

Seeing Marcellus in *Aeneid* 6*

KIRK FREUDENBURG

ABSTRACT

This paper will examine the claims of the excudent alii ('others will hammer out') priamel of Aeneid 6.847–53 within the immediate context of the parade's end, where Marcellus, parading the spolia opima, is used to exemplify the claims made about fine and speculative arts belonging to the Greeks, and war and the arts of empire to the Romans. It will be shown that certain, highly specific memories of the elder Marcellus are cued by the priamel that run directly counter to Anchises' claims. The paper will look at how these claims are spoken in character, and driven by specific narrative motives, and it will relate the mismatch of exemplified to exemplifier to certain larger patterns within the Aeneid of things being left unsaid only to stand out all the more by being left unsaid. The paper concludes with a speculative essay on the necessary reductions and revisions that go into the making, and reading, of culturally instrumentalized monuments.

Keywords: Virgil; Marcus Claudius Marcellus; Anchises; *exempla*; *monumenta*; *Heldenschau*; Fabius Maximus Cunctator; historiography; dramatic irony; Romantic irony; Daedalus; Icarus; ecphrasis; Roman funerals; *tumulus*; Archimedes; sack of Syracuse; Plutarch; Greek science; *paideia*; *teichoscopia*; Roman education; Ennius; Roman memory; Roman gaze; *spolia opima*

'Fabii, where do you take me in such a rush, tired as I am? You, there, you are that Greatest One (Maximus), the one man who saved the state for us by delaying. Others, I trust, will hammer out bronzes that breathe more peaceably. They will draw living faces from marble. They will be better at pleading cases, and with pointers they will mark out the movements of the heavens and predict the rising of the constellations. But you, Roman, remember — your arts will be these — to guide Earth's peoples by your rule; to impose upon them the ways of peace; to spare the subjected and fight down the defiant.' Father Anchises says these things, and as they look on in wonder he adds: 'look there, see how distinguished Marcellus is as he advances with the *spolia opima* ...' (*Aen.* 6.845–55)

* This paper was first presented as a lecture at an international conference on 'Augustan Poetry: New Trends and Revaluations', held at the University of Sao Paulo, 8–10 July 2015. I wish to thank Paulo Martins for organizing (yet another) stellar conference, as well as all those who provided helpful criticisms and encouragement in response to the talk (Andrea Cucchiarelli, Andrew Feldherr, Stephen Harrison, Andreas Michalopoulos, and Gianpiero Rosati). My Yale colleagues, Christina Kraus and David Quint, were tremendously helpful in reading the entire first draft and providing incisive comments and encouragement. In addition, Niek Janssen offered fresh insights and provocations that caused me to rethink some of my assertions and produce a better paper. Bill Metcalf, the Ben Lee Damsky Curator of Coins and Medals at the Yale University Art Gallery, arranged for the purchase of the Marcellus denarius that is pictured in the article below. He is to be thanked for generously sharing his numismatic expertise, and for going the extra mile in procuring a particularly fine example of the coin itself.

Near the end of the *Heldenschau* ('Parade of Heroes') that constitutes the final underworld episode of *Aeneid* 6, Anchises takes a short (seven-line) break from describing the parade that passes before his eyes in order to spell out some of the basic lessons that he would like his son to take away from all that he has given him to see. By this point in the parade the demands of his task, an unrelenting, forward review of an empire without end, have caught up with the old teacher. Anchises admits to being exhausted (*fessum*, l. 845), unable to keep pace with the members of the *gens Fabia* as they go racing off to be born. The rare, successive anapaests of l. 845 (*rapitis Fabii*) emphasize just how hurried the Fabians are, and the molossus midway in the next line (*cunctando*) slows the pace to a trudge; as the word for 'delay' produces a metrical delay, all the while it emphasizes the irony of what Anchises has just given his son to see: Fabius 'The Delayer' in a breathless hurry to get born so that he can do what he does best: slow things down.¹ His father's knowing joke is surely lost on Aeneas. But it is directly after the pause marked by *cunctando*, within the short breathing space that Anchises makes for his worn out self, that he issues his famous *excudent alii* claim: 'others, I trust, will hammer out bronzes that breathe more softly', and so on.

It is this passage, well hammered on the anvils of scholarship, that I will focus on in this paper. I quote the passage in full above, with a small cushion of context both before and after, because it is the main purpose of this paper to demonstrate just how curiously the lessons taught by Anchises align with the specific moment in the parade where he pauses to teach them. Much has been said, and much of that quite insightfully, about the passage's many connections to the larger *Heldenschau* or 'Parade of Heroes' within which it occurs, functioning as an epilogue or retrospective very near the parade's end. But very little has been said about its connections to the exact context within which it occurs, standing as it does between the description of the *gens Fabia* racing off to be born, and immediately before Anchises points to the most prominent and conspicuous member of the Marcellan branch of the Claudian clan, only to have Aeneas ask 'who is that other young man there at his side, the one with his head clouded in a shroud of gloom?' The main question I want to pose in this paper is, how is Marcellus the right man to step into Anchises' field of view here, in order to serve the specific exemplary purposes that Anchises uses him to serve? How well does he suit these purposes? In the process of working through these questions, I hope to show that there are multiple strong and fine-grained connections to be drawn between the assertions of Anchises' 'others will hammer out' priamel and the specific career achievements of Marcellus, and I hope further to show that these connections do as much to establish Marcellus as the perfect negative illustration of the values being touted as they do to prove him the right man to exemplify them: pulling one way is the iconic version of Marcellus as he is pointed to by Anchises, but pulling the other are multiple complex and highly problematic versions of the man that emerged from the culture wars of the late Republic, beginning already in Marcellus' own lifetime, and that are recalled with a high degree of specificity by Anchises' *excudent alii* priamel.²

But before heading off to show this, I must make clear that the Marcellus under review in this paper is not the Marcellus who tends to grab the bulk of attention in studies of the parade's end: Marcellus the Younger. Rather, it is the man who is his spitting, bigger image and exact namesake: Marcus Claudius Marcellus, awarded the *spolia opima* for killing his Celtic rival, Viridomarus, in single combat at the Battle of Clastidium in 222 B.C.E. When it comes to the end of Virgil's parade, scholars tend to hurry past this far more prominent and

¹ On the pronounced slowing of the metrical pace in the transition from l. 845 to l. 846, see Norden 1957 ad loc., and Henderson 1997: 123.

² On the priamel structure of Anchises' *excudent alii* claim, see Horsfall 2013 ad 847–53 (p. 577 n. 3). Norden 1957 ad 847–53 (p. 335) lacks the technical term 'priamel', but identifies the rhetorical structuring of the comparisons.

eye-catching Marcellus, much as Aeneas does, on their way to analysing the young boy who lurks in his shadow, Augustus' young heir apparent: all at once his nephew, son-in-law, and (some have thought, though the evidence is not secure) his adopted son.³ But for the duration of this paper the focus will be on the man Anchises points to in this passage, the one he wants Aeneas to look at, offering him as a particularly eye-catching example of the Roman *mores* that he wants his son to take note of, to learn from, and follow.

I divide the study that follows into four parts, narrowing my focus as I go from a wide-angle view of the parade in its larger context (within Book 6, and within the epic as a whole), to a much tighter focus on the elder Marcellus as the capstone and final exemplification of the parade. In Part I I set the general context of the *Heldenschau*, paying particular attention to the various lines of sight that the spectacle invites readers to take as a means of reckoning with what they are given to see, and in Part II I look at the parade's figuration as a scene of instruction: a Roman father passing on values to his son by pointing to high-achieving ancestors who are perlustrated by teacher and student in a series of highly legible, monumental poses. The idea that specific features of the parade are fashioned after the practices of a traditional aristocratic Roman education, and with strong reference to the ancestral parades of Roman aristocratic funerals, has been well established by recent scholarship, but more remains to be said about the limits and peculiarities of the funerary education that Aeneas receives from Anchises, and how those limits and peculiarities relate to the specific needs of the story, especially in the crucial matter of how the story will end. In Part III I proceed to explore the particular values that Marcellus is made to exemplify in foreshadowing that end, and I will demonstrate that there is a remarkably loud silence that can be heard to issue from what Anchises leaves unsaid about Marcellus in the direct aftermath of his *excudent alii priamel*, where multiple memories of Marcellus (mere general truisms, not ascribable to him if he is left unmentioned, but highly ascribable to him if he is) wait to be cued. It is by the uncanny timing of Marcellus' arrival that these memories are activated, and that the Roman values trumpeted in the priamel are assigned a body to parade in. In fact that is why Anchises points to him, i.e. to illustrate the points he has just made. But what Anchises shows to his son is a version of the man that leaves unspoken and out of the picture all of the further memories that his timely arrival activates, and it is here, in the remarkable tension between what is 'shown' of Marcellus and what is 'known' of him more generally, that the loud silence, to which I refer above, is heard: experienced as a dramatic irony that needs to be reckoned with as a meaningful feature of the poetry. In Part IV of this paper (the conclusion) I will relate the memory work of these lines to certain larger patterns of problematic and painful things being left unsaid in the *Aeneid* (and of characters being 'helpfully' left in the dark), only to stand out all the more by being left unsaid. The main point of comparison here will be to the doors of Apollo's temple at Cumae, the ecphrasis that serves as the bookend, on the front side, to the visual tour that concludes the book. There, too, in the supple and utterly lifelike carvings of a Greek master artist, the last

³ The question concerns whether Augustus had actually adopted Marcellus by the time of the young man's death, or whether he merely planned to adopt him, but had not yet done so. Against taking the strong assertions of both Plut., *Ant.* 87 (ἅμα παῖδα καὶ γαμβρὸν ἐποίησατο Κάϊσαρ) and Servius *ad Aen.* 6.861 ('Marcellum ... quem sibi Augustus adoptavit') as reliable evidence for Marcellus' adoption by Augustus, see A. Gahéis, *RE* III.2, 2760 s.v. M. Claudius Marcellus (230). According to Syme 1939: 341–3, the adoption of Marcellus was perhaps a 'secret wish' of Augustus that surfaced in the critical year of 23 B.C.E., but was subsequently thwarted by the machinations of Agrippa. What evidence we have seems to suggest that Marcellus was slated to become Augustus' son by adoption (perhaps as a known, or merely rumoured, stipulation of Augustus' will; or as something understood to be on the near horizon), but that Marcellus had not been officially adopted by Augustus at the time of his death. Perhaps adding to the confusion was the obvious 'fatherly' rôle that Augustus played at Marcellus' funeral (see below).

hero, another boy of high promise who died before his time, has been left out of the picture and uncarved. And yet, like the younger Marcellus at the parade's end, he fails to stay hidden.

I SETTING THE SCENE

First, the larger context. Having just met up with his father in a high, purple-lit meadow peopled by once great Trojans working out to the tunes of Orpheus, Aeneas looks down from the sun-drenched heights of Elysium to see what Anchises has been studying down below.⁴ Far in the distance, he catches sight of a thicket of woods bustling with activity. Beside the grove runs a river, and streaming towards the grove he sees a gigantic 'troop' of men, swarming over the site like bees as they 'settle upon' (*insidunt*, l. 708) the flowers of a summer meadow. That same word, *insidere*, meaning 'to sit or settle upon' (e.g. as bees on flowers, or persons on chairs) in *OLD* s.v. 1 means 'to occupy (a strategic position) with armed forces' in *OLD* s.v. 2.⁵ The military language of troops and occupying forces tells us 'how' Aeneas sees what he sees, putting us in his emotional line of sight. Aeneas takes fright at the sight, not because bees are portentous,⁶ but because the men gathering below are so very army-like in their swarming appearance.⁷ As we descend with Aeneas and Anchises into the valley below and mount the conveniently placed *tumulus* of l. 754, we see that these souls constitute a military parade: they are ascending to the world above not to write poems or invent things or heal the sick, but to make war, and impose Roman ways. Taking them as they come, face-on, from Silvius Aeneas, with his untipped wooden spear at the front of the parade, to the two Marcelli in full military dress at the parade's end, these souls are, with few exceptions, dressed for battle.⁸ They are, in the eyes of Aeneas, a massive 'army on the move' (*tanto agmine*, l. 712).⁹ Not since his days peering out from atop the walls of Troy has Aeneas seen anything like it: towards the horizon far below, a broad plain, sliced through by a river, and teeming with soldiers in swarms, complete with a *tumulus* (in that earlier case, the tomb of Hector).¹⁰ It all looks much too familiar, and the sight sends a post-traumatic shudder down his spine (*horrescit visu subito*, l. 710). But there are other emotional lines of sight to be reckoned with here, in

⁴ Burke 1979: 227 points out just how decidedly Anchises stands apart from the other heroes of the *sedes beatae*, who spend their time dancing, singing, and exercising.

⁵ cf. Livy 3.50.13: 'eunt agmine ad urbem et Aventinum insidunt.'

⁶ Horsfall 2013 ad loc. argues that Aeneas takes fright because bees are portentous, as if Aeneas were actually looking at bees not men. But the bee analogy does not describe what is there to be seen by Aeneas, as if an omniscient view. Rather, it takes us into his mindset, treating us to his particular take on what he sees.

⁷ One observes a similar double meaning of *insidere* at 1.718–19 'inscīa Dido / insīdat quantus miserae deus'. Eros (disguised as Ascanius) 'sits on' Dido's lap, metaphorically 'settling into' her emotions. But he also 'lays siege to' her, prefiguring the destruction of Carthage by Rome. Servius ad loc. notes that some manuscripts of his day read *insideat*, making the military connotations (an 'ambush') more explicit: 'legitur tamen et "insideat", id est ut quidam volunt insidias faciat'.

⁸ On the military outfitting of the heroes in the parade, see Kondratieff 2014: 180–5. The parade features only two heroes who are not dressed for a fight: Numa in priestly attire in ll. 808–9, and Serranus sowing seeds in a furrow in l. 844. Horsfall 2013 ad loc. explains the strange phenomenon of Serranus sowing seeds in a parade as a reference to known visual representations of the man.

⁹ *OLD* *agmen* 5.

¹⁰ On the visual poetics of Homer's *Iliad*, with specific emphasis on mapping the Trojan battle space, see Clay 2011. Besides sounding a funerary (Marcellan) note (see below), the detail of the *tumulus* mounted as a vantage point from which to view advancing troops has a model in Homer's 'Catalogue of Ships'. At the end of the catalogue we are informed that Priam's son, Polites, has been watching the Greek troops marching towards Troy from his watch station 'posted atop old Aesyetes' tomb' (τῦμβῳ ἐπ' ἄκρωτάτῳ Αἰσυήταο, Hom., *Il.* 2.794).

places and activities much closer to home for Virgil's first readers *qua* visualizers.¹¹ In the aftermath of the funeral to which the parade's tail-end refers, the same sketchy clues add up to a different shudder-inducing vista: looking out from the Capitoline Hill, far below to the north, a broad plain cut through by a river, beside which stands a crowded grove of cedar enclosing a *tumulus* approached by a long line of men in full military dress, actors sporting the gear and wearing the *imagines* of both the Julian and Claudian clans.¹² Positioned at the parade's end, and the last to arrive at the *tumulus*, none other than the young Marcellus himself; not to pass into the upper world this time, but to leave it for the world below.

II THE RITUAL/EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURES OF THE *HELDENSCHAU*

So much for setting the general scene. The task now is to move in closer and examine how the claims made by Anchises in his *excudent alii priamel* take up with, and reflect back upon, what he has given Aeneas to see in the parade. The funereal aspects of Virgil's parade of heroes have been noted by many scholars, and Anchises' activity in picking out the faces of the not-yet-embodied as they head towards the *tumulus*, telling his son who they are, and what they will achieve, has been thought to resemble the visual-educational practices of Romans watching ancestral *imagines* march by in the procession of a noble Roman's funeral, parading first from the house to the forum, then from the forum to the family tomb outside the city walls.¹³ Denis Feeney captures the connection of narrative (mythic) scenario to cultural practice in a snapshot taken at street level: 'Aeneas has the individuals pointed out and explained to him by his father, as would any son in a Roman street, watching the procession go by.'¹⁴

A substantial number of heroes in the parade are described by Anchises in ways that cannot but refer to specific works of art well known to Virgil's public, as well as to the specific *tituli* or identifying 'tags' that were attached to those works to name the person in question, and to the laudatory *elogia* that summarized their *res gestae*.¹⁵ All of this, I think, gives special point to Anchises' claim that others, presumably the Greeks of a later time, will produce marble portrait sculptures that have 'faces that are alive' (*vivos vultus*, l. 848) and that they will give a softer, more supple and lifelike look to their statues in bronze.¹⁶ If the comparison here, as I think it must be, is with the

¹¹ Working independently, both Kondratieff 2014 and Pandey 2014 have sought to show that certain topographical details of the *Heldenschau* evoke specific features of Rome's urban landscape. To my mind, Kondratieff 2014 (in an otherwise excellent article) overworks his idea by pushing too hard for the making of highly specific topographical connections based on hard to specify clues. In the end, he is right to develop, and insist on, the idea that the *recognitio equitum* is a ritual structure built into the *Heldenschau*, but he tries too hard to make all the Virgilian details work with, and add up to, that idea. Pandey 2014 is more interested in connecting the architectural monuments of the *Aeneid* (especially the temple of Juno in Book 1, and the temple of Apollo in Book 6) to monuments within the Augustan cityscape. She caps off her article with a short study of the Roman topography of Virgil's underworld.

¹² Anchises describes the funeral of Marcellus at ll. 872–4 in terms that mirror the physical setting of the *Heldenschau* point for point: the plain, the *tumulus*, the crowd, and the river; see Pandey 2014: 112–13. On the funeral of Marcellus, see Flower 1996: 240–1 and Fantham 2006: 29–31.

¹³ On connections between the *Heldenschau* and Roman funeral processions, see especially Skard 1965: 59–65, Horsfall 1976, Burke 1979, Feeney 1986, Flower 1996: 109–14, and Dufallo 2007.

¹⁴ Feeney 1986: 5. Blösel 2003 argues that the primary audience for the aristocratic funerary spectacles of the middle and late Republic was the Roman public at large, and he makes clear that the conceptual connections between the funerary rites of the aristocracy and the first written histories of Rome were very strong; cf. Roller 2009: 219.

¹⁵ The argument for the influence of statues and relief sculptures on Virgil's rendering of the heroes in his parade goes back to Delaruelle 1913. See most recently Kondratieff 2014: 180–7; cf. Horsfall 1976: 83 and McDonnell 2006: 152–3. For statues in the Forum of Augustus displayed with *tituli* and *elogia*, see Gowing 2005: 138–45.

¹⁶ On *mollis* as a positive aesthetic term describing statuary that is 'supple', 'flowing', and 'lifelike', see OLD s.v. 3c; cf. Horsfall 2013 ad loc. and Brink 1971 ad Hor., *Ars.* 33. Given that these lines are spoken by Anchises from

monumental, funereal, and teacherly-exemplary ‘look’ of all that Anchises has just given us to see, then we must concede Anchises’ point: those old Roman *imagines* (the oldest of which were of painted wax, not marble or bronze) are remarkably ‘stiff’ by comparison. And if they seem much less supple and ‘alive’ in their expressions than do the portraits sculpted by the Greeks, it is because they may, in some especially ‘gaunt’ cases, have been lifted from the actual faces of the dead.¹⁷ At the very least, they capture values and achievements that Romans associated with advanced age.¹⁸ But much the same could be said of men represented as military champions in equestrian or triumphal pose: such images have nothing softly emotive or supple about them.¹⁹ This, the archaic stiffness of republican Roman art as Anchises describes it, has nothing to do with a lack of artistic ‘skill’ *per se*, and everything to do with the way Anchises construes (for his son’s Roman edification) the cultural purposes and functions of art in Rome. Here we must understand that Anchises is donning a traditional Roman mask of his own, voicing the concerns of the stern, military-minded republican Roman that he is urging Aeneas to become.²⁰ Portraits of great men, Anchises insists, should capture and monumentalize what was great about them when they were alive. To be thus monumentalized you must be dead, having served your family and country selflessly, and well. The presumption built into the priamel’s first claim about the plastic arts is that serious ‘hard’ deeds are done by hard-looking, serious, and seriously scarred, men. The stiffer the image, the better the man. Their faces, staring out with expressions of ‘ennobled verism’ and/or profound disapproval from inside the atria of noble homes, and from tombs in the family plot, are not to be valued for the aesthetic pleasure that they give.²¹ They are to

a disapproving point of view, the (normally positive) aesthetic term can also be heard here as a dismissive swipe at the ‘weakness’, ‘cowardliness’, and ‘effeminacy’ of such art; see *OLD* s.v. 3a, 5, 13, and 15. In the parlance of ancient art criticism, the adjective *durus* ‘hard’ was commonly used to describe the ‘wooden’ and ‘unlifelike’ qualities of works in the so-called ‘severe style’ of the Greek Archaic period; cf. *Inst.* 12.10.1–10, where Quintilian repeatedly figures the history of Greek art as a progression from ‘hard’ effects to ‘soft’, especially 1.10.7: ‘nam *duriora* et Tuscanicis proxima Callon atque Hegesias, iam *minus rigida* Calamis, *molliora* adhuc supra dictis Myron fecit.’ Cf. Hor., *Sat.* 2.3.22 ‘quid scalptum infabre, quid fusum durius esset’, and *Ars* 33 ‘mollis imitabitur aere capillos’. For the ‘hard’ styles of Kallon and Hegesias, see Pollitt 1965: 26–8. The ‘hardness’ that was deplored by many critics of art was embraced by others as emblematic of a lost ‘toughness’ (*duritia*) that Romans once lived by; cf. Cato *apud Festum* 281.23 Müller, s.v. ‘repastinari: in parsimonia atque in duritia atque industria omnem adolescentiam meam abstinui, agro colendo.’ On ‘hardness/ruggedness’ as a stylistic virtue in conservative Roman parlance, see Freudenburg 1993: 153–62.

¹⁷ Jackson 1987 follows a long (but overly confident) tradition in locating a cause for the sunken, drawn and overly-skeletal facial features of many portraits of the first century B.C.E. in death masks cast from the faces of the deceased. Stewart 2004: 6–9, while open to the idea, is careful to distinguish between these death masks and the *imagines maiorum* paraded in funerals and installed, in various media, in the *atria* of noble homes; cf. Flower 2009: 70. In contrast to Jackson, Gruen (see below n. 21) argues sharply against connecting the roughness of *imagines maiorum* in the so-called ‘veristic’ style to the casting of death masks from the faces of the deceased. In the end, there is no need to establish the casting of death masks as a cultural practice in order to prove that many ‘veristic’ portraits of the late Republic possess corpse-like features (Jackson is solid on this point).

¹⁸ Stewart 2004: 9: ‘The most important public offices were held, at least in the Roman imagination, by stern and uncompromising, morally upright older men, and the physiognomy of the veristic portraits often seems (to us) to communicate such enduring republican values as *gravitas* and *seueritas*.’

¹⁹ The clear ‘art historical’ context of the passage pushes one to take the adverb *mollius* in l. 847 (on which, see above n. 16) with *ducent* midway in the next line; a rather long stretch. But there are equally valid grammatical and syntactical arguments to be made for taking the adverb (as R. D. Williams does, and as I do in the translation above) within the cluster ‘spirantia mollius aera’, in the sense of ‘bronzes that breathe more peaceably’, i.e. expressing a less martial disposition; see *OLD mollis* 10 ‘peaceful’, ‘unwarlike’. For *spirare* with an adverb or internal accusative in the sense ‘to express a particular spirit or disposition’, see *OLD spirare* 6a.

²⁰ Williams 1972: 215 connects the appearance of Cato in l. 841 to the *excurrent alii* priamel that begins in l. 847. On Roman moralists deploring the corrosive effects of Greek art upon Roman national character, see Pollitt 1978 and Gruen 1992: 84–130.

²¹ Gruen 1992: 153–70 argues convincingly that the ‘warts and all’ emphasis of republican veristic portraiture has to do not with Romans lacking artistic skill, or with their making *imagines* from the faces of the dead, but with

be used as teaching tools, props for the replication of unsoft and unyielding values (*duritia, constantia, gravitas*), and valued for daring to look so unapologetically Roman in whatever present moment they stare out upon. Such monuments (and here one automatically thinks of Livy's prologue) are highly legible repositories of inherited values, things to think with, to teach with, and to be corrected by. Let others worry about making them pretty and emotionally expressive, Anchises says. They do so not because they are better artists, but because they are softer men, incapable of self-rule.

Denis Feeney follows Horsfall (following von Albrecht following Oppenheimer) in categorizing the entirety of the historical vision that Anchises treats his son to in the *Heldenschau* of Book 6 as a 'genealogical protreptic, using historical *exempla* and the promise of glory to steer Aeneas towards virtuous rule'.²² I would add that the protreptic, in this case, is heavily on the side of military virtues, with very little emphasis on anything that does not have to do with fighting bravely and selflessly for the cause of Rome and its *imperium sine fine*.²³ That 'empire without end' has yet to take on its physical existence. Like the souls parading forward to fight it into existence, Rome's *imperium* has yet to acquire a physical body. It is an idea waiting to be realized by the hard-nosed and selfless heroes who are passing into the upper world. For his part, Aeneas must see all this and take it into his soul as a passion for future glory (*famae venientis amore*, l. 889), so that he may take up his sword as one of those selfless, empire-building heroes he has been given to see.²⁴ In fact he must give rise to those heroes as their *auctor generis*, 'founder of the family line', and an *exemplum* for them to follow. Unless he models the behaviour he has seen in them to *them*, none of it happens. Unless he earns his own death mask, the parade disappears. And that is why he is being given to see the future of Rome in the flattened-out, militarizing way he is being given to see it, as so much military work to be done: enemies to be warred into submission, peace to be imposed, Roman institutions to be carried forward past every conceivable boundary. This is the lesson he must take back into the upper world; a lesson about sacrificing your body to an eternal cause, putting all your worldly effort into the one thing that lasts: not the soul in this case, as it was for Plato in his Myth of Er, but Rome herself.²⁵

their choosing to take up with a certain strain of Hellenistic art in order to 'make it emblematic of their own self-representation' (p. 161). Further on the 'ennobled verism' of Roman republican portraiture, see Pollini 2012: 48–9.

²² Feeney 1986: 1. The case for connecting the parade, as made use of by Anchises, to the ways of Roman fathers passing on values to their posterity via visual moral exemplification goes back as far as Donatus *ad Aen.* 6.841–4. Bettini 1991: 145–7 points out the individual shortcomings of the many models and parallels that have been proposed for the *Heldenschau*, including the aristocratic funeral. But he concludes that 'the parallel with the Roman funeral remains surely the most suggestive' (p. 146). Horsfall 1976: 84 draws the phrase 'genealogical protreptic' from von Albrecht 1967: 176 n. 76. For a detailed analysis of the rhetorical structuring of Anchises' 'große Rede' in ll. 752–886, see Norden 1957: 312–16.

²³ See Horsfall 1976: 83. Lamacchia 1964: 272 indicates that the same point of focus is reflected in Virgil's Ciceronian model for the *Heldenschau*. Kondratieff 2014: 180 notes that the Virgilian parade lacks many features typical of a funeral procession, and that 'those to whom Anchises calls attention seem *not* to be wearing magisterial robes that represent their highest *civil* rank' (his emphasis). He adds that Vergil has Anchises refer to known visual references that 'tend to be military in character'.

²⁴ Horsfall 1976: 80: 'The Parade of Heroes serves as a protreptic to fire Aeneas with zeal (vi.806, 889) before Anchises tells him *quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem* (892).' Cf. Sall., *Jug.* 4.5 on the aristocratic funerary parade of *imagines* as a means of 'firing' the mind of the beholder towards *virtus* (martial and political prowess): 'cum maiorum imagines intuerentur vehementissime sibi animum ad virtutem accendi'; see also Polybius 6.53.10–54.3 and 6.55.4.

²⁵ Kirichenko 2013: 78 points out that 'what one is thus made to see by looking at this series of statue-like images is nothing less than the growth of the Roman Empire. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Anchises ultimately declares Rome to be a notional work of art and its rulers to be notional artists'. In other words, Aeneas is being enjoined by Anchises to produce art of the hard Roman kind that he has been given to see in the parade. There is

Connections linking Anchises' protreptic to the ways of a republican Roman 'exemplary' education (an education that was always backwards-looking and 'funereal' at its core) have been well explored by scholars. But, as far as I know, no one has remarked on just how topsy-turvy and decidedly 'wrong' that same education is from a traditional Roman perspective.²⁶ Consider: all the emphasis in such an education is on replication, looking to the past as a model for the present and future. For that to happen you need not just an elder to teach and a student to learn, but a graveyard full of Roman ancestors to teach with. That is where the problem lies. Aeneas has no Romans in his past. Only Trojans. Thus, in order to become the Roman he must become to fight the battles he must fight, Aeneas must look not to his ancestors (his *maiores*), but to his descendants (his *minores*). The young, in this case, are assigned the task of instructing the old, and it is hard to imagine anything less Roman than that.²⁷ In addition, the basic funerary rôles have been switched, in that the task of lauding the passing members of the parade has fallen to the father. As many scholars have noted, Virgil's mythic reversal in this case calls to mind the 'tragic' scenario that played out at the younger Marcellus' funeral, where it was Augustus, the grieving Priam/Evander-figure, who took up the son's traditional rôle by conducting a tour of the boy's illustrious ancestors. Everyone in the audience that day knew that the scene playing out before them was the reverse of what had been scripted: it was the younger Marcellus who, when the time came, was supposed to speak in praise of Augustus. That is the way the succession was set up to work. But, as Seneca reminds Marcia, in consoling her over the loss of her son, one merely hopes that 'they (sc. one's children) will be the ones to perform your last rights, and that you will be praised by your sons (*laudari te a liberis tuis*)'. But what one has to prepare for, he adds, is the opposite: putting your child on the pyre (Sen., *Dial.* 6.17.7). Seneca's language here helps alert us to the oddly mixed message that Servius manages to fold into his description of the second of the two 'intentions' that, he claims, Virgil had in writing the *Aeneid*: namely, 'to praise Augustus by (way of) his parents/ancestors (*Augustum laudare a parentibus*)'. At first glance, the project is a straightforward Pindaric one: that of orienting praise into the present from the past 'by way of ancestors', i.e. 'by glowing reference to them'. The best mechanism for doing that, in Rome, was the aristocratic funeral. And yet, that same project was given a radical turn by Virgil when he put key elements of the poem's praise of Augustus into the mouth of Anchises, a mythic progenitor of Augustus' family line, so as to literalize *a parentibus* as praise actually spoken 'by (Augustus') ancestors'. Within a Roman setting, where the main public setting for praise *a liberis* or *a parentibus* was the aristocratic funeral, Servius' language describes not only the task that Virgil set for himself in writing his *Aeneid*, but the solution that he worked out for solving that task's core problem: how to praise a man who was still very much alive, as if he were already dead.²⁸ One lets the dead do the praising.

perhaps an etymological play upon the name *Aeneas* (*Aeneus* 'made of bronze') in l. 847. See Austin 1977 ad l. 842 for a similar play upon the name of the Scipiones.

²⁶ Bettini 1991: 148 comes closest when, in describing Roman conceptualizations of time in terms of a forward, linear movement through space, he points out that 'Aeneas, as founder of the Roman race, ought to be ahead of the whole procession, the unwitting leader of a parade that winds behind him, like Virgil in Dante, who made light for the one who followed'.

²⁷ cf. Hor., *Ep.* 2.1.84–5, where Horace complains to Augustus that the conservative audiences of his day value the canonical poems of their youth, to the disadvantage of anything new, 'because they deem it disgraceful to obey their juniors (*quia turpe putant parere minoribus*), and to admit that what they learned as striplings they must in their old regard as trash'.

²⁸ On the problem of praising the living in Rome (in marked contrast to Greek practice), see Cic., *de Orat.* 2.341. For a similar contrast of 'Greek exuberance' versus 'Roman stinting' in the awarding of monuments and praise to men of high distinction, cf. the last lines of Cato fr. 83 Peter.

It is only in Aeneas' future where lessons about winning empires rather than losing them are to be found, and that is why Aeneas must visit his father in the underworld, in order to look upon the future as if it were his past. Within the mind-bending wormhole that is the *Aeneid*, everyone he sees in the parade has already looked to him as their *auctor generis* and *exemplum*.²⁹ They have soaked in his *imago*, studied his achievements, and taken their cues about how to be an empire-builder, *from him*. He learns from them so that they can learn from him. One of the reasons that this has serious implications for the further literary-*qua*-cultural workings of the poem is that it provides a way of connecting the poem's two halves, and for understanding the tug-of-war inside Aeneas that pulls his character from one extreme to another in the poem's second, 'Iliadic' half, swinging him from a responsible *alius Hector* at one moment to an *alius Achilles* at another.³⁰ If Aeneas is at times consumed by a bloodlust that causes him to lose sight of his pious cause and to hack fathers down atop their sons on the same bloody pile, it is because that is who he is, because that is what Romans do. It is a fact of their history, and he is the *auctor* who gives rise to their conflicted kind by taking in the highs and lows of the *Heldenschau* of who they are: a people steadily committed to their (and their gods') own communal/familial cause, except when they fly off into fits of brother killing brother for the sake of avenging a father, or in the name of some other bloody piety. To rid Aeneas of his Achillean *furor* would be to rob Rome of Romulus and Caesar, and to rid the *Heldenschau* of Romulus and Caesar would be to rob Aeneas of his Achillean *furor*. My point here is not to locate some New Critical unity that helps harmonize the poem's two halves and explain away its (and its main character's) spectacular contradictions. Rather, it is to underscore the poem's capacity to scrutinize Roman readers *by means of* Aeneas' character, by noting that his cruelties and contradictions are, in the end, a reflection upon themselves.

III THE LESSONS AND LIMITS OF THE 'OTHERS WILL HAMMER OUT' PRIAMEL

Returning to the *excudent alii* priamel, we see that Anchises does not bother to name the artisans who pursue non-military arts. Given the incessant pointing and naming that surrounds the priamel on both sides, their dismissal as so many anonymous 'others' stands out as a slight, evincing a mindset that dismisses men of their kind as unworthy of a *nomen* ('a name', *OLD* s.v. 1–9 = 'fame' *OLD* s.v. 10–12). About the existence of such men Anchises can only speculate (*credo equidem*), not because they belong to some unknowable future, but because they do not belong to the parade: they are not there to be pointed to because they are not 'other' Romans, but Greeks pursuing arts that Romans took up with as skills brilliantly mastered by others, but never quite 'entirely' or comfortably their own (*tota nostra*).³¹ By holding these arts at arms length and cautioning against their Roman pursuit, Anchises locates the provenance of future suspicions and animosities towards defeated Greeks in a mythic past where the Greeks are, in fact, the ones who do the defeating of gullible Trojans (future Romans) by means

²⁹ Horsfall 1976: 80: 'Aeneas himself will serve as an *exemplum* to Ascanius: *disce puer virtutem ex me verumque laborem*.' Further on connections between Aeneas' advice to his son at *Aen.* 12.435–440 and Anchises' advice to his son at 6.847–53, see Goldschmidt 2013: 148–9. For Aeneas' words to his son in Book 12 as a reworking of Soph., *Ajax* 550–1, Hom., *Il.* 6.476–7, and Accius' *Armorum Iudicium* (156 R²), see Tarrant 2012 *ad Aen.* 12.435–6. On the collapsing timescales ('wormholes') of the *Aeneid*, see Feeney 2007: 161–3.

³⁰ The fundamental study of the mixed intertextual cues of the *Aeneid* that establish Aeneas as both a new Hector and a new Achilles is Anderson 1969. See most recently Barchiesi 2015: 117. On the 'bewilderingly numerous' rôles that Aeneas is made to play in the *Aeneid*, see Hardie 1998: 80–3.

³¹ For the typical Roman binary opposing 'our' Roman virtue/morality to 'their' Greek learning, cf. Cic., *de Orat.* 3.137 and *Tusc.* 1.2. On painters and sculptors as 'ministers of luxury', see Sen., *Ep.* 88.18.

of oratorical treachery (Sinon) and technical craft (Ulysses and his wooden horse, *divina Palladis arte*, 2.15). By situating this attitude in his own past, Anchises provides both an *exemplum* to be followed (most obviously by the elder Cato), as well as an originary rationale (an *aetion*) for a certain strand of later Roman political thought.³²

After the sculptural arts in marble and bronze, the first pursuit that Anchises urges his son to leave to the Greeks has to do with pleading cases in courts (not oratory *per se*, but forensic oratory) and the second with mapping the heavens by means of geometrical measurements and mathematical calculations. The second of these was a key ingredient of Greek *paideia* that never really caught on in the education of Roman élites,³³ and the training of young men for forensic careers by means of rhetorical handbooks and mock trials, pleading cases both pro and con, was never not a thing to be worried about and/or vociferously deplored by Romans of a more conservative bent — one remembers Cato's famous dictum 'tene rem, verba sequentur', 'keep to the topic, words will follow', advice passed on from an elderly father to his son, 'ad Marcum filium'.³⁴ Anchises warns his son against pursuing these crafty and highly specialized (suspiciously theoretical and 'ethereal') arts, then he points directly at the elder Marcellus as if to imply that he is the visible embodiment of the lessons just taught, and that Aeneas must take care to remember (*memento*).³⁵ The imperative *memento* 'make sure to remember' calls to mind the monumental purposes of the Roman art that Aeneas has been given to see (men as *monumenta*, and physical monuments as a means of reminding and remembering), but it also raises questions about the narratological set-up of who is talking to whom in these lines. Who is this unnamed 'you, o Roman (*tu, Romane*)' of l. 851?³⁶ On what basis do we assume it is Aeneas, and not one of the souls passing by? It is they, after all, who are 'Roman' in a way that Aeneas can never be (nowhere else in the epic is Aeneas referred to as a 'Roman'), and they are the ones who are decidedly memory-challenged at that very moment, heading off as they are to drink from the river Lethe, thus to forget the better part of whatever it is that they have learned in their fore-life among the dead. What is to say, then, that the 'You, Roman' being urged to remember that Romans pursue the arts of empire, not the arts of Greek *paideia*, is not, in fact, Fabius Maximus Cunctator, the man whom Anchises is directly addressing right as he launches into his famous priamel? Or perhaps he is to be thought of as calling ahead to Marcellus just as he pops into view. In either case, the narratological scenario may be one of indirect instruction rather than direct: Aeneas taking in lessons that are being urged upon someone else.

In the end, these narratological worries are of little consequence, as the clear target of the lessons that are laid out in the priamel is Aeneas. He is the one who needs to hear them, whether they are addressed to him directly or not. But it is with these narratological worries in mind that I would like now to follow Anchises' lead and

³² Hardie 1998: 63: 'Whereas Ennius wrote a historical epic, recording Roman history sequentially from the Sack of Troy down to the most recent events of the second century B.C., the *Aeneid* may better be described as an aetiological epic, locating the origins of Roman history and culture in a legendary past.'

³³ See Rawson 1985: 156. On geometry and mathematics/astronomy as arts 'not ours' among the Romans, cf. Cic., *Tusc.* 1.5.1.

³⁴ For the Romans' 'deep distrust of Greek rhetoric as a power capable of evil as well as good', see Rawson 1985: 76–9. Suetonius begins his *de Rhetoribus* with a series of tales about the resistance of *maiores nostri* to the teaching of rhetorical skills to the young. On the antagonistic binary 'rhetorical eloquence' versus 'military duty' in Plutarch's life of the elder Cato, see Stok 1988: 35–6. For Cato's famous *rem tene* dictum, see *Libri ad Marcum Filium* 80.15 Jordan. Mellor 2002: 19 points out that the phrase 'was intended to be a rejection of Greek-style rhetoric'. See also Aston 1978: 153.

³⁵ Smith 2005: 89: 'Marcellus' victory over Viridomarus at Clastidium in 222 BC exemplifies the principles outlined by Anchises. Aeneas must remember (851) and see (855).'

³⁶ As vatic language, reminiscent of a Sybilline oracle, see Horsfall 2013 ad loc., and Nisbet and Rudd 2004 ad Hor., *Carm.* 3.6.2: 'Romane, donec templa refeceris.' Horsfall takes *tu* in l. 851 to refer to Virgil's readers rather than to Aeneas, who is Anchises' 'not-yet-Roman hearer'.



FIG. 1. Denarius of 50 B.C.E. Obverse: portrait of Marcus Claudius Marcellus. Reverse: a scene from 222 B.C.E. showing Marcellus dedicating the *spolia opima* taken from Viridomarus, at the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. Scale 3:1. (Image courtesy of the Yale University Art Gallery, ©)

actually ‘look at’ Marcellus, just as Anchises orders Aeneas to do (*aspice*), in order to see what Anchises would have him see. A precise visual analogue to Anchises’ description in words can be found on a denarius of 50 B.C.E., issued by the moneyer, Publius Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (Fig. 1).

On the obverse one sees the gaunt and dead-serious *imago* of the elder Marcellus, and on the reverse he is pictured in action, playing upon his near-unique association with Romulus by dedicating the *spolia opima* in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius.³⁷ This denarius, lauding Marcus Claudius Marcellus as ‘five-times consul’ (*cos quinque*), was issued during the consulship of Gaius Claudius Marcellus, husband of Octavia and (as of 42 B.C.E., eight years after the coin’s issue) father of Marcus, the younger Marcellus. In his recent book *From Republic to Empire*, John Pollini uses this particular coin type to illustrate the idea that ‘in the late Republic it became common to represent ancestors on coins, with naturalistic images in all likelihood based on a wax ancestral mask or sculpted portrait’.³⁸ The image on the coin makes clear that what Anchises is urging Aeneas to look at, in illustration of his ‘leave the Greeks to their fine arts’ thesis, is a particular, highly legible version of the great man that many in Virgil’s audience would have known from various media: statues, signet-rings and coins, certainly, but also from the recent revivification of the elder Marcellus as a stand-out member of the ghostly parade at the younger Marcellus’ funeral. Harriet Flower has recently argued concerning the image on the coin that ‘it is possible that the iconography of Marcellus in front of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius was derived from another, much larger work of art, such as a painting’.³⁹ It is a near certainty that the man was

³⁷ Delaruelle 1913: 166 draws a strong connection between the iconography of Romulus and that of Marcellus dedicating the *spolia opima*, and he suggests that the connection would not have been lost on Virgil’s audience.

³⁸ Pollini 2012: 46.

³⁹ Flower 2000: 47. It is likely that Marcellus also appeared with the *spolia opima* within the statue group of the three Marcelli that was set up in front of the temple of Honos et Virtus. Despite being dedicated after his death, the

later monumentalized in exactly this pose, carrying the trophy of his enemy's arms, within the gallery of Roman heroes of the Forum of Augustus.⁴⁰

That is how the elder Marcellus was known 'iconically' to Virgil's audience: as the third and last Roman since Romulus to cut down an enemy commander in single combat, and strip him of his gear. It is in that pose that the elder Marcellus gets spotted as the parade's brightly-lit *dénouement*, and Anchises apparently intends him, captured in that exact pose, as the last and decisive *imago* that he needs Aeneas to see.⁴¹ But then the boy comes into view, leaving much more to be said. Given what we know of the *Aeneid* and its incessant habits of patterning and prolepsis, one sees why Anchises (which is to say Virgil) might want to end the parade exactly where he attempts to end it, with the elder Marcellus bearing the *spolia opima*. That image puts us in mind of the heartless (or is it pious, necessary, and selfless?) last imperializing act of the epic itself. Taken as Anchises intends it, as the last crucial lesson that he must have his boy learn before sending him back to the world above, one sees why Anchises needs to end on a Marcellan note. For the epic to end, and the empire to begin, Aeneas must find himself in the last image that Anchises points out. He needs to plunge his sword into the fallen Turnus, and strip him of his arms. In fact, there were not just two Romans before Marcellus to kill enemy commanders in battle and strip them of their gear, there were three: Romulus, Cossus, and Aeneas. But that only works if you count Aeneas not as a Trojan, but a Roman, and Turnus as a foreign enemy, and thus not a (proto-)Roman.⁴² Clearly much more could be said here about a dead young boy's suddenly coming into view both at the end of the parade (the younger Marcellus in the shadow of his spoil-laden ancestor) and at the poem's end (Pallas remembered via the spoils worn by Turnus), but a fuller study of that corresponsion (Pallas as Marcellus) will have to wait for another time. More on the younger Marcellus will follow below.

To this point the focus has been on taking Marcellus exactly as Anchises would have us take him: as an oak-hewn icon of selfless military *virtus*, parading the spoils of an enemy combatant. But there were other sides to the man, aspects of his public character and achievements that the picture we are given to see leaves unrendered and unspoken. As Harriet Flower has brilliantly shown, the positive traditions that gathered up around the figure of Marcellus were offset by equally strong negative traditions that sought to denigrate his achievements and destroy his fame. The existence of such wildly divergent versions of the same man, she shows, 'reflect[s] differing cultural and political concerns of later generations as they reassessed the past for their own political purposes'.⁴³ By taking these alternate traditions into account, we will see that there is much about Marcellus that does not lend itself to teaching the rigid Roman lessons that Anchises uses him to teach. In fact, as Mary Jaeger has pointed out, much of what Marcellus

temple had been vowed by Marcellus to commemorate his victory over the Gauls. For the statue group, see Blösel 2003: 55 (with descriptions of the statues' inscribed Latin *titulus* n. 12), Stewart 2004: 2–4, and Flower 1996: 71–2. Kondratieff 2014: 182 points out that there is no extant literary testimony for a non-numismatic representation of the scene described by Anchises, but that the Marcellus denarius itself indicates that statues of the type may have existed.

⁴⁰ The statue of Marcellus does not survive, but a fragment of what is likely to have been his *elogium*, referencing the *spolia opima*, has been found; see Geiger 2008: 146–7 and Itgenshorst 2005: 134. For an alternate possibility, see Degrassi *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII.3, 25 (*elogium* n. 19). There can be little doubt that within the Forum of Augustus Marcellus was depicted in his 'Romulan/Clastidian' pose, dedicating the *spolia opima*. On the conceptual and visual similarities between the heroes of the *Heldenschau* and statues in the Forum of Augustus, see Horsfall 1976: 83. On the educational and exemplary functions of the gallery of *summi viri* in the Forum of Augustus, see Suet., *Aug.* 31.5, on which see Chaplin 2000: 173–8.

⁴¹ Taking issue with Norden, who construed the appearance of the Marcelli as an appendage to the *Heldenschau*, von Albrecht 1967: 180–2 argues that the Marcelli are, in fact, the parade's epitome, and the necessary third rung of a three-part structure.

⁴² On discrepancies among the ancient sources concerning who had the right to claim and dedicate the *spolia opima*, see McDonnell 2005.

⁴³ Flower 2003: 40.

came to represent in the culture wars of the second and first centuries B.C.E. speaks directly against the lessons that Anchises is trying to teach with him, countering those lessons in no uncertain way.⁴⁴ One notes, for example, that the emphasis in the *monumentum illustre* pointed to by Anchises rests entirely on Clastidium, and that he says nothing about Marcellus' other, perhaps even his most famous, military exploit,⁴⁵ as the conqueror of Syracuse in 212 B.C.E., a feat that was lavishly celebrated in 211 by an 'Alban' triumph and *ovatio* in the city of Rome.⁴⁶

Ancient sources are powerfully divided over this Marcellus. Fabius Pictor, Rome's first historian, seems to have taken the side of his relative Cunctator, and that of the Scipiones, to the disadvantage of Marcellus in his late third- or early second-century history of Rome.⁴⁷ Early in the second century the elder Cato attacked Marcellus mercilessly for the rapacity of his sack of Syracuse, while at the same time Ennius seems to have featured him in a positive way in his *Annales*.⁴⁸ Slightly later, and here we finally have some firm ground to stand on, Polybius took special pains to denigrate Marcellus at every turn, as did Coelius Antipater, the late second-century annalist who found Marcellus irresponsible and prone to recklessness even in the act of handing Hannibal his first significant defeat, at Nola in 215 B.C.E.⁴⁹ But Marcellus comes off quite well in Livy and Plutarch especially, though both of these later writers acknowledge that the man was a source of much controversy in his own day as well as in theirs.⁵⁰ Other writers who took a special interest in Marcellus include Posidonius, Valerius Maximus, and even (if Plutarch can be believed) Augustus himself.⁵¹

⁴⁴ Jaeger 2008: ch. 4, especially 98–100.

⁴⁵ Most famous, that is, had not Virgil chosen to pose him the way he poses him in this parade. Habinek 1989: 97 points out that the term *tumulus* of l. 857 'refers to the arming of all of Italy against an irruption of the Alpine Gauls'. Accounts of Marcellus' victory at Clastidium survive in neither Polybius nor Livy. Naevius wrote a laudatory historical drama, *Clastidium*, celebrating Marcellus' winning of the *spolia opima*. The play is likely to have been put on at his funeral games in 208 B.C.E., or later (or perhaps again) in 205, when his son dedicated the temple of Honos et Virtus; see Flower 1995 and Goldberg 1995: 32–3. The brief account of Front., *Strat.* 4.4 suggests that some sources faulted Marcellus even here, in his handling of the battle against Viridomarus, accusing him of recklessness: 'Claudius Marcellus, cum in manus Gallorum imprudens incidisset.'

⁴⁶ Clausen 2002: 151: 'A Roman reader might have wondered why Anchises, in extolling the elder Marcellus, omits his greatest achievement, the siege and capture of Syracuse in 213–211 BC.' Goldschmidt 2013: 103 comments on the 'muffled' presence of the Punic Wars in the *Aeneid*, taking aim at Wigodsky 1972. The lack of explicit interest in these wars within the *Heldenschau* is especially surprising given their importance in Roman history, as well as their prominence elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (e.g. the poem of Book 1, and Books 4 and 5) and in the *Somnium Scipionis*, one of Virgil's main models for the *Heldenschau*. Reed 2007: 166 points out that: 'In Cicero, the purpose of the whole exposition is to prepare Scipio for the Roman conquests (starting with that of Carthage) and diplomatic missions for which he will become famous.'

⁴⁷ McDonnell 2006: 208 and 228 opposes Flower 2003: 43–4, in arguing that Marcellus' treatment by Fabius Pictor was likely to have been unfavourable.

⁴⁸ On Cato's speech attacking Marcellus' depredations of Syracusan statuary, see Liv. 34.4.3, and Flower 2003: 44. Cic., *Arch.* 22 indicates that the treatment of Marcellus by Ennius was highly laudatory, and not out of step with his treatment of the elder Africanus, Cato the Elder, Fabius Maximus Cunctator, and Fulvius Nobilior. On the little that can be known of Ennius' treatment of the battles for Sicily in the Second Punic War, see Goldschmidt 2013: 109–27, with specific attention to the sack of Syracuse by Marcellus pp. 113–14, n. 38.

⁴⁹ On the negative characterization of Marcellus by Coelius Antipater, see Carawan 1985.

⁵⁰ Marincola 2005: 226: 'the portrait of Marcellus is consistent and overall quite favourable: Livy knows the negative tradition but downplays it.' Further on the complex binaries at work in the characterization of Marcellus in Livy, with special attention to his being stereotyped, to some extent, as a 'rash commander', see Levene 2010: 197–214. On the lost accounts of Valerius Antias and Coelius Antipater, see Carawan 1985. On the sources behind Plutarch's account, see Scardigli 1979: 38–42, and Klotz 1934: especially 299–300 on Plutarch's use of Livy: 'so ist also eine enge Beziehung der plutarchischen Erzählung zu Livius auch hier unverkennbar.'

⁵¹ On Posidonius' lost work devoted to Marcellus, see Klotz 1934: 292–4 and Clausen 2002: 150. Augustus' writings on the death and burial of the elder Marcellus, mentioned by Plutarch at *Marc.* 29, were perhaps adapted from (if not equivalent to) the *laudatio funebris* that Augustus himself delivered at the funeral of the younger Marcellus; see Dio 53.30, SDan. *ad Aen.* 1.712, and Augustus fr. 14 Malcovati. On possible

Nearer the tail-end of a centuries-long tradition of Marcellus analysis, in the first paragraph of his biography of Marcellus Plutarch offers a picture of the man that is roughly analogous to, and in certain ways uncannily reminiscent of, the one promoted by Anchises in *Aeneid* 6. But the picture darkens considerably as Plutarch goes on to explain that Romans faulted Marcellus not only for despoiling Syracuse of its treasures, and parading statues of the gods ‘like captives’ in his triumph, but for introducing a simple people ‘accustomed only to war or agriculture’ to the fine arts, so that they became ‘idle and full of glib talk about arts and artists’. Instead of taking offence at such censure, Plutarch says, ‘Marcellus spoke of this with pride even to the Greeks, declaring that he had taught the ignorant Romans to admire and honour the wonderful and beautiful productions of Greece’ (Plut., *Marc.* 19.3–5, trans. Perrin (1917)). The problem that this raises for Anchises’ exemplification of his *excudent alii* lesson via Marcellus is obvious: in another telling, pointed to as the art-mad despoiler of Syracuse in 212 B.C.E. rather than the killer of Viridomarus in 222, Marcellus goes from being the very best illustration of Anchises’ ‘leave gorgeous statuary to the Greeks’ lesson to being arguably the worst illustration of the very same lesson. All depends on which side of the culture war you choose to see him from, and how far down into the man’s career you are willing to go.

Much of the hostility that we see ‘quoted’ from anonymous others by Plutarch in the passage cited above (in what is otherwise a very positive account) is likely to have been there, and in a very big way, already in Fabius Pictor.⁵² The battle lines over his legacy were drawn and fought over already in Marcellus’ own lifetime. In the early second century B.C.E. the elder Cato loudly opposed Marcellus’ introduction of statues from Syracuse as a menace to the state,⁵³ and by the mid-second century we see ample anti-Marcellus sentiment larded into the pages of Polybius. As Harriet Flower has pointed out: ‘[Polybius] does not ignore Marcellus but systematically denigrates his achievements, and does so *both* in the narrative he constructs *and* in the editorial/authorial comments he makes.’⁵⁴ Already in Polybius, the case against Marcellus centres primarily on his unrestrained depredations of some of the city’s most legendary works of art.⁵⁵ And yet there was another event that took place during the sack of Syracuse that quickly (quoting Jaeger) ‘became a focal point of Roman shame and regret’.⁵⁶ Namely, the thoughtless killing of Archimedes, a bumblingly wonderful old scholar who, in the chaos of the city’s last day, was burst in upon by violent, muscle-bound Roman soldiers while drawing geometrical diagrams in the dust with his *radius*. Sources are divided over the extent to which Marcellus should be blamed for his death, but it is clear that he came in for much criticism on this point already in his own day. Later sources are fairly even-handed: none makes Marcellus directly responsible for the death

connections between Anchises’ *epicedion* for the younger Marcellus and Augustus’ funeral oration in his honour, see West 1993: 294–6.

⁵² McDonnell 2006: 208. The specific way that Plutarch deploys a disparaging quip by Fabius Maximus Cunctator as the pivot that turns his description from positive to negative speaks in favour of McDonnell’s thesis.

⁵³ Livy 34.4.4: ‘infesta, mihi credite, signa ab Syracusis inlata sunt huic urbi.’ Gruen 1992: 113 points out that the speech ‘is a fiction, invented by Livy, shot through with anachronisms’, and he makes clear that the fragmentary evidence of Cato’s speeches having to do with art and military spoils (known mostly from their suggestive titles: *uti praeda in publicum referatur, de praeda militibus dividendae, ne spolia figerentur nisi de hoste capta*, and *de signis et tabulis*) does not provide evidence sufficient to establish the existence of a cultural movement hostile to the arts of the Greeks.

⁵⁴ Flower 2003: 47 (Flower’s emphasis).

⁵⁵ In *Ver.* 2.4, Cicero develops an elaborate synchrisis comparing Verres to Marcellus in order to suggest that, when it came to robbing Syracusans of their artistic treasures, the most recent sacker of the city was far more rapacious than the original one. For reasons of rhetorical effect, Marcellus is offered as a picture of restraint. For Cicero’s use of Marcellus as a contrasting *exemplum* in the *Verrines*, see Jaeger 2008: 89–90; cf. Gruen 1992: 96.

⁵⁶ Jaeger 2008: 84.

of Syracuse's most famous citizen, by that time an international treasure, esteemed by all men of learning for his studies of geometry and astronomy. And yet, as Mary Jaeger has pointed out, they expend extraordinary effort in attempting to absolve Marcellus from responsibility for Archimedes' death. Whether responsible or not, the special relevance of the elder Marcellus to the specific lessons that Anchises teaches is easy to make out: mapping the heavens with pointers and predicting the rising of the constellations by mathematical means is precisely the territory of Greek *paideia* over which Archimedes presided as a living legend. Until Marcellus came along. The historians would have us believe that Archimedes was happened upon working out problems in the dust when he was killed by Marcellus' soldiers.⁵⁷ So again, as we look to Marcellus — not the icon, but the embattled and much talked about public figure — for the specific lesson that Anchises wants to teach with him, what do we actually see? The man who thoughtlessly war-mongered his way through Syracuse, crushing whatever human treasures stood in his way? Or do we see the man who took special pains to save Archimedes, but failed to do so, then wept when reminded of his demise and personally saw to his burial?⁵⁸ According to the account given by Philus near the beginning of Cicero's *de Republica*, from the huge spoils that he hauled off from Syracuse ('ex tanta praeda domum suam deportavisset', *de Rep.* 1.21), Marcellus kept just one precious artifact for himself: a spherical globe of the heavens, made by Archimedes' own hand.

The same ancient sources who tell of Archimedes' senseless death, figuring him as helpless and hopelessly impractical, all agree that his geometrical and mathematical skills played a huge rôle in repelling the Roman assault and delaying the city's fall. Archimedes, they say, was responsible for the design and construction of numerous deadly war machines, such as long-range catapults and machines that grappled Roman ships and lifted them from the water.⁵⁹ Livy famously begins his account of the siege of Syracuse by saying that 'the first assault would have met with success, had not one man been there in Syracuse at the time: Archimedes, who was unrivalled as an observer of the heavenly constellations, and yet he was also an amazing inventor and maker of machines of war'.⁶⁰ Livy, who comes close to *ad verbum* translation of Polybius in these lines, is amazed that the mild-mannered mathematician should have been able to repel the Roman attack and mastermind the destruction of so many ships.⁶¹ After suffering huge losses in the initial assault, Marcellus decided to blockade the city and starve it into submission. Having set the blockade, he departed to attack other parts of Sicily that had thrown in with the Carthaginians.

For his part, and quite unlike Livy, Polybius is not amazed by the fact that Archimedes' mathematical studies turned out to have such lethal, real-world applications. When he resumes his account of the sack of Syracuse at 8.37 (after a lacuna), the first thing that Polybius gives his reader to see is Marcellus standing outside the walls that had defied him earlier in the same year, doing a mathematical calculation: he has just 'counted the courses of masonry (Ἐξηριθμήσατο τοὺς δόμους)' on a vulnerable spot along the wall in order to calculate the exact distance from the ground to the battlements on top. Then, Polybius continues, Marcellus has ladders built for exactly the height needed to scale the wall. He then works out the perfect moment for launching the assault, under the cover

⁵⁷ Livy 25.31 has Archimedes killed by an ignorant soldier as the old man was 'engrossed in the designs that he had drawn in the dust (*intentum formis quas in pulvere descripserat*)'. Plut., *Marc.* 19.4–6 gives several accounts of Archimedes' death, one of which has him killed by a soldier while 'engrossed in working out some calculation by means of a diagram' (ἀνασκοπῶν ἐπὶ διαγράμματος).

⁵⁸ For Marcellus weeping at the thought of Archimedes' death, see Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 6.30.26, quoted by Jaeger 2008: 82.

⁵⁹ Polybius devotes many pages to describing these devices; see Polybius 8.3–6.

⁶⁰ Livy 24.34.

⁶¹ On Livy's occasional point-for-point recasting of Polybius, see Davidson 2009: 128.

of night, in the aftermath of a festival of Artemis that leaves the Syracusans underfed and passed out from excessive drinking, something that Marcellus had anticipated. He sends a small party ahead with two ladders custom-made to scale the walls (Polybius mentions these ladders five times in the space of a page and a half). Other Roman soldiers follow. They take the battlements and towers, then descend down to the Hexapyli unnoticed; the gates are opened, Romans pour through them, and the rest, as they say, is history (except that here it is not history, because Polybius' account breaks off right at this point).

Why does Polybius put so much emphasis on the ladders, and the calculation of their exact height? To make that calculation Marcellus cannot have just 'counted the courses of masonry' (the Greek quoted above) in order to make ladders of the correct size. A section is missing from the end of this first paragraph, and in that missing section Polybius surely had to point out that, in order to get the size of the ladders right, Marcellus had to imagine them leaning against a wall so as to form a triangle. The height of the ladders had to be taller than the height of the wall by just so much, and to determine exactly by how much, he had to do some very basic geometrical calculation using what we now know as the Pythagorean theorem. Putting emphasis where it does, Polybius' account is all about Marcellus adapting to the mathematical expertise of Archimedes, in order to defeat Archimedes. It is a practical illustration of a lesson that Polybius will develop at great length in the very next book, where in section 19 he insists that the arts of a successful general must include mastery of the basics of astronomy, not only for properly timing battles, but for understanding that eclipses are natural phenomena, not portents sent from the gods; and geometry, where again the emphasis is on getting siege ladders made of exactly the right height. He gives several examples of foolish generals of the past who lost battles precisely because they did not know the basics of astronomy and geometry that could have helped them win.⁶²

It is in this one facet of his sack of Syracuse that Polybius, otherwise hostile to the man, seems to give Marcellus rare full credit. And the basic lesson he teaches with Marcellus is obvious: he took the city not by pounding it with Roman muscle, but by carefully calculating the best way to infiltrate and unleash that muscle after having been put to shame by Archimedes in the initial assault. In Polybius' telling, Marcellus became Archimedes in order to defeat him, imbibing just enough of Archimedes' own *paideia* to tilt the balance towards the Roman side. The tale is perhaps as tall as the ladders that it builds, but it makes clear just how fully loaded and malleable Marcellus was as a symbol to fight with in the culture wars of the second century and beyond.

IV ON REDUCING MEN INTO MONUMENTS

In Book 11 of the *Odyssey*, having been instructed by Circe, the epic's wandering hero makes his way to the underworld to see Teiresias, who gives him information crucial to his finding, and taking back, his home. In Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, having been instructed by Helenus, Aeneas makes his way to Hades to see Anchises, who tells him that he has a home to fight for in Italy, and that the fight for that home will be much bigger than he realizes, carried forward by his descendants beyond the borders of any world that he knows. Odyssean memories provide basic coordinates, even as they are radically departed from and remade.⁶³ At times these memories of Odysseus' *nostos* are

⁶² On Polybius' insistence that military commanders should learn the basics of astronomy, see Bowen 2002: 93–4. Val. Max. 8.11.1–2 makes a similar case for the 'great effects of the arts', citing the case of Sulpicius Gallus whose readings *in omni genere litterarum* paid off when he 'discoursed expertly on the nature of the stars' to convince his troops that the eclipse by which they were terrified was in fact a regular activity of nature.

⁶³ On the *Aeneid* as an Odyssean *nostos*, see Barchiesi 2015: 118 and Cairns 1989.

subsumed by other memories that provide new structures for readers to orient themselves by within an ever-changing, yet always strangely familiar, landscape. Odysseus' visit to the underworld in *Odyssey* 11, the *teichoscopia* of *Iliad* 3, Plato's Myth of Er, and its Ciceronian counterpart in the 'Dream of Scipio' (*de Republica* 6) are among the more obvious and better studied of literary memories that pop into view in the *Heldenschau*, helping readers thread their way along.⁶⁴ But along that path these memories are encountered not merely as patterns and points of interest that have been met up with before in books, but as memories radically re-imagined both 'by' and 'as' the cultural traditions of Rome: the Roman aristocratic funeral, republican hero galleries and *atria* with their *tituli* and *elogia*, the Roman triumph, the censor's *recognitio equitum*, and so on.⁶⁵ Perhaps more so than anywhere else in the *Aeneid*, in the *Heldenschau* of Book 6, Roman cultural structures are worked into patterns remembered from books, and book memories are made over as cultural practice.

Anchises' Marcellus, we have seen, is not every Roman's Marcellus. He is the man that Anchises needs Aeneas to see, rendered as an icon, an instrument of culture, for the promotion of certain values. But the specific values that this 'instrumentalized' Marcellus is tasked with illustrating rustle with memories from late in his career that run directly counter to the *imago* offered by Anchises. These memories, we have seen, bring to mind versions of the man that featured him promoting exactly those frivolous, non-Roman things that Anchises uses him to urge 'remembering' Romans to eschew. As Mary Jaeger, the one scholar to have noted and probed into these ironies, has shown, even the one item on Anchises' list that bears no obvious Marcellan stamp (i.e. technical expertise in pleading court cases) has strong associations with Syracuse.⁶⁶ For it was in Syracuse that Corax and/or Tisias devised the first handbook(s) on the 'Art of Rhetoric' (ἡ τέχνη λόγων), and it was from Sicily that these arts made their way to Athens, where they were much deplored by later moralists, such as Plato.⁶⁷ Among the several ironies produced by Marcellus' failure to neatly match up to his exemplary purpose, there is a dramatic irony that finds viewers/readers of Anchises' hero tour knowing important things that Aeneas himself does not (on which, more below). But there is another conjoined irony that finds readers being made aware of how partial, ideologically angled, and untrue to life the shown version of the man is.⁶⁸ This latter ('Romantic') irony is perhaps the more provocative, precisely because there is nothing particularly noteworthy about Marcellus' having been radically reduced and spiffed up for public view. The same might be said of all the *monumenta illustria* that Anchises has given his son to see, just as it might be said of their many counterparts in marble and bronze decorating the various public and private hero galleries of Rome, such as (somewhat later, but rightly considered relevant) the Forum of Augustus. For without such radical reductions of men into monuments emblazoned with 'expertly reticent' *elogia*, Romans

⁶⁴ For a point-by-point comparison of Virgil's *Heldenschau* and Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, see Lamacchia 1964. As an imitation of Homer's *teichoscopia*, see Norden 1957: 312.

⁶⁵ On the various Roman cultural practices that have been proposed as models for Virgil's *Heldenschau*, with specific emphasis on the censor's *recognitio equitum*, see Kondratieff 2014.

⁶⁶ Jaeger 2008: 98: 'Anchises does not name the "others" who will be better sculptors, orators, and astronomers ... but nothing rules out projecting an image of Syracuse onto the outline of these "others". After all, Syracuse's art was famous, tradition credited the invention of systematic rhetoric to Syracusans, and Archimedes was a "unique watcher of the sky" (Livy 23.34.2). Moreover, after apostrophizing the future Roman, Anchises draws attention to Marcellus.'

⁶⁷ Cic., *Brut.* 46: 'sublati in Sicilia tyrannis ... tum primum, quod esset acuta illa gens et controversiae nata, artem et praecepta Siculos Coracem et Tisiam conscripsisse.' On Tisias and Corax as semi-mythical inventors of the art of rhetoric, see Cole 1991 and De Jonge 2015. For a typical 'Socratic' dismissal of Tisias as a purveyor of dangerous sophistries, see Plato, *Phaedrus* 267A and 273A–274A.

⁶⁸ On 'Romantic irony' having to do with readers being made aware of the failure of texts (even texts that 'say I') to contain selves in anything other than absurdly reduced forms, see Fowler 1994: 9 and Freudenburg 2010: 274–6.

would have no *monumenta* to put on display.⁶⁹ The Marcellus of the *Heldenschau* has had the greater part of himself pared away as so much un-cooperative human scree. But some of the most colourful of his unsuitable bits have been left to hide in plain sight by Virgil, touched on by the provocative ‘Marcellan’ associations of the *excudent alii priamel*. But why leave them there to be noticed, or passed over?⁷⁰ There are many ways one could go with this, but I prefer to think that the ironies inherent in these lines, if picked up on, invite readers of the *Heldenschau* to look into themselves as consumers of, and revellers in, Anchises’ blatantly patriotic tour of Rome’s rise to greatness. In the tension that holds between what is shown of Marcellus by Anchises and what was known of him from multiple other tellings, (we)/Virgil’s Roman readers must come face to face with (our)/their own penchant for telling, and wanting to be told, and to buy into, useful lies: lies of omission and creative un-remembering, told for the sake of making instruments of culture (Roman ‘monuments’) out of mere Roman men.

Often in Virgil, it is the tail-end of a scene of extended viewing where especially eye-catching and sorrowful things suddenly come into view: Penthesileia, for example, spotted still fighting at the end of the temple ecphrasis in Book 1; Camilla astride her horse at the parade’s end that concludes Book 7; the belt of Pallas spotted in the epic’s last lines. The sudden, sad appearance of the younger Marcellus at the end of the *Heldenschau* hews to the same general pattern⁷¹ (a pattern that derives ultimately from Homer⁷²), but its closest counterpart in the *Aeneid* is the scene of extended gazing to which the *Heldenschau* serves as a bookend at the close of the same book. On the doors of Apollo’s temple, Daedalus has carved his own most glorious achievements: Pasiphaë’s cow, the labyrinth cleverly threaded, and so on, contrivances of high Greek *ars/tέχνη*, utterly unlike the stiff, empire-inspiring *imagines* studied at the book’s end. Anyone reading that story, panel by panel, would have to be amazed by the hero’s achievements, just as Aeneas clearly is. But that same reader, again like Aeneas, would also be left completely in the dark about what happens to be the one most famous episode of Daedalus’ legend: the death of Icarus by means of the most magnificent of the artist’s many contrivances, i.e. the wings that he devised for his escape from Crete, and that he fixed as wings of victory, and symbols of vows fulfilled, inside the temple at Cumae. It turns out that this, his life’s greatest achievement, is also his biggest failure and cause of regret, and a story much too sad for him to tell. And thus, what he carves on the temple doors, as a public spectacle of his life, is a partial truth: a hero story neatly set off in

⁶⁹ Beard 1998: 88 uses the phrase ‘expertly reticent’ to describe the *elogium* of Marius’ statue in the Forum of Augustus. For a study of the *elogium* (with text and translation) as a deliberate manipulation of memory, see Gowing 2005: 142–4.

⁷⁰ Feeney 1986 was the first to point out how numerous ambiguities and painful details of Rome’s history are larded into the parade, and that these might reasonably be taken to qualify the triumphalism that the parade trumpets. His reading has been seconded by Thomas 2001: 209–13, within a larger study of the ‘policing of the parade’ by scholars committed to cleansing the text of its uncertainties. See also O’Hara 1990: 116–22 on the *Heldenschau* as a prophecy that leaves Aeneas with a vague and overly optimistic sense of Rome’s future, but with little sense of the true costs (to himself and others) of the wars he will fight. Firmly on the side of taking the parade as unambiguous panegyric is West 1993. Slightly more amenable to Feeney’s argument, though sceptical of it, is Horsfall 2013: 513–14.

⁷¹ See Austin 1977: 264–5.

⁷² The *teichoscopia* of *Iliad* Book 3 sets the pattern of a surprise turn taken towards *pathos* at the end of a scene of extended viewing. After telling Priam about the Greek warriors who have come into *his* field of view, Helen scans the battlefield *for herself*, looking for two men she has been wanting to see, but has not yet managed to find: her brothers, Castor and Polydeuces. She is sure that they must be there. Unable to find them, Helen surmises that they must have stayed behind in Sparta, too ashamed to make the trip to Troy, because of her. Little does Helen know, Homer adds, that ‘the earth already held them fast, long dead in the life-giving earth of Lacedaemon’. The last warriors taken note of in the *teichoscopia*, then, are men looked for, but not caught sight of: beautiful young warriors who died before their proper time, and Helen has yet to be apprised of her loss. Similarly, at the end of the *Heldenschau*, for the first time Aeneas undertakes to look *for himself*, and he fixes his attention on a beautiful young man who was fated to die before his time.

panels, all about Daedalus' clever adventures in monster making (the cow), monster trapping (the labyrinth), and monster killing (not Ariadne's thread, but *his*, and with no sign of Theseus anywhere in sight).⁷³ It is a story where his inventions save young boys and girls from being killed, and do not kill them; where that sort of devastating pathos is encountered at the story's beginning ('septena ... corpora natorum', ll. 21–2), as something gotten away from, thanks to our hero, rather than at its end. And yet, considering that it is so untrue to the whole of his real life, the story that Daedalus carves ends up being unusually clunky for the work of a master artist. By writing it the way he does, leaving the last panel uncarved, he has deliberately chosen not to supply the final, master touch that would have given the work a neatly balanced, interlocking chiasmic structure (*A/B/main verb/b/a*)⁷⁴ that one might expect of a story crafted by someone of his calibre: (A) dead children; (B) hero undertakes to save children; (*main verb*) the monster is slain; (b) hero undertakes to save child; (a) dead child.⁷⁵ As a decision taken by the world's greatest artist, the choice to leave Icarus uncarved stands out as deliberately ruinous, like a slash running through a masterwork, inflicted by the artist's own hand. The ideal opportunity for achieving a perfect harmonization of art with the artist's own real life has been skipped over by Daedalus, left as a panel that he refuses to finish on the monument of his life's greatest works.

Monuments do not remember, they 'warn' and 'remind'.⁷⁶ By definition, they are cues to memory, and not the thing itself. As such, they do not 'keep' memories as so many things collected and held in store. Recent studies of memory in Virgil have not only explored how the *Aeneid* crafts a new collective historical monument for Rome (looking especially at what gets played up, forgotten, and/or repressed in the process of monumentalization), but they have also shown how remembering is itself an act of construction: not a matter of calling up facts and experiences from the past (mere 'recall' of stockpiled items), but an active process of reshaping the past and imposing fresh interpretations on those facts and experiences; a process more about doing (selecting, forgetting, re-interpreting, re-narrativizing) than receiving.⁷⁷ In other words, it is not just the monuments' artisans, such as Daedalus and Anchises, who create in the crafting of cultural reminders, but those who engage with their works are equally creative in the memories they make from those reminders.

Perhaps the best example of the personally constructivist nature of 'remembering' in the *Aeneid* is to be found early on in the poem, when Aeneas scans the temple frieze at Carthage (*Aen.* 1.453–93). There Aeneas sees the war that destroyed his life painted as a strictly sequential narrative (*ex ordine*, l. 456), but he does not work through the events depicted in the order in which they are laid out. Instead he picks out whatever details happen to catch his eye: an elderly king threatened by brutish violence on all sides; Greeks slaughtering men in their sleep, ambushing and killing mere children, terrifying pious Trojan women, and selling princely corpses to devastated relatives in return for piles of gold. Aeneas sees no heroism here, only Greek bloodthirstiness, greed, and brutality. As Alessandro Schiesaro has recently argued, in a brilliant reading of this scene as a study in the workings of memory, Aeneas is not (just) reading a story, he is telling one, using the images of the frieze as a series of 'passive props for an active

⁷³ On the strange emphases and omissions of the scenes carved on the doors of Apollo's temple, see Casali 1995.

⁷⁴ This is the structure of what would later be known as a 'golden line'.

⁷⁵ Ovid completes the chiasmus begun by Daedalus by making an end of Virgil's beginning. At *Met.* 8.236 he re-assigns the phrase that Virgil had used to describe the dead youth of Athens (*corpora natorum*, l. 22) to the fallen Icarus, buried by his father: 'hunc miseri tumulo ponentem *corpora nati*.'

⁷⁶ Cic., *ad Caes.* fr. 7 Shackleton Bailey (= Nonius 47 Lindsay): 'sed ego quae monumenti ratio sit nomine ipso admoneor, ad memoriam magis spectare debet posteritatis, quam ad praesentis temporis gratiam.'

⁷⁷ See especially Berlin 1998, Fowler 2000, Seider 2013, and Schiesaro 2015.

re-enactment' of his past.⁷⁸ What we end up with, then, is a version of Troy's fall that is profoundly shaped by the viewer's emotional state, told as a tragic tale where men who are otherwise the greatest of Greek heroes have nothing heroic about them. Instead they are devious killers and violent marauders, not because that is how they are represented on the frieze, but because that is the way that Aeneas remembers them. That is, in fact, what he sees, and his way of 'seeing' his past in the ecphrasis in Book 1 becomes his way of 'telling' the story of Troy's fall in Book 2, as a crime pulled off by bloodthirsty liars who butcher children and relish the slaughter of helpless old men.

Aeneas engages with the frieze as a monument to Trojan sorrow (*sunt lacrimae rerum*, l. 462), but that has little if anything to do with the purposes of the frieze, or with what the artists can reasonably be presumed to have intended. This is Juno's temple, after all. The fall of Troy is her greatest triumph. That is why Troy's destruction is pictured on the temple wall: not because the Carthaginians somehow feel compelled to remind viewers of the sorrows of Juno's greatest enemy, but because they want to celebrate Juno's magnificent powers in crushing them. The bloodier the representation the better. But Aeneas sees none of that. In fact, his failure to pick out a single god in the course of his sorrowful and disgusted reading of the frieze is one of the scene's most remarkable features — and yet, to my knowledge, no scholar has ever raised this issue as a problem worth pondering. How can a frieze relating the events of Homer's *Iliad* not have gods here and there at least, if not depicted in nearly every scene, looking down from Olympus, coaching heroes, and fighting battles? How can Juno not have been depicted on her own temple frieze as the central, and most eye-catching, figure of all? Gods must have been everywhere on this frieze, and yet they are nowhere in sight. Their absence, I suggest, is less a matter of Carthaginian (Semitic) artisans refusing to represent the divine than it is a matter of how Aeneas engages with the frieze from his own angry, and deeply traumatized, perspective. From that perspective he can see no gods orchestrating Troy's destruction. He sees only a cruel and utterly 'godless' mistake, no matter how many gods he may actually see before him on the frieze itself. Their absence from (his relating of) the temple ecphrasis of Book 1 becomes all the more pronounced when one considers how absurdly 'theomachic' and god-driven the depiction of Actium is on Aeneas' shield in Book 8.⁷⁹ In poring over the details of the shield, Aeneas sees gods brightly pictured at the centre of the work's central scene, dominating a battle that many Romans remembered from their own lived experience. None of the combatants who fought at Actium (one suspects) could recall seeing massively large gods, anthropomorphic, dog-headed, or otherwise, clashing on either side. For those who fought the battle, it was all just the ugly mess of war. Obviously the change from Book 1 to Book 8 in Aeneas' way of seeing things is drastic, and deserves much more study than I can devote to it here. It may have something to do with Vulcan's choice to depict future events in a (Homeric) mode that puts gods front and centre. But it may also have to do with changes in Aeneas himself, or with the shield's being for him not a reminder of past experiences (a *monumentum*), but a scene pointing to a future (Virgil's own recent past) that Aeneas cannot begin to comprehend. This time there is no Anchises on hand to steer his vision and interpret what he sees.

I say all of this about the complex ways of crafting monuments, and making memories from them, because all that I have said about the *Aeneid's* inset artisans, and the inset readers who interpret their works, might be said about the craftwork of Virgil himself, as a maker of the *Aeneid*, and the rôle that readers play in taking up with the work's 'reminders' and converting them into 'memories' of many (often radically opposed) kinds. As we have seen, the elder Marcellus, as Anchises gives Aeneas to see him, is a

⁷⁸ Schiesaro 2015: 168.

⁷⁹ On theomachy in Roman epic, see Chaudhuri 2014.

product of Anchises' own handicraft: an icon of values heavily struck, so as to be rugged, unchallengeable, and unyielding. Wanting to end on a high (Ennian/triumphal) note, Anchises steers his son's gaze towards the dazzling glare of a Roman empire-builder parading his enemy's spoils.⁸⁰ But what Aeneas catches sight of, and makes his father explain to him, is the curiously downcast figure at the dazzling man's side, so easily lost in the glare of his halo. Like his artisan counterpart in Daedalus, Anchises chose to leave the dead boy unrendered, thinking that his was a tale too sad to tell, and no suitable way to end the kind of story that he was trying to tell. The sudden appearance of the younger Marcellus is that last master stroke that Daedalus could not bring himself to provide; an unexpected, sorrowful coda that defies being made sense of as the handicraft of Providence, and the end to which everything leads. Like a baleful star rising at the parade's end, the younger Marcellus points to what lies ahead for Aeneas, and for the poem's darkly disorienting end: to those beautiful young men that Aeneas will sadly see killed, and to those other beautiful young men that he will see to killing, and to stripping of their spoils. Looked back upon from its last scene, from the place where Anchises has the least control of it, the *Heldenschau* seems much less certain in the sense it makes, and in the values it puts on display. The sudden appearance of the younger Marcellus lets us know that things 'inconvenient' to the story have been left out, and that other versions of Rome's story might be constructed from things that have been helpfully kept from our view.⁸¹ For his part, the elder Marcellus shows traces of having been 'willed into convenience' for the sake of the story that he is needed to tell. In both cases, the stories of the Marcelli are told in ways that call attention to the repairs and helpful elisions that have gone into their figuration as heroes. In telling their stories the way he tells them, Virgil lets us in on a dirty secret: that Roman heroes are 'made' rather than just 'are'. That says something about the way Virgil writes, certainly, but more importantly it touches on the work that readers must do to authorize Virgil's (or any other author's) 'parade of heroes' as heroic. In any such parade, the work of spotting 'heroes', and of assigning values to their achievements, falls to readers, whether that is fully in keeping with, or in spite of, whatever the writer writes, and whatever guidance he (or any inset guide, such as Anchises) provides.⁸² How that authoring/authorizing work is performed, and thus the sense that is made of the parade, will depend largely upon where we/Roman readers fix our sights, and from atop whose *tumulus* we choose to view the parade. In the end, that is where meanings happen, where values are assigned, and 'heroic' epics are written: what one viewer goggles at as an underworld *Heldenschau* rising gloriously into the light, another looks upon as the hell that Rome will unleash (because it did unleash it) on the world.

Yale University

kirk.freudenburg@yale.edu

⁸⁰ On the Ennian rise of the parade's conclusion, see Norden 1957: 315–16, and Austin 1977 ad 842, 846, and 857. For Anchises' underworld encounter with Aeneas as a restaging of the opening scene of the *Annales*, in which Ennius encounters the shade of Homer, establishing Ennius' place in the succession of epic poets, see Hardie 1998: 53–4. Laudizi 1990: 51 comments on Anchises' desire to omit the younger Marcellus from the parade, connecting Aeneas' demand to know more to an awareness that real life is much harder than what he has been given to see.

⁸¹ O'Hara 1990: 116: 'We could say that Aeneas, unlike Turnus, is misled for his own good, because at any given moment a true picture of what lay ahead for him would have crushed his already flagging spirits and made him unable to continue.'

⁸² See Fowler 2000: 209, reacting to the 'monumental hermeneutics' of Galinsky. For the latest monumental effort to establish a single best and right way of reading the work (as a poem 'underpinning' Augustan power), see Stahl 2016.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, W. S. 1969: *The Art of the Aeneid*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Aston, A. E. 1978: *Cato the Censor*, Oxford
- Austin, R. G. 1977: *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, Oxford
- Barchiesi, A. 2015: *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative*, Princeton
- Beard, M. 1998: 'Vita inscripta', in *La Biographie antique*, Fondation Hardt Entretiens 44, Geneva, 83–114
- Berlin, N. 1998: 'War and remembrance: *Aeneid* 12.54–60 and Aeneas' memory of Troy', *American Journal of Philology* 119, 11–41
- Bettini, M. 1991: *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, Baltimore
- Blösel, W. 2003: 'Die *memoria* der *gentes* als Rückgrat der kollektiven Erinnerung im republikanischen Rom', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi and U. Walter (eds), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, Darmstadt, 53–72
- Bowen, A. 2002: 'The art of the commander and the emergence of predictive astronomy', in C. J. Tuplin and T. E. Rihll (eds), *Science and Mathematics in Ancient Greek Culture*, Oxford, 76–111
- Brink, C. O. 1971: *Horace on Poetry: The 'Ars Poetica'*, Cambridge
- Burke, P. 1979: 'Roman rites for the dead and *Aeneid* 6', *The Classical Journal* 74, 220–8
- Cairns, F. 1989: *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge
- Carawan, E. 1985: 'The tragic history of Marcellus and Livy's characterization', *The Classical Journal* 80, 131–41
- Casali, S. 1995: 'Aeneas and the doors of the temple of Apollo', *The Classical Journal* 91, 1–9
- Chaplin, J. 2000: *Livy's Exemplary History*, Oxford
- Chaudhuri, P. 2014: *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry*, Oxford
- Clausen, W. 2002: *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*, Leipzig
- Clay, J. 2011: *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*, Cambridge
- Cole, T. 1991: 'Who was Corax?' *Illinois Classical Studies* 16, 65–84
- Davidson, J. 2009: 'Polybius', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 123–36
- De Jonge, C. 2015: 'Sicily and the birth of rhetoric', in D. Burgersdijk, R. Calis, J. Kelder, A. Sofroniew, S. Tusa and R. von Beek (eds), *Sicily and the Sea*, Zwolle, 62–4
- Delaruelle, L. 1913: 'Les souvenirs d'oeuvres plastiques dans la revue des héros au livre VI de l'*Énéide*', *Revue Archéologique* 1, 153–70
- Dufallo, B. 2007: *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*, Columbus, OH
- Fantham, E. 2006: *Julia Augusti, the Emperor's Daughter*, London and New York
- Feeney, D. C. 1986: 'History and revelation in Vergil's underworld', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 32, 1–24
- Feeney, D. C. 2007: *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley
- Flower, H. 1995: 'Fabulae praetextae in context', *Classical Quarterly* 45, 170–90
- Flower, H. 1996: *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford
- Flower, H. 2000: 'The tradition of the *spolia opima*: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus', *Classical Antiquity* 19, 34–64
- Flower, H. 2003: 'Memories of Marcellus: history and memory in Roman republican culture', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi and U. Walter (eds), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, Darmstadt, 39–52
- Flower, H. 2009: 'Alternatives to written history in republican Rome', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 65–76
- Fowler, D. 1994: 'Postmodernism, Romantic irony, and classical closure', in I. J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan (eds), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, Leiden, 231–56
- Fowler, D. 2000: 'The ruins of time: monuments and survival at Rome', in D. Fowler (ed.), *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*, Oxford, 193–217
- Freudenburg, K. 1993: *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton
- Freudenburg, K. 2010: 'Horatius anceps: persona and self-revelation in satire and song', in G. Davis (ed.), *A Companion to Horace*, Chichester, 271–90
- Geiger, J. 2008: *The First Hall of Fame: a Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*, Leiden
- Goldberg, S. 1995: *Epic in Republican Rome*, Oxford

- Goldschmidt, N. 2013: *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford
- Gowing, A. 2005: *Empire and Memory: the Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge
- Gruen, E. 1992: *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, Ithaca, NY
- Habinek, T. N. 1989: 'Science and tradition in Aeneid 6', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92, 223–55
- Hardie, P. 1998: *Virgil, Greece & Rome*, New Surveys in the Classics, Oxford
- Henderson, J. 1997: *Figuring Out Roman Nobility: Juvenal's Eighth Satire*, Exeter
- Horsfall, N. 1976: 'Virgil, history and the Roman tradition', *Prudentia* 8, 73–89
- Horsfall, N. 2011: 'Excudent alii', *Vergilius* 57, 63–73
- Horsfall, N. 2013: *Virgil Aeneid 6: a Commentary*, Berlin
- Itgenshorst, T. 2005: *Tota illa pompa: der Triumph in der römischen Republik*, Göttingen
- Jackson, D. 1987: 'Verism and the ancestral portrait', *Greece and Rome* 34, 32–47
- Jaeger, M. 2008: *Archimedes and the Roman Imagination*, Ann Arbor
- Kirichenko, A. 2013: 'Virgil's Augustan temples: image and intertext in the Aeneid', *Journal of Roman Studies* 103, 65–87
- Klotz, A. 1934: 'Die Quellen der plutarchischen Lebensbeschreibung des Marcellus', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 83, 289–316
- Kondratieff, E. 2014: 'Future city in the heroic past: Rome, Romans, and Roman landscapes in Aeneid 6–8', in A. Kemezis (ed.), *Urban Dreams and Reality in Antiquity*, Leiden, 165–228
- Lamacchia, R. 1964: 'Ciceros Somnium Scipionis und das sechste Buch der Aeneis', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 107, 261–78
- Laudizi, G. 1990: 'L'episodio di Marcello (VERG. Aen. 6, 860–886)', in E. Cadoni (ed.), *Seminari sassaresi II*, Sassari, 47–61
- Levene, D. 2010: *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford
- Marincola, J. 2005: 'Marcellus at Syracuse (Livy XXV, 24, 11–15): a historian reflects', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII*, Brussels, 219–29
- McDonnell, M. 2005: 'Aristocratic competition, horses, and the *spolia opima* once again', in J.-J. Aubert and S. Várhelyi (eds), *A Tall Order: Writing the Social History of the Ancient World: Essays in Honor of William V. Harris*, Munich, 145–68
- McDonnell, M. 2006: *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge
- Mellor, R. 2002: *The Roman Historians*, London and New York
- Nisbet, R., and Rudd, N. 2014: *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*, Oxford
- Norden, E. 1957: *Die Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (4th edn), Stuttgart
- O'Hara, J. 1990: *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton
- Pandey, N. 2014: 'Reading Rome from the farther shore: Aeneid 6 in the Augustan urban landscape', *Vergilius* 60, 85–116
- Pollini, J. 2012: *From Republic to Empire*, Norman, OK
- Pollitt, J. 1965: *The Art of Greece, 1400–31 B.C.: Sources and Documents*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Pollitt, J. 1978: 'The impact of Greek art on Rome', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 108, 155–74
- Rawson, E. 1985: *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London
- Reed, J. 2007: *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*, Princeton
- Roller, M. 2009: 'The exemplary past in Roman historiography and culture', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 214–23
- Scardigli, B. 1979: *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs*, Munich
- Schiesaro, A. 2015: 'Emotions and memory in Virgil's Aeneid', in D. Cairns and L. Fulkerson (eds), *Emotions between Greece and Rome*, London, 163–76
- Seider, A. M. 2013: *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid*, Cambridge
- Skard, E. 1965: 'Die Heldenschau in Vergils Aeneis', *Symbolae Osloenses* 40, 53–65
- Smith, A. 2005: *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*, Austin, TX
- Stahl, H.-P. 2016: *Poetry Underpinning Power: Vergil's Aeneid: The Epic for Emperor Augustus*, Swansea
- Stewart, P. 2004: *Roman Art*, Oxford
- Stok, F. 1988: *Percorsi dell'esegesi virgiliana: due ricerche sull'Eneide*, Pisa
- Syme, R. 1939: *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford
- Tarrant, R. 2012: *Virgil Aeneid Book XII*, Cambridge

- Thomas, R. 2001: *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, Cambridge
- von Albrecht, M. 1967: 'Vergils Geschichtsauffassung in der "Heldenschau"', *Wiener Studien* 80, 156–82
- West, D. 1993: 'The pageant of heroes as panegyric', in H. D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*, Liverpool, 283–96
- Wigodsky, M. 1972: *Virgil and Early Latin Poetry*, Hermes Einzelschriften 24, Wiesbaden
- Williams, R. D. 1972: 'The pageant of Roman heroes – *Aeneid* 6.756–853', in J. R. C. Martyn (ed.), *Cicero and Virgil: Studies in Honour of Harold Hunt*, Amsterdam, 207–17