the <i>Aeneid</i> ...	135
VI. The End(s) of Architecture: Ovid, Augustus, and the Transcendence of Structure.....	163
VII. Conclusion: Roman Monumentality and the Modern Death(s) of the Monument.....	188
REFERENCES.....	205

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

*OLD*      *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford, 1968-1982.

*TLL*      *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig, 1900-.

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the idea of the monument in the Roman imagination of the Augustan age (31 BCE – 14 CE). It examines the different ways in which three Augustan poets – Horace in his *Odes*, Vergil in his *Aeneid*, and Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* – imagined their works as monuments that contributed to the broader discourse of monumentality of the period. A survey of the importance of architecture to how the Romans structured the world around them conceptually will be followed in each subsequent chapter by a reading of these poems which seeks to accomplish two goals: [1] to demonstrate the very nuanced manner in which the Augustan poets fashioned their works as *monumenta* (“monuments”) and [2] to connect aspects of the poems’ monumentality to strategies employed by the *princeps* himself in his *Res Gestae* when discussing his reconstruction of Rome on both a literal and metaphorical level. This study will argue that by analyzing the sophisticated manner in which these poets contributed to the monumentalization of their city we can understand better the success that Augustus had in turning Rome from a city of brick to one of marble – not just in its physical landscape, but in the Roman imagination, as well. The conclusion will then look at what the Roman understanding of monumentality in the Augustan age can reveal about possible limitations of the discourse surrounding the idea of the monument today.

# CHAPTER I

## Introduction

### Roman Architecture

“I am leaving behind a city of marble, which I received as a city of brick.”<sup>1</sup> Augustus’ famous boast is not without merit. The people of Rome no doubt witnessed an incredible amount of building in their city under the reign of the *princeps*. For nearly two millennia historians have praised the Augustan age for its prolific and resplendent architecture.<sup>2</sup> Classicists in particular have analyzed Augustus’ sophisticated building program in order to show how the visual culture of Rome was an essential component of the so-called Augustan “Cultural Revolution” that saw the city rise out of decades of civil war into an era of peace and relative stability.<sup>3</sup> The continual attention to, and fascination with, the physical remains of Rome’s many Augustan monuments – small or large, functional or commemorative – is a testament to just how successfully Augustus

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 28.3: ...*Augustus urbem adeo excoluit, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisse.*

<sup>2</sup> In the very first chapter of his *Siècle de Louis XIV*, for example, Voltaire lists the age of Augustus as one of the only “lucky ages...in which the arts were perfected and which – by serving at the time the greatness of the human spirit – are the example for posterity” (*âges heureux...où les arts ont été perfectionnés, et qui, servant d’époque à la grandeur de l’esprit humain, sont l’exemple de la postérité*, 1751 [1819], 188-189). The twentieth-century architectural theorist Sigfried Giedion (1949, 646-647) would even go so far as to say that “[w]e do not doubt that in some periods there has existed a unity of culture. In those periods imagination and the external world flowed into one another. Then the spirit was not condemned to go its way alone, and reality had not the single meaning of struggle for existence. Those were the happy hours of mankind, but they have been rare and of tragic brevity. [...] [S]o it was in Rome during the lustrous reign of Augustus. [...] These periods, with their unity of intellectual, emotional, and political culture, are those in which life has been able to manifest such splendor as is possible to man.”

<sup>3</sup> Zanker 1988 is still in many ways the standard for an approach to Roman architecture of the Augustan age which focuses on the remains that have survived either physically or through the images from coins, painting, and literature. See also F. R. Brown 1961, Ward-Perkins 1981 [1994], 21-45, Gros 1976, Kellum 1981, Favro 1996, Galinsky 1996, Larmour and Spencer 2007a, and Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 73-211.

employed architecture to monumentalize not just the city of Rome, but the very idea of the city in the imagination of the Romans, as well as in the minds of their cultural inheritors.<sup>4</sup>

This dissertation is not about the physical monuments that Augustus constructed.<sup>5</sup> The different focus of my dissertation arises from the fact that some of the most important monumental constructions that Augustus accomplished were not constructed with extravagant, long-lasting marble, but with the words of the Latin language in his *Res Gestae*.<sup>6</sup> Augustus did monumentalize the city of Rome, of course, but he also “constructed” the *res publica* anew after years of civil strife had left it in “ruin.” That was his charge, after all, when he first assumed power as a *triumvir rei publicae constituendae*.<sup>7</sup> As this study will suggest, an essential part of Augustus’ success in accomplishing this task was in how he skillfully used architectural *discourse* to establish his novel *constitutio* for Rome – the one in the imagination as much as the physical one – upon foundations that were at the same time traditional.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Edwards 1996, esp. 69-135, and Galinsky 2014, 135-162.

<sup>5</sup> Important work still remains to be done in that field of study, of course, as classicists complete the “spatial turn” and transition from an examination of space to that of movement in and through space. See Ewald and Noreña 2010a, Laurence and Newsome 2011, and now Favro 2014.

<sup>6</sup> For Augustus as a rhetorical figure see Lamp 2013. Lamp argues that “Augustus and his administration turned to traditional Roman rhetorical theory and practice...to inform the Augustan cultural campaigns.” The rhetorical “artifacts” that the scholar analyzes range from speeches to “buildings, monuments, coins, altars, and even city planning” (6). The *Res Gestae* itself has been the topic of much recent scholarship concerning the way Augustus’ inscribed “autobiography” helped fashion a particular image of the *princeps* and the Augustan age, including Ramage 1987, Ridley 2003, Cooley 2009, 1-43. See also Stuart 1905, 429-440, for an outdated but still useful examination of Augustus’ inscriptional practices when it comes to the monuments of the period, and Syme 1939, 520-524, presenting an insightful (though perhaps overly hostile) account of the rhetorical stance that Augustus takes up in the *Res Gestae*.

<sup>7</sup> *RGDA* 1.4: “In the same year, moreover, the people elected me as consul...and as triumvir for the purpose of establishing the state” (*populus autem eodem anno me consulem...et triumvirum rei publicae constituendae creavit*).

<sup>8</sup> Although classicists have treated the “discourse of monumentality” in the ancient world previously, an application to the poetry of the Augustan age is largely lacking. Although Elsner 1994 presents a useful overview of how the discourse functions in ancient historians from Herodotus to Pausanias, the approach most similar to mine can be found in Fowler 2000, 193-219. His discussion of the very thin line between “monument” and “ruin” has been particularly influential for my own reading of Roman poetry in the Augustan age. For other classicist discussions of Roman monumentality see also Bodel 1987, Rea 2007, E. Thomas 2007, Roller 2010, Thomas and Meyers 2012, and now Jenkyns 2013, 311-364.

Augustus was not alone in using architectural discourse to articulate the work he did to reshape the idea of Rome. Far from it. To think that the *princeps* was operating outside the shared discourse of his times is no doubt a mistake – and one that does not fully account for his success.<sup>9</sup> Chapter II of this dissertation will demonstrate the important role that architectural discourse and in particular the idea of the monument played for Romans in how they “structured” the world around them, whether rhetorical or literary, actual or symbolic. This largely introductory chapter will start with an analysis of the only surviving intact architectural treatise from antiquity, Vitruvius’ *De architectura*, which was addressed to Augustus himself. I will analyze in particular the treatise’s architectural imagery so as to draw out further the close connection that existed between architecture and the idea of “order” or “structure” in the Roman imagination.<sup>10</sup> From this point I will then turn to perhaps the most famous example of this connection in antiquity: the “memory mansion” that was used by Roman orators as an *aide-mémoire*. The idea of using architecture to “structure” one’s thoughts is not limited to constructing memory, however, but is in fact emblematic of a much deeper connection that existed between physical structures and the way Romans conceived of the world around them conceptually. And nowhere is this relationship more apparent than in the Roman idea of

---

<sup>9</sup> The idea that architectural discourse was an important one in late republican and Augustan literature is by no means novel. Mazzolini 1970, Ceaușescu 1976, and Labate 1991 each treats the impact that the idea of Rome as a city had on Roman thought. F. R. Brown 1963, Gros 1991, Callebat 1994, Caye 2011, and now Elsner and Meyer 2014, 35-114, all tackle the complex nexus of architecture and rhetoric. Whereas Edwards 1996 present the “Romes” that texts of several eras have fashioned, Reitz 2013 argues “that describing the process of (architectural) construction within a literary text can also be a way of encouraging the reader to consider the (literary) construction of the text itself” (8). Moreover, several excellent and detailed studies have attempted to find meaning in architecture that goes beyond the physical structures within the works of Cicero, Livy, and Vitruvius, including Vasaly 1993, on Cicero’s manipulation of monuments in his oratory, Jaegar 1997, on how Livy uses monuments – both within and including his own work – to construct a Rome for his readers, and McEwan 2003, on Vitruvian constructions of empire.

<sup>10</sup> On the Roman *ars memoriae* see Rossi 1960, 1-14, Yates 1966, 1-49, Blum 1969, Leach 1988, 75-78, Bergmann 1994, and now Möller 2013. See Wilson 1988, 75-78, and Said 2000, 179-180, for non-classicist perspectives on the idea of the art of memory and how it is different for us in modernity from what it was for Greeks and Romans in antiquity.



monumentality, that is, those characteristics which make something into a *monumentum* (“monument”). A discussion of Roman monumentality will lead then to an analysis of two Augustan authors who demonstrate the concept in action, namely, the historian Livy in the preface of his *Ab urbe condita* and the *princeps* himself at the beginning of his own *Res Gestae*.

This examination of monumental architecture’s relationship to Roman thought as found in these prose texts is essential to establishing a new interpretative framework through which to analyze the way that the poets of the Augustan age conceived of their works as *monumenta*. Most studies on the poetic *monumenta* that will be analyzed in this dissertation have examined either [1] the metapoetics at work in each case (e.g., as a “competition,” whether between Greek vs. Roman, past vs. present, or visual vs. verbal media),<sup>11</sup> or [2] tried to match these “structures” with actual monuments in Augustan Rome.<sup>12</sup> Although I will also draw upon both approaches in this dissertation, my goal is to explore how the poets who built these *monumenta* are interacting with – that is, employing as well as critiquing – the architectural *discourse* that existed in Augustan Rome and which was used by Augustus himself to articulate his monumentalization of the city.

---

<sup>11</sup> Scholars of Augustan poetry have often looked at the metapoetic competition between text and building. Recent examples of a metapoetic approach can be found in Jaeger 1990, Labate 1991, Deremetz 2001, Meban 2008, Armstrong 2009, and Jones 2011. It should be noted, though, that Deremetz 2001, 144, does warn that any such metapoetic analysis of these texts should be handled “*avec la plus grande prudence*,” as these passages are often more complicated than they might initially appear.

<sup>12</sup> For the ways that these three Augustan poets are writing in response to particular monuments in Rome see Jaeger 1995, on Horace *C.* 1.8 and the monuments of Campus Martius; Boyle 2003, 1-62, where the scholar treats several passages in the works of Ovid that engage with monuments in Rome; Barchiesi 2005, looking to Augustan poetry for how to understand specific Augustan monuments (and *vice versa*) in suggesting that we should see a kind of “intertextuality” between the two media; Harrison 2006, on the way that Vergil’s *Aeneid* is in dialogue with the monuments of the Augustan age; Rea 2007, examining the responses of Ovid (as well as Tibullus and Propertius) to the physical construction of what the scholar calls “archaic-Augustan Rome” on Palatine and Capitoline Hills; and Dufallo 2013, 108-136, for an exploration of the relationship between Vergil’s *templum* at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 with Augustus’ temple of Palatine Apollo (in addition to Propertius’ description of the same in Prop. 2.31). Welch 2005 balances a metapoetic approach with an attention to the competition between specific Augustan monuments and the account of those same spaces in Book 4 of Propertius’ poems.

The prose texts examined in Chapter II will provide a framework for interpreting the poetic monuments of the Augustan age in a new light. But why poetry? What does it offer that further analysis of prose cannot? The Greco-Roman tradition is full of poets who imagined their works architecturally<sup>13</sup> – whether as grand, stable structures,<sup>14</sup> or in the case of Hellenistic poetry as a means of articulating their (supposedly) much smaller poetic aspirations.<sup>15</sup> The Augustan poets were thus working within a long-standing, established tradition that attached architectural imagery to what we today might call a poem’s “generic structure.” For these poets to make a metapoetic statement via architectural imagery was a highly self-reflexive enterprise – one which not only called attention to their poetic predecessors, but also allowed them to articulate their own poems as a particular type of poetry.<sup>16</sup> These intensely marked “architextural” moments therefore enabled the Augustan poets in particular to explore the monumentalization of the space around them in a critical way as they contemplated how their own works *qua* “monuments” would contribute to it.<sup>17</sup>

A bit about definitions before I provide a summary of the remaining chapters which will follow. I use the term “architecture” in this dissertation not to call to mind the complex architectonic “topomorphology” of Augustan age poetry that has been the focus of countless

---

<sup>13</sup> See Reitz 2013, 105-110, for a concise survey (with bibliography) of “architectural poetics” in Greek literature, as well as Newlands 2014, providing an overview of architectural ecphrasis in Roman poetry, with particular attention to the poetry of the Augustan age (60-67).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 6.1-4, *Pyth.* 6.10-18; Aristoph. *Pax* 749-750. See Reitz 2013, 106-107, for discussion of these passages.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Theocr. *Id.* 7.45-48. Although Callimachus does not use architectural metaphors in what remains of his poetry, the idea of grand “epic” spaces is opposed in his works to the small, more manageable scale of his poetics (cf. Call. *H.* 2.106-110).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Verg. *G.* 3.8-16; Hor. *C.* 3.1.44-48, 3.30.1-5; Ov. *Met.* 15. 871-879.

<sup>17</sup> Armstrong 2009 makes the general claim that these poets are able to provide insight into the rapid monumentalization of Augustan Rome because “they have the flexibility to offer a more nuanced reflection on these swiftly sprouting marvels than any architect or sculptor, and the room to explore, rather than simply represent, the fears and aspirations of their age, and the role of the artist within it” (76).

studies on its structural arrangement (in terms of books, individual poems, lines, etc.).<sup>18</sup> Nor do I use “architecture” in a loose way to talk about how “memory is constructed like a text.”<sup>19</sup> My use of the term is close to how the influential French narratologist Gérard Genette employed the almost impossibly nuanced concept of “*architextualité*” for thinking about how a text fits into a particular generic structure (or what he calls an “*archigenre*”).<sup>20</sup> Genette is not concerned, however, with the more straightforward way that texts themselves can configure this relationship in their very language. My use of the word architecture is meant to examine this connection, that is, to explore how architecture is an operative metaphor in Horace, Vergil, and Ovid for how they imagine the generic “structures” of their own poetry. This dissertation is not simply about metapoetics, however. I argue that the act of defining their poetry’s architecture offered these three poets a vehicle through which to engage critically with the discourse surrounding architectural monuments – a discourse which itself was critical to reshaping and redefining Rome in the Augustan age.

Chapters III-VI will demonstrate the relative strengths and weaknesses of this discourse by examining the monumental architecture of Horace’s *Odes* (23 BCE), Vergil’s *Aeneid* (18 BCE), and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (8 CE) in juxtaposition to that of Augustus’ own *Res Gestae* (14 CE). In order to tease out the subtle nuances of this sophisticated discourse in the space provided by a dissertation-length study I will be examining closely these texts themselves. I will therefore not be providing an in-depth architectural analysis of any physical monumental structure in Rome. This does not mean that I believe the physical environment of the city was at

---

<sup>18</sup> Eriksen 2001, xiv, defines the concept of “topomorphology” as the “analytical method that examines the distribution of rhetorical markers to clarify the structure and plot of a text.” This approach – as exemplified by Collinge 1961, Dettmer 1983, and Santirocco 1986, to name only a few – has been very fruitful for the study of Horace’s *Odes*, in particular, even if it seems to have run its course for now.

<sup>19</sup> See Ender 2005, 15-16.

<sup>20</sup> Genette 1979.

all irrelevant to how and why the Augustan poets built their poetic *monumenta*. Horace, Vergil, and Ovid – these three authors experienced first-hand the transformation of Rome into a city of marble monuments during the span of the Augustan age.<sup>21</sup> It is not surprising, then, that they might turn to monumental architecture as the signifier with which to express something about their own “constructions.” What I want to emphasize again is that my focus will be on how real and poetic monuments are discussed – and to what ends – by Augustus and the poets of his age. These poets and their *princeps* were all tapping into the common language which monumental discourse supplied when they articulated what made their works monumental. And it is that discourse which is in much greater need of scholarly attention than the physical structures themselves.

I will begin my analysis of Roman architecture in Chapter III with Horace’s lyrical *Odes*. After consistently making claims that one should aim for the “golden mean” (*aurea mediocritas*, C. 2.10.5) and outwardly lamenting the excesses of contemporary architecture,<sup>22</sup> the poet appears to make a remarkable “about-face” at the end of his first publication of the collection. In the final poem, C. 3.30, Horace claims to have built a *monumentum* that will not only be higher than the pyramids but which will even escape the grasp of decaying time itself. I will argue that this apparent contradiction between the content of his lyric and the “form” which he ultimately gives it is anticipated throughout the *Odes* by a type of rhetorical disavowal – what I term an “inverted” *recusatio* – that allows the poet to incorporate into his lyric structure that which he

---

<sup>21</sup> Propertius was also writing during the Augustan age and likewise relies on the language of architecture and monumentality in interesting ways (cf. Prop. 3.2, 4.1, 4.6-7), as Welch 2005 has demonstrated through her close readings of how the poet “constructs” Rome vis-à-vis his “elegiac cityscapes.” The elegiac poetry of Propertius and much of Ovid’s corpus will not be included in this dissertation, however, in order to keep the focus specifically on lyric and epic poetry.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Hor. C. 2.10, 2.15, 2.18, and 3.1.

claims to exclude.<sup>23</sup> By using this rhetorical device to balance the tensions between lyric and non-lyric Horace can erect a dynamic and innovative “monument” of lyric poetry while – or rather *through* – claiming to be “traditional.” This method of innovating without destabilizing the structure of the tradition will then be compared to the strategies that Augustus used when discussing his own buildings in the *Res Gestae*. Both poet and *princeps*, I will suggest, use the idea of a stable structure provided by monuments to balance present innovations against past traditions – generic for the one, social and political for the other.

The subsequent analysis of Vergil’s *Aeneid* in Chapters IV-V will likewise examine what the epic poet has to say about architecture and monuments in the poem before then turning to how he might be fashioning his poem itself as a *monumentum*. Because of the epic’s size it will be necessary to break up the analysis of its architecture into two separate chapters. Chapter IV will treat two of the most common and significant architectural tropes of the poem, artificial caves and deceptive labyrinths, as they demonstrate a very different focus on the part of the poet from what can be found in the *Odes*. The disruptive forces of Vergil’s poem are not external, but rather are shown to have been trapped *inside* these grand structures. As we will see, however, despite their size and divine craftsmanship these constructions are shown to “fail” again and again – thereby releasing the violent forces of Rome’s past contained within them.<sup>24</sup> Chapter V will then focus in particular on the epic’s *monumenta* – including the ones that Anchises (mis)remembers while on Crete, the ones found on Doors of Daedalus in the form of the

---

<sup>23</sup> See Lynn 1995, 35-36, for a concise discussion of how Horace inverts the typical *recusatio* of Augustan poets. (Lynn was anticipated in this interpretation by both Commager 1962, 114-116, and Smith 1968.) See also Davis 1991, Lowrie 1997, and Harrison 2007b, 168-206, for three studies that carefully parse the rhetorical disavowals found in Horace’s *Odes*.

<sup>24</sup> Putnam 1965 and Bartsch 1998 both present several thematic links between the artificial caves of the poem, which include the Cave of Aeolus in Book 1, the “cave” inside the Trojan Horse in Book 2, and Cacus’ cave in Book 8. The labyrinths I will be focusing on can be found at *Aen.* 5.580-603 and 6.14-35. See Fitzgerald 1984 and Miller 1995 for alternative ways of interpreting the connection between these two labyrinths. Doob 1990, 227-253, provides a lengthy (and at times overly subtle) examination of the idea of the labyrinth in the *Aeneid*.

Minotaur, the ones in the environs of pre-Rome, and the multiple ones that the baldrick of Pallas may represent<sup>25</sup> – before turning to how they all can help us to understand the poem itself as a kind of *monumentum*.

Taken together Chapters IV and V will examine the way that Vergil's architecture is less about keeping out those external forces which could disrupt the *status quo* than about the chaos and violence of Rome's past – distant and very recent – that the poem-as-monument tries to contain within its magnificent epic surface. What I aim to do in these two chapters is to explore how Vergil is engaging with the monumental discourse of Augustan Rome through a poem whose surface might be as resplendent as a Roman temple, but whose interior hides a chaotic force that should not be forgotten lest it break free and cause the past to repeat itself. A return to the *Res Gestae* at the end of Chapter V will set in further relief how Augustus dealt in his own monumental discourse with the *furor* and chaos of Rome's past which he too needed to contain when attempting to construct a new Roman *constitutio*.

In Chapter VI, as the dissertation itself approaches its end, I will then examine the conclusion of another "epic" poem, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, to see how a poet writing at the far end of the Augustan age further explores the ideas of stability and instability in the monumental edifices examined in Horatian lyric and Vergilian epic, respectively. The metaphor of a poem as a *monumentum* may have begun to run its course as something fresh and dynamic by the conclusion of the Augustan age. As I will argue, however, Ovid's poem represents not the dying of this architectural metaphor but rather its evolution to reflect the way in which Augustus himself had re-arranged the boundaries which had structured Roman space and Roman identity during Rome's rise to power. The late Augustan poet concludes his *Metamorphoses* as Horace

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.102-110, 6.25-31, 8.307-348, 12.945-952.

does in *Odes*, namely, by claiming that he too has constructed a monument.<sup>26</sup> Ovid's structure is rather different from that of his Augustan predecessor, however. Like the content of his poem itself, in fact, the monument that Ovid has constructed seems to transcend its own boundaries, that is, to become a structure without a structure.<sup>27</sup> I argue that this transcendence of structure mirrors the way that the boundaries between public and private space also fade away in the final chapter of *Res Gestae*. It might be, in fact, that the most important "construction" that Augustus completed was not just to build a new *res publica* without destabilizing the foundations of the past, as Horace does with his *monumentum*. Nor was it to give a frame to a new understanding of what it meant to be Roman while keeping the horrors of the past present, as Vergil accomplishes in his poem. Even more important perhaps was how the *princeps* carefully articulated his own constructions in the *Res Gestae* as a means of radically renegotiating the boundaries between his property and that of the state.<sup>28</sup>

My conclusion in Chapter VII will look to the broader consequences of what an analysis of this "dialogue" between the poets and *princeps* can teach us about monumentality today. I will provide a brief survey of the idea of the monument in modernity in order to show by way of contrast that the various ways which the Romans embraced the dual nature of monuments to be

---

<sup>26</sup> Much has been written on this famous conclusion to the *Metamorphoses*, including Fränkel 1945 [1969], 110-111; Anderson 1963, 27; Segal 1969b; Woodman 1974, 127-128; Bömer 1986 488-451; Feeney 1991, 248-249; Barchiesi 1994, 262-265; Spahlinger 1996, 40-50; Holzberg 1997, 153-158; Solodow 1988, 220-222; Wickkiser 1999; Fowler 2000, 195-196; Hardie 2002, 91-97; Habinek 2002, 54-57; and Feldherr 2010, 78-83.

<sup>27</sup> Woodman 1974, 128, sees the lack of precision in Ovid's metaphor for his poem as a kind of unintentional "imagistic fragmentation." I argue that the "fragmentation" is quite intentional – as well as very important to understanding the kind of monument that Ovid has constructed through his poetry.

<sup>28</sup> See Milnor 2005, 1-139, on the way that Augustus brought the private into the public (and *vice versa*) through the imperial *domus*. See also Wiseman 1987, Eck 1997, and Wallace-Hadrill 2008 for more discussion of the renegotiation of the boundaries of public and private in this period.

both stable and unstable might just provide a more productive alternative to the at times rather limiting discourse surrounding modern monumentality.<sup>29</sup>

Let us now return for a moment, though, to the words that began this introduction: “I am leaving behind a city of marble, which I received as a city of brick.” This boast is more nuanced than it might first appear. The *princeps* is not claiming to have knocked down Rome and replaced it with something new. Even if the material is different, the *structure* is importantly still the same. Rome is still Rome – and its ancient foundations lie untouched. This is not by chance. Augustus was incredibly careful with his use of monumental discourse to articulate the Rome that he (re-)constructed. And this dissertation will attempt to suggest why.

---

<sup>29</sup> The bibliography on the idea of the monument in modern thought is immense and varied. Some of the most influential works include: Hugo 1831, Ruskin 1849, Nietzsche 1874, Riegl 1903, Mumford 1937, Barthes 1964, Le Goff 1978, North 1985, Nora 1989, Hung 1995, Choay 2001, Carpo 2007, and Frichot 2011. A variety of different perspectives on the topic can also be found in the special edition of *World Archaeology*, “Monuments and the Monumental” (22.2: 1990), as well as in Nelson and Olin 2003, which is an edited volume with contributions from leading scholars on monumentality in various fields, including classical studies.



## CHAPTER II

### Reading Rome Architecturally

#### Structure, Memory, and Monuments in the Roman Imagination

Two bronze columns were placed in front of Augustus' Mausoleum at Rome after the death of the *princeps* in 14 CE. These columns were inscribed with a text describing the “*Res Gestae* of the Divine Augustus” (*RGDA*).<sup>1</sup> The prose of the inscription was relatively “simple” and full of officialese phrases that some scholars would suggest provide very little insight into how Augustus actually viewed his achievements.<sup>2</sup> Others see the text as “a complex and allusive document, addressed to many audiences and with many levels of meaning.”<sup>3</sup> No matter which way one decides to read the *Res Gestae*, though, it still represents perhaps the most definitive statement that exists of how Augustus framed his work at Rome for posterity.<sup>4</sup> It is truly a

---

<sup>1</sup> As it is stated in the heading to copies of the *RGDA* itself found outside of Rome: “A copy has been placed below of the *res gestae* of the divine Augustus, by which he subjected the world to the rule of the Roman people, and of the expenses which he incurred for the state and the Roman people, having been inscribed on two bronze pillars, which were placed at Rome” (*Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terra[rum] imperio populi Roma[n]i subiecit, et impensarum quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus aeneis pilis, quae su[n]t Romae positae, exemplar sub[i]jectum*; cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 101.4: *indicem rerum a se gestarum, quem vellet incidi in aeneis tabulis, quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur*). I will be using the Latin text of the *RGDA* from Cooley 2009 here and in following chapters of this dissertation. All translation are my own, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> Although Gordon 1968, 132, maintains that the *Res Gestae* is “simple in structure, flat, without style...not in the least reflective or philosophical in tone,” he nevertheless does provide a useful summary of what other critics have thought about the style of the *Res Gestae* – most of whom praise the inscription’s “clarity,” “brevity,” “simplicity,” and “cool dignity” (137-138, n. 61). Rowe 2014 makes the intriguing suggestion that we should understand the *RGDA* as a compilation of various honorary decrees from the senate to Augustus that he (or someone else) put together just before his death in 14 CE; according to Rowe, in fact, the text is as much a “commemoration of commemorations” from the senate to Augustus as any personal statement by the *princeps* himself.

<sup>3</sup> Bosworth 1999, 1. See also Ridley 2003, 51-66, for a discussion of several “parallel texts,” including the famous four-verse epitaph for Scipio Hispallus and the inscription detailing the life and works of L. Munatius Plancus.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 2, n. 6, above for bibliography on the *Res Gestae*.

monument both of and to the Augustan age.

This dissertation argues that the *Res Gestae* is also a text whose monumentality needs be understood within the context of other literary monuments of the Augustan age.<sup>5</sup> The *RGDA* demonstrates how Augustus used architecture – as much in his language as in the landscape of the city – to redefine the way his subjects would see their restored *res publica* on a continuum from Rome’s humble beginnings to its “collapse” at the end of the republic and finally to its monumental transformation under Augustus.<sup>6</sup> But this monumentalization of Rome in the Roman imagination was by no means the project of the *princeps* alone. Horace, Vergil, and Ovid each added “monuments” of their own which would anticipate the different ways in the *Res Gestae* that Augustus himself would articulate his reconstruction of Rome – both as a city and as an idea. Subsequent chapters will look in particular at how these three poets of the Augustan age both critiqued and contributed to a metaphorical transformation of Rome from crumbling brick to monumental marble in the Roman imagination as much as in its physical reality.<sup>7</sup>

To examine this shared project of the *princeps* and the Augustan poets it will first be

---

<sup>5</sup> See Elsner 1996, 48, claiming that “[m]onumentality, the conceptual and rhetorical space a monument occupies in the environment of its observers, is of the essence to the *Res Gestae*’s programme.” Recent scholarship has paid particular attention to monumentality in the ancient world – from Häusle 1980, 29-63, which examines the language of Roman monuments, to Elsner 1994, analyzing the language describing monuments, to Fowler 2000, 193-219, which looks critically at both these sets of discourse. Wiseman 1987, Bodel 1997, Eck 1997, and Roller 2010 all treat the monumentality of the physical aristocratic houses and villas in the late republic and early principate. Thomas and Meyers 2012 represents perhaps the most recent attempt to define Roman monumentality, with particular emphasis on Etruscan and early Roman architecture. See Part 3 of the current chapter (pp. 29-36) for a fuller discussion of Roman monumentality, including the definition that is employed in this dissertation.

<sup>6</sup> Elsner 1996, 40: “In effect, by surveying the city topographically and by cataloguing a carefully selected group of monuments constructed or restored by Augustus, the *Res Gestae* framed the viewing of Augustan Rome. For it told Romans how their city should now be seen.” As this dissertation will suggest, however, the *Res Gestae* has the same effect for the *metaphorical* structure of the Roman *res publica* in the Roman imagination

<sup>7</sup> My focus will be on the rhetoric that accompanied and supported the idea of the monument rather than on Augustan monuments themselves, as the latter has been topic of much scholarship in recent years. See Zanker 1988 for an approach to Augustan architecture that focuses on the architectural remains that have survived either physically or through the images from coins, painting, and literature. Ward-Perkins 1981 [1994], 21-45, and Favro 1998 present excellent overviews of Augustan architecture’s importance from this perspective, as well – the latter suggesting that “Augustus sparked a reconceptualization of the city’s physical form as a bearer of meaning” (216). But see also Galinsky 1996 and Wallace-Hadrill 2008 for analyses of Augustan culture that complicate the almost strictly top-down approach that both Zanker and Favro espouse.

necessary to understand how each of them negotiated his position from within the Roman tradition of viewing their world architecturally. The current chapter will outline some aspects of this tradition by briefly analyzing a few of the ways that architecture helped to determine how the Romans structured their reality conceptually.<sup>8</sup> I will begin in Part 1 by analyzing the fundamental link between architecture and order (political and otherwise) in Vitruvius' *De architectura*. Part 2 will then look at architecture's essential role in the Roman "art of memory" (*ars memoriae*). In Part 3 the ideas of the preceding two sections will be applied to exploring the concept of Roman monumentality, with particular attention to how "monuments" (*monumenta*) provided an opportunity for Romans both to remember their past and critically examine how it fit within their present. This survey will end by then turning in Parts 4 and 5 to how two Romans – the historian Livy and Augustus himself – used a common language of monumental architecture at the beginning of their respective texts to represent the work they did to help "rebuild" Rome after the supposed "collapse" of both the *res publica* and the *mores* upon which it was founded.<sup>9</sup>

This survey is not intended to provide a comprehensive analysis of the role of architecture in the Roman imagination. Several of the topics and texts touched upon here have been the subjects of much more thorough studies. My purpose in this chapter is rather to build upon the work of other scholars in order to provide a framework through which we might

---

<sup>8</sup> Elsner 2014, 19, employs Aristotle's famous triad of *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos* to suggest that "[a]rchitecture, as a three-dimensional discourse that formed the environment where people lived their lives, may be said to stress *logos*, as the social reality that mediated the doings of people within the Roman world." That is not an unreasonable suggestion. In this chapter, though, I draw upon the way that the Romans themselves conceived of architecture in order to establish my own theoretical framework for analyzing the texts in subsequent chapters.

<sup>9</sup> Of course, as Gruen 1974, 1-2, wisely warns, "[h]indsight deceives and distorts. [...] In order to explain the Republic's fall, it has seemed appropriate to ransack preceding generations for symptoms of decline and signposts for the future. The portrait is shaped to suit the result – a retrojected prophecy." However, as Larmour and Spencer 2007b, 56, argue, "[p]olitically, a ruinous and decaying space was an important element of Augustan ideological fashioning, and...the notion that destruction and devastation are the foundations upon which the city flourishes is a vital element...of Augustus' 'cultural revolution.'" This dissertation is not concerned with the reality of a historical "collapse" of the republic, but rather examines that same "hindsight" which Gruen mentions – which clearly paints the narrative of Rome's recent past as one of "collapse" – as found for instance in the works of Livy and Horace. For more discussion of this "collapse" see Part 4 below, pp. 36-43.

contextualize how Augustan age poets fashioned their poetic *monumenta* as contributions to the monumentalization of Rome. The point will be to establish the historical and literary milieu in which to examine why these poets fashioned their works as “monuments” in the first place, as well as to consider how we might understand Augustus’ collective work in Rome as an architectural *monumentum* in its own right.

Later chapters will demonstrate how Augustus used architecture in his *Res Gestae* to redefine the traditional boundaries between past and present, between private and public, as well as those between Rome as a republic and Rome as his empire. He fashioned the city itself as a kind of “memory store,” I argue, one which all of its citizens could experience and use to define what it meant to be Roman in the Augustan age. The *princeps* did not just add new monuments to the city, in other words, but rather made Rome itself a monument, as he took what was a city of brick and left it one of marble.<sup>10</sup> The poets of this period used the idea of the monument, too, as a means of expanding, dissolving, and reconstituting the boundaries of their own poetry. This was not just in response to what Augustus was doing; the poets were rather in dialogue with Augustus’ monumentalization of the city – and in such a way that their readers could then also better appreciate and evaluate what was happening to their Rome.<sup>11</sup> It is one of the main

---

<sup>10</sup> See above, p. 11, for a brief discussion of Augustus’ famous boast (recorded in Suetonius) that “he was leaving behind a city of marble which he had received as one of brick” (*urbem...marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisse, Div. Aug. 28.3*). Hölkeskamp 2006, 481, defines “collective memory” in the Roman republic as that which “helps a group or society as a whole to articulate an awareness of its defining characteristics and its unity, and therefore forms an essential basis for its self-image and identity.” By turning Rome itself into a kind of *monumentum* – that is, by not simply adding monuments to its landscape, but transforming the landscape itself in the imagination of his subjects – Augustus could have a tremendous influence on the institutions and places through which the Roman people came to “articulate an awareness of its defining characteristics...its self-image and identity.”

<sup>11</sup> In examining the way that the poems of Vergil, Tibullus, and Propertius treat specific Augustan monuments, Rea 2007, 16, proposes that “the poets’ texts and the Augustan landscape, while raising awareness of both the potential advantages and problems that the community would encounter when trying to rebuild their society, also permitted viewers to realize their own conclusions about what they saw and took away from their interaction with the texts and the landscape.” Whereas Rea sees Augustus’ monuments as “inspiration” for the poets, it is important to consider their poems not merely as responses to the Augustan project of monumentalization, but as contributions to its definition, as well.

contentions of this dissertation, in fact, that we can better account for Augustus' successful monumentalization of Rome by examining in parallel the "architecture" that several contemporary poets built in fashioning their works of literature as "monuments," too.<sup>12</sup> And the purpose of this chapter is to show why it was monumental discourse in particular that served as the language through which Augustus and the poets of his age imagined their works.

### **Part 1. Architecturally Speaking: The Imagery of Vitruvius' *De Architectura***

Perhaps the most suitable place to start exploring the role that architecture played in how Romans structured the world around them conceptually would be with the only architectural treatise that survives intact from antiquity, namely, Vitruvius' *De architectura*. The language that this late 1<sup>st</sup>-century BCE architect employed provides a useful window into the intersection of architectural and political discourse in the Roman imagination. It would seem that for Vitruvius the state could in a sense not exist without its architecture – whether in physical fact, or in even the language one uses to describe it.<sup>13</sup> It is through this discourse of monumental architecture that the architect made sense of what Augustus had done to the *res publica*'s physical and metaphorical foundations. And it should not be surprising, then, to find that Vitruvius' language anticipates to a certain degree the *princeps*' own account of this transformation in the *Res Gestae* that will be examined at the end of this chapter, as well as throughout the rest of this dissertation.

---

<sup>12</sup> I find inspiration for this approach in Saiber 2005, 10, where in the analysis of the architectural discourse in Giordano Bruno's writing the scholar expresses the idea that "spatial conceptualization *is* intrinsic to human thought and that exploring the many ways in which space and form manifest in literary language – metaphorically, structurally, methodologically, hermeneutically – will help deepen our understanding of the world around and inside us, as well as the reason for literature." See pp. 5-6 above for how I define "architecture" in this dissertation.

<sup>13</sup> See McEwan 2003 for an analysis of the Vitruvian/Augustan architectural project which suggests that the "body" (*corpus*) of the Roman empire only came into being through its architecture. Both Gros 1994 and Novara 1994 come to similar (yet more cautious) conclusions that anticipate McEwan's argument.

There is no passage in the treatise that better illustrates the architectural nature of this transformation than the preface addressed to Augustus himself. Vitruvius was quite aware of what the *princeps* had been doing to the physical appearance of Rome by the mid-20s BCE; in fact, that is why the architect claims to have written his treatise in the first place:

cum uero adtenderem te non solum de uita communi omnium curam publicaeque rei **constitutione** habere, sed etiam de opportunitate publicorum aedificiorum ut civitas per te non solum prouinciis **esset aucta**, uerum etiam ut maiestas imperii publicorum aedificiorum egregias haberet auctoritates, non putauit praetermittendum quin primo quoque tempore de his rebus ea tibi ederem... (Vitr. Pr.2)<sup>14</sup>

When indeed I noticed the concern you had not only for the common life of all and the **structure** of the state but also concerning the opportunity for public buildings, so that the state would not simply **be made greater** by the acquisition of provinces, but that the majesty of the empire might also have the illustrious authority of public buildings, I thought I should not let pass even the first moment for me to publish the following on these topics for you..."

In the same preface Vitruvius adds that he has dedicated his treatise to Augustus because of what the *princeps* had done, was doing, and would do to the architectural landscape of Rome. "I began to write this for you," the architect tells Augustus,

quod animaduerti multa te aedificauisse et nunc aedificare, reliquo quoque tempore et publicorum et priuatorum aedificiorum, **pro amplitudine** rerum gestarum ut posteris **memoriae** traderentur curam habiturum... (Vitr. Pr.3)

since I noticed that you had built and continue to build much, and that you would in your remaining time take care of both public and private buildings so that **memorials** would be passed down to posterity **proportional to the size** of your achievements...

These two passages demonstrate the importance that Vitruvius believes Augustus attributed to architecture in Rome. In the first one, the architect relates that the *princeps* erected buildings which had "illustrious authority" (*egregias...auctoritates*) in order to ennoble the state – even on the same level as the acquisition of new territories. In the second, moreover, Vitruvius suggests

---

<sup>14</sup> The Latin text of Vitruvius here and following is from Fleury 1990 and Callebaut and Gros 1999 for Books 1 and 2, respectively. See below, pp. 43-45, esp. n. 87, for a discussion of the nuances of the noun, *constitutio*, and its verb, *constituo*.

that both public and private buildings could serve as memorials (*memoriae*) to the greatness of Augustus himself in the sense that they would reflect the magnitude (*amplitudo*) of his military and political achievements. As Kristina Milnor suggests, Vitruvius' point here is "not simply that [Augustus] has built more, better, and bigger...but rather that he has revealed the ways in which architecture can mean something more than the construction of buildings."<sup>15</sup>

That is not the point of my analysis, however. What interests me in these passages is how the architectural *language* in them configures (and reconfigures) the relationship between architecture and the metaphorical structure of the Roman state. In the first passage, Vitruvius neatly parallels the "structure of the state" (*publicae rei constitutio*) with its public architecture (*publica aedificia*) through a *non solum...sed etiam* construction. Through the *ut*-clause expressing effort, moreover, Vitruvius suggests that the reason Augustus has been taking such good care of Rome's metaphorical and physical *constitutio* is that the *princeps* himself is aware that the grandeur of the *res publica*'s physical appearance can affect and indeed amplify the majesty of its metaphorical greatness.

The use of architectural metaphors for the state in republican Roman literature is not new, of course, as we will see below. What is striking here is how by the end of the second passage it would seem that those same sorts of architectural metaphors – and, in particular, the one regarding "size" – have come to represent something other than "the structure" of the republican state. In the first passage, it is the majesty of the state that can be metaphorically increased in size by Augustus' deeds at home and abroad. In the second, however, the actual buildings of Augustus' reign, both private and public, suddenly become *memoriae* for a new kind of metaphorical "structure" to be handed down to posterity. The sense of greatness that these new

---

<sup>15</sup> Milnor 2005, 119.

buildings evoke through their magnificent appearance is now proportional to the great “size” of Augustus’ own “accomplishments” (*pro amplitudine rerum gestarum*) – and no longer the greatness of the state, as it was in the earlier passage.<sup>16</sup>

The architectural language that Vitruvius employs thus allows the architect to stress the stability and structure that the *princeps* has restored to the Roman world – something architectural metaphors do quite well in general<sup>17</sup> – while at the same time suggesting that a transformation has occurred between the old “structure” of the state and the new one under Augustus. In short, the *princeps* might be taking care of the “structure” of the *res publica*; by the end of the preface, however, that *constitutio* has been transformed from the old republican one to one of Augustus’ own construction that signifies *his* greatness, and no longer just the state’s.

Vitruvius was an architect, of course, and he was writing about architecture. It should be noted, though, that seeing the state as a building was not uncommon in the context in which Vitruvius was building, writing, and thinking. At the very origins of Latin literature, for example, there is a fragment from the epic *Annales* of Ennius – famous already in antiquity, as quoted by Cicero at the start of Book V of the *De re publica* – which proclaims that “the Roman state is founded upon (*stat*) its *mores* and men of old.”<sup>18</sup> Rome the city and Rome the institution went together to such an extent that the permanence and stability of its material buildings could even

---

<sup>16</sup> Nor even of the Roman people, as it is in Livy, for example, when he writes of the time when “the senate ordered that duumvirs be elected for making the temple [of Juno Moneta] **proportional to the greatness of the Roman people**” (*Senatus duumviros ad eam aedem pro amplitudine populi Romani faciendam creari iussit*, Liv. 7.28).

<sup>17</sup> As Foucault 1980, 148, puts it in speaking of pre-Modern structures, “the art of building corresponded to the need to make power, divinity and might manifest. [...] Architecture manifested might, the Sovereign, God.” The same could be said of architectural imagery, as Victor Hugo is so keenly aware in his *Notre Dame de Paris* (1831) when discussing architecture and its ability to represent the “structure” of power.

<sup>18</sup> Cic. *Rep.* 5.1 in Ziegler 1969: *moribus antiquis res stat romana virisque* (cf. Enn. *Ann.* 500 V.<sup>2</sup>). For this metaphorical use of *stare* see *OLD*, s.v. “**4** (of things) To be in an upright position on or set in the ground or other support... **15** (of cities, building, etc.) To continue to stand (usu. implying the continuance of the institutions associated with them... **21** (of abst. things, w. abl. or *in* + abl.) To rest, depend, be based (on).” See Richardson 2005 (with bibliography) for how the Roman camp can also be seen to reflect this connection between metaphorical (or “celestial”) and physical order.



represent the structure and stability of the state itself, as Cicero is so eager to suggest of his own house in his *De domo sua*.<sup>19</sup> According to Alexander Demandt, in fact, “the stability of the masonry, the symmetry of the overall system, the subordination of all individual forms to the overall plan make the traits of the Roman political system architecturally visible.”<sup>20</sup> That is not to say that Vitruvius should necessarily be taken as wholly representative of how all Romans *consciously* thought about the structure of their state (if such a thing is even possible to determine). What I would like to suggest is rather that we understand the architect’s work as a more explicit articulation of a deep connection that underlies the way that Romans saw the world around them – a connection not just between the physical and metaphorical idea of the Roman state, but more broadly between the idea of architecture and structure itself.

A sequence of passages from the beginning of Book 2 of the *De architectura* will help to flesh out this connection further. According to Vitruvius, at least, the relationship between the architectural and political spheres starts at the very beginnings of civilization. It was the discovery of fire, Vitruvius tells us, which led to the near simultaneous invention of architecture, political associations, and even language:

In eo hominum congressu cum profundebantur alitae e spiritu voces, cotidiana consuetudine **uocabula** ut optigerant **constituerunt**, deinde significando res saepius in usu ex eventu fari fortuito coeperunt, et ita sermones inter se procreauerunt. [...] Ergo cum propter ignis inuentionem conuentus initio apud homines et concilium et conuictus esset natus...coeperunt...alii de fronde facere tecta, alii speluncas fodere sub montibus, nonnulli hirundinum nidos et aedificationes earum imitantes de luto et uirgulis facere loca quae subirent. (Vitr. 2.1.1-2)

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Cic. *Dom.* 100-103. See Jaeger 1990, 32-39, and Edwards 1993, 156, claiming that “this passage...suggest[s] the particular symbolic associations the destruction of a man’s house might have.” See also Treggiari 1999, 55-56, on *Dom.* 143-147 and the way that “Cicero links the gods of the City and those of his private house”; for Cicero, Treggiari argues, “the home was inextricably linked with religion, civilization, the city and state, the institution of marriage and the family” (40).

<sup>20</sup> Demandt 1982, 54: “*Die Stabilität des Mauerwerks, die Symmetrie der Gesamtanlage, die Unterordnung aller Einzelformen unter den Gesamtplan machen Wesenszüge der römischen Staatsordnung architektonisch sichtbar.*” See also Purcell 1989, 160, where in speaking of the *Forum Romanum* he claims that the space contains “a concrete rendering in the architectural space of institutional forms” – an “illustration,” according to Purcell, “of how the Romans reified their constitutional abstractions.”

In this gathering of people when voices were being poured forth from the soul, **they established words**, as they happened to do, from daily habit. They began then by chance in this way to speak more and more, signifying objects from habit, and thus invented speech among themselves. [...] Therefore, when from the invention of fire the first meeting, assembly, and political association among humankind was born...some began to make houses of leaves, others to hollow out caves under mountains, and some in the imitation of nests and constructions of swallows began to fashion from mud and twigs places where they could dwell.

This passage is famous for how Vitruvius tells of the origins of architecture in such a way that it “becomes embedded with the memory of primary human symbols, especially of fire and of the hearth, and of shelter.”<sup>21</sup> As before, however, the focus of this current study is on the architect’s language. And it is notable that just as humans start building physical structures, they are also said to be “building” language (cf. *uocabula...constituerunt*) – and with it the very foundations of society.<sup>22</sup> It makes sense, then, that Vitruvius’ language itself suggests a correlation between political associations and their architecture: without architecture, there would be no language and no civilization.<sup>23</sup> “In other matters, and especially in architecture,” Vitruvius claims, “there are

---

<sup>21</sup> Frith 2004, 39-40: “With the story of origins of the Primitive hut is also woven the history of human speech and community arising from the gathering around the hearth. Through this narrative, architecture becomes embedded with the memory of primary human symbols, especially of fire and of the hearth, and of shelter... In this way Vitruvius aligns the origins of building with the origins of human society and of concord. Through the reconciliation of the Primitive dwelling with human speech, order is possible in society.”

<sup>22</sup> The connection between architecture and thought is certainly not unique to the Roman imagination. It is interesting to note – as Hahn 2001, 100-101, does – that Egyptian goddess Seshat was the “goddess of architecture and reckoning,” as well as being “recognized as the inventor of writing and the Head of the House of Books.” Hugo 1831 would appear in agreement with Vitruvius concerning the connection of human thought and architecture, as the nineteenth-century Frenchman would write that “[a]rchitecture...developed together with human thought; it became a giant with a thousand heads and a thousand arms, and fixed under an eternal, visible, palpable form all this floating symbolism” (*L’architecture...se développa avec la pensée humaine; elle devint géante à mille têtes et à mille bras, et fixa sous une forme éternelle, visible, palpable, tout ce symbolisme flottant*). See also Heidegger 1951 [2000], 163, where the German philosopher famously triangulates the relationship between thinking and building with the idea of “dwelling” – which he sees as “*the fundamental trait of being, in accordance with how mortals exist*” (*Das Wohnen...ist der Grundzug des Seins, demgemäß die Sterblichen sind*). On the relationship between architecture and writing see also Alain 1920, 105-123, Le Goff 1978, Hamon 1986, Hollier 1989, Wigley 1993, Karatani 1995, and Cowling 1998.

<sup>23</sup> Several scholars have noted the importance of the Roman conceptualization of architecture to rhetoric and the Roman conceptualization of rhetoric to architecture. Frith 2004, 41, claims that “[i]f the task of architecture is to represent order, its means are enabled by *eloquence*. [...] The significance of the reliance by Vitruvius on rhetoric cannot be overstated. Architecture takes on the character of oratory in Western traditions, such that buildings are expected to ‘say’ something.” See also F. R. Brown 1963, Bek 1976, Gros 1991, Callebat 1994, Caye 2011, and now

these two components: that which is signified and that which signifies.”<sup>24</sup> In Roman architecture, for Vitruvius, it is not just the state that is signified by architectural structures, but the idea of order itself – whether physical, political, or perhaps even linguistic.<sup>25</sup>

Only a few paragraphs later in Book 2 of the *De architectura* the reader comes to a passage that confirms more concretely the deep connection between architecture and the Roman state in particular:

apud ceteras quoque gentes et nonnulla loca pari simulique ratione casarum perficiuntur **constitutiones**. Non minus etiam Massiliae animaduertere possumus sine tegulis subacta cum paleis terra tecta. Athenis Areopagi antiquitatis exemplar ad hoc tempus luto tectum. Item in Capitolio commonefacere potest et significare **mores** uetustatis Romuli casa et in arce sacrorum stramentis tecta. (Vitr. 2.1.5)

Among other peoples and in certain places, as well, the **structures** of houses are fashioned in a like and similar way. No less can we pass over the roofs at Marseilles which are made without tiles but with earth joined with straw. The Areopagus at Athens – up to this time an example of antiquity – is roofed with clay. In the same way with straw Romulus’ hut on the Capitoline and the roofs of the temples on the citadel are able to call to mind and signify the *mores* of antiquity.

In the immediately preceding sentences Vitruvius is merely discussing how peoples in different places build their houses with the materials available to them. However, as the architect continues to list the varieties of materials necessary for the various kinds of *constitutiones*, his language starts to slip between describing the physical structures that remain and the *mores* (“behavior/customs”) of the people who built them. This transition starts perhaps with a mention

---

Elsner and Meyer 2014, 35-114, esp. E. Thomas 2014, each of which takes a slightly different approach to the intersection of the “architecture” of architecture and that of rhetoric (and *vice versa*). See also Woodman 1988, 81-95, for an overview of Cicero’s use of architectural metaphors for discussing the “foundations of historiography.”

<sup>24</sup> Vitr. 1.1.3: *Cum in omnibus enim rebus, tum maxime etiam in architectura haec duo insunt, quod significatur et quod significant.*

<sup>25</sup> According to the famous 17<sup>th</sup>-century French architect Claude Perrault in his edition of Vitruvius, “[a]rchitecture is of all the sciences the one to which the Greeks gave a name signifying superiority and stewardship over the others” (cited in Hollier 1989, 36). See also Ruskin 1849, 205, claiming that “architecture must be the beginning of arts, and that the others must follow her in their time and order.” For how Vitruvius is in possible dialogue here with Stoic philosophy see also McEwan 2003, 57, arguing that “Vitruvius understood architecture in terms of a purposeful universe, a world-body shot through with same cohesive ratio that made, for Cato, the Stoic system which reflected it ‘so well constructed, so firmly jointed and welded into one.’ It is especially in its unquestioning assumption of the cardinal value of coherence that *De architectura* belongs to Stoicism.”

of the Areopagus in Athens, which still exists as “an example of antiquity,” but becomes more pronounced in the discussion of Romulus’ hut. “The image here is of a primitive hut,” of course, but as Idris McEwan rightly suggests in her reading of the passage, “primitive construction methods are not its signified matter.” It is such a basic assumption for Vitruvius that the *constitutiones* of old buildings represent the early “foundations” of the state – the *mores* upon which it stands, as Ennius and Cicero put it – that he easily transitions from talking about roof-making in Marseilles to the famous Areopagus of Athens to Romulus’ hut in Rome together with the *mores* that it represents.<sup>26</sup>

This all appears to be very natural for Vitruvius, though. In his mind, at least, architecture and political structures (together with the language to describe them both) have been closely bound from the very start of human civilization. And it is by practicing architecture, he goes on to claim in the very next paragraph, that humankind not only discovered “other arts and disciplines,” but also advanced “from a wild and savage life to civilized society.”<sup>27</sup> It is by *doing* architecture, in other words, that people began to understand and conceptualize other “structures” – scientific as well as political.<sup>28</sup> It is not hard in that case to see why architecture and

---

<sup>26</sup> McEwan 2003, 81, also connects this passage in the *De architectura* to the aforementioned line from Ennius (which Cicero quotes at the beginning of Book 5 of his *De re publica*): “For an educated Roman, the *mores vetustatis* signified by the hut of Rome’s founder would have been the same as the customs of ancient times that Cicero claimed were the foundation of the Roman commonwealth.” See also Rea 2007, 21-43, for an analysis of the hut of Romulus in Augustan poetry, with a particular focus on its relation to the *Domus Augusti*.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Vit. 2.1.6: *cum autem cotidie faciendo tritiores manus ad aedificandum perfecissent et sollertia ingenia exercendo per consuetudinem ad artes peruenissent... tunc uero ex fabricationibus aedificiorum gradatim progressi ad ceteras artes et disciplinas, e fera agrestique uita ad mansuetam perduxerunt humanitatem*. See also Callebat and Gros 1999, 75, noting *ad loc.* that “this theory of civilization – which dates without doubt to Xenocrates, but was developed to its full potential by the schools of Hippocrates and Democritus – may have been transmitted to Vitruvius through Cicero” ([c]ette théorie de la civilization qui remonte sans doute à Xenocratès, mais dont les écoles d’Hippocrate et de Démocrite ont développé toutes les potentialités, a peut-être été transmise à Vitruve par l’intermédiaire de Cicéron). But see Rowland, Howe, and Dewar 1999, 173, *ad loc.*, suggesting that “Vitruvius probably got most of his account from Lucretius” and citing Lucr. 5.925-1105 as the most likely source.

<sup>28</sup> See Hollier 1989, 33, claiming that “[t]here is...no way to describe a system without resorting to the vocabulary of architecture. When structure defines the general form of legibility, nothing becomes legible unless it is submitted to the architectural grid. Architecture under these conditions is the archistructure, the system of systems. The keystone of systematicity in general, it organizes the concord of languages and guarantees universal legibility.” Wilson 1988, 61-62, 153, takes an anthropological approach to this topic and argues that “[a]rchitecture is a materialization of

architectural language are such important parts of how Vitruvius articulates what he sees happening to the landscape of Rome under Augustus both physically and metaphorically. In short, the idea of “structure” – be it political or otherwise – is by its very nature architectural for Vitruvius.<sup>29</sup>

If we return to Vitruvius’s preface it is perhaps possible to see more clearly now why he is so prone to employ architectural imagery to communicate the changes that Augustus made to the *res publica* through his public and private buildings. Since systems in general would appear to be architectural for Vitruvius, it makes sense that the architect uses architectural imagery to convey the change in Rome’s system of government – that is, its structure, or in Latin, its *constitutio*.

Did all Romans consciously see such a deep connection between architecture and the imaginative systems by which they ordered their existence? It is not possible to determine that with any certainty. And we should be cautious about applying the *specifics* of Vitruvius’ views as an architect to what other Romans, including Augustus, may have consciously thought about architecture’s power as a metaphor for the way they conceived the world around them. There is

---

structure, and the adoption of architecture as a permanent feature of life introduces spatial organization and allocation as an ordering visual dimension. Some circumstantial evidence of the transfer of spatial structure to the structure of human activities is present from the beginning... Domesticated society is founded on and dominated by the elementary and original structure, the building, which serves not just as shelter but as diagram and, more generally, as *the source for metaphors of structure that make possible the social construction and reconstruction of reality*” (my emphasis).

<sup>29</sup> See Frith 2004, 40, analyzing this passage and similarly concluding that “[s]ociety can only have developed once the origins of building had been established, permitting human beings to develop the other arts and sciences, and so human beings ‘passed from a rude and barbarous mode of life to civilization and refinement.’” In speaking of the emergence of Western politics in the Greco-Roman world, McEwan 1993, 73-74, goes so far as to suggest that “if we understand the craftsman as a *demiourgos* in the wider Greek sense of the term, yet retain the primordality of the notion of craft in its more limited, physical sense, as the early Greeks did when they claimed that there was no community, no civilization, without such craft, then it becomes quite clear that the emergence of Greek politics – indeed of Western politics – hinged upon the craft tradition, and upon how craft was understood”; in fact, according to McEwan, “all of Western thinking was first grounded in architecture” (130). See also Senseney 2011, 9, where he argues for a connection between architectural drawing and the birth of Western philosophy. One of Senseney’s primary contentions is that we should understand the “relationship between drawing, seeing, and the birth of theoretical philosophy as an inward seeing associated with knowledge (‘insight’), ways of envisioning nature, and even the nature of vision itself.”

fortunately other evidence, however, that suggests how architecture may have been an essential component in the way that Romans gave order and meaning to their lives and thoughts. The famous “art of memory” (*ars memoriae*) that Roman orators employed required its users, as the next section will demonstrate, to create architectural settings in their minds for the purpose of structuring their own thoughts, as well as the thoughts of their audiences.

## Part 2. The Architecture of the Roman *Ars Memoriae*

In Book 2 of the *De oratore* Cicero writes about how the Greek poet Simonides invented the so-called “art of memory.”<sup>30</sup> And the particular origin story that Cicero describes is relevant to this current study for the role that architecture plays in it. The poet is said to have been dining with one of his patrons, Scopas, when he was called outside to meet with a pair of youths. As soon as he left, though, the room (*conclave*) in which they were dining collapsed upon Scopas and his companions. But when the friends of the dead wished to bury their comrades it was Simonides who was able to help identify each of the corpses because he knew the place in which each of them had sat by remembering the setting itself.<sup>31</sup> It was because of this, Cicero writes, that the poet “is reported to have discovered that it is order most of all that gives clarity to

---

<sup>30</sup> On the Greco-Roman *ars memoriae* see Rossi 1960, 1-14, Yates 1966, 1-49, Blum 1969, and Leach 1988, 75-78. Vasaly 1993, 100-102, Treggiari 1999, and now Möller 2013, 283-294, all treat Cicero’s account of the art in particular. Bergmann 1994 successfully demonstrates how a Roman aristocrat could use the *ars memoriae* to structure the art displayed in his villa in such a way as to emerge “as a cultured agent in the Roman creation of an ancestral past” in front of his guests (255). Non-classicist scholars have also paid attention to the Roman *ars memoriae*, including: Said 2000, 179-180, arguing that “[m]emory for Cicero was something organized and structured. [...] The modern art of memory is much more subject to inventive reordering and redeploying than that”; and Wilson 1988, 76, where he suggests that “[i]n many ways the memory system of Cicero is a reversal of the ‘order’ of events in which architecture serves people. The memory system pins facts onto buildings, but in everyday life buildings present, represent, and commemorate facts of the world to people.”

<sup>31</sup> Cic. *De or.* 2.353: *Paulo post esse ferunt nuntiatum Simonidi, ut prodiret; iuvenis stare ad ianuam duo quosdam, qui eum magno opere evocarent; surrexisse illum, prodisse, vidisse neminem: hoc interim spatio conclave illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidisse; ea ruina ipsum cum cognatis oppressum suis interisse: quos cum humare vellent sui neque possent obtritos internoscere ullo modo, Simonides dicitur ex eo, quod meminisset quo eorum loco quisque cubisset, demonstrator unius cuiusque sepeliendi fuisse...*

memory” (*invenisse fertur ordinem esse maxime, qui memoriae lumen adferret, Cic. De or.*

2.353). Simonides thus came to the conclusion that one could create places in the mind to set the ideas one wanted to remember. In this way, then,

*ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conservaret, res autem ipsas rerum effigies notaret atque ut locis pro cera, simulacris pro litteris uteremur. (Cic. De or. 2.354)*

while the order of places would keep the order of things, the symbol of the things would denote the things themselves, and we would use the places as we would wax tablets, and the symbols as we would letters.

Given that the first place to be involved in the art of memory was a room in a house (*conclave*), it seems logical that it is mostly architectural locales which are recommended as the places in which to set symbols of what one wishes to remember. In the 1<sup>st</sup> Century BCE Latin rhetorical treatise known as the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for instance, it is to architectural forms that the orator should turn as the most suitable places for grounding his memory:

Locos appellamus eos qui breviter, perfecte, insignite aut natura aut manu sunt absoluti, ut eos facile naturali memoria comprehendere et amplecti queamus: ut **aedes, intercolumnium, angulum, fornicem, et alia quae his similia sunt.** ([Cic.] *Rhet. Her.* 3.16.29)

We call “settings” those places which are either naturally or artificially set off on a small scale, as a complete unit, and conspicuously, so that we can grasp and embrace them easily by our natural memory, such as **a house, the space between two columns, a corner, an arch, and other settings like these.**

Although the writer of the treatise suggests that the best places to set symbols can be either “naturally or artificially set off” as distinct (*aut natura aut manu...absoluti*), his list of locales includes *only* architectural ones.<sup>32</sup> Natural spaces can of course be small in scale (*breviter*) and

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Quint. 11.2.18-20, where the 1<sup>st</sup>-century CE Roman rhetorician suggests that a typical Roman villa is an excellent place for setting the symbols that one wants to remember. Leach 1988, 75, argues that “[a]lthough the rhetorical writings of the Republic contain no specific guidelines for describing topographical contexts or landscapes, they do provide evidence, perhaps even more enlightening than prescriptive formulas might be, for a structure of thinking closely associated with the conceptualization of physical places and for the visual powers that such mental activity necessitates. These suggestions are incorporated into the fundamental discipline of the *ars memoriae*.”

quite conspicuous (*insignite*) – both of which are good qualities for constructing memory stores. It is architecture, though, that best provides the sense of completeness (cf. *perfecte*) which can give order and stability to a system of memory in which to place symbols.<sup>33</sup> Architectural settings give clear, distinct boundaries, in other words, which promote a sense of order that a fully natural setting on its own would seem less able to create.

Nor does it matter in the end how conspicuous and memorable a symbol on its own might be. As the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* stresses, it is absolutely essential for orators to keep the architectural backgrounds themselves fresh in their minds:

**Sed illud facere oportebit**, ut identidem primos quosque **locos** imaginum renovandarum causa celeriter animo pervagemus. ([Cic.] *Rhet. Her.* 3.22.37)

But **it will be essential to do this**: that we again and again run quickly in our minds through all the original **places** for the sake of remembering the symbols.

Orators should think of symbols that are distinctive enough to keep separate in their minds; even more important, though, they must be able to refresh the backgrounds for these symbols, or else it would seem that the symbols have little value for memory on their own.<sup>34</sup> If you lose the place, in other words, you risk losing all the symbols that go with it, too.

As scholars have argued, however, these “memory mansions” can affect not just the minds of the orators, but potentially the minds of their audiences, as well. In her influential book on Cicero’s use of space Ann Vasaly has shown the way in which the *ars memoriae* also impacted how the listeners of an oration would see the world around them. Since the “training in

---

<sup>33</sup> See Part 1 of this chapter above, pp. 16-25, for a discussion of the connection of order and architecture in the Roman imagination. This link between order and architecture can be found in many modern theorists, as well, including: Scott 1914 [1999], 174, where he claims that “our instinct craves for order, since order is the pattern of the human mind. And the pattern of the mind, no less than the body’s humour, may be reflected in the concrete world”; and Olsen 1986, 307, stating that “[t]he human mind has in all times and places attempted to impose an intelligible structure on disorderly reality” through architectural structures.

<sup>34</sup> As the 20<sup>th</sup>-century French philosopher Gaston Bachelard puts it in his important essays on *La poétique de l’espace*, “memories are motionless, all the more solidly those which are better fixed in space” (*souvenirs sont immobiles, d’autant plus solides qu’ils sont mieux spatialisés*, 1957 [1961], 37).



the *ars memoriae* not only accustomed the orator to create ‘visual’ pictures in his mind but taught him to associate abstract ideas with these pictures,”<sup>35</sup> Vasaly suggests that

Cicero may well have understood that the mnemonic technique by which he impressed ideas on his own mind could be employed to impress concepts on the minds of his listeners. [...] Cicero’s connection of ideas with specific places and objects... might...have figured in his application (whether conscious or unconscious) of the principles of the *ars memoriae* to the task of manipulating the thoughts and feelings of an audience.”<sup>36</sup>

It is in part this specific understanding of the *ars memoriae* that leads Vasaly to conclude her study with the pithy (and oft-cited) remark that Cicero’s “constant reliance on the visual and the concrete was but the Roman gateway to the world of ideas.”<sup>37</sup> Although only the Roman orator would see the memory mansion, of course, the construction of that structure might have demonstrated to him the usefulness of using “the concrete” (as Vasaly puts it) in order to impact the minds of his listeners, too. “This method of memory training reminds us,” as Bettina Bergmann claims, “how essential the built frame was for the Romans as an organizer of objects, thoughts, and experience.”<sup>38</sup> It is therefore architecture, just as it was for Vitruvius above, which can be said to have provided a sense of order for the Romans – even for a world created within their imaginations.

Now that the fundamental connections between architecture and structure in the constructions of the Roman state and of Roman memory have been outlined it is possible to discuss a particular kind of architectural space that links these two “structures” even more

---

<sup>35</sup> Vasaly 1993, 100.

<sup>36</sup> Vasaly 1993, 101, 256.

<sup>37</sup> Vasaly 1993, 257. See Jaeger 1997, 20-23, for how the *ars memoriae* was a model that Livy relied upon in his reconstruction of Rome – as well as in his “construction” of a readership that could read it (for which see below, pp. 42-43).

<sup>38</sup> Bergmann 1994, 225. See also Elsner 1995, 49-87, for an analysis that treats the house as perhaps the essential structure for Roman thought.

closely. These special spaces, which will be examined throughout the rest of this dissertation, produced a powerful and persuasive reminder of the past in the present by serving as both setting and symbol at the same time. They thus acted as an essential means by which Romans could establish an identity for themselves that transcended time and (re-)defined their past as part their present. These incredible and fascinating structures are what the Romans called *monumenta* (“monuments”).

### **Part 3. Roman *Monumenta* and Monumentality**

There is a clear divide in rhetorical theory between the architectural settings and the symbols one places within them. As noted in the previous section, Cicero writes that “while the order of places would keep the order of things, the symbol of the things would denote the things themselves.”<sup>39</sup> In the preface to Vitruvius’ treatise, however, Augustus’ architectural structures *themselves* seem to become the symbols for representing his power: they are to serve as the “memorials” (*memoriae*) to be handed down to posterity in proportion to the “height” (*amplitudo*) of the *princeps*’ achievements.<sup>40</sup> Such buildings have a different effect on one’s memory from simply being the background in which symbolic objects are placed; rather, they are in a sense the symbols, too – just as both the Areopagus in Athens and Romulus’ hut on the Capitoline can come to symbolize ancient *mores* in Vitruvius’ eyes.<sup>41</sup>

Architectural structures of this sort thus occupy a unique space as both the symbol and the setting, representing what must be remembered and the space that can give a solid form to that symbol in the imagination. The Romans had a particular word for such a structure:

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Cic. *De or.* 2.354. For further discussion of this passage see pp. 25-26 above.

<sup>40</sup> See pp. 17-20 above for analysis of the preface to Vitruvius’ *De Architectura*.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Vitr. 2.1.5, examined above, pp. 22-24.

*monumentum*.<sup>42</sup> For the Romans, at least, a *monumentum* provided not just a “reminder” of some event or person in the past; more than that, it presented a tangible, ordered, and often very conspicuous space in which to ground and sometimes redefine that memory.<sup>43</sup>

The next part of this chapter will demonstrate that the label of *monumentum* need not be applied to a literal building – let alone a physical object – in the text of Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*. That does not mean, however, that an architectural significance is ever completely absent from the term. In his *De latina lingua*, for instance, the 1<sup>st</sup>-century BCE antiquarian Varro provides an etymology which stresses an evolution of the word along architectural lines.

Meminisse a memoria, cum in id quod remansit in mente rursus movetur; quae a manendo ut manimoria potest esse dicta. [...] Ab eodem monere, quod is qui monet, proinde sit ac memoria; sic monimenta quae in **sepulcris**, et ideo secundum viam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis. Ab eo **cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa** monimenta dicta. (Varro *Ling.* 6.49)<sup>44</sup>

*Meminisse* (“to remember”) comes from *memoria* (“memory”), since there is again movement back toward that which has remained in the mind – and it is possible that this word was derived from *manere* (“to remain”) like *manimoria*. [...] From the same word comes *monere* (“remind”), because he who reminds is exactly like a memory; so are derived *monimenta* (“monuments”) which are in **gravesites**, and for that reason they are along the road so that they can remind passersby that they themselves lived and that the passersby are mortal. From this definition **other things that are written or produced for the sake of memory** are called *monimenta*.

Although the word *monimenta* was originally attached to “gravesites” (*sepulchra*) along the road, Varro claims that the word eventually came to refer to anything “written or produced for the sake of memory” (cf. *cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa*).<sup>45</sup> This particular version

---

<sup>42</sup> Although the alternative spelling, *monimentum*, is less frequent, it will appear in several of the texts that I will cite hereafter. I will always use the *monumentum* spelling for discussing the concept in general.

<sup>43</sup> See also Jaeger 1997, 16, speaking of how *monimenta* “occupy a middle ground” in a more temporal sense from the one I am discussing here, namely, that “[t]hey remind people here and now of events and persons that are remote in space and time. They stand between – between their maker and their viewer; between an exploit, *res gesta*, and the viewer or reader whom the commemorated exploit inspires.”

<sup>44</sup> The Latin text of Varro is from Spengel and Spengel 1885.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Festus p.123 L: *Monumentum est, quod et mortui causa aedificatum est et quicquid ob memoriam alicuius factum est, ut fana, porticus, scripta et carmina*; Porph., *ad Hor.* C. 1.2.15: *monumentum non sepulcrum tantum dicitur, sed omnia quidquid memoriam testator*; Flor. *Dig.* 11.7.42: *monumentum generaliter res est memoriae*

of the word's history does suggest, however, that Romans at the end of the republic still understood the architectural significance of *monumentum*; in fact, as John Bodel puts it, “[t]he term *monumentum*...was in classical Latin *vox propria* for ‘tomb’, and the primary purpose of a tomb.”<sup>46</sup>

A *monumentum* is thus on the one hand an object that reminds us of something else – something that is absent, that is abstract, that is separate from us.<sup>47</sup> Roman monumentality creates a kind of “aura,” as Walter Benjamin would say, that produces “a sense of distance, however close [an object] may be” (*apparition unique d’un lointain, si proche soit-il*).<sup>48</sup> And yet architectural *monumenta* are present, right in front of us, visible as well as tangible. It is just as important to acknowledge this sense of presence together with that of absence because of the effects that the former can have upon a viewer. For example, as Jaś Elsner claims in his study on the discourse of monumentality in Greco-Roman historiography,

monuments as ideas or ideological constructs always have the added dimension of having been real things. They authorize discourse, and thus act to persuade the reader, by referring with apparent simplicity to artefacts outside language. [...] They *exist* (as artefacts), and so what they *mean* (as signs in language) must therefore be true.<sup>49</sup>

---

*causa in posterum prodita*. For a concise catalog of the different uses of *monumentum* see Jaeger 1997, 17-18 (and, in particular, n. 9). Drawing upon *TLL* 8.1460-1466 Jaeger suggests that the term denotes virtually any sort of “reminder” – from “buildings to place-names; from items made for the purpose, like inscriptions and statues, to acquired marks, like scars and mutilations; from published versions of speeches to trophies and spoils.”

<sup>46</sup> Bodel 1997, 21. See also Hollier 1989, 36, claiming that “[t]he monument and the pyramid are where they are to cover up a place, to fill in a void: the one left by death. Death must not appear, it must not take place: let tombs cover it up and take its place.”

<sup>47</sup> As Häusle 1980, 59, frames it, “[i]t is the nature of every monument that it points beyond itself” (*[e]s liegt im Wesen jedes Denkmals, daß es über sich hinausweist*). See also Jaeger 1997, 18, arguing that “to look on a *monumentum* is to experience a psychological distance between oneself and the *monumentum*, the consciousness of being separate from, contrasted with, or measured against it.”

<sup>48</sup> Benjamin 1936, 43. This discussion of “aura” comes from Benjamin’s famous essay (originally published in French) on idea of “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” For a discussion of Benjamin and his thoughts on architecture see Vidler 2000, 81-97. Larmour and Spencer 2007b, 12-15, also turn to Benjamin’s conception of architectural space to introduce their recent volume on *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*.

<sup>49</sup> Elsner 1994, 224-225. See also E. Thomas 2007 for a nuanced treatment of Roman monumentality in the Antonine era. According to Thomas, monuments were largely responsible for giving tangible form to the idea of the Roman empire in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century CE.

The “present-ness” of a monument makes it an effective form of persuasion. Architectural structures of stone or some other long-lasting material impose a sense of solidity and permanence upon the mind of an onlooker that helps turn such artifacts into “proof” that an event in the past happened.<sup>50</sup> There is a reason, as discussed above in the preceding section, why Roman orators relied upon such structures not only for enhancing their own memories but even for changing the perspectives of their audiences. What could be a more persuasive form of evidence than an imposing structure that seems to resist the corrupting agents of time or the limits of gravity placed upon all things?

Roman monumentality when understood in this light is not merely about the size or shape of a structure.<sup>51</sup> Nor about the time and wealth that it took to construct it.<sup>52</sup> Nor even necessarily related to the monumental nature of the “subject” itself that is being commemorated.<sup>53</sup> All those aspects – together with the sense of durability discussed above – do contribute to monumentality.

---

<sup>50</sup> See Edwards 1996, 134, where the scholar notes that “[t]ying ideas and monuments to places may seem to anchor them, to give them permanence,” even if that anchoring itself is only temporary. There are other effects, of course, that a monument’s assumed stability and permanence can have upon its viewer according to modern scholarship on the topic. Choay 2001, 6-7, argues that “[f]or those who erect it, as for those who receive its messages, the monument is a defense against the traumas of existence, a security measure. It is the guarantor of origins, allaying anxieties inspired by the uncertainties of our beginnings. Antidote to entropy, to the dissolving action of time on all things natural and artificial, it seeks to appease our fear of death and annihilation.” To this end, moreover, a monument can even serve as a means of proclaiming one’s immortality to posterity, as Wilson 1988, 130, suggests: “[Monuments] aim to produce *the effect of permanence*. At the deepest metaphysical, spiritual level, tombs overcome death. If this is so, then the greater, more solid and monumental the tomb or mausoleum, the greater the effect of overcoming death, the more convincing and successful the effort would seem to be, the more probable it would appear to onlookers as well as perpetrators that death has been conquered.”

<sup>51</sup> Meyers 2012, 1-20, presents an excellent introduction to the idea of monumentality in the Roman and Etruscan world in a co-edited volume with Michael Thomas that is dedicated to the topic. Meyers points to three qualities of monumentality in specific: [1] “durability,” [2] “visibility,” and [3] “commemoration.” See also the contribution to the volume by P. Gregory Warden (82-110), in which he argues that “[t]he impression of monumentality can also result from the deep historicity of architectural forms” (97). E. Thomas 2007, 17-28 (“Principles of Monumental Form in Antiquity”) presents a wide-ranging yet concise survey of monumentality in the ancient world in general and 2<sup>nd</sup>-century CE Rome in specific.

<sup>52</sup> See Tuck 2012, 56: “[M]onumentality need not be understood simply in terms of amplification of architectural scale. The perception by the intended audience of monumentality, whether of structure or event, relates more to the degree of observable energy and expense invested in it.”

<sup>53</sup> Warden 2012, 97: “A work can be monumental in its style as well as in its materiality, and I would argue that a work might be monumental in its subject.”

As I define it, however, monumentality is the ability of a structure in particular to suggest something significant about the past to a viewer, that is, to urge an onlooker to stop and reflect upon the structure's meaning.<sup>54</sup> I am not suggesting that all "documents" of the past should necessarily be seen as monuments, as Michel Foucault claimed that they are today by historians.<sup>55</sup> It is rather the sense of having an architectural *structure* – as with the original conception of the Roman *monumentum* as a tomb noted above – which sets monuments apart from other objects of the past in this dissertation. That structure does not always have to be literal, of course, as we will see in the case of the poetry examined in the following chapters. What all these texts do have in common is the way they use the idea of structure inherent to Roman monumentality to configure the generic boundaries of their poetry – whether by stressing it (Chapter III), destabilizing it (Chapter IV-V), or even transcending it (Chapter VI).

The location, the size, the material, the decoration, the labor, even the age<sup>56</sup> – all these attributes, either in total or individually, open up a dialogue with the viewer.<sup>57</sup> Why is a

---

<sup>54</sup> According to Miles 1995, 17, "*Monumentum*...is based on IE \**men-*, 'to think,' plus the causative suffix \**-yo*, plus *mentum*, and expanded form of the suffix *-men*, and so means, at base, 'something that makes one think.'" In his famous essay on "Architecture" (1910) Alfred Loos describes one's experience of architectural structures along fairly similar lines: "When walking through a wood, you find a rise in the ground, six foot long and three foot wide, heaped up in a rough pyramid shape, then you turn serious, and something inside you says: someone lies buried here. *That is architecture*" (as cited in Hollier 1989, xxi).

<sup>55</sup> Foucault 1969, 15. I will discuss below, pp. 199-200, how Foucault's views fit into the more general discourse of monumentality in modernity.

<sup>56</sup> See Riegl 1903, 22-29, for a discussion of *Alterswert* ("Age-Value"). In his influential 1903 essay on *Der Moderne Denkmalkultus: Sein Wesen und Seine Entstehung* ("The Modern Cult of the Monument: Its Form and Origin"), Riegl goes on to distinguish also [1] *historische Wert* ("Historical Value") and [2] *gewolte Erinnerungswert* ("Intentional Commemorative-Value"), as well as in his own time [3] *Gebrauchswert* ("Use-Value") and [4] *Kunstswert* ("Art-Value"), as the other ways in which one can appreciate the monumentality of an object.

<sup>57</sup> The 20<sup>th</sup>-century Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein would seem to have understood architecture – or at least "*gute Architektur*" – in a similar way, that is, as something that engenders a response in its viewer. "Architecture is a *gesture*," Wittgenstein claims. "Not every purposeful movement of the human body is a gesture. No more is every functional building architecture. [...] Remember the impression of good architecture, that it expresses a thought. You want to respond to it with a gesture." (*Architektur ist eine Geste. Nicht jede zweckmäßige Bewegung des menschlichen Körpers ist eine Geste. Sowenig, wie jedes zweckmäßige Gebäude Architektur [...] Erinnere Dich an den Eindruck guter Architektur, daß sie einen Gedanken ausdrückt. Man möchte auch ihr mit einer Geste folgen*, 1980, 42, 22.)

monument where it is? What does its form or decoration or inscription signify? Who built it and why? And ultimately what does it mean to me and who I am? Those are just a few of the questions that a monumental structure raises in the imagination of whoever its audience may be. There might not be one meaning, of course, but the point is that a structure with monumentality can stimulate people who come across it to respond by thinking about its significance to them and by extension their place in the world.

It is this quality of monumentality to cause reflection that makes monuments so important for the way that many cultures give definition to their own identity. For the Romans, too, as Wallace-Hadrill suggests, “monumental building require[d] such a concerted attempt on the part of a community, [was] such a commitment of resource, and le[ft] behind so conspicuous a public symbol, that it is hard not to read it as a significant statement of identity.”<sup>58</sup> Part 1 of this chapter suggested that such an understanding of monumentality underlies several of the passages from Vitruvius’ treatise: a *monumentum* such as the hut of Romulus can serve, for instance, as a mirror by which Romans could understand the humble *mores* of Rome’s past – just as the grand monuments of the architect’s present could help Romans come to terms with the current greatness of their empire, as well as that of their new *princeps*.

There is another side to monumentality, however, that is just as important to consider when looking at the idea of the monument in the Roman imagination. In the moment that a

---

<sup>58</sup> Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 103. For how monuments can serve to define Greek and Roman “Others,” as well, see also Elsner 1994, 228-229, where he argues that a “monument, the product of a people, can serve to epitomise what is typical about them. It can freeze what is...the essence of a people in a convenient and accessible miniature. The monument becomes not only the product of, but also a metonym for the race, the culture, the way of living, the rationality and expectations of the people and environment. [...] They encapsulate identity by embodying the past as it exists in the present; they focus in terms of the past the present’s sense of being what it is.” On the connection between architecture and identity more broadly see also Norberg-Schulz 1971, 29, claiming that “[d]uring his [or her] development the individual discovers a structured whole which he [or she] shares with others and which more than anything else gives him [or her] a sense of identity,” and Sherratt 1990, 165, where the scholar concludes that “[m]egalith building became the metaphor within which social conflicts and ideological competition were played out. In this sense, megaliths were as much a cause as a consequence of social complexity.”

*monumentum* causes its onlooker to think about its meaning there is also the opportunity for him or her in this instant of reflection to consider the nature of monuments themselves. There is an opening, in other words, to think about how a monument works – as well as how it might fail. In an illuminating essay on monuments in Roman poetry Don Fowler tried to articulate this complex duality inherent in monumentality:

The epistemological status of the monument is an uncertain one... Reading the stones is always multiple, but it cannot be so controlled: and it will do no good to argue that those who read the monuments differently must have been misreading them. [...] The essence of the monument is paradoxically its lack of monumental stability, the way in which it is constantly reused and given new meaning, and therefore its inability to offer a return rather than a new journey.<sup>59</sup>

Monuments do not last forever.<sup>60</sup> Yet their physical appearance is not the lone aspect of these structures that begins to fade away with time: their meaning is subject to change even more rapidly perhaps with each new viewer. Although modern scholarship tends to describe this epistemological “failure” of the monument as part of its so-called “death” in the 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries,<sup>61</sup> this dissertation suggests that the Romans of the Augustan age productively acknowledged and even embraced the inherent malleability of meaning within their idea of monumentality.<sup>62</sup> The chapters following this one will examine how the Augustan poets engaged

---

<sup>59</sup> Fowler 2000, 205, 209-210, 211.

<sup>60</sup> This was especially the case, perhaps, in Roman culture where *spolia*, that is, architectural pieces taken from one building or monument to construct another, demonstrated quite explicitly the physical malleability of monuments. See Kinney 2001 where he delves deeply into significance of *spolia* as not merely “symptoms of influence, but symbols of the acceptance of authority of the Latin/Roman past” (140).

<sup>61</sup> On the “death(s) of the monument” in modernity see Hugo 1831, Mumford 1937, Smithson 1966 [1996], Choay 2001, Carpo 2007. I will return to this topic in the conclusion to this dissertation below, pp. 189-202.

<sup>62</sup> Many scholars of monumentality today have discounted the Roman version of the concept as facile. See Choay 2001, 19, arguing in her landmark study on the idea of the monument in Western culture that the monuments of the Romans – while seemingly based on a modern conception of monumentality – were “not oriented toward a vision of the past” in the way that modern ones are; rather, according to Choay, these monumental structures were “motivated by taste and a desire [on the part of the Romans] to infuse themselves visually with the plastic world of Greece.” See also Riegl 1903, 10, claiming that “[a]ll of Antiquity and the Middle Ages in essence only knew intentional monuments” (*Das ganze Altertum und Mittelalter haben nun im Grunde bloß gewollte Denkmale gekannt*). In the same essay, though, Riegl would at least admit that the Romans presented “an anachronistic precursor of modern commemorative value” (*ein anachronistischer Vorläufer des modernen Erinnerungswertes*). As I demonstrate in



with the monumentalization of Rome by staging it in the monumentalization of their own poems – taking advantage of the dual nature of monuments to open the process up to critique while contributing to it at the same time. In the concluding chapter I will return to the issues surrounding monumentality in our own present to suggest that the Romans responded to a monument’s dual nature as both stable and unstable epistemologically not by proclaiming its “death,” as many have today, but rather by utilizing that very same (seemingly paradoxical) stable flexibility to breathe new life into traditional structures, generic and political as much as architectural.

Before I begin to analyze Augustan poetry, however, it will be beneficial to have a better sense of the sort of monumental discourse with which the poets were engaging. And for that I will now turn to a prose author and text whose monumentality has been the focus of much scholarship: Livy and his history of Rome *Ab urbe condita* (“From the Founding of the City”).<sup>63</sup> My focus here will be on Livy’s famous preface. Not only will the analysis of Livy’s text provide a taste of what is to follow in the examination of Augustan poets; it will also illustrate in action several of the ideas regarding monumentality in the Roman imagination discussed thus far.

#### **Part 4. Livy’s Monumental History**

The Roman historian Livy started at the very beginning of the Augustan age to write his history on the city of Rome from its earliest days to his present. The preface to this immense work presents a connection between architecture and the state that is very similar in certain

---

this dissertation, however, the Roman understanding of *monumenta* was highly-developed and perhaps even more nuanced in certain respects than the way many look at monuments today.

<sup>63</sup> See Wheeldon, 1989, Moles 1993, Miles 1995, 16-20, Jaeger 1997, *passim*, esp. 1-29, and Feldherr 1998, 1-50.

respects to the one that was analyzed above in the imagery of Vitruvius' treatise. There is a difference, though, and a rather important one: whereas the architect writes about the building up of Rome, the historian is focused just as much on Rome's supposed "collapse." Livy was writing at a time when Rome was in ruin – both the physical city and the idea of the state – and the future seemed far from certain.<sup>64</sup> What matters most for the present study is that Livy seems to put forth his own work as a possible solution to the breakdown of Rome's "structure." He fashions his history as a *monumentum* in itself – one that can anchor and materialize the past while at the same time utilizing the less stable side of monumentality to fashion better readers of Rome's monumentalization under Augustus.

Several passages in Livy's preface aim to establish his history as another *monumentum* within the city of Rome. The historian quite explicitly uses the example of a monument, in fact, in explaining to his readers how they should understand his work:

Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli **documenta** in illustri posita **monumento intueri**; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod uites. (Liv. Pr.10)<sup>65</sup>

There is this exceptionally beneficial and fruitful part in the study of [past] affairs, namely, that you **examine proofs** of every possible example as set on a distinguished *monumentum*. You may then choose for yourself and your state what to imitate, as well as what you should avoid as being as bad in its beginning as it is in its outcome.

In this way, as scholars have argued, Livy's history itself also becomes a kind of *monumentum*.<sup>66</sup> The language he uses here transforms his readers into viewers who can examine (*intueri*) the examples (*exempla*) that Livy puts forth in his text – choosing to emulate the good and avoid the bad. This is not the first time in the preface that Livy uses the word *monumentum*, either. A few

---

<sup>64</sup> Livy wrote the first five books of his *Ab urbe condita* from 27 to 25 BCE. For discussion (with bibliography) of the dating of the text see Feldherr 1998, 48, n. 149.

<sup>65</sup> The Latin text of Livy's *Ab urbe condita* is from Ogilvie 1974.

<sup>66</sup> Moles 1993, 153: "[t]he *monumentum*...is also Livy's *Ab urbe condita* itself."

sentences earlier he mentions that he is not going to affirm or deny the tales of Rome’s early history which he claims are “more fitting for poetic stories than for the incorruptible *monumenta* of accomplishments” (*poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis*, Pr. 6). It is clear here, too, that Livy sees his work as on par with *monumenta*. It is important to note, moreover, that for Livy these “monuments” take on the quality of being able to display an established truth as opposed to poems, which are filled with mere “stories” (*fabulae*). It would seem, in other words, that the historian fashions his history as a *monumentum* at least in part because of the ability that monuments have to serve as more fitting sources of “proof” than mere words themselves. As discussed in the previous section, architectural *monumenta* do at least appear to have a certain stability – physical and therefore epistemological – which can lend credence to the events of the past that they commemorate. And it is precisely because of their status as (seemingly) stable evidence that Livy claims they can present actual *exempla* from the past to imitate or avoid.

Livy’s use of architectural imagery is much more nuanced, however, and it will be necessary to examine the architectural nature of a few other passages from the preface to grasp more accurately what he sees as the purpose of his work.<sup>67</sup> Just a couple of sentences earlier, for instance, Livy talks of his work in the context of other writers who have done or will do more than he has – and thus cast him and his work into obscurity:

...si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama **in obscuro** sit, nobilitate ac **magnitudine** eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler. (Liv. Pr.3)

...if in such a great crowd of writers my own reputation should be thrown **into the shade**, I would console myself with the renown and **greatness** of those who obscure my fame.

---

<sup>67</sup> Jaeger 1997, 23, argues that Livy is more concerned with “the active role that his audience must play to comprehend the past” in viewing a monument than its “size, solidity, and durability.” At the same time, however, it is important to see how Livy here does rely on metaphors of size and stability – or rather their lack – in discussing not only his *monumentum*, but the structure of the Roman state, as well.

Here the architectural metaphor applies to more than just Livy's work: other historians have in a sense "erected" histories whose great size will throw his history into their shade. They not only have a certain nobility (*nobilitas*) because of their undertakings, but their works also have a certain magnitude (*magnitudo*). Given the way that Livy carefully configures his work as a *monumentum* it seems likely here that he means something more than huge volumes that exceed his in physical size. Each history is seen by Livy as a "monument" in its own right – perhaps just like the ones that had begun to fill Rome as the *princeps* started to assert his power and transform the architectural landscape of the city in the early 20s BCE.

There is even more to examine here, though. Livy's metaphorical use of *magnitudo* in this passage is similar to the way in which we saw Vitruvius employ *amplitudo* in relation to the transformation of the Roman state under Augustus.<sup>68</sup> And Livy not surprisingly justifies his own work – which is by no means small – by juxtaposing it to the "size" of the Roman state, too:

Res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creuerit ut iam **magnitudine** laboret sua. (Liv. Pr.4)

The subject, moreover, is also one of an immense labor, as one which we must investigate starting from over 700 years ago and which, having originated from humble beginnings, has grown to such an extent that it now toils under its own **great size**.

Even if the Roman historian's *monumentum* is not the largest, it is by no means small, either.

Livy's topic necessitates a certain "size," as he immediately goes on to say, because the subject – that is, the history of Rome – requires an immense amount of work (cf. *res est praeterea et immensi operis*). Livy's monument must be large enough, in other words, to cover the whole history of Rome – a place which, having "originated from humble beginnings, has grown to such an extent that it toils under its own great size" (*ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua*).

---

<sup>68</sup> See pp. 17-18 above.

The architectural imagery in the preface thus extends to more than simply Livy's own history, or even those of his peers; it also extends to the greatness of Rome itself. Livy is thus clearly participating in the same tradition of looking at the Roman state architecturally that was examined above in the works of Ennius, Cicero, and, most notably, Vitruvius.<sup>69</sup> It is important to note, however, that unlike Vitruvius the historian here speaks of a state – and the *mores* upon which it was founded – not increasing in magnificence but instead in terms that suggests its gradual “collapse,”<sup>70</sup> as the following passage demonstrates:

**labente** deinde paulatim **disciplina** uelut **dissidentes**<sup>71</sup> primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque **lapsi sint**, tum **ire** coeperint **praecipites**... (Liv. Pr.9)

Then as gradually morality **declines**, let [the reader] follow how our *mores* at first **fractured**, then **collapsed** more and more, and finally began **to plunge into headlong ruin**...

The very same *mores* that were the foundations upon which we saw Ennius and Cicero claim the Roman state stood (*moribus antiquis res stat romana virisque*) have gradually weakened over the course of Rome's history until the point that they have now “collapsed” (*lapsi*) – and sent the state into ruin with them (*ire...praecipites*).<sup>72</sup>

In the above analysis of Vitruvius' treatise it was argued that to view the state architecturally also meant that its physical architecture would become symbolic for the idea of the *res publica* itself. This is significant for the present discussion of Livy because the physical setting of Rome had deteriorated much in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century BCE, at least from the perspective of

---

<sup>69</sup> See pp. 16-25 above.

<sup>70</sup> See Jaeger 1997, 6, where the scholar proposes that “[t]he reader of Livy's preface...comprehends Rome's entire past...in the architectural metaphor of the construction and collapse of a massive edifice.”

<sup>71</sup> There is an important textual issue in this passage with the word *dissidentes*, which has also been read as *desidentes* (“falling”). However, I agree with Ogilvie 1965, 27, arguing *ad loc.* that “the metaphor is not of a slipping body but of a house tottering, breaking up, and collapsing and *dissidentes*, describing the disunity and disintegration of the *mores*, seems an appropriate word.”

<sup>72</sup> Ogilvie 1965, 27, *ad loc.*, cites a fragment from Sallust's *Historiae* as a *comparandum*; in fact, according to Ogilvie, even though “the collocation recalls Ennius...the terms had long passed into the political vocabulary.”

texts of the period which connect this apparent physical deterioration to that of state's metaphorical structure and *mores*. For example, Horace emphatically begins one of his famous "Roman *Odes*" with a lament for "the collapsing (*labentis*) temples of the gods" – together with an exhortation to Romans to "restore" (*reficere*) them if they are ever to atone for the sins of their fathers committed during the civil wars:

Delicta maiorum inmeritus lues,  
Romane, donec **templa refeceris**  
**aedisque labentis** deorum et  
foeda nigro simulacra fumo. (Hor. C. 3.6.1-4)

Though you do not deserve it, Roman, you will continue to atone for your fathers' sins, until you have **restored the temples and the collapsing shrines** of all the gods and their images defiled with black smoke.

For the poet the physical renewal of Rome is absolutely essential to its metaphorical reconstruction: the Romans cannot make up for the damage they did to the state in the past until they rebuild the temples that represented their former virtues. The *monumenta* in Rome had begun to crack, in other words, and so had its people's belief in the virtue that these structures were supposed to represent.<sup>73</sup> For Rome to re-establish itself and breathe life back into the values it had relied upon during its rise to power not only did someone have to improve the physical landscape of the city – or restore (*reficere*) it, as Horace writes – but that person also had to re-establish the belief in that landscape's ability to reflect what it meant to be Roman as it had done in the past.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Zanker 1988, 16-17, detects a change in the physical monuments of the late republic, as well, in the way that "[p]ublic monuments ceased to express any of the old political values, such as rank and service to the state."

<sup>74</sup> In writing of cultural memory in the Middle Republic, Hölkeskamp 2006, 481, argues that "[t]he spectrum of forms, institutions, and places through which a cultural memory may find its articulation and permanence, the relative importance of these forms and, above all, the specific, synergetic connections of media and location that result in 'systems' or 'landscapes' of memory...are themselves integral components of [a society's] cultural memory." In the case of late republican Rome, however, there seems to have been the sense that this link between the "landscapes" of their city and the Roman "cultural memory" had been destabilized by the "collapse" of the structures themselves.

If that is the case, though, an interesting question arises: how should one read Livy's *monumentum* in the context of such "ruin"? What purpose does it have when it would seem that the "structures" of Rome's past have themselves collapsed? It has been suggested that Livy's *monumentum* represents a small part of a rehabilitation process – not just as another monument to Rome, but also as a means of revitalizing the Roman people's belief in the structures that these monuments were meant to symbolize.<sup>75</sup> As Mary Jaeger has shown in her monograph on the topic, however, the process by which Livy accomplishes this task is not a simple one. Jaeger argues that the historian's focus on monuments both provides lessons about the past and at the same time should make a reader suspicious of those same lessons. Since Livy must rely on imperfect monuments of the past to construct his history, his work simultaneously cannot but "remind the reader that a coherent account of real past events is not a reproduction but a reconstruction."<sup>76</sup> Jaeger looks particularly at *monumenta* in the text that "fail to point unambiguously back to a particular person or event" in order to show how Livy provides an alternative perspective to Augustus' "Golden Age" Rome.<sup>77</sup> This is not so much to critique the *princeps*' monumentalization of the city as to "construct a reader" who could play an active role in interpreting monuments and thus make "national memory personal." The historian accomplished this task, according to Jaeger, by making sure that his reader would "receiv[e] Livy's interpretation of the past, not just as images in the mind's eye, but as a heightened and

---

<sup>75</sup> See Moles 1993, 153-154, arguing that "[i]n so far as it is an abiding monument, its solidity will help shore up the collapsing edifice of the Roman state... In important senses, therefore, it may be said that for Livy AUC history is his own work, the *Ab urbe condita*, and that in reconstructing Roman history he is in a moral sense reconstructing contemporary Rome." See also Wheeldon 1989, 59, who concludes that "[h]ere, in addition to the traditional claim for the value of *historiae* as sources of right conduct, Livy offers first, in the image of monumentality, a summation of the earlier claims for his work (on the basis of its size and the labor involved in writing it) and second, in the order in which the metaphors of the two passages appear, the more ambitious suggestion of the reconstruction – via the reading of his own work – of Roman greatness." It is not just Rome that he is reconstructing, I would argue, so much as the power of Roman monumentality itself to give Romans a sense of themselves as Romans in a new age.

<sup>76</sup> Jaeger 1997, 12.

<sup>77</sup> Jaeger 1997, 10.

altered awareness of the space around him or her.”<sup>78</sup>

It was not Livy’s responsibility alone to “construct” readers who could critically read Augustus’ monumentalization of Rome and understand their place in it. Subsequent chapters of this dissertation will show how the historian was indeed not the only writer in the Augustan age to critique the project of monumentalization to which he was also contributing through his monumental work. The critical assessment of Rome’s transformation that I argue can be found in several poets of the Augustan age may have been just as important part of its eventual success as the historian’s contribution.

Before I turn to how these poets contributed to this project, though, it is time to return to where this chapter began, namely, to Augustus and his *Res Gestae*. Although I will come back to the *princeps*’ version of his transformation of Rome in much more detail at the end of each subsequent chapter (with the exception of Chapter IV), the present analysis of Augustus’ language here in the final section of this chapter will help to demonstrate how the *princeps* dealt with the reconstruction of the state’s appearance not just in reality, but in the Roman imagination, as well, from the very start of his account.

## Part 5. A Monument to the Monumentalization of Rome

In the opening chapter of his *Res Gestae* Augustus speaks of the two charges that he received when he first came into real power:

**res publica n[e quid detrimenti caperet,] me pro praetore simul cum consulibus pro[videre iussit. p]opulus autem eodem anno me consulem, cum [consul uterqu]e in bel[lo ceci]desset, et **triumvirum rei publicae constituend[ae] creavit**]. (RGDA 1.3-4)**

The state ordered me as a propraetor to take care together with the consuls **that it not be diminished in any way**. In the same year, moreover, the people elected me as consul, when both consuls had died in war, and as triumvir *rei publicae constituendae*.

---

<sup>78</sup> Jaeger 1997, 14.



As a *propraetor* the young Octavian was assigned by the state itself to take care “lest it be diminished in any way” (*ne quid detrimenti caperet*). In the same year, moreover, the people elected him as consul and triumvir *rei publicae constituendae*. The wording of these two charges is not entirely unexpected or remarkable. The first was the “usual formula” for addressing emergencies in the late republic when a *senatus consultum ultimum* (SCU) was issued.<sup>79</sup> And *rei publicae constituendae* is a stock phrase of sorts – one that might have originated with Sulla,<sup>80</sup> one which was used often by Cicero in his works,<sup>81</sup> and one that can be found on several denarii minted by the individuals of second triumvirate themselves.<sup>82</sup>

These two tasks are thus not altogether novel – and Augustus certainly did not invent the language for them. But they do reflect something important about the Roman state suggested at length in this chapter, that is, the connection between architecture and the idea of the Roman state in the language that Romans used to discuss their *res publica*. There is the sense here, in other words, of there being a “structure” of the *res publica* in the words that Augustus uses to talk about his charges. For one, the word *detrimentum*, whose primary definition is “material

---

<sup>79</sup> See Cooley 2009, 113, *ad loc.*

<sup>80</sup> Sulla’s “official” title according to the *Lex Valeria* was *dictator legibus scribendis et rei publicae constituendae*. (cf. Appian *BC* 99.1). On this title see Hurlet 1993, 95, Sordi 1993, and Vervaeet 2004, 41, n. 18, stating that “it should not be questioned that [Sulla] was indeed appointed *dictator legibus scribendis et rei publicae constituendae* by virtue of the *lex Valeria*.” See also Kunkel and Wittmann 1995, 702-711, claiming that, on the contrary, Sulla “*war kein Diktator legibus scribendis*,” but only “*rei publicae constituendae*” (703). For further bibliography on Sulla’s title see Vervaeet 2004, 41, n. 20.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Cic. *Rep.* 1.11, 2.64, 3.7, and esp. 6.12, where Scipio Aemilianus is told in his famous dream that “as dictator [he] should structure the state, if [he] will have escaped the impious hands of [his] relations” (*dictator rem publicam constituas oportet, si impias propinquorum manus effugeris*). However, as Zetzel 1995, 229, *ad loc.*, points out, Cicero rather “anachronistically introduces a phrase that gained constitutional significance only in his own lifetime.” It is interesting to note – as Hurlet 1993, 95, n.6 does – that this “expression is not attested outside of Cicero” (*expression n’est attestée que chez Cicéron*).

<sup>82</sup> See Cooley 2009, 114, *ad loc.*, stating that “[t]his phrase echoes the official title given to the triumvirate of Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus, as illustrated on *denarii* minted in Africa c. 40-37 BC, which depict...Octavian on their reverse, with the words CAESAR IMP(erator) III VIR R(ei) P(ublicae) C(onstituedae) (*BM Coins, Rom. Rep.* II 579 nos. 29-31).”

reduction” or “diminishment,”<sup>83</sup> is derived from *detero* – a verb that is specifically related to the wearing down of physical objects, such as streets (in Lucretius) or tablets (in Propertius).<sup>84</sup>

Moreover, although most translations of *rei publicae constituendae* read something like “for settling the state,” or “for setting the state to rights” (as one scholar translates it in a recent book which addresses the topic),<sup>85</sup> the verb *constituo* and its noun *constitutio*<sup>86</sup> are commonly used to refer both to the “founding” of a city and its laws,<sup>87</sup> as well as to the “construction” of a building such as a house, as seen above in the passages from Vitruvius.<sup>88</sup> Even at this early point in the *Res Gestae*, then, a reader would come across a subtle balancing act that the *princeps* performs again and again throughout the document: while Augustus was in charge of making sure that the “collapse” which Livy writes about did not continue, he simultaneously had to construct the Roman state anew. Whereas Augustus needed to build a new Rome out of the ruin (*rei publicae constituendae*), he also needed to avoid damaging its traditional structure in any obvious way.

Are these empty metaphors typical of an Augustan inscription? That possibility cannot entirely be ruled out, of course. What I would like to propose, however, is that the wording here and elsewhere in the *Res Gestae* suggests something essential about how Augustus articulated

---

<sup>83</sup> *OLD*, s.v. *detrimentum*: “**1** Material reduction, diminishment.”

<sup>84</sup> *OLD*, s.v. *detero*.

<sup>85</sup> Lange 2009, 18-19. See also Bringmann 1988 and Wallman 1989, *passim*, for a comprehensive study on the second triumvirate’s self-presentation and propaganda.

<sup>86</sup> The primary meaning of *constitutio*, according to the *OLD*, is “**1** Physical arrangement, disposition, structure; position, placing (in a scheme); **b** organization, arrangement, disposing (or affairs); an organized state.”

<sup>87</sup> See Hurllet 1993, 95, stating that “*rem publicam constituere* refers to both the founding of cities and establishing laws; furthermore, it does not strictly recover the theoretical constructions of philosophers – essentially that of Plato, to whom Cicero is constantly looking – but has a concrete meaning and still applies to constitutions and real states. *Rem publicam constituere* must be translated not as ‘to draft a fictional constitution’ but as ‘to give foundation (a constitution) to the State’” (*rem publicam constituere désigne à la fois la fondation de cités et l’établissement de lois; en outre, elle ne recouvre pas formellement les constructions théoriques des philosophes – essentiellement celle de Platon, à laquelle pense constamment Cicéron – mais possède un sens concret et s’applique toujours aux constitutions et aux Etats réels. Rem publicam constituere doit donc être traduit non pas par ‘rédiger une constitution fictive’ mais par ‘donner des fondements (une constitution) à l’Etat’*). See also Fleury 1990, 55, noting in his commentary on Book 1 of Vitruvius’ *De architectura* that “*constituere* is used to talk about the organization of a province by a magistrate invested with *imperium*” (*constituere s’emploie aussi pour parler de l’organisation d’une province par un magistrat muni de l’imperium*).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Vitr. Pr. 2 and 2.1.5, cited above on p. 17 and p. 22, respectively.

for posterity his (re-)construction of Rome upon its traditional foundations. It does not seem unreasonable, for instance, to connect the architectural discourse in the *RGDA* to the complex idea of the monument that underlies Augustus' famous claim to have left Rome a city of marble examined in Chapter I.<sup>89</sup> It is in fact the goal of each of the following chapters to flesh out the nuances of this connection by juxtaposing later sections of the *Res Gestae* with close analysis of the *monumenta* that poets of the Augustan age built through their poems.

It is certainly correct to say that “Augustus used the physical topography of the city to his advantage: through the reorganization of the urban environment of Rome, he effectively communicated that a change had taken place.”<sup>90</sup> And the way that the Augustan poets treated that topography in their poetry allowed Romans more fully to appreciate and better interpret the specific monuments of their physical reality. The point of this dissertation is to show how Horace, Vergil, and Ovid also helped their readers to navigate the architectural *discourse* that Augustus would use in his *Res Gestae* to articulate this monumentalization of their city. These three poets each provides a mirror, I will argue, by which we can understand how Augustus used architectural discourse to redefine – without appearing to knock down – the traditional boundaries that had “structured” the Roman state up to his time. By analyzing how they expand, test, and dissolve the generic boundaries of their poems *qua* “monuments” we can come to recognize the effectiveness of the *Res Gestae* to celebrate the monumentalization of Rome in reality as well as the idea of it in the Roman imagination. This dissertation will propose, in short, that these poets helped to fashion readers who could better understand what had happened to their Rome, real and imagined, through the lens of architectural discourse that their poetry helped

---

<sup>89</sup> See above, p. 11, for a brief discussion of this passage as quoted in Suet. *Div. Aug.* 28.3.

<sup>90</sup> Rea 2007, 133.

to focus.

## CHAPTER III

### Horace's Lyric *Monumentum*

#### The Augustan Architecture of "Refusal"

Horace is a poet of structure.<sup>1</sup> And nowhere more so than in his *Odes*. Scholars again and again refer to his poems using architectural vocabulary.<sup>2</sup> It is almost more of a surprise, in fact, when a scholar of Horace does *not* discuss the "structure" of an individual poem, of a single book, or of the collection as a whole. This sense of structure can include the more literal way that different poems are arranged within and between themselves, that is, the "architectonics" of Horace's poetry. The idea of structure can also extend beyond this organizational sense, though, to the more metaphorical ways in which Horace has "constructed" his *Odes*.<sup>3</sup> In Gregson Davis' study of the complexities of the Horatian lyric voice, for instance, he considers the *Odes* to be "an ideational building, which it is part of the business of the critic to reconstruct."<sup>4</sup>

This use of architectural discourse to discuss Horace's *Odes* is no accident. The poet himself famously proclaims his first collection of lyric poetry to be a *monumentum* – one higher than the pyramids no less – and this image has influenced how readers (and scholars) thereafter

---

<sup>1</sup> Harrison 2007a, 264, makes the generalizing but accurate statement that "[a]s always with Horatian poems, structure is important."

<sup>2</sup> See Collinge 1961, 129, claiming that "the collection must...be appraised as a structure of structure," Dettmer 1983, and Santirocco 1986, 174, where he concludes that Horace's poems are "the individual stones out of which a single monumental edifice is constructed. Horace has woven, or built, so successfully, that his three books do not appear to be a medley of discrete poems but almost one large poem."

<sup>3</sup> Whereas von Albrecht 1973, 67, claims that *C.* 3.30 is the *Schlufstein* ("keystone") of the collection, Putnam 1986, 23, writes of the *Odes* that "the extraordinarily moving structure of their sum suggest a decisive awareness on Horace's part of his poetic, and therefore of his intellectual and moral, design."

<sup>4</sup> Davis 1991, 9.

have understood and imagined the *Odes*.<sup>5</sup> This chapter will look at the “structure” of the *Odes*, too, but not in the sense of a lyric collection with a brilliant design of lines, poems, and books. Nor will I be using architectural metaphors only to introduce or summarize – as Davis does – how I as a scholar of the *Odes* might read Horace’s lyric corpus. The focus of this chapter is rather to examine Horace’s architecture, that is, the architectural imagery that the poet himself employs to represent the generic limits of his poetry. The point of this analysis is not merely to admire or praise Horace’s amazing “structure,” as so many rightly have. I aim rather to show how engaging in architectural discourse of this sort allows the poet to redefine “traditional” lyric space and time in a way that puts him in dialogue with Augustus’ own redefinition of traditional Roman structures in the language of the *Res Gestae*.

What is “traditional” lyric time and space in the *Odes*? It is not simply the dimensions that Horace’s lyric predecessors, Greek and Roman, had crafted in their poems. Horace was starting fresh in the sense that when he “decided to compose lyric, despite experimentation by Callimachus, Theocritus, Laevius, and Catullus,<sup>6</sup> the kind was dead, that is, there was no living tradition of lyric to generate some sort of ‘natural,’ rule-generating form.”<sup>7</sup> What counted as “traditional” was therefore open to interpretation and debate – just as it was in the politics and culture of the Augustan age more broadly.<sup>8</sup> Horace defined the spatio-temporal limits of his lyric

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Hor. *C.* 3.30.1-2: *Exegi monumentum aere perennius / regalique situ pyramidum altius*. Hannah 2007, 165, goes so far as to suggest that *C.* 3.30 “contains the most sustained meditation on the relationship between poetical and architectonic *monumenta* in Roman poetry.” I will treat this poem at length below, pp. 74-79, as it represents one of the core architectural images of Horace’s *oeuvre*.

<sup>6</sup> On Horace and his “rivalry” with Catullus, in particular, see Segal 1969a, 246, maintaining that “Horace’s ode [i.e., *C.* 2.6] defines a mode of life totally antithetical to Catullan vehemence. Horace here shows himself in deliberate *aemulatio* with the greatest lyric poet yet produced in Rome, *trying to widen the scope of the lyric and redefine its boundaries*” (my emphasis).

<sup>7</sup> Lowrie 1997, 39. See also Paschalis 2002b, 71, claiming that “[o]ne of Horace’s major contributions to the shaping of ancient lyric...is his construction of lyric space,” and Harrison 2007b, 169, where he suggests that “[t]he relative absence of prescribed content in ancient lyric is crucial...for an appreciation of the literary form of Horace’s *Odes*.”

<sup>8</sup> See Galinsky 1996 for analysis of how “tradition” in the Augustan age was often defined by the “restoration” of former mechanisms in tandem with the “innovation” of new ones – whether in its politics, its religion, its art, or its literature. Syme 1939, 319, claims (from a less generous perspective perhaps) that in creating the principate

not so much with an eye to past lyric, I would argue, as with an ear to the discourse regarding the redefinition of traditional Roman structures in his present. In what I will suggest was a particularly Augustan move the poet built his lyric structure to be simultaneously “traditional” *and* innovative enough to have extrageneric material as part of its definition. As this chapter will demonstrate, moreover, Horace accomplished this seemingly paradoxical construction through a delicate balancing of apparent opposites to be in perfect tension with each other: the private, personal *hic et nunc* (“here and now”) of his lyric, on the one hand, and the public, political dimensions of epic that he claims are unfitting for his lyre, on the other.<sup>9</sup>

Therefore, while Horace’s Greek lyric predecessors are important to his *Odes*,<sup>10</sup> and their poetry forms the basis for many of the poems (and their meters) in the corpus,<sup>11</sup> I will not be looking directly at their influence for the present analysis. Horace was engaging in a poetic enterprise which was radically different from any that his precursors, Greek or Roman, had attempted in their poems<sup>12</sup> – an enterprise that was very much in tune with his own moment in Augustan Rome. As Paul Allen Miller puts it, “[t]he creation of a private poetry which ultimately engages the public realm, without becoming the discourse of the state, requires the presence of... [a] set of social, technological, and political conditions which separates Horace’s world from that of his Lesbian predecessors.”<sup>13</sup> This chapter will show how Horace’s architecture reflects these

---

Augustus “exploited with art and with success the traditional concepts and the consecrated vocabulary of Roman political literature.”

<sup>9</sup> I follow the very reasonable premise of Lowrie 1997, 49, that “lyric time is the *hic et nunc*.”

<sup>10</sup> Alcaeus, Sappho, Bacchylides, and Pindar, to name perhaps the most notable. See Paschalis 2002a for several essays which discuss Horace’s relationship to Greek lyric poetry.

<sup>11</sup> As I will note below in footnotes, where appropriate.

<sup>12</sup> Although Horace does claim to be the “Roman Alcaeus” (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.99-100), Feeney 2012, 12, points to *Epist.* 1.19 to suggest that “Horace does not say ‘I am the Roman Archilochus or the Roman Alcaeus’; he says ‘I am carrying on a tradition and recreating it just as they did.’ He claims to be like them, obviously, in important respects; but he is not their incarnation, or their equivalent or counterpart.” Indeed, according to Zetzel 1983, 87, “Horace...is combining Hellenistic and Roman elements in what is in fact a *radical transformation* of the lyric forms of early Greece” (my emphasis).

<sup>13</sup> P. A. Miller 1991, 387. See also Smith 1968, esp. 63-65, Leach 1988, 197-260, and Santirocco 1995, 229-232.

particular “conditions” in the way it redefines traditional lyric space and time to include extrageneric (especially epic) material which might seem inappropriate or even opposed to it.

This particular opposition between traditional lyric dimensions and the extrageneric ones of epic is given concrete form in the *Odes* through a specific juxtaposition of contrasting architectural structures. Horace’s traditional lyric space-time is represented often by the figure of the poet’s own Sabine farm<sup>14</sup> – a modest dwelling from a simpler time that seems perfect for housing the self-proclaimed Callimachean nature of his lyric.<sup>15</sup> In contrast to this humble structure of the poet stands the excessively luxurious, expansive, and “modern” (cf. *novo...ritu*, C. 3.1.45-46) villas of the Roman elite that appear in many poems of the corpus but receive special attention in C. 2.18 and 3.1. Horace warns again and again against building such edifices: they cause their owners, the poet implies, to lose a sense of the lyric here and now – owners who are always off on some epic-like quest over the sea to quarry stone from some far off land to show off one day in their atriums, or perhaps constructing some monumental structure that (they believe) will stave off their inevitable deaths. Through establishing this set of opposing structures – the light, contained lyric farm of the poet and the massive, transgressive epic estates of the wealthy – Horace is able to establish the spatio-temporal limits of his *Odes* in a way that seems “traditional” to his Roman readers, especially in how they align with good old Roman *mores* regarding the luxury (or lack thereof) in one’s own house.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. C. 2.16.37: *parva rura*; 2.18.14: *unicis Sabinis*; 3.1.47: *valle...Sabina*. On the importance of Horace’s Sabine estate for his poetic vision see Percy 1977, 779, Leach 1988, 210-211, 292-293, Miller 1991, 372-381, Leach 1993, Paschalis 2002b, 73, Faber 2005, Harrison 2007b, 113-114, and Armstrong 2009, 88-89.

<sup>15</sup> See Cody 1976, Fowler 1995a, 254, claiming that “one of the most distinctive features of Horace’s work is a union of Callimachean poetics with Epicurean stress on the simple life,” and Harrison 2007a, 262: “Horace’s carefully crafted poetic style [was] fundamentally influenced by the Callimachean aesthetics of brevity, elegance and polish.”

<sup>16</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 288, note that “[t]he Roman orators were fond of denouncing extravagance, particularly in building,” and cite Cato the Elder as an example (cf. Cato *or. fr.* 174, 185). Augustus also tried to cultivate such *mores* in his own “modest” house on the Palatine (cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.* 72-73). Whereas La Rocca 1986, 16-17, presents some of the archaeological findings on the *domus augustea*, which reveal it to be rather



Yet there is a problem with a simple dichotomy between Horace's own rural structure and those of the rich villa owners whom he criticizes: this binary opposition does not appear, at least initially, to leave any room at all for the famous architextural structure of the poet presented in the finale to his first collection of *Odes*. There Horace proclaims that the *monumentum* of his lyric poetry will soar "loftier than the royal structure of the pyramids" (*regali...situ pyramidum altius*, *C.* 3.30.2); more than that, the structure will exist outside of the temporal boundaries that nature imposes on everything man-made through its "decaying rain" and the "flight of ages" (*imber edax...fuga temporum*, *C.* 3.30.3-5). Horace even goes so far as to state that through his *monumentum* he "will not die completely" (*non omnis moriar*, *C.* 3.30.6). How could the same Horace who tells his reader to "forget about the pointless honors of a tomb" (*sepulcri / mitte supervacuos honores*, *C.* 2.20.23-24) at the end of the previous book suddenly turn around at the conclusion of Book 3 and claim to have erected a *monumentum* grander than even the pyramids? All this is suggestive of the mindset of those same villa owners whom he reprimands throughout the *Odes* for forgetting the enjoyment of the lyric "here and now."<sup>17</sup> It would appear, then, that at the very edge of his lyric corpus Horace transgresses the boundaries established through his own small estate and ventures into building an architextural structure whose dimensions he formerly rejected as antithetical to his lyric.<sup>18</sup>

---

impressive, "like that of a Pergamene king" (*come quella dei re pergameni*), Edwards 1993, 166-168, and Milnor 2005, 47-93, offer different interpretations of its complex meaning.

<sup>17</sup> Paschalis 2002b, 73: "[T]he lyric enjoyment of the here and now is incompatible both with temporal extension (i.e. commitment to the future) and with spatial expansion."

<sup>18</sup> Something similar might be said in relation to the poem at the other "edge" of the corpus, namely, *C.* 1.1, where an opening (and lengthy) priamel which focuses on the sort of transgressive activities with which Horace does not want to associate himself ends up anticipating in a sense the poet's own transgressive desire to "strike the stars with his lofty head" (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 1.1.36). Since this poem does not have many explicit architectural references, it is outside the scope of this study. I would tentatively suggest, however, that *C.* 1.1 as a whole might itself be anticipating the entire rest of the first three books of the *Odes* in which the very sort of building activity that Horace seems to reject throughout is ultimately taken up by him in the finale in the form of his *monumentum*. See also Musurillo 1962 for further analysis of the end of *C.* 1.1.

I argue in this chapter that this transgressive *monumentum* is in fact the perfect symbol for Horace's architecture. The "tension" found in the *Odes* between the two opposed architectural styles of the farm and the transgressive villa is not a problem to be solved, but rather is essential to the ultimate success of Horace's redefinition of "traditional" lyric. This tension is not an accident, moreover, but the intended result of a rhetorical strategy that Horace uses repeatedly in the *Odes* to introduce extrageneric material from epic into his lyric without destabilizing its lyric foundations – a rhetorical device that I call an "inverted" *recusatio* ("refusal"). The paradigmatic *recusatio* involves a poet who is told by some divine figure not to write epic.<sup>19</sup> In Horace's *Odes*, though, it is the poet *himself* who often feels he has to restrain his Muse who has wandered off into very non-lyric territory, which the poet then describes at length. Through this device, I suggest, Horace is able to offset the innovations he is making to traditional lyric space and time through the inclusion of extrageneric material in such a way that his structure remains stable even as it is redefined – a process that Horace's *monumentum* represents perfectly in its own seemingly paradoxical ability to be both stable and dynamic.

This chapter will be divided into four parts. The first will briefly examine the Augustan *recusatio* with a view to the ways in which Horace inverts the typical formula of the trope in his *Odes*, as well as his potential reasons for doing so. The next part will deal with how Horace uses this trope to bring extrageneric space and time in tension with the lyric dimensions of his farm so as to revitalize while also altering the structure of "traditional" lyric. The third part will turn to C. 3.30 to suggest that these tensions within the poet's architecture are represented there, as well, in a monument that is both more stable than anything ever constructed and yet constantly changing.

---

<sup>19</sup> See pp. 54-55 (esp. n. 23) below for discussion and examples of the prototypical *recusatio*.

Finally, the fourth part will explore how Horace's redefinition of "traditional" lyric in his poetry mirrors strategies employed by Augustus himself in the *Res Gestae* to redefine the traditional structures of Rome, both literal and metaphorical.<sup>20</sup>

### **Part 1. The Inversion of the *Recusatio* in Horace**

Although the *recusatio* was a common trope that many Augustan poets employed to "extricate themselves from the expected imposition" to write epics on the military exploits of Augustus,<sup>21</sup> the rhetorical device as used in Augustan poetry takes its cue from the programmatic opening of Callimachus' highly influential *Aitia*.<sup>22</sup> In the prologue to that Hellenistic work the narrator claims that Apollo himself appeared to him as he was about to compose a poem. The god then told the poet that he should "raise [his] sacrificial victim to be as fat as possible – but nurture [his] Muse to be slender" (τὸ μὲν θύος ὄττι πάχιστον / θρέψαι, τὴν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην, *Aitia* fr. 1.23-24). And it was this particular version of "divine intervention" that was then to establish the standard formula for the *recusatio* which the Augustan poets would take up over two centuries later at Rome: a divine being appears to the poet, forbids him from engaging

---

<sup>20</sup> My argument again is not so much interested in how Horace is engaging with the monuments of the Augustan age as it is in how he plays a part in creating the discourse surrounding monuments in general. For Horace's interaction – or rather lack thereof – with actual Augustan monuments see Hardie 1993, 126, claiming that "[o]ne reason for Horace's reluctance to evoke actual monuments in his verse is the desire to establish his own words as an alternative, and superior, kind of monument," and Jaeger 1995, 191, where she argues that "[b]y circumventing the buildings to focus attention on the ephemeral and the permanent [in *C.* 1.8], [Horace] has celebrated the place while maintaining his own standards for his chosen genre." Despite the lack of Roman monuments in Horace's poems I find Larmour and Spencer 2007b, 26, to be right in suggesting that "Horace is the first poet who shows clear signs of being deeply affected by...changes in the experiential fabric of Rome," especially given all the attention he bestows upon architecture throughout the *Odes*.

<sup>21</sup> See Lynn 1995, 31-32, where he notes that "[g]reat Roman military figures had expected and received epic poems on their military exploits" and goes on to list several of these works composed to celebrate the achievements of Julius Caesar. It even appears, according to Lynn, that the contemporary Roman poet Rabirius may have written an epic on the battle of Actium. See also White 1993, 81-82, suggesting that the *recusatio* was a means by which a poet could "disembarrass himself of the [epic] genre by a graceful sidestep."

<sup>22</sup> For the tremendous influence of Callimachus on Augustan poetry see Wimmel 1960, Clausen 1964, R. F. Thomas 1983, R. F. Thomas 1993, Fantuzzi and Hunter 2005, 444-485, and now Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012, 204-269.

in epic flight, and suggests instead that he should keep to light matters and meters.

The earliest full Latin example we have of such a *recusatio* appears in Vergil's *Eclogues* where it is a humble shepherd – as a stand-in for the poet himself – who first sounds the strain of “refusal”:

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem  
uellit, et admonuit: “Pastorem, Tityre, pinguis  
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.” 5  
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt, qui dicere laudes,  
Vare, tuas cupiant, et tristia condere bella)  
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam.  
non iniussa cano... (Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3-9)

When I was starting to sing of kings and battles, Apollo plucked my ear, and warned me: “Tityrus, it is fitting for the shepherd to make his sheep fat, to utter a song finely spun.” Now I (for there will be others, Varus, who will wish to tell your praises and compose poems about gloomy wars) will practice the rustic Muse on a slender reed. The songs I sing are not unordered...

The standard formula that begins with Callimachus is illustrated perfectly here: the divine Apollo appears to the poet, tells him to forget about epic, and advises that he focus instead on singing a finely-spun song (cf. *oportet...deductum dicere carmen*, 5). As the premier instance of the trope in surviving Latin poetry, it has been argued, this Vergilian *recusatio* helped to cement the Callimachean version as the prototype for Roman poets to follow.<sup>23</sup>

In the poetry of Horace, however, there is something that seems off about his “refusals,” for they do not seem to be proper refusals at all. Steele Commager was right to assert that the Horatian *recusatio* is a bit peculiar. “The *recusatio* was of course a common form,” Commager

---

<sup>23</sup> In his concise survey of the Augustan trope of “refusal,” Lynn 1995 goes so far as to suggest that “[t]he term ‘recusatio’ is best applied in the first instance to texts which follow our first-known example of the *topos*, Vergil *Eclogue* 6.3 ff., i.e. to texts which follow Vergil’s graceful and specific tactic in those lines” (32). Cf. Prop. 2.13.3-4: *hic* [i.e. *Amor*] *me tam gracilis vetuit contemnere Musas / iussit* (“Love forbade me to despise Muses of such grace”); 3.3.13-16: *...me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus / sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra: / “quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te / carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?”* (“...Apollo seeing me from the Castalian forest spoke in this way as he leaned on his gilded lyre near a cavern: ‘Are you crazy? What is your business with such a stream? Who ordered you to touch a work of heroic song?’”)

begins, “but in Horace’s hands it usually becomes equivalent to the rhetorician’s *praeteritio*.”<sup>24</sup>

In the introductory poem to his Second Book of *Satires*, for example, Horace sets himself in dialogue with an interlocutor who advises him that he *should* write epic only to have Horace respond by declining the offer – all the while giving a rather “descriptive catalogue”<sup>25</sup> of those same epic themes that he is disavowing:

“...aut si tantus amor scribendi te rapit, aude           10  
Caesaris invicti res dicere, multa laborum  
praemia laturus.” “cupidum, pater optime, vires  
deficiunt; neque enim quivis horrentia pilis  
agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos  
aut labentis equo describit vulnera Parthi.” (Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.10-15)<sup>26</sup>

“Or if so great a love of writing snatches you, dare to utter the deeds of the unconquerable Caesar – and you will carry off many rewards for your labors.” “Though I desire it, my good sir, my strength fails me; for not just anyone at all can describe the battle lines bristling with spears, nor the Gauls dying when the points of their spears have been broken, or the wounds of a Parthian falling from his horse.”

This passage contains not only an “inversion” of the typical formula – in that the one addressing the poet is actually *encouraging* him to write epic – but also demonstrates how such an inverted *recusatio* can offer the poet a chance to “commandeer his language from the subjects he rejects.”<sup>27</sup> In other words, the poet employs a catalog of epic themes to give the reader the sense that he is more than adequate at doing the very thing he professes that he cannot.<sup>28</sup>

Horace’s *Odes* extends this function of the trope even further. The poet inverts the procedure of the *recusatio* in a still more remarkable manner by at times reprimanding his own

---

<sup>24</sup> Commager 1962, 112.

<sup>25</sup> Commager 1962, 113. Cf. Prop. 2.1.17-42 for an even longer catalogue of what the poet claims he cannot put into song.

<sup>26</sup> The Latin text of Horace’s poems is from Wickham 1901.

<sup>27</sup> Commager 1962, 114-115. See also Lynn 1995, 35-36, where he claims that “Horace evades the prospect of an epic on Octavian...with motifs that may be felt to recall and invert the ‘recusatio’, that indeed are funnier if they recall the ‘recusatio.’” For Lynn, however, Horace’s inversion of the trope seems merely for the sake of a “joke.”

<sup>28</sup> See Smith 1968, 57: “That the protests of deficient strength are ironical can be seen by their juxtaposition with passages that prove the ability and virtually fulfill the heroic request.”

Muse for overstepping the boundaries of his lyric domain. In the introductory poem of *Odes* 2, for instance, Horace starts by discussing the gloomy nature of Pollio's works on the civil wars; he reproduces so much epic-sounding material, however, that the poet then feels compelled to "reel in" his own Muse before he can end the poem,<sup>29</sup> as the passage below demonstrates:

Sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis  
Caeae retractes munera neniae,  
mecum Dionaeo sub antro  
quaere modos leuiore plectro. (Hor. *C.* 2.1.37-40)

But lest you, my naughty Muse, take up again the rites of the Cean dirge leaving behind all jokes, seek measures on a lighter instrument with me within the cavern of Venus.

In this passage it is Horace himself – and not some divine being – who instructs *his* Muse to behave herself and stick to light topics that are more fitting for light meters. This is not the last glimpse we get of Horace's *procax* Muse, though. In Book 3 the poet again feels his Muse has begun to slip out of his control after he has sung about a council of the gods in which Juno delivers a lengthy (and epic-sounding) prophecy for Rome. Here is the poet's address to his Muse at the poem's conclusion:

non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae:  
quo, Musa, tendis? desine pervicax                    70  
referre sermones deorum et  
magna modis tenuare parvis. (*C.* 3.3.69-72)

This will not be fitting for my playful lyre: where are you heading, my Muse? Intractable! Cease to report the speeches of gods and to diminish great things with your small measures.

In both of these passages it is not the usual divine being that comes to Horace to turn him away

---

<sup>29</sup> Johnson 1966, 273, argues that "[t]he meaning of this arrogant transparent irony is, of course: 'I have distilled the essence of epics, tragedies, and histories into forty rather tasteful verses; a small thing, but my own.'" See also Davis 1991, 247, concluding that "[a]fter nine strophes of an ode that engages in the 'sincerest form of flattery' – quasi-involuntary imitation of the addressee's grandiloquent matter and manner – the very speaker who has already stretched lyric norms in the poem encodes his audacious transgression in a closing apostrophe that both restores light lyric and defends the transgeneric *fait accompli*."

from the epic mode; it is rather the poet himself who confronts his Muse – not for inspiration, as one might expect, but to restrain her from going into generic territory (cf. *Ceae...neniae; magna*) which is unfitting for his light lyric poetry (cf. *leviore plectro; iocosae...lyrae; modis... parvis*).<sup>30</sup>

It should be clear by now what I mean by “inverted” *recusatio* when comparing the Horatian art of “refusal” to the typical formula employed by other poets. But why does Horace invert the trope in the first place? What does the poet gain by transfiguring the *recusatio* formula in such a way? Commager recognized the tension that such “refusals” produce, but never fully resolved it. “Horace stands as the classic example,” he writes,

of the man who manages to eat his cake and have it too. Indulging the most extravagant of pastoral fantasies, he escapes charges of sentimentality; dispensing moral unction, he avoids the reproach of sermonizing; rising to an epic grandeur, he denies pretensions to sublimity; summoning all wealth’s sensuous reality, he receives credit for banishing it.<sup>31</sup>

And the scholar ends his discussion of the tension there. Peter Smith also left the matter of this “tension” only “partially solved” by his own admittance.<sup>32</sup> For Smith the tension is one that (unsatisfactorily even to him) seems to be located within the historical person of the poet himself: “in the *recusatio*, the slender poet had shown an irresistible tendency to soar, for all his reticence. [...] Though he had learned to live with the conflicting drives of self and state, Horace was never altogether comfortable.”<sup>33</sup> The main issue I take with these approaches (besides the obvious biographical fallacy which motivates Smith’s reading) is that they consider this

---

<sup>30</sup> See Lowrie 1999, 41, arguing that “[t]he question to the Muse, *quo, Musa, tendis?* (70) uses the language of transgression and digression; she is going ‘out of bounds.’ The split between poet and Muse mirrors that between what Horace thinks lyric ‘should be’ and his actual poetry. He addresses her as if she were not the abstraction of his own poetic self, and underscores this self-difference with *pervicax* (70). The transgression is generic.” See also Harrison 2007b, 188, where he claims in analyzing the end of this poem that “[t]he epic elevation and serious tone achieved in this poem is thus explicitly marked as inappropriate for Horatian lyric poetry: ‘playful lyre’ suggests that these themes are too grand for the current generic context, and the Muse is rebuked for her supposed stubbornness in retailing material which is traditionally epic, the contents of divine councils (‘the speeches of gods’).”

<sup>31</sup> Commager 1962, 116.

<sup>32</sup> See Smith 1968, 64.

<sup>33</sup> Smith 1968, 65.

“tension” to be a problem which needs to be solved rather than a crucial component of how Horace constructs his particular lyric structure, as I will suggest below.

Gregson Davis, Michèle Lowrie, and Stephen Harrison have each attempted in more recent decades to provide a more nuanced approach to this same tension through their respective studies on the rhetorical posturing of Horatian lyric.<sup>34</sup> Their answers focus on how Horace uses these moments to introduce extrageneric material into his lyric poetry – whether through what they term generic “assimilation,” “negation,” or “enrichment,” respectively. Davis suggests that “the supposed aim of ‘refusal’ probably masks an intent to *incorporate*, rather than utterly repudiate, matter traditionally regarded as alien to a particular literary orientation,” with the result that Horace can then “assimilate” other genres through disavowing their material.<sup>35</sup> The idea of “generic enrichment” that Harrison has put forth more recently does not differ much from Davis’ understanding of these disavowals: “generic enrichment,” as Harrison defines it, is “the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres.”<sup>36</sup> Neither of these scholars looks outside of Horace’s lyric world for the motivation behind these rhetorical gestures.<sup>37</sup> In contrast to these studies Lowrie’s reading of Horace’s “disavowals” does extend beyond the poetic implications and into the political realities of the Augustan age. Although she also claims that Horace’s “poetry defines itself largely by

---

<sup>34</sup> Davis 1991, Lowrie 1997, Harrison 2007b, 1-33, 168-205.

<sup>35</sup> Davis 1991, 5. As Davis goes on to claim, “an ancillary objective of many proclaimed ‘refusals’ is not to *exclude*, but, paradoxically, the opposite – to *include* generically disparate material while protesting vigorously against it” (28).

<sup>36</sup> Harrison 2007b, 1.

<sup>37</sup> The upshot of Davis 1991 is a thorough analysis of the complex “lyric self” that Horace crafts in his *Odes* and, in particular, how it is “constructed...often against the backdrop of generic others (epic, elegiac, or iambic).” While Harrison’s idea of “generic enrichment” is a useful and easily applicable tool for the study of Augustan literature as “the intergeneric form of intertextualism” (16), it does not seem to produce a substantial advancement – at least when it comes to the *Odes* – beyond the ideas of Davis 1991 or Lowrie 1997.



saying what it is not,” Lowrie convincingly argues that this “tug-of-war...surpasses the formal conflict within the aesthetic realm, to encompass that between aesthetics and ideology.”<sup>38</sup> While Lowrie’s approach does then help to show how Horace’s project of lyric definition interacts with elements of Augustan ideology, it does not go deeper to explore fully how the poet is also engaging with the very ways in which that ideology was itself promoted<sup>39</sup> – as it was through Augustus’ own *Res Gestae*, for instance, in the ways I will suggest in Part 4 below.

I would like to acknowledge at the outset that scholars have touched obliquely upon a possible connection between the respective rhetorical stances of the poet and the *princeps*.<sup>40</sup> Karl Galinsky’s reading of the repeated use of *recusatio* in the *Odes* probably comes closest to some of the conclusions I arrive at in this chapter in that he also sees the kind of rhetorical “refusals” that Augustus makes in the *Res Gestae* as a source of indirect “inspiration” for the poet.<sup>41</sup> The scholar spends only a paragraph on this idea, however, and does not fully develop the parallel. Nor does he look at what either Augustus or Horace has to say about architecture in this context – which will be the main focus of my comparison between the two at the end of this chapter.

Before I can discuss the nuances of this parallel, however, it will first be necessary to work through the complex nature of Horace’s own architecture in the *Odes*. The next two

---

<sup>38</sup> Lowrie 1997, 2, 4. For Lowrie, this “tug of war” exists between “lyric” and what she calls “narrative” – the latter of which “often goes hand in hand with content primarily associated with genres other than lyric (epic especially, but also elegy).”

<sup>39</sup> Lowrie 1997 does at several points discuss how Horace is almost “retailing” Augustus’ *Res Gestae*, especially in his Fourth Book of *Odes*, but she does not suggest that there is a parallel in the rhetorical techniques employed by the two authors.

<sup>40</sup> See Fowler 1995a, Santirocco 1995, Galinsky 1996, 257-258, Oliensis 1998, and Lowrie 2005 (in a logical development of Lowrie 1997). Oliensis 1998, 132, is right to claim that “[i]n writing before the emperor, Horace uses various devices not only of tactful evasion but also of self-restraint,” even if she does not explicitly acknowledge that this “self-restraint” is also a part of the emperor’s own rhetoric. Santirocco 1995, 229-231, also analyzes the *Res Gestae* together with the *Odes*, even going so far as to say that “many of the literary strategies deployed in [the *Res Gestae*] appear frequently in Horace’s *Odes*” (230) – though he unfortunately does not specify exactly which ones he means.

<sup>41</sup> Galinsky 1996, 258. Although I came to the idea of a parallel between the rhetoric of Horace and Augustus independently of Galinsky, I find his approach to the idea of influence between the poet and the *princeps* very useful, as I will discuss below, pp. 87-88.

sections of this chapter build on the scholarship discussed above to ask not just *how* Horace defines traditional lyric space and time, but also *why* he does it in the precise way he does, that is, through a delicate balancing of the two opposed architextural images of his farm and the transgressive Roman villas he criticizes. It is by recognizing the importance of this tension, I suggest, that one can better understand how Horace’s *monumentum* in *C.* 3.30 is a perfect metaphor not only for his own poems, but just as much for the age of redefinition in which he constructs it – an age when the seemingly paradoxical idea that one could redefine what was “traditional” became an important way for the *princeps* to articulate what it meant to be Roman.

## Part 2. Transgressive Architecture in the *Odes*

The latter half of Horace’s second book of *Odes* and the beginning of the third contain several poems that discuss excessive architectural structures. The focus of this section will be on the most extensive of such discussions, namely, *C.* 2.18 and 3.1. Although Horace in these poems might seem to portray grand, ostentatious architecture in an unappealing light in contrast to his modest Sabine farm, it is by claiming to disavow such transgressive structures that the poet is actually able to make them a part of his traditional lyric space and time. Let us start with the beginning of *C.* 2.18:

Non ebur neque aureum  
 mea renidet in domo lacunar,  
 non trabes Hymettiae  
 premunt columnas ultima recisas  
 Africa, neque Attali 5  
 ignotus heres regiam occupavi  
 [...]
   
 ...nihil supra  
 deos lacesso nec potentem amicum  
 largiora flagito,  
 satis beatus unicus Sabinis. (*C.* 2.18.1-6, 11-14)

An ivory and golden ceiling does not shine in my house, Hymettian beams do not press

upon columns quarried from the ends of Africa, nor have I as the unknowing heir to an Attalus come in the possession of a palace [...] I bother the gods for nothing more, nor do I demand anything more lavish from my powerful friend, content enough as I am with my unique Sabine holdings.

This opening priamel should come as no surprise for readers of Horace: not only is it an “imitation” of Bacchylides fr. 21;<sup>42</sup> the theme of excessively luxurious architecture should be rather familiar by the time one reaches this poem near the end of Book 2.<sup>43</sup> Horace has devoted many lines already to criticizing such structures and the problems that accompany them. In *Odes* 2.10, for instance, he warns against “halls inciting envy” (*invidenda... aula*, 7-8). *C.* 2.15 begins with a lament that “regal structures soon will leave a few acres for the plough” (*iam pauca aratro iugera regiae / moles relinquent*, 1-2) – quite in contrast to the traditional Roman way of life that the poet discusses in the latter half of that poem (cf. *C.* 2.15.10-20). As Horace then notes in *C.* 2.16, such structures only serve to make one more anxious with all “the cares that flitter about paneled ceilings” (*curas laqueata circum / tecta volantis*, 11-12). It should not be unexpected therefore to find Horace ranting against such architecture at the beginning of *C.* 2.18, as he relates all those trappings of luxury which are *not* in his own house, including a ceiling of ivory and gold (*ebur... aureum... lacunar*, 1-2), marble beams (*trabes Hymettias*, 3), and columns quarried from the ends of Africa (*columnas ultima recisas / Africa*, 4-5).

It is not just the luxury itself that is the problem, however, as much as the excessive and *transgressive* nature of building such a “palace” (*regiam*, *C.* 2.18.6).<sup>44</sup> Taking marble from a distant locale is not the only way that these villa owners seek to extend their boundaries across

---

<sup>42</sup> See Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 287, and West 1998, 137, calling *C.* 2.18 a “motto” poem in that it takes its start from a Greek predecessor.

<sup>43</sup> In his survey of the figure of the “ambitious builder” in the *Odes*, Whitehorne 1969, 38, claims that the trope of excessive architecture is “a purely Roman invention” – even if he acknowledges, 29-30, that the trope as a symbol of social decay goes back as least as far as Demosthenes’ *Third Olynthiac*. See also Pearcy 1977, 772, arguing that “the image of the builder is one of Horace’s devices for defining the poet’s relation to society.”

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *C.* 2.15 in which – according to Pearcy 1997, 775 – “rich men’s villas, fishponds, and sterile gardens were set against the natural landscape as emblems of the unnatural society of Horace’s day.”

and beyond natural boundaries.<sup>45</sup> The poet goes on to accuse the rich of “greedily tear[ing] down the boundary stones of [their] land and leap[ing] beyond the borders of [their] clients” (*revellis agri terminos et ultra / limites clientium / salis avarus*, *C.* 2.18.24-26); even worse, these avaricious individuals desire to extend their villas so as “to drive back the shores of the sea, being too little rich themselves since the shore restrains them” (*maris...summovere litora, / parum locuples continente ripa*, *C.* 2.18.20-22, cf. *C.* 3.1.34-38). Both of these actions are examples of what Ellen Oliensis has called a “debauched imperialism” in which “formal, spatial, and moral boundaries all give way at once”<sup>46</sup> – not to mention natural and social ones.<sup>47</sup>

What scholars have paid less attention to here are the generic boundaries being crossed with the specific and marked image of extending one’s villa into the sea – a space in the *Odes* which has often been read as “a recurrent image for unsettledness and danger.”<sup>48</sup> The various reasons to sail on the sea – for trade, for making money, for expanding one’s power – all present values opposed to those of the quiet life of *autarkeia* that Horace imagines for himself in several poems of the collection,<sup>49</sup> including the very first one with its famous opening priamel (cf. *C.* 1.1.11-14). As the reader learns only shortly later in *C.* 1.3, moreover, the very act of sailing is a “crime” (*nefas*, 26) against the natural order of things: “The prudent god divided the lands from

---

<sup>45</sup> Whitehorne 1969, 29, suggests that the 1<sup>st</sup>-century BCE Roman aristocrat Lucullus was “among the first to spend fortunes on his seaside villas and it was a Stoic, Aelius Tubero, who nicknamed him the ‘*Xerxes togatus*’” (cf. Vell. 2.33.4; Plut. *Luc.* 39.3). According to Whitehorne, moreover, the trope went on to provide Roman writers “with an extremely useful literary peg on which to hang a variety of ideas, concerned with *luxuria*, moral decadence and the place of man in nature and society.”

<sup>46</sup> Oliensis 1998, 110.

<sup>47</sup> See Pearcy 1977, 777: “His disregard for the natural limits is symbolized by his estate’s disregard for the limits of land and sea.”

<sup>48</sup> See Segal 1969a, 239, where in his analysis of *C.* 2.6 Segals goes on to claim that the “ever-seething sea” (cf. *semper / aestuat unda*, 3-4) stands in contradistinction to “the tilled, cared-for land where the poet will find rest.” See also Paschalis 2002b, 77, arguing that the “open sea space becomes the space of anxiety and mental agitation... resulting from commitments diametrically opposed to those of lyric *bios*,” which is reflected primarily by small, interior spaces throughout the corpus; according to Paschalis, in fact, the open sea is “most commonly negatively marked and reflects values radically opposed to those of primary lyric space.”

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *C.* 1.34, 2.16.13-29, 3.1.21-32, 47-48, 3.19.

the discordant Ocean in vain, if impious ships still sail over waters that are not to be touched” (*nequiquam deus abscidit / prudens Oceano dissociabili / terras, si tamen impiae / non tangenda rates transiliunt vada*, 21-24). Horace even goes so far in that poem as to associate sailing with other famous acts that defy the natural limitations of man, including Promethean thefts, Herculean journeys to the underworld, and precarious Daedalean flights (cf. *C. 1.3.27-36*).<sup>50</sup> From almost the very start, then, the sea in the *Odes* comes to represent a space beyond the limits imposed on all mortals.

But the borders that Horace is working out in *C. 1.3* are not just related to natural limitations of man; rather, as the famous addressee of the poem would suggest, these bounds of nature are also meant to represent the generic boundaries that are being crossed in that poem, as well as in several others of the collection.<sup>51</sup> The poet in *C. 1.3* is wishing his good friend Vergil a safe journey to Athens. That is what the poem claims on its surface, at least. It is hard, however, not to understand this *bon voyage* as having more to do with Vergil’s work on the epic *Aeneid* than with a simple trans-Adriatic crossing.<sup>52</sup> Indeed, as Michael Paschalis has put it, the “open sea space” in the *Odes* functions as “a metaphor or metonym...for non-lyric (‘grander’) genres and themes,” such as epic poetry.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> See Zumwalt 1974, 458, claiming that “[m]an is confined first to earth, ultimately to the underworld. He cannot cross the set bounds of time and space.”

<sup>51</sup> The generic implications of this trope can be traced back to Callimachus, who concludes his *Hymn to Apollo* by comparing his light poetry – which “both pure and unpolluted springs upward from a holy fount trickling a little at a time the choicest of waters” (καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράντος ἀνέρπει / πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον, 110-111) – to “the poet who sings however many things are of the sea” (τὸν αἰοιδὸν ὃς... ὅσα πόντος ἀεῖδει, 106) and whose poetry is like the “the mighty flow of the Assyrian river” (Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, 108). See also Paschalis 2002b for how the open sea is a trope employed by the Greek poet Alcaeus (cf. fr. 208), even if to a much different effect from the way that Horace uses it in the *Odes*.

<sup>52</sup> See Santirocco 1986, 28-29, arguing that “Horace’s *bon voyage* for Vergil can...be understood as a reflection on the composition of the *Aeneid*.”

<sup>53</sup> Paschalis 2002b, 77. See also Anderson 1966, 91, and Santirocco 1986, 75. Epic poetry is not the only generic referent possible for the open/stormy sea, however. The space can be a metaphor for violent erotic passion, as well, and thus a location suitable for more elegiac themes. In *C. 1.5*, for instance, the poet compares Pyrrha’s love to “harsh waters” (*aspera...aequora*, 5-6) for any inexperienced lover of hers. Vessey 1984, 486, argues that “Pyrrha herself, the golden Pyrrha, has the *gracilis puer* in her arms at the outset of a voyage that must prove disastrous to

The generic implications of this trope likewise appear in several other poems in the first and second books of the *Odes*. In the famous Soracte Ode, for example, Horace advises his companion to “entrust everything else to the gods who have now calmed the warring winds on the seething surface of the sea” (*permitte divis cetera, qui simul / stravere ventos aequore fervido / deproeliantis*, *C.* 1.9.9-11) – the stormy sea having no place within the intimate lyric atmosphere of Horace’s private space.<sup>54</sup> This idea is then made even more explicit in *C.* 1.14, where the fragile ship which Horace addresses has rightly been read as a representation of his poetry: it is a craft whose parts “creak” (*gemant*, *C.* 1.14.6) and lines are shred (cf. *non tibi sunt integra lineta*, 9), certainly no match for the harsh waters and “winds” (*ventis*, 15) of epic.<sup>55</sup> One can similarly interpret *C.* 1.34 and the poet’s aborted sea journey into “epic” territory in that poem.<sup>56</sup> In Book 2 itself, moreover, traditional lyric space is repeatedly carved out in contrast to those who wish to seek out the deep even when there are storms on the water (*C.* 2.10.1-3), or those who find themselves trapped in the wide open sea when rough weather has suddenly befallen them (*C.* 2.16.1-4).<sup>57</sup> By the time a reader gets to *C.* 2.18, then, the act of entering the open sea is not only an established trope for crossing boundaries; it is a generically charged

---

him, though not to her; neither she nor the sea ever changes or disappears. Only experience can teach her victims that all that glistens is not gold so that, soaked and buffeted by the waves of her perfidy, they at last retire from the life of love...” This interpretation has led some scholars – mistaking elegiac space for actual erotic circumstance – to see the ship in *C.* 1.14 as an allegory for a woman whom Horace is trying to dissuade from embarking on another amatory (mis)adventure. See Anderson 1966, Woodman 1980, and Knorr 2006 in favor of this argument and Jocelyn 1982 for a critique of it. Murgatroyd 1995 provides a detailed survey of the “sea of love” trope in both Greek and Latin poetry.

<sup>54</sup> See Paschalis 2002b, 74-76, for analysis of *Odes* 1.9 with attention to Horace’s use of the open sea therein.

<sup>55</sup> Anderson 1966 was the first to consider seriously that Horace here might be referring to “poem-ship” – though he rejects this idea in the end because of “the simple fact that Horace separates himself from his ‘ship,’ whereas the poet and ship conventionally belonged together” (91). Zumwalt 1978-1979 builds upon this point and argues that the poet transfigures the allegory as the “Ship of Love Poetry” – a symbol for Horace’s “creative faculty as love or ‘light’ lyricist” (250). It is lyric in general, however, and not lyric as love poetry that I would argue is the referent.

<sup>56</sup> Zumwalt 1974 provides a comprehensive analysis of *C.* 1.34, arguing that “Horace has sailed into forbidden poetic territory. He finds himself, perhaps, on the high sea, representing... grander themes, and is forced to retreat.”

<sup>57</sup> See Paschalis 2002b, 72, where in his analysis of *C.* 2.16 the scholar proposes that the poem “opposes the open space of stormy seas, war, and self-imposed exile, which are identified with the unrestrained impulse for the acquisition of wealth and power, to the restricted space of the speaker’s Sabine farm where he leads an untroubled life devoted to lyric *otium*.”

action, as well, when read in juxtaposition with several poems in Books 1 and 2 of the *Odes*.

What then should a reader make of those who build villas that transgress the maritime boundaries of the natural world – who literally “drive back the shores of the sea” (*maris... / summovere litora*, *C.* 2.18.20-21) through their constructions? Such builders are clearly engaging in an ambitious undertaking that would seem rather out of tune with the traditional lyric space that Horace delineates for himself, that is, a space which seems completely opposed to the extension of boundaries, whether physical, natural, or generic, as I will suggest below in the figure of his Sabine farm. Bad as all this is, though, such architecture in *Odes* 2.18 not only transgresses the spatial bounds of “traditional” lyric, but the temporal ones, as well:

tu secunda marmora  
locas sub ipsum funus et sepulcri  
immemor struis domos  
[...]  
Nulla certior tamen  
rapacis Orci fine destinata                    30  
aula divitem manet  
erum. Quid ultra tendis? (*C.* 2.18.17-19, 29-32)

At the very footstep of death you contract marble to be cut and unmindful of the tomb pile up houses. [...] Nevertheless, when the territory of rapacious Death has been reached, no palace more surely awaits the rich master. Why do you strive further?

While the rich go beyond the physical limits prescribed by man and nature in extending their homes across boundary stones and even into the sea, respectively, there is also the suggestion here that in doing so they no longer have any concern for death (cf. *sub ipsum funus sepulcri / immemor struis domos*, 18-19), especially in their apparent belief that what they build will protect them from its inevitability.<sup>58</sup> According to Ellen Oliensis, in fact, the rich man in this

---

<sup>58</sup> Whitehorne 1969, 32-33, notes that “[t]he wealthy man is so intent upon contracting his work that he has lost touch with reality and has forgotten even the approach of death [...] The motif of excessive building acquires...the connotations of overflowing wealth and a hybristic desire to escape the fate that awaits all men.” See also Santirocco 1986, 105, where the scholar argues that “[b]y thus denying social and natural boundaries, the rich man seeks to

passage is actually “seek[ing] to postpone the temporal *finis* of death by expanding the *fines* of his property.”<sup>59</sup> Yet it does not matter what kind of building you erect for yourself in life, according to the poet, since “no palace more surely awaits the rich master” (*nulla certior... / aula divitem manet / erum*, 29, 31-32) in the underworld.<sup>60</sup> The greedy aristocrat has lost sight of the lyric “here and now” in his desire to extend his building activities further past all boundaries, temporal as well as spatial, and seek the sort of immortality more befitting an epic hero who will be kept alive in song. It seems that it is all for naught, though. All Horace can do is to ask such misguided men a version of a question that he asks in reprimanding his naughty Muse, namely, “why do you stive further?” (*quid ultra tendis?* 32).<sup>61</sup>

In contrast to this excessive, seemingly unlimited drive of such architecture to transgress boundaries, both spatial and temporal, stands Horace’s own “unique Sabine holdings” (*unicis Sabinis*, *C.* 2.18.14). There is not much to say about Horace’s country abode, however, since the structure (rather conspicuously) bears no architectural description in a poem largely devoted to detailed accounts of architecture.<sup>62</sup> It is almost as though the Sabine farm has left no imprint on nature at all. And that might be part of the point: Horace’s farm blends into the landscape, not extending further than it should, not overstepping the bounds of nature.<sup>63</sup> The humble structure

---

deny his own mortality,” and Miller 1991, 377, claiming that the *avarus* “displays a failure to understand his own limits, since he is every bit as subject to death as the lowest slave (29-40).”

<sup>59</sup> Oliensis 1998, 110. See also Percy 1977, 781, stating that “[e]xtravagant architecture violates the limits of nature and betrays a misunderstanding of the inevitability of death.”

<sup>60</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 307, *ad loc.*, put it well in noting that the rich man “encroaches unnaturally on the sea, but the land will open up for him without any difficulty. He oversteps the boundaries imposed by nature and morality, but he himself will soon reach his limits.”

<sup>61</sup> Cf. *C.* 3.3.70: *quo, Musa, tendis?* See above, pp. 57-58, esp. n. 30, for an analysis of this passage from Book 3.

<sup>62</sup> Leach 1988, 231, aptly notes that “[t]he least of Horace’s concerns is to inform his reader of the actual particularities of the farm” – though without explaining exactly why there is this reticence on the part of the poet.

<sup>63</sup> It is interesting to compare this non-description of Horace’s Sabine farm to *C.* 2.15 in which – according to Santirocco 1986, 101 – the luxurious villa depicted is seen as “an assault upon nature” and as “an external threat to the natural landscape,” even “threaten[ing] the land’s fertility, leaving few acres to the plough.” See also Percy 1977, 775, suggesting that in *C.* 2.15 “extravagant architecture serves to indicate resistance, public and private, to the natural order of things.”



serves, according to Paul Allen Miller, as “the symbol of his acceptance of the limits of mortality on normal human existence,” as well as “a symbol of Horace’s poetry, of his satisfaction with his lot in life.”<sup>64</sup> It is very different, in other words, from the transgressive structures that fill the rest of the poem and several of those in Book 2 – structures whose owners unlike Horace are never “happy enough” (*satis beatus*, C. 2.18.14) with what they already have at the present moment.

It might seem, then, that for Horace architecture which seeks to go beyond the boundaries of lyric space and time achieves nothing in the end – and certainly does not adhere to his traditional lyric principles of design.<sup>65</sup> Such architecture is not just ostentatious; more importantly, it is *transgressive*, spatially as well as temporally. And the first poem of Book 3 elaborates further on this idea:

...somnus agrestium  
 lenis virorum non humilis domos  
     fastidit umbrosamque ripam,  
     non Zephyris agitata Tempe.  
 desiderantem quod satis est neque                   25  
 tumultuosum sollicitat mare  
 [...]
 quodsi dolentem nec Phrygius lapis  
 nec purpuratum sidere clarior  
     delentit usus nec Falerna  
     vitis Achaemeniumque costum,  
 cur invidendis postibus et novo                   45  
 sublime ritu moliar atrium?  
 cur valle permutem Sabina  
     divitias operosiores (C. 3.1.21-26, 41-48)

Gentle sleep does not despise the humble houses of rustic men and the shady riverbank, nor is the valley of Tempe disturbed by storm winds. The tumultuous sea does not bother the man desiring what is enough. [...] But if Phrygian stone does not soothe a grieving man, nor wearing purple more brilliant than a star, nor Falernian wine or Persian perfume, why should I construct a lofty atrium in a new style, with doorposts that incite envy? Why should I exchange my Sabine valley for riches more full of worries?

---

<sup>64</sup> Miller 1991, 378, 383.

<sup>65</sup> See Paschalis 2002b, 73.

The imagery here should be familiar by now to a reader of the *Odes* after all the warnings against the dangerous sea and luxurious architecture in the first two books. The tumultuous sea (*tumultuosum... mare*, 26) is of no concern to simple, “rustic” (*agrestium*, 21) men like Horace who inhabit “humble homes” (*humilis domos*, 22), only “desiring what is enough” (*desiderantem quod satis est*, 25).<sup>66</sup> After all, a grieving man cannot be helped by what such exploration can bring back, whether it be wealth, or the marble columns, purple dye, wine, and perfume that accompany it (41-45). What is the point, the poet therefore asks, of building a grand structure in a new style (*novo...ritu*, 45-46) – one that is designed with doorposts that will just incite envy (*invidendis postibus*, 45) and a lofty hall (*sublime...atrium*, 46) whose very height could only serve to cause one concern?<sup>67</sup> In contrast to all this “modern” architecture once again stands Horace’s own lowly farm, or rather – in a way that calls even less attention to its actual physical structure – his “Sabine valley” (*valle...Sabina*, *C.* 3.1.47).<sup>68</sup> According to the poet, at least, that is all he needs to be content.

Is he actually content, though? Horace spends quite a bit of time, as we have seen, describing the excessiveness of villa architecture in the *Odes* – so much time, in fact, that Eleanor Leach has seen some of these poems as “virtually a celebration of luxury.”<sup>69</sup> If Horace

---

<sup>66</sup> Whereas Pasquali 1920, 659, notes an Epicurean influence in Horace’s depiction of the carefree *agrestes* (cf. Epic. fr. 570), Nisbet and Rudd 2004, 4, suggest that “Horace was also influenced by the end of the recently issued second *Georgic*, which in the same philosophical tradition had drawn a contrast between the happiness of farmers and the pomp of the rich” (cf. Verg. *G.* 2.461 ff.).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *C.* 2.16.11-12. G. Williams 1969, 31, *ad loc.*, points out that “however high he goes (in wealth or building), fear and forebodings...go as high.” Indeed, as Horace warns in an earlier poem, “lofty towers fall with a greater crash” (*celsae graviore casu / decidunt turres*, *C.* 2.10.10-11). Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 163, *ad loc.*, direct us to a passage from Lucretius as the “*figura etymologica*” for the idea here (cf. Lucr. 1.741: *et graviter magni magno cecidere ibi casu*).

<sup>68</sup> Nisbet and Rudd 2004, 21, *ad loc.*, are to right to note that “[a]s *valle* suggests both lowness and seclusion it makes a contrast with *sublime*.”

<sup>69</sup> Leach 1988, 286-287. See also Whitehorne 1969, 32, arguing that “there is here little open reproof for the builder.” Armstrong 2009, 90-91, would seem to take this idea too far in suggesting that Horace’s “poetic self-positioning as one who rejects high mansions is destabilized by his repeated descriptions of them within his verse... For all the rants against ambitious building projects, therefore, it is possible to detect at least a sideways acknowledgement of the attractions of such unnatural luxuries.” Indeed, according to Armstrong, “it is possible to

has such great contempt for these structures, why then does he devote so many poems and lines to describing them and relatively so little to the description of his own modest farm? I will return to that question momentarily. It is important, though, to understand that – as with the architectural rants in Book 2 – personal luxury here is not the only, or even most important, referent.<sup>70</sup> There is a sense that the excessive villa and the humble farm combine to form a kind of generic discourse; they are architextural, in other words, to use the terminology put forward in this dissertation.<sup>71</sup> Nor has the metapoetic nature of these structures escaped scholars of the *Odes*. Riemer Faber has correctly suggested, for instance, that “[j]ust as the Sabine estate represents a lifestyle and literary aesthetic that contrasts with greater wealth associated with a more ambitious form of poetry, so too the preceding clause, in 3.1.45-46, may be read as literary discourse.”<sup>72</sup> According to Faber’s argument, C. 3.1 in particular is about the pressures of joining “private, non-political life and personal poetry to public, national, and political poetry.” It is not that Horace is unable to do so, Faber claims, but rather that he is “express[ing] the difficulty he has in uniting them.”<sup>73</sup> Horace cannot escape the public spotlight, the argument runs, and its trappings of wealth and grandeur cannot but find their way into his private lyric.

Even if one were to forgive the biographical fallacy to which this view runs dangerously

---

read that most extreme example of man’s hubris, seaside engineering works, more positively, as the Augustan imposition of order on society writ large, extended to an imposition of order on the natural world.” While I agree with Armstrong that we need not read these structures wholly negatively, as I will discuss below, I do not find the extent to which the scholar takes this argument particularly compelling.

<sup>70</sup> For a comparison between these two poems, C. 2.18 and 3.1, see Whitehorne 1969, 32 and Percy 1977, 778-779.

<sup>71</sup> See above, pp. 5-6, for further discussion of what I mean by “architexture” and “architextural.”

<sup>72</sup> Faber 2005, 97. Faber’s “metaphorical” (or more accurately metapoetic) reading of these lines is based also “upon references to the poetry of Vergil and Pindar [cf. *Ol.* 6.1-4] in which the image functions figuratively, and upon diction which supports a higher level of meaning” (97). See also Armstrong 2009, 88-89, for whom “[t]he poem is a diatribe against the thoughtless accumulation of wealth and the reliance upon luxury to bring happiness, but it also hints at a poetic angle to the relationship between man and nature. The simple life, because closer to nature, is a happier one: Horace’s modest Sabine estate will always be preferable to a high-rise mansion; similarly, Horace’s verse, which expresses these moral values, aligns itself aesthetically with the most modest form of building, the *humilis casa*.”

<sup>73</sup> Faber 2005, 103.

close, Faber's conclusion nevertheless does not seem to give Horace enough credit, especially if one considers more closely the nuanced rhetorical stance that the poet is taking in these odes on architecture. The constant attention to transgressive architecture does not necessarily mean that Horace is having "difficulty" fitting it together with his traditional lyric mode as represented by his modest farm. The previous section introduced the idea of the inverted *recusatio* in the *Odes* for poems in which Horace reprimands his Muse for transgressing the limits of his lyric. This allowed the poet, I argued, to integrate extrageneric material from epic into his poem while actively disavowing it. A similar interpretation can be applied to his architextural images of excess and their owners in the poems examined in this section: it is not that the poet has trouble incorporating the grand, public, political mode into his humble, private, personal lyric; rather, on the contrary, he is able to do just that *through* claiming to renounce the former.

For this technique to be effective, however, it requires a delicate balancing of the two sides. It is no wonder, then, that Horace spends so many lines on villas that try to extend beyond boundaries of traditional lyric space and time, of the lyric "here and now," in contrast to so few on his own farm. Horace can easily establish his "traditional" lyric space and time through the mere mention of his Sabine farm; the space automatically has the poet's stamp of approval because it is Horace's, after all, and Horace is a lyric poet. The Sabine farm does not need much therefore to authorize it as a symbolic architextural structure for Horace's lyric. To introduce the opposing extrageneric material is a different matter: the poet needs to give more attention to that which he claims to disavow – as is common in the "inverted" *recusatio* trope – so that it too can be become established in his poetry, even while Horace appears to reject it as another's prerogative. Too much description of his farm would throw this tension out of balance. Too little about the transgressive villas, on the other hand, and the reader might miss the point – just as too

much discussion of them would make Horace seem insincere in his rejection of them. The balance has to be just right, in other words, for the tensions to be weighed appropriately so that the boundary of “traditional” lyric space and time that separates the two can remain stable.

Michèle Lowrie interprets Horace’s apparent “crossing [of] the limits he has established” as “serv[ing] a definitional purpose” for his poetics. While that interpretation is not incorrect, I do not agree with Lowrie’s conclusion that the poet is “mov[ing] from an initial limiting gesture, to an expansive one, back to a compromise between the two.”<sup>74</sup> Horace is not entirely disingenuous in his injunctions against such transgressive structures. The function of the inverted *recusatio* is to make it possible, I would argue, for Horace to avoid choosing either the lyric form or the “epic” architecture of contemporary villas – or even to have to make a “compromise” between the two, as Lowrie suggests it. That does not mean Horace is employing the inverted *recusatio* trope here because he is non-committal, or because he wants to “eat his cake and have it too,” as Commager remarked.<sup>75</sup> Maintaining this tension is in fact essential to Horace’s redefinition of traditional lyric space and time: it serves to *reinforce* the stability of traditional lyric boundaries, even as they are redefined, in such a way that Horace can revitalize the structure without destabilizing its foundations.

To understand this complicated dynamic it might be helpful to turn to the theories of the 20<sup>th</sup>-century Russian semiotician Juri Lotman. In *The Structure of the Artistic Text*, for example, Lotman argues that the “violation” of a structure can often catalyze the “informational activation” of that very same structure. In the case of an “artistic text,” in fact, the text

---

<sup>74</sup> Lowrie 1997, 2. As Lowrie goes on to conclude, “[a] full understanding of Horace’s address to his own poetic inspiration must take account of the simultaneous assertion of a boundary, of its transgression, and of the accommodation of such transgression through a contemporary aesthetic.” See also Oliensis 1998, 102-157, for an excellent analysis of the concept of *finis* within the *Odes* and how it fits into a larger discussion of limits in the Augustan age. I will examine more the “imperial” character of Horace’s *Odes* in the final section of this chapter below, pp. 79-89.

<sup>75</sup> See pp. 58-59, above, for a discussion of the analysis of this tension in Commager 1962.

does not merely represent the implementation of structural norms, but their violation as well. It functions in a dual structural field consisting of the tendency to establish order and to violate it. Although each tendency tries to dominate and destroy the opposing one, the victory of either would prove fatal to art. *The life of an artistic text depends on their mutual tension.*<sup>76</sup>

The inclusion of extrageneric time and space through an inverted *recusatio* does not destabilize the generic boundaries of “traditional” lyric that are established through Horace’s Sabine farm; rather, as Lotman suggests, the tension created helps to activate, or revitalize, the traditional structure of Horatian lyric – and, more importantly, to keep it “alive” and dynamic. The poet’s statements about his farm gain meaning and definition, in other words, from the contrast between it and the transgressive nature of the other architextural images in the *Odes*, and *vice versa*. The tension that is thus produced by the rhetorical figure of the inverted *recusatio* is not deleterious to the traditional boundaries of lyric but instead allows both sides of the spectrum to exist within Horace’s lyric structure – in tension, yes, but equally balanced in such a way as to keep the boundary between the two sides stable.

The tension discussed in this section between the two architextural extremes is therefore integral to *stabilizing* the structure of “traditional” lyric even while adding what might seem to be hostile to it. This notion of balanced tensions leading to stability and new life can also help account for the tensions that exist in Horace’s most famous architextural image: his *monumentum* that concludes his first collection of *Odes*. It is in fact the tension within his poetry as brought out by the contrast between Horace’s farm and transgressive architecture analyzed in this section that enables Horace to create a structure that is stable enough to overcome death and yet dynamic enough to always be “fresh” (*recens*, C. 3.30.8).

---

<sup>76</sup> Lotman 1977, 299 (as cited in Fowler 1995b, 3); my emphasis.

### Part 3. *Exegi Monumentum...*

In *C.* 2.10, the very ode in which Horace famously introduces the idea of the “golden mean” (*aurea mediocritas*, 5), the poet claims that “high towers fall with a greater crash” (*celsae graviore casu / decidunt turres*, 10-11). By so far as architecture departs from the natural bounds of space and time, the poet seems to be saying, to that degree it will tumble into ruin. Where does that leave Horace’s own rather impressive monument that he imagines in *C.* 3.30? How does *that* fit into this picture when it seems to contradict so blatantly the kind of traditional lyric space and time symbolized by Horace’s farm when contrasted to the transgressive villas discussed in the previous section?<sup>77</sup> Indeed, Horace’s *monumentum* seems to transgress the very boundaries of his traditional lyric structure in an even more extreme manner than any structure which he criticizes previously in the *Odes*, as the beginning of the poem demonstrates:

Exegi monumentum aere perennius  
regalique situ pyramidum altius,  
quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens  
possit diruere aut innumerabilis  
annorum series et fuga temporum.                    5  
non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei  
vitabit Libitinam: usque ego postera  
crescam laude recens... (*C.* 3.30.1-8)

I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze and loftier than the royal structure of the pyramids, which neither the decaying rain nor the powerless north wind could up-root – or even the innumerable series of years and flight of ages. I will not die entirely, and a great part of me will avoid death: constantly I, fresh, will grow by posterity’s praise...

This poem has been interpreted in a number of ways to account for the apparent contradiction between such a monument that completely transgresses the laws of nature and the earlier injunctions in Books 2 and 3 against the kind of architecture that does just that. Neville Collinge

---

<sup>77</sup> Lowrie 1997, 14, frames this problem in its temporal aspect in relation to *C.* 3.30 by stating that the *Odes* seem paradoxically to “belong to both the here and now, and eternity.”

tries to solve the tension by considering that the poem is simply “diffident in tone” and not entirely serious.<sup>78</sup> Don Fowler suggests, on the other hand, that the lack of “restraint” in the finale to the *Odes* is representative of a hidden “guilty will to power” on the part of Horace – that the poet simply could not help but make such grand claims living in the regime that he does.<sup>79</sup> Matthew Santirocco represents perhaps a middle position between these two approaches, in arguing that while the poem might be “a bit self-deprecatory” the “pride” which Horace feels is genuine; in fact, according to Santirocco, the poem reveals a desire on the part of the poet to establish himself in such a way that he would become “to poetry what Augustus is to the state.”<sup>80</sup>

I will explore the implications of this parallel between Augustus and Horace in the final section of this chapter. It is first necessary, though, to show how the architextural *monumentum* here is perhaps the perfect symbol for the kind of lyric that the poet has constructed in his *Odes*. Although it is transgressive to the highest degree, the *monumentum* is built just like the traditional lyric structure that Horace constructs, that is, through a balancing of tensions in such a way that the monument too can be more stable than anything ever built and yet eternally

---

<sup>78</sup> Collinge 1961, 69. In focusing on the end of the poem (14-16) and Horace’s prayer to his Muse for approval, G. Williams 1969, 152, claims that “[t]he attitude of prayer and thanksgiving is a perfect antidote to the expression of personal pride; the pleasure he feels in the pride of his humble home-town and the prayer of thanks to the Muse are two successive steps down from the assertion of his own achievement in 1-9.” Oliensis 1998, 104, considers Horace’s submission to the Muse at the poem’s end in a different and more affirming light: “Horace proudly submits himself here to the Muse, and to no other. Certainly not to Maecenas, nor even to Augustus.”

<sup>79</sup> See Fowler 1995a, 266, where he argues that while one should read with more than a hint of irony how Horace’s “great and glorious fame in *Odes* 3.30 will spread...all over Puglia and Basilicata,” the overall statement of the poem reveals a desire on the part of the poet that has been mostly hidden until this point.

<sup>80</sup> Santirocco 1986, 167-168. See also Putnam 1973, 10, where he claims that Horace here “proves himself an Augustus of the spirit whose feats are in parallel with, but incomparable to, those of his patron,” and Gibson 1997, 314, claiming that “Horace’s poem, confident and assured as it is, nevertheless suggests that the poet’s proper role is to seek immortality through poetry, rather than the more dangerous sphere of political achievement.” Fraenkel 1957, 302-307, likewise considers Horace to be proud of his feat as a *princeps* of poetry (cf. 3.30.13); for Fraenkel, however, the poem illustrates that Horace was “convinced that [his inspiration] came from heaven” (307). Hutton 1972 makes the rather unconvincing biographical suggestion that the ambitious claims of *C.* 3.30 “follow and represent Horace’s reaction on reading through his writings” (501).



dynamic at the same time.<sup>81</sup>

The first five lines of the poem present the *monumentum* as a structure that clearly transgresses both temporal and spatial boundaries of Horace's lyric here and now.<sup>82</sup> From a temporal standpoint the monument will survive longer than the longest-lasting metal that humankind can work.<sup>83</sup> Nor will it be affected by the physical limits of nature as represented by the "decaying rain" (*imber edax*, 3) and the now "powerless" wind (*impotens*, 3); even more impressively, it will exist outside of the eternal cycling of seasons (cf. *innumerabilis / annorum series et fuga temporum*, 4-5).<sup>84</sup> In terms of spatial excess, moreover, Horace's monument will be "loftier than the regal structure of the pyramids" (*regalique situ pyramidum altius*, 2).<sup>85</sup> All this suggests that the *monumentum* of the poet would be perhaps the most stable structure ever constructed in its ability to resist those forces – gravity and time – that ultimately destroy all works crafted by humankind.

---

<sup>81</sup> See Hardie 1993, 127, arguing that "C. 3.30 articulates the tension between the static immobility of the monument, or of the words viewed as signs marked on a sheet or tablet, and the dynamic and vital motion that inheres in Horace's lyric poetry."

<sup>82</sup> Fraenkel 1957, 302, claims – without any citations – that "[t]he magnificent opening period, down to 5 *et fuga temporum*, revives thoughts familiar from Greek poetry, especially choric lyric; in it there is nothing that might not have been said by a Greek poet." There is an immense bibliography on the similarities and differences between Horace here and his predecessors, including Hutton 1972, 500 (Sappho, Leonidas of Tarentum); Putnam 1973, 2-5 (Ennius, Lucretius, Pindar); Syndikus 1973, 275-276 (Pindar, Bacchylides); von Albrecht 1973, 62 (Ennius); Woodman 1974, 119-120 (Pindar), 121-122 (Lucretius); Kennedy 1975 (Pindar); Hardie 1993, 127-128 (Pindar, Ennius); Galinsky 1996, 352-353 (Ennius); Lowrie 1997, 71-74 (Pindar); Nisbett and Rudd 2004, 365 (Aristophanes, Simonides, Callimachus); and Reitz 2013, 106-107 (Pindar).

<sup>83</sup> On this particular line see Borzsák 1964. Hardie 1993, 127, considers that *aere* can be read in two ways – [1] as "a bronze inscription," since "[t]he language of the opening lines of C. 3.30 is strongly reminiscent of the lapidary style of the monumental inscription," or [2] as "refer[ring] to statues of bronze." Hardie seems more intrigued by the second of these options, conjuring up Horace as "a Pygmalion who makes a statue of himself." On the word *exigi* see also Putnam 1973, 2, and Galinsky 1996, 351-352, asserting that "Horace's choice of the word for 'to build' has no counterpart in the surviving Roman inscriptions: instead, they use words like *aedificare*, *locare*, *facere*, and *absolvere*. *Exigere* also sounds the note of careful craftsmanship in the tradition of Hellenistic poetry."

<sup>84</sup> See Putnam 1973, 2-3, pointing out that the word *perennius* serves as a "pun" (vis-à-vis the poet Ennius) which gives "particular importance" to the "aloofness from temporality." According to the scholar, in fact, the "splendid unconcern with the horizontal line of time's passage would...gain particular importance to an Augustan reader, aware of his Latin poetic heritage, from the word *perennius*."

<sup>85</sup> On the image of the pyramids here see Fuchs 1962, Trencsényi-Waldapfel 1964, and Gibson 1997. Nisbett and Rudd 2004, 366, *ad loc.*, maintain that "Horace's comparison with the pyramids has no recorded parallel in Greek poetry."

Yet the monument is at the same time shown to be dynamic. It might well seem odd at first that Horace says he will “grow” (*crescam*, 8) from the praises of posterity. As scholars have suggested, however, the imagery here is not inappropriate since the poet and his lyric *monumentum* have “imperceptibly” become one and the same by this point in the poem.<sup>86</sup> But then the question becomes: “How can a stable monument grow?” This is an issue that has spurred some interesting and highly subtle interpretations. Whereas Michael C. J. Putnam argues that “growth retaining continued freshness, eternity imposed on futurity...only certifies the initial programme of a *monumentum* espousing stature beyond space and time,”<sup>87</sup> Michèle Lowrie suggests that “image of a breathing monument” is able to avoid “the stasis of formalism” because a “*monumentum* (monument, reminder, tomb, literary corpus) is not only a piece of architecture, but a speech act.”<sup>88</sup> It would seem, however, that these scholars are overlooking the straightforward way in which Horace’s *monumentum* is figured in an explicitly physical sense: it has materiality (*aere perennius*, 1); it has physical dimensions (*regalique situ pyramidum altius*, 2).<sup>89</sup> The poet is employing the idea of the monument here, I would argue, because monuments offer a tangible feeling of stability that gives their viewers a sense of surety against the forces which affect all mortals. The notion that this *monumentum* can overcome those forces does not make it less physical; if anything, in fact, Horace’s structure is a monument, *par excellence*, in its

---

<sup>86</sup> Woodman 1974, 121, claims that “[a]lmost imperceptibly Horace has changed ground to become identified with his own poetry. The change is intentional.” See also Putnam 1973 and Lowrie 1997 for similar interpretation of the identification of the poet and his monument.

<sup>87</sup> Putnam 1973, 6. See also Tarrant 1995, 33, making the pithy but apt statement that “the poet covers ground while adopting a structure that presents the illusion of standing still,” and Fowler 2000, 198, putting a more deconstructive spin on the dynamic nature of Horace’s *monumentum* by asking us to consider that “[t]his is metaphorical marble, not real marble. But if real monuments decay, can we be so sure of metaphorical ones? Beneath the surface polish lurks the beginnings of decay, the potential for letters and sense to fall off the stone, the inner instability which in Horatian diagnostics always waits to betray the smooth marble front.” This reading is one that I find more applicable to Vergil’s *Aeneid*, as Chapters IV-V demonstrate below.

<sup>88</sup> Lowrie 1997, 11.

<sup>89</sup> As opposed, for instance, to the much less material monument that Ovid constructs at the end of his *Metamorphoses* (15.871-879), examined at length below, pp. 169-179.

ability to endure past all bounds. If this is the case, though, then there would certainly seem to be a real tension here between the stability that Horace's *monumentum* as a monument promises and his prophecy that it will be eternally dynamic.<sup>90</sup>

That very tension is the point, however. It makes sense for Horace's architextural monument to be both stable and dynamic,<sup>91</sup> for it represents a poetics that is itself based on tensions that allow the poet to stabilize traditional lyric space while he redefines it. I have argued in this chapter that Horace "inverts" the *recusatio* in order to construct his generic boundaries so that he can incorporate generic tensions into its very structure without causing it to crack at the foundations, that is, to create a stable lyric structure that can remain traditional while still being innovative. That might seem paradoxical – just as a monument that is stable and yet grows also might appear paradoxical. This is not paradox for the sake of paradox, though, or some kind of deconstructive dark humor for that matter. It is precisely *because of* the incorporation of these mutual tensions through the poem's opposed architextural images that I have suggested Horace's poetry can achieve a dynamic enough nature to be *simultaneously* old and new, traditional and innovative.<sup>92</sup>

The use of such tensions can be found outside of Horace's *Odes*, as well. The remaining

---

<sup>90</sup> For the quality of monuments to be inherently dual in this respect see the discussion of Roman monumentality above, pp. 29-36, esp. 34-36.

<sup>91</sup> See von Albrecht 1973, 67, where he likewise interprets *C.* 3.30 as a balancing of tensions when he writes that "[o]uter world and inner life, space and time, the typical and individual, political and private life are artfully balanced against each other. The Augustan Horace combines freedom and constraint" (*Außenwelt und Innerlichkeit, Raum und Zeit, Typisches und Individuelles, Politisches und Privates sind kunstvoll gegeneinander ausgewogen. Der Augusteer Horaz vereint Freiheit und Gebundenheit*). The idea of a co-existence of opposites in Horace's poetry can also be found in Schiesaro 2009 with his ingenious notion of "Bacchic poetics" in which the god of wine in the *Odes* "stands as the guarantor of a freedom which is both thematic and stylistic because he can make opposites co-exist: pain and pleasure, *tenuitas* and *grandia*, the labours of *meditari* with the emotions of sudden inspiration, the paradox that prescribes the poet to be at one and the same time both himself and someone else in the struggle to combine originality and tradition" (72).

<sup>92</sup> The capacity of the *Odes* to be both traditional and novel also has been seen to occur at the linguistic level. According to Collinge 1961, 13, "[t]he first feature" of Horace's language in the *Odes* that suggests itself to a reader is "the curious parallel existence of bold and tame, old and new."

part of this chapter will suggest that understanding how Horace constructs his *monumentum* can also inform one's reading of the tensions within the rhetoric of monumentality in the Augustan age more broadly.<sup>93</sup> It is the fact that Horace's *monumentum* does not represent a compromise but rather a delicate balancing of tensions that makes Horace's *Odes* into a true Augustan monument, that is, one which is stable *and* dynamic,<sup>94</sup> one which is able to signify past tradition and present innovation at the same time.

#### Part 4. Horace's Augustan Monument

In her book on *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Ellen Oliensis argues that the poet's lyric poetry

with its multiple articulations and recurrent arrests, tends to concentrate...on *finis*. [...] And *yet* it is just this emphasis on limit that lends Horatian lyric an "imperial" character. The peculiar energy that charges Horace's lyric *finis* both derives from and feeds a larger cultural preoccupation with the masterful articulation of space.<sup>95</sup>

This "cultural preoccupation" is of course a reference to what Augustus himself was doing to the structure of Rome – the physical one as well as the one in the Roman imagination. The *princeps* was pushing the borders of the empire farther than ever before. If Rome keeps growing and

---

<sup>93</sup> Horace's political stance towards Augustus and Augustan ideology has been the topic of a good deal of scholarship in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century – much of which is non-Anglophone, particularly (and not surprisingly) in the aftermath of WWII – including Mancuso 1953, Pöschl 1956, La Penna 1963, and Doblhofer 1966. See also Santirocco 1995 (with bibliography) for a concise survey of the topic.

<sup>94</sup> Many scholars have remarked upon the inherently innovative quality of Horatian lyric, including: Putnam 1986, 24-25, where he suggests that "what we learn as we follow out such a narrative of lyrics is a cumulative matter. It is a process of discovery which never reaches an end. It forces us, once we have finished any such gathering of poems, to begin over again, with earlier questions answered and beauties elucidated, but with new issues, needing explanations, being raised, and new areas of connotation ever opening out"; Miller 1991, 388, arguing that "the lyric consciousness of the poet exists as a series of potential poetic sequences which together reflect and refract a finite series of historical, political and personal issues in an infinite variety of ways"; Edmunds 1992, 46, suggesting further that "the careful arrangement of the poems in books 1-3 presupposes reading and rereading"; and Lowrie 1997, 4, with the idea that Horace achieves eternal freshness because his "[l]yric keeps fragmenting any monolithic narrative sense."

<sup>95</sup> Oliensis 1998, 107. See also Putnam 1990, 218, where he claims that "Horace is one of the great poets of liminality." In a similar fashion Lowrie 1997, 36, calls Horace "a poet who delights in excursions *ultra terminum* ('beyond the limit')."

incorporating more and more land and peoples, though, how can Roman identity remain stable? That is an important question, no doubt, and one that may have entered the minds of those living under Augustus amidst so much change. Yet the physical borders of the empire were not the only ones that were being redefined. At the same time, and more pertinently to the focus of this dissertation, Augustus was redefining the structure of the *res publica*, too, and incorporating into it ingredients and roles that were very different from those of the Roman state during its rise to power. Could Rome still remain “Rome” in the midst of so much redefinition of its boundaries, outwards as well as from within its *finēs*?

Chapter II demonstrated just how important architecture was to the Romans’ conception of the world around them and, in particular, to the way that they saw their state. Yet the old structure of Rome was simply that, old, and it had fallen into ruin – at least, according to Horace himself, when he laments that Rome’s own architectural structures had fallen into disrepair during the civil wars, and with them so had the Roman state and its *mores*.<sup>96</sup> Coming to this particular situation Augustus needed to rebuild Rome, the idea of it as much as its physical appearance. For this monumentalization of the city to be successful, however, it had to be connected to the foundations of Rome’s past. Augustus could not simply disregard the old structure of the republic, in other words, even as he built his new one in the form of the principate.

This chapter has teased out some of the nuances of Horace’s rhetorical strategies in his attempt to redefine “traditional” lyric dimensions through a balancing of tensions. It is interesting to see what this approach can tell us about the careful words that the *princeps* used to articulate his own revitalization of traditional Roman “structures” in the *Res Gestae* through a similar

---

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *C.* 3.6.1-4. For discussion of these lines see pp. 40-41 above.

balancing of tensions. The Augustan program needed to be traditional and yet new, republican and yet imperial. The *princeps* protests, too, in favor of the traditional structures upon which Rome had been founded. At the same time – and just like Horace – by keeping old and new systems in subtle tension with each other he simultaneously integrates into these structures a novel system of power without outwardly appearing to destabilize the old foundations; if anything, in fact, it allows the *princeps* to revitalize them, even as he introduces dramatic changes to the republican structure.<sup>97</sup>

There are numerous sections in the monumental inscription of the *Res Gestae* where a reader can find Augustus refusing to accept novel honors and titles. In *RGDA* 6, for example, Augustus claims that he “did not receive any magistracy offered against the custom of his ancestors,” even though it was what he claims the senate and Roman people wanted for him.<sup>98</sup> This comes at the end of a long list of “*res non gestae*” which – according to Walter Eder – “serve[s] only to profile the *princeps* as the incorruptible guardian of tradition who took care, even against the will of Senate and People, not to contradict the constitution of the fathers.”<sup>99</sup> That seems to be correct, at least on the surface. But it would also seem that if Augustus constantly goes against the will of the Senate and People he is making just as much of a statement about his power and its innovative nature. He neither needs nor desires honors such as

---

<sup>97</sup> Hölscher 2006, 241, suggests that there is a “presentness” in Augustan culture that “seems difficult to reconcile with a fundamentally retrospective orientation toward an all-dominating past.” As he argues, however, “[t]he artistic forms served the specific statement – and this statement was not at all retrospective, but contemporary and actual.” It is not that the Romans are obsessed with the past, for Hölscher, but that they use the forms of that past as “universal cultural instrument[s]” to produce a “vivid expression of contemporary concepts” (258, 244). From a non-classicist perspective Hirsch 1995, 23, claims that the “tension between tradition and the modern” can be “momentarily resolved in a representation that encapsulates the political fiction of a unified nation.” I would argue that the unresolved tensions of the Augustan age can be just as effective in creating a powerful political fiction.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *RGDA* 6: ...*senatu populoq]u[e Romano consentientibus] ut cu[rator legum et morum summa potestate solus crearer, nullum magistratum contra morem maiorum delatum recepi* (“...although the senate and people of Rome were in agreement that I alone should be made guardian of laws and conduct with the highest power, I received no magistracy offered against the custom of my ancestors”). Galinsky 1996, 258, also notes this as a possible source of “inspiration” for the kind of *recusatio* found in Horace’s *Odes*.

<sup>99</sup> Eder 2005, 14.

the consulship (or worse the dictatorship) that represented the height of the republican *cursus honorum*.<sup>100</sup> And so he can “refuse” receiving them in an untraditional way. As Horace with his ambitious builders transgressing the boundaries of his traditional lyric time and space, so too Augustus with his subjects offering to him what they should not. The transgression appears to be all theirs, not his. By employing the rhetoric of the inverted *recusatio* here – by being the active refuser of something seemingly untraditional – the *princeps* is able to show his respect for past traditions while simultaneously communicating that his new system no longer requires them.

Refusing honors in this way was not the only manner in which Augustus was successful in carefully articulating the transformation of Rome from the old republic to the new principate through the use of an inverted *recusatio*. The more significant examples for the purposes of this chapter concern what Augustus has to say in his *Res Gestae* about his own building program. The *princeps* lists several of his architectural efforts in Chapters 19, 20, and 21,<sup>101</sup> which is provided in its entirety below for full effect:

**19.** curiam et continens ei chalcidicum templumque Apollinis in Palatio cum porticibus, aedem divi Iuli, lupercal, porticum ad circum Flaminium, quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat, Octaviam, pulvinar ad circum maximum, aedes in Capitolio Iovis Feretri et Iovis Tonantis, aedem Quirini, aedes Minervae et Iunonis Reginae et Iovis Libertatis in Aventino, aedem Larum in summa sacra via, aedem deum Penatium in Velia, aedem Iuventatis, aedem Matris Magnae in Palatio feci.

**20.** Capitolium et Pompeium theatrum utrumque opus impensa grandi refeci sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei. rivus aquarum compluribus locis vetustate labentes refeci, et aquam quae Marcia appellatur duplicavi fonte novo in rivum eius inmisso. forum Iulium et basilicam quae fuit inter aedem Castoris et aedem Saturni, coepta profligataque opera a patre meo, perfecit et eandem basilicam consumptam incendio, ampliata eius solo, sub titulo nominis filiorum m[eorum i]ncohasi, et, si vivus non

---

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *RGDA* 5: [dic]tat[ura]m et apsent[i e]t praesent[i mihi delatam et a popu]lo et a se[na]tu...non rec[epi]. [...] consul[at]um] quoqu[e] tum annuum e[t perpetuum mihi] dela[tum non recepi] (“I did not accept the dictatorship offered by the people and the senate to me both absent and present. [...] I also did not accept at that time the consulate offered to me both then for the year and in perpetuity”).

<sup>101</sup> Sablayrolles 1981 provides an excellent analysis of the ideological implications of the organization of *RGDA* 19-21. See also Milnor 2005, 188-123, and Cooley 2009, 182-202.

perfecissem, perfici ab heredibus [meis ius]si. duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sex[tu]m ex [auctori]tate senatus refeci nullo praetermisso quod e[o] tempore [refici debeba]t. consul septimum viam Flaminiam a[b urbe] Ari[minus] refeci pontes]que omnes praeter Mulvium et Minucium.

**21.** in privato solo Martis Ultoris templum [f]orumque Augustum [ex ma]n[i]biis feci. theatrum ad aedem Apollinis in solo magna ex parte a p[r]i[v]atis empto feci, quod sub nomine M(arci) Marcell[i] generi mei esset. don[a e]x manibiis in Capitolio et in aede divi Iu[l]i et in aede Apollonis et in aede Vestae et in templo Martis Ultoris consecravi, quae mihi HS circiter milliens. auri coronari pondo triginta et quinque millia municipiis et colonis Italiae conferentibus ad triumpho[s] meos quintum consul remisi, et postea, quotienscumque imperator a[ppe]llatus sum, aurum coronarium non accepi, decernentibus municipi[s] et colonis aequ[e] benigne a<sup>l</sup>t<sup>l</sup>que antea decreverant.

**19.** I built the curia and the chalcidicum next to it and the temple of Apollo on the Palatine with its porticoes, the temple of the divine Julius, the Lupercal, the portico near the Circus Flaminius, which I allowed to be called Octavian from the name of him who had first built it in that same place, the Pulvinar at the Circus Maximus, the temples on the Capitoline of Jupiter Feretrius and of Jupiter Tonans, the temple of Quirinus, the temples of Minerva and of Queen Juno and of Jupiter on the Aventine, the temple of the Lares on the top of the Sacred Way, the temple of the Penates gods on the Velia, the temple of Youth, and the temple of the Great Mother on the Palatine.

**20.** I renovated the Capitolium and the Theatre of Pompey – each work at a great cost – without any inscription of my name. I renovated the aqueducts in several places where they were falling apart because of old age and I doubled the aqueduct which is called the Marcian by letting a new spring into its stream. I finished the Forum Julium and the basilica which was between the temple of Castor and the temple of Saturn – works having been begun and advanced far by my father – and I began under the title of the name of my sons work on the same basilica which had been destroyed by a fire, with the base of it having been increased in size, and I ordered it to be finished by my heirs if I did not finish it while I was alive. I renovated 82 temples of the gods in the city as consul for the sixth time on the authority of the senate – with not one having been passed over which needed to be renovated at the time. As consul for a seventh time I renovated the Via Flaminia from the city to Arminium, as well as all the bridges except the Mulvian and Minucian.

**21.** On private ground I built the temple of Mars Ultor and the Forum Augustum from my plunder. I built a theatre near the temple of Apollo on ground for the most part having been bought from private citizens, which would be in the name of my son-in-law, Marcellus. I consecrated gifts from public spoils on the Capitolium, on the temple of divine Julius, on the temple of Vesta, and on the temple of Mars Ultor, which cost me around 100 million sesterces. When I was consul for a fifth time I sent back 35,000 pounds of crown-gold although the municipalities and colonies of Italy were offering it for my triumphs, and afterwards, each single time I was called imperator, I did not accept crown-gold, even though the municipalities and colonies were decreeing it as kindly as they had decreed it previously.



I have cited the whole list here to demonstrate that while it might be impressive in length and content the style in which Augustus talks about his buildings is rather understated. For all the structures he claims to have built (*feci*), rebuilt (*refeci*), or completed (*perfecei*), there is almost no description of them – of their height, of their material, or of really anything specific about their quality. He does mention their costs a few times, but their physical nature as buildings is dramatically underplayed. There is certainly nothing too explicit in his language about how their impressive quality has increased the *maiestas* of Rome, as Vitruvius claims in the preface to his *De architectura* analyzed above in Chapter II.<sup>102</sup>

This passage is certainly in keeping with the at times rather un-descriptive language of many an inscription.<sup>103</sup> And anyone reading in Rome, at least, would of course have the physical buildings themselves at which to marvel.<sup>104</sup> However, the way that Augustus simply lists, without much detail at all, the structures that contributed to the incredible transformation which he has brought about to the city of Rome seems almost *too* modest, especially when compared to Augustus' own famous boast recorded by Suetonius to have left Rome a city of marble,<sup>105</sup> or Strabo's over-the-top praise of the Campus Martius in Book 3 of his *Geography*,<sup>106</sup> or even Vergil's allusions to the golden-roofed Capitoline temple in Book 8 of the *Aeneid*.<sup>107</sup> Augustus does mention amounts of gold and other materials elsewhere in the inscription. At the end of

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Vitr. Pr. 2. For a discussion of this passage from Vitruvius see above, pp. 17-20.

<sup>103</sup> On the linguistic qualities of the *Res Gestae* see above, pp. 12, n. 2.

<sup>104</sup> See Elsner 1996, 39, suggesting that the most impressive Augustan monuments “do not need to be mentioned, because for a Roman citizen who wished to read the *Res Gestae*, they were inseparable from the experience of standing in front of the inscription.”

<sup>105</sup> Suet. *Div. Aug.* 28.3: *Augustus urbem adeo excoluit, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisse.* For more discussion of this passage see p. 11 above.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Strab. 5.3.8.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.347-348: *hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit / aurea nunc, olim siluestribus horrida dumis* (“[Evander] leads [Aeneas] from here to the Tarpeian seat and the Capitoline, / now golden, formerly bristling with forest-thorns”).

Chapter 21 (cited above), for example, he speaks of the donation of 100 million sesterces that he made, as well as the 35,000 pounds of “crown-gold” that he “refused” to take from the Italian colonies. Perhaps it should not be surprising, though, that Augustus picks the end of his architectural deeds to insert these many “refusals” to accept all the crown-gold offered to him: in the language of the *Res Gestae* neither “heads” of Rome – that is, the Capitoline or Augustus’ – are to be depicted with their respective golden crowns. To depict them as such would be out of line with tradition.<sup>108</sup> To show restraint in his words and actions grants the *princeps*, on the other hand, the opportunity to allude to the image of these novelties within *Res Gestae* even while seeming to downplay or reject them. Augustus can thus create a subtle tension in his *Res Gestae* that helps him to articulate his new powers through the actions of others without going outside the traditions of the past himself.

Augustus achieves this tension in other ways, as well, through his building program itself. He does not merely build under his own name, for instance, but often does so under that of another. In the most telling example of this non-naming Augustus claims to have “renovated” the Theatre of Pompey “without any inscription of my [i.e., Augustus’] name” (*refeci sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei, RGDA 20*) – a statement which receives additional emphasis from its placement after the verb *refeci*.<sup>109</sup> It is not restraint that compels Augustus to behave in this manner. This “refusal” instead demonstrates that Augustus does not need to use the republican tradition of inscribing buildings with one’s name if he so chooses. Why? Because his power goes beyond simple republican display. Inscribing every building with one’s own name – that was part of Pompey’s and Caesar’s strategy, just as it was for many a Roman aristocrat before them.

---

<sup>108</sup> See Cooley 2009, 201, *ad loc.*, pointing out that “[t]he giving of gold by subjects to their rulers was a long-established practice associated with eastern kingship. [...] The giving of crown-gold was an expression of submission and homage on the part of the donor. It became usual for such ‘gifts’ to be turned into crowns of gold.”

<sup>109</sup> Cooley 2009, 23.

It can be assumed that every Roman knew exactly who was responsible for these buildings whether the name of the *princeps* was there or not. Augustus stresses in this passage that he has kept the physical structures of the past intact in his reconstruction of the city; he goes out of his way, in fact, to emphasize that he has repaired all the temples in Rome that needed it (cf. *nullo praetermisso quod e[o] tempore [refici debeba]t*, *RGDA* 20). By discussing this reconstruction as he does in his *Res Gestae*, however, the *princeps* can show how these structures take on new meaning under the principate, even if – or rather *because* – he “refuses” to change their form, or add his name in place of the original builder.

The *princeps* built more than anyone else has. That much is clear from the lengthy passage cited above.<sup>110</sup> His description does not stress that he is building *differently* from his predecessors, however. And the particular strategy of “refusal” that he employs here – whereby he actively denies to himself the power or recognition that he has already gained – should be familiar now from the above examination of Horace’s *Odes* in this chapter. Indeed, as with the poet’s lyric, the genius of Augustus’ redefinition of Rome was that his refusals to change it actually allowed him to articulate that he had. The monumentalization of Rome as described in the *Res Gestae* is conveyed not through blatant statements of transformation, but rather in the implications that lie behind, and are almost contradictory to, what his words claim in the inscription. And like the poet Augustus used this tension to respect the past – to redefine and revitalize Roman traditions – while simultaneously constructing something new.

By thus reconstructing the traditional borders of Rome’s structure, physically as well as metaphorically, the *princeps* could stabilize what it meant to be a good traditional Roman while

---

<sup>110</sup> One of the most important points of this catalogue of buildings – despite the dedications to other people – is to show, as Ramage 1987, 36, rightly claims, that “no one is given credit for doing any building or rebuilding in Rome and Italy except Augustus.”

in some ways dramatically departing from what it had meant in the republic. This is only possible, however, because he has injected his architectural discourse with a stabilizing tension between the new and the traditional. Augustus does not have choose between what was conventional and what was not: he can have both *simultaneously* by delicately balancing them in tension with each other. The Augustan age was not just a period in which Rome's traditional structures were redefined; just as important, it was also an age of redefining *how* one can define such structures in the first place.

This chapter has demonstrated why the lyric *monumentum* in finale of the *Odes* is perhaps the perfect architextural structure for representing his first collection of lyric poetry. Horace builds up the tensions on which it is based from the start – transgressive structure by transgressive structure, inverted *recusatio* by inverted *recusatio*. The tensions that emerge in contrasting his Sabine farm with these transgressive structures allowed him *both* to establish a “traditional” structure for his lyric *and* to bring novel material inside of it. This rhetorical strategy should not be seen as deceitful in some way: from the start Horace has been proclaiming – albeit through “refusing” – his poetry's innovative, dynamic nature from within its “traditional” lyric bounds.

How does understanding the way that Horace builds his “monument” give us insight into the architectural discourse of the monumentalization of Augustan Rome? It might be tempting at first to suggest that in *C.* 3.30 Horace is in some way “exposing” and thereby subtly criticizing the “delicate” nature of Augustus' rhetorical strategy.<sup>111</sup> But that interpretation would suggest

---

<sup>111</sup> See Fraenkel 1957, 287-288, where he introduces the idea (echoed by several later scholars) that Horace was still cautious in 23 BCE of a relapse into civil war, as well as Putnam 1990, 238: “My reading of the Horace of *Odes* 1-3 sees [Horace] suggesting the very fragility of what would be assumed as Augustus' ideals and the contingency of their realization on a series of delicate factors.”

that the parallel is entirely intentional – and, more importantly, quite limited in its aims. We can never know for certain how conscious Horace was of the parallel, let alone whether he meant it negatively.<sup>112</sup> In his book on Augustan culture Karl Galinsky has suggested a more nuanced way of understanding the sense of a “shared direction” between the poet and the *princeps*:

It would be futile to fall back on the schematic explanation that one man “influenced” the other or, worse yet, to relapse into the hierarchical model according to which Horace takes orders from Octavian. Rather, what we see here at an early stage, long before Augustus’ expanding *auctoritas*, is a sense of shared direction. Its elaboration is left to the inclination and creativity of the individuals. This accounts for another characteristic that the implementations of both Horace and Augustus have in common: neither is content with simply replicating... Rather, both turn their creative energies to surpassing the model and giving it a meaning of their own. It is a process that is profoundly characteristic of Augustan culture. [...] Horace, instead of being a mere imperial versifier, carries on a creative dialogue with the Augustan milieu. He reacts to some of its ideas and reshapes them in his own way. Above all, he is never passive.<sup>113</sup>

One does not have to accept Galinsky’s seemingly all-encompassing idea of *auctoritas* for his approach here to have validity. What we can reasonably say given the findings of this chapter is that Horace’s *Odes* tap into the rhetorical strategies of the Augustan age in which a “refusal” to condone modifications to a traditional structure actually granted existence to those same innovations as part of the structure itself – innovations which in turn revitalized the structure.

Horace did not write an epic for the *princeps*. Nor did he need to. His lyric *monumentum* is an especially fitting contribution to Augustus’ monumentalization of Rome: it represents for us the kind of claim through architectural imagery that Augustus could not make explicitly because to make it would in a sense disrupt the perfect balance of republic and imperial power that the

---

<sup>112</sup> See Santirocco 1995, 229, suggesting that “ideology does not necessarily pre-exist the creative act, nor is it promulgated from on high, but that it is an interactive production involving poet, patron, and *princeps*.” Oliensis 1998, 149, is right to acknowledge that just “[h]ow wholehearted a supporter [he] is [is] a question Horace himself might not have been able to answer. Thoroughly implicated as he was in the Augustan regime, there was nowhere outside it for him to sit and think.” I do agree with Fowler 1995a, however, in starting from the premise that “Horatian politics is bound up with Horatian poetics” (252), even if we may never separate the two.

<sup>113</sup> Galinsky 1996, 257. Lowrie 1997, 13, puts it well in claiming that “[t]he Augustan age creates Horace as much as Horace creates the Augustan age, but neither is univocal.”

“refusals” themselves had already allowed the *princeps* to assume. The poet could decide without too much anxiety to build his immortalizing monument while alive. He had little to fear (besides perhaps ridicule) by proclaiming his own poetic “apotheosis” at the end of the first publication of his *Odes*. For obvious reasons such was not the case for the *princeps*, who smartly waited until after he died to let himself be deified in Rome. The point is that Augustus did not have to say he would become immortal for it to happen. And we can imagine that even without C. 3.30 much the same could be said about Horace and his forever stable yet eternally dynamic lyric *monumentum*.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Cracks in Vergil's Epic Architecture I

#### Constructed Caves and Deceptive Labyrinths in the *Aeneid*

Horace is not the only or the first Augustan poet to predict his “immortality” – or to do so by imagining his poetry as a monumental edifice. Vergil had already done as much in the celebrated proem that begins the second half of his *Georgics*, as the below excerpt from Book 3 of the poem demonstrates:

...temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim  
tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora.  
primus ego in patriam mecum, modo uita supersit,                   10  
Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas;  
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.                   15  
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit (*G.* 3.8-16)<sup>1</sup>

I must attempt a path by which I too might be able to lift myself from the ground and fly victorious through the mouths of men. I returning to my native land shall be the first – provided that I live long enough – to lead back with me the Muses from the Aonian peak; I shall be the first to carry back the Idumean palms to you, Mantua, and I will establish a temple of marble in a green field near the water, where the great Mincius wanders, slowly curving, and covers its banks with tender reeds. In the middle of my temple will be Caesar, and he will possess it.

It is clear from the first two lines of this passage (cf. *temptanda...ora*, 8-9) that Vergil too is speaking of achieving immortality through his poetry.<sup>2</sup> And like Horace he uses the image of a

---

<sup>1</sup> The Latin text of this passage from the *Georgics* is from Mynors 1969. For the text of the *Aeneid*, however, I will be using the recent Teubner edition of Conte 2009.

<sup>2</sup> See Hinds 1998, 54-56, for a discussion of the Ennian intertext with which these lines are in dialogue.

monumental structure to stake his claim to it. “I will establish a temple of marble” (*templum de marmore ponam*, 13), the Mantuan poet proclaims to his readers, a temple to Augustus Caesar (cf. *in medio...Caesar erit templumque tenebit*, 16). There is one significant and obvious difference, of course, between the respective poetic statements of these two poets: Horace has already built his monument (*exegi monumentum...*, *C.* 3.30.1) when he announces his claim to immortality while Vergil has yet to erect his “epic” temple, using only future verbs (*ponam*, 13; *tenebit*, 16) throughout the description of the building.

Although it is not hard to understand why this monumental temple has been read as a metaphor for what the *Aeneid* would become,<sup>3</sup> the goal of this chapter and the next one is not to decide whether or not this particular structure should be seen as somehow representative of the exact epic poem that Vergil would end up writing. Nor will I undergo an extensive analysis of the very complex images of this proem from the *Georgics*.<sup>4</sup> I briefly mention Vergil’s temple here at the start only to point out two important elements for a study of his architecture in the *Aeneid*. First, this passage demonstrates explicitly that the poet employs the imagery of architecture – and in particular monumental, public architecture – in order to give concrete form to his poetics. Epic for Vergil is represented here as a grand, seemingly stable structure “of marble” (*de marmore*, 13) in an idyllic, peaceful setting (13-14). The proem to *Georgics* 3 is thus significant for establishing monumental architecture as an operative metaphor for Vergil’s epic poetry, especially since he is not nearly so explicit in the *Aeneid* as Horace is in his *Odes* when the latter states that his poem is a *monumentum*. Second, whereas Horace speaks only of his

---

<sup>3</sup> Otis 1964 [1995], 38-39, argues that it should be “apparent to anyone who grasps the meaning of the symbolic description of the future epic” that the referent here is indeed the *Aeneid*. See also Richter 1957 and Fleischer 1960 for a similar point of view.

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion of this passage see also: Wilkinson 1969; Buchheit 1972, 92-159; Putnam 1979, 165-74; Meban 2008; J. F. Miller 2009; and now Dufallo 2013, 108-136.



monument's impenetrable exterior and its apparently impervious nature,<sup>5</sup> the poet of the *Georgics* lets us see inside his temple, right to the statue of Augustus Caesar at its center. And it is this focus on what lies behind the surface of structures that marks a notable difference in Vergil's own architecture when it comes to his epic.<sup>6</sup> The *princeps* might possess the temple here in the *Georgics* in a way that gives stability to the building's meaning through his "numinous power" in contrast to the allusive depictions of civil war on the exterior of its doors.<sup>7</sup> In the *Aeneid*, however, the interiors of many of the poem's structures are much darker, I argue, and filled with forces that seek to destabilize order rather than impose it. One of the main architectural images of the poem – the Temple of Janus (*Aen.* 1.293-296) – is possessed not by an Augustus, in fact, but rather by the *furor impius* of Rome's past which while temporarily bound seems eager to break free at any moment.

The previous chapter examined how Horace constructs generic boundaries that while purporting to keep out extrageneric space and time actually incorporate them within his traditional lyric dimensions. This way of constructing a dynamic and innovative kind of lyric monument through what I have termed an inverted *recusatio* was shown to parallel the kind of

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Hor. *C.* 3.30.1. See above, pp. 74-79, for discussion of Horace's famous *sphragis* to his first collection of *Odes*.

<sup>6</sup> This interest in the interior space of architecture is perhaps characteristically Roman – in part, at least, because of the Romans' ability to create much more dynamic spaces with the invention of concrete construction in the latter half of 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BCE. For the importance of this innovation for architecture, see Ling 1988, 1672-1689, arguing that the ability to shape interior space through concrete was "Rome's great legacy to posterity." As Ward-Perkins 1981 [1994], 101, points out, in fact, "[a]lready...in the Roman architecture of the Late Republic one can detect a growing awareness of the properties of interior space." For a modern perspective of this issue, see also Wright 1928, 148-149, where the famous modern architect discusses Greek architecture as "a mere matter of constructing decoration" that led to a building that could be seen as "a block of building material...from the outside" with no attention to what existed within. The Romans adopted the architecture of the Greeks, of course, but with an attention to interior spaces that was previously less significant. In a way similar to much modern architecture in Wright's estimation, Vergil's *monumentum* of a text also seeks for "exterior expression" (149), that is, to give a voice to what a monument's facade might conceal.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Verg. *G.* 3.28-29: *atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem / Nilum ac nauali surgentis aere columnas*. See Dufallo 2013 for an analysis of how this *templum* does more than make a statement concerning Vergil's own poetry. "Vergil's temple may be a (future) text," Dufallo suggests, "but it is, more significantly, a statement of the numinous power with which Octavian, through his link to Apollo, fills both Rome and Vergil's own poetry" (116).

rhetoric that Augustus also employs in his *Res Gestae* when speaking of his architectural productions in the Roman cityscape. In both cases, I argued, the structures created are not as traditional as they might first appear; they become enhanced rather by their ability to take on the meaning that they claim to exclude through rhetorical disavowals. These structures – whether poetic, political, or real – thus achieve a dual nature of being old and new simultaneously, with a delicate but perfect balancing of tensions between those two extremes.

The analysis of the *Aeneid* in this dissertation will examine the way that Vergil takes the architecture of Horace's *monumentum* and flips our perspective: the epic poet looks not at the extrageneric forces that Horace balances against his lyric traditional structure to enhance its stability, but rather at the chaos from Rome's past that threatens the stability of his epic poem *qua* "monument" from *within* its structure.<sup>8</sup> The ability of a monument to hide something disruptive rather than simply keep out what is inappropriate thus sets the stage for a much different understanding of monuments and generic boundaries than the one arrived at for Horace's *Odes*. Can the *Aeneid* with its epic facade provide a stable frame for a teleological narrative from Aeneas to Augustus?<sup>9</sup> Can it successfully conceal beneath its magnificent surface the chaotic violence of Rome's past from its very origins to Vergil's present? And what does the poem's success or failure in these regards tell us about the idea of the monument in the Augustan age? Those are the primary questions that will be asked in this chapter, as well as the next one.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Bartsch 1998, 325, where she calls these sorts of boundaries the "*compages artis*" of the poem. I accept several of the positions argued for in Putnam 1965 (and several later studies of the scholar) regarding the inherent "violence" of Vergil's epic cosmos, and I will refer to him below in cases where I touch upon the same passages in the poem that the scholar analyzes.

<sup>9</sup> For a brief but engaging discussion of the *Aeneid* as "a poem of history" see Feeney 1992 [1993], 94-96, where his argument focuses upon the idea that "the poem is very interested in the flux which always makes it hard to impose [a] fixed pattern" of interpretation on the past, as well as that of the future. See also Johnson 1976, 133, asserting that "Vergil's subject is, in large measure, how men and nations behaved in the past, how they tend now to behave, and why. [...] [T]he longer Vergil pondered his contents and design, the more his poem came to be about the nature of history." I will argue that it is in its nuanced treatment of architecture – the very thing that makes history possible in the poem – that the *Aeneid* directs one of its most engaging critiques of historical narrative.

My concern will therefore not be to analyze the idea of the city in the poem as a “poetological metaphor” for the text.<sup>10</sup> Nor will I focus on the allusions to actual Augustan monuments, as has been the custom of many examinations of the poem when discussing architecture’s place in it.<sup>11</sup> I am not attempting, moreover, to analyze closely how the poem helps us to understand better the visual aesthetics of actual Roman architectural monuments.<sup>12</sup> What I aim to do is to explore how the poem engages with the monumental discourse of Augustan Rome – not only employing it to articulate what an epic monument like the *Aeneid* can and cannot do, but at the same time also exploring the strengths and weaknesses of the discourse itself in relation to Rome’s past, present, and future.<sup>13</sup>

The discussion of the poem along these lines will be divided across two chapters due to the vast amount of material in the *Aeneid* that could be analyzed for these purposes. I will leave aside the poem’s named *monumenta* for Chapter V in order to provide a context for them first by focusing in this present chapter on the poem’s recurring theme of “failed” architecture. I use the term “failed” architecture here to refer to edifices that ultimately do not contain the chaos of the past that they were built to conceal, but rather release it when their boundaries become compromised, whether literally or metaphorically.<sup>14</sup> These constructions consist most notably of

---

<sup>10</sup> See Labate 1991, Morwood 1991, and now also Reitz 2013, 126-136.

<sup>11</sup> See Morwood 1991, 218-219, for an extensive list of such allusions. In more recent scholarship, Harrison 2006 can be seen as typical of an approach that examines monuments in the poem in direct contrast to, and comparison with, those in the Augustan reality.

<sup>12</sup> See Elsner 2007 for studies representative of an approach that emphasizes the ways in which texts can help us understand better the visuality of Roman culture.

<sup>13</sup> Of course, Vergil was not the first ancient poet to mix history and epic. The Hellenistic poet Apollonius Rhodius and the Romans Naevius and Ennius all did so before their Augustan successor. See M. F. Williams 1991, 187-188, arguing that the text of the *Argonautica* is filled with “visible monuments” for the purpose of “combining history and mythology.”

<sup>14</sup> My reading of architecture in the *Aeneid* as “failing” to maintain its boundaries is influenced by Bartsch 1998. In this article on the ecphraseis of the poem Bartsch remarks on several of the same objects that I analyze in the current chapter, as well as in the next one (e.g., the Trojan horse, the Doors of Daedalus, Pallas’ Baldric). Bartsch likewise notes the problem with the boundaries of art to contain violent and chaotic forces that disrupt meaning and upset the established order of things, claiming that “the artworks of the *Aeneid* participate in this economy of values that sets control and containment against the consequences of an impassioned violence. This attribute of the Virgilian

certain caves and labyrinths in the poem, examined below in Part 1 and Part 2, respectively. The former of this pair comprises not “natural” caves, one should note, but *moles* – unnatural, constructed objects that are erected to contain the chaos which the *Aeneid* reveals to be a central part of Roman history from the start. These include Aeolus’ Cave in Book 1, the Trojan Horse in Book 2 (which is also described several times as a “cave”), and the Cave of Cacus in Book 8. With an examination of the labyrinths in Books 5 and 6 of the poem I will transition in Part 2 to structures whose failure to restrain the chaotic forces of the past occurs at a less literal level: the walls of the labyrinths are not broken, *per se*, but are revealed to be always shifting and thus unable to contain within themselves the past disorders and mistakes (*errores*) they were designed to keep hidden. The point of this chapter will therefore be to illustrate how such structures fail to maintain not just their physical boundaries, but in the case of labyrinths often their “epistemological” boundaries, as well, since what they appear to mean on the outside is shown to be just as susceptible to collapse as their material structure.<sup>15</sup>

Before we begin to look at these “failed” structures, however, let us briefly return to where this chapter began. The immense scholarly attention given to the passage from the *Georgics* quoted at the start of this chapter points to something else which it is important to keep in mind during the following examination of Vergil’s architecture: whatever the poet might have meant his temple to signify at the time that he wrote the proem, it has not stopped future scholars from bestowing their own interpretations on it – and thus transforming the meaning of the

---

artwork is counterbalanced, however, by its repeated failure to fulfill such a task: unable to restrain violence, the artwork literally lets it spill out, like a troop of murderous Greek warriors issuing from the carved cavity of a wooden horse’s womb” (322). My focus is not only on artworks, but on architectural structures, in particular, and how they influence the way that we understand Vergil’s epic architecture as part of the broader monumental discourse of the Augustan age.

<sup>15</sup> I am indebted to Fowler 2000, 193-219, for the illuminating discussion therein of the problems that are just as inherent to the idea of the monument in antiquity as they are to the present understanding of monumentality in modernity. For further discussion of Fowler’s essay see above, pp. 34-36.

structure into anything from an “abandoned project” to the *Aeneid* itself.<sup>16</sup> The present chapter and the following one will explore how the architecture of the *Aeneid* illustrates that such an instability of meaning is not only inherent in monumentality, as was suggested above in Chapter II;<sup>17</sup> more importantly, the poem demonstrates the need for one always to be aware of this instability when “reading” *monumenta* – whether poetic ones, such as the *Aeneid*, or real ones in Rome’s physical landscape, such as the Temple of Janus.

### **Part 1. The Constructed Caves of the *Aeneid***

A cave is normally a natural “place” with firm boundaries that separate inside from outside,<sup>18</sup> distinguish light from dark,<sup>19</sup> and can even house primordial forces that defy rationalization and structure.<sup>20</sup> For the Romans, however, caves could be constructed, as well, and in a way that blurred those seemingly rigid boundaries.<sup>21</sup> In the case of decorated grottoes, for instance, aristocrats and emperors could enjoy nature in safety and under their control as part of their domain – thus breaking down the distinction between the natural and the artificial.<sup>22</sup> In

---

<sup>16</sup> For a concise survey of this debate see R.D. Williams 1979, 178.

<sup>17</sup> See above, pp. 34-36, for more discussion of this aspect of Roman monumentality.

<sup>18</sup> As the 20<sup>th</sup>-century architectural theorist Christian Norberg-Schulz claims, “[e]nclosure...determines a space which is separated from its surroundings as a particular place. Such spaces exist in nature, for instance as caves” (1979, 39).

<sup>19</sup> See Bloomer and Moore 1997, 59: “Up and the sky are divine, spiritual, ethereal, light, rarefied, spreading, a canopy. Down and the earth are material, mineral, dark, compact, firm, a solid, a cave.”

<sup>20</sup> The French philosopher Michel de Certeau once wrote that in the modern age with its structures and “strategies” imposed upon humankind it is “[o]nly the cave of the home [that] remains believable, still open for a certain time to legends, still full of shadows” (1984, 106).

<sup>21</sup> It is interesting to note the way that the cave becomes a symbol for the entire cosmos by Late Antiquity. As Demandt 1982, 56, points out in regards to the art of Constantine’s reign, “the whole cosmos is interpreted as an interior, as the world’s cave, as a *spelunca aevi*” (*der ganze Kosmos wird als Innenraum, als Weltenhöhle gedeutet, als spelunca aevi*).

<sup>22</sup> See Jones 2011 for a discussion of the way that Roman gardens also break down the boundaries of the natural and the artificial, as well as those of inside and outside. Zanker 1999, 13, discusses how the villa gardens at Pompeii “consciously included nature and the landscape in their designs to enhance them and add a new dimension to the inhabitants’ enjoyment.” See also Bloomer and Moore 1997, 12-13, for the way that Louis XIV in following the traditions of Imperial Rome constructed his massive gardens, “locking nature (by implication) in the proud imperial grasp.”

their poetry, moreover, Roman authors used caves in a similar way to destabilize the boundaries of what is crafted and what is untouched by human beings. In Vergil's bucolic poems, for example, Frederick Jones has recently shown how caves are one of the "various apparently natural features in the *Eclogues* [that] turn out not to be unequivocally natural"; according to Jones, in fact, caves play an important role as an "element of bucolic iconography," representing an ideal space for bucolic song that is at once natural and artificial.<sup>23</sup>

The caves in the *Aeneid* examined below are not entirely natural, either. They are constructions – *moles* – imposed upon nature to contain the destructive, chaotic forces of the past that seek to escape and upset the established order of things.<sup>24</sup> It is the way that these caves *fail* to keep such forces at bay, however, that makes them relevant to a discussion of Vergilian architexture. It is not merely that they become a marked space for epic song; they help rather to illustrate what happens when someone – whether a god, an emperor, or a poet – attempts to impose a structure upon the chaotic forces of the past that exist as part of Rome's history from its very origins. The role of caves in the *Aeneid* is thus two-fold: they are simultaneously architectural in the way they try to restrain the violence of the past and *anti*-architectural in the sense that their own failure to do so illustrates the very fragility of such restraints.<sup>25</sup>

#### (i) Aeolus' Cave

When readers (ancient or modern) come to Aeolus' Cave in Book I of the *Aeneid* they might have certain expectations based on the passage in Homer's *Odyssey* where Aeolus gives

---

<sup>23</sup> Jones 2011, 72.

<sup>24</sup> Putnam 1965, 141, defines caves in the *Aeneid* as "place[s] of suppressed power."

<sup>25</sup> See Hollier 1989, 23, for a discussion of how the writings of the French intellectual Georges Bataille also use the image of a "cave" that is at once "architectural" and "anti-architectural" to show how writing "loosen[s] the structure that is hierarchical and at the same time creates hierarchy...reopening a hole, remaking a hollow, a cave once more."

Odysseus a bag full of winds in order to make his journey back home a little easier. Those expectations are quickly disappointed, however.<sup>26</sup> And the dramatic changes which Vergil makes to his Homeric model provide a useful starting point for an examination of an architectural feature in the form of constructed caves that appears again and again in his epic poem.

Let us start by comparing the two structures that Aeolus inhabits in each poem. Below is a short excerpt from Homer that describes Aeolus' domain and activities in the *Odyssey*:

We reached the island of Aeolia. There lived  
 Aeolus Hippotades, dear to gods immortal,  
 on a floating island, a wall of unbreakable bronze  
 all around it, and the smooth rock ran sheer up. 5  
 His twelve children were also in the palace,  
 [...] 5  
 They always dine beside their dear father and devoted mother.  
 Countless good things lie beside them, and the house,  
 steaming with sacrifice, echoes around the courtyard 10  
 by day, and at night they sleep again beside their venerable wives  
 in blankets and in corded beds.<sup>27</sup>

Homer's Aeolus lives in a palace (ἐνὶ μεγάροις, 5) with his twelve children – a place of constant feasting and merriment where Odysseus and his comrades spend a month enjoying the king's hospitality while telling of their journey thus far. The “wall of unbreakable bronze” (τεῖχος χάλκεον ἄρρηκτον, 3) and “sheer” rock cliffs (cf. λισσῆ...πέτρη, 4) that surround Aeolus' kingdom are clearly intended to be barriers to keep others out of this small piece of paradise.<sup>28</sup>

Vergil gives us a rather different picture of Aeolus' “kingdom” when he narrates Juno's visit there early in Book 1 of the *Aeneid*:

<sup>26</sup> Bertman 1983, 48-50, details the differences between the two figures, suggesting that Vergil crafts his Aeolus in order to “prefigure” Aeneas who has yet to appear in the poem.

<sup>27</sup> Hom. *Od.* 10.1-5, 8-12: Αἰολίην δ' ἐς νῆσον ἀφικόμεθ'· ἔνθα δ' ἔναιεν / Αἴολος Ἴπποτάδης, φίλος ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, / πλωτῆ ἐνὶ νήσῳ· πᾶσαν δέ τέ μιν πέρι τεῖχος / χάλκεον ἄρρηκτον, λισσῆ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη. / τοῦ καὶ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροις γεγάασιν ... οἱ δ' αἰεὶ παρὰ πατρὶ φίλω καὶ μητέρι κεδνῇ / δαίνυνται· παρὰ δέ σφιν ὄνειάτα μυρία κεῖται, / κνισῆεν δέ τε δῶμα / περιστεναχίζετα αὐλῆ, / ἤματα· νύκτας δ' αὐτε παρ' αἰδοίησ' ἀλόχοισιν / εὐδουσ' ἐν τε τάπησι καὶ ἐν τρητοῖσι λέχεσσι. All translations of Homer are from Lattimore 1965.

<sup>28</sup> As Bertman 1983, 48, puts it, the Homeric Aeolus is presented as “dwelling on a free-floating island whose smooth and sheer walls can fend off the unwelcome.”

Talia flammato secum dea corde uolutans 50  
 nimborum in patriam, loca feta furentibus Austris,  
 Aeoliam uenit. hic uasto rex Aeolus antro  
 luctantis uentos tempestatesque sonoras  
 imperio premit ac uinclis et carcere frenat.  
 illi indignantes magna cum murmure montis 55  
 circum claustra fremunt. (Verg. *Aen.* 1.50-56)

Debating such things with herself in her inflamed heart the goddess arrived at Aeolia, the land of the storm-clouds, places filled with raging southwest winds. Here in a vast cave Aeolus as king keeps in check the winds struggling to break free and the boisterous storms, and restrains them in chains and a prison. They angrily roar at their bonds as the mountain rumbles loudly.

Aeolus' country is certainly no island paradise in the *Aeneid*, but instead is a place “filled with raging southwest winds” (*feta furentibus Austris*, 51). His home is still immense – but only a cave (*uasto...antro*, 52).<sup>29</sup> Aeolus' companions are not his family, moreover, but “winds struggling to break free and boisterous storms” (*luctantis uentos tempestatesque sonoras*, 53), which he must keep under control in a sort of “prison” (*carcere*, 54). And even then these unwilling inhabitants continue to roar at the constraints that bind them (*indignantes...circum claustra fremunt*, 55-56). This island prison is certainly not the impression one gets from Aeolus' palace in the *Odyssey*.

I will return to examine more fully the nature of the architecture in this passage below. It is important, however, to consider beforehand also the charge that is given to Aeolus in both poems. First, from Homer:

[Aeolus] gave [Odysseus] a leather bag, of a nine year-old ox he'd skinned,  
 and bound the ways of the blustering winds in it,  
 for Cronion had made him master of the winds,  
 both to start and stop the ones he wishes.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Austin 1971, 44, notes *ad loc.* that “Homer does not mention a cave; his Aeolus lives richly in a city.” Austin goes on to compare this passage with Lucr. 6.189-203, where “the winds are pent in clouds like wild beasts.” For the influence of Lucretius on Vergil's Aeolus see also Shea 1977.

<sup>30</sup> Hom. *Od.* 10.19-22: δῶκε δέ μ' ἐκδείρας ἄσκῶν βοῶς ἐννεώροιο, / ἔνθα δὲ βυκτῶν ἀνέμων κατέδησε κέλευθα· / κείνον γὰρ ταμίην ἀνέμων ποίησε Κρονίων, / ἤμην παυέμεναι ἢ δ' ὀρνύμεν, ὅν κ' ἐθέλησι.



All Aeolus has to do in the *Odyssey* apparently is put the winds in a bag – and everything is suddenly calm for Odysseus to go on his way. He is not the jailor of the winds as Aeolus is in the *Aeneid*; on the contrary, he simply controls them according to his fancy (cf. ὄν κ' ἐθέλησι, 22). Homer's Aeolus is thus “an authoritarian figure who exercises absolute and peremptory judgment.”<sup>31</sup> This could not be further from the nature of Aeolus' task in Vergil's poem, as the following passage demonstrates:

...celsa sedet Aeolus arce  
 sceptrā tenens mollitque animas et temperat iras.  
 ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum  
 quippe ferant rapidi secum uerrantque per auras;  
 sed pater omnipotens speluncis abdidit atris 60  
 hoc metuens molemque et montis insuper altos  
 imposuit, regemque dedit qui foedere certo  
 et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas. (*Aen.* 1.56-63)

Aeolus sits in his high citadel, holding his scepter, as he both softens their spirits and checks their wraths. If he should not do this, they would no doubt carry away the seas and the lands and the vast sky in no time and sweep it all with them through the breezes. But fearing this would happen the all-powerful father hid them in dark caverns, placing a *moles* and high mountains above, and he gave them a king who under a fixed agreement would know how to restrain them and – when given the order – to loosen the reins.

It is Aeolus' job to make sure that he “checks the wraths” of the winds (*temperat iras*, 57); for if he should not, they would “sweep away” (*uerrant*, 59) everything – sea, land, sky – in their uncontrollable rage. Jupiter, realizing this (in fact, “fearing this,” *hoc metuens*, 61), built Aeolus' Cave to ensure that there could be order in the cosmos. He then made Aeolus the “king” (*regem*, 62) of the winds. This charge is given to Aeolus not so that he can use them as he pleases, as he does in Homer; it is “under a fixed agreement” (*foedere certo*, 62) here that Aeolus is said to control the winds “when given the order” (*iussus*, 63), presumably, by Jupiter himself. This is not then a simple matter of putting the winds in a bag. The cosmic significance of Aeolus' charge

---

<sup>31</sup> Bertman 1983, 48.

in the *Aeneid* signals a need for a different kind of architecture – one not simply for display, or one that is intended to keep things out, but rather one which would contain, or “hide” (cf. *abdidit*, 60), that which would upset the established order of Jupiter.<sup>32</sup>

But why speak of this cave as architectural? Aeolus’ palace in the *Aeneid* is a “vast cave” (cf. *vasto...antro*, 52; *speluncis*, 60), after all. It is important to note, though, that it is also an *artificial* cave constructed by Jupiter himself: *molemque et montis insuper altos / imposuit* (61-62). In other words, this mountain is not natural, *per se*, but *imposed* upon nature by the king of the gods. The artificiality of this “mountain” is emphasized, moreover, by the poet’s identification of it as a *moles*, that is, a large, usually man-made structure often built as a means to create land over a body of water.<sup>33</sup> At the same time, however, this is no ordinary *moles* that functions merely as a dam or as a means to extend the land into the sea.<sup>34</sup> The structure is meant rather to contain the chaos that apparently used to run rampant in a time before any order. One could even say that Aeolus’ Cave is the very *first* structure in the sense that it necessarily precedes all others: if Aeolus should not restrain the winds in this *moles*, the poet warns, “they

---

<sup>32</sup> Pöschl 1950 argues that Aeolus’ role here is analogous to that of Augustus in how it is also the charge of the *princeps* to contain the fury of the cosmos in the context of a Rome ripped apart by civil wars. See also Phillips 1980, 24, claiming that the Aeolus episode expresses “the new Augustan order with its stabilizing subordination of all things to Caesar, a functioning by which the state not only imitated but participated in the divine order.”

<sup>33</sup> *OLD* s.v. **3d** “a solid structure built across a stretch of water, jetty, mole, dam.” For the unnatural quality of these structures in Augustan poetry cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.15.1-2: *iam pauca aratro iugera regiae / moles relinquent*; 3.29.9-10: *fastidiosam desere copiam et / molem propinquam nubibus arduis*; Verg. *G.* 2.161-164: *an memorem portus Lucrinoque addita claustra / atque indignatum magnis stridoribus aequor, / Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso / Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Auernis?* On these passages see also Armstrong 2009, 89-91, and for a fuller discussion of how Horace uses the image of extending land into the water see above, pp. 63-64.

<sup>34</sup> This is not the first time in the poem that the reader has come across the word *moles*. Nor is it the last, as we will see throughout the first part of this chapter. In the famous line that ends the proem of the *Aeneid*, for instance, Vergil asks the question: “Was it of such a great effort (*molis*) to found (*condere*) the Roman race?” (*tantae molis erat Romanum condere erat, Aen.* 1.33). Although the word obviously has a different meaning here, the operative metaphor is architectural with *condere* – used just a few lines earlier to describe Aeneas’ task of founding a city in Italy (*multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem / inferretque deos Latio*, 1.5-6). And this “effort” is not just that of Aeneas, but it is the task of Vergil, as well, as he begins to construct his own massive epic poem on that difficult topic. To find the word again so soon afterwards, not more than thirty lines, suggests an indirect connection between (a poem on) founding Rome and the construction of Aeolus’ Cave – which makes the latter’s subsequent “failure” all the more ominous. On the parallel nature of the difficult tasks that the Trojan hero and the poet must accomplish, respectively, see Reitz 2013, 134.

would no doubt carry away the seas and the lands and the vast sky in no time and sweep it all with them through the breezes” (*ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum / quippe ferant rapidi secum uerrantque per auras*, 1.58-59). Nothing could stand for very long, in other words, without this massive structure to keep the winds in check. It is possible, therefore, to see a double meaning in Aeolus’ statement to Juno that gods have made him *tempestatum...potentem* (1.80), namely, that he is not only “powerful over the storms,” but over “time” itself,<sup>35</sup> since there would be nothing – no structures, no monuments – to mark the passage of time if the winds were to roam free as previously in what could only be an eternal chaos.<sup>36</sup> It is architecture, then, which the *Aeneid* suggests as the very craft which gives structure not only to space but even to time against the chaos which seems to be a constant in the story of Rome from the start.<sup>37</sup>

It makes a certain amount of sense that the first building to appear in Vergil’s narrative would also be the primordial edifice of his epic cosmos.<sup>38</sup> With such significance, however, it is important to note again that there is something quite unnatural about this *moles*. Aeolus must subdue the winds struggling to break free (*luctantis uentos*, 53) with his “power” (*imperio*, 54) and – even more unnatural – he must do so by “restrain[ing] them in chains and a prison” (*uinclis et carcere frenat*, 54) that his cave represents. Indeed, these winds are further described as

---

<sup>35</sup> *OLD*, s.v. “**1** a portion of time, period, season, event. **b** one of a consecutive series of divisions of time, a season, a day, an age, etc.”

<sup>36</sup> From an anthropological perspective Wilson 1988, 148, makes the claim that “[t]he ancient monument... assembled together in one place the scattered powers of nature.” In the case of Vergil’s cosmos, it should be noted, those forces are particularly violent, as stressed by Putnam 1965.

<sup>37</sup> See above, pp. 20-25, for how the contemporary Roman architect Vitruvius draws a similar conclusion for architecture being necessary for order of any sort.

<sup>38</sup> Wittgenstein 1980, 69, talks of the existence of architecture as dependent upon “something” that it can “glorify” and “immortalize”; according to the 20<sup>th</sup>-century Austrian philosopher, in fact, “there can be no architecture where there is nothing to glorify” (*Architektur verewigt und verherrlicht etwas. Darum kann es Architektur nicht geben, wo nichts zu verherrlichen ist*). In a similar vein one of the most important architects of the 20<sup>th</sup> and now 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries, Daniel Libeskind, has recently claimed that “all architecture is guided by memory, in forming our sense of space, of orientation, and our relationships with one another” (2014, 165). The *Aeneid* seems to be suggesting that the converse is also true: there can be nothing to glorify and remember without architecture.

*indignant*es at their imprisonment,<sup>39</sup> as they “roar at their locks” (*circum claustra fremunt*, 56). This imposition of a structure upon a clearly unwilling element of nature is thus both explicitly highlighted and rather extreme – especially when compared, for instance, to the mere “bag” that Aeolus uses to hold the winds in the *Odyssey*. The fact that the next part of the line after the caesura calls Aeolus’ residence a lofty citadel (*celsa...arce*, 56) further illustrates that this is certainly not as natural a cave as it might have appeared at first.<sup>40</sup>

The above analysis of this primeval edifice thus far has highlighted two important points about the place of architecture in Vergil’s *Aeneid*: [1] nature in the poem is filled with chaotic and violent forces and [2] the structures that try to impose order upon them are not accepted willingly by those forces. What is even more significant perhaps for this present study is the fact that this “first” structure eventually fails – even if only temporarily – to contain those forces: Aeolus is easily bribed by Juno to set free the winds and cracks open the *moles* imposed upon them in order to give them a breach from which to depart.<sup>41</sup> This failure is particularly noteworthy because it means that even a structure built by the “all-mighty” (*omnipotens*, 60) Jupiter cannot keep these forces in check permanently.

It is not simply “violence suppressed and then coming to the surface” that is the “all-encompassing motif” of this opening scene,<sup>42</sup> but a much more primordial kind of chaos from the deep past that must be overcome for order to exist at all. Such cosmic order is quickly regained,

---

<sup>39</sup> The word *indignant*es is a direct borrowing from the passage of Lucretius mentioned above, p. 99, n. 29. Cf. *Aen.* 8.728, where the Araxes River – another natural force – is described as *indignitus* at the bridge that Augustus has imposed upon it.

<sup>40</sup> Austin 1971, 45, *ad loc.*, considers this wording to be “deliberately ambiguous,” as “it could mean an actual ‘citadel,’ high above the winds’ dungeon, or the ruler’s headquarters, or simply a mountain-peak.”

<sup>41</sup> Juno offers Aeolus a wife who will bear him many children. This is then a further demonstration of the differences between Vergil’s Aeolus and that of his model in Homer who already has a wife and twelve children. Bertman 1983, 49-50, n. 5, notes that this passage is also adapted from Hom. *Il.* 14.263-269, where Hera bribes Hypnos with a nymph, as well.

<sup>42</sup> Putnam 1965, 26.

of course, when Neptune emerges from the sea to chastise the winds.<sup>43</sup> Yet the fact that the “first” building in the poem fails to accomplish the purpose for which it was built – if only for a short while – should make readers somewhat suspicious from the start of architecture’s ability to maintain the stability of its imposition on these buried chaotic forces of the past. The examination below of other caves in the poem will show that the failure of such structures to hold in check these forces is in fact a common theme throughout the epic.

Before I turn to those other failed structures, however, it is essential at this point to introduce another edifice in Book 1 that I will return to several times in my analysis of the epic’s architecture. After discussing in very general terms the history of Rome for the sake of the distressed Venus, whose son Aeneas has been tossed about on the sea by Aeolus’ storms, the father of the gods goes into great detail to depict what lurks inside of the Temple of Janus in Vergil’s own day:

...dirae ferro et compagibus artis  
 claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus  
 saeua sedens super arma et centum uinctus aenis 295  
 post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento. (*Aen.* 1.293-296)

Those terrible gates of War will be closed with tight, iron bounds. Seated within upon cruel weapons and bound by a hundred bronze knots behind his back impious *Furor* will give a terrifying roar from his mouth stained with blood.

The imagery in this passage is remarkably similar in several respects to features of Aeolus’ Cave examined above.<sup>44</sup> The Temple of Janus is also presented as a sort of prison that has been bolted

---

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 1.124-156. This passage contains a famous simile that suggests an association of Neptune with an Augustus-like politician who calms a rabid mob (148-154). Although it is true that Augustus did bring a sense of peace and order to Rome, the rebellion of the winds at the start of the epic might make one consider just how stable that peace really is. If Neptune (or Jupiter) is in control, for instance, how should the winds be able to break free at all? And are all the Aeolus-like figures who might want to overthrow the newly established order in Rome gone for good? It is not hard to imagine that those are the types of questions which might still have passed through the minds of Vergil’s intended readership in Rome when the poem was first published in 18 BCE.

<sup>44</sup> See Austin 1971, 114, *ad loc.* Putnam 1965, 16-17, discusses the similarity of language and imagery between the imprisonment of *Furor* here and that of the winds earlier in Book 1. He also connects the equine imagery in both cases with that of the Trojan Horse – an object also examined below, pp. 106-115.

shut (*ferro et compagibus artis / claudentur*, 293-294). Just like the winds, moreover, the main prisoner – the personified *Furor* – is bound with chains: his hands have been tied behind his back by a thousand brazen knots (cf. *centum uinctus aenis / post tergum nodis*, 295-296). Finally, the main verb, *fremet* (“roars,” 296), almost cannot but remind a reader of the winds who also are said to *fremunt* at their own bonds (*circum claustra fremunt*, 56) not too much earlier in Book 1. There is no Augustus at the core of this temple as in the proem of *Georgics* 3. The space in the *Aeneid* is occupied instead by a personification of disorder itself that though chained is definitely not a willing prisoner.

In both of these scenes, then, the depiction of architecture represents it as a means of containing (or even hiding) a violent, chaotic force from the past that threatens to break down established structures and general order. Given the proximity in the poem of these two buildings at the very start of the epic, however, it does not seem inappropriate to question the ability of the temple to continue to keep such a force in check. If a cavernous *moles* built by Jupiter himself fails to contain this chaos permanently, who is to say that the Temple of Janus might not one day crack, as well? Rome might be an *imperium sine fine* (“an empire without boundary,” *Aen.* 1.279) when it comes to its ability to expand without limit. There *are* boundaries that exist within it, though, at its very center and which contain a force – civil strife – perhaps even more destructive than anything at its outer borders, as any Roman living through the decades of civil war in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century BCE could attest. In short, the *Aeneid* from the start configures the story of Rome as a constant struggle to contain a violent chaos that seeks to break down any order imposed upon it – from Aeolus’ Cave at the very start of time all the way to the Temple of Janus in the Augustan age itself.

The first 300 lines of the *Aeneid* present a much different understanding of architecture than what is found in Horace's *Odes* where his *monumentum* of a poem was able to resist indefinitely the storms of time that wear down all human achievement.<sup>45</sup> In the *Aeneid*, on the other hand, it is the chaos *within* the structure that is the point of interest. Aeolus' Cave sets the stage from the very start of the poem for a particular kind of architectural boundary that does not help one to expand what one has so much as to enclose within that which would threaten the stability of everything that one has established. The failure of this kind of architecture to contain such forces repeats throughout the *Aeneid* in other "caves," as well as in the poem's labyrinths, and should alert the reader to the fragile nature of the more triumphant kind of architecture that the poem presents in the form of *monumenta*, particularly in Book 8. As the next chapter will demonstrate, in fact, the architecture of Vergil's *Aeneid* finds a place between these two kinds of architecture: it is at once a monumental facade that makes a claim to a specific, glorious meaning *and* a "failed" monument that shows the cracks in its magnificent epic frame, revealing the chaos of the past lurking behind it.

### (ii) The Trojan Horse

Although the Cave of Aeolus was built by Jupiter, it ultimately fails to contain permanently the chaotic forces of the deep past that threaten the order he has established on a cosmic level. Failed attempts to contain such forces also occur on a smaller scale in the poem, as can be witnessed, for instance, in the case of the Trojan Horse. This section will show that the various descriptions in Book 2 of the Trojan Horse – another unnatural *moles*<sup>46</sup> – bear a striking

---

<sup>45</sup> For further discussion of this passage from Hor. *C.* 3.30 see pp. 74-78 above.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 2.32: *molem mirantur equi*; 2.150: *quo molem hanc immanis equi statuere*; 2.185-186: *hanc tamen immensam Calchas attollere molem / roboribus textis caeloque educere iussit*. Austin 1966, 42, *ad loc.*, notes that *moles* "implies not only the bulk of the Horse, but the elaborate work that had gone into the building of it."

resemblance to the way that the poet described Aeolus' Cave analyzed above. There are certain differences between the two structures, however, and analyzing these will help to flesh out additional important aspects of "failed" architecture in the *Aeneid*, especially from the perspective of those who see only the present surface and are unmindful of the past chaos within.

Let us start where Aeneas himself begins his narrative of the fall of Troy at the beginning of Book 2:

...fracti bello fatisque repulsi  
ductores Danaum, tot iam labentibus annis,  
instar montis equum diuina Palladis arte                   15  
aedificant sectaque intexunt abiete costas;  
uotum pro reditu simulant: ea fama uagatur.  
huc delecta uirum sortiti corpora furtim  
includunt caeco lateri penitusque cauernas  
ingentis uterumque armato milite complent. (*Aen.* 2.13-20)

When the commanders of the Greeks were broken by war and driven back by fates – so many years having slipped by already – they build a horse the equivalent of a mountain with the divine craft of Pallas Athena and weave its ribs from the chopped-up wood [of their ships]. They pretend that it is an offering for their safe return: this is the rumor that spreads. Secretly they enclose the bodies of men selected by lot there in its dark flank, within its vast caverns, filling its womb with an armed band of soldiers.

With nothing else left to try the Greek leaders turn to trickery in order to take the city of Troy.

What is immediately noteworthy about this passage is the tension between natural and artificial – a characteristic already noted above in the description of Aeolus' Cave in Book 1. First of all, one usually does not "build a horse" (*equum...aedificant*, 15-16), or use pieces of ships to "weave ribs" (*intexunt...costas*, 16).<sup>47</sup> There is again something unnatural about this construction for the Greeks who are doing it all with the help of another god, that is, "with the divine craft of Pallas

---

<sup>47</sup> See Putnam 1965, 6, claiming that there are "three distinct metaphors" at work here: [1] the horse as a living horse; [2] the horse as a ship; and [3] the horse as a mountain. Putnam's discussion of the similarities in language between the descriptions of the Trojan Horse and Aeolus' Cave (and that of Cacus, as well) touches upon many of the same passages as the current analysis. His point is to show that Vergil is using similar imagery to emphasize the "all-encompassing motif of...violence suppressed and then coming to the surface" which is central to the poem in Putnam's analysis (26). My focus is not on violence, *per se*, but the interaction between the fragile order brought about through architecture and the primordial chaos of Rome's story that that it is meant to contain.



Athena” (*divina Palladis arte*, 15).<sup>48</sup> And it is not just that they are building a horse; more than that, they are raising it to be “the equivalent of a mountain” (*instar montis*, 15), rivaling the natural with their artificial construction. The Horse is not merely as big as a mountain, though. Just as with the *moles* that Jupiter constructs to house the winds the Trojan Horse is also said to contain a violent force “within its vast caverns” (*penitus...cavernas / ingentis*, 19-20),<sup>49</sup> namely, the Greeks who “fill its womb with an armed band of soldiers” (*uterumque armato milite complent*, 20).<sup>50</sup> This idea that the Greeks have somehow “impregnated” the Horse calls to mind the very first detail the reader learns about Aeolus’ land: it too is “pregnant with winds” (cf. *feta uentis*, *Aen.* 1.51) – furious winds that Jupiter has implanted within his artificial construction. The Greeks not only “build” (*aedificant*, 16) a horse, then, but construct it as a *moles* to rival even a mountain together with the dark caves it might contain. Both of these ideas suggest an overstepping of what is natural for one to construct. But the poet goes a step further by implying that the Greeks even impregnate it (cf. *uterumque... complent*, 20), too, with men ready to destroy the city of Troy.<sup>51</sup> The poet makes it explicit in several ways therefore that the Trojan Horse from its very first description is represented like Aeolus’ Cave as an artificial construction that contains violent, destructive forces of the past which seek to destroy all order – in this case, the Greeks with their desire to overturn the order of Trojan life and the city that contains it.

It is not just the similarity to the description of Aeolus’ Cave that brings the Trojan Horse

---

<sup>48</sup> See Austin 1966, 33-34, *ad loc.*, where he notes that “[t]raditionally Athene herself helped to build the Horse or advised on its construction,” and cites examples from Homer (*Od.* 8.493), Euripides (*Tro.* 10. 560-561), and Propertius (3.9.42). The Horse can thus be seen as another divinely-made *moles* similar to the cave built by Jupiter for Aeolus in Book 1.

<sup>49</sup> As Bartsch 1998, 324, puts it, the horse is “filled to teeming with the furor of soldiers whom it contains and thus keeps back from deeds of violence until it...is breached and opened.”

<sup>50</sup> Clausen 1987, 34, claims that “Virgil preserves [the] ambiguity [between alive and not alive] with two nouns, first describing the interior of the Horse as *cavernae* then as *uterus*, so that attention is drawn equally to its inanimate and animate nature.”

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 2. 38: *aut terebrare cauas uteri et temptare latebras.*



these forces of violence from the past that break free of their bounds to wreak havoc on the established order of things – whether it be in the middle of the sea, or inside the stable, long-standing city of Troy.

There are also two important differences, however, between Aeolus's Cave and the Trojan Horse that complicate the theme of "failed" architecture in the *Aeneid*. First, the primary purpose for the construction of the former structure is to prevent the chaos it is holding from destroying all order – something the *moles* fails to accomplish temporarily at least when Aeolus releases the winds. In the case of the Horse, however, there are different motivations for such a construction: the Greeks build it in order to hold a destructive force that will eventually destroy the solid citadel of Troy when unleashed. In other words, the monumental horse is a case of an intentionally failed piece of architecture, that is, an edifice designed to "crack" and release the chaos from the past that it contains.

This does not mean, though, that the purpose of the Horse is apparent to all. And the ambiguity of its meaning suggests a second important difference between the two artificial *moles*. Aeolus' Cave seems to be far away from the realm of mortals in the middle of the sea; its external appearance – be it an immense mountain – is not too important. The Trojan Horse is an explicitly monumental structure, on the other hand, one meant to elicit the awe of those who see it. The purpose of its construction is to create a facade that allows the structure to express another meaning than the one for which it was actually built. It will be easiest perhaps to see this ambiguity of meaning which exists between what one sees on the surface and what lies beneath by examining the different ways that the Trojan priest Laocoon and the Greek "runaway" Sinon craft their respective arguments regarding the Horse's meaning, as well as the relative success of each.

The priest of Neptune makes several remarks that encourage his fellow Trojans to look past the magnificent exterior of the Horse:

...‘o miseri, quae tanta insania, ciues?  
credit is auctos hostis? aut ulla putatis  
dona carere dolis Danaum? sic notus Vlixes?  
aut hoc inclusi ligno occultantur Achiui, 45  
aut haec in nostros fabricata est machina muros  
inspectura domos uenturaque desuper urbi,  
aut aliquis latet error: equo ne credite, Teucri.  
quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentis.’ (*Aen.* 2.42-49)

‘My misfortunate fellow citizens, what so great madness is this? Do you believe the enemy has sailed away? Or do you think that any gifts of the Greeks are without tricks? Is that the Ulysses we know? Either the Achaeans are hidden closed within this wood, or this war-machine has been constructed against our walls so that it can inspect our homes and come into our city from above, or some *error* lies hidden: do not believe in this horse, Trojans. Whatever it is, I fear even Greeks bearing gifts.

For Laocoon, at least, this structure is no doubt hiding Greek “tricks” (*dolis Danaum*, 44) and/or Greeks themselves (cf. *occultantur Achiui*, 45). It is a structure, moreover, that Laocoon claims has been “constructed against [Troy’s] walls” (*in...fabricata est...muros*, 46): it will not only look over the city, but the very homes (*domos*, 47) of its inhabitants – bypassing the distinction between private and public in the urban realm. What it contains Laocoon himself does not know (*quidquid id est*, 49) – only that some *error*, some devious, unexpected outcome lies hidden (*aliquis latet error*, 48).<sup>54</sup> This is no ordinary “horse.” And the priest is right to urge his citizens not to put their faith in it (*equo ne credite, Teucri*, 49).

The interpretation that Laocoon presents might be correct: he is certainly right, after all, to try to reveal the sinister contents that the monumental facade hides. That does him little good, though, as he cannot pierce the exterior to the truth underneath:

sic fatus ualidis ingentem uiribus hastam 50

---

<sup>54</sup> See Austin 1966, 47, *ad loc.*, noting that “Servius explains *error* as *dolus*, comparing the *inextricabilis error* of the Labyrinth.” As the next chapter will demonstrate, in fact, this *error* is an important characteristic of the chaotic forces of Vergil’s story of Rome.

in latus inque feri curuam compagibus aluum  
contorsit. stetit illa tremens, uteroque recusso  
insonuere cauae gemitumque dedere cauernae (*Aen.* 2.50-53)

When he had said this [Laocoon] hurled his great spear with mighty strength into the side of the beast, into the belly round with joints. The spear stood there trembling, and at the strike of the womb the hollow caverns echoed and let go a groan.

In this passage, too, the reader can see again not only the suggestion that the “beast” is in some way pregnant (*curuum...aluum*, 51; *uteroque recusso*, 52), but also the image of the Horse as a kind of cave: the “hollow caverns” (*cavae...cauerna*, 53) resound and give a groan when struck by the priest’s weapon. Laocoon’s actions might even remind the reader of the way that Aeolus used his spear to release the winds and set them about on their rampage: as the king of the winds is said to have struck the mountain with his spear (*cauum conuersa cuspide montem / impulit in latus*, *Aen.* 1.81-82), Laocoon also strikes into the side of the horse (*in latus*, 51) with his spear (*hastam*, 50). Yet even if he is able to hit the structure, the priest is unable to reveal what lies beneath its surface within the Horse’s artificially constructed cavern.<sup>55</sup>

Laocoon is not the builder of the Horse. Unlike Aeolus, moreover, the Trojan priest is not the owner of the “beast,” either. It is as a mere spectator that Laocoon fails in his attempt to display the *error* that lies hidden within the facade. His inability to reveal the hidden meaning of the structure is not insignificant, however, when compared to the much different outcome that the Greek “runaway” Sinon encounters upon his explanation of the Horse’s meaning. Sinon is in fact much more successful in the way that he determines the meaning of the Horse and its monumental size for its Trojan onlookers. And it is important for the discussion of Vergilian *monumenta* below in the following chapter to consider the reasons for Sinon’s success in contrast to the failure of Laocoon to control the meaning of the structure.

---

<sup>55</sup> For further analysis of this passage along similar lines see also Putnam 1965, 13-14.

Below is what the crafty Greek claims in response to Priam's question as to why this *moles* of a Horse was built in the first place:

hanc pro Palladia moniti, pro numine laesa  
effigiem statuere, nefas quae triste piaret.  
hanc tamen immensam Calchas attollere molem     185  
roboribus textis caeloque educere iussit,  
ne recipi portis aut duci in moenia posset  
neu populum antiqua sub religione tueri. (*Aen.* 2.183-188)

They constructed this effigy at [Calchas'] warning on behalf of the Palladium, for the sake of the wounded divine will, so that it could atone for their grim crime. Yet Calchas ordered them to erect this immense *moles* of woven oak and build it to the sky, in order that it could not be received by your gates or led into your walls, and so that it could not watch over your people in the course of their ancient religious rites.

It was the Greek prophet Calchas, according to Sinon, who ordered the Greeks to “erect this immense *moles*” (*hanc...immensam...attollere molem*, 185) in order to atone for stealing the Palladium from Troy. The sly Greek makes it look like a regular (albeit massive) offering: he uses none of the language that seeks to blur the distinction between natural and artificial – not even calling the structure a “horse” at any point. He focuses on the grand exterior, explaining that structure was built so big that it would be able neither to be led into gates and walls of a city (cf. *ne recipi portis aut duci in moenia posset*, 187) nor to be worshipped under the Trojans’ traditional religion (cf. *neu populum antiqua sub religione tueri*, 188).<sup>56</sup>

By focusing on the exterior Sinon succeeds where Laocoon failed in persuading his fellow onlookers of the meaning of the monumental *moles*.<sup>57</sup> And the inclusion of the Horse in

---

<sup>56</sup> These two reasons for its massive size place the Horse in obvious opposition to the order of the city: it is a monument made to exist outside of city space, as well as the culture that the city might contain; to try to include it in one's city is bound to have disastrous consequences. Indeed, the literal downfall of Troy and its order is prefigured even before the chaos that the Horse contains is released: in order for the *moles* to enter the city the Trojans needed to “divide and spread open the walls of the city” (cf. *diuidimus muros et moenia pandimus urbis*, *Aen.* 2.234). See also Laurence 1996, 119, where in a discussion of the meaning of the city in the Roman imagination the scholar claims that “cities were part of a human landscape, but their creation and perpetuation was a necessary part of the world order, to destroy a city was to bring the destroyer into conflict with that order.”

<sup>57</sup> Putnam 1965, 14, claims that Laocoon's action is “futile because it is fated neither for him to prove his point successfully nor for the horse yet to reveal its armed brood.” The “fatedness” of the failure does not detract

the city despite Sinon's rhetorical "warnings" is significant for illustrating the effects that grand facades can have on their spectators. The Trojans are completely unaware of the import of what they are doing and refuse to see the clear signs of trouble: for instance, when the Horse halts four times on the threshold and the weapons that it contains rattle, the inhabitants of the city seem oblivious (*immemores*) to the sounds that the beast makes and instead "blinded with fury" (*caeci...furore*) place the *monstrum* in the center of the city (cf. *Aen.* 2.240-243).<sup>58</sup> Again, it is important for the discussion below in Chapter V to stress here the effects that this kind of monumental architecture can have on people – that is, to make them *immemores* of, or *caeci* to, what could lie behind a grand facade, or what monsters of one's past a monumental structure could contain.

The Trojan Horse therefore demonstrates another important element of the failed structures in the poem, namely, the way that a monumental exterior can make those who behold a massive *moles* unmindful of what fury of the past it could be concealing. The need for a critical approach to reading beneath the surface of such structures is suggested not only by Laocoon's inability to persuade his fellow Trojans to look beyond the awesome facade of the Horse; more than that, it is the relative ease with which Sinon tricks the Trojans by focusing their attention on the Horse's extraordinary frame that makes an ability to read beneath the surface so critical. The Trojans are blinded by the monumental facade of the horse – and it costs them dearly. The poet's narrative of the Trojan Horse is thus similar to his account of Cacus' cave in the way that it too should make one suspicious of architecture's ability to contain the chaos inherent to the past in

---

completely, however, from the fact that the priest's rhetorical strategy fails to achieve the same effect on his audience that Sinon gains through an approach that emphasizes the monumental surface over any hidden meaning.  
<sup>58</sup> The subtle suggestion in Laocoon's speech that the Horse would "mount" the city – and the blurring of the artificial and the natural implied therein – is made explicit here: "the fateful machine mounts the walls, pregnant with weapons" (*scandit fatalis machina muros / feta armis, Aen.* 2.237-238).

the Vergil's story of Rome. The poet's telling of Troy's downfall warns his readers at the same time to be suspicious of monumental structures, in particular, especially those whose splendid exteriors can make one forgetful of the chaos that might lie below their marvelous surfaces.

The close parallel of the Horse's imagery with that of Aeolus' Cave in the previous book of the poem should again make the reader consider whether it is wise (or even possible) to hold at bay the forces of chaos from the past that these cavernous *moles* contain. Is the Temple of Janus – a structure placed at the center of Rome as the Horse was at Troy – another construction that could eventually fail and let loose again the violent chaos of Rome's past? The Trojan Horse and the Cave of Aeolus do not offer the epic's readers much confidence in architecture's ability to contain such a force; if anything, in fact, they demonstrate vividly the disaster which the release of such a force can wreak, whether on a city or the world at large.

### (iii) Cacus' Cave

In Book 8 of the poem Aeneas sees the site that eventually will become Rome. And even at that time in the distant past there are *monumenta* there. Evander is Aeneas' guide and reveals to him "the remains and monuments of the men of old" (*reliquias ueterumque...monumenta uirorum*, *Aen.* 8.356, cf. 8.312). The next chapter will examine exactly what such *monumenta* might mean to Evander, to Aeneas, and to the contemporary Roman reader. It is necessary first, however, to look at another important constructed cave that appears in this book of the poem, namely, the Cave of Cacus. This cave also contains an evil, chaotic force that existed in Rome's distant past – on the very site of Rome no less – in ways not dissimilar to Aeolus' Cave and the Trojan Horse examined above. The crucial difference with the failure of this final cavernous *moles* is the way that the destructive force within can also affect those who actively break open the structure to engage with it – even in the attempt to rid the world of such a chaos permanently.



The Trojans sail on the Tiber to the Greek colony of Pallanteum and are received hospitably at a feast in which the dislocated Greeks under Evander are participating. After both peoples have taken in such festivities Evander tells Aeneas what exactly it is that they are celebrating: it is not some “empty superstition” (*uana superstitio*, *Aen.* 8.187) that established the ritual, he informs his Trojan guest, but rather the fact that his people were “saved from severe dangers” (*saevis...periclis / seruati*, 8.188-189). The Greek king then goes on to relate the story of how Hercules rescued them all from Cacus, a fire-breathing monster that had terrorized the region until the demigod’s arrival – all while pointing to the very place where the violent struggle happened. The following lines are the beginning of his description:

iam primum saxis suspensam hanc aspice rupem,     190  
 disiectae procul ut moles desertaque montis  
 stat domus et scopuli ingentem traxere ruinam.  
 hic spelunca fuit uasto summota recessu,  
 semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat  
 solis inaccessam radiis; semperque recenti     195  
 caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis  
 ora uirum tristi pendebant pallida tabo.  
 huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros  
 ore uomens ignis magna se mole ferebat. (*Aen.* 8.190-199)

Now first take a look at this cliff, rocky and overhanging, how *moles* have been scattered far and wide, how a deserted mountain home stands there, and how the boulders have drawn done a mighty collapse. Here set back in a vast recess was the cave that the terrible appearance of the half-man Cacus was possessing – a cave inaccessible to the rays of the sun. Always the ground was warm with recent slaughter, always fastened to his haughty doors were dangling the heads of men pale with grim gore. Vulcan was this monster’s father: it was *his* black fires that Cacus would vomit from his mouth while he was bearing the great mass of himself.

Here again is a “cave” (*spelunca*, 193).<sup>59</sup> And once again it does not seem to be entirely natural.

It has been “set back in a vast recess” from the mountain, Evander tells Aeneas, made into a “home” (*domus*) for Cacus (192-193). It is indeed another *moles* – albeit one that has been

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 8.217: *uastoque sub antro*; 8.224: *speluncam*.

destroyed already (cf. *disiectae...moles*, 191) and is now lying in ruin. Vulcan is the father of this “half-human” (*semihominis*, 194), massive, fire-vomiting “monster” (*monstro*, 198). As the reader learns a little later, moreover, it was by the fire god’s own craftsmanship (*arte paterna*, 8.226) that the “cave” has a means of closing.<sup>60</sup> Although it might then appear initially to be a natural phenomenon, Cacus’ Cave is thus similar to the other “caves” examined above: it too serves as a constructed object that hides a force of pure destruction – of evil itself, in fact, as the monster’s name implies<sup>61</sup> – which stands in the way of civilization and the attempt to establish order.<sup>62</sup>

There is an important difference between this cavernous *moles* and the previous ones, however. Although Aeolus is not the builder of his cave, the king of the winds is in control of the chaos that lives within his cave – and he opens it under his own will. With the Trojan Horse, moreover, the Greeks who constructed it are the ones that break the seal and wreak their havoc upon the city (though Laocoon tried his best to reveal the *error* that lurked within the beast). In the case of Cacus’ Cave, on the other hand, the evil is *unwillingly* exposed by Hercules, who not only breaks open the *moles* (and breaks it apart), but also enters it in order to confront the destructive force that lies hidden within.

There are significant similarities, as one might expect, between how Hercules opens the cave and the way that both Aeolus breaks open his own cave in Book 1 and Laocoon attempts to pierce the “caverns” of Trojan Horse in Book 2, as the following passage makes clear:

hanc, ut prona iugo laeuum incumbibat ad amnem,  
dexter in aduersum nitens concussit et imis

---

<sup>60</sup> *Aen.* 8.225-227: “...he closed himself within and with the ropes cut let loose a massive rock, which was held up with iron and his father’s skill, and he fortified the doorposts supported by this block” (...*sese inclusit ruptisque immane catenis / deiecit saxum, ferro quod et arte paterna / pendebat, fultosque emuniit obice postis*)

<sup>61</sup> One obvious etymology for Cacus is the Greek word, κακός, meaning “evil.”

<sup>62</sup> See Putnam 1965, 131, where he connects the story of Hercules and Cacus to the episodes surrounding both Aeolus’ Cave and the Trojan Horse as “a further transformation into epic story of the figure of *impius Furor*.”

auulsam soluit radicibus, **inde repente  
impulit; impulsu quo maximus intonat aether,  
dissultant ripae refluitque exterritus amnis.** (*Aen.* 8.236-240)

Once [Hercules] had shaken this [stone] with all his effort from the right side, as it lay sloping along its ridge to the river on the left, and loosened it having ripped it up from its lowermost roots, **he then suddenly struck it. The upper air thunders loudly at such a blow, the riverbanks jump back, and the river terrified reverses its course.**

Hercules through his great strength removes a giant stone so that he can gain access to the top of the cave in which Cacus has hid himself. In order to accomplish this, he had to “strike” (cf. *impulit*, 239) it with all his force – a strike that makes the upper air thunder and causes the river itself to reverse its course.<sup>63</sup> It is significant that *impulit* is enjambed in the same position at the beginning of the line as when Vergil narrates how Aeolus “struck” his cave (cf. *Aen.* 1.81-82). That is not the only similarity, though, which links the two events: both strikes result in thunderstorms (cf. *Aen.* 1.81-91); more than that, the blow is so great that it too disrupts the established order of things in making the river reverse its course (*refluitque exterritus amnis*, 240) – just as the winds had made what was on the bottom of the sea suddenly rise to the top.<sup>64</sup>

Hercules thus opens the cave as Aeolus does and thereby succeeds where Laocoon failed. Yet there is still a price he must pay for breaking open this divinely-built structure and unleashing the chaotic forces within. Something happens to the hero upon his entry into the primordial chaos that the cave seeks to contain and hide: Hercules becomes very much like the monster that he is trying to vanquish.<sup>65</sup> Cacus’ Cave is a dark place – not only because the rays

---

<sup>63</sup> Putnam 1965, 133, also notes the importance of *impulit* as a way for the poet to strengthen the connection between these various episodes.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1. 84-86: “They fell upon the sea and together both the east wind and the south wind – and with frequent gales the southwest wind – overturn everything from the lowermost depths and roll immense waves towards the shores” (*incubere mari totumque a sedibus imis / una Eurusque Notusque ruunt creberque procellis / Africus et uastos uoluunt ad litora fluctus*). It is not a coincidence, it would seem, that Cacus himself is compared to the east wind when he tries to run away from Hercules: *fugit ilicet ocior Euro / speluncamque petit* (*Aen.* 8.223-224).

<sup>65</sup> This transformation is anticipated by the poet in the way that he (via Evander) uses fire imagery to describe Hercules’ wrath even before the hero even enters the cave. At 8.219-220, for instance, Hercules’ pain blazes with

of the sun cannot access it (cf. *solis inaccessam radiis*, 8.195), but also because of the “black fires” (*atros...ignis*, 8.199-200) which Cacus vomits from his mouth.<sup>66</sup> And this darkness seems to envelop and penetrate Hercules himself as he fights against the monster in his lair:

ille autem, neque enim fuga iam super ulla pericli,  
faucibus ingentem fumum (mirabile dictu)  
euomit inuoluitque domum caligine caeca  
prospectum eripiens oculis, glomeratque sub antra  
fumiferam noctem commixtis igne tenebris. 255  
non tulit Alcides animis seque ipse per ignem  
praecipiti iecit saltu, qua plurimus undam  
fumus agit nebulaque ingens specus aestuat atra. (*Aen.* 8.251-258)

[Cacus], on the other hand, since there was now no more escape from danger, vomits forth a great cloud of smoke from his jaws (marvelous to say) and envelops his home with a blinding darkness, snatching sight from [Hercules’] eyes. He gathers in his cave a smoke-filled night with shadows mixed together with flame. Hercules did not endure this in his spirit and threw himself with a headlong jump through the fire, where the thickest smoke came in waves and the vast cavern seethed in a black cloud.

The fire which Cacus “vomits forth” (*evomit*, 253) envelops the cave in a “blinding darkness” (*caligne caeca*, 253). Much as the winds in Book 1 which snatch away the sight from the eyes of the Trojans and bring about an untimely night (cf. *Aen.* 1.88-89), Cacus also takes the sight from Hercules’ eyes (*prospectum eripiens oculis*, 254) and manifests in his cave a “smoke-filled night” (*fumiferam noctem*, 255). None of this darkness deters Hercules, however, as the hero throws himself with a “headlong jump” (*praecipiti...saltu*, 257) right into the middle of the

---

black gall (cf. *Alcidae furiis exarserat atro / felle dolor*); at line 230, moreover, he is described as “blazing with anger” (*fervidus ira*) because he cannot find a way into the cave. Even before his battle with the monster, then, it is possible to detect a monstrous change in the hero himself. For more discussion of the transformation Hercules undergoes in fighting Cacus see also: Doob 1990, 241, where she claims that although Hercules serves “a model for Aeneas” in certain respects, the hero’s rage “is also a warning” to not “become the monster you destroy”; Putnam 1998, 161-162, arguing that “Virgil’s text both confirms the similarity [between Hercules and Aeneas/Augustus] and complicates it by drawing a series of verbal parallels between Hercules and Cacus”; and Henry 1989, 170-171, with the suggestion that “[t]he strength as well as the brutality of Cacus is repeatedly emphasized as Virgil prepares the reader for Hercules’ merciless wrath (VIII. 194-212). [...] It is because he must move so close to all these threatening nonhuman forces that Hercules runs so fearful a risk of madness.” It is important to keep in mind – as Heinze 1903 [1915], 485, n.1, notes – that it was on Vergil’s own initiative that he expanded upon the myth and made the battle a “*dramatisch bewegte Handlung*” that had previously been a much simpler, non-narrative affair.  
<sup>66</sup> Putnam 1965, 133-134, mentions also the possible etymology of Cacus’ name from *caecus* (“blind”).

flames and the shadows. Heroic as these actions may be, Vergil's description (via Evander) of what happens next suggests that Hercules has lost control of himself as a result of his rage:

hic Cacus in tenebris incendia uana uomentem  
corripit in nodum complexus et angit inhaerens 260  
elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur.  
[...]  
...pedibusque informe cadauer  
protrahitur. nequeunt expleri corda tuendo 265  
terribilis oculos, uultum uillosaque saetis  
pectora semiferi atque extinctos faucibus ignis. (*Aen.* 8.259-261, 264-267)

Wrapping him into a knot [Hercules] seizes Cacus vomiting vain fires in the shadows and gripping him tight he chokes him until his eyes popped out and his throat is dry with blood. [...] The hideous cadaver is dragged out by the feet. Our hearts cannot get enough of seeing the terrible eyes of the beast, his face, his chest shaggy with hairs, and the fires from his jaws extinguished.

Although Cacus is a horrible monster, of course, and one that has terrorized humankind for many years (and has stolen Hercules' cattle),<sup>67</sup> the way that the hero kills the beast in this passage is rather gruesome, perhaps even excessive, as he strangles the half-human being to the point that Cacus' eyes pop out (*angit...elisos oculos*, 260-261).<sup>68</sup> Moreover, even while Evander and his people derive a twisted sort of pleasure from seeing Cacus' dead body, the detail that Vergil gives to the scene – with the corpse being dragged out by his feet to be gawked at by the onlookers – has almost a twinge of sympathy. The poet had shown such sympathy before, after all, for another “monster” (*monstrum*, 3.658) back in Book 3: the blinded Polyphemus who can himself be seen as a model for Cacus with his own barbaric behavior in Book 9 of Homer's *Odyssey*.

---

<sup>67</sup> See Clausen 1987, 71-72, claiming that in his depiction of Cacus the poet “obviously intended to create an impression of unmitigated savagery and horror.”

<sup>68</sup> Hercules' strangling of the monster might also cause a reader to remember the way that the monstrous serpents in Book 2 wrap themselves around Laocoon and his children (cf. *amplexus...amplexi*, *Aen.* 2.214, 218) – thus creating one of the most pathetic and memorable scenes in the entire poem, as the priest of Neptune lifts shouts in vain to the heavens (cf. *Aen.* 2.220-224).

This fire-breathing monster has been brought low. But at what cost? It is not too much to suggest – as several scholars have – that when the hero enters the darkness of the cave he loses control of himself and a sense of his own humanity.<sup>69</sup> He would not be the first one in the poem to do this: Aeneas also enters a *spelunca* in book 4 and forgets himself and his mission, becoming *immemores* together with Dido.<sup>70</sup> And the chaos that is unleashed from Aeolus’ *antrum* and the “caverns” within the Trojan Horse when they are opened should not be forgotten, either. Caves in the *Aeneid* represent a place where darkness and chaos dominate – a place where the repressed forces of chaos that overturn any attempt to establish order can find a “home” (*domus*, 8.192). When a hero enters such a cave (or tries to in the case of Laocoon) these forces are unleashed upon him – ending either with his destruction, as with Laocoon, or the breakdown of his very humanity, as seems to happen even to the heroic son of Jove.

Cacus’ Cave is thus another case of “failed” architecture in the poem. Unlike in the previous two examples, however, it is not so much because the chaos inside breaks out. In the episode in Book 8 it is rather because the dark chaos of Rome’s past surrounds and temporarily traps the one who breaks open the structure in the attempt to destroy it. The result is a hero who becomes a monster while inside the construction – even if momentarily and for seemingly justifiable reasons. Even when one attempts to rid the world of these forces, in other words, it comes at a price, and with no certainty of any sort of lasting success.

Hercules is perhaps not the only “hero” to undergo such a transformation in Book 8, however. The Cave of Cacus is built by his divine father Vulcan, but it is not the only (or the

---

<sup>69</sup> See p. 118-119, n. 65, above. It is also possible to understand this episode in a more positive light. Otis 1964 [1995], 335-336, argues that the account is “an example of the conduct by which man can become divine and by which Hercules himself became the true predecessor of Aeneas, Romulus and Augustus... [T]he Hercules who exposes and throttles the fire-breathing monster in his infernal lair becomes the symbol of enlightened *vis temperata*.” See also Bacon 1986, 331, stating that “[i]n Book 8 the transformation of chaos into order begins.”

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 4.194: “forgetful of their kingdoms” (*regnum immemores*).



219) in his battle with Cacus. Augustus has tamed his own monstrous *Furor*, namely, the one which dwells inside the Temple of Janus in Book 1. What did it cost him to confront and subdue this monster? What structures of Rome's past did he have to destroy in that battle? And what does it do to those who try to tame the darkness and violence that disrupt any attempt to establish (or re-establish) order? Those are some of the questions that the episode surrounding Cacus' Cave raises for anyone – whether a god or a man, whether an Aeneas or an Augustus – who tries to subjugate the destructive and violent chaos of Rome's story that is bound only temporarily within the poem's constructed caves.

The three “caves” examined above present us with one type of “failed” architecture that attempts to impose structure on the chaotic forces of the past in Vergil's poem. These *moles* are revealed to be unstable constructions: their boundaries fail to contain the chaotic fury of Rome's past – a violent force that can upset the ordered structures of the cosmos, of the city, and even of one's own humanity. The labyrinths in the poem represent another set of structures that attempt to contain and conceal such forces. In a similar way to the caves in the *Aeneid*, however, it is their “failure” to keep this chaos of the past at bay which the poem demonstrates for its readers.

## **Part 2. Labyrinths of Meaning**

As difficult as it might be to escape from labyrinths – to find that one “right” way out – it is similarly no easy task to understand their symbolic value. Penelope Doob in her wide-ranging study on the idea of the labyrinth in Western literature speaks of a constant “double perspective” that one must consider when one is attempting to comprehend the meaning of these structures. Labyrinths are incredible feats of humankind – architectural masterpieces that elicited awe from



those who saw or even read about them in antiquity.<sup>74</sup> At the same time, however, labyrinths are also buildings that seem to lack a solid structure and organization to anyone who must enter and eventually escape them.<sup>75</sup> As Doob puts it,

[w]hat you see depends on where you stand, and thus, at one and the same time, labyrinths are single (there is one physical structure) and double: they simultaneously incorporate order and disorder, clarity and confusion, unity and multiplicity, artistry and chaos.<sup>76</sup>

For many modern (and post-modern) authors and architects, it is the latter of these two perspectives that has made the labyrinth a perfect symbol for their own struggles with meaning and language.<sup>77</sup> Walter Benjamin thought of “the modern experience” as “labyrinthine.”<sup>78</sup> And

---

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Pliny, *NH* 36.19.84: “We should also speak of labyrinths, that is, the most awe-inspiring work of human expenditure, but not think them fictions, as one might suppose they are” (*dicamus et labyrinthos, vel portentosissimum humani impendii opus, sed non, ut existimari potest, falsum*). Doob 1990, 17-36 (“Chapter 1: The Literary Witness”), presents a collection of ancient sources that express a sense of wonder at labyrinths, including Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and Varro, in addition to Pliny the Elder. Morris 1992, 190, claims that in Greek the term λαβύρινθος eventually came to signify “parts of Greek monumental architecture, according to the building accounts from Hellenistic Didyma, which refer to an element called λαβύρινθος, in the context of more technical terms for parts of the temple.”

<sup>75</sup> Varro describes the difficulty of escaping such labyrinths in discussing the tomb of Lars Porsenna (= Pliny, *NH* 36.19.91): “He was buried under the city of Clusium, in which place he has left a monument of rectangular masonry, each side being three hundred feet wide, and fifty feet high, and within the square of the foundation is an inextricable labyrinth, out of which no one who enters it without a mass of thread can ever discover an exit” (*Sepultus sub urbe Clusio, in quo loco monimentum reliquit lapide quadrato quadratum, singula latera pedum tricenum, alta quinquagenum, in qua basi quadrata intus labyrinthum inextricabile, quo si quis introierit sine glomere lini, exitum invenire nequeat*). But see Rawson 1985, 191, cautioning that “[w]e do not know Varro’s context; it might not have been wholly serious.”

<sup>76</sup> Doob 1990, 1. See also McEwan 1993, 60, claiming similarly that “the Labyrinth, it is essential to realize, appears under two very different and seemingly self-contradictory guises,” and Choay 2001, 175, arguing that “the labyrinth is the human edifice par excellence, the one most capable of channeling duration and compelling space to defer its necessary deployment toward meaning, the one most capable of leading to human alterity; the most redoubtable too, as it can both trap or liberate, and as its creative powers cannot be experienced without the unrestricted involvement of mind and body together.”

<sup>77</sup> Galileo once famously said that the universe “is written in the language of mathematics, and its characters are triangles, circles, and other geometric figures, without which it is humanly impossible to understand a single word of it; without these one is wandering about in a dark labyrinth” (as quoted in Saiber 2005, 18).

<sup>78</sup> See Benjamin 1982, 647: “*Nicht im Irrgang verfällt ihr der Mensch sondern er unterliegt dem monotonem, faszinierend sich abrollenden Asphaltband. Die Synthese dieser beiden Schrecken aber, den monotonen Irrgang, stellet das Labyrinth dar.*” For discussion of this passage see Vidler 2000, 240, where he claims that for Benjamin “the modern experience was, as Nietzsche had already proposed, ‘labyrinthine’; not clear and transparent like the Heideggerian temple, but obscure and ambiguous as to both its figure and its ground.” See also Choay 2001, 178, where the scholar also uses the idea of the labyrinth as an allegory for where she claims we are at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in terms of our understanding of our past: “As represented by a labyrinth, hidden under the beguiling surface of a mirror, our built heritage and the conservative practices attached to it may be construed as an allegory of man’s situation at the dawn of the twenty-first century: uncertain of the direction in which science and technics are

the architectural writer Carl Jencks defined as “Post-Modern” any space that “suspends the clear, final ordering of events for a labyrinthine, rambling ‘way’ that never reaches an absolute goal.”<sup>79</sup> For the semiotician Umberto Eco, moreover, “the universe of semiosis can be postulated in the format of a labyrinth.”<sup>80</sup> It is not, then, that labyrinths have no meaning or structure; it is rather that they might have too many meanings within a seemingly shifting structure. One might even go so far as Roland Barthes in discussing another great monument – the Eiffel Tower – to say that the labyrinth is similarly “impossible to escape, *because it means everything*.”<sup>81</sup> Labyrinths are thus at once architectural wonders *and* structures that seem to defy the very idea of a stable architecture.<sup>82</sup>

This double nature of architecture should already be somewhat familiar from the cavernous *moles* of the *Aeneid* examined in the previous part of this chapter. The labyrinths of the poem are likewise shown to present something on the surface that seems very stable and/or that delights while also “cracking open” to reveal darker, violent forces from the past that lie hidden beneath. With the labyrinth, however, there is a transition from the literal breakdown of

---

leading him, seeking a path on which they might liberate him from space and time in order to be differently and more creatively immersed in them.”

<sup>79</sup> Jencks 1977 [1981], 124, makes the argument that “Post-Modernists complicate and fragment their planes with screens, non-recurrent motifs, ambiguities and jokes to suspend our normal sense of duration and extent.” Jencks goes on to compare this kind of ambiguous space to that of a Chinese garden which “crystallizes a ‘liminal’ or in-between space that mediates between pairs of antinomies, the Land of the Immortals and the world of society being the most obvious mediation. It suspends normal categories of time and space, social and rational categories which are built up in everyday architecture and behavior, to become ‘irrational’ or quite literally impossible to figure out.”

<sup>80</sup> Eco 1984, 2. Eco’s use of the metaphor here originates from Eco 1979, 9, in which he details the reader’s role in working through the “maze-like structure of the text.” For Eco, at least, this maze *does* have a limited amount of meanings, since “[y]ou cannot use the text as you want, but only as the text wants you to use it. An open text, however ‘open’ it be, cannot afford whatever interpretations.”

<sup>81</sup> Barthes 1964, 27: “*impossible de le fuir*, parce qu’il veut tout dire.” I address in more detail and contextualize Barthes’ take on the idea of the monument below, pp. 197-198.

<sup>82</sup> Hollier 1989, 58, claims that “[t]he labyrinth is basically the space where oppositions disintegrate and grow complicated, where diacritical couples are unbalanced and perverted, etc., where the system upon which linguistic function is based disintegrates, but somehow disintegrates by itself, having jammed its own works.” See also Tschumi 1990, 29, where the “deconstructivist” architect suggests that “one’s perception is only part of the labyrinth as it manifests itself. One can never see it in totality, nor can one express it” (as cited in Shanks and Pearson 2001, 126).

boundaries to a more metaphorical collapse of the frame that allows the chaotic forces to escape. Although the figure of the labyrinth is a motif that has been demonstrated by scholars to run throughout the *Aeneid*,<sup>83</sup> the focus of this section will be on the two times such structures are explicitly mentioned in close proximity, that is, near the end of Book 5 during the *Lusus Troiae* and at the beginning of Book 6 in the ecphrasis of Daedalus' doors. In both instances, I argue below, these structures amaze their spectators and yet are instable and ultimately fail to contain the chaos of the past that they are built to conceal.

(i) The Labyrinthine *Lusus Troiae*

The first time that the poet mentions a labyrinth explicitly occurs in a simile comparing the mythical edifice to the intricate twists and turns of the mock-battle between the Trojan youths known as the *Lusus Troiae*:

ut quondam Creta fertur Labyrinthus in alta  
parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque                   590  
mille uis habuisse dolum, qua signa sequendi  
frangeret indeprentus et inremeabilis error:  
haud alio Teucrum nati uestigia cursu  
impediunt texuntque fugas et proelia ludo... (*Aen.* 5.589-594)

As it is said that the labyrinth on high Crete once possessed a path woven amid blinding walls and a trick deceptive with its thousand turns, where *error* that was untraceable and unsolvable would break the signs to follow: in a not at all different course did the sons of the Trojans arrange their steps and weave retreats and battles in their play...

The comparison here between the labyrinth and the games helps to illustrate the high level of intricacy and complexity of the boys' maneuvers.<sup>84</sup> The Cretan labyrinth was a marvel, after all,

---

<sup>83</sup> See Doob 1990, 227-253 ("Chapter 8: Virgil's *Aeneid*). According to Doob, in fact, "the idea of the labyrinth constitutes a major if sometimes covert thread in the elaborate *textus* of the *Aeneid*, providing structural pattern and thematic leitmotif" (228).

<sup>84</sup> See 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. [...] The comparison of game to labyrinth is apt, then, because of the artistic complexity they share." There might even be a connection between the idea of the labyrinth and that of dance. Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 147, connects the Cretan labyrinth, for example, to the crane dance ritual

and one that was highly praised in antiquity for just such a reason.<sup>85</sup> Yet the association between the details of this building and the boys' spectacle might seem rather odd. The focus of the description is not so much on the labyrinth's complexity as it is on the deceptive nature of the structure: its walls deprive one of sight (cf. *parietibus...caecis*, 590), and it contains a deceptive trick (*ancipitem...dolum*, 590-591) due to its many, winding paths; even more than that, though, the labyrinth is a place where one can see neither where one has gone nor where one should go, so that one is trapped in a constant state of *error* – an *indepreusus et inremeabilis error* (592).<sup>86</sup>

The emphasis of Vergil's simile is on the way that the labyrinth traps whoever enters it. That is surely not the quality that one would expect of a spectacle that is said to bring pleasure and a feeling of pride to its spectators. The poet has already told the reader that the Trojans "receive the timid [boys] with applause, rejoice at the sight of them...and recognize in them the faces of their old parents" (*excipiunt plausu pauidos gaudentque tuentes...ueterumque agnoscunt ora parentum*, *Aen.* 5.575-576). Let us think for a moment about this pleasure, though. It seems significant that the joy which the Trojans experience from watching the show comes from recognizing the past in the faces of their future. This is not, however, the past of Troy with which the readers of the poem are most familiar. The Troy that they have seen is merely a ruin, a place that was destroyed right before their eyes during Aeneas' graphic narrative of the city's sack in

---

on Delos as *tout naturellement* related in that they both not only have the same inventor in the figure of Daedalus, but also in that the dance "appears as a new repetition of the same pattern, already expressed by two figures: that of a path defined by a building [i.e., the labyrinth] and that of one defined by a spiral drop" (*apparaît comme une nouvelle répétition du même schéma, déjà exprime par deux figures: celle d'un trajet délimité par une construction et celle d'une spirale se déroulant*).

<sup>85</sup> See p. 124, n. 74, above.

<sup>86</sup> For Doob 1990, 31, these words serve as "oblique glances at the negative face of the Cretan maze." Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 143, argues that the labyrinth of Daedalus is indeed an "[e]nigmatic place, barely material...far from presenting itself as a building [it] appears mainly as the spatial expression of the concept of *aporia*, of an insoluble problem, of a particularly perilous situation" (*[L]ieu énigmatique, à peine matériel, le Labyrinthe de Dédale, loin de se présenter comme un bâtiment, apparaît surtout comme l'expression spatiale de la notion d'aporie, de problème insoluble, de situation particulièrement périlleuse*).

Book 2. It might seem therefore that *Lusus Troiae* is helping the Trojans on one level, at least, in the way that it allows them to forget about the recent disaster that befell their homeland and at the same time to remember events of Troy's past that bring happiness to their hearts.

If this is the case, though, why is there all the talk of deception in the simile that describes these same maneuvers? One way to answer this question, I would argue, is to suggest that the simile is emphasizing how the Trojans are "trapped" in a past they choose to remember, smoothing over the destruction of Troy that must still be paramount in their minds. The windings and twisting of the boys seem to be enough, in other words, to make the weary wanderers forget for a moment about the horrors that occurred at Troy and in the aftermath of its fall. The labyrinthine movements of the boys help to conceal a dark, chaotic time in the Trojans' past – to frame it in an elaborate fiction that presents to the Trojans only what they want to remember.<sup>87</sup> It is only able to accomplish this, however, for as long as the show lasts. The Trojan women bring that *furor* back into their minds soon enough by burning the ships while the Trojan men are watching this mesmerizing spectacle.<sup>88</sup> The labyrinthine dance thus proves a rather costly distraction for the Trojans: its complex borders and frames cannot actually keep the chaos of the past at bay for very long.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> P. A. Miller 1995 also sees the *Lusus Troiae* as a "strategy of containment." However, Miller's reading of the labyrinth presents it as "symbolic" (in the Lacanian sense) of "the attempt to domesticate the chaotic powers associated with passion and the feminine" (228). Indeed, for Miller, "[t]he labyrinth as the symbolic functions as a mechanism of repression, which makes a controlled, socially sanctioned desire possible" (234) and represents "those patriarchal strategies of containment that try to shut out the other, both from within and without" (240). See also Habinek 2005, 254-256, where he picks up on the symbolic nature of the labyrinth as "feminine," in that "[t]he knowledge acquired by the journey into and return from the labyrinth... is also knowledge of the innards of the body, whether construed as entrails or female sexual organs or both." (254). It is interesting to note in the context of this passage, moreover, that the idea of the labyrinth as "imposing order on chaos" might be a particularly Roman idea. See McEwan 1993, 60, who argues that "[t]he Western tradition has been to interpret the skillful embrace of *aporia* revealed through the construction of...[the] Labyrinth as a question of imposing order on chaos. This is a misrepresentation whose roots may well lie with the Romans."

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 5.604-663.

<sup>89</sup> The labyrinth's function would be similar, then, to the many pseudo-Troys in Book 3 that distract Aeneas and his followers from their mission and prolong their *errores*. See Quint 1982, 34, arguing that "[w]ith its parade of replica

It is not only the past that must enter into one's understanding of this simile, but the future of Rome, as well. Soon after the simile that juxtaposes the *Lusus Troiae* to the Cretan Labyrinth (and before the Trojan women's attack) the poet interrupts the narrative to discuss how this ritual would become very important to his own contemporary society:

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                   600  
accepit Roma et patrium seruauit honorem;  
Troiaque nunc pueri, Troianum dicitur agmen. (*Aen.* 5.596-602)

Ascanius was the first to bring back this kind of course and these games, when he was encircling Alba Longa with walls, and taught the ancient Latins to celebrate them in the way that he as a boy had himself done, in the way that the Trojan youth had done with him. The Albans taught their own. From there greatest Rome later on received and kept the rite of their ancestors. Today the boys are called "Troy" and the column "Trojan."

Why does the poet choose this moment to make explicit the aetiology of the event?<sup>90</sup> Although the *Lusus Troiae* probably first appeared as an event in Rome in the time of Sulla (and Caesar used it in his triumph in 46 BCE), it was Augustus who revived the "games" on a greater scale.<sup>91</sup> The aetiology might then be a way, it has been suggested, of "complimenting Augustus by tracing the origin of the *lusus Troiae* to Aeneas and Ascanius."<sup>92</sup> However, the close proximity of this aetiology to the rather dark labyrinth simile might also lead a reader to understand this

---

Trois – each successively and more explicitly revealed to be a place of death – the fiction of Book 3 has emphasized the Trojans' need to escape their past and its memories."

<sup>90</sup> For bibliography on the origins of the *Lusus Troiae*, see Doob 1990, 27, n. 15. Kern 1981 suggests that the games served either as a rite that was performed at the founding of cities or as an initiation rite for young boys into manhood. P. A. Miller 1995, 234, agrees with this interpretation, suggesting that the event functions as "a ritual of manhood and purification that readies adolescent boys for the serious work of defending their city"; according to Miller, however, the game's "conscious symbolic force...is undergirded by a deeper, pre-rational evocation of the necessity of containing desire."

<sup>91</sup> See Syme 1939, 445, and Doob 1990, 27.

<sup>92</sup> Doob 1990, 27.

association in a less positive light.<sup>93</sup> It might even be possible, for instance, to see the revival of the games as another attempt to give order to the chaos of a grim past of conflict – just as the games do for the Trojans who see them performed for the first time.<sup>94</sup> Is the attempt successful? At first, yes, it is, as the boys repeat the past in such a way as to bring pleasure to the Trojans. Yet this repetition distracts the Trojans not only from the horrors of their past that still follow them but also from the fact that they have not yet reached the solid land of Italy; and while they enjoy the spectacle, the Trojan women try to destroy their fleet.

The labyrinth that the boys weave with their maneuvers conceals the chaos of the past that eventually does not stay subdued within the boundaries of their art. If understood in this way the labyrinth is employed in this passage to suggest how a structure that almost defies structure can trap its beholder in a constructed past through its many turns. The figure of the labyrinth cannot be controlled so easily, however.<sup>95</sup> While the labyrinth might make the Trojans feel free from the always present sense of chaos in their past, as well as the one in their uncertain future, the poem demonstrates how that very same architectural frame is unstable and ultimately “fails” to control that chaos permanently. A labyrinth aims to entrap those who enter its boundaries, distracting them with its complexity while simultaneously letting go something more sinister as

---

<sup>93</sup> Although Doob 1990, 235-236, claims that this event “looks both ways” with a “characteristic labyrinthine duality,” her main point is to contrast this event to the later mention of the labyrinth in Book 6, arguing that in the case of the former the “the dangers of the maze are tamed, and indeed Romanized, as *errores* define the artistic pattern within which *labores* joyously imitate the works of war and peace-making which constitute Rome’s art.” The above analysis has shown that the dangers of the labyrinth are not in fact “tamed” here. See also P. A. Miller 1995, 232, interpreting the games as “represent[ing] a masculine strategy of containment directed against a feared and dangerous desire that is symbolically represented as feminine, but that...exists within us all.”

<sup>94</sup> Fitzgerald 1984, 60, claims that “[f]ar from being absorbed into the *error* that is the labyrinth, the Trojans themselves create it and weave the past into tradition.” See also Otis 1964 [1995], 284, where he identifies the labyrinth as symbolizing “the labyrinthine past and its hidden contents.”

<sup>95</sup> Hollier 1989, 60, frames the inability to control the meaning of a labyrinth well when he claims that “[t]he labyrinth does not hold still, but because of its unbounded nature breaks open lexical prisons, prevents any word from finding a resting place ever, from resting in some arrested meaning, forces them into metamorphoses where their meaning is lost, or at least put at risk. It introduces the action of schizogenesis into lexical space, multiplying meanings by inverting and splitting them: it makes words drunk.”

the boundaries between inside and outside shift. And if a labyrinth – one of the great structures in the ancient world – cannot succeed in containing such a *furor*, what faith should one put in the Temple of Janus to keep at bay the *Furor* of Rome’s own recent past?

(ii) The Labyrinthine Art of Daedalus

The labyrinthine spectacle of the *Lusus Troiae* alerts readers of the epic to the way that labyrinths can trap those who enter their winding, innumerable paths; in an even more nuanced way, though, Vergil’s narrative of the games also demonstrate how labyrinths can for a time at least keep certain aspects of the past hidden, imposing a highly complex artistic frame – a fiction of sorts – that conceals something that one might want to forget. At the same time, however, such “labyrinths” fail to impose a permanent, stable structure on the chaotic, destructive forces of the past that could break out of them at any moment. They can provide momentary relief from the horrors of the past, in other words, but they cannot keep them from repeating.

The next labyrinth that the reader encounters in the poem shares many of these same characteristics. It is again not part of the narrative, *per se*, but a small piece of an ecphrasis that details the life and works of the great craftsman Daedalus on the doors which he designed for the temple of Apollo upon his arrival at Cumae.<sup>96</sup> As with the labyrinth simile in Book 5, moreover, Daedalus’ labyrinth “fails” as a structure to keep hidden the monsters and *errores* of the past that it was designed to conceal; if anything, in fact, such chaos is shown *through* Daedalus’ own art to break out of the architectural structure that frames it and thereby to re-enter the present.

After the ships are saved by Jupiter from the Trojan women’s fury Aeneas sails to Italy

---

<sup>96</sup> Fitzgerald 1984, 54, states that one of the “distinguishing features” of the description is that “possibly for the first time in ancient literature an artistic work is described in which the artist represents his own story.” Putnam 1998, 5, is in agreement with Fitzgerald – and even goes so far as to claim (with more certainty) that this work of art “documents the only instance in ancient literature where an artist tells his own tale solipsistically in art, appropriating his own creativity for a final burst of inspiration.”



and finally makes landfall at Cumae at the start of Book 6. He stops there in front of the doors of the temple of Apollo on his way to see the Sibyl to gaze at the reliefs carved upon them. This scene will be examined again in more detail in the following chapter that looks at the *monumenta* of the poem.<sup>97</sup> For now, the focus will be on the labyrinth itself that is represented on the doors' panels, as shown in the below passage:

hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto                    25  
 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,            30  
 caeca regens filo uestigia. (*Aen.* 6.25-31)

Here is displayed the cruel love of a bull, here Pasiphae placed beneath [it] secretly, here the mixed race and two-formed offspring, the Minotaur, the *monumenta* of a criminal Venus. Here is displayed that toil of the house and the inescapable *error*. But indeed Daedalus himself taking pity on the queen's great love unlocks the tricks and twists of the house, leading blind footsteps with a string.

The labyrinth was meant to conceal the Minotaur within its highly complex weaving of paths that the poet labels as *inextricabilis* (28), "from which one cannot find a way [out]."<sup>98</sup> Yet this structure does not seem inescapable from the description of it here. Daedalus himself actually "opens up" the labyrinth by solving the very maze that he built to trap those who enter it (cf. *Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit, / caeca regens filo uestigia*, 30-31).<sup>99</sup> Nor does the labyrinth depicted on the doors even hide the Minotaur: the beast – and the sinful affair it represents – is actually freed from the darkness of the labyrinth and displayed as on the doors for all to see.

---

<sup>97</sup> See below, pp. 139-142.

<sup>98</sup> *OLD*, s.v. **1b**.

<sup>99</sup> See Putnam 2001, 180, arguing that "we do hear of the labyrinth, the 'toil' and the 'deceit' of its house, incapable of being disentangled. But disentangle is exactly what Daedalus does, unraveling the intricacy of his art now because of Ariadne's love, which he pities."

The architect can thus be said to break open his labyrinth: not only does he solve it in the myth itself; in a more unintentional way perhaps, he is also re-presenting to Aeneas (and the reader) the “failure” of his own construction to contain what was supposed to lie hidden by depicting the Minotaur on the doors and his own unlocking of the maze. Daedalus’ labyrinth is not just an example of “failed” architecture, therefore, but a *representation* of such failure.<sup>100</sup> The master craftsman (as well as the poet describing his work) cracks open the labyrinth through his own art by revealing how to escape its twists and turns, its *errores*, as well as by depicting the monster that lies within them. In this way, then, the edifice might serve as a *mise en abyme* for the poem itself – a poem which I have argued also reveals the violent chaos of the past that exists within several structures meant to contain it.<sup>101</sup>

But what effect does such a release have? In the narrative, at least, it might seem like the outcome is rather negligible: Aeneas simply marvels at such *spectacula* (6.37) before the Sibyl comes and diverts his attention to more urgent matters.<sup>102</sup> As William Fitzgerald suggests, however, the passage allows the labyrinth in the *Aeneid* to emerge as

a complex symbol of the status of the past. It is both a highly elaborate artistic work that freezes the past in a harmlessly discontinuous relation with the present and, as an instigator of repetition that transforms pattern into path, it offers the possibility of reactivating that past and assimilating it into the flow of history.<sup>103</sup>

Fitzgerald may be right to claim that labyrinths offer the “possibility” of bringing the past into a

---

<sup>100</sup> Fitzgerald 1984, 55, argues suggestively that the “temple frieze *is* a labyrinth” – one “whose balanced symmetry baffles the eye that would trace a narrative line through its contents.”

<sup>101</sup> See Bartsch, 1998, 328, maintaining that the *Aeneid* uses the labyrinth (and other “labyrinthine artworks”) as a symbol for the complexity of its own meaning.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 6.33-37: “He would have no doubt scanned all of it with his eyes had not Achates, who was already sent ahead, then arrived and with him the priestess of Apollo and Diana, Deiphobe, daughter of Glaucus, who said the following to the king: ‘This time does not lend itself to such spectacles.’” (*quin protinus omnia / perlegerent oculis, ni iam praemissus Achates / adforet atque una Phoebi Triuiaequae sacerdos, / Deiphobe Glauci, fatur quae talia regi: / ‘non hoc ista sibi tempus spectacula poscit’*). See also Henry 1989, 141-142, for the “particular importance” these events might have had for Aeneas, and Casali 1995, 1-9, for a speculative hypothesis regarding what Aeneas might have seen if he had continued to examine the doors.

<sup>103</sup> Fitzgerald 1984, 58-59.

structured frame. It is only a possibility, though, and the results are only provisional at best, as additional analysis of this passage in the next chapter will reveal. By representing the monsters of Rome's violent past can the *Aeneid* provide a frame for containing them? Or does it run the risk of revealing and releasing what would rather be forgotten? Once again, the question arises of whether architectural structures – even architecture as intricate as that of a labyrinth – can really provide a permanent, stable frame that prevents the *furor* of Rome's past from breaking free of its bounds.

This chapter has demonstrated that grand constructions such as cavernous *moles* and intricate labyrinths offer only the illusion of creating a frame that can contain the past within a stable narrative. The following chapter will show how the boundaries of monuments in the *Aeneid* also appear to be ineffectual in containing the chaos of the past that they represent within their artistic frames. As with the labyrinths examined above, moreover, the failure of the poem's *monumenta* is not so much in the collapse of their physical boundaries as it is in a breakdown of their epistemological borders – which results in the release of the *errores* of the past so that they can repeat in the present. The same can be said for the *Aeneid* itself and its epic architecture as symbolized in magnificent Baldrick of Pallas, whose resplendent frame is unable to keep the *furor* in Rome's past at bay.

The poem does not show the “cracks” in its epic architecture to a wholly negative end, however. The failure of its architecture to provide a stable structure that can conceal and contain permanently the chaos it holds within it demonstrates at the same time the need to be aware of the fury that exists behind a monumental facade. For it is by being able to read beneath what one sees on the surface, I will argue, that the *Aeneid* shows how one can best prepare for – and perhaps even prevent – such a collapse of structure from occurring in the first place.

## CHAPTER V

### The Cracks in Vergil's Epic Architecture II

#### The "Failure" of *Monumenta* in the *Aeneid*

The previous chapter examined several examples of "failed" architecture in the *Aeneid*. These included in particular the constructed caves and the artful labyrinths meant to cover over and contain chaotic forces and elements of the past that would upset any established order imposed upon them. It is now time to see what this analysis brings to bear on how one might understand the *monumenta* in the poem and ultimately the monumental architecture of epic itself.

Part 1 of this chapter will analyze three of the poem's *monumenta*, namely, those on Crete that Anchises mentions in Book 3, those embodied by the Minotaur in Book 6, and those at the site of Rome that Evander shows to Aeneas in Book 8. By putting these *monumenta* within the context of the other architectural structures of the poem discussed in Chapter IV it becomes possible to see that they too are often unsuccessful in achieving a stable meaning, revealing the "cracks" in their epistemological foundations.<sup>1</sup> These "failed" monuments should alert the reader to the instability of meaning inherent to monuments that has the potential to upset any stable narrative of the past (and future) that the monuments of the Augustan age – whether Augustus' or that of the *Aeneid* itself – might try to establish.

Part 2 will then build upon the conclusions reached regarding architectural boundaries

---

<sup>1</sup> Newlands 2002 deals similarly with the "fissures" and "fault-lines" in the boundaries of meaning in the Roman poetry under Domitian which – while mostly latent – have the potential to explode those boundaries (59).

and monuments in the poem in order to arrive at a definition of Vergil's own architecture. Whereas Horace sought to stabilize the borders of his genre while subtly introducing extrageneric and novel material, Vergil's poem shows us in contrast how the external facade of epic that he places upon his story of Rome is unstable: his epic frame cannot ultimately keep the chaotic forces of the Roman past from breaking through and disrupting a tidy teleological narrative from Aeneas to Augustus. An analysis of the *monumenta* on the Baldric of Pallas – read often as a *mise-en-abyme* for the poem itself – will serve to weave together the threads of thought from the preceding section and allow us to arrive at some general conclusions regarding the poem's overall architectural structure. Like the frame of the baldric, I propose, the poem as a monument of Roman history fails to contain the chaos (actual and epistemological) that is a significant component of Rome's story as Vergil tells it – a failure that is most apparent when Aeneas slaughters the injured and defenseless Turnus after seeing the baldric. It might then appear based on this reading that the *Aeneid* itself is just as much a “failed” *monumentum* as the ones that it contains.

Yet, as I argue in Part 3, it is the very “failure” of the *Aeneid* as a monument that perhaps makes it a monumental success in the way in which the poem causes its readers to reflect upon the nature of monuments. What the *Aeneid* suggests is not that the instability of meaning makes all *monumenta* failures, *per se*, but that to appreciate a monument fully and learn all it has to tell us about the past we need to be aware of the multiplicity of meanings that lie underneath what appears on its magnificent exterior. It is in this way, in fact, that I argue the poem can illustrate for its readers that the very power of a monument actually lies not only in its apparent stability (literal and epistemological), which Horace stressed, but also in the awareness on the part of the spectator of the monument's capacity to fail – without which the “immortality” that a monument

promises would have little meaning. As I suggest in concluding, moreover, this same polysemy of monuments did not escape Augustus, either, in his use of monuments in the *Res Gestae* to remember Rome's own chaotic past – good and bad – while simultaneously giving his subjects hope for a better present and future. The nuanced way that the *princeps* describes the Temple of Janus in particular provides an interesting parallel to the sophisticated architextural *monumentum* that the *Aeneid* represents.

### Part 1. Vergilian *Monumenta*

The previous chapter briefly mentioned the *monumenta* that Evander shows to Aeneas in Book 8. These are the only *monumenta* in the poem that are strictly architectural. At the same time, though, the poem is filled with several non-architectural *monumenta* that require attention for understanding what kind of monument the epic poem itself can be said to represent.<sup>2</sup> This part of the present chapter will analyze a few of the most important *monumenta* in the poem before turning at last to the structures found at the proto-Rome of Evander. This brief survey will demonstrate not only that these monuments “fail” to maintain a stable meaning; it will also show, more importantly, that this instability of meaning leads to the kind of chaos and *errores* of the past that the failed structures examined in Chapter IV also could not contain.

The very first time that word *monumentum* appears in the poem should not inspire confidence in the reader for the ability of “monuments” to present a stable and unambiguous meaning. When the Trojans are trying to decode Apollo's prophecy that they should “seek their ancient mother” (*antiquam exquirite matrem, Aen.* 3.96), Anchises calls upon *monumenta* in

---

<sup>2</sup> For discussions of the *monumenta* in the poem see Henry 1989, 18-42 (“Chapter 2: Spoils, Gifts, and Memorials”), and Jaeger 1990, 177-203 (“Chapter 7: Vergil's *Aeneid* and the Campus Martius”). The ten times that Vergil uses the word *monumentum* (or *monimentum*) in the poem occur at: *Aen.* 3.102-105, 3.382-491, 4.494-499, 5.535-538, 5.570-572, 6.24-27, 6.511-512, 8.310-312, 8.355-358, and 12.945-949.

order to find a solution to the puzzle:

tum genitor ueterum uoluens monumenta uirorum  
'audite, o proceres,' ait 'et spes discite uestras.  
Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto,  
mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae. (*Aen.* 3.102-1065

“Hear me, leaders,” said my father, revolving in his mind the *monumenta* of ancient men, “and learn what you can hope for. Crete lies in the middle of the sea, the island of mighty Jove, where there exists a Mt. Ida and the cradle of our race.

Aeneas’ father advises the Trojans to go to Crete where they can find their origins, that is, their *cunabula* (“cradle,” 105). This is the place, Anchises continues, where Cybele’s cult originated with its brazen symbols (cf. 3.111). The founder of Troy himself first came from this island, too – if Anchises remembers correctly (*si rite audita recordor*, 107) – and “therefore” (*ergo*, 114) it must be where the Trojans should found their city. This is not the right interpretation of Apollo’s prophecy, of course. What one should note here is the fact that it is specifically *monumenta* that cause Anchises to make such a mistake. They lead him and his fellow Trojans, in other words, to continue the *errores* that they have endured to that point since departing from the shores of Troy.

The very first set of *monumenta* in the poem is thus a “failure.” Anchises’ mistake illustrates for the reader not just that monuments fail to provide their interpreters with a clear message; more than that, the failure here demonstrates that these structures can mislead their interpreters, too, as happens with the Trojans when they try to impose their own meanings and desires upon them. The passage suggests, in other words, that the failure of a monument to achieve a single, stable meaning allows for the weary Trojans to fit these monuments – regardless of their original meaning – into an interpretation that on the one hand suits their desire for a new home, but on the other is still geared to their past and thus leads them away from

arriving at their new future.<sup>3</sup>

An even more complicated “monument” is the one which the labyrinth on Daedalus’ Doors both hides and makes its viewers remember, namely, the Minotaur represented in the carvings and labeled as the *Veneris monumenta nefandae* (*Aen.* 6.21),<sup>4</sup> as discussed in the previous chapter.<sup>5</sup> These *monumenta* are of particular importance since they present in an explicit way both the attempt to control the past through monumental structures and the failure of that effort.<sup>6</sup> Here is the passage again in full:

hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto                    25  
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,            30  
caeca regens filo uestigia. (*Aen.* 6.25-31)

Here is displayed the cruel love of a bull, here Pasiphae placed beneath [it] secretly, here the mixed race and two-formed offspring, the Minotaur, the *monumenta* of a criminal Venus. Here is displayed that toil of the house and the inescapable *error*. But indeed Daedalus himself taking pity on the queen’s great love unlocks the tricks and twists of the house, leading blind footsteps with a string.

To label the Minotaur as the “*monumenta* of a criminal Venus” would seem to exonerate Daedalus in the narrative he presents. As William Fitzgerald has suggested, in fact, the “configuration is notable for its absolute lack of Daedalus, who does not feature in Pasiphae’s

---

<sup>3</sup> See Quint 1982, 31, arguing that “Anchises’ misreading of the oracle of Delos which leads to the short-lived settlement on Crete – and the ways in which this episode is linked to others in Book 3 – indicate how an obsession with a former Troy threatens the Trojans’ efforts to make a new beginning.”

<sup>4</sup> This is not the only time in the poem when *monumenta* commemorate something bad that one might wish to be hidden or forgotten. Other examples include the wounds that Deiphobus received from Helen (*Aen.* 6.511-512: *sed me fata mea et scelus exitiale Lacaenae / his mersere malis; illa haec monumenta reliquit*) and, of course, the savage acts of the Danaids depicted on the sword-belt of Pallas (*Aen.* 12.945: *saeui monumenta doloris*) that I will examine at length below. (On the former of these “monuments” see the discussion in Henry 1989, 37-38.)

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion of the labyrinthine meaning of this famous passage from Book 6 see pp. 131-134 above.

<sup>6</sup> See Jaeger 1997, 17, n.8, where she notes in her discussion of *monumenta* in Latin literature that “Daedalus constructed the impenetrable and inescapable labyrinth precisely to hide the offspring that preserved the evidence of Pasiphae’s shameful passion. The labyrinth itself is an enormous reminder built to counter and block the unforgettable product of bestiality.”



escapade.”<sup>7</sup> Indeed, although the master craftsman was the one who built the cow which allowed Pasiphae to copulate with the bull, he appears nowhere in this part of the doorframe. By presenting the story in this way, then, Daedalus is able to elide his own role from the Minotaur’s conception – making the creature the fault of a *Veneris...nefandae* (27). At the same time, however, by representing the Minotaur at all the artist fails to keep hidden the horrors of his own past. Instead of allowing this evil to lie concealed in the past Daedalus instead monumentalizes it for all to see and thus forever keeps his own *errores* on display regardless of the label that is given to the creature.<sup>8</sup> The architect cannot escape from the horrible mistakes of his past even by providing a frame that re-interprets them in a way more sympathetic to him. Aestheticizing the past through *monumenta* cannot fully hide Daedalus’ mistakes, in other words, no matter how brilliant and mesmerizing those monumental golden doors appear.

Before we move on to examining the *monumenta* of proto-Rome it seems relevant to note that while Daedalus’ selective depiction of the past can only be inferred from the passage discussed above, it becomes abundantly clear in the way that the master craftsman depicts (or rather does not depict) his dead son Icarus on the same doors.

...Tu quoque magnam 30  
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.  
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,  
bis patriae cecidere manus... (*Aen.* 6.30-33)

You too would have an important part in so great a work, Icarus, were grief to allow it.  
Twice [Daedalus] had tried to fashion your fall in gold, twice the father’s hands fell...

In this passage Vergil explicitly tells the reader that Daedalus cannot fashion the fall of his son – an incident that is the fault of his creations yet again – for his hands cannot but fall (cf. *cecidere*,

---

<sup>7</sup> Fitzgerald 1984, 54.

<sup>8</sup> Jaeger 1990, 177, also notes a “two-edged” nature of the Minotaur as *monumenta* in another sense, as “it both reminds men of the past and looks forward, suggesting that men (I should say women and bulls) cannot control the product of their actions, and that the product can both remind them of the deed and lead a horrible life of its own.”

33) when he tries to complete the frame.<sup>9</sup> But Icarus is there, nonetheless, brought before the readers' eyes by the poet himself through an apostrophe to the fallen boy.<sup>10</sup> Whereas the absence of Daedalus from the frames above goes unmentioned by the poet, this final scene demonstrates more explicitly the way that the ingenious inventor is ultimately not able to keep hidden in his art the mistakes of his past. The conspicuous absence of Icarus that the poet notes transforms the doors into a monument not just to Daedalus' dead son but also to the pain that he felt at having lost him. Vergil thus monumentalizes Daedalus' grief for his son – even when it was the intention of the Athenian inventor to leave out of the frame the fall that he had caused because of the pain it would bring him to reproduce it.

By representing his story in the pictorial medium Daedalus is able to frame his past, giving it a kind of rigid structure. That does not mean, though, that he can control what others read back into that fictional frame. The events and details of his past that are not represented there can be made present by its interpreters even when Daedalus does not depict them – thus making it impossible for him to escape the past that he would clearly rather forget.<sup>11</sup> He can try all he might to give a stable narrative to that past, to cover over its horrors in gold carvings. Yet the *monumenta* that the Minotaur represents within these frames can be read as symbolizing the

---

<sup>9</sup> Traditionally, Daedalus was said to be able to bring his works of art to life (though Aristotle, *De an.* 1.3, appears skeptical in his reading of Democritus, who claims that the inventor brought his statues to life by pouring “liquid silver,” ἄργυρον χυτόν, into them). It is ironic, then, that he cannot even carve his own son who has died. See Morris 1992, 215-237 (“Chapter 8: Magic and Sculpture”), for a discussion of the power of Daedalus to bring his own statues to life. Morris attributes the metaphorical language used to describe Daedalus' art and other objects with *daidal-* words in early Greek poetry as the source for the later idea that his works came to life. On the figure of Daedalus in Greco-Roman myth see also Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, McEwan 1993, 48-56, and Armstrong 2009, 80-83.

<sup>10</sup> See Bartsch 1998, 336, claiming that “the most important element of the Daedalian scene...[is] the way in which Icarus is *not* missing from this work. Another artist steps in to supply him, and that is Virgil, who apostrophizes him, and who, although Icarus is not on the frieze proper, brings him before us as reader-viewers via the same literary medium of epic as the rest of the frieze.”

<sup>11</sup> Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 101-150, presents a detailed analysis of how every Daedalian answer (the pseudo-cow, the labyrinth, the wings of wax) serves as the grounds for another Daedalian problem (the minotaur, his prison, the death of his son).

*errores* of the artisan just as readily as they can be interpreted as the fault of “Venus.” In other words, the fact that the Minotaur is presented at all allows interpreters to read back into the myth those very mistakes that Daedalus might have wanted to leave out of his wondrous, intricate construction. In the end, therefore, even a master craftsman such as Daedalus is shown as unable to build a stable monument that would ease his suffering.<sup>12</sup> The surface meaning of the monument – as the labyrinth itself – is not firm but can be broken down to reveal additional meanings that lie beneath its resplendent, magnificent surface.

The *monumenta* that Anchises uses to interpret the prophecy of Apollo fail him, misleading him and his fellow Trojans into further *errores*. The *monumenta* that the Minotaur represents fail to save Daedalus from reliving his own *errores* of the past but instead perpetuate them. It should be no surprise, then, that problems of interpretation also accompany the only time when Vergil uses *monumenta* in an explicitly architectural sense, namely, in his description of the place that will one day become Rome.<sup>13</sup> To whom are these structures “monuments”? Evander sees them as meaning one thing, Aeneas perhaps as meaning something else in his amazement. What about Roman readers, though? What do these incredibly ancient *monumenta* mean to them? In the passages analyzed below the problem is one of a multiplicity of viewpoints that confuse or at the very least destabilize the meaning that the *monumenta* might have.

Vergil introduces Aeneas’ famous “tour” of Rome in Book 8 of the poem with the following passage:

...ibat rex obsitus aeuo  
 et comitem Aenean iuxta natumque tenebat  
 ingrediens uarioque uiam sermone leuabat.  
 miratur facilisque oculos fert omnia circum                      310

<sup>12</sup> See Armstrong 2009, 82, claiming that “Daedalus’ ingenuity is not allowed to remain detached and impersonal; the craftsman’s own life and happiness is affected by the exercise of the very skills that define and distinguish him.”

<sup>13</sup> The poet uses the word *monumenta* twice during Aeneas’ tour of Rome: once in his narrative and once in the mouth of Evander, at *Aen.* 8.312 and 8.356, respectively.

Aeneas capiturque locis et singula laetus  
exquiriturque auditque uirum monumenta priorum. (*Aen.* 8.307-312)

The king went forth, besieged with age, and as he progressed he held Aeneas and his own son nearby as companions and lightened their way with various talk. Aeneas marvels and moves his eyes eagerly over all things. He is captivated by the places, happily asking and hearing one at a time about the *monumenta* of former men.

What is at first simply a way to lighten the journey through conversation becomes something by which Aeneas is utterly “captivated” (*capitur*, 311) as he marvels at what he sees – much as he did in front of Daedalus’ Doors in Book 6.<sup>14</sup> The difference in this case is that he has a guide to explain the different “monuments of former men” (*uirum monumenta priorum*, 312). But what exactly are these *monumenta*? The first “monuments” that Evander mentions are merely “groves” (*nemora*, *Aen.* 8.314) where the Nymphs and the first inhabitants of the place dwelled. The Greek king then goes on for 28 lines to tell Aeneas about the way things used to be in the “golden age” of Saturn, when no laws were needed and everything was in abundance, before briefly explaining his own journey to the place itself and the founding of his city.<sup>15</sup> If Evander is also a recent immigrant, though, how does he know the way things used to be in these lands which seem uninhabited upon his arrival except for the monster Cacus discussed in the previous chapter? Are these bare sites themselves all the “evidence” that remains of these events? Although there is only a hint of the ambiguity of meaning of these *monumenta* here, they set the tone for the rest of the passage which is likewise filled with such problems of perspective to an even greater degree.

In the intervening lines before Evander speaks again Vergil narrates more of the tour that

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 6.33-37.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Aen.* 8.313-336. Edwards 1996, 11, suggests that the “use of ruins” in this passage is “to evoke a superior past.” “These traces are a poignant reminder,” according to Edwards, “of the irrecoverability of the past, a sign of its profound absence. The age of Saturn, whose ruins still stand in Evander’s proto-Rome, is a prelapsarian golden age which can never return.”



Evander knows about the Carmentine Gate: he might know about the prophecy, or he might not. Any such uncertainty of how much knowledge Evander has of the “monuments” that he is showing to Aeneas disappears completely in the case of the second *monumentum* mentioned in this passage, namely, the asylum of Romulus. There is simply no way that Evander could know of Romulus; for the Greek ex-pat, at least, the grove can only be notable (if at all) because of its great size (*ingentem*, 342). And the same no doubt goes for Aeneas’ interpretation of this “monument,” as well. Only a reader of the epic would be able to interpret this grove for its historical value. This is not the only time on Evander’s tour that the reader encounters such an ambiguity of meaning between Rome’s past and present:

hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit  
aurea nunc, olim siluestribus horrida dumis. (*Aen.* 8.347-348)

[Evander] leads [Aeneas] from here to the Tarpeian seat and the Capitoline, now golden, formerly bristling with forest-thorns.

The Tarpeian “seat” (*sedem*, 347) obviously cannot have any historical value to Evander; it would be another 500 years before Tarpeia would betray her city (cf. Liv. 1.11). And the Capitoline for the two of them is merely “bristling with forest-thorns” (*siluestribus horrida dumis*, 348). This is not the case for a Roman reader, however, who as Vergil points out would have associated the Capitoline with the “now golden” (*aurea nunc*, 348) roofs of its buildings.<sup>16</sup>

There are clearly some strange anachronisms that emerge from this passage.<sup>17</sup> Vergil’s Augustan readers do not see the *monumenta* that Aeneas and Evander do in both a physical and

---

<sup>16</sup> As Bacon 1986, 328, notes, “[t]he boundaries between past and present are blurred as the splendors of Augustan Rome are superimposed on Evander’s primitive settlement.” For further discussion of this passage see Feeney 1992 [1993] and Edwards 1996, 31. See also Hopkins 2012 for a discussion of the Capitoline’s “monumentality” and its influence on the course of Rome’s architectural development.

<sup>17</sup> Wiseman 1984, 117-128, is not bothered by the bizarreness of this “double vision” (as the scholar calls it), but sees it rather as a very “skillful” superimposition of Augustan Rome on Evander’s city by the poet.

historical sense.<sup>18</sup> Yet Aeneas is said to “marvel” (*miratur*) at them – whatever they are – and “happily” (*laetus*, 8.311), too. Evander’s tour thus illustrates not only the way that *monumenta* can change meaning depending on their viewer; just as important, these passages shows that ignorance of what a monument means does not stop a viewer from enjoying them – as was noted above, for example, with the Trojans’ fateful enjoyment of the monumental Horse in Book II.<sup>19</sup>

It is the perspective of the viewer that ultimately gives these monuments their meaning(s). This is not say that these architectural “monuments” are “failures” in quite as an explicitly negative way as either the *monumenta* that Anchises (mis)remembers or the ones that Daedalus carves. The *monumenta* that Evander shows to Aeneas amaze and inspire the Trojan leader, after all. Nevertheless, when one takes into account the failures of the architectural structures analyzed in the previous chapter and those of the *monumenta* in this chapter, it would not seem inappropriate to read the ambiguity of meaning that Evander’s “monuments” present in a less than positive light, as well. Although their external appearance (or name) might suggest a certain association, such an association is particular to the perspective of the onlooker – whether as a character in the poem, the narrator, or the reader. And different “readers” (including Aeneas and Evander) will no doubt bring their own interpretations. It is certainly the case, for instance, that the tour means something very different to a modern reader from what it might have meant to one who lived in Rome at the time that Vergil was writing.

What these scenes from Evander’s tour therefore demonstrate to their readers is the way that architectural *monumenta* can amaze even when the audience does not fully understand what they mean. It would seem that sometimes only the outward appearance of monumentality –

---

<sup>18</sup> Morwood 1991, 216, tries to solve this problem by suggesting that “[f]or Aeneas,” at least, “Rome is not a real city of bricks and mortar but a state of mind.”

<sup>19</sup> See pp. 106-115 above.

regardless of its meaning or what it commemorates – is enough for a structure to make an impact on its audience, or simply to appear monumental. Where these monuments “fail” is in the sense that without the proper knowledge of the past (or in Evander and Aeneas’ case the future) such structures or places can amaze but cannot impart the meaning they were perhaps meant to commemorate, whether good or bad.<sup>20</sup> Without their stories these monuments still manage through their external appearance to cause their audiences to consider the significance of these spaces, even if only to be in awe of them; where they “fail” is in their inability to keep a stable frame on prior events which can help one to avoid repeating past *errores*. Who built the *monumenta* that Evander shows to Aeneas, one may ask, and more importantly what happened to them and their civilization so that all they leave behind in Evander’s time are these monumental “relics” (*reliquas*, 8.356)?<sup>21</sup> Might it be that Rome could one day return to ruins whose original meaning no one would know? These are the kinds of questions that are raised when one considers these *monumenta* in the context of the other “failed” structures that the poem contains.

The *Aeneid* has been shown in this chapter and the last one to be full of monumental structures whose very boundaries are revealed to be unstable, epistemologically as much as physically. Their awe-inspiring surfaces can cause one to forget what one should remember; or put in another way, their magnificent frames can keep hidden – and thus alive – that which one might want to forget. The same can be said for the architecture of the poem itself, as the next part of this chapter will now suggest.

---

<sup>20</sup> Choay 2001 traces the idea that the definition of a monument has more to do with its “effect” than with what it commemorates to 19<sup>th</sup>-century France after the Revolution, citing Quatremère de Quincy (1755-1849), whose definition of the word “monument” maintains that “the idea of *monument*, referring more to the effect of the edifice than to its intention or purpose, can suit and be applied to all types of building” (as cited in Choay 2001, 7). As the case of Aeneas in this passage suggests, however, the ancients could also clearly conceive of monuments based purely on the effect that certain buildings had on their spectators.

<sup>21</sup> Otis 1964 [1995], 337, suggests that these *monumenta* must be “relics of civilizations which grew out of the ruins of the golden age...and were in turn ruined by their own vices.”



## Part 2. Vergilian Architexture: Fractured Frames of Meaning

The architecture in the *Aeneid* – both in its failed constructions and ambiguous *monumenta* – sets the foundation for a much different kind of architexture for Vergil than for Horace in his *Odes*. The epic poet focuses not so much on how to bring new elements into his generic boundaries without destabilizing them as on what happens when one tries to frame the violence and chaos of the past – and, in particular, Rome’s past – within the grand and monumental structure of epic that the proem of *Georgics* 3 suggested the *Aeneid* might be.<sup>22</sup> As the balance of this chapter will show, however, the poem’s apparent failure in this regard is not nearly so important as the sophisticated representation of that failure which the *Aeneid* provides – as well as the lessons it can thereby offer to its readers, ancient and modern.

The analysis of architecture and monuments in this chapter and the last one has demonstrated two issues that might arise when one attempts to construct an epic poem as a frame for the chaotic forces that are a part of Rome’s story from the start. Architectural constructions are repeatedly shown, on the one hand, as a means to contain chaotic forces of Rome’s past that would upset any order which one might try to impose upon them – and they are repeatedly shown to fail at keeping such forces restrained and hidden. The artificial boundaries placed upon the fury of the winds, the Greeks, and Cacus are ultimately broken and release such forces to wreak havoc on the world of Rome’s origins. Even the labyrinth (whether metaphoric or real) is shown to be ineffectual at keeping at bay such forces permanently – not only distracting the onlooker from the chaos contained through the complex artistry of its structure, but also forever monumentalizing the *errores* of the past in its shifting architectural frame that cannot be controlled.

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *G.* 3.8-16. See pp. 90-92 above for a brief discussion of this proem.

It is not just the chaos under the surface, on the other hand, that Vergil is bringing to light in the *Aeneid*. The poem's failed *monumenta* also bring one's attention to the problems with the magnificent frames placed upon such destructive forces. Neither those who produce nor those who receive such *monumenta* can give them a stable meaning which will endure. There are some meanings, moreover, that simply cannot be contained – even if one wants to forget them. Horace's poetry showed how two opposed meanings can create a tension that allows a structure to evolve without compromising its traditional boundaries. If a *monumentum* can have two meanings at once, however, who is to say it cannot have even more meanings – many more meanings – so many that those stable boundaries begin to crack?<sup>23</sup> Vergil's *Aeneid* suggests a possible answer to that question. Its epic surface no matter how grand it might appear cannot in the end provide a stable frame for the chaos that inhabits Rome's past and haunts its present.

These two issues – the inefficacy of an epic frame to contain the destructive forces of the past and to maintain a single, stable meaning – are brought together in the poem's final set of *monumenta*: the Baldric of Pallas. This object has also been seen as a *mise-en-abyme* of the poem itself in a way not dissimilar to Horace's *monumentum* in the finale of his first collection of *Odes*.<sup>24</sup> The belt is not architectural, of course. It does further illustrate, however, the way that a monument's lack of stability in terms of its meaning can lead men to commit the same violent mistakes of the past by releasing the violent forces that it both commemorates and tries to frame. Its frame is revealed to be just as susceptible to “collapse,” in fact, as the boundaries of Aeolus' Cave, the Trojan Horse, the Cave of Cacus, or the poem's labyrinths – and with similar disastrous results when those boundaries fail. The baldric is “unique,” moreover, in that it is the

---

<sup>23</sup> Fowler 1990, 58, puts it well when he claims that “reality appears in the *Aeneid* as if reflected in a cracked mirror. It exists as many times over as there are active points of view.”

<sup>24</sup> Putnam 1994, 187, argues that “the description of the baldric is in certain key senses a synecdoche for the poem as a whole.”



These *monumenta* represent the most complex set of “monuments” in the poem. Even more than with any of the monuments examined above there are in this passage multiple potential viewers and multiple people/events that the *monumenta* might be commemorating.<sup>26</sup> First of all, for Aeneas, the baldric is a reminder not only of Pallas himself, but also of the “savage grief” (*saevi...doloris*, 945) that he feels at Turnus’ act of slaying the young Greek.<sup>27</sup> For Turnus, on the other hand, these are “spoils” (*exuuias*, 946; *spoliis*, 947) in which he formerly “rejoices and takes delight” (*ouat...gaudetque*, *Aen.* 10.500) when he rips them from Pallas’ dead body in Book 10; they are from his perspective simply a sign of his own military prowess. Turnus thus clearly interprets these *monumenta* rather differently from Aeneas. Yet there is another perspective to consider here, namely, that of the poet himself. When Turnus picks up the baldric in Book 10 the poet intrudes to lament humankind’s ignorance of the future:

nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae  
 et seruare modum rebus sublata secundis!  
 Turno tempus erit magna cum optauerit emptum  
 intactum Pallanta et cum spolia ista diemque  
 oderit. (*Aen.* 10.501-505)

O the mind of mortals, unknowing of fate and future lot, ignorant of how to keep proper measure when lifted up by favorable affairs! There will be a time when Turnus will have wished he could buy the untouched body of Pallas at a great price, hating those damned spoils and the day.

These “spoils” (*spolia*, 504) that for Turnus brought such delight will soon cause him to regret his decision to strip Pallas’ corpse for plunder – let alone kill him in the first place. The poet’s

---

<sup>26</sup> See Fowler 2000, 214: “Aeneas’ reaction to [the baldric] can also be generalized to make it an example of the use in general of *monumenta*. For Pallas, presumably, the monument meant one thing, for Turnus another: Aeneas then imposes on it his own reading, a reading which will be disastrous for Turnus.” See also Jaeger, 1990, 177, arguing that “within the economy of the poem the baldric is a doubly forceful *monumentum*, since both Aeneas and Vergil’s audience share the memory it evokes.”

<sup>27</sup> Most 2001, 151, suggests that “Turnus loses his life to a memory which comes to life so as to avenge itself for its own death, to a memory which has forgotten that it is only a memory.” See also Henry 1989, 19, where the scholar notes that “Virgil calls the belt of Pallas *saevi monimenta doloris*, ‘a reminder of bitter grief’; it is not the belt itself, but Aeneas’ memory of how the belt was taken, that brings doom to Turnus.”

lament for the inability of mortals to know the consequences of their actions here thus signals once again the inability of *monumenta* to maintain a stable meaning: the future will bring different viewers and thereby different interpretations to a single object – and this makes it impossible for that object have a single, stable way of understanding of it. The epistemological boundaries of these *monumenta* are not stable, in other words, but are constantly being broken down, re-interpreted, and built back up depending on the viewer.<sup>28</sup>

There is still at least one more very important level, however, on which to interpret the *monumenta* of the baldric – one that has great significance for how to understand both its inability to keep in check the chaotic forces of the past and its instability of meaning. Vergil’s phrasing is somewhat ambiguous when he describes Aeneas’ actions as the Trojan hero looks at the baldric. As scholars have noted, the *saeui monumenta doloris* (945) that he takes in through his eyes can also refer to the images which have been engraved on the baldric.<sup>29</sup> The reader is aware of the scene depicted on the sword-belt because when Turnus first strips the piece of armor from the dead Pallas the poet enters into a brief ecphrasis on its decoration:

...exanimem rapiens immania pondera baltei  
impressumque nefas: una sub nocte iugali  
caesa manus iuuenum foede thalamique cruenti,  
quae Clonus Eurytides multo caelauerat auro;  
quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus. (*Aen.* 10.496-500)

...snatching the heavy weight of the baldric and the sin pressed upon it: during the course of a single wedding night a band of young men slain in sin and marriage chambers bloodied, which events Clonus, son of Eurytus, had engraved in much gold. And it is in this set of spoils which Turnus now rejoices and takes pleasure having obtained them.

The baldric frames the story of the Danaids who killed their husbands on their wedding night.

---

<sup>28</sup> As Fowler 2000, 216-217, is right to suggest, “whatever the scene on the baldric or Turnus’ wearing of it was supposed to mean, what matters is what Aeneas does with it: the *monumenta* mean what the audience wants them to mean.”

<sup>29</sup> See Putnam 1994, Bartsch 1998, and Fowler 2000.

Much scholarly attention has been given to the details of this description – and, in particular, its relation to the actual monument on the Palatine in Augustan Rome mentioned above which presents the same myth.<sup>30</sup> The point I want to emphasize, however, is that Turnus does not seem to realize that by taking up the baldric he is also taking up “the sin pressed upon it” (*rapiens immania pondera baltei / impressumque nefas*, 10.496-497). His interpretation of the baldric as a set of spoils (*spolio*, 500) does not see past the thick layer of gold (*multo...auro*, 499) that frames – and thus in a sense covers over – the brutality of what is depicted. When Aeneas sees the baldric, though, he is said to “drink in with his eyes the *monumenta* of the cruel grief and the spoils” (cf. *oculis postquam saevi monumenta doloris / exuiasque hausit*, 12.945-946), which suggests a different and more penetrating reading than seeing them only as *spolia*.<sup>31</sup> Could it be that the savagery of events depicted stirs him to reject pity and slay the subdued Turnus?<sup>32</sup> That is certainly not excluded by Vergil’s vague wording here.<sup>33</sup> I would suggest that the poet allows for a reading of the scene whereby Aeneas is himself reading in the violence depicted on the baldric a reminder (or “monument”) to violence which then stirs him to take Turnus’ life.<sup>34</sup>

The *monumenta* of the baldric – whether the sword-belt itself or the images depicted on it

---

<sup>30</sup> Putnam 1994, 171-189, provides a close analysis of the myth and provides previous bibliography on the subject. For a more recent interpretation see also Harrison 2006, 174.

<sup>31</sup> See Fowler 2000, 213, arguing that “[t]he killing of Turnus is a reaction to *monumenta*, and a reminder again that meaning is determined by the reader: whatever Turnus wanted his monuments to say, to Aeneas they were a spur to the act of vengeance.”

<sup>32</sup> See Putnam 1994. Jaeger 1990, 203, also suggests that “[t]hrough the story of Pallas’ baldric Vergil stresses that a *monumentum* both reminds men of history and impels them to action, that memory takes on a life of its own.”

<sup>33</sup> See Bartsch 1998, 334, claiming that “[t]he baldric is thus doubly *saevi monumenta doloris*: its reminding function points both to Pallas’ death and to its own imagery, a reminder of another, far older moment of savagery. It is, in fact, a reminder to savagery.”

<sup>34</sup> That is not to say that Aeneas might not have good reasons to kill Turnus. Galinsky, 1996, 211, argues (with help from Servius) that “[t]he *Aeneid* ends with Aeneas’ killing of Turnus, a justified act of vengeance that has both a personal and a public dimension. As for the latter, it suffices to quote Servius again, who clearly saw (*ad Aen.* 12.949) that it was *ultio foederis rupti* – revenge for the breaking of the treaty, a violation of divine and human law for which there was no clemency in Rome. This public aspect is complemented by Aeneas’ private obligation (an act of *pietas*, as Servius noted) to avenge the death of Evander’s son Pallas who had been entrusted to him.” In fact, Galinsky connects the baldric-as-*monumenta* to the Temple of Mars Ultor, which he claims was similarly a “monument to both Augustus’ private and public revenge, respectively, on the murderers of his adoptive father and on the Parthians.”

– clearly do not have one stable meaning; they change meaning, rather, depending on who sees them and what exactly that viewer sees. These several, often competing meanings cause readers to re-evaluate constantly the boundaries of any single interpretation. The baldric thus very clearly “fails” as a monument in two related ways. It cannot maintain a single meaning, on the one hand, as Turnus cannot control the meaning of the baldric, and Aeneas cannot see the object without unleashing the violence it commemorates, whether intentionally or not.<sup>35</sup> By looking at the play between surface and meaning, on the other hand, we can see that the baldric also fails to contain the chaos it depicts on its resplendent, golden exterior. The artistry of the frame does not matter: in the *Aeneid*, at least, that which bounds the fury inherent to Rome’s origins is shown as susceptible to collapse – and thereby releasing the chaos inside. And for that reason Aeneas’ violence-inducing interpretation of the baldric becomes perhaps the perfect way for Vergil to end his poem.<sup>36</sup> It makes the baldric emblematic, I would argue, of a structure that pervades and perhaps even mirrors the entire poem, as the epic too fails to aestheticize in an unambiguous way the destruction and violent chaos of Rome’s past within its beautiful, highly-wrought, “golden” frame.<sup>37</sup> What remains inside it is not a single truth but a chaotic force – one that not only breaks through the frame of the fiction that contains it to affect Aeneas but at the same time also reveals the fiction that any frame can safely contain such fury.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Eco 1979, 34, maintains that “[t]he end of the text is not its final state, since the reader is invited to make his own free choices and to reevaluate the entire text from the point of view of his final decision. Such a situation is typical of many avant-garde texts (fictional and nonfictional)...” The multiplicity of perspectives at the end of the poem here and the unresolved nature of the baldric’s and perhaps the poem’s meaning as *monumenta* suggests that the openness of the text is not a purely modern or “avant-garde” phenomenon. On this issue see also Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler 1997 for essays that tackle the different kinds of “closure” to be found in a variety of classical texts.

<sup>36</sup> See Hardie 1997, 142-151, on the difficulties presented by the ending of the *Aeneid*.

<sup>37</sup> See Putnam 1994, 189: “[The end of the poem] warns that, even as we advance idealistically toward Augustus’s putative golden age, human nature doesn’t change.”

<sup>38</sup> Bartsch 1998, 325-326, connects the permeability of the Baldric’s boundaries with those of the Trojan Horse and the labyrinth, which are both “breached,” leading to violent outcomes in both cases. “This paradoxical failure of art

### Part 3. Reading Beneath the Surface of Augustan Monuments

Vergilian architecture is not so much about what a genre claims to exclude as what it can include – or rather tries to contain. Certain chaotic forces of Rome’s past cannot be tamed by an attempt to give them a facade of epic that seeks to frame those forces. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the poem is criticizing the grand monuments of the Augustan age as pure propaganda which needs to be seen through to the chaotic past they hide.<sup>39</sup> Such an interpretation of the poem takes away from the complexity of meaning that the *Aeneid* highlights in dealing with monuments. The poem might suggest that there is something sinister lurking behind those glorious, travertine facades in Rome, something in the past that should not be forgotten lest it return to wreak havoc on the present. But it does so, I would argue, in order to make its readers into more effective readers of that past and better caretakers of their own future – not merely to destabilize the meaning of the present.

The poem helps its readers (ancient and modern) to understand more fully what monuments can accomplish even in their apparent “failure.” Monuments allow us, on the one hand, to move into the future without forgetting the mistakes we have made in the past; that is often a significant part of their purpose, after all, according to Françoise Choay in her seminal study on the idea of monument in modernity.<sup>40</sup> What the *Aeneid* shows us, on the other hand, is

---

to contain,” according to Bartsch, “relies on the deception of the viewer (whether human or quadruped) in Virgil’s text and points to concerns inherent in ancient notions of the workings of art.”

<sup>39</sup> Fowler 1990, 56-58, argues that the allowance of multiple viewpoints – or “deviant focalization,” as he terms it – is an “ideological act...[that] challenges the Augustan order.” But see Bartsch 1998, 336, stressing that we should read the art in the poem “neither in the optimistic and perhaps claustrophobic Augustan view of art as a force to contain political unrest, nor in the idea that art both deceives and potentially infects its viewer with a propensity to violent imitation.”

<sup>40</sup> See Choay 2001, 6-7: “The affective nature of [the monument’s] purpose is essential; it is not simply a question of informing, of calling to mind a neutral bit of information, but rather of stirring up, through the emotions, a living memory. In this original meaning, one would term a monument any artifact erected by a community of individuals to commemorate or to recall for future generations individuals, events, sacrifices, practices or beliefs. The specificity of the monument is therefore a direct function of the way it acts on memory. Not only does it mobilize and engage memory through the mediation of affectivity, in such a way as to recall the past while bringing it to life as if it were present. But the past that is invoked and called forth, in an almost incantatory way, is not just any past: it is localized



how the very failure of a monument to maintain a specific meaning and/or to conceal the horrors of the past can (paradoxically perhaps) achieve a similar effect: by exposing readers to such failures, by showing them the “cracks” in the facade of the epic structure, the poem is not claiming that monuments are useless; on the contrary, the *Aeneid* urges its readers through its failed architecture (and architexture) to see the need for understanding the flaws and limitations of such structures if one is to gain anything from them.

The poem is therefore not quite demonstrating only the “impossibility of dictating artistic interpretation,” as Shadi Bartsch has suggested.<sup>41</sup> Nor does it merely show the dangers of forgetting the past.<sup>42</sup> The *Aeneid* should not be seen, moreover, as presenting only a complementary narrative to the monuments of the Augustan age because its “fictional framework allows a broader perspective on Roman history than the propagandistic monument.”<sup>43</sup> Vergil crafts a *monumentum* whose architexture can celebrate the past and the future while simultaneously making its readers aware *through* its failure of the *errores* of that past and the chaos that could break out at any moment in that future.<sup>44</sup> It is thus very similar to the Temple of

---

and selected to a critical end, to the degree that it is capable of directly contributing to the maintenance and preservation of the identity of an ethnic, religious, national, tribal or familial community.”

<sup>41</sup> Bartsch 1998, 338-339, concludes by claiming that “what Virgil is trying to do with the *Aeneid*’s reflections on the role of art in the political world is to banish the binary alternatives that ideology offers us, precisely by invoking the impossibility of dictating artistic interpretation even as Augustus begins his turn to an ideological artistic program at Rome. [...] What the thriving industry of the interpretation of the *Aeneid* demonstrates is the success of the artwork at producing differing and ambiguous interpretations, even those that undermine its overt message.”

<sup>42</sup> See Quint 1982, 38, arguing that “[c]ontradictions within Augustan propaganda and policy may underlie the *Aeneid*’s alternative, apparently irreconcilable viewpoints: its hope in a new national future, its dread that Roman history cannot escape from a destructive repetition compulsion. But perhaps Virgil realized that his poem, by contributing to an official program of historical revision and mythification, might produce the very effect it sought to avoid. By forgetting its past, Virgil’s Rome is condemned to repeat it.”

<sup>43</sup> Harrison 2006, 183. Harrison’s general argument is that “the filtering of politically charged monuments through indirect literary allusion, analogous to the filtering and modification of other literary texts, allows (as in the *Aeneid* generally) more complex, nuanced, and humane views on the tragic aspects of heroic achievement to have a place alongside undoubted complements to the striking reconstruction of Rome under Augustus.”

<sup>44</sup> Fowler 2000, 217, rightly sees the efficacy of *monumenta* as “simultaneously hopeless and necessary: hopeless, because the belief that there can be anything between desire and memory that we can talk about in language is just another example of our deluded pursuit of the lost presence of the imaginary, necessary because without desire there can be no beginning at all, no setting out on the journey.”

Janus that Jupiter describes in Book 1 of the poem: the Temple is also a monument that celebrates the current peace not by eradicating the *furor* of Rome's past but by bounding it within its doors – gates barred tightly with iron, yes, but ones which also have the potential to be re-opened at any moment, releasing the chaos from the past that they contain.

The poem can thus even become a *monumentum* that represents in its “failure” a strategy for interpreting other monuments of the Augustan age, as well. Augustus was certainly not ignorant of the sorts of problems that accompany the use of monuments. Chapter III has already suggested that the *princeps* presents a highly sophisticated understanding of the idea of the monument in his own *Res Gestae* that parallels Horace's own complex use of the idea in the *Odes*.<sup>45</sup> A similar case can be made here by examining other sections of Augustus' monumental inscription about his achievements. It is noteworthy, for instance, to look at what Augustus has to say regarding that same Temple of Janus mentioned several times throughout the past two chapters:

[I]anum] Quirin[um quem cl[aussum ess[e maiores nostri voluer]runt, cum [p]er totum i[mperium pop]uli Roma[ni terra marique es]set parta victoriis pax, cum, pr[iusquam] nascerer, [a condita] u[rb]e bis omnino clausum [f]uisse prodatur m[emori]ae, ter me princi[pe] senat]us claudendum esse censui[t]. (*RGDA* 13)

Although before I was born it is said that the temple of Janus Quirinus had been closed twice since the founding of the city – a temple which our ancestors wanted to be closed whenever peace had been won by victories through the whole empire of the Roman people on both land and sea – while I was *princeps* the senate ordered that it should be closed three times.

The point here is not just that Augustus has established peace more times during his rule alone than in all of Roman history combined. That is what the words say, of course. As the present study of the *Aeneid* has shown, however, monuments have a meaning beneath their surfaces, as well. Closing the doors does not mean that *furor* is gone forever; it is trapped, rather, and that

---

<sup>45</sup> See pp. 79-89 above.

should not be forgotten. Just as important as how many times Augustus has closed the doors is the fact that Rome has been at war for almost its entire history. *Furor* has always been a part of Rome's story – the *Aeneid* demonstrates that aspect of its history again and again in a time before Rome the city even existed. Augustus does not mention explicitly this fact but instead focuses on the positive: his birth signifies a new age where peace is finally possible.<sup>46</sup> Again that does not mean that *Furor* has been eliminated, as even under Augustus' reign the gates were closed and then re-opened.<sup>47</sup> Yet it is that very acknowledgement – that Rome could fall into chaos again – which gives Augustus' statement even more significance and power for his Roman readers. To close the gates so many times signifies a new age where peace can finally happen; the horrors of the past are still there, though, within the walls of the structure – no matter how grand it is, no matter how tightly shut it may be – ready to burst out at any moment.

Reading Augustus' words in this way suggests that while the *princeps* alone has been able to control and contain the *Furor* of Rome's past, that containment might not last forever. It is precisely because this situation may only be temporary, though, that Romans therefore need Augustus (or his successor) to continue to be their *princeps* and keep chained the *Furor* of their past as Romans. And so it is to Augustus' advantage as well as their own for the readers of the *Res Gestae* and of Augustus' other monuments to be able to see past the exterior of the temple and its closed doors, to be able to imagine the chaos that resides inside the architectural monument, that is, at least for the moment.

It is possible to detect a similar destabilization of the surface in other Augustan

---

<sup>46</sup> Cooley 2009, 158, *ad loc.*, notes that the “implicit claim” that Augustus' birth marked a new age for Rome is “captured exactly by use of the word αἰών in the Greek version [of the inscription], rather than χρόνος.”

<sup>47</sup> Brunt and Moore 1967 [1981], 54-55, *ad loc.*, provide a brief survey of the possible dates of these three closures over which there has been some scholarly debate. See also Cooley 2009, 159-160, *ad loc.*, for further discussion of the debate, with bibliography.

monuments. The Ara Pacis has even more significance, for instance, when rather than seen as covering over the horrors of the recent past of civil strife such *errores* are imagined to exist right below its marble surface in such a way that the glorious present and future can be set in relief against them.<sup>48</sup> Peace and concord mean much more, after all, when set against war and conflict. No one should blame Augustus for not depicting the horrors of Rome's recent civil wars on Augustan monuments any more than anyone should criticize Daedalus for not carving his son's death (for which he had some responsibility) on the doors of the temple of Apollo.<sup>49</sup> What the *Aeneid* demonstrates is how to look at what is not on the surface, as in the case of Daedalus' failed *monumenta*, and to see what might be hard to take in but which is important not to forget lest Romans make the same mistakes again. Even when the chaos of the past is framed within Augustan architecture – as in the case of the Danaid friezes of his Temple of Apollo,<sup>50</sup> or the depiction of a bound *Furor* in his own forum<sup>51</sup> – those monuments gain more importance when seen not merely as portrayals of triumph over chaos but as reminders that such chaos could break free of its frame at any moment if Romans become complacent in times of peace and order. The poem shows its readers a way to interpret *monumenta* whereby one can be aware of their

---

<sup>48</sup> There is a tremendous amount of scholarship devoted to difficulties of interpreting the Ara Pacis. See Zanker 1988, 126-130, where it is suggested that the monument's "[I]ack of narrative and an intellectualized symbolism lend classicistic imagery a remarkable 'openness' of interpretation," and Galinsky 1996, 141-169, esp. 149, similarly suggesting that there is an "intentional multiplicity of meanings" in the monument. See also Mayer 2010, 119-120, n. 17, for further bibliography.

<sup>49</sup> Armstrong 2009, 82, even suggests that "Daedalus' temple for Apollo acts (at least on some levels) as a prefiguration of Augustus' temple of Apollo on the Palatine, dedicated after escape at a price, as Augustus' was dedicated after Actium and the terrible losses of the civil war."

<sup>50</sup> See Galinsky 1996, 221, where the scholar argues from his reading of the Danaid portico among other monuments that "[t]he evidence suggests that from the beginning of his reign, Augustus and the artists working with him were intent on developing an imagery that involved experimentation and multiple meanings."

<sup>51</sup> Augustus apparently included in his forum Apelles' famous representation of *Furor* bound and sitting atop weapons – just as Vergil portrays him in Book 1. Cf. Servius Danielis' note on *Aen.* 1.294, as well as Pliny *HN.* 35.27, 93-94, as cited in Harrison 2006, 181-182, who sees the installation of Apelles' work in the Forum of Augustus as not only Augustan but also occurring possibly in the late 20s BCE while the *Aeneid* was being composed. The argument I am making here (unlike Harrison's) is not dependent on whether such a work was a part of the Forum before or after the completion of the epic poem: Vergil is not so much discussing individual works of architectural detail as the very idea of what architectural monuments can and cannot do.

magnificent surfaces – of the order that they attempt to give to the events of history – and at the same time can understand that such frames do not tell the entire story, that it is the interpreter’s own task to inquire into the past, confronting head-on former *errores* and horrors of that past to understand how to keep them from repeating.

I am not claiming that Vergil and Augustus were alone in having this perspective on monumental discourse of the Augustan age.<sup>52</sup> Their fellow Romans could hardly turn a corner in the city without coming “face to face with the visual evidence of the contradictions and paradoxes which underlay the imperial system,” as the city of Rome was certainly “a realm of multiple perspectives and dramatic collisions.”<sup>53</sup> Nor were historians such as Livy and elegiac poets such as Propertius unaware of the multiplicity of meaning that is inherent to monuments.<sup>54</sup> What I am suggesting are the ways that the *Aeneid* is further exploring an element of monumental discourse in the Augustan age – one which can be found in the *Res Gestae* of Augustus himself – not inventing it wholesale, but both shaping it and being influenced by it.

The *Aeneid* is a text that enwraps Rome’s past in an epic facade. It fails to accomplish

---

<sup>52</sup> Galinsky 1996, 222, argues that “Augustan culture was characterized not by frigid homogeneity, but by the existence of plentiful tensions and contradictions, the monarchic republic or republican monarchy being the prime example. [...] Instead of simple and obvious ‘messages,’ Augustan art (and poetry) asks for the intellectual participation of the viewer or reader and for their scrutiny of alternative interpretations in order that the intentions of the creators may be understood all the more thoroughly.”

<sup>53</sup> Larmour and Spencer 2007b, 23. According to the two of them, in fact, “[t]he shifting positions of spectatorship, the experience of ‘double vision’ and the phenomenon of the visual palimpsest all feature prominently, amid a general interest in lack of closure and the contestation of meaning in this most remarkable of urban, public spaces,” that is, the city Rome (9). See also Welch 2005, 23, suggesting that for the Romans of the Augustan age “[t]he presence of Rome’s divergent over time thus multiplies the ways one may interpret Roman monuments.”

<sup>54</sup> On Propertius’ take on the idea of the monument see Welch 2005, 19-34, where she claims that “[t]he multiple perspectives on Rome’s places offered in elegy 4.1 raise the possibility that Rome’s monuments are not monolithic in their meaning, but rather mean different things to different people or to the same people at different times or in different contexts” (34). For the way that Livy uses monuments in his history see Jaeger 1997, *passim*, and esp. 11-12: “When monuments fail and the text restores them, reminders of stories give way to stories about reminders. By drawing attention to the [Livy’s] reconstructive activity, the restored monuments [in the *Ab urbe condita*] commemorate his recollection of that past.” I discuss in more detail Livy’s “monumental” history, as well as Jaeger’s arguments about it, in Chapter II above (pp. 36-43).

this completely, however, letting the chaos that is a part of the Roman past break out at certain points in the poem, whether it be the winds of Aeolus or the Greeks in the Horse, whether it be the fury of the Trojan women on Sicily or the rage of Aeneas that ends the poem. It is a *monumentum* that forces its readers to focus not merely on what is on its surface but on what lies behind it, what past monsters of *Furor* exist within its boundaries. This is not because it seeks to undercut or “deconstruct” its facade – that would be a simplistic way of understanding the poem’s complex monumental architecture. The *Aeneid* shows its readers these “cracks” and allows them then to gain a fuller appreciation of the peaceful stability that Augustan monuments represent, as well as how fragile that peace can be should they forget what lies behind their magnificent facades.

The *Aeneid* and its sophisticated architecture also points towards a development in the modern understanding of the monument during the twentieth century: an anxiety about what our monuments mean, or can mean, when we somehow have to confront the horrors of the past while still having hope that we can do better in our future.<sup>55</sup> The poem proves, on the one hand, that this need for a double perspective is not just a modern phenomenon or problem. It does more, on the other hand, than just point to this anxiety. The *Aeneid* demonstrates to its readers, ancient and modern, that it is only by acknowledging the capacity of monumental architecture to “fail” that we can truly appreciate the service it provides for us.<sup>56</sup> The poem does not destabilize the meaning(s) that we give to monuments to no end by showing the flaws in their epistemological foundations. It is rather by showing “failure” to be inherent to the idea of the monument that the

---

<sup>55</sup> For further discussion of this anxiety see pp. 193-196 below.

<sup>56</sup> The idea of memory itself – like the idea of the monument – cannot exist without the possibility of its failure, i.e., that one can forget. See Most 2001, 149, where he proposes that Vergil “not only knew that human memory is constantly besieged by oblivion and that every effort of memory must struggle against the insistence of forgetfulness; he also recognized that memory even presupposes forgetting and depends upon it.”

*Aeneid* can demonstrate how monuments might help us come to grips with our past – no matter how chaotic or full of violence – while also having the belief that we can learn from our mistakes and thereby do better in the present and future.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Larmour and Spencer 2007b, 55-56, suggest that a balanced perspective such as this was an essential ingredient to the success of the Augustan age to rise out of the chaos of Rome's recent past, since "the civil wars of the first century BCE and a material decline in the fabric of Rome could be represented as integral to a period of optimistic transformation and restoration under Augustus."

## CHAPTER VI

### The End(s) of Architexture

#### Ovid, Augustus, and the Transcendence of Structure

Horace stabilizes his architextural *monumentum* by keeping opposites in perfect tension through rhetorical disavowals. Vergil destabilizes the boundaries of his, on the other hand, by exposing what horrors of Rome's past seek to escape through the cracks in his epic facade. The *princeps* employed both strategies when constructing a new Rome within the Roman imagination; it was perhaps even imperative for him to do so if he was to be successful in introducing new elements to Rome's traditional structure while at the same time keeping alive the memory of Rome's rough recent history in the cultural consciousness. Although Augustus claimed to keep intact the traditional "structures" of Rome, it was in these very same claims – or rather rhetorical refusals – that he could perhaps best articulate the novel power he had acquired. At the same time, however, Augustus was also in charge of creating a new "structure" to reframe Roman existence after the "collapse" of the republic.<sup>1</sup> And for Romans to appreciate fully Augustus' marble city as a monument built upon Rome's past foundations the *princeps* also required citizens who could see beneath the city's newly resplendent surface to the ruin and chaos of its history that could just as easily return if completely forgotten. Augustus' ability to perform this balancing act throughout his reign was thus an important part of reconstructing a

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *RGDA* 1.4: *triumvir rei publicae constituendae*. For further analysis of this phrase from the beginning of the *Res Gestae* see above, pp. 43-46.



Roman state that would last. And this dissertation has argued that in his *Res Gestae* Augustus relied on the discourse of monumentality – like the poets of his age with their *monumenta* – in order to frame his reconstruction of Rome in the imagination of his new subjects just as much as in its physical landscape.

By the end of the Augustan age, however, different issues arose as the once stable boundaries which had structured Roman existence in the republic were in large part replaced by new ones under Augustus. The political system was different. Augustus had powers above and beyond what any single Roman before him had amassed. The city was different, too. It had undergone a transformation that was unlike anything that its inhabitants had witnessed before. It was a time of transition to something new, a time of flexibility and flux.<sup>2</sup> Not surprisingly, the architexture of late Augustan poetry reflects this state of affairs. The *Metamorphoses* of Ovid in particular demonstrates yet another important element of the success that the *princeps* achieved. Ovid does not seek to stabilize or destabilize his architextural structure, as Horace and Vergil did, respectively; rather, as I argue below, the late Augustan poet transcends the very idea of structure in such a way that he can enable his Roman readers to become participants in endowing his structure-less monument with meaning.<sup>3</sup>

The present chapter will examine Ovid's poem with particular attention to this seemingly paradoxical idea of a structure that resists the idea of structure. Part 1 will analyze the poem's structural "frame"<sup>4</sup> – its difficult proem and much-debated epilogue – in order to understand

---

<sup>2</sup> Several scholars have tried to define the "revolution" of the Augustan age – from the political perspective of Syme 1936 to the "cultural revolutions" described by Habinek and Schiesaro 1997 and Wallace-Hadrill 2008. Regardless of the particular perspective, however, most are in agreement that it was indeed "a time of genuine transition, which was felt by all to varying degrees" (Galinsky 1996, 238).

<sup>3</sup> Hinds 1987, 121, is right to claim that in the *Metamorphoses* "[b]oundaries are crossed and recrossed as in no poem before" – so much so in fact that it might be better, as I argue in this chapter, to see this as a transcendence of the very idea of a stable boundary rather than a nearly continuous crossing of boundaries within the poem

<sup>4</sup> As this chapter is about ends I will not be examining other structures in the *Metamorphoses* that could benefit from an architextural analysis of the sort proposed by this dissertation – the most notable being the Palace of the Sun in

better the way that the monument of the *Metamorphoses* attempts to transcend structure, as well as what implications that has for the Roman reader. This close analysis of Ovid's transcendent poetics will set the stage for one last return to Augustus' *Res Gestae* in Part 2 to see how the *princeps* performs his own transcendence of structure in assuming a comprehensive control over Roman space at the end of his own monumental work.

### Part 1. Ovid's Transcendent Poetics

Horace's collection of *Odes* is a work of lyric poetry. Vergil's *Aeneid* is an epic. They may negotiate their places within these two genres, as Chapters III-V have shown, but both poets at least have a clear architextural model to work with/against as they present their poems architecturally. The situation is different when it comes to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The genre of the poem has long been debated among scholars. To some it is "an uncategorizable multiform prodigy" – one that purposefully defies generic classification through an extreme mixture of genres and modes.<sup>5</sup> Others acknowledge epic as the "point of reference for generic conflict," seeking then to evaluate just how epic the *Metamorphoses* really is.<sup>6</sup>

The point of the present analysis will not be to provide a comprehensive study on the poem's complex meaning. Nor will it so much aim to solve the debate about genre as to change its parameters, that is, to look through the poem's architexture to ask why the *Metamorphoses* is so difficult to define in the first place. Ovid is not so much "deconstructing" the idea of genre,

---

Book 2 of the poem (cf. *Met.* 2.1-30). For analysis of this monumental structure see R. Brown 1987 (with bibliography), Leech 1988, 459-452, Hardie 2002, 177-178, and Feldherr 2010, 280-289, where he notes that the placement of this episode at the opening of Book 2 "equates the process of beginning the book with entering a *domus*."

<sup>5</sup> Feeney 1991, 189. See also Galinsky 1996, 262, arguing that "[t]he *Metamorphoses* is a kaleidoscope of literary forms and moods – drama both comic and tragic, mime, hymn, catalog poetry, epic, epigram, epyllion, and elegy, to name only the most important."

<sup>6</sup> Hinds 1987, 121.

*per se*,<sup>7</sup> as he is staging the transcendence of structure itself in order to keep himself and his poem continually alive in the imagination of his readers. He leaves his structure “open,” in other words, so that it becomes dependent upon his readers themselves to give it a final sort of definition and establish its ultimate meaning in relation to their Roman reality.<sup>8</sup>

Before examining the architextural “structure” that Ovid claims to have built in his famous epilogue at the end of Book 15, it is important to understand the context in which he constructs it. And it is perhaps at the beginning of the poem that Ovid as the narrator most clearly sets the boundaries of his scope, generic and otherwise, even if those same boundaries hardly appear stable from the very start.

In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas  
corpora; di, coeptis (nam uos mutastis et illa)  
adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi  
ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen. (Ov. *Met.* 1.1-4)<sup>9</sup>

My mind urges me to speak of forms changed into new bodies. Inspire my undertakings, gods (for you have changed those, too), and spin a continuous song from the very origin of the world up to my own times.

Much has been written about these four lines and their importance to the poem.<sup>10</sup>

Transformations from the beginning of the world to Ovid’s present are the topic of the

---

<sup>7</sup> See Farrell 1992 for a reading of the poem in relation to its genre that approximates a deconstructive approach.

<sup>8</sup> The idea of a text as simultaneously “open” and “closed” as put forth by Eco 1962 [1976] has been very influential for my interpretation of the poem as such. Eco thinks an awareness of this understanding of art is modern, claiming that “certainly an artist of a few centuries ago was far from being intellectually aware of this fact” (*certamente un artista di qualche secolo fa era assai lontano dall’essere criticamente cosciente di questa realtà*, 36). That seems unfair to what Ovid is doing in his *Metamorphoses*. As I will discuss below, pp. 177-179, his poem addresses the issue of “open” and “closed” in a more nuanced manner than Eco’s conception of the idea initially allows for. See also Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler 1997, which contains several essays on the theme of “closure” (or the lack thereof) in Greek and Roman literature, including Barchiesi 1997, 184-200, presenting an analysis of the end of the *Metamorphoses* in this light. The transcendence of structure suggests not merely a lack of closure, however, but rather the gesturing on the part of the author for the reader to provide closure.

<sup>9</sup> The Latin text of the *Metamorphoses* here and following is from Tarrant 2004.

<sup>10</sup> See Holzberg 1997, 123: “Four verses, not more. But they are full of important statements about the work – directly and indirectly” (*Vier Verse, mehr nicht. Doch sie sind reich an wichtigen Aussagen über das Werk – direkten und indirekten*). For additional discussion of the poem see also: Herter 1948; von Albrecht 1961; Bömer 1969, 11-16; Kenney 1976; Knox 1986, 9-11; Hinds 1987, 120-132; Myers 1994, 1-5; Spahlinger 1996, 27-40; Holzberg 1997, 123-125; O’Hara 2004/2005; and Feldherr 2010, 1-3.

*Metamorphoses*. That much is certain. The more one looks at the proem, though, the less clear its meaning becomes. The past is Ovid's frame, yes, but the first two words of the poem – *in nova* – point towards something new, as scholars have stressed.<sup>11</sup> And which past is it anyway? A historical one? Or one largely concerned with myth?<sup>12</sup> Or both? Transformation is the focus, obviously, but what kind of transformation? Although the more typical way of stating such a theme would be to say that the poem will examine bodies changing their shapes, it has been noted that Ovid rather peculiarly says he will sing of the shapes themselves (*formae*) changing into new bodies (*in nova... / corpora*, 1-2).<sup>13</sup> Then there is the question of genre, with particular focus on the frustrating “generic paradox” implied in the juxtaposition of *deducite* and *perpetuum...carmen* in line 4.<sup>14</sup> Whereas the former is an elegiac word, used by Vergil, Propertius, and Horace to describe their respective songs,<sup>15</sup> the latter is an “unmistakable” allusion to the kind of grand epic that Callimachus in his elegiac *Aetia* does not write.<sup>16</sup> On one

---

<sup>11</sup> See Kenney 1976, 46-47, for how *nova* signals that Ovid is embarking on something new as a poet, and Spahlinger 1996, 28, discussing the importance of *nova* to the poet's subtle claim of surpassing his predecessors. Galinsky 1996, 261, claims that the poem's “raconteurial geniality should not mislead us: it was a highly ambitious undertaking, one, in fact, that was without precedent, as Ovid rightly emphasizes in the very first line of the poem (*in nova fert animus*).”

<sup>12</sup> Viarre 1964, 357, states that “[o]ne can only wonder if this is a historical human time, or a mythical time” (*On peut seulement se demander s'il s'agit d'un temps humain historique, ou d'un temps mythique*).

<sup>13</sup> See Fantham 2004, 5, who rhetorically asks us: “But isn't it the other way round? Bodies are transformed into new shapes: it is the shapes that change.” But see Anderson 1963, 23, claiming that “[o]ne of the most important themes from the *Metamorphoses* is that *forma* has more than a passive quality. Not only is it changed, but it also causes change.”

<sup>14</sup> Hinds 1987, 132.

<sup>15</sup> See Bömer 1969, 15, where he compares Ovid's wording here to Horace in *Odes* 3.30.13-14 (*princeps Aeolium carmen ad ltales / deduxisse modos*) and Propertius 1.16.41 (*saepe novo deduxi carmina versu*). Cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 6.5: *oportet...deductum dicere carmen*.

<sup>16</sup> Knox 1986, 9. An oft-cited discussion of this topic can be found in Herter 1948. See also Kenney 1976, 51-52, claiming that the proem seems to present a “contradiction in terms” because “a poem cannot be both ‘deductum’ and ‘perpetuum,’ both Callimachean and un-Callimachean,” as well as Hinds 1987, 121, arguing that “[t]he *Metamorphoses* aspires to be a *perpetuum carmen*, one of those continuous epic poems of many thousands of lines on kings and heroes deplored in the preface to Callimachus' *Aetia*; but the aspiration is at once rendered problematic by the word *deducite*, which hints that the poem will also seek to align itself with the opposing, unepic tradition of the *deductum carmen*, the slender Muse preferred by the *Aetia* preface.” Spahlinger 1996, 36, suggests that the proem sets the stage for a poem that will be “the mixture of Ennian genius and Callimachean art” (*die Verbindung von ennianischem ingenium mit kallimacheischer ars*), while Holzberg 1997, 124, concludes that in sharp contrast to Callimachus' opening “it is precisely a ‘continuous song’ which the prefaces of the *Metamorphoses* announces” (*ist es...gerade so ein ‘kontinuierliches Lied’, das die Vorrede der Metamorphosen ankündigt*).

side of the debate, scholars have stressed epic as the base upon which Ovid is innovating. According to Stephen Hinds, for instance, “the meter, bulk and scope of the poem ensure that the question implied in that opening paradox [i.e., of *deducite* and *perpetuum Carmen*] will never be completely eclipsed: namely, in what sense is the *Metamorphoses* an epic.”<sup>17</sup> Even if the general appearance of the poem seems epic, however, the first line of the proem has already informed the reader that appearances (*formae*) are not stable.<sup>18</sup> Joseph Farrell has argued, on the other side of the spectrum, that we should see the different genres and modes of the poem as part of a “dialogue,” that is, as individual “ingredients of [Ovid’s] *carmen perpetuum*,” which undermines any set authority, narrative or generic.<sup>19</sup> From this viewpoint, then, epic is just one of several different modes that Ovid is weaving together like “a chain of iridescent tales out of one or more pre-existing texts, using material from different genres.”<sup>20</sup> Regardless of the particular side of the debate that one falls on, however, there is one notion with which most would agree: all of these subtle reversals within the relatively brief opening to the poem point to the many different ways that Ovid has purposefully fashioned “the proem to the *Metamorphoses* to arouse, and then defeat the expectations of the reader.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Hinds 1987, 121. See also Feeney 1991, 188, arguing that “[f]rom its first lines the poem continually confronts us with the problem of the extent to which, and the ways in which, it is and is not epic.”

<sup>18</sup> Myers 1994, 4, maintains that “Ovid by using this term [*perpetuum carmen*] suggests that his poem will indeed conform to traditional Homeric epic standards of magnitude, chronological continuity (*ab origine ... ad mea tempora*), and thematic grandeur, but in no other sense can the *Metamorphoses* be considered a conventional *epos*.”

<sup>19</sup> See Farrell 1992, 267, where in expanding his analysis of Polyphemus’ polyphonic song to the rest of the poem he concludes that “the voice of the authorial narrator throughout the poem” is one “that persistently undermines itself, problematizing its own authority – a voice, that is, in dialogue with itself.” See also Wickkiser 1999, 115-116, paraphrasing Farrell as: “[T]he *Metamorphoses* is characterized by a dialogue, rather than a compartmentalization of genres.”

<sup>20</sup> Fantham 2004, 131. Unlike Farrell 1992, however, Fantham understands a sense of harmony between the different strands, comparing the poem also to “a complex necklace whose central strand sustains loops (both short and long) of beads of different colors and materials, which separate and rejoin the main ordered sequence at different places to create an overall symmetry.” See also O’Hara 2004/2005, 158-159, suggesting that Ovid’s proem in particular “is evoking both the epic and elegiac tradition of worrying about the problem of whether human and divine motivation are to be seen as complementary or contradictory.”

<sup>21</sup> Knox 1986, 6. See also Kenney 1976, 46, warning us that even the form of the proem, consisting of only four lines, is a reversal of expectations for a poem that is around 12,000 lines long. “That very brevity,” according to Kenney, “ought to put us on our guard.”

This immediate frustration of expectation at several different levels should not be entirely unexpected, though, given that change is the very topic of the poem itself. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* proclaims from the start that change is and has always been happening, a sort of "endless flux" in the cosmos,<sup>22</sup> all the way "from the very origin of the world up to [his own] times" (*primaque ab origine mundi / ad nostra tempora*, 3-4).<sup>23</sup> One might then say that the basic assumption of the poem is that change is the only constant – even for Ovid's own undertakings themselves (cf. *nam uos mutastis et illa*, 2). Yet that is an assumption which cannot but prompt reflections upon the nature of change itself. For if change is truly a constant, then logically even the parameters by which we evaluate change must themselves change.<sup>24</sup> And sure enough, as scholars have noted, the poem of the *Metamorphoses* serves as a perfect foundation for the rest of a poem whose very hermeneutical boundaries are constantly changing – a "poetics of flux," as Stephen Wheeler puts it.<sup>25</sup>

"The whole *Metamorphoses* is built around precisely the crossing of boundaries," Don Fowler writes, "but it presupposes that those boundaries are there to be crossed."<sup>26</sup> The poem helps to make that tension explicit: in a world of constant change the short opening of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Segal 1969b, 289.

<sup>23</sup> See Holzberg 1997, 158: "The theme of the work is...humankind within a constantly changing world" (*Das Thema des Werkes ist...der Mensch innerhalb einer permanent sich wandelnden Welt*).

<sup>24</sup> As Barchiesi 1994, 263, points out in regards to the title itself: "[t]he heading of the work, *Metamorphoses*, heightens the sensitivity of the reader for all that is temporary, mobile, open to revisions. Signals and effects of closing tend to control this flow, but are in turn exposed to a sense of continuous rearrangement, and displacement" (*[I]a testata dell'opera, Trasformazioni, acuisce la sensibilità del lettore per tutto ciò che è provvisorio, mobile, esposto a revisioni. Segnali ed effetti di chiusura tendono a controllare questo flusso, ma sono a loro volta esposti a un senso di rimaneggiamento continuo, e si spiazano*).

<sup>25</sup> Wheeler 1995, 117. In discussing how the focus on change in the poem influences one's reading of the "cosmic ordering" of the world that follows in Book 1, Wheeler goes on to claim that "[t]he very provisionality of this cosmic order serves only to highlight Ovid's continual redefinition of his poetic project" (118). See also Feldherr 2010, 35, 37, stating that "metamorphosis throughout the poem is something that must be continually reimagined... [T]he poet's own definition of change is itself changeable."

<sup>26</sup> Fowler 1995b, 14. For Fowler, in fact, "[t]he Ovidian viewpoint on segmentation is that it is inevitable and necessary, but always provisional: it is not wrong to divide up the world or the text, but it is wrong to think that one's divisions are eternal, that there is one right way to segment phenomena."

*Metamorphoses* introduces the idea of a generic structure without a stable framework – one whose boundaries indeed seem to be established only to be transgressed. The *Metamorphoses* is a poem, after all, whose narrative is itself in a constant state of flux: stories cross over the “boundaries” of the poem’s books,<sup>27</sup> or are often embedded within others stories,<sup>28</sup> as narrators narrate the tales of other narrators.<sup>29</sup> It is no coincidence, then, that the “boundaries” of the poem’s primary architextural image examined below are much less stable than even those in Vergil’s *Aeneid*. The epilogue of the *Metamorphoses* not only reveals how Ovid’s “monument” is emblematic of a poem without a stable generic structure; more importantly, the poem’s concluding architextural image helps to illustrate how the poet transcends the very idea of structure inherent to monuments in order to reshape the boundaries of the real world, as well as his place in it.<sup>30</sup>

*Iamque opus exegi*. “And now I have completed my work.” With these words Ovid begins the epilogue to his poem of roughly 12,000 lines. This is not exactly a traditionally epic ending to a poem that might seem epic to judge by its length.<sup>31</sup> That should not necessarily be a

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.751-2.400 (Phaethon), 4.604-5.249 (Perseus), 7.404-9.97 (Theseus), 10.1-11.66 (Orpheus), and 13.623-14.582 (the “Little” *Aeneid*).

<sup>28</sup> For example, the story of Pyramus and Thisbe (*Met.* 4.55-166) is embedded in the story of the daughters of Minyas (4.1-415). The famous tale of Pygmalion and his statue (10.243-297) is one of the many stories that Orpheus tells in the poem (10.143-10.739), which also includes the tale of Venus and Adonis (10.503-739), with Venus herself narrating the story of Atalanta and Hippomenes (10.560-680).

<sup>29</sup> Feldherr 2010 provides an incredibly subtle reading of the different narrative levels in the *Metamorphoses* that demonstrates the remarkable fluidity and evasiveness of the poem’s narrative structure. See also Coleman 1971, Barchiesi 1989, Keith 1992, Tissol 1997, Solodow 1988, Wheeler 2000, and Rosati 2002.

<sup>30</sup> Nearly every full account of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* touches upon its controversial conclusion. Some of the scholarship that has most shaped my own interpretation includes: Fränkel 1945 [1969], 110-111; Anderson 1963, 27; Segal 1969b; Leach 1974, 134-135; Woodman 1974, 127-128; Bömer 1986 488-451; Feeney 1991, 248-249; Barchiesi 1994, 262-265; Spahlinger 1996, 40-50; Barchiesi 1997, 184-200; Holzberg 1997, 153-158; Solodow 1988, 220-222; Wickkiser 1999; Fowler 2000, 195-196; Hardie 2002, 91-97; Habinek 2002, 54-57; and Feldherr 2010, 78-83.

<sup>31</sup> See Solodow 1988, 52-53, claiming that “there is nothing traditionally epic in the first-person discourse at the close of the *Metamorphoses*. The passage which ends the poem (15.871-79) is a lengthy statement of the poet’s own immortality, more closely resembling personal lyric – Horace *Odes* 3.30 is the chief model – than anything familiar from more ‘objective’ narrative.”

surprise, though, given the poem's generic puzzles as presented in the proem. Although Ovid is also in dialogue with Vergil's *Aeneid* here,<sup>32</sup> these three opening words are clearly alluding to Horace's *exegi monumentum*, that is, the phrase which begins the finale to Horace's first collection of *Odes* examined above in Chapter III.<sup>33</sup> It is in the differences between how the two poets envision the architecture of their respective works, however, that one can best appreciate the striking nature of what Ovid is attempting to do in what is considered by many as a sort of personal *sphragis*,<sup>34</sup> or "seal," for his lengthy poem:

Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis  
 nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas.  
 cum uolet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius  
 ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi:  
 parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis                    875  
 astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum;  
 quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris  
 ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama  
 (si quid habent ueri uatum praesagia) uiuam. (Ov. *Met.* 15.871-879)

And now I have completed a work, which neither the wrath of Jove nor fire nor a sword nor decaying old age will be able to efface. May that day which has power over nothing except this body of mine end the uncertain span of my life when it wants to end it. I will forever be carried by the better part of me above the lofty stars, and my name will be indelible; wherever Roman power spreads in lands subdued, I will be read by the mouths of the people, and because of my fame through all the centuries (if the prophecies of bards have any truth) I shall live.

Even if Ovid is adopting the *exegi* of Horace (*C.* 3.30.1), he calls his work an *opus* as opposed to Horace's *monumentum*. Tony Woodman sees this as a flaw in Ovid's exposition, since the poet "does not specify what he imagines his immortal construction to be, *opus* being a weak word

---

<sup>32</sup> Just as Ovid is almost everywhere else in the poem, as well. See Galinsky 1996, 262-266, where he argues that the "the *Metamorphoses* is an almost constant dialogue with the *Aeneid*" in terms of "verbal reminiscences" as well as more importantly its status as an "alternative to Vergil's interpretation of myth."

<sup>33</sup> See Spahlinger 1996, 46, stating that *Iamque opus exegi* is "eine bewußte Aufnahme" of Horace's *Exegi monumentum*. For comparisons of the two poems see also Woodman 1974, 127-128, Solodow 1988, 222-223, Wickkiser 1999, 127-129, and Feldherr 2010, 82.

<sup>34</sup> On the use of *sphragis* for the ending of the *Metamorphoses* see Wickkiser 1999, 113.



commonly used of any literary composition.”<sup>35</sup> According to Bronwen Wickkiser, on the other hand, *opus* actually “reinforces the architectural metaphor” that is more explicit in Horace’s *monumentum*; in fact, drawing upon the works of Vitruvius and Ovid himself, Wickkiser argues that “*opus* refers especially to works of public architecture,” such as monuments.<sup>36</sup> Both scholars are right to a degree. The image does have an architectural valence – both in its own right and by virtue of its connection to the Horatian intertext – though it may not be as strong as Wickkiser suggests. For one, as Wickkiser herself points out, “[t]he word *opus* occurs many times throughout the *Metamorphoses*, and often in reference to non-architectural works of art, such as the weavings of Minerva (6.82) and Arachne (6.14, 102, 130) and Pygmalion’s statue (10.249, 254).”<sup>37</sup> There is a bit of ambiguity, in other words, in the term *opus* within Ovid’s own work with respect to what kind of image is evoked. And it is not an insignificant choice on the part of the poet to avoid an unambiguously architectural image. Woodman is certainly correct, after all, that Ovid’s image does lack the specificity of Horace’s very architectural and physical *monumentum* – and he justly prompts us to ask what exactly Ovid is envisioning here. For instance, would the sturdy monument of Horace be disturbed in the slightest by a mere “sword” (*ferrum*)?<sup>38</sup> Probably not. However, even though Woodman (somewhat pejoratively) calls Ovid’s *opus* an “imagistic fragmentation” for these very reasons,<sup>39</sup> the fluid nature of the poem as discussed above suggests that perhaps “imagistic fragmentation” is *exactly* what Ovid is trying to

---

<sup>35</sup> Woodman 1974, 127.

<sup>36</sup> Wickkiser 1999, 129.

<sup>37</sup> Wickkiser 1999, 127. Feldherr 2010, 82, presents a more subtle and compelling reading of these lines, claiming that “Ovid’s final account of his completed *opus* has been claimed to approximate such imperial constructs, but another glance back at the Horatian intertext complicates this impression. Horace unambiguously spoke of his text as a *monumentum*; Ovid employs the much broader *opus*, making the building metaphor less insistent, if still available.”

<sup>38</sup> See Woodman 1974, 127-128: “It is hardly a compliment to himself if Ovid says that a mere ‘sword’ (*ferrum*) will not destroy his *opus*.” Woodman goes so far in fact as to criticize Ovid’s slight anthropomorphization of time and age “as if they were a man with sharp teeth who attacks monuments and the like” (128).

<sup>39</sup> Woodman 1974, 128.

achieve.

Joseph Solodow in his monograph on the complexities of narration in the *Metamorphoses* presents an argument that takes a more moderate path between Woodman and Wickkiser in redeeming Ovid's lack of specificity in the *sphragis* of the poem. While Solodow agrees with Woodman both that Ovid "presents a more abstract notion" than Horace with the word *opus* and that the threats to his imagined work (i.e., the lightning bolt, the sword, time) "evoke no one particular image,"<sup>40</sup> the former scholar sees this "fragmentation" not as a flaw but rather as part of Ovid's "triumph" over Horace; for Solodow, in fact, "Ovid's claim is grander" than that of his predecessor, even if it is less "epic."<sup>41</sup> His reasoning here has to do with the notion that Ovid's *opus* is "in every point more private."<sup>42</sup> Unlike Horace's account – whose massive *monumentum* is "objective, nearly impersonal," striving for a sort of epic grandeur despite its lyric mode – Ovid's accomplishment "originates in him, its sphere is himself, the glory that results will be his alone."<sup>43</sup> Ovid wants his readers to see him as an artist, according to Solodow, and his final words help establish the poet as the sole creator of the world inside his poem.<sup>44</sup>

Solodow is right to see the abstract image of Ovid's *opus* as symbolic for a poem that "strives for visible clarity and for the public and permanent qualities of a monument...[a]nd yet at the same time...remains a feat of triumphant subjectivity."<sup>45</sup> And there is something more "private" about Ovid's apparent farewell than Horace's grander and more solemn send-off. It

---

<sup>40</sup> Solodow 1988, 221-222.

<sup>41</sup> See Zetzel 1982, 96, claiming that in *C.* 3.30 Horace's "poetry has become the virtual equivalent of epic."

<sup>42</sup> Solodow 1988, 222.

<sup>43</sup> Solodow 1988, 222.

<sup>44</sup> On the subjectivity of Ovid's narrator in the *Metamorphoses* see also Leach 1988, 440-467, where she argues that "[w]ith its discrepancy between authoritative information and ethical indeterminacy, the poem engages us in a world that is neither evil nor negative, but recognizably fallible and human. To this end we may understand Ovid's controlled point of view as a knowing illustration of the way persuasion aims to activate our responses by making us see, hear, and feel" (466).

<sup>45</sup> Solodow 1988, 220.

would seem, however, that Solodow goes too far in claiming that “[n]either the poet nor his poem claims to speak for anything larger than the individual, not divinity or national life, not history or society.”<sup>46</sup> In contrast to this view, Wickkiser is not incorrect to stress the importance of the historical – and, in particular, architectural – context in which Ovid was writing. Although Ovid’s architextural image might be more difficult to determine, as Woodman suggests, and his tone perhaps more subjective and personal, as Solodow is right to point out, the poet is still working within the architectural discourse of his age. It is in fact the very idea of structure inherent to monumentality which Ovid is aiming to transcend while simultaneously also employing it.<sup>47</sup>

This is perhaps not a simple idea to grasp. How one can both use and abuse the metaphor of structure at the same time? Let us start unpacking this concept by looking first at the poet himself and the relationship he has with his monument. For one, it is not Ovid’s *monumentum* that will defy time and space, as Horace’s did, so much as the poet himself<sup>48</sup> – albeit not in his current mortal form. Time has control over Ovid’s body, yes, but nothing more than that: *dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius / ius habet* (874-875). Time also has the ability to “end the space of [his] life” (*spatium mihi finiat aevi*, 875). Yet Ovid will not be bound by a physical space anymore, either, as he will be carried not just *to* the stars, but all the way *beyond* them (cf.

---

<sup>46</sup> Solodow 1988, 222. See also Spahlinger 1995, 40, claiming similarly that “the sphragis of Ovid is about nothing else but the author himself and his certainty of future glory” (*handelt die Sphragis Ovids von nichts anderem als von dem Autor selbst und seiner Gewißheit künftigen Ruhmes*), and Ramsby 2005, 389, where – citing the final line of the poem – the scholar suggests that “the reason that Ovid wrote at all” was in fact “to achieve immortality in and through his words.” Knox 1986, 79-80, sees the *sphragis* as less about Ovid himself than “an assertion of the intrinsic worth of his poem, which is alone enough to guarantee immortality to the poet’s name.”

<sup>47</sup> See above, pp. 29-36, for a discussion of the idea of structure as an essential component of monumentality. The transcendence of structure does not mean Ovid’s response is necessarily an “anti-Augustan” one; rather, as I suggest below, such a strategy is one that the *princeps* himself employs. For views of the poem’s ending that see it as blatantly “anti-Augustan” see Fränkel 1945 [1969] (111: “one sharp clarion note of defiance”) and Segal 1969b (290: “a rude anticlimax”). In more recent years, of course, such a negative view of the Ovid’s poem – as well as the whole anti- vs. pro-Augustan dichotomy in general – has been seen as too simplistic (Galinsky 1996, *passim*, esp. 228; Wickkiser 1999) and/or lacking in evidence (Bömer 1986, 490-491; Knox 1986, 79; Holzberg 1997, 154-155).

<sup>48</sup> See Hardie 2002, 96, stating that “Ovid himself will become the fixed enduring monument.”

*super...astra ferar*, 875-876).<sup>49</sup> Chapter II demonstrated the way in which monuments have the ability to make past time and space present.<sup>50</sup> One could argue that Ovid here is calling to mind the very time and space that monuments help to manifest only to transcend them as the material version of the poet himself disappears and a version of his self is kept alive “forever” (cf. *perennis*, 875) in the imagination of the Roman people. In order to transcend structure, after all, one needs to have a structure to transcend – and it is precisely this which the idea of the monument provides for Ovid here.

It is not just that Ovid transcends structure, however, but the precise way in which he does that is so essential to understanding the broader implications of his work for the world outside it. Ovid might be more “private” in his send-off, as Solodow suggests, but he has made that “private” part of him a public object through his poem, as well. Indeed, as Ovid himself claims, his “better part” (*parte meliore*, 875) will no longer be just his own. Every Roman citizen wherever Roman power has spread (cf. *quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris*, 877) will contribute to making Ovid’s prophecy of immortality (cf. *vivam*, 879) come true precisely because the poet will now be read by all Romans (cf. *ore legar populi*, 878). Even if Ovid’s body (*corporis*, 874) might die and rot and disintegrate, the Romans themselves will nevertheless ensure that his name becomes indestructible (cf. *nomenque erit indelebile nostrum*, 876). Ovid’s

---

<sup>49</sup> Wickkiser 1999, 135, claims that “[t]he image that Ovid creates with *super astra* is itself remarkable. It is unprecedented in statements of poetic prowess.” For Ovid’s journey beyond the stars see also: Feeney 1991, 249: “Ovid will go higher than the stars, and become a book”; Barchiesi 1994, 262: “This is more than a catasterism: above the stars the poet has a sort of immortality beyond that of a Caesar. His work will not be able to be destroyed by *Iovis ira* (15.871), the most obvious signifier of Augustan power (*Questo è più di un catasterismo: sopra le stelle, il poeta ha una sorta di immortalità ultracesarea. La sua opera sarà indistruttibile per la Iovis ira (15,871), il più ovvio significante del potere augusteo*); Hardie 2002, 93: “Ovid will both fly above the stars, outdoing the apotheoses of Hercules, Aeneas, Romulus, and Julius Caesar, and be omnipresent on earth (877-8); his very last ‘dying word’, the *nouissimum uerbum* in this poem of novelties, is *uiuam* ‘I shall live’”; and Feldherr 2010, 81: “The sense of a poetic trumping of the ‘historical’ immortality of the divinized emperor comes above all from Ovid’s vow to be carried above the stars; if Caesar was star quality, so to speak, Ovid has surpassed him.”

<sup>50</sup> See pp. 29-36, esp. 29-31, above.

poem is his own. The *sphragis* makes that clear. It is through a transition into the public realm, though, that poem and poet can achieve a sort of immortality that is granted to an existence without firm physical boundaries of time and space.

Yet this transcendence is about more than mere “textual survival.”<sup>51</sup> If the conclusion to the poem shows how the private has become public in Ovid’s world, the poem itself also shows conversely how the public has become private. The poet is telling not only his own story in the *Metamorphoses*, as Horace does for the most part in his *Odes*; Ovid is relating, rather, all the changes that have ever happened from the beginning of the world to his own time in leading to Rome’s current position as a world power – which is an extension, backwards and forwards, of even what Vergil had done in his epic poem in telling only of Rome’s origins.<sup>52</sup> More lyric than lyric, more epic than epic, Ovid’s claim for comprehensiveness means that anything and anyone that exists or has existed in the Roman world – mythical and historical – is subject to his reinterpretation in the world of his poem.<sup>53</sup> It is not simply, then, that the Romans will make Ovid eternal. By authorizing the poet and his world through the act of reading itself the poem’s audience also brings into being a distinctive sense of what it means to be Roman – one which is defined by Ovid’s worldview,<sup>54</sup> that is, one which is without firm bounds, one which “lies open”

---

<sup>51</sup> Hardie 2002, 94. Indeed, according to Hardie, “the living presence of the poet *is* the text, the poem as a whole, into which the mortal person has been transformed.” See also Feeney 1991, 249, for the interpretation that Ovid is describing his transformation into a book (cited above, p. 175, n. 49), and similarly Fowler 2000, 196, where he claims that “Ovid’s name will be indelible, he will never suffer the newly popular erasure of *damnatio memoriae*, but it will be indelible not because of oral reperformance but because of the empire-wide book trade which ensures his victory over Augustus’ attempts at suppression. Ovid’s name will last because...his works will continue to exist through constant recopying and reinterpretation by the reader.”

<sup>52</sup> Ovid’s scope can even be said to extend beyond what Ennius sang of in his epic *Annales*, namely, Roman history from the end of the Trojan War all the way to his own time in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BCE.

<sup>53</sup> Leach 1974, 135, puts it well in claiming that “Ovid does not identify himself with the fragile artists who have fared so poorly in his mythical world, but rather boasts of a power of survival like that of Hercules, Aeneas and the Caesars: the god-favored heroes of force. By this very gesture, he reminds us that they are all persons in a mythical world that his own imagination has created. As *ira Iovis*, even Augustus’ own displeasure is relegated to the world of myth.”

<sup>54</sup> Although Wickkiser 1999, 141, is correct to argue that “all of the ideas in the *sphragis* ground Ovid as a Roman,” the poet is also giving definition to his Roman audience by transforming his private, personal vision of the Roman

(*patet*, 877).<sup>55</sup> They can thus establish their common public identity by reading the monument that Ovid erects despite – or rather *because of* – the fact that they themselves give it a final structure and meaning by reading and interpreting the poem.

By crafting his poem as a monument whose seemingly epic structure is transcended in his ambiguous architextural image at its conclusion Ovid can therefore leave his poem “open” for the reader to give it shape. Is it epic? Is it something else? If the former, can I even trust it? And ultimately what does it mean to me and my place in Roman history? Ovid’s *monumentum* has a monumentality of the highest degree, perhaps, because it continuously prompts its readers to question the very significance of the history that it tells – that is, their own history – which thereby forces them to come to terms with it.<sup>56</sup> And by thus giving a final shape to the poem and its author they have granted Ovid access to the public consciousness in such a way as to shape (as he has so much else in his poem) how his readers see their constantly changing world and their place in it.

This sort of tension in a text between being at once left “open” by the author and “closed” by the reader was famously worked out by the twentieth-century semiotician Umberto Eco in his influential essay on “The Poetics of the Open Work” (*La poetica dell’opera aperta*). Eco understood any “work of art” as a

---

world into a shared perspective common to the public through his poem. For a view that seeks to separate Ovid from his Roman context, however, see also Solodow 1988, 220-222 (discussed above, pp. 173-174). Anderson 1969, 27, Leach 1998, 440-467, and Galinsky 1996, 238-264, each sees Ovid as focusing more on the “human” than the “Roman” in the *Metamorphoses* – and it is that more humanistic perspective, according to them, which seems to account for the poem’s enduring quality more than anything else.

<sup>55</sup> See Habinek 2002, 54-55, for an interesting argument regarding Ovid’s use of *patet* as meaning “lies open” in line 877. “To say that Roman power lies open,” according to Habinek, “indicates that it brooks no rival, it has no reason to surround itself with guards, it is open to all.” The full expression would seem to receive extra emphasis from the fact that it is actually “a reversal compared to the usual notion ‘*terra pate potentiae*’” (*eine Umkehrung gegenüber der üblichen Vorstellung ‘terra patet potentiae’*), as noted by Bömer 1986, 480, *ad loc.*

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion of “monumentality” as defined in this dissertation see above, pp. 29-36.

complete form and *closed* in its perfection as a perfectly calibrated organic whole [which] is also *open* because of the possibility of being interpreted in a thousand different ways without a resulting change in its irreproducible uniqueness.<sup>57</sup>

It is Eco's contention that a full awareness of this tension is a peculiarly modern phenomenon, perhaps originating in the "open form" (*forma aperta*) of baroque architecture.<sup>58</sup> "Rather than suffer this 'openness' as an unavoidable fact," Eco claims, the modern poet in particular "enters it into a productive program, and indeed renders it so as to foster in it the maximum possible number of 'openings'."<sup>59</sup> What Ovid is doing at the end of his poem is even more complex, however. He gives the reader the opportunity to help construct the architextural monument of his poem by leaving its imaginary structure open. This is not to point to a sort of epistemological nihilism,<sup>60</sup> nor to serve merely as a sort of intellectual game; rather, on the contrary, the poet's narrative technique makes the reader a part of the "building" process itself – and thereby gives the reader a stake in what Ovid has to say about his or her identity. Ovid does this all throughout the *Metamorphoses*, of course, as he forces the reader again and again to make decisions about the poem's many ambiguities.<sup>61</sup> What the conclusion does is to present a symbol for this process

---

<sup>57</sup> Eco 1962 [1976], 34: *un'opera d'arte, forma compiuta e chiusi nella sua perfezione di organismo perfettamente calibrato, è altresì aperta, possibilità di essere interpretata in mille modi diversi senza che la sua irreproducibile singolarità ne risulti alterata.*

<sup>58</sup> Eco 1962 [1976], 38. Although it may be no coincidence that Eco looks to architecture as one of the earliest examples of the "open" work, the theorist does not seem to reflect much upon the architectural nature of the spatial metaphors he is employing.

<sup>59</sup> Eco 1962 [1976], 36: *...anziché subire la 'apertura' come dato di fatto inevitabile, la elegge a programma produttivo, ed anzi offre l'opera in modo da promuovere la massima aperture possibile.*"

<sup>60</sup> Feldherr 2010, 80, suggests that "when we read of the poet's indestructible name, we wonder whether it is materially indestructible...or whether it is indestructible precisely because there is nothing there to destroy." Although Feldherr's reading of the epilogue is very subtle, it tends towards an implicitly negative reading that seems to take away from Ovid's very positive claim about Roman identity.

<sup>61</sup> In speaking generally about the poem, Galinsky 1996, 264, claims that "[w]hen we try to locate the author's point of view, we are faced with considerable elusiveness. From the perspective of reader participation, however, which in typical Augustan fashion is strongly invited, the effect is to open up the narration of the myths to various reader responses."

through Ovid's own transcendence of the very structure that represents his poem, namely, his architextural *opus*.

To be a Roman in the Augustan age meant in part being able to read the new structure of the metaphorical Roman state through the physical landscape of the city itself. The ways in which Augustus himself renegotiated the space of the city were grand and impressive to the eye – but at the same time could be rather subtle and nuanced in the language that he used to describe them. As this dissertation has shown, in fact, for Augustus' message to be appreciated fully the *princeps* needed readers of his Rome who could interpret the often subtle architectural gestures that he made whether in stone or in word. In turning now to the *Res Gestae* for a final time, it will be possible to see how Augustus also ends his own account of his monumentalization of Rome by transcending the very boundaries of the structures that he erected. In a similar way to Ovid's poem, I argue, the conclusion of the inscription allows its author to assume a power that blurs private and public to such an extent that the boundaries themselves could be radically reconstructed and even become temporarily unbound. Even more importantly, though, Augustus' Rome is shown to be a provisionally open structure just like that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* – and one that likewise needed the participation of the Roman people if it was to achieve an enduring stability after the physical passing of its builder.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> I am not the first to suggest that the kind of participation required by the reader in the *Metamorphoses* has parallels to the kinds of mental tasks which faced a Roman in the Augustan age more broadly. For instance, Feldherr 2010, 83, proposes that “the kind of interpretative choices required of Ovid's audience really do imitate and reproduce the hermeneutic challenges that lay at the core of the political impact of the emperor's actual monuments.” See also Galinsky 1996, 228-229, arguing that “the *Metamorphoses* calls for the constant participation of the beholder. There is an authorial center as the poet is very much in evidence, ultimately tying together the heterogeneity and flux of the material: the parallel with Augustus' similar role in the public realm is suggestive,” as well as Wickkiser 1999, 122-123, where she claims that the *sphragis* in particular is “a response to Augustus and the Augustan period” because it employs an architectural metaphor to define itself. Although Wickkiser does look to the *Res Gestae* in her article on the end of the *Metamorphoses*, her focus is not on Augustus' language, and she looks mostly to the physical



## Part 2. Augustus' Reconstruction of Roman Space

“I am leaving behind a city of marble, which I received as a city of brick.” In the *Res Gestae* the change that Roman space undergoes is importantly not articulated through such an easy and explicit architectural metaphor – as it is, for instance, in Vitruvius’ preface,<sup>63</sup> or for that matter in the above boast of Augustus as recorded in Suetonius.<sup>64</sup> As previous chapters have demonstrated, the *princeps* uses architecture in the text to articulate this metamorphosis of the city in much more subtle ways, too. This is no different when one turns to very end of the *Res Gestae*:

tertium dec[i]mum consulatu[m cum gereba]m, sena[tus et e]quester ordo populusq[ue] Romanus universus **appell[av]it me p[at]r[em p]atriae**, idque **in vestibulo aedium mearum inscribendum et in curia [Julia e]t in foro Aug(usto)**...[censuit.] Cum scripsi haec annum agebam septuagensimum sextum. (*RGDA* 35.1)

When I was consul for the thirteenth time, the senate, the equestrian order, and the Roman people in full agreement **gave me the title of *pater patriae***, and decreed that it should be inscribed **in the vestibule of my house and in the Curia Julia and in the Forum of Augustus...** When I wrote down these accomplishments of mine I was seventy-seven years old.

Here at the conclusion of the account of his accomplishments Augustus lists three structures in which an inscription was placed proclaiming him as *pater patriae* (“father of the fatherland”): first, in the vestibule of his house (*in vestibulo aedium*); then, in the Curia Julia (*in Curia Iulia*); and, finally, in his own forum (*in foro Augusto*). As impressive as these structures might be (especially the forum),<sup>65</sup> this list is not just another statement of what Augustus has built in

---

buildings of his reign. There is no study I know of that examines how Augustus’ strategy at the end of the *Res Gestae* has a counterpart in the conclusion of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* despite the similarities that I will now point out below.

<sup>63</sup> For analysis of Vitruvius’ preface see above, pp. 17-20.

<sup>64</sup> This boast is not quite as simple as it appears, either. See above, p. 11, for further discussion of its subtle nuances of meaning.

<sup>65</sup> On the Forum of Augustus and its architectural program see: Zanker 1968; Luce 1990, 123-138; Kockel 1995, 285-295; Galinsky 1996, 197-213; Favro 1996, 175-178; and Spannagel 1999. For how the Forum reflected a change in the structure of the state in particular see also Syme 1936, 470-471, where the historian claims that “[t]his dynastic monument is a reminder, if such be needed, that Dux was disguised but not displaced by Princeps,” and

Rome. He had already covered that topic sufficiently in paragraphs 19-21 of the *RGDA* that were discussed above in Chapter III.<sup>66</sup> Much more than a simple enumeration of structures Augustus is instead offering here a final statement through his building enterprise of how he has reconstructed the state during his reign. One might even say that the *princeps* is saving his most revealing statement for last – not by calling attention to these buildings as physical structures so much as in the way that he has reconfigured the metaphorical boundaries that exist between them. In short, Augustus uses his farewell – like the poet Ovid – to demonstrate how he too has transcended the symbolic boundaries of the edifices he “completed.”

Scholars have not entirely overlooked the way that Augustus uses the trinity of his own home, his new senate house, and his innovative forum to stress the creation of a new structure for the state that breaks down the symbolic boundaries of private and public which existed between the three forms. Both Edwin Ramage and Kristina Milnor argue that the frame of the *Res Gestae* neatly encapsulates the transformation of Augustus from a *privatus* citizen at the beginning to a “transcendent public figure” by its end through the triple inscription of *pater patriae*<sup>67</sup> – though they differ on what exactly these spaces represent. Whereas Ramage sees Augustus “go[ing] out of his way to underline the religious, civil, and military applications of the title when he points out it was to be displayed in three places,”<sup>68</sup> Milnor suggests that Augustus’ inclusion of his house here is not meant to invoke a religious significance (as Ramage argues) so much as to

---

Hölscher 2006, 247-248, suggesting that the Caryatids which were placed in Augustus’ Forum help to represent “contemporary ‘state architecture’ – in the concrete as well as the metaphorical sense.” According to Ewald and Noreña 2010b, 16, the Forum of Augustus represented one of the “hybrid forms of space in which the ‘dual’ republican-monarchical character of the Principate was very clearly articulated.”

<sup>66</sup> See pp. 82-87 above.

<sup>67</sup> Milnor 2005, 26.

<sup>68</sup> Ramage 1987, 84.

extend the meaning of *pater patriae* to the “private or domestic” aspect of Roman life.<sup>69</sup>

Although Milnor is likely correct to understand the inscription’s placement in the house as blurring the boundaries of private and public, she follows Ramage’s reading of the *Forum Augustum* here as merely a marker of Augustus’ power over the military. As I argue below, however, it is the forum (together with what it symbolizes) that has a rather important role for Augustus in how it allows him to open up the boundaries of Roman space.

Before I discuss the forum, though, it is important first to consider the meaning of the other two structures and their relationship to each other in the text. It is not simply the work that Augustus did in completing the new *Curia Julia* which is the point here so much as the idea of the *curia* itself as a symbolic structure – one that has in a sense now become a part of Augustus’ own house.<sup>70</sup> The *curia* represented the old “structure” of power.<sup>71</sup> It was the location where the “fathers” (*patres conscripti*) of the aristocracy deliberated about the Roman state. Under Augustus, however, the *curia* now had a new head of the Roman household: the *pater patriae* himself.<sup>72</sup> When juxtaposed so closely with the same inscription placed in Augustus’ own house the significance of the words as inscribed on the *curia* becomes even clearer: the twin

---

<sup>69</sup> Milnor 2005, 26: “The places correspond to the different aspects of Roman society on which the title touches, the civic in the Curia Julia where the senate met, the military in the representation of Augustus *triumphator*, and the private or domestic in the reference to Augustus’ house.”

<sup>70</sup> On Augustus and the *Curia Julia* see Zanker 1988, 54-55, 79-81, with images of the building on coins that “symbolize Octavian’s promise...to restore the Republic.”

<sup>71</sup> According to Favro 1996, 156, “[i]n the Republic, Romans linked the status of a city with the appearance of its central administrative building, the curia.” Favro cites as evidence Vit. 5.2.1, which states that “most of all the curia in particular must be constructed with an eye to the dignity of its town or state” (*maxime quidem curia in primis est facienda ad dignitatem municipii sive civitatis*). Cf. also Cic. *Cat.* 4.2, where the Roman orator claims that the old *curia* in Rome was “the greatest refuge for all peoples” (*summum auxilium omnium gentium*).

<sup>72</sup> For Augustus as a father figure of the state see Strothmann 2000, *passim*, and especially 73-80, where the scholar stresses the link that Augustus tried to create between himself as *paterfamilias* of the *domus Augusta* and as *pater patriae* of the *res publica*. On the term *pater patriae* itself see also Alföldi 1971 and in this context Ramage 1987, 104-109, and Cooley 2009, 273-275, *ad loc.*, claiming that “the title *pater patriae* evoked the connotations of the father figure in Roman society, reflecting not only the affection and responsibility a father feels towards his children, familiar to modern society, but also the obedience required by Roman law from children to their father, as enshrined in the principle of *patria potestas*, paternal power” (274).

inscriptions illustrate how Augustus has reconfigured private and public in such a way as to blur the boundaries of the categories,<sup>73</sup> as his house and the old home of the Roman “fathers” become joined through the words of the inscription – as well as their placement next to each other here in the *Res Gestae* itself.

The addition of a third inscription in Augustus’ own forum complicates this equation even further. As he does with the senate house, Augustus is not inserting his forum into the *Res Gestae* at this point simply to boast that he built it. The point is rather that the inscription connects this new structure to the architectural seats of power from both Rome’s past and present, in the *curia* and in his own house, respectively. Augustus is adding still more meaning here, though, because of how he had set a very specific narrative of Roman history within his forum in a way akin to what Ovid accomplished in his *Metamorphoses*.<sup>74</sup> According to Suetonius, Augustus set the statues of Rome’s great men within two colonnades of his forum and added the proclamation:

commentum id se, ut ad illorum vitam velut ad exemplar et ipse, dum viveret, et insequentium aetatum principes exigerentur a civibus. (*Div. Aug.* 31.5)

I have done this so that both I myself, while alive, and the leaders of following ages may be compelled by the citizens to [take] the life of those [men of old] as an example.

---

<sup>73</sup> Milnor 2005, 47-93, provides an excellent discussion of the way that Augustus’ complex of buildings on the Palatine, including his own house and adjacent temple of Apollo, helped to demonstrate visually as well as symbolically the redefinition of the boundaries between public and private space. In short, Milnor concludes that “[t]he Palatine complex...serve[d] to underscore certain concrete issues about the relationship between public and private space in the Augustan age, and also, in a symbolic sense, to address the question of what it means for a single individual to take to himself alone the power which used to belong to an entire community” (50). Milnor cites as a crucial piece of evidence a passage from Cassius Dio that suggests how Augustus’ house was at once both private and public, open and closed. “When Augustus had constructed his house,” according to the 3<sup>rd</sup>-century CE historian, “he donated it to the state, whether because of the contribution from the people to him, or since he was high priest, in order that he could live in places that were simultaneously private and public” (ὁ δὲ Αὐγουστος τὴν οἰκίαν οἰκοδομήσας ἐδημοσίωσε πᾶσαν, εἴτε διὰ τὴν συντέλειαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ δήμου οἱ γενομένην, εἴτε καὶ ὅτι ἀρχιτέρεως ἦν, ἵν’ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἅμα καὶ ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς οἰκοίη, Dio 55.12.5).

<sup>74</sup> Barchiesi 2005 presents a good recent overview of the Forum’s relationship to the poetry of the Augustan age. He does not try, however, to connect what the *princeps* is doing in the *Forum Augustum* (or in the *RGDA* for that matter) to the end of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

By lining up the heroes of Rome's past within the space that bears his name Augustus could structure a version of Roman history that was able to provide a new frame for Roman identity after years of disunity and civil discord.<sup>75</sup> And by taking upon himself such a task Augustus thus incorporated a very public structure into his own personal space. "In effect," as Diane Favro suggests, "the opulent Forum Augustum assumed the position of atrium for the State, replete with representations of revered ancestors."<sup>76</sup> Just as with the *Cura Julia*, then, Augustus as *pater patriae* could create a structure through his own forum that blurs the boundaries between private and public. What now counted as Augustus' "house" went far beyond its physical boundaries.

However, just as for Ovid's structure in his *Metamorphoses*, if this opening up of boundaries is to have some definition in reality, Augustus needed to have the participation of the Roman citizens to give it a sense of closure, particularly the elite whose opportunity for display had become limited under Augustus.<sup>77</sup> As the *princeps* himself suggests in the above proclamation, the people of Rome are indeed the judges; they are the ones, that is, who must ground in reality the sense of Roman identity that Augustus' monuments generate and who will validate that narrative by compelling their leaders to follow it (cf. *principes exigentur a civibus*, *Div. Aug.* 31.5). By thus claiming to have the same inscription of *pater patriae* posted in his forum as in his house and his senate Augustus could emphatically introduce this new

---

<sup>75</sup> See Zanker 1988, 211-212, stressing that "[t]here can be no doubt that Augustus participated directly in designing this program and in the selection of the *summi viri*. According to Pliny (*N.H.* 22.6.13), he was even thought to have composed the *elogia* inscribed below the statues himself."

<sup>76</sup> Favro 1996, 126-127. As Favro goes on to say, moreover, Augustus further "strengthen[ed] the metaphorical link between the new forum and the *domus* atria of the *paterfamilias*" in the way that "the great *Forum Augustum* became a center for the worship of the *Lares* and *Genius Augusti*" (127).

<sup>77</sup> See Zanker 1988, 291-292, stating that "[t]he fact that Augustus now dispensed public honors and determined who would receive a statue in the available space still remaining in the *Forum Augustum* obviated any desire for extravagant self-glorification." For senatorial display within their own homes during the early empire see also Wiseman 1987, as well as Eck 1984 and Eck 1997. Mayer 2010 makes the intriguing argument that there was still an opportunity for senatorial display in the act of praising the emperor, as many of the Augustan monuments were in fact "decreed" by the senate and the people of Rome. In other words, according to Mayer, "imperial propaganda" may have been more of a two-way dialogue than Zanker and his adherents suggest.

structure and frame for Roman identity as a counterpart to the structures that had shaped Roman space, private and public, in the republic during its rise to prominence.

Reporting these three inscriptions in close juxtaposition at the very conclusion of his *Res Gestae* therefore represents another way that the *princeps* could articulate his essentially limitless power through the physical structures he had established. He is not stressing their innovative physical nature here, or their magnificence for that matter; the *princeps* uses these architectural monuments, rather, in order to present a new structure of the state – one in which Augustus becomes the *paterfamilias* of Rome itself, that is, not only of his family in his home, but also of the senate in the *curia*, and even of all Romans past, present, and future in his own forum. Although he lists these important “structures,” the conclusion to his *Res Gestae* stresses how Augustus has opened Roman space up in such a way that he now had a power which transcended the traditional limits of Rome’s structure itself – and could thereby create a new one which would endure for centuries.<sup>78</sup>

The end of his monumental text is not an end for Augustus, though, just as the conclusion of Ovid’s monumental *Metamorphoses* is not the end for the poet. Both poet and *princeps* transcend their physical, private bodies to become something that can live on after death, something forever alive, something immortal.<sup>79</sup> They both accomplish this by concluding their works with architectural structures while simultaneously opening them up in such a way as to

---

<sup>78</sup> Milnor 2005, 303-304, concludes her study of Augustan space by claiming that “one of the things which made the Roman Empire work in its first inception” was “the ability of the Augustan age to represent itself as a different kind of answer to the problems which had long beset the *res publica*, *constructing a new system which transcended the divide between public and private life*” (my emphasis).

<sup>79</sup> See Bosworth 1999 for an account of how the *RGDA* contains allusions to the “Hellenistic doctrine of apotheosis,” particularly to “the ‘Sacred Record’ of Euhemerus, which had become a Latin classic through Ennius’ translation” (1). Milnor 2005, 27, is right to note that “Augustus as the representative of household virtue is still very much alive at the text’s conclusion *even though Octavian the private citizen has long since perished*” (my emphasis). In this way, then, it would seem that both poet and *princeps* end up in the same place: forever alive in the imagination of the Roman public.

invite the reader to ground in reality the narratives that the monuments create. It is on the reader to close the work and stabilize the structure, even a structure whose boundaries are far from firm. It was not so much a god, one might then say, as the Roman people themselves who ultimately granted that Augustus' domain become an *imperium sine fine*, "empire without end" (Verg. *Aen.* 1.279) – both metaphorically within the city itself as much as physically in the provinces.

Chapter II demonstrated how the Romans read their world architecturally. In the decades of civil strife before Augustus came to power, however, their faith in monuments to give stable meaning to their existence had begun to falter, at least as it is presented in the works of writers such as Livy and Horace examined above.<sup>80</sup> In his project of monumentalizing Rome, both the city and the idea, Augustus had to restore the ability of monuments to help frame his subjects' sense of themselves as Romans in a new age. This was not as simple as merely rebuilding the city more majestically and renovating its collapsed public structures. The idea of the monument had to change, as well, in order to allow for a redefinition of Roman identity that would both be accepted in alignment with Rome's past and then also endure into its future. Whereas Vitruvius is relatively explicit in describing how Augustus has transformed the state (both physically and metaphorically) through his monumental architecture,<sup>81</sup> Augustus' architectural discourse is more nuanced and thus enables him to articulate his own very careful construction of Rome as one built anew but still upon the foundations of Rome's past *constitutio*. Although he did make Rome grand through his monumental building projects, as Vitruvius is correct to claim, the *princeps* also takes up the republican charge of making sure that the structure of the *res publica*

---

<sup>80</sup> See above, pp. 36-43.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Vitr. Pr.2. For discussion of this passage from Vitruvius' preface to his *De architectura* see above, pp. 17-20.

was not diminished.<sup>82</sup> His building program – however great in reality – is described accordingly in a way that downplays his *physical* construction of anything conspicuously new or out of line with Roman tradition lest it suggest an explicit change to the metaphorical state, too. (No Mausoleum of Augustus to be found in this inscription.) Augustus might have rebuilt Rome as a city of marble, he might even have completely altered the *constitutio* of the *res publica* itself, but one will not find such talk in the *Res Gestae* because Augustus takes care in his use of architectural language when presenting his literal and metaphorical construction of the state. As this dissertation has demonstrated, however, the way that the *princeps* does articulate the changes he brought about to the structure of the state throughout his monumental inscription does still put stress on his architectural projects – real and metaphorical – even if Augustus uses them ultimately to stage his own transcendence of the traditional boundaries between the public and private spheres of Rome’s past.

The Roman poets of the Augustan age opened up and examined the flexibility of monuments in a way that reflected an awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of monumentality. They helped to create readers who not only could read the monuments around them, but were also able to interpret them actively as a part of the reconstruction of Rome in their imaginations. This was not just a hermeneutical game. It was absolutely critical if Augustus was to establish a new Rome upon the foundations of the past one. The “deconstruction” of the monument as a stable epistemological unit was not the goal; rather, it was the *reconstruction* of the idea of the monument – and of Rome itself – along lines that engaged Romans in the process.

---

<sup>82</sup> Cf. *RGDA* 1.3: *res publica n[e quid detrimenti caperet,] me pro praetore simul cum consulibus pro[videre iussit.* See pp. 43-46 above for analysis of Augustus’ words here near the start of his *Res Gestae*.



## CHAPTER VII

### Conclusion

#### Roman Monumentality and the Modern Death(s) of the Monument

The Augustan age provides a particularly useful lens through which to examine the idea of the monument. It represented a relatively short period of time in which Romans witnessed the monumental make-over of their city, their government, and even what it meant to be Roman. Building was on the minds of many Romans during Augustus' reign. The poets and writers of the period are famous for constru(ct)ing their works as buildings or monuments of some sort. Livy and Horace have their own *monumenta*. Vergil his *templum*. Ovid has his *opus*. Might Augustus have thought of his work in Rome in such architectural terms? ...*rei publicae constituendae*...<sup>1</sup> That was the task that Augustus took up when he first came into power. He did not do it alone, though. There were also the Augustan poets who contributed to his monumentalization of Rome with their own *monumenta* – poets who helped Romans to become better readers of the structures around them, both physical and metaphorical.

To conclude this dissertation I will now turn to the situation of the monument in modernity. By outlining some of the ways that the idea of the monument has been viewed in modern times I hope demonstrate by way of contrast just how productive the Roman understanding of monumentality was in Augustan Rome. The rather concise history of

---

<sup>1</sup> *RGDA* 1.4. For further discussion of this phrase see pp. 43-46 above.

monumentality in modernity below is not the only story that one could tell about the idea of the monument in the 18<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries. It is a cursory review, not a comprehensive study, and several important players and moments in the debate simply had to be left out for the sake of concision. My aim in looking now at more recent times is rather to demonstrate how the concept of monumentality in the Augustan age was a fruitful response to some of the same issues which we deal with today when we think of the structures around us – both in our physical reality and in the way they help us to frame how we see the world in which we live.

“The Death of the Monument.” With this bold title Lewis Mumford famously announced the fall of monumental architecture in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. What was the cause of its demise? Death by “contradiction.” That was Mumford’s initial diagnosis, at least.<sup>2</sup> The idea of the monument – an object “oriented toward death and fixity” – simply did not fit any conception of modern architecture, which for Mumford stressed “life and change.”<sup>3</sup> The very stone materials that had so long been endowed with “a metaphysical belief in fixity and immortality” now became dangerous “encumbrances” in Mumford’s eyes: monumental structures “stifle the possibilities of adaptation, movement and effective improvement” – and for that reason, Mumford warned, they might even bring about civilization’s “ultimate downfall.”<sup>4</sup>

This was not the first time that the death knell had sounded for the monument. Nor would it be the last. The monument had died and would continue to “die” in modern thought – whether

---

<sup>2</sup> Mumford 1937, 264: “The very notion of a modern monument is a contradiction in terms: if it is a monument, it cannot be modern, and if it is modern, it cannot be a monument.”

<sup>3</sup> Mumford 1937, 264. The original Mission Statement for the Metropolitan Kansas City Performing Arts Center (now known as the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts) is an excellent illustration of this change in the way that we think about grand architecture. It reads: “Great architecture is not the goal. Iconic reference is not the goal. The goal of any world-class performing-arts centre today must be the enhancement of the experience for the artist, for the audience, and, finally, for the myriad of services necessary before great performances can happen in the modern age: everything from administrative offices to parking spaces” (as cited in Hammond 2006).

<sup>4</sup> Mumford, 1937, 264, 270.

as a symbol of past traditions, as a physical structure erected to represent present powers, or as a metaphor operative in giving structure to the ways in which we think about thinking. This conclusion will examine three “deaths” of the modern monument in particular, each time with an eye to the different conclusions of this dissertation regarding the idea of the monument in Augustan Rome. Although the Romans faced some of the same issues with the nature of the monument, especially with regard to its physical and epistemological instability, this study has suggested that these anxieties did not lead to the collapse of the idea but rather its reconstruction – and with it the reconstruction of Roman society after years of civil strife and political disillusionment.

### **Part 1. The First “Death”: Demolishing the Structures of the Past**

“Let there be no mistake,” Victor Hugo wrote in his *Notre-Dame de Paris* (1831), “architecture is dead.”<sup>5</sup> The culprit this time? Gutenberg’s printing press, according to Hugo, which had given everyone the ability to build (metaphorically) his or her own grand edifice of knowledge that the church and palace had once represented.<sup>6</sup> As a result, it has been argued, grand architecture began to lose the symbolic authority that it had possessed when it was closely bound to the ideas of the sacred and the royal before finally dying with the fall of the *Ancien*

---

<sup>5</sup> Hugo 1831: “*Qu’on ne s’y trompe pas, l’architecture est morte.*” This quotation comes from a chapter of Hugo’s *Notre-Dame de Paris*, “This [i.e., Text] Will Kill That [i.e., Architecture]” (*Ceci tuera cela*), which is perhaps one of the most sensitive appraisals of the relationship of architecture and text ever written. I want to thank Prof. Michèle Hannoosh in the Department of Romance Languages and Literature at the University of Michigan for directing my attention to this work in conversation.

<sup>6</sup> See Hugo 1831: “The grand poem, the grand edifice, the grand work of humanity will be built no longer, it will be printed. [...] Every mind is a mason. The humblest fills his hole or lays down his stone.” (*Le grand poème, le grand édifice, le grand œuvre de l’humanité ne se bâtera plus, il s’imprimera.* [...] *Chaque esprit est maçon. Le plus humble bouche son trou ou met sa pierre.*) One could say that Hugo was extraordinarily prescient considering that he was writing over a century before the advent of the internet, blogs, and social network engines such as Facebook with its “walls.” See also Choay 2001, 8, claiming that “[t]he memorial hegemony of the monument was not... threatened until printing gave to writing an unprecedented power in the matter.”

*Régime* and the questioning of all the power structures that it had represented.<sup>7</sup>

The French Revolution had also stripped monuments of the ability to make material the binding structure of past authority. Indeed, while Henri Léonard Jean Baptiste Bertin (1720-1792) as Louis XV's *contrôleur général des finances* wrote to his king that "[t]he history and public law of a nation are based on its monuments,"<sup>8</sup> the aftermath of French Revolution with its wish to produce a radical break from the structures of the past produced a rather different attitude towards monuments: the past that grand architecture commemorated was a lost (and undesirable) past;<sup>9</sup> it was rather the new needs of the present and future that monuments should address.<sup>10</sup> And while there were certainly attempts by those like the English art critic, John Ruskin, to save the monuments of the past and the authority they could materialize,<sup>11</sup> the ancient structures that

---

<sup>7</sup> See Bloomer and Moore 1977, 17, where they suggest that "[a]rchitecture had benefited from an embodied and memorable legacy when it was centered around a sacred model, but with the Enlightenment a great many new models evolved; palaces and churches had to compete for architectural eminence with a range of secular building types." Crossley 1998, 175, discusses the structure of the medieval church as the embodiment of "moral education," as well as "the internal and ordered theatre for the workings of the intellect, the memory or the soul." See also Olsen 1986, 289, arguing that monumentality had survived the new "religion" of capitalism (which should have looked down on excessive expenditures) precisely because "[w]hat had once been the peculiar privilege of the spiritual and secular masters of society became a universal indulgence." This evolution of the monumental was also noted in Marx and Engels 1848 when the two political theorists famously wrote in Chapter 1 of the *Communist Manifesto* that the bourgeoisie of their time were "the first to demonstrate what human activity can bring about" in accomplishing "marvels wholly different from Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals. (*Die Bourgeoisie...[e]rst...hat bewiesen, was die Tätigkeit der Menschen zustande bringen kann. Sie hat ganz andere Wunderwerke vollbracht als ägyptische Pyramiden, römische Wasserleitungen und gotische Kathedralen...*)

<sup>8</sup> Cited and translated into Italian by Le Goff 1978, 38, as: "*La storia e il diritto pubblico di una nazione si basano sui monumenti.*"

<sup>9</sup> See Morley 2011, 220: "[M]onumental history...depends on the assumption that there is a direct connection of some kind between these different temporalities." A "fundamental break in this tradition" can be achieved, according to Morley, when that assumption is called into question by "the development of a sense of a rupture between past and present." Bataille 1970, 171, goes so far in fact as to claim that it is hard to understand the taking of the Bastille as motivated by something other than "the hatred of the people for the monuments which are their real masters" (*l'animosité du peuple contre les monuments qui sont ses véritable maîtres*).

<sup>10</sup> See Choay 2001, 8: "'Monument' would [after the French Revolution] denote power, greatness, beauty: it was explicitly charged with affirming grand public schemes, promoting styles, and addressing itself to aesthetic sensibility." Choay's book presents an in-depth account of the process whereby monuments in France and elsewhere went from being "commemorative" to what she calls "historical," as well as the consequences of that transformation for their role in society today.

<sup>11</sup> See Ruskin 1849, 155, where he impassionedly claimed that "the greatest glory of a building is not in its stones, nor in its gold. Its glory is in its Age, and in that deep sense of voicefulness, of stern watching, of mysterious sympathy, nay, even of approval or condemnation, which we feel in walls that have long been washed by the passing waves of humanity." Ruskin was famously against any sort of intervention in one's experience of monuments of the past; for him, even restoration was to be viewed with contempt. It is important to note, however,

did exist came to be seen with a more questioning eye by historians, even once the strong desire for “rupture” from the past had subsided.<sup>12</sup> To Fustel de Coulanges at the end of the nineteenth century, for example, it was the “document” – and specifically *not* the “monument” – that became our tie to the “truth” of the past.<sup>13</sup>

Already in the nineteenth century, then, it is possible to detect a version of what Mumford would call a “distrust for the monumental”<sup>14</sup> – not only in the inability of monuments to produce the same kind of awe that they once had done for the church and traditions of the past, but also in the failure of these structure to create for humanity a stable link to that past. The collapse of the power structures of church and state revealed what seemed to be a flaw in the nature of the monument, namely, its inability to endure once the link between it and the figurative structure of the state had been severed. Structures fade away over time. And those structures that had once been symbols of power were now symbols of that very power’s collapse.

The Romans at the beginning of the Augustan age did not abandon the structures of their past, whether real or figurative; they rebuilt them, rather, despite the narrative of the Roman state’s “collapse” at the end of the republic, as voiced in authors such as Livy and Horace.<sup>15</sup>

---

that Ruskin should be seen as reacting to the changes of his time more than necessarily a representative figure of them more generally.

<sup>12</sup> Nora 2001, xiii: “Historical time of the revolutionary type is informed by the desire for rupture. The devaluation of the notion of rupture that accompanied the decline of the revolutionary idea restored legitimacy to the idea of tradition. Not a tradition of which we would be the heirs and sustainers (as in the revolutionary mode), but a tradition from which we would be forever separated, one that would thereby become precious, mysterious, and imbued with an uncertain meaning, which was our task to recover.”

<sup>13</sup> See Le Goff 1978, 38, where he discusses how Fustel de Coulanges in his *La monarchie franque* (1888) criticized the German tradition of historiography based on monuments – exemplified in the *Germania Monumenta historica* (1828) – as written “not with the seal of science, but with that of patriotism” (translated by Le Goff as: “*non dal sigillo della scienza, ma da quello del patriottismo*”).

<sup>14</sup> Mumford 1937, 268.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Liv. Pr.9; Hor. C. 3.6.1-4. For analysis of these passages see pp. 40-41. Gruen 1974 is right to emphasize that this idea of “collapse” was perhaps created in hindsight by later authors. It is precisely that narrative of authors such as Livy and Horace which I am analyzing, however, and not the historical validity of such a “collapse.”

These new structures were built upon past foundations, so to speak, but used the stability offered by monumentality to balance innovations against the previous structures of Rome's history. Horace did this with his *Odes* by constructing a poetic *monumentum* that was lyric but also incorporated forces that might seem to upset its generic framework. In this way, as I argued in Chapter III, the poet crafted a work whose generic tensions allowed for a constantly dynamic structure that was at once traditional and innovative – one that would breathe new life into an old structure. Augustus in his *Res Gestae* also employed a similar rhetorical strategy in describing his own building activities to articulate the novel kind of power that he had fashioned for himself without destabilizing the traditional boundaries of Rome's political and cultural past. It was just as much in downplaying the radical nature of his works as in stressing their magnificence that allowed the emperor to incorporate new ideas and structures within traditional republican boundaries without seeming to break them down even further. Neither Horace nor Augustus shied away from employing the power of monuments – and the idea of a dynamic structure that they provide – even at a time when the old monuments of Rome that represented the *res publica* were in ruin. In short, both the poet and the *princeps* saw the advantages to employing such structures of the past, if only because it allowed them to articulate delicately the innovations which they made to those structures' traditional frames.

## **Part 2. The Second “Death”: Shaking the Foundations of Present Authority**

Let us return briefly now to Mumford and his autopsy of the monument's “corpse.” A closer look at his essay reveals that modernism was not the sole cause of death. “[E]very stone has become ironic to us,” Mumford noted. “[T]ime is a bomb that will split the most august

temple open, if the wanton savagery of men's swifter bombs does not anticipate time."<sup>16</sup> Faith in present monuments still did exist for the moment, though, as the ability to create secular monuments fell to the people of the French Revolution and its aftermath. However, the doubt that had adhered to monuments of the past eventually – and in a certain sense inevitably – also began to enter into people's thoughts concerning monuments of their present, as well as those of their future. In the aftermath of one World War and at the cusp of yet another there was a certain awareness of the fragility of mankind's affairs and structures. And this "distrust for the monumental," as Mumford put it, would only increase following WWII when the atrocities of that war produced monuments that "stopped celebrating great deeds, as their specialty [was] to register grave errors."<sup>17</sup>

A transformation of the monumental to commemorate what one might wish had never happened was not the only blow to the West's faith in monumentality that WWII delivered. The grand building projects of Mussolini and Hitler each left their own impact on the idea of the monument. The desire of *Il Duce* to remake Rome "vast, ordered, powerful, as it was in the time of the first empire of Augustus," had led to several monumental building projects in Rome that integrated or directly called upon Roman monuments in an attempt to capitalize on the imperial monumentality of the Augustan age itself.<sup>18</sup> There was the dangerous belief among Mussolini's

---

<sup>16</sup> Mumford 1937, 264.

<sup>17</sup> Carpo 2007, 54. Meyers 2012, 13, notes in a similar vein that a "crisis point for modern European architects occurred after World War II, as they sought appropriate expression for the melancholy relationship of war trauma and history." See also Young 2000 for the impact of the Holocaust on the idea of the monument. As Roxani Marconi claims in her introduction to the 2000 exhibition on "Counter-Monuments and Memory" at MoMA, "[i]n an era that resonates with the aftereffects of World War II, the Vietnam War, and the removal of the Berlin Wall, the need to recollect has intensified. Yet, paradoxically, the capacity of traditional monuments to preserve memories proves ever more precarious" ([http://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/2000/openends/open\\_ends.html](http://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/2000/openends/open_ends.html)). I would like to thank Prof. Christopher Ratté, the Director of the Kelsey Museum at the University of Michigan, for recommending I examine this exhibition, as it proved inspirational for some of the key concepts in this dissertation.

<sup>18</sup> This quote comes from a speech delivered by Mussolini on New Year's Eve 1925, as cited in Kostof 1978, 323, n.18: "*vasta, ordinata, potente, come fu ai tempi del primo impero di Augusto.*" See also Scobie 1990, 1-2, claiming that "Mussolini turned the monuments of Augustan Rome into political symbols partly to validate his own role as the founder of a new Roman empire and partly to rekindle a new spirit of 'heroism' in the Italian people. [...]"

followers, moreover, that these projects legitimated his plans for domination of the Mediterranean.<sup>19</sup> The Italian art historian Gustavo Giovannini would go so far as to proclaim that “[w]hile the Empire returns to the fated hills of Rome and new glories join themselves with the ancient ones, from our hearts comes the vow that architecture of the Fascist times will resume – in the return to our grand tradition – the path of domination which was that of the past.”<sup>20</sup>

Yet this was all relatively tame compared to the vast (and utterly intrusive) building programs that Hitler was planning in Northern Europe.<sup>21</sup> To reclaim the monuments and monumentality of imperial Rome for his own use was not so easy a task in Germany as it was for Mussolini in Rome. Hitler’s strategy had to be different. As the famous German architectural theorist Léon Krier would later say, Hitler sought not merely to “copy historic styles, but to create a new style which was itself to become historical” – one that far surpassed the “coarse Latinism of Italian Fascism.”<sup>22</sup> The goal was not imitation of Roman monumental architecture, *per se*, but of its high degree of sheer monumentality.<sup>23</sup> “[I]t was gigantic proportions,” then, and

---

Absolute power was now revealed unambiguously in absolute architecture, which provided the emperor and his successors with a stage set for intimidating rituals of encounter between mortal subjects and their divine ruler.” Edwards 1996, 51-52, also provides a brief overview of some of Mussolini’s projects in Rome and the way they employed Roman ruins.

<sup>19</sup> See Millon 1965, 53, where he argues that “historians of art and architecture in Italy in the late 1930s directly aided the Fascist regime by advocating an expansionist policy based on the scholarly evidence they were able to gather concerning the extent of Italic or Latin (both words were used interchangeably) control, power, and influence from antiquity to the rise of the Fascist regime.”

<sup>20</sup> From the *Atti del 1° congresso nazionale di storia dell’architettura* (1938), as cited in Millon 1965, 55-56, n. 10: “*Mentre che l’Impero ritorno sui colli fatali di Roma e le glorie nuove si ricongiungono con le antiche, parte dai nostri animi il voto che l’Architettura del tempo fascista riprenda, nel ritorno alla grande nostra tradizione, il cammino di domino che ebbero quelle del passato.*”

<sup>21</sup> As Demandt 1982, 59, notes, Hitler also “thought of himself as architect” (*sich selbst als Architekt empfand*) – and saw building as an important part of his cultural program. Indeed, according to Scobie 1990, 37, one of the messages of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* was “that industrialized German cities of his own day lacked dominating public monuments and a central focus for community life.” As Scobie goes on to show, moreover, Hitler would address this “problem” in a rather significant way in several German towns and cities by building his own monuments – without much concern, of course, for whatever older buildings were in his way.

<sup>22</sup> Krier 1985, 226, as cited in Scobie 1990, 16.

<sup>23</sup> See Demandt 1982, 59, where he suggests that “Hitler took Classicism as the way to monumentality” (*Hitler...schätzte am Klassizismus die Möglichkeit zur Monumentalität*).



“not purity of style, that interested Hitler.”<sup>24</sup> More importantly, though, it was an obsession with using his buildings to create a message that would – according to his chief architect Albert Speer – “deliver his time and its spirit to posterity.”<sup>25</sup>

It would have no doubt been enough to make people wary of monuments if Mussolini and Hitler had succeeded in their architectural endeavors.<sup>26</sup> The fact that they failed, however, that their buildings and building projects came to be judged as “colossal mistakes,”<sup>27</sup> would create a further distrust in the idea of the monument by reinforcing the emptiness, fragility, and instability of the meaning of monuments both ancient and modern. Just consider, for instance, whether there could ever be another Lincoln Memorial in America, or another face added to Mt. Rushmore. No matter how great a president might be, I would argue, the very idea of erecting such a monument to him or her has become almost inconceivable today.

As Chapters IV and V demonstrated, however, the “failure” of a monument to maintain a single, triumphant narrative can be just as useful as its success for making a viewer think about the past and its relation to him or her. Vergil again and again show the inability of monuments, whether old or new, to serve as epistemological ballasts. However, the ability of a monument to have multiple meanings does not necessarily render it any less useful – whether for the poet or

---

<sup>24</sup> Scobie 1990, 19.

<sup>25</sup> See Speer 1969, 68, as cited in Scobie 1990, 94: “*Hitler liebte zu erklären, dass er baue, um seine Zeit und ihren Geist der Nachwelt zu überliefern.*”

<sup>26</sup> North 1985, 18, claims that “[t]he public monument has succumbed to the modern habit of equating the public with the false, the meretricious, the propagandistic.” This “modern habit,” I would suggest, has a large part to do with the Fascist and Nazi architecture discussed above.

<sup>27</sup> Most notably, the Piazzale Augusto Imperiale, at least according to how Kostof 1978, 322, evaluates the structure. See also Reitz 2013, 215-229, on the construction of Mussolini’s obelisk and its obviously forced sense of *Romanità*. In the case of Hitler’s monumental failures of architecture, as Speer quipped in a 1977 interview, while “[t]he Romans built arches of triumph to celebrate the big victories won by the Roman empire...Hitler built them to celebrate victories he had not yet won” (Dal Co and Polano 1978, 43, as cited in Scobie 1990, 133-134). See also Scobie, 1990, 136, where he cautiously suggests that “Hitler’s architecture is sometimes misjudged because he was building for the future in anticipation of a greatly enlarged Reich.”

Augustus himself. For the Augustan peace to have its full significance, I argued above, it was necessary for Romans to see beyond the monumental frame of their city to the chaotic past that existed beneath the marble facade. *Furor* had been bound and chained by Augustus, it is true, but that did mean it was gone forever. And Augustus needed his subjects to remember that, too. Vergil helps to craft readers who can appreciate the beauty and magnificence of the surface of Augustan monuments while remembering the violent and chaotic past that such monuments try to frame and contain. Far from “deconstructing” the positive message of a monumental structure both Vergil and Augustus used the epistemological “failure” of monuments to establish an even deeper appreciation of the new and improved present within the Roman imagination.

### **Part 3. The Third “Death”: The Collapse of the Monumental Metaphor**

The idea of the monument was first killed in modernity when the loosening of authority that the printing press had set in motion began to shatter the power structures of the past (as well as the monuments that materialized them) in the revolutionary air of the late eighteenth century. It was at this time, however, that the idea of the monument was reborn as a monumentality geared to the present and future – only to die again, though, when its stability (physical and epistemological) was revealed to be a farce by the World Wars that shook humanity to its foundations.<sup>28</sup> It was not long afterwards that Roland Barthes would write in his important essay

---

<sup>28</sup> Or live on, according to Choay 2001, 171, in a form that serves solely as a “patrimonial mirror,” presenting us with an “illusion” of reality by “eras[ing] all its differences, heterogeneities, and fractures...[and] suppress[ing] the conflicts and interrogations we are unable to face.” See also Smithson 1966, 11, claiming that “[i]nstead of causing us to remember the past like the old monuments, the new monuments seem to cause us to forget the future,” and Carpo 2007, 54, where the scholar argues that “[m]onuments can no longer point to the future because the postmodern construction of history does not provide one, or it provides too many. Historical monuments have no place in posthistorical times.” This way of thought regarding the future finds a major proponent with Nora 1989, 17, where the French historian maintains that “[s]ince no one knows what the past will be made of next, anxiety turns everything into a trace, a possible indication, a hint of history that contaminates the innocence of all things.” Nora sees this problem, in other words, as resulting in the birth of a new kind of monument, *les lieux de memoire*, which are “fundamentally remains, the ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it” (12).

on *La Tour Eiffel* (1964) that the famous French edifice was an “empty monument” (*monument vide*) – one that was “impossible to escape, *because it means everything*” and yet also “*nothing*” in that “it achieves a kind of zero degree of the monument.”<sup>29</sup> Such a point had been reached, in other words, when the physical monument which had once been the chief symbol of humanity for representing authority past and present was now a representation of the problems with representing any idea – including not least of all representation itself.

The possibility of an “empty” monument that Barthes raised has additional significance for the discussion of modern monumentality. The monument was not just an important signifier for the traditions of the past and power structures of the present; it had been from the start perhaps one of the fundamental metaphors for “thinking about thinking” in the West.<sup>30</sup> The above narrative regarding the “death” of physical monuments runs parallel to another history concerning the demise of metaphorical ones in the context of (the aptly named) post-structuralism and, in particular, the theories and practices of deconstruction.

Majestic architecture had always been – in the words of Hugo – the “grand book of humanity.”<sup>31</sup> A strange thing happened, though, when the physical monument began to lose its power as the Ur-symbol, as discussed above with its first two “deaths.”<sup>32</sup> If anything, in fact, losing its physical nature seems to have allowed the architectural monument to gain additional power as a metaphor. Just at the point when architecture ceased to be the universal text of

---

<sup>29</sup> See Barthes 1964, 27, 33: “*Ce signe pur – vide, presque – il est impossible de le fuir, parce qu’il veut tout dire. [...] [E]n fait la Tour n’est rien, elle accomplit une sorte de degré zéro du monument...*”

<sup>30</sup> See Karatani 1995, xxxi-xxxii, claiming that “Platonic architecture is metaphorical. Plato’s use of the metaphor of architecture, like that of Descartes, Kant, and Hegel who followed him should thus be understood as the will to construct an edifice of knowledge on a solid formulation. [...] Philosophy, in fact, is another name for this *will to architecture*.”

<sup>31</sup> Hugo 1831, 142: “*En effet, depuis l’origine des choses jusqu’au quinzième siècle de l’ère chrétienne inclusivement, l’architecture est le grand livre de l’humanité.*” Later in the same work Hugo also refers to grand architecture as having been “*la grande écriture du genre humain*” (144), “*l’écriture principale, l’écriture universelle*” (146), and “*le registre principal de l’humanité*” (147).

<sup>32</sup> As Nora 1997, ix, puts it, the “Land, Cathedral, and the Court” were once *the* “models of models.”

humanity in Hugo's text, for instance, text became humanity's universal architecture.<sup>33</sup>

Hugo was not alone in carrying the discourse surrounding architecture and monuments into the text. Kant had already erected his famous "edifice of metaphysics" in the *Kritik der Urteilkraft* near the very start of the French Revolution in 1790.<sup>34</sup> As this transformation continued, moreover, the removal of the monument from history (and historiography) proved harder than Fustel de Coulanges and others would have liked. Nietzsche would claim that we need a sense of the "monumental" in our history – despite its many dangers<sup>35</sup> – if we are to learn anything at all from the past and not be severed from it entirely.<sup>36</sup> Foucault writing over a

---

<sup>33</sup> See Hugo 1831, 152: "We must admire and always examine the book written by architecture, but we must not deny the grandeur of the edifice which printing in turn has erected." (*Il faut admirer et refeuilleter sans cesse le livre écrit par l'architecture; mais il ne faut pas nier la grandeur de l'édifice qu'élève à son tour l'imprimerie*). Hugo's narrator does not suggest that architecture has won anything from this transformation; it is clear, however, in the language he uses to speak of text here (and elsewhere towards the end of the chapter) that such a transformation has in fact occurred – and, more importantly, that architecture has been reborn as a metaphor in a form that is just as or even more potent. Indeed, the very idea that grand architecture has died entirely is perhaps negated by the fact that Hugo is writing a book that is called the *Notre-Dame de Paris*, after all.

<sup>34</sup> See Kant 1790 [1799], 6: "Then, if such a system under the general name of Metaphysics should come to stand someday...the critique of it must have previously explored the base of this edifice to the deepest foundation of the properties of its principles independent of experience, so that it not in some part sink and thus inevitably draw with it the collapse of the entire structure." (*Denn, wenn ein solches System unter dem allgemeinen Namen der **Metaphysik** einmal zu Stande kommen soll...so muß die Kritik den Boden zu diesem **Gebäude** vorher so tief, als die erste Grundlage des Vermögens von der Erfahrung unabhängiger Prinzipien liegt, erforscht haben, damit es nicht an irgend einem Teile sinke, welches den Einsturz des Ganzen unvermeidlich nach sich ziehen würde*. Translation adapted from Meredith 1911.) Kierkegaard 1836-1846 [2008], 2.279, also adopts the metaphor of grand architecture in his critique of some philosophers when he says that "[m]ost systematizers in relation to their systems are like a man who builds an enormous castle and himself lives alongside it in a shed."

<sup>35</sup> See Nietzsche 1874 [1893], where in Chapter 2 of his "On The Use and Abuse of History for Life" (*Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben*) he claims that "monumental history deceives by analogies with seductive similarities: it excites the brave to rashness, the enthusiastic to fanaticism" (*monumentale Historie täuscht durch Analogien: sie reizt mit verführerischen Ähnlichkeiten den Mutigen zur Verwegenheit, den Begeisterten zum Fanatismus*).

<sup>36</sup> See Nietzsche 1874 [1893], maintaining in Chapter 3 of the same work that "should one's past be considered critically, then one can take a knife to its roots, and we proceed beyond all reverence. It is always a dangerous process, namely, one hazardous for life itself: and people or times that serve life in such a way that they judge and destroy their past are always dangerous and vulnerable people and times. For since we are now the results of earlier generations, we are also the results of their aberrations, passions, and errors – even their crimes; it is not possible to loosen oneself entirely from this chain" (*wird seine Vergangenheit kritisch betrachtet, dann greift man mit dem Messer an seine Wurzeln dann schreitet man grausam über alle Pietäten hinweg. Es ist immer ein gefährlicher, nämlich für das Leben selbst gefährlicher Prozeß: und Menschen oder Zeiten, die auf diese Weise dem Leben dienen, daß sie eine Vergangenheit richten und vernichten, sind immer gefährliche und gefährdete Menschen und Zeiten. Denn da wir nun einmal die Resultate früherer Geschlechter sind, sind wir auch die Resultate ihrer Verirrungen, Leidenschaften und Irrtümer, ja Verbrechen; es ist nicht möglich, sich ganz von dieser Kette zu lösen*).

hundred years afterwards might have put it best, though, when he noted that whereas history used to turn monuments into documents the opposite had occurred in his own time: historians now make documents into monuments.<sup>37</sup> It had become clear, in other words, that documents of the past are in essence fashioned just like monuments – and thereby are open to the same dangers of interpretation.<sup>38</sup> It might not be a coincidence, then, that it was in this particular intellectual milieu in which Barthes and Foucault were writing – when the monument had died, lost the power of its materiality, and been reborn in the text – that post-structuralism came to prominence.

The monument would “die” once again in this context, of course. The executioner this time would be none other than the theories and practices of deconstruction. The transformation of the monument from a physical building in reality into a metaphorical one in the text had left the latter vulnerable to the same instabilities that had been noted in the former. Kant’s worst anxieties thus came to fruition: the foundations of his edifice of metaphysics were seen to be just as susceptible to failure as any real building – and with their cracking would come “the collapse

---

<sup>37</sup> Foucault 1969, 14-15: “Let us say to be brief that history, in its traditional form, sought to ‘remember’ the *monuments* of the past, to transform them into *documents*, and to make speak those traces that, in themselves, are often not verbal, or that say in silence something other than what they say; in our time, history is that which transforms *documents* into *monuments*” (*Disons pour faire bref que l’histoire, dans sa forme traditionnelle, entreprenait de “mémoriser” les monuments du passé, de les transformer en documents et de faire parler ces traces qui, par elles-mêmes, souvent ne sont point verbales, ou disent en silence autre chose que ce qu’elles disent; de nos jours, l’histoire, c’est ce qui transforme les documents en monuments*). Foucault was preceded indirectly in this line of thought by Riegl 1903, where the Austrian art historian claims that when we use the word “monument” to refer to something as “historical” evidence “it is not by virtue of their original purpose that the sense and meaning of monument come to these works, but rather we as modern subjects who label them such” (*nicht den Werken selbst kraft ihrer ursprünglichen Bestimmung kommt Sinn und Bedeutung von Denkmälern zu, sondern wir moderne Subjekte sind es, die ihnen dieselben unterlegen*, 7). See also Le Goff 1978, 43: “The document is a monument. It is the result of the effort made by the historical societies to impose on the future – like it or not – that given picture of themselves.” (*Il documento è monumento. È il risultato dello sforzo compiuto dalle società storiche per imporre al futuro – volenti o nolenti – quella data immagine di se stesse*).

<sup>38</sup> Le Goff 1978 provides a concise narrative of this evolution from monument to document and then back to monument. See also Morley 2011 for an examination of Nietzsche and Foucault’s use of “monumentality” and, in general, the “constant possibility [of monumentality] in all historiography” that historians need to acknowledge even as they deny its presence (226).

of the whole structure.”<sup>39</sup> Indeed, as the Japanese cultural critic Kojin Karatani would put it, the desire of Kant (and much Western philosophy) “‘to construct a solid edifice’ ultimately does not achieve a foundation, but reveals instead the very absence of its own foundation.”<sup>40</sup> Western thought cannot but undermine itself, according to Karatani, as the very will “to establish order and structure within a chaotic and manifold becoming” betrays the fact that the order is not only constructed, but also subject to collapsing back into the chaos it masks.<sup>41</sup> It would seem, in fact, that this third death of the monument – that is, the collapse of the grand metaphorical edifice of Western philosophy which was supposed to provide stability and fixity for all thought – was perhaps not an insignificant factor for the strength of deconstructive discourse itself over the past few decades.

This modern response is one way to come to grips with the acknowledgement that monuments are inherently unstable, as physical structures and as metaphors. But what if one decided to embrace fully the malleability of meaning inherent to the structural metaphor of a monument? What if one used that same instability to enlist one’s audience in validating and stabilizing that new structure whatever it may be? Would that not allow one to erect something that can transcend the traditional boundaries that limit one’s potential to create something new and innovative? Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* perhaps gives us an answer to these sorts of questions. The very lack of structure in his architextural monument allows him at the end of his text to craft

---

<sup>39</sup> See p. 199, n. 34, above.

<sup>40</sup> Karatani 1995, 8. See also Wigley 1993, 7, arguing that “metaphysics is no more than the attempt to locate the ground” – a “ground” which does not exist, *per se*, but arises from the assumption of philosophy that there is something under its foundations. This line of thought – as Wigley 1993, 39, points out – has its roots in Heidegger’s 1953 work *Introduction to Metaphysics (Einführung in die Metaphysik)*, where the German philosopher “raises the possibility that the ground (*Grund*) might actually be a concealed ‘abyss’ (*Abgrund*) and that metaphysics is constructed in ignorance of, or rather, to ignore, the instability of the terrain on which it is erected, such that ‘we move about over this ground as over a flimsily covered abyss.’”

<sup>41</sup> See Karatani 1995, 18.

a poem that achieves its power not by establishing a solid edifice; the power of the *Metamorphoses* lies rather in the way that it asks its audience to establish firmly the open and ever-changing nature of the work. It was by these means, as Chapter VI suggested, that Ovid could make his private self a permanent part of the public consciousness and transcend the physical limits of his body – all while also helping to shape through his poem how the Roman public understood what it now meant to be Roman in a new age. Augustus’ monumentalization of Rome represented a similar response to the opening up of boundaries that his reign had produced: the *princeps* at the end of his *Res Gestae* broke down and reconstructed the republican boundaries of private and public in such a way that he too could have his subjects themselves become partners in establishing a new frame for structuring Rome and Roman identity. Neither poet nor *princeps* might have been quite so successful, though, if each had not embraced the inherent epistemological instability of architectural discourse when articulating how they had reshaped Roman space and through it Roman identity. They were not afraid to let their audiences give the final meaning to their monuments; in fact, that very well may have been the secret to their subsequent immortality.

\*\*\*

“Remember the impression of good architecture, that it expresses a thought,” Ludwig Wittgenstein once wrote. “You want to respond to it with a gesture.”<sup>42</sup> Augustus might have opened up the dialogue by making Rome a city of marble. He needed people who could “respond” to him, however, especially since the meaning of his monumental structures and their relation to what it meant to be Roman was often far from unambiguous. Nor could they be

---

<sup>42</sup> Wittgenstein 1980, 22: *Erinnere Dich an den Eindruck guter Architektur, daß sie einen Gedanken ausdrückt. Man möchte auch ihr mit einer Geste folgen.* For more discussion of Wittgenstein and his thoughts on architecture see above, p. 33, n. 57, as well as p. 102, n. 38.

otherwise when the *princeps* had to be careful to establish his new Rome upon what Rome had been – both in good times and bad. The Augustan poets in turn investigated the monumentality of their age through their own monumental poems. This dissertation has suggested that their *monumenta* entered into a dialogue with the monumentalization of their city, shaping it and being shaped by it. They not only built monuments that would last even longer than that of the *princeps*; more than that, the self-reflective nature of their monuments made explicit the assumptions of the dialogue itself – and thus opened it up as a dialogue in which any Roman reader could critically engage.

What about those readers? The Roman people themselves played an essential part in responding to the architectural gestures of the *princeps* and thereby giving meaning to the structures of their existence. And in closing this dissertation I want to look at *this* dialogue in the context of one final architectural passage – this time from Augustus himself. In an edict recorded by Suetonius, the *princeps* claimed:

Ita mihi **salvam ac sospitem rem p. sistere in sua sede** liceat atque eius rei fructum percipere, quem peto, ut **optimi status auctor dicar** et moriens ut feram mecum spem, **mansura in vestigio suo fundamenta rei p. quae iecero.** (*Div. Aug.* 28.2)<sup>43</sup>

May it thus be permitted for me **to establish in its place the *res publica* securely and soundly**, and to reap from that action the fruit that I seek, on the condition that **I may be called the architect of the best state**, and that when I die I may carry with me the hope that **the foundations of the *res publica* which I have set will remain in its position.**

Suetonius adds that Augustus “himself granted his own wish by striving in every way that there be no dissatisfaction with the new state” (*fecitque ipse se compotem voti nisus omni modo, ne quem novi status paeniteret, Div. Aug.* 28.2). Although Suetonius might be right here about the political situation, his interpretation completely misses the importance of the architectural metaphors at play in Augustus’ statement (cf. *salvam ac sospitem rem p. sistere in sua sede ...*

---

<sup>43</sup> The Latin text of Suetonius is from Ihm 1907.



*mansura in vestigio suo fundamenta rei p. quae iecero*). Architectural meaning cannot be established by a top-down approach – neither in the case of physical buildings nor with the structure of the *res publica* itself. Augustus seems to have understood that notion better than the average leader, whether in antiquity or today. And the fact that he allowed the Roman people to be a part of the dialogue that monumental architecture opens up – whether in stone or in word – was just as important to making sure he would be called the “architect of the best state” (*optimi status auctor dicar*) by his subjects.<sup>44</sup> For it was by leaving it to the Romans themselves to validate the new *status* that the *princeps* could ensure his monument of the city itself (and what it now meant) would remain standing in place long after he had died.

It was much to Augustus’ advantage, then, that there were contemporary poets whose self-reflective *monumenta* could provide lessons in the nature of monumentality. Horace, Vergil, and Ovid each brought out different aspects of monumentality, its weaknesses as well as its strengths, with the understanding that monuments were structures which were inherently (and paradoxically) both stable and unstable, epistemologically and much as physically. This was not a harsh critique of what Augustus was doing in reality. Nor was it merely a game, either, that paralleled a loss of faith in the meaning of structures that had framed Roman existence in the aftermath of the republic’s supposed “collapse.” It was rather in part because of these poets that the Roman people could fully understand why the monumental *constitutio* that Augustus had built was the best that Rome had ever seen – and, even more importantly, that it ultimately could not stand for very long without their consent.

---

<sup>44</sup> *OLD*, s.v. *auctor*: “**14** The founder (of a city, etc.), builder (of an empire).” The architectural imagery throughout the brief edict suggests a translation of the often difficult translate *auctor* as “architect” or “builder.”

## REFERENCES

- Acosta-Hughes, B. and S. A. Stephens.** 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge.
- Alain.** 1920. *Système des beaux-arts*. Paris.
- von Albrecht, M.** 1961. "Zum Metamorphosenproem Ovids." *Rheinisches Museum* 104: 269-278.
- 1973. "Zur Selbstauffassung des Lyrikers im augusteischen Rom in Rußland – Horaz (*carm.* 2,20 und 3,30) – Deržavin – Puškin – Jevtušenko." *Antike und Abendland* 18: 58-86.
- Alföldi, A.** 1971. *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im Römischen Denken*. Darmstadt.
- Anderson, W. S.** 1963. "Multiple Change in the *Metamorphoses*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 94: 1-27.
- 1966. "Horace 'Carm.' 1.14: What Kind of Ship?" *Classical Philology* 61: 84-98.
- Armstrong, R.** 2009. "Against Nature? Some Augustan Perspectives on Man-Made Marvels." In *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, edited by P. Hardie, 75- 94. Oxford.
- Austin, R. G. (ed.)** 1964. *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.
- (ed.) 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford.
- Bachelard, G.** 1957 [1961]. *La poétique de l'espace*. Paris.
- Bacon, H.** 1986. "The *Aeneid* as a Drama of Election." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116: 305-334.
- Barchiesi, A.** 1989. "Voci e istanze narrative nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 23: 55-97.
- 1994. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Laterza.
- 1997. "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6." In Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler 1997, 181-208. Princeton.
- 2005. "Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 281-305. Cambridge.

- Barthes, R.** 1964. *La Tour Eiffel*. Photography by A. Martin. Paris.
- Bartsch, S.** 1998. "Ars and the Man: The Politics of Art in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Classical Philology* 93: 322-242.
- Bataille, G.** 1970. *Oeuvres complètes. Tome I: Premiers écrits, 1922–1940: Histoire de l'œil – L'Anus solaire – Sacrifices – Articles*. Paris.
- Bek, L.** 1976. "Antithesis: A Roman Attitude and its Changes as Reflected in the Concept of Architecture from Vitruvius to Pliny the Younger." In *Studia Romana in honorem Petri Kraraup septuagenarii*, edited by K. Ascani et al., 154-166. Odense.
- Benjamin, W.** 1936. "L'œuvre d'art à l'époque de sa reproduction mécanisée." *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5: 40-68.
- , 1982. "Die Straßen von Paris." In *Gesammelte Schriften* (Vol. 5), edited by R. Tiedemann and H. Schweppenhäuser, 643-654. Frankfurt am Main.
- Bergmann, B.** 1994. "The Roman House as Memory Theater: The House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii." *The Art Bulletin* 76: 225-256.
- Bertman, S.** 1983. "The Keeper of the Winds." *Vergilius* 29: 48-50.
- Bloomer, K. C., and C. W. Moore.** 1977. *Body, Memory, and Architecture*. New Haven.
- Blum, H.** 1969. *Die antike Mnemotechnik*. Hildesheim.
- Bodel, J.** 1997. "Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 10: 5-35.
- Bömer, F.** 1969. *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen. Kommentar. Buch I-III*. Heidelberg.
- , 1986. *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen. Kommentar. Buch XVI-XV*. Heidelberg.
- Borzsák, I.** 1964. "Exegi Monumentum Aere Perennius." *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 12: 137-147.
- Bosworth, B.** 1999. "Augustus, the *Res Gestae*, and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *Journal of Roman Studies* 89: 1-18.
- Boyle, A. J.** 2003. *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Berwick.
- Bringmann, K.** 1988. "Das zweite Triumvirat. Bemerkungen zu Mommsens Lehre von der außerordentlichen konstituierenden Gewalt," in *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte: Festschrift für K. Christ*, edited by P. Kneissl and V. Losemann, 22-38. Darmstadt.

- Brown, F. E.** 1961. *Roman Architecture*. New York.
- 1963. "Vitruvius and the Liberal Art of Architecture." *Bucknell Review* 11: 99-107.
- Brown, R.** 1987. "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, 211-220. Bristol.
- Brunt, P. A., and J. M. Moore. (edd.)** 1967 [1981]. *Res gestae divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Oxford.
- Buchheit, V.** 1972. *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgica*. Darmstadt.
- Callebat, L.** 1994. "Rhétorique et architecture dans le *De Architectura* de Vitruve." In *Le projet de Vitruve: Objet, destinataires et réception du De Architectura*, edited by P. Gros, 31-46. Rome.
- Callebat, L., and P. Gros (edd.)** 1999. *Vitruve. De l'architecture. Livre II*. Paris.
- Carpo, M.** 2007. "The Postmodern Cult of Monuments." *Future Anterior* 4: 50-60.
- Casali, S.** 1995. "Aeneas and the Doors of the Temple of Apollo." *Classical Journal* 91: 1-9.
- Caye, P.** 2011. "Architecture et rhétorique: Approche cicéronienne de leur identité et de leur différence." In *La rhétorique des arts. Actes du colloque tenu au Collège de France sous la présidence de Marc Fumaroli, de l'Académie française*, 73-85. Paris.
- Ceașescu, P.** 1976. "Altera Roma: Histoire d'une Folie Politique." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 25: 79-108.
- de Certeau, M.** 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by S. F. Rendall. Berkeley.
- Choay, F.** 2001. *The Invention of the Historic Monument*. Translated by L. M. O'Connell. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Clausen, W.** 1964. "Callimachus and Roman Poetry." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 5: 181-196.
- 1987. *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Berkeley.
- Cody, J. V.** 1976. *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*. Brussels.
- Coleman, R.** 1971. "Structure and Intention in the *Metamorphoses*." *Classical Quarterly* 21: 461-477.
- Collinge, N. E.** 1961. *The Structure of Horace's Odes*. Oxford.
- Commager, S.** 1962. *The Odes of Horace*. New Haven.

- Conte, G. B. (ed.)** 2009. *Vergil: Aeneis*. Berlin.
- Cooley, A. E. (ed.)** 2009. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Cowling, D.** 1998. *Building the Text: Architecture as Metaphor in Late Medieval and Early Modern Poetry*. Oxford.
- Crossley, P.** 1998. "The Man from Inner Space: Architecture and Meditation in the Choir of St. Laurence in Nuremberg." In *Medieval Art: Recent Perspectives. A Memorial Tribute to C. R. Dodwell*, edited by G. R. Owen-Crocker and T. Graham, 165-182. Manchester.
- Dal Co, F., and S. Polano.** 1978. "Interview with Albert Speer, October 1977." *Oppositions* 12: 39-53.
- Davis, G.** 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley.
- Demandt, A.** 1982. "Symbolfunktionen antiker Baukunst." In *Palast und Hütte: Beiträge zum Bauen und Wohnen im Altertum von Archäologen, Vor- und Frühgeschichtlern*, edited by D. Papenfuss and V. M. Strocka, 49-62. Mainz.
- Deremetz, A.** 2001. "Énée Aède. Tradition auctoriale et (re)fondation d'un genre." In *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, tome XLVII: L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine: huit exposés suivis de discussions* 143-181. Vandoeuvres-Genève.
- Dettmer, H.** 1983. *Horace: A Study in Structure*. Hildesheim.
- Doblhofer, E.** 1966. *Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht*. Heidelberg.
- Doob, P. R.** 1990. *The Idea of the Labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages*. Ithaca.
- Dufallo, B.** 2013. *The Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman Ecphrasis*. Oxford.
- Eck, W.** 1984. "Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period." In *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, edited by F. Millar and E. Segal, 129-167. Oxford.
- 1997. "Cum dignitate otium: Senatorial *Domus* in Imperial Rome." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 16: 162-190.
- Eco, U.** 1962 [1976]. *Opera aperta: forma e indeterminazione nelle poetiche contemporanee*. Milano.
- 1979. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington.
- 1984. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington.
- Eder, W.** 2005 "Augustus and the Power of Tradition." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 13-32. Cambridge.

- Edmunds, L.** 1992. *From a Sabine Jar: Reading Horace, Odes 1.9*. Chapel Hill.
- Edwards, C.** 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.  
 ----- 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Eriksen, R.** 2001. *The Building in the Text: Alberti to Shakespeare and Milton*. University Park.
- Elsner, J.** 1994. "From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing." In *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, edited by S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, 225-254. Cambridge.  
 ----- 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge.  
 ----- 1996. "Inventing *Imperium*: texts and the propaganda of monuments in Augustan Rome. In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by J. Elsner, 32-53. Cambridge.  
 ----- 2007. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton.  
 ----- 2014. "Introduction." In *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*, edited by J. Elsner and M. Meyer, 1-34. Cambridge.
- Elsner, J., and M. Meyer (edd.)** 2014. *Art and Rhetoric in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- Ender, E.** 2005. *Architexts of Memory: Literature, Science, Autobiography*. Ann Arbor.
- Ewald, B. C., and C. F. Noreña (edd.)** 2010a. *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*. Cambridge.  
 ----- 2010b. "Introduction." In Ewald and Noreña 2010a, 1-43. Cambridge.
- Faber, R.** 2005. "Poetics of Closure in Horace *Odes* 3.1." *American Journal of Philology* 126: 93-106.
- Fantham, E.** 2004. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Oxford.
- Fantuzzi, M., and R. Hunter.** 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, J.** 1992. "Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13.719-897)." *American Journal of Philology* 113: 235-268.
- Favro, D.** 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge.  
 ----- 2014. "Moving Events: Curating the Memory of the Roman Triumph." In Galinsky 2014, 85-101. Ann Arbor.
- Feeney, D.** 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.  
 ----- 1992 [1993]. "The *Aeneid* as a Poem of History." *Omnibus* 23: 19-21; reprinted in *Classical Outlook* 70: 94-96.  
 ----- 2002. "The Odiousness of Comparisons: Horace on Literary History and the Limitations of Synkrisis." In Paschalis 2002a, 7-18. Rethymnon.

- Feldherr, A.** 1998. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley.  
 -----. 2010. *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*. Princeton.
- Fitzgerald, W.** 1984. "Aeneas, Daedalus, and the Labyrinth." *Arethusa* 17: 51-65.
- Fleischer, U.** 1960. "Musentempel und Oktavianehrung des Vergil im Proömium zum dritten Buch der Georgica." *Hermes* 88: 280-331.
- Fleury, P. (ed.)** 1990. *Vitruve. De l'architecture. Livre I*. Paris.
- Foucault, M.** 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris.  
 -----. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited by C. Gordon. New York.
- Fowler, D.** 1990. "Deviant Focalization in the *Aeneid*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36: 42-63.  
 -----. 1995a. "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics." In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, edited by S. J. Harrison, 248-266. Oxford.  
 -----. 1995b. "From Epos to Cosmos: Lucretius, Ovid, and the Poetics of Segmentation." In *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling, 3-18. Oxford.  
 -----. 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.
- Fränkel, H.** 1945 [1969]. *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley.
- Fraenkel, E.** 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Frichot, H.** 2011. "Conexa, Conjuncta, Disjuncta: What Can a Monument Do?" *Future Anterior* 8: 74-86.
- Frith, S.** 2004. "A Primitive Exchange: On Rhetoric and Architectural Symbol." *Architectural Research Quarterly* 8: 39-45.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F.** 1975. *Dédale: Mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
- Fuchs, H.** 1962. "'Nun, o Unsterblichkeit, bist du ganz mein...'" Zu zwei Gedichten des Horaz." In *Antidoron: E. Salin zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by E. von Beckerath, H. Popitz, H. G. Siebeck, and H. W. Zimmermann, 149-166. Tübingen.
- Galinsky, K.** 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretative Introduction*. Princeton.  
 -----. (ed.) 2014. *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*. Ann Arbor.
- Genette, G.** 1979. *Introduction à l'Architext*. Paris.
- Gibson, B. J.** 1997. "Horace, *Carm.* 3.30.1-5." *Classical Quarterly* 47: 312-314.

- Giedion, S.** 1949. *Space, Time, and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Gordon, A. E.** 1968. "Notes on the *Res Gestae* of Augustus." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1: 125-138.
- Gros, P.** 1976. *Aurea Tempia: Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste*. Rome.
- 1991. "De la rhétorique à l'architecture: L'ambiguïté de l'*asperitas*." *Voces* 2: 73-79.
- 1994. "*Munus non ingratum*: Le traité vitruvien et la notion de service." In *Le projet de Vitruve: Objet, destinataires et réception du De Architectura*, edited by P. Gros, 75-90. Rome.
- Gruen, E. S.** 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- Habinek, T.** 2002. "Ovid and Empire." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by P. Hardie, 46-61. Cambridge.
- 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore.
- Habinek, T., and A. Schiesaro (edd.)** 1997. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Hahn, R.** 2001. *Anaximander and the Architects: The Contributions of Egyptian and Greek Architectural Technologies to the Origins of Greek Philosophy*. Albany.
- Hammond, M.** 2006. *Performing Architecture: Opera Houses, Theatres and Concert Halls for the Twenty-First Century*. London and New York.
- Hamon, P.** 1986. "Texte et architecture." *Australian Journal of French Studies* 23: 290-308.
- Hannah, B. G.** 2007. "*Exegi Monumentum*: Architecture in Latin Epic." (Diss.) Ithaca.
- Hardie, P.** 1993. "*Ut pictura poesis?* Horace and the Visual Arts." In *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*, edited by N. Rudd, 120-139. London.
- 1997. "Closure in Latin Epic." In Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler 1997, 139-162. Princeton.
- 2002. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.
- Harrison, S. J.** 2006. "The Epic and the Monuments: Interactions between Virgil's *Aeneid* and The Augustan Building Programme." In *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*, edited by M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, 159-183. Oxford.
- 2007a. "Style and Poetic Texture." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by S. J. Harrison, 262-273. Cambridge.
- 2007b. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
- Häusle, H.** 1980. *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Thematik eines Motivs in lateinischen Inschriften*. Munich.



- Heidegger, M.** 1951 [2000]. *Gesamtausgabe. I. Abteilung: Veröffentlichte Schriften 1910-1976 (Band 7: Vorträge und Aufsätze)*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Heinze, R.** 1903 [1915]. *Vergils Epische Technik*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Leipzig.
- Henry, E.** 1989. *The Vigour of Prophecy: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Carbondale.
- Herter, H.** 1948. "Ovids Kunstprinzip in den *Metamorphosen*." *American Journal of Philology* 69: 129-48.
- Hinds, S.** 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge.  
 -----, 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hirsch, E.** 1995. "Landscape: Between Place and Space." In *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*, edited by E. Hirsch and M O'Hanlon, 1-30. Oxford.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J.** 2006. "History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic." In *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, edited by N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx, 478-495. Malden.
- Hollier, D.** 1989. *Against Architecture: The Writings of Georges Bataille*. Translated by B. Wing. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Hölscher, T.** 2006. "Greek Styles and Greek Art in Augustan Rome: Issues of the Present Versus Records of the Past." Translated by J. Trimble. In *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, edited by James I. Porter, 237-269. Princeton.
- Holzberg, N.** 1997. *Ovid: Dichter und Werk*. Munich.
- Hopkins, J. N.** 2012. "The Capitoline Temple and the Effects of Monumentality on Roman Temple Design." In Thomas and Meyers 2012, 111-138. Austin.
- Hugo, V.** 1831. *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Paris.
- Hung, W.** 1995. *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture*. Stanford.
- Hurlet, F.** 1993. *La dictature de Sylla: monarchie ou magistrature républicaine? Essai d'histoire constitutionnelle*. Brussels.
- Hutton, A. O.** 1972. "Exegi monumentum: Horace on his Poetry. *Latomus* 31: 497-502.
- Ihm, M. (ed.)** 1907. *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera*. Leipzig.

- Jaeger, M.** 1990. "The Poetics of Place: The Augustan Writers and the Urban Landscape of Rome." (Diss.) Berkeley.
- , 1995. "Reconstructing Rome: The Campus Martius and Horace, *Odes* 1.8." *Arethusa* 28: 177-191.
- , 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor.
- Jencks, C.** 1977. [1981]. *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. New York.
- Jenkyns, R.** 2013. *God, Space, and the City in the Roman Imagination*. Oxford.
- Jocelyn, H. J.** 1982. "Boats, Women, and Horace *Odes* 1.14." *Classical Philology* 77: 330-335.
- Johnson, W. R.** 1966. "The Boastful Bird: Notes on Horatian Modesty." *Classical Journal* 61: 272-275.
- , 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley.
- Jones, F.** 2011. *Virgil's Garden: The Nature of Bucolic Space*. London.
- Kant, I.** 1790 [1799]. *Kritik der Urteilkraft*. Berlin.
- Karatani, K.** 1995. *Architecture as Metaphor: Language, Number, Money*. Edited by M. Speaks. Translated by S. Kohso. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Keith, A.** 1992. *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2*. Ann Arbor.
- Kennedy, N. T.** 1975. "Pindar and Horace." *Acta Classica* 18: 9-24.
- Kierkegaard, S.** 1836-1846 [2008]. *Kierkegaard's Journals and Notebooks (Vol. II: Journals EE-KK)*. Edited and translated by N. J. Cappelørn, et. al. Princeton.
- Kellum, B.** 1981. "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine and the Forum of Augustus." (Diss.) Cambridge (Mass.)
- Kenney, E. J.** 1976. "Ovidius Prooemians." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 22: 46-53.
- Kern, H.** 1981. *Labirinti: forme e interpretazioni. 5000 anni di presenza di un archetipo*. Milan.
- Kinney, D.** 2001. "Roman Architectural Spolia." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 145: 138-161.
- Knorr, O.** 2006. "Horace's Ship Ode (*Odes* 1.14) in Context: A Metaphorical Love-Triangle." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 136: 149-169.
- Knox, P. E.** 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.

- Kockel, V.** 1995. "Forum Augustum." In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae II*, edited by E. V. Steinby, 285-295. Rome.
- Kostof, S.** 1978. "The Emperor and the Duce: The Planning of Piazzale Augusto Imperatore in Rome." In *Art and Architecture in the Service of Politics*, edited by H. A. Milton and L. Nochlin, 271-325. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Krier, L.** 1985. "An Architecture of Desire." In *Albert Speer: Architecture 1932-1942*, edited by L. Krier. Brussels.
- Kunkel, W., and R. Wittmann.** 1995. *Staatsordnung und Staatspraxis der römischen Republik. Zweiter Abschnitt: Die Magistratur*. Munich.
- Labate, M.** 1991. "Città Morte, Città Future: Un Tema della Poesia Augustea." *Maia* 43: 167-184.
- Lamp, K. S.** 2013. *A City of Marble: The Rhetoric of Augustan Rome*. Columbia.
- Lange, C. H.** 2009. *Res Publica Constituta: Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment*. Leiden.
- La Penna, A.** 1963. *Orazio e l'ideologia del principato*. Turin.
- Larmour, D. H. J., and D. Spencer (edd.)** 2007a. *The Site of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford.
- 2007b. "Introduction – *Roma, recepta*: A Topography of the Imagination." In Larmour and Spencer 2007a, 1-60. Oxford.
- La Rocca, E.** 1986. "Il lusso come espressione di potere." In *Le tranquille dimore degli dei: La residenza imperiale degli horti Lamiani*, edited by M. Cima and E. La Rocca, 3-35. Venice.
- Lattimore, R. (trans.)** 1965. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York.
- Laurence, R.** 1996. "Ritual, Landscape, and the Destruction of Place in the Roman Imagination." In *Approaches to the Study of Ritual: Italy and the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by J. B. Wilkins, 111-121. London.
- Laurence, R., and D. J. Newsome (edd.)** 2011. *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*. Oxford.
- Leach, E. W.** 1974. "Ecphrasis and the Theme of Artistic Failure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Ramus* 3: 102-142.
- 1988. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscapes in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton.

- , 1993. "Horace's Sabine Topography in Lyric and Hexameter Verse." *American Journal of Philology* 114: 271-302.
- Le Goff, J.** 1978. "Documento/Monumento." In *Enciclopedia Einaudi* (Vol. V), edited R. Romano, 38-43. Turin.
- Libeskind, D.** 2014. "Memorials and Their Voices." In Galinsky 2014, 165-176. Ann Arbor.
- Ling, R.** 1988. "Roman Architecture." In *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome* (Vol. II), edited by M. Grant and R. Kitzinger, 1671-1690. New York.
- Lotman, J.** 1977. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Translated by G. Lenhoff and R. Vroon. Ann Arbor.
- Lowrie, M.** 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.
- , 2005. "Inside Out: In Defense of Form." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 135: 35-48
- Luce, T. J.** 1990. "Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, 123-138. Berkeley.
- Lynn, R. O. A. M.** 1995. *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven.
- Mancuso, U.** 1953. *Orazio poeta civilia: Dalle odi romani alle odi cesaree*. Rome.
- Marx, K., and F. Engels.** 1848. *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. London.
- Mayer, E.** 2010. "Propaganda, Staged Applause, or Local Politics? Public Monuments from Augustus to Septimius Severus." In Ewald and Noreña 2010a, 111-134. Cambridge.
- Mazzolini, L. S.** 1967. *L'idea di città nel mondo romano: L'evoluzione del pensiero politico in Roma*. Milan.
- McEwan, I. K.** 1993. *Socrates' Ancestor: An Essay on Architectural Beginnings*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- , 2003. *Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Meban, D.** 2008. "Temple Building, Primus Language, and the Proem to Virgil's Third Georgic." *Classical Philology* 103: 150-74.
- Meyers, G. E.** 2012. "Introduction: The Experience of Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture." In Thomas and Meyers 2012, 1-20. Austin.
- Miles, G. B.** 1995. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca.

- Miller, J. F.** 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.
- Miller, P. A.** 1991. "Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of *Odes* 1-3." *American Journal of Philology* 112: 365-388.
- , 1995. "The Minotaur within: Fire, the Labyrinth, and Strategies of Containment in *Aeneid* 5 and 6." *Classical Philology* 90: 225-240.
- Millon, H.** 1965. "The Role of History of Architecture in Fascist Italy." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24: 53-59.
- Milnor, K.** 2005. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford.
- Moles, J.** 1993. "Livy's Preface." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39: 141-168.
- Möller, M.** 2013. *Ciceros Rhetorik als Theorie der Aufmerksamkeit*. Heidelberg.
- Morley, N.** 2011. "Monumentality and the Meaning of the Past in Ancient and Modern Historiography." In *The Western Time of Ancient History: Historiographical Encounters with the Greek and Roman Pasts*, edited by A. Lianeri, 210-226. Cambridge.
- Morris, S. P.** 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton.
- Morwood, J.** 1991. "Aeneas, Augustus, and the Theme of the City." *Greece & Rome* 38: 212-223.
- Most, G. W.** 2001. "Memory and Forgetting in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 47: 148-170.
- Mumford, L.** 1937. "The Death of the Monument." In *Circle: An International Survey of Constructive Art*, edited by J. L. Martin, B. Nicholson, N. Gabo, 263-270. London.
- Murgatroyd, P.** 1995. "The Sea of Love." *Classical Quarterly* 45: 9-25.
- Musurillo, H.** 1962. "The Poet's Apotheosis: Horace, *Odes* 1.1." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 93: 230-39.
- Myers, K. S.** 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor.
- Mynors, R. A. B. (ed.)** 1969. *Virgil: Opera*. Oxford.
- Nelson, R. S., and M. Olin (edd.)** 2003. *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*. Chicago.
- Newlands, C.** 2002. *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*. Cambridge.
- , 2014. "Architectural Ecphrasis in Roman Poetry." In *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, edited by T. D. Papanghelis, S. J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis, 55-78. Berlin.

- Nietzsche, F.** 1874 [1893]. *Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen*. Leipzig.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard (edd.)** 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and N. Rudd (edd.)** 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford.
- Nora, P.** 1989. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*." *Representations* 26: 7-24.
- (ed.) 1997. *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past (Vol. II: Traditions)*. Translated by A. Goldhammer. New York.
- (ed.) 2001. *Rethinking France: Les Lieux de Mémoire (Vol. I: The State)*. Translated by M. Trouille. Chicago.
- Norberg-Schulz, C.** 1971. *Existence, Space, and Architecture*. London.
- North, M.** 1985. *The Final Sculpture: Public Monuments and Modern Poets*. Ithaca.
- Novara, A.** 1994. "Faire Oeuvre Utile: La Mesure de L'ambition chez Vitruve." In *Le projet de Vitruve: Objet, destinataires et réception du De Architectura*, edited by P. Gros, 47-61. Rome.
- Ogilvie, R. M.** 1965. *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1-5*. Oxford.
- (ed.) 1974. *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita. Vol. I: Books 1-5*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Oxford.
- O'Hara, J. J.** 2004/2005. "'Some God... or His Own Heart': Two Kinds of Epic Motivation in the Proem to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Classical Journal* 100: 149-161.
- Oliensis, E.** 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.
- Olsen, D. J.** 1986. *The City as a Work of Art: London, Paris, Vienna*. New Haven.
- Otis, B.** 1964. [1995] *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Norman.
- Paschalis, M.** 2002a. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Rethymnon.
- 2002b. "Constructing Lyric Space: Horace and the Alcaean Song." In Paschalis 2002a, 71-84. Rethymnon.
- Pasquali, G.** 1920. *Orazio lirico: Studi*. Florence.
- Pearcy, L. T., Jr.** 1977. "Horace's Architectural Imagery." *Latomus* 36: 772-81.
- Phillips, O.** 1980. "Aeole, namque tibi." *Vergilius* 26: 18-26.
- Pöschl, V.** 1950. *Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Innsbruck.
- 1956. *Horaz und die Politik*. Heidelberg.

- Putnam, M. C. J.** 1965. *The Poetry of the Aeneid: Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- 1973. "Horace C. 3.30: The Lyricist as Hero." *Ramus* 2: 1-19.
- 1979. *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the Georgics*. Princeton.
- 1986. *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca.
- 1990. "Horace *Carm.* 2.9: Augustus and the Ambiguities of Encomium." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher, 212-238. Berkeley.
- 1994. "Virgil's Danaid Ekphrasis" *Illinois Classical Studies* 19: 171-189.
- 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven.
- 2001. "The Ambiguity of Art in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 145: 162-183.
- Purcell, N.** 1989. "Rediscovering the Roman Forum." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 2: 156-166.
- Quint, D.** 1982. "Painful Memories: *Aeneid* 3 and the Problem of the Past." *Classical Journal* 78: 30-38.
- Ramage, E. S.** 1987. *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' Res Gestae*. Stuttgart.
- Ramsby, T. R.** 2005. "Striving for Permanence: Ovid's Funerary Inscriptions." *Classical Journal* 100: 365-391.
- Rawson, E.** 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore.
- Rea, J. A.** 2007. *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London.
- Reitz, B.** 2013. "Building in Words: Representations of the Process of Construction in Latin Literature." (Diss.) Leiden.
- Richardson, A.** 2005. "The Orientation of Roman Camps and Forts." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 24: 415-426.
- Richter, W. (ed.)** 1957. *Vergil: Georgica*. Munich.
- Ridley, R. T.** 2003. *The Emperor's Retrospect: Augustus' Res Gestae in Epigraphy, Historiography, and Commentary*. Leuven.
- Riegl, A.** 1903. *Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung*. Vienna.
- Roberts, D. H., F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (edd.)** 1997. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton

- Roller, M. B.** 2010. "Demolished Houses, Monumentality, and Memory in Roman Culture." *Classical Antiquity* 29: 117-180.
- Rosati, G.** 2002. "Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by B. W. Boyd, 271-304. Leiden.
- Rossi, P.** 1960. *Clavis universalis: Arti mnemoniche e logica combinatoria de Lullo a Leibniz*. Milan.
- Rowe, G.** 2014. "A Commemoration of Commemorations: The *Res Gestae* in the Context of Augustan Epigraphy." University of Sydney, September 29, 2014.
- Rowland, I. D., T. N. Howe, and M. Dewar (edd.)** 1999. *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*. Cambridge.
- Ruskin, J.** 1849. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London.
- Sablayrolles, R.** 1981. "Espaces urbain et propaganda politique: L'organisation du centre de Rome par Auguste (*Res Gestae* 19 à 21)." *Pallas* 28: 61-77.
- Saiber, A.** 2005. *Giordano Bruno and the Geometry of Language*. Burlington.
- Said, E.** 2000. "Invention, Memory, and Place." *Critical Inquiry* 26: 175-192.
- Santirocco, M. S.** 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill.  
----- 1995. "Horace and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 28: 225-243.
- Schiesaro, A.** 2009. "Horace's Bacchic Poetics." In *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and His Readers*, edited by L. B. T. Houghton and M. Wyke, 61-79. Cambridge.
- Scobie, A.** 1990. *Hitler's State Architecture: The Impact of Classical Antiquity*. University Park.
- Scott, G.** 1914 [1999]. *The Architecture of Humanism: A Study in the History of Taste*. With a Forward by H. H. Reed and a new introduction by P. Barolsky. New York and London.
- Segal, C.** 1969a. "Horace, *Odes* 2.6 (*Septimi Gadii aditure mecum*): Poetic Landscape and Poetic Imagination." *Philologus* 113: 235-253.  
----- 1969b. "Myth and Philosophy in the *Metamorphoses*: Ovid's Augustanism and the Augustan Conclusion of Book XV." *American Journal of Philology* 90: 257-292.
- Senseney, J. R.** 2011. *The Art of Building in the Classical World: Vision, Craftsmanship, and Linear Perspective in Greek and Roman Architecture*. Cambridge.
- Shanks, M., and M. Pearson.** 2001. *Theatre/Archaeology*. London.
- Shea, J.** 1977. "Lucretius, Lightning and Lipari." *Classical Philology* 72: 136-8.



- Sherratt, A. G.** 1990. "The Genesis of Megaliths: Monumentality, Ethnicity and Social Complexity in Neolithic North-West Europe." *World Archaeology* 22: 147-167.
- Smith, P. L.** 1968. "Poetic Tension in the Horatian *Recusatio*." *American Journal of Philology* 89: 56-65.
- Smithson, R.** 1966 [1996]. *Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Edited by J. Flam. Berkeley.
- Solodow, J. B.** 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill.
- Sordi, M.** 1993. "Dittatura sillani e triumvirate." In *Il triumvirato costituente alla fine della Repubblica romana: scritti in onore di Mario Attilio Levi*, edited by A. Gara and D. Foraboschi, 85-92. Como.
- Spahlinger, L.** 1996. *Ars latet arte sua: Untersuchungen zur Poetologie in den Metamorphosen Ovids*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Spannagel, M.** 1999. *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg.
- Speer, A.** 1969. *Erinnerungen*. Berlin.
- Spengel, L., and A. Spengel (edd.)** 1885. *M. Terenti Varronis de lingua latina libri*. New York.
- Strothmann, M.** 2000. *Augustus: Vater der res publica. Zur Funktion der drei Begriffe restitutio – saeculum – pater patriae im augusteischen Principat*. Stuttgart.
- Stuart, D. R.** 1905. "Imperial Methods of Inscription on Restored Buildings: Augustus and Hadrian." *American Journal of Archaeology* 9: 427-449.
- Syme, R.** 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- Syndikus, H. P.** 1973. *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden (Vol. II)*. Darmstadt.
- Tarrant, R. J. (ed.)** 2004. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford.
- Thomas, E.** 2007. *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age*. Oxford.
- , 2014. "On the Sublime in Architecture." In Elsner and Meyer 2014, 37-88. Cambridge.
- Thomas, M. L., and G. E. Meyers (edd.)** 2012. *Monumentality in Etruscan and Early Roman Architecture: Ideology and Innovation*. Austin.
- Thomas, R. F.** 1983. "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry." *Classical Quarterly* 33: 92-113.

- , 1993. "Callimachus Back in Rome." In *Callimachus*, edited by ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker: 197-215.
- Tissol, G.** 1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Princeton.
- Treggiari, S.** 1999. "The Upper-Class House as Symbol and Focus of Emotion in Cicero." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 12: 33-56.
- Trencsényi-Waldapfe, I.** 1964. "...*Regali situ pyramidum altius*." *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 12: 149-167.
- Tuck, A.** 2012. "The Performance of Death: Monumentality, Burial Practice, and Community Identity in Central Italy's Urbanizing Period." In Thomas and Meyers 2012, 42-60. Austin.
- Tschumi, B.** 1990. *Questions of Space*. London.
- Vasaly, A.** 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley.
- Vervaet, F. J.** 2004. "The *Lex Valeria* and Sulla's Empowerment as Dictator (82-79 BCE)." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 15: 37-84.
- Vessey, D. W. T.** 1984. "Pyrrha's Grotto and the Farewell to Love: A Study of Horace *Odes* 1.5." *American Journal of Philology* 105: 457-469.
- Viarre, S.** 1964. *L'Image et la Pensée dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide*. Paris.
- Vidler, A.** 2000. *Warped Space: Art, Architecture, and Anxiety in Modern Culture*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Voltaire.** 1751 [1819]. *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire. Tome XVII*. Paris.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A.** 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Wallman, P.** 1989. *Triumviri rei publicae constituendae: Untersuchungen zur politischen Propaganda im Zweiten Triumvirat. (43-30 v. Chr.)*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Warden, P. G.** 2012. "Monumental Embodiment: Somatic Symbolism and the Tuscan Temple." In Thomas and Meyers 2012, 82-110. Austin.
- Ward-Perkins, J. B.** 1981 [1994]. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New Haven.
- Welch, T. S.** 2005. *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monument*. Columbus.

- Wheeldon, M. J.** 1989. "‘True Stories’: The Reception of Historiography in Antiquity." In *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, edited by A. Cameron, 33-63. London.
- Wheeler, S. M.** 1995. "Imago Mundi: Another View of the Creation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *American Journal of Philology* 116: 95-121.
- 2000. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Tübingen.
- West, D. (ed.)** 1998. *Horace Odes II: Vatis Amici*. Oxford.
- White, P.** 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Whitehorne, J. E. G.** 1969. "The Ambitious Builder." *Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 31: 28-39.
- Wickham, E. C. (ed.)** 1901. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford.
- Wickkiser, B. L.** 1999. "Famous Last Words: Putting Ovid's *Sphragis* Back into the *Metamorphoses*." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 42: 113-142.
- Wigley, M.** 1993. *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Wilkinson L.P.** 1969. *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey*. Cambridge.
- Williams, G. (ed.)** 1969. *The Third Book of Horace's Odes*. Oxford.
- Williams, M. F.** 1991. *Landscape in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Frankfurt am Main,
- Williams, R. D. (ed.)** 1979. *Virgil: The Eclogues and Georgics*. London.
- Wilson, P. J.** 1988. *The Domestication of the Human Species*. New Haven.
- Wimmel, W.** 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom*. Wiesbaden.
- Wiseman, T. P.** 1984. "Cybele, Virgil and Augustus." In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by T. J. Woodman and D. West, 117-128. Cambridge.
- 1987. "Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo: The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire." *Collection de l'École Française de Rome* 98: 393-413.
- Wittgenstein, L.** 1980. *Culture and Value*. Edited by G. H. von Wright and H. Nyman. Translated by P. Winch. Chicago.
- Woodman, A. J.** 1974. "Exegi monumentum: Horace, *Odes* 3.30." In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, edited by A. J. Woodman and D. West, 115-128. Cambridge.
- 1980. "The Craft of Horace in *Odes* 1.14." *Classical Philology* 75: 60-67.
- 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. Portland.

- Wright, F. L.** 1928. "What 'Style' Means to the Architect." *Architectural Record* 64: 145-151.
- Yates, F.** 1966. *The Art of Memory*. Chicago.
- Young, J. E.** 2000. "Memory and Counter-Memory: Toward a Social Aesthetics of Holocaust Memorials." In *The Holocaust's Ghost: Writings on Art, Politics, Law, and Education*, edited by F. C. DeCoste and B. Schwartz, 165-178. Edmonton.
- Zanker, P.** 1968. *Forum Augustum. Das Bildprogramm*. Tübingen.  
 ----. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.  
 ----. 1999. *Pompeii: Public and Private Life*. Translated by D. L. Schneider. Cambridge (Mass.)
- Ziegler, K. (ed.)** 1969. *Cicero. De Re Publica: Librorum Sex Quae Manserunt*. Leipzig.
- Zetzel, J. E. G.** 1982. "The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century B.C." In *Artistic and Literary Patronage in Ancient Rome*, edited by B. K. Gold, 87-102. Austin.  
 ----. 1983. "Re-Creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past." *Critical Inquiry* 10: 83-105.  
 ----. (ed.) 1995. *Cicero. De Re Publica: Selections*. Cambridge.
- Zumwalt, N. K.** 1974. "Horace C. 1.34: Poetic Change and Political Equivocation." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 104: 435-467.  
 ----. 1978-1979. "Horace's *Navis* of Love Poetry (C.1.14)." *Classical World* 71: 249-254.