Inscribing Augustan Personae: Epigraphic Conventions and Memory Across Genres

Morgan E. Palmer

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2014

Reading Committee:

Alain M. Gowing, Chair

Catherine M. Connors

Stephen E. Hinds

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Classics

University of Washington

Abstract

Inscribing Augustan Personae: Epigraphic Conventions and Memory Across Genres

Morgan E. Palmer

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Professor Alain M. Gowing

Department of Classics

This dissertation investigates the ways in which authors writing during the reign of the emperor Augustus, a period of increased epigraphic activity, appropriate epigraphic conventions in their work. Livy, Ovid, and Virgil furnish case studies to explore the ways in which Augustan authors create epigraphic intertexts that call upon readers to remember and synthesize literary and epigraphic sources. Investigation of Livy is foundational to my discussion of Ovid and Virgil because his selective treatment of epigraphic sources illustrates how inscriptions can be both authoritative and subjective. Augustan poets exploit the authority and subjectivity of inscriptions in accordance with their own authorial purposes and the genres in which they write, appropriating epigraphic conventions in ways that are both traditional and innovative. This blending of tradition and innovation parallels how the emperor himself used inscriptions to shape and control his own persona. The distinctive authority and influence of inscriptions, although not limited to the Augustan era, is characteristic of Augustan writing across genres.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the product of many years of work on Augustan literature and epigraphy at the University of Washington and Brown University. In the course of studying and writing on these topics, I have met many friends, teachers, students, and scholars who have provided encouragement while introducing me to new ideas, and it is my pleasure to acknowledge them here.

I would like to acknowledge all of the support that I have received at the University of Washington. My dissertation director, Alain Gowing, enthusiastically supported my research interests while introducing me to innovative ideas about memory and Roman culture. Catherine Connors and Stephen Hinds have both provided invaluable and thoughtful advice during the dissertation process and at the earlier stages of my graduate career, and I am delighted that they are serving as members of the dissertation reading committee. In addition, I would like to thank Ruby Blondell, Deborah Kamen, Olga Levaniouk, and Brigitte Prutti for serving as members of my doctoral supervisory committee. I would also like to thank Larry Bliquez, Jim Clauss, Daniel Harmon, Alex Hollmann, and Kate Topper. In addition, the dissertation has benefitted from discussion with participants in a series of digital humanities workshops sponsored by the Simpson Center for the Humanities at the University of Washington. My research at the University of Washington was supported by Jim Greenfield Graduate and Dissertation Fellowships, as well as travel awards in the form of Jim Greenfield Travel Bursaries, a Nesholm Family Endowed Fellowship, Phillip and Estelle DeLacy Fellowship travel awards, and a Graduate School Fund for Excellence and Innovation Travel Fund Award, and I am grateful for all of this generous support.

I would also like to thank my teachers and mentors from Brown University who, like the faculty at the University of Washington, introduced me to many of the ideas and methodologies that are in this dissertation, and did so with warm enthusiasm and encouragement. Joseph Pucci taught me about allusion in Latin literature while serving as a kind and dedicated advisor. John Bodel introduced me to Latin epigraphy, and has been a warm and enthusiastic mentor. Pura Nieto-Hernandez provided kind support and encouragement inside and outside of the classroom. Michael Putnam introduced me to many ideas that have shaped my teaching and research on Virgil, and I am grateful to him for his warm encouragement. I would also like to thank the other members of the faculty, including Deborah Boedeker, David Konstan, and Kurt Raaflaub. My research at Brown was supported by Karen T. Romer Undergraduate Teaching and Research Assistantship awards, and I am grateful for the opportunities that this program helped to make possible. I am delighted to have been a part of two institutions and departments that work hard to foster a welcoming environment for students and colleagues.

This project has also benefitted from insightful comments and kind support from friends and colleagues in Seattle and farther afield. For thoughtful questions and comments from colleagues at the University of Washington I thank Matthew Gorey, Josh Hartman, Brandon Jones, Eunice Kim, Bridget Langley, Megan O'Donald, and Adriana Vazquez. For helpful questions and comments at the 2014 APA meeting in Chicago I thank Richard Thomas, Christina Perkell, Leo Landrey, and Elena Giusti. I also thank Jocelyne Nelis-Clément and Damien Nelis for sharing with me their chapter "Furor Epigraphicus: Augustus, the Poets, and the Inscriptions" before publication. I also thank Peter Barrios-Lech, Bryan Brinkman, Liz Dollins, Martin Halprin, Colin Shelton, Janice So, and my high school Latin teacher Maria Cherry, as well as many other helpful friends, colleagues, teachers, and classmates for their encouragement,

knowledge, and enthusiasm over the years. I would also like to thank my students for their hard work and enthusiasm. Last but not least I would like to thank my family and my friends. Of course, I am responsible for the content of this dissertation, and any oversights or errors are my own.

Abbreviations

Here follows a list of abbreviations for epigraphic *corpora* used in this dissertation. Abbreviations for Classical authors and works follow the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, and abbreviations for journals follow the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

AE	*L'Année Épigraphique* (Paris 1888–)
CCA	*Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque*, M. J. Vermaseren (Leiden 1977)
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Theodor Mommsen et al. (Berlin 1863–)
CLE	*Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Buecheler (Stuttgart 1894–)
CLENuovo	*Per un nuovo Corpus dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica. Materiali e discussioni*, P. Cugusi (Rome 2007)
CSE	*Carmina Saturnia Epigraphica*, P. Kruschwitz (Stuttgart 2002)
EAOR	*Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano*, vol. 1, Roma, P. Sabbatini Tumolesi (Rome 1988)
EDCS	*Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby* <http://www.manfredclauss.de/>
EE	*Ephemeris Epigraphica*, W. Henzen (Rome and Berlin 1872–1913)
GLIStone	*Greek and Latin Inscriptions on Stone in the Collection of Charles University*, V. Marek (Prague 1977)
ILLRP	*Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, A. Degrassi (Florence 1957–1963)
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, H. Dessau (Berlin 1892–1916)
InscrIt	*Inscriptiones Italiae* (Rome 1931–)
MNR	*Museo Nazionale Romano* (Rome 1983)

Introduction

spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum,
et visum lecto Caesare maius opus. (Ov. *Fast*. 5.567–68)

And he looks at the temple bordered with the name Augustus,
and the work seems greater with Caesar having been read.

Ovid illustrates the visual power of Augustus' inscriptions in the lines above, describing the presence of the emperor's name on the temple of Mars Ultor in the Augustan forum, as viewed by Mars himself. Alföldy begins his seminal study on Augustan epigraphy with this passage, noting that it indicates the importance that contemporaries of Augustus placed on his inscriptions (1991: 290).[1] Mars' reaction mirrors the reaction that Augustus or those writing in his service presumably intended to elicit from viewers, who would have seen the inscription and considered the added authority that Augustus' name gave to the temple.[2] The inscription would have served as a signal of the emperor's integration of his own persona into this and other Roman monuments.[3] By mentioning this inscription and Mars' reaction to it explicitly, Ovid appropriates both epigraphic conventions and the way in which Augustan readers would have responded to them. This is one of many epigraphic appropriations in Augustan literature, which occur across genres, reflecting creative innovation on the epigraphic tradition, as well as growing awareness of the emperor's own epigraphic activities and their impact on Rome.

[1] Cf. Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 330–31.

[2] Of course, we cannot assume that everyone would have been able to read the inscription. Harris, discussing the difficulty of assessing literacy levels, notes that "Where inscriptions were put up, there was literacy; but how much there was remains to be investigated" (1989: 11). It is possible that even those who were not fully literate might have recognized Augustus' name on this and other inscriptions. As Franklin notes, "Particularly those [inscriptions] cut from the Augustan age were heavy with details of office-holding and honors that bore significance for the educated reader, whereas the name alone—again normally cut at a larger scale, and at least recorded first—was what signified to the less deft" (1991: 86). Cf. Barchiesi arguing for varying individual interpretations of the monument (2002: 6).

[3] Cf. Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 330–31.

Epigraphy and Memory Across Genres

Ovid's references to this and other inscriptions privilege the interpretive power of the reader to recognize the epigraphic resonances and contextualize them with their own knowledge of Roman inscriptions. Hence, I will suggest that Augustan authors across genres employ a sort of "epigraphic intertextuality" in their work. This intertextuality extends across genres in multiple ways: authors engage with epigraphic resonances in their literary predecessors, and they also engage with conventions that would have appeared on Roman inscriptions, relying upon their readers to recognize their allusions to these various different sources. Gowing, in his discussion of intertextuality, allusion, and memory, has noted that "An author ... may tap into a reader's knowledge of events and places in the same way as he taps into that reader's knowledge of texts" (2013: 323). He may also tap into knowledge of inscriptions and their conventions. By tapping into epigraphic sources, Augustan authors unlocked additional possibilities for intertext. Inscriptions brought with them a variety of cultural and emotional associations which would have nuanced interpretations of Augustan texts.

Memory is central to epigraphic intertextuality, just as it is central to the Augustan agenda. As Gowing has noted, "Octavian, the future Augustus, quickly sought to assert control over memory" (2005: 18). He has also observed that "The arena in which anxiety over the loss of the Republic is played out is in literature. In some sense, the Empire's writers take over from the Republic's orators the task of preserving memory" (2005: 25). Inscriptions by their very nature are repositories and preservers of memory, and that is a major reason why they appealed to both Augustus and Augustan authors. As Gowing has observed, "In the *De senectute*, Cicero identifies the chief value of tombs, and specifically of inscriptions placed on tombs, as the means

by which he can retreat into or refresh the memory of the dead" (2005: 13).[4] Varro also discusses the role of *monimenta*, including tombs, as preservers of memory (*Ling*. 6.49).[5] The fact that the Romans recognized this property of inscriptions as repositories of memory is also evident from instances of what they called "damnatio memoriae," which involved the excision of individual names from inscriptions, symbolically expunging them from memory.[6] Bodel has noted that this practice was "particularly common during the Roman Empire" (2001: 23), and this is not surprising given the increased emphasis on the power of memory during the Augustan era.[7] Furthermore, inscriptions are a medium that allows the inscriber to control how memory is constructed. As Bodel has noted, *carmina funeraria* in particular "tend to combine greater freedom of expression with a propensity to articulate not only personal vicissitudes but individual attitudes and values, aspirations and regrets" (Bodel 2001: 39).[8] The memory of a beloved wife may be presented to a husband's specifications on an inscription (as is the case with the *Laudatio Turiae*) allowing a loved one to control the memory of the deceased.[9] This is especially true of funerary inscriptions, but it is in fact the case for many types of inscriptions, which combine conventional language with opportunities for individuals ranging from freedmen to the emperor to stake out their own control over memory. This subjectivity of a seemingly objective, authoritative medium is precisely what appealed to Augustan authors, who made

[4] See Cicero *Sen*. 7.21. Gowing also notes that "Funeral inscriptions occasionally refer to themselves (and the place they mark) as a *memoria* (e.g., *CIL* 12.1036)" (2005: 13n36).

[5] Varro writes, "sic monimenta quae in sepulcris, et ideo secundam viam, quo praetereuntis admoneant et se fuisse et illos esse mortalis. Ab eo cetera quae scripta ac facta memoriae causa monimenta dicta" (*Ling*. 6.49). [So the monuments which are on tombs and along the road are called monuments for this reason, that they may admonish the ones passing by that they were mortal and that those passersby are, too. From this the rest of the things that are written and done for the sake of memory are called *monimenta*.] Cf. Gowing 2005: 13n36. Cf. also discussion by Jaeger 1997: 16.

[6] See Kajava 1995, Bodel 2001, and Flower 2006.

[7] Gowing has noted that "while the centrality of memory in Roman life and culture from the earliest periods on has been sufficiently documented, there is no mistaking a heightened sense of the importance and *power* of memory characteristic of the Augustan period" (2013: 320).

[8] Cf. discussion on pp. 106-7.

[9] CIL VI 41062 = CIL VI 1527 = CIL VI 31670 = CIL VI 37053 = EDCS-01000178. The *Laudatio Turiae* will be discussed in more detail below (pp. 18-19 and 122–23).

creative use of epigraphic conventions to shape and portray individual personae and to create epigraphic and literary intertexts.[10]

But control of memory is not merely an authorial pursuit. In the case of both physical and literary inscriptions the memory and interpretation of readers plays a role in cementing the authority of the tradition. As Habinek remarks on the tomb of the Scipios, which will be discussed in the first chapter, "Tradition is invoked both by comparisons between the recently deceased and the ancestors and by the arrangement of epitaphs in a familial context, while the role of the judging audience is specifically mentioned in several places" (Habinek 1998: 52). Reader response is just as important for epigraphic intertexts as it is for interpretation of other intertexts. As Gowing has noted, "The author, who in the evocation of textual precedents coincidentally delineates the parameters of his own literary memory, counts on the reader's memory to allow him or her to discern what the text is doing" (2013: 322). The audience contextualizes Augustan inscriptions and epigraphic appropriations based on their knowledge and memory of the traditions that constitute epigraphic and literary memory. This allows Augustan authors to play on the horizon of expectations, in some instances adhering closely to epigraphic habits, and in others subverting them in noticeable ways.[11]

There are several ways in which Augustan authors take advantage of the memories and expectations of the reader when appropriating epigraphic conventions. For example, inscriptions

[10] In fact, there is an analogy between the act of creating an inscription and the act of creating a literary text. Hinds, discussing the relationship between author, text, and point of reception, notes that "there is no getting away from the fact that the production of a poetic text *is* in some very important ways a private, self-reflexive, almost solipsistic activity; and even the poet's dialogue with the work of other poets can be a very private, self-reflexive and solipsistic kind of dialogue" (1998: 48–49). This is also the case for inscriptions such as the *Laudatio Turiae* (CIL VI 41062 = CIL VI 1527 = CIL VI 31670 = CIL VI 37053 = EDCS-01000178) and the highly idiosyncratic epitaph of Allia Potestas (CIL VI 37965 = CLE 1988 = CLENuovo p. 139 = CLENuovo p. 173 = AE 1913 88 = AE 1929 100 = EDCS-16100342). While the point of reception (which will be discussed next) remains critical, the self-reflexive musings of the author play an important role in controlling the memory of the deceased.

[11] For the term "horizon of expectations" see Jauss 1982 (originally published in 1967). He notes that: "The historical life of a literary work is unthinkable without the active participation of its addressees" (1982: 19).

provide opportunities for generic play across media, and Ovid in particular experiments with "breaking epigraphic habits" and subverting expectations about epigraphic conventions. Furthermore, inscriptions are traditionally classified according to various types (i.e. epitaph, dedicatory altar, triumphal notice, graffito) and by appropriating conventions of inscriptions, Augustan authors may also appropriate the contexts and authorial purposes that are associated with these types of inscription.[12] For example, Thomas has established that Virgil uses the language of sepulchral epigram to foreshadow Turnus' "doom" (1997: 283–85), playing upon associations with death that are commonplace on Roman funerary inscriptions. Virgil takes advantage of the authority of inscriptions to set the emotional tone, and readers sensitive to these nuances recognize the ramifications of the epigraphic appropriations. Augustan authors also call upon their readers to recall earlier aspects of the epigraphic tradition, and to contextualize new inscriptions within existing historical, epigraphic, and literary traditions. Livy in particular does this in ways that reflect his skepticism of the growing influence of Augustus, inviting his readers to view imperial activities critically and carefully.

In short, epigraphic conventions allow Augustan authors to shape texts and personae in ways that are distinctly Roman, emphasizing tradition and innovation, and calling upon the reader to interpret the blended epigraphic and literary resonances. By "inscribing" epigraphic language and thought into their work, Augustan authors appropriate highly visible and accessible sources that might have had significant historical, cultural, and personal meaning for their audiences. Hence, in order to achieve a better understanding of the Augustan cultural and literary climate, characterized by imperial attempts to control memory, it is crucial not only to

[12] For discussion of how divisions into epigraphic genre are not always apt cf. Wolf 1996: 24 and discussion in the Ovid chapter (pp. 88-98).

study Augustan epigraphy and Augustan literature, but also to examine the intersection between the two.

In this dissertation, I explore the ways in which several representative authors writing during the reign of the emperor Augustus appropriate epigraphic conventions in their work. I argue that Roman inscriptions would have been a visible and accessible source for these authors and their audiences. Evidence suggests that epigraphic activity, although not limited to the age of Augustus, increased during that time, heightening the visibility and frequency of inscriptions in Rome.[13] I begin by surveying the growing presence of the imperial persona on Roman inscriptions, contextualizing well-known examples with Augustus' concern for shaping and controlling his image. The idea of the persona, authorial or otherwise, is a commonplace in modern literary criticism, including criticism of Classical texts, and it may also be applied to inscriptions that memorialize and carefully craft portrayals of individuals, including Augustus.[14] By way of introduction to the dissertation as a whole I examine a few well-known instances of epigraphic appropriation by Augustan authors not treated in the main chapters. Livy, Ovid, and Virgil furnish case studies for exploring in more detail the ways in which Augustan authors appropriate epigraphic conventions across genres, with a chapter devoted to each author. I begin with Livy, whose direct and indirect references to a variety of different types of inscription reflect his critical awareness of inscriptions as historical sources. I then discuss Ovid, who

[13] For the increased presence of inscriptions in the Augustan era see MacMullen 1982, Alföldy 1991, and Bodel 2001.

[14] I have chosen the term *persona* both for its associations with modern literary criticism and for its flexibility. *Persona* has the primary meaning of "an assumed character or role, *esp.* one adopted by an author in his or her writing, or by a performer" (OED, "persona" 1). It also has the more obsolete meaning of a dramatic or literary character (OED, "persona" 1) and a secondary meaning of "The aspect of a person's character that is displayed or perceived by others" (OED, "persona" 2). Clay has noted the relevance of the persona to epitaphs: " ... Greek and Roman poets exploited the persona of both the poet and that of his audience, or reader. One only has to recall the convention of funerary inscriptions in which the deceased identifies himself (or the monument identifies itself) to an unknown passerby or the passerby enters into a dialogue with the person hidden under the monument, who is no longer able to speak out or to respond" (1998: 18).

writes literary inscriptions in his epic and elegiac poetry, relying heavily on funerary inscriptions to shape character and portray his own poetic persona. This is consistent with the etymologization of "elegy" from ἔλεος, εὖ λέγειν, or ἔ ἔ λέγειν, suggesting that the genre had its origins in funerary lament.[15] I end with Virgil, who also uses epigraphic conventions, but does so in more subtle ways that reflect the subjective style of his epic. Like Ovid, Virgil relies heavily on the language and thought of funerary inscriptions to convey character, but his usage of these conventions is more subtle. Virgil uses inscriptions to create a suspenseful, melancholy mood throughout the epic, and knowledge of how Ovid makes clear use of inscriptions to convey character can enhance our understanding of how Virgil uses them in ways that have not been recognized. My argument leads to the conclusion that the distinctive authority and influence of inscriptions, although not limited to the Augustan era, is characteristic of Augustan writing across genres.

Inscribing the Augustan Persona

Literary and material evidence, including inscriptions, indicate Augustus' concern for controlling his own image. Imperial portraiture portrayed Augustus in various guises, including famously, those of *pontifex maximus* and *imperator*.[16] Portraiture of the emperor underwent a noticeable change, presumably after he took the title "augustus" (Zanker 1988: 98). It is likely that this change stemmed from the emperor's desire to project a new, more venerable image that

[15] See Hinds 1987a: 103 and 103n13, citing Chaintraine on ἔλεος, *Etym. Magn.* 326. 48ff, and Orion *Etym.* 58. 7ff (Sturz).

[16] For a survey of Augustan portraiture see Kleiner 1992: 61–69. A statue of Augustus as *pontifex maximus* from the Via Labicana is on display in the Museo Nazionale Romano (see Kleiner 1992: plate 41). The famous portrayal of Augustus as *imperator* from the Villa of Livia at Primaporta, a Tiberian copy of an Augustan original, is located in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican Museum (see Kleiner 1992: plate 42). These are just two of many extant examples of Augustan portraiture, with Kleiner noting that the Primaporta type (referring to the hairstyle featured on this portrait) "is today preserved in 170 replicas and variations" (Kleiner 1992: 63).

reflected his increased power and status.[17] In addition, Suetonius tells us that before he died Augustus asked for a comb and mirror, and made a remark about playing his part in life well (Suet. *Aug*. 99).[18] Furthermore, Augustus' funeral procession broke with ordinary conventions, giving his own image increased prominence and visibility (Cass. Dio 56.34.1–4).[19] The care that Augustus took to control his image is also evidenced by his mausoleum, which was part of a complex of buildings promoting the emperor in the Campus Martius.[20] The mausoleum, like the temple of Mars Ultor, was accompanied by an inscription in which the emperor figured prominently.

The *Res Gestae*, a lengthy inscription detailing Augustus' achievements, was on display outside of the mausoleum. Although the authorship of the *Res Gestae* has been the subject of debate, it is written in the first person, in the voice of Augustus.[21] A heading which, as

[17] Zanker notes that "The new likeness was unlike anything to be found in Late Republican portraiture. It expresses Augustus' new image of himself, how he imagined himself as 'Augustus,' and how he identified himself with the new title. Whoever commissioned the individual honorary statues employing this portrait type, the original must have been designed with Augustus' approval, or even at his own instance" (1988: 98).

[18] Of course, we must be cautious about drawing conclusions from the sensationalist accounts of Suetonius, but his portrayal of Augustus does seem to fit the image of the emperor that we have from other sources. Although the account may be dramatized, it is certainly clear that Augustus was concerned with appearances.

[19] Flower notes that "Dio appears to claim that Augustus' body in its casket, and his wax funeral portrait as well as the two other likenesses of him, preceded the *imagines* in the procession. This in itself would have been a startling departure from the accepted practice of having the ancestors lead the deceased ... If Augustus was indeed carried out ahead of his ancestors and the famous figures from Rome's past, this was a striking dramatization of his claim to outshine the merits of past leaders" (Flower 1996: 245).

[20] For the mausoleum cf. Platner and Ashby 1929: 332–35, Nash 1968: 38–43, Richardson 1992: 247–49, von Hesberg 1996: 234–37, and Coarelli 2007: 302–4. For Augustan building activity in the Campus Martius see Elsner 1996: 38–39 and Coarelli 2007: 265.

[21] Cf. Cooley 2009: 42–43. Scheid remarks that "Auguste n'avait certainement pas rédigé ce document de sa main ... Auguste a certainement relu et contrôlé les *Res Gestae*, et il a sans doute même donné une touche personnelle à certains passages; mais il ne s'agit ni d'un poème ni d'un morceau de prose d' art extraordinnaire. Ce texte était à la portée de tout secrétaire de haut niveau" (2007: XXVI–XXVII). [Augustus certainly did not write the document in his own hand ... Augustus certainly reread and controlled the *Res Gestae*, and without doubt he even gave a personal touch to certain passages; but it is a matter neither of a poem nor a piece of prose of extraordinary art. This text was within the reach of every high-level secretary.] Regardless of whether Augustus was actually involved with the composition of the *Res Gestae*, the inscription is written in his voice, portraying him as the authorial persona. And in fact, Scheid remarks that "Les bons secrétariats sont ceux qui ont complètement assimilé le style de celui qu'ils servent, ou qui lui ont même créé un style propre" (Scheid 2007: XXVII). [The good secretaries are the ones who have completely assimilated the style of those whom they serve, or those who created a specific style for them.] Conversely cf. Gordon, remarking that "Seldom also do we have an autobiographical document composed by the chief of a great state such as Rome while he is still at the head of it" (1968: 126).

evidenced by the appellation *divus,* was likely added after Augustus' death (Cooley 2009: 103) begins by naming the emperor explicitly:

> rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terra[rum] imperio populi Rom[a]ni subiecit, et inpensarum, quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus ahenis pilis, quae su[n]t Romae posita, exemplar sub[i]ectum. (*RG* Heading)[22]
>
> Placed below is a copy of the deeds of divine Augustus, by which he subjected the world to the ruling authority of the Roman people, and of the expenses that he incurred for the state and for the Roman people, as inscribed on two bronze columns, which were placed in Rome.

These words, which are visible on copies of the *Res Gestae* from Ancyra and Antioch (Cooley 2009: 102) draw attention to the original context of this *monumentum*. *Incisarum* emphasizes that these words were inscribed, and the notice also tells us that they were originally etched onto two bronze columns in Rome. The information about the original context of the inscription allows the audience to envision the imperial persona in its original Roman context.[23] We know that the inscribed words were part of a *locus* of other inscriptions that honored Augustus' relatives, allowing visitors to the site to contextualize the Augustan persona along with other prominent members of the imperial family.[24] By emphasizing the epigraphic nature of these words and their location in Rome, this heading reinforces the monumental presence of the emperor and his achievements, projecting a distinct and exceptional Roman persona. This is in

[22] The text of the *Res Gestae* is after Cooley 2009. The translations are my own.

[23] Cf. Cooley, noting that "This detail allows us to form a more accurate picture of the text's display outside the Mausoleum" (Cooley 2009: 104). This is valuable information since, as Cooley notes "No physical trace remains of the *RGDA* in Rome, since the bronze tablets on which it was inscribed must have been melted down many centuries ago" (Cooley 2009: 6–7).

[24] Cooley notes that "Augustus' achievements were not the only ones presented outside his Mausoleum. A whole sequence of inscriptions displayed the achievements, or *res gestae*, of other members of the family too, some set up before the *RGDA*, others afterwards. On the premature death in AD 19 of Germanicus, Tiberius' heir presumptive, the senate decreed that bronze pillars displaying the senatorial decree which had been passed in his honor should be displayed in front of the Mausoleum next to the similar decrees which had been passed in honor of Gaius and Lucius, who had also died prematurely" (Cooley 2009: 5).

line with Augustus' authorial purpose for the original inscription, which served as a monumental narrative of his achievements situated amongst buildings of his own construction.

Augustus or those writing in his service make use of epigraphic conventions within the *Res Gestae* inscription. Cooley has noted that, "On the whole, the *RGDA* lacks literary elegance; instead, as is appropriate for an inscribed text, it is notable for the conciseness and apparent simplicity with which Augustus expressed himsef" (2009: 22). In addition, Augustus or those writing in his service make use of the convention "rei publicae constituendae" which is attested on other inscriptions and on numismatic evidence:

> populus autem eodem anno me consulem, cum [consul uterqu]e in bel[lo ceci]disset, et triumvirum rei publicae constituend[ae creavit]. (*RG* 1.4)
>
> Moreover in the same year the people made me consul, since both consuls had died in war, and triumvir for setting in order the republic.

The phrase "rei publicae constituendae" is attested on the following inscriptions dating to the age of Julius Caesar:[25]

> Imp(eratori) Caesari divi f(ilio) / III(viro) r(ei) p(ublicae) c(onstituendae) patrono (AE 1966 73)[26]
>
> To the Emperor Caesar, divine son, triumvir for setting in order the republic, patron.
>
> C(aio) Iulio C(ai) [f(ilio Cae] / sare pat[re patr(iae)] / imperato[re dict(atore)] / rei public[ae con] / [stit]uendae [ ] (CIL I 2969 = AE 1969/70 132)[27]
>
> To Gaius Julius son of Gaius Caesar, father of the fatherland, emperor, commander of setting in order the republic.

In addition, Cooley notes that African *denarii* dating to c. 40–37 B. C. E. "depict on their obverse the head of Lepidus, labelled LEPIDVS PONT(ifex) MAX(imus) III V(ir) R(ei)

[25] The expression also appears at Suet. *Aug*. 27 and Livy *per*. 120 (Scheid 2007: 29n3). For the *Res Gestae* in Suetonius cf. Gordon 1968: 125.

[26] EDCS-10701678 (March 16, 2014). This inscription is from Larinum.

[27] EDCS-09700898 (March 16, 2014). This inscription is from Tarentum. Although the inscription is fragmentary, I think that the reconstruction of "rei publicae constituendae" is secure.

P(ublicae) C(onstituendae), and Octavian on their reverse, with the words CAESAR IMP(erator) III VIR R(ei) P(ublicae) C(onstituendae) (*BM Coins, Rom. Rep.* II 579 nos. 29–31)" (Cooley 2009: 114n1.4). Hence, it is clear that the emperor himself or those writing in his service appropriated epigraphic conventions in the *Res Gestae*.

In addition to commissioning his own buildings and inscriptions, Augustus also transformed the city of Rome by undertaking repairs and renovations, and the *Res Gestae* mentions these achievements.[28] For example, the *Res Gestae* notes the emperor's repair work on aqueducts:

> rivos aquarum compluribus locis vetustate labentes refeci, et aquam quae Marcia appellatur duplicavi fonte novo in rivum eius inmisso. (*RG* 20.2)
>
> I repaired aqueducts that were collapsing due to old age in several locations, and I doubled the aqueduct which is called Marcia by introducing a new source into its channel.

In fact, an extant Augustan inscription at the site of the Aqua Marcia at the Porta Tiburtina also commemorates the emperor's restoration work:

> Imp(erator) Caesar divi Iuli f(ilius) Augustus / pontifex maximus co(n)s(ul) XII / tribunic(ia) potestat(e) XIX imp(erator) XIIII / rivos aquarum omnium refecit. (CIL VI 1244 = ILS 98a)[29]
>
> The emperor Caesar Augustus, son of the divine Julius, pontifex maximus, consul for the twelfth time, with tribunician power for the ninth time, acclaimed emperor for the fourteenth time, repaired the channels of all the waters.

The inscription not only gives Augustus credit for repairing the aqueduct, but also mentions his lineage and various positions that he held.[30] Readers of the inscription would note not only the

[28] For the significance of Augustus' building and renovation projects as described in the *Res Gestae* see Elsner 1996. For the significance of the building projects in general see Favro 1996 and Haselberger and Therin 2007.

[29] EDCS-17700626 (September 25, 2013). This inscription is Gordon 29 (1983).

[30] Although as is the case with the *Res Gestae* it is difficult to determine the emperor's level of involvement with this project, literary evidence suggests that he presented himself as the sponsor. Frontinus, citing the *senatus consultum* of 11 B. C. E., recognizes the emperor's contribution to this rennovation project: "... de riuis specibus fornicibus aquae Iuliae Marciae Appiae Tepulae Aniensis reficiendis: quos Augustus Caesar se refecturum impensa sua senatui pollicitus est ..." (*De Aqu*. 125; after Scheid 2007: 58n2). [... Concerning the conduits, channels, and

repair job, but also the presence of the Augustan persona on the refurbished aqueduct. One notable aspect of the characterization of Augustus on this aqueduct inscription is his descent from *Divus Iulius*, and elsewhere Augustus also emphasizes his family lineage and descent from the gods.[31] In fact, he made ingenious use of both epigraphy and Roman topography to strategically situate himself and his family within the historical and mytho-historical traditions that shaped the city.[32] Hence, it is crucial to consider not only Augustus' usages of inscriptions, but also how these usages intersect with Roman history and topography.

Augustus' forum furnishes an excellent case study for examining how the changes that he made to the city, including increased epigraphic activity, allowed him to "inscribe" his own presence into Roman history and culture. In the forum, the Temple of Mars Ultor was flanked on both sides by parallel columns and exedrae, which originally included statues and inscriptions. On the left statues and inscriptions honoring Aeneas, the kings of Alba Longa, and members of the Julian family were displayed; on the right, Romulus was displayed along with the *summi viri* (great men of the republic) (Coarelli 2007: 110).[33] As Coarelli has observed, "We see a compromise between tradition and innovation. Republican history takes on a new life and is at the same time identified with the history of the Julian family. Romulus was descended from Aeneas, and their divine parents—Mars for Romulus and Venus for Aeneas—were brought together in the cult of the Temple of Mars Ultor" (Coarelli 2007: 11). These images and

---

arches of the Aqua Iulia, Marcia, Appia, Tepula, and Anio that needed to be restored: which Augustus Caesar promised the senate would be repaired at his own expense ...] For conventions of imperial titles on inscriptions see Keppie 1991: 44–45.

[31] The Forum of Augustus emphasizes Augustus' descent from Venus, Aeneas, and Mars, and this connection was also emphasized elsewhere in Augustan iconography (Zanker 1988: 195).

[32] Zanker has argued that "In antiquity there was no clear distinction between myth and history. The deeds of one's heroic ancestors were considered no less 'historical' than those of more recent generations. On the contrary, the former were especially prized for their value as *exempla*" (1988: 210). For "The Assimilation of Augustus' Successors into the National Mythology" see Zanker 1988: 215–38.

[33] See Platner and Ashby 1929: 221, Zanker 1988: 210–15, Richardson 1992: 161, and Kockel 1995: 291. For the literary evidence see Suet. *Aug*. 31.5, Cass. Dio. 55.10.3, Plin. *HN* 22.13, Gell. 9.11.10, Ovid *Fast*. 5.563–66, and SHA *Alex*. *Sev*. 28.6.

inscriptions, functioning together in a carefully arranged topographical context, displayed the image of Augustus that he himself wanted to project. He portrayed himself as the continuation of many great predecessors, and perhaps even intended for his audience to consider him the greatest of all.[34]

In fact, it is likely that Augustus intended for viewers to consider the inscriptions in the forum in the context of his other epigraphic monuments. Frisch has observed that Augustus did not seem to base the *elogia* in the forum on earlier models, instead opting to produce original inscriptions. In fact, there are "inhaltliche und stilistische Übereinstimmungen zwischen den Elogien und den Res gestae des Augustus" (Frisch 1980: 93). [Correspondences in content and style between the *elogia* and the *Res Gestae* of Augustus.] Augustus created his own distinct epigraphic material while at the same time engaging with earlier traditions. By doing so, he was able to give himself a distinct visual presence in the city while at the same time respecting the tradition that was already in place, and he made significant changes at a gradual pace.[35] Augustus found in inscriptions a traditional, authoritative medium for writing himself into Roman history in ways that were revolutionary while at the same time showing concern for the

[34] See Luce citing Frisch 1980 for the idea that "the achievements meticulously recorded in the *Res Gestae* were meant to be measured against the achievements of the men whose *elogia* appeared in the forum, and were meant to be found far greater" (Luce 1990: 127 and 127n14). On the significance of the *summi viri*, Frisch comments: "Augustus hat durch ein Edikt verkündet, dass er (und seine Nachfolger) an der Norm dieser Männer gemessen werden sollten (Suet. Aug. 31,5). Er hat sich amit also als (vorerst) letztes Glied dieser Kette verstanden (1980: 93). [Augustus proclaimed through an edict that he (and his successors) should be measured by the standard of these men (Suet. Aug. 31.5). He therefore had himself understood by it as (for the time being) the last link of this chain.] Cf. pp. 43-44 and 44n100 below. Also see Elsner noting that "The self-fashioning, indeed the fabrication, of the principate was achieved not only by the production of images but additionally by what were in effect written *instructions* on how those images should be interpreted and read" (1996: 35).

[35] Favro has noted that "Change on an urban scale cannot be instituted overnight. Following his motto, *festina lente*, Augustus moved slowly. After the example of Caesar, he was especially concerned with the popular perception of his role" (Favro 1992: 72). This gradual process is in fact exemplified by the Augustan forum. Although Augustus built the Temple of Mars Ultor in fulfillment of a vow made before the Battle of Philippi in 42 B. C. E., the dedication did not take place until 2 B. C. E. See Platner and Ashby 1929: 220, Nash 1968: 401, Richardson 1992: 160, Kockel 1995: 289, and Coarelli 2007: 108.

tradition that was already in place.[36] Inscriptions reinforced the idea that Augustus' ascent to power was a natural continuation of the Roman historical narrative.[37]

Augustus also integrated his own imperial persona into public shrines for the *Lares Compitales* at crossroads, "inscribing" himself into Roman religion. As Favro has noted, "Shortly after becoming head priest (*Pontifex Maximus*) in 12 B. C., the Princeps joined worship of both his own personal Genius and the spirits of his family, the *Lares Augusti*, with that of the *Lares Compitales*. Thereafter, images of the imperial family appeared at every crossroad shrine in the capital" (Favro 1992: 80). Inscriptions mentioning *vicomagistri* exemplify these changes.[38] One striking example is an inscribed altar which also includes images of Augustus, Livia, and L. Caesar:

> Imp(eratore) Caesare Augusto XIII M(arco) Plautio Silvan(o) co(n)s(ulibus) / D(ecimus) Oppius |(mulieris) l(ibertus) Iaso D(ecimus) Lucilius D(ecimi) l(ibertus) Salvius L(ucius) Brinnius |(mulieris) l(ibertus) Princeps L(ucius) Furius L(uci) l(ibertus) Salvius / mag(istri) vici sandaliari // Laribus Augustis
> (CIL VI 448 = ILS 3614)[39]
>
> With Caesar Augustus acclaimed Emperor for the thirteenth time, with Marcus and Plautius Silvanus as consuls, Decimus Oppius the freedman of a woman, Iaso Decimus Lucilius the freedman of Decimus, Salvius Lucius Brinnius the freedman of a woman, and the leader Lucius Furius Salvius freedman of Lucus, the block captains of Sandal-maker Street dedicate this to the *Lares Augusti*.

This altar honors the imperial family while at the same time mentioning the *vicomagistri*, freedmen who must have enjoyed a certain degree of increased prestige expressed by this monument commemorating them together with the emperor. In addition, an altar dedicated by the *vicomagistri* from the *vicus censori* honors the *Lares Augusti* while also mentioning the

[36] See Ramsby for "the Roman authoritative voice of the public record" and "epigraphic authority" (2005: 366). Cf. 38n84 below.

[37] Cf. Gowing for the emperor's desire "to advance the notion that the Augustan regime was merely the logical (and even fated) end toward which the Republic had been headed all along" (2005: 19).

[38] For the *lares Augusti* and the *vicomagistri* see Fullerton 1985: 482 and Bloch 1962: 219–20. For a summary of ancient literary sources for the *lares Augusti* and the *vicomagistri* see Niebling 1956.

[39] EDCS-17300601 (January 12, 2014). Niebling dates the altar to 2 B. C. E. (1956: 310–11).

dedicators by name (CIL VI 446 = ILS 3612 = MNR 1.2).[40] In Ostia, the *Lares Augusti* took center stage in the years following Augustus' rule, with a central *compitum* and accompanying inscriptions erected near the Temple of Rome and Augustus, emphasizing the enduring prominence of the Augustan persona.[41]

Of course, the heightened presence of Augustus was not limited to Rome, and inscriptions mentioning the emperor (like the one accompanying the *compitum* in Ostia) existed throughout the empire. A full study of the dissemination of Augustus' name in inscriptions through the empire is beyond the scope of this project, but it is important to contextualize the evidence discussed in this dissertation with the more global impact of Augustan activities.[42] We know that the persona of Augustus was featured on inscriptions throughout the empire, sometimes together with the ideals that he wanted to promote. One example is this inscription from Praeneste (modern Palestrina) that promotes the ideal of "Pax Augusta":

> Paci August(i) / sacrum / decuriones populusque / coloniae Praenestin(ae) // Paci August(i) / sacrum / decurion(es) populusque / coloniae Praenest(inae)
> (CIL XIV 2898 = ILS 3787)[43]
>
> Sacred to Augustan peace, the *decuriones* and the people of the colony of Praeneste [dedicated it].

[40] EDCS-17300599. This inscription, which was found on Tiber Island, is on display in the Museo Nazionale Romano, and includes iconography similar to that of the Ara Pacis. Platner and Ashby note that the *vicus censori* might have been the only *vicus* on Tiber Island. For a similar dedication to the *Lares Augusti* cf. CIL VI 4447 = ILS 3612a.

[41] Bloch (1962) published a series of inscriptions which support the identification of this structure as a *compitum* associated with the *Lares Augusti*. For the inscriptions cf. AE 1964 151–56 and AE 1966 65. Bloch notes that "What lends the establishment of the cult of the Lares Augusti in Ostia special color is the choice of the site for the circular sanctuary. It occupies literally the center of the city. With the temple of Roma and Augustus as its backdrop, the *aedicula* of the Lares Augusti completed the transformation of the Forum, newly created under Tiberius, into an area devoted to the worship of the emperors" (1962: 223). Bloch also notes that "The circular building, which stands almost exactly in the longitudinal axis of the new temple, must be either contemporary with it or later" (1962: 212). The AE suggests that the *compitum* was built under Claudius (AE 1964 156). Cf. Meiggs also arguing for a Claudian dating (1960: 354).

[42] For imperial ideology in the provinces cf. Ando 2000.

[43] EDCS-05800880 (January 12, 2014). This inscription is on display in the archeological museum at Palestrina. Weinstock observes: "It is important to note that another altar with the same decoration was dedicated to 'Securitas Augusta' at the same time (*CIL* 14, 2899 = *ILS* 3788). Their Augustan date can be established beyond doubt through the fact that, as Professor A. Degrassi kindly points out to me, Praeneste was made a municipium by Tiberius, Gell. 16,13,5" (1960: 56n126).

This altar pays tribute to the "Pax Augusta" and commemorates provincial respect for the emperor and his ideals. In addition, it features iconography reminiscent of the *Ara Pacis* (garlands and *bucrania*), which reinforces the visual power of the inscribed message.[44] Furthermore, inscriptions in honor of Aeneas and Romulus that mirror the *elogia* in Augustus' forum have been found in Pompeii (CIL X 808 = CIL X 8348 = EE 8.1.311 = EE 8.1.854 = InscrIT 13.3.85 = ILS 63 = EDCS-11400892; CIL X 809 = InscrIT 13.3.86 = ILS 64 = EDCS-11400893) as well as in Mérida, Spain (AE 1996 864).[45] These are just a few examples of how Augustan innovation on the epigraphic tradition expanded beyond the city of Rome, gaining increased prominence and visibility throughout the empire.

The Epigraphic Habit in the Augustan Era

Having discussed how Augustus used inscriptions, it will now be useful to consider how his activities marked a continuation of and innovation on the Roman epigraphic habit. The framework for Augustus' widely visible epigraphic activities was already in place, and he in fact added his own personal touch to the existing Roman predilection for creating inscribed monuments.[46] The increase in epigraphic activity that occurred during the Augustan era represents not only a major shift toward increased visual communication, but also the

[44] Cf. Toynbee: "And it is noteworthy that the front of the Praeneste piece bears a swag of fruits slung between *bucrania* which vividly recalls the swags of fruit that decorate the upper zone of the inner side of the precinct-wall of the Campus Martius altar" (1961: 155). Conversely, cf. Weinstock arguing that the altar "is a frequent type with a common-place decoration which was not specifically created for Pax" (1960: 56).

[45] The extension of Augustan elements to other parts of the empire also marked continuation of a tradition of Romanization. As Fentress has noted, "The idea that Roman colonies reproduced elements of the urban form, and by this reproduction encouraged the formation of aspects of the Roman character, has been a commonplace in discussions of Romanization" (2000: 12). She argues that Cosa, first colonized by the Romans in 273 B. C. E., "was *mutatis mutandis*, an edited version of Rome" (2000: 11). For Romanization in the Augustan age cf. Trillmich and Zanker 1990.

[46] For the possibility that Augustus added "une touche personelle" to sections of the *Res Gestae* cf. p. 8n21 above (citing Scheid 2007: XXVII).

simultaneous continuity and innovation of the epigraphic tradition.[47] In 1982 MacMullen coined the term "epigraphic habit" to refer to the Roman predilection for creating inscribed monuments, suggesting that fluctuations in epigraphic activity were likely due to "a sense of audience" (1982: 246).[48] The epigraphic habit became more prominent during the Augustan era, and saw the introduction of distinct innovations, but it was certainly not a new phenomenon. It is difficult to pinpoint the origin of Roman epigraphic activity, but we can trace it back to as early as the republic.[49] We have seen how Augustus incorporated aspects of republican history into his forum, creating a narrative of change and continuity, and this parallels how he engaged with the epigraphic tradition. During the Augustan period, epigraphic activity increased dramatically, decreasing again in the third century C. E.[50] As Alföldy has noted, we know of approximately 3,000 inscriptions that date to the age of Julius Caesar or earlier, and approximately 30,000 that date to the Augustan period or later (Alföldy 1991: 292). Of course, these figures are likely skewed by the accident of survival, but there is compelling evidence that Augustus ushered in a new era of increased visual activity, including the production and dissemination of inscriptions throughout the Roman empire.

This change in the epigraphic habit was not limited to an increased number of inscriptions, but also included changes to the character of Roman inscriptions. Commenting on the various types of inscriptions which were part of the Augustan "explosion of epigraphic activity," Bodel observes that "all these types of inscription not only proliferated in number but changed in form as a result of the influence of the first Princeps, who effectively transformed the

[47] For increased visual communication in the Augustan era cf. Zanker 1988 and Smith 2005.
[48] Cf. Bodel 2001: 6.
[49] Woolf argues that "The origins of Latin epigraphy are to be sought in the early Republic, and probably in the uses to which archaic Etruscans and their neighbours put writing soon after adopting it from visitors from the eastern Mediterranean" (Woolf 1996: 22).
[50] Cf. Woolf 1996: 22 and Bodel 2001: 6–7.

existing epigraphic culture of Rome into an empire-wide vehicle of Augustan ideology" (Bodel 2001: 7).[51] In fact, the Augustan era saw an increased trend towards the use of high quality marble, as well as higher quality lettering (Bodel 2001: 7–8). Hence, there was not only an increased presence of Roman inscriptions, but also an increased presence of visibly Augustan inscriptions.

Another factor to consider is the content of Augustan inscriptions and the style of the text inscribed. The increased presence of the emperor and his family on inscriptions has been discussed, and this is exemplified by the *Res Gestae*, with Cooley noting that "The syntax of the *RGDA* conveys the unambiguous message that Augustus is central to the state. The fact that the whole text is written in the first person makes this clear on a basic level, and this is reinforced by the repetition and emphatic positioning of the adjective *meus*" (Cooley 2009: 24). In addition, it is sometimes possible to identify stylistic differences between Augustan and later imperial inscriptions. The aforementioned inscription at the Porta Tiburtina and two accompanying later inscriptions (CIL VI 1244, 1245, and 1246) furnish an excellent case study. Gordon has noted that the presence of the two later additional inscriptions on the monument make it possible to note stylistic variations: "Change of style in similar texts cut on the same monument is well illustrated by [CIL VI 1244, 1245, and 1246], where we have statements from three different emperors, separated by over two centuries: we go from the plain style of Augustus to the less plain style of Titus, to the new, florid style or Caracalla ..." (Gordon 1983: 33). Certain Augustan inscriptions also featured distinct ideals that the emperor wanted to promote, including the aforementioned "Pax Augusta." In addition, Gowing has discussed the presence of "clementia" and "crudelitas", words characteristic of Augustan propaganda (Gowing 1992: 288)

[51] Cf. Alföldy 1991.

in the so-called *Laudatio Turiae*, an inscription in honor of a wife who heroically entreated Lepidus on behalf of her husband during the proscriptions (Gowing 1992: 283).[52] These inscriptions are only a few examples of Augustan innovation and blending of traditions, which extended across genres and media. This blending of tradition and innovation on inscriptions is analogous to how Augustan authors engaged with previous traditions while innovating. In particular, appropriation of epigraphic conventions by Augustan authors exemplifies this phenomenon, and I will now discuss a few well-known examples of how authors blended literary and epigraphic traditions across genres. These introductory examples will serve as useful *comparanda* for how the representative authors discussed in the main chapters appropriate epigraphic conventions.

Epigraphy and Augustan Authors

Tibullus is the first Augustan elegist to quote an epitaph in his work, and his poetic tombstone can be read in comparison with extant Roman inscriptions:

> quod si fatales iam nunc explevimus annos,
> fac lapis inscriptis stet super ossa notis:
> HIC IACET IMMITI CONSVMPTVS MORTE TIBVLLVS,
> MESSALLAM TERRA DVM SEQVITVRQVE MARI (Tib. 1.3.53–56)
>
> But if even now I have fulfilled the fated years,
> see to it that a stone stands above my bones with inscribed lettering:
> Here lies Tibullus, destroyed by harsh death,
> while he follows Messalla on land and sea.[53]

In addition to describing the act of putting the tombstone in place, Tibullus uses language that is conventional for Roman epitaphs. The phrase "hic iacet," the Latin equivalent of "here lies," is a

[52] CIL VI 41062 = CIL VI 1527 = CIL VI 31670 = CIL VI 37053 = EDCS-01000178. For discussion of this inscription see pp. 3 and 122-23.

[53] For discussion of this epitaph cf. Bright 1978, Cairns 1979, and Ramsby 2007.

recognized convention that appears on many tombstones.[54] I would also suggest that in this context *sequitur* has epigraphic parallels, and a study of how it is used on inscriptions may enhance our understanding of the Tibullus passage. The phrase "hoc monumentum heredem (non) sequitur" appears frequently on Roman funerary inscriptions.[55] Although the negative version of the phrase is more common, there are a handful of examples without "non," which seem to suggest that the monuments in question follow heirs. One example is the monument for Sextus Oppus Surus:[56]

> Sex(ti) Oppi T(iti) l(iberti) Suri / et Trebia Q(uinti) f(ilia) Tertia / hoc monumentum / heredem sequitur / in fr(onte) p(edes) XII in ag(ro) p(edes) XVI
> (CIL VI 38697a = CIL I 1351= ILLRP 95)[57]
>
> To Sextus Oppus Surus freedman of Titus and Trebia Tertia the daughter of Quintus. This monument follows the heir, in front twelve feet, in the field sixteen feet.

If we compare the two epitaphs, in Tibullus' inscription *Messallam* is in the position of *heredem*, and *Tibullus* is in the position of *hoc monumentum*. In addition to saying that he follows his patron on land and sea, Tibullus may also be casting himself in the role of an heir whose literary monument follows Messalla. By doing so, he heightens the intimacy between himself and his patron, portraying them as family members who share the same literary monument. The epigraphic parallels suggest that this additional layer of meaning might be inscribed in the poetic

[54] See Keppie for the similar expression "hic situs est" which was common in the first centuries B. C. E. and C. E. (1991: 107). For discussion of this convention in Tibullus see Yardley 1996: 269.

[55] Keppie explains that in the case of the negative phrase, the significance was that "the tomb and its plot of ground were not a piece of heritable property that passed to the person's heirs, to be disposed of at their whim, or allocated to another use. The ground was sacred" (1991: 109).

[56] The CIL indicates that this inscription, which is one of two very similar ones that were found when a road was built to join the Corso d' Italia with the Via Salaria, dates to the end of the Republic, which makes it likely that it pre-dates the Tibullus poem. For other examples with this convention cf. CIL VI 11451, CIL XII 3631, and CIL XIV 4028. For variants of the phrase and their meanings see Sandys 1927 and Mierow 1934. Mierow writes that although the argument has been made that the variant without *non* is due to stonecutters' errors, the fact that it is present on some stones is significant. He argues that in these various cases "the principal concern of the testator must have centered upon the vital matter of the preservation of the place of burial for the exclusive use of his own *familia* and the maintenance of the family worship by his descendants, ruling out heirs of another name" (1934: 173). CIL XIV 4028 is damaged, and the extant text reads "[ ]m sequitur."

[57] EDCS-23102324 (January 28, 2014). CIL I includes inscriptions thought to date to the age of Julius Caesar or earlier, and this inscription is probably pre-Augustan.

epitaph. By using this language, Tibullus is able to conjure sentiments and ideas that would be familiar to his Augustan readers from inscriptions.

Propertius also appropriates epigraphic conventions, and his inscription accompanying an image of Vertumnus is a precursor to the generic play, construction of personae, and breaking of epigraphic habits that characterize Ovid's work. After describing various aspects of his identity in the poem, Vertumnus proclaims "sex superant versus" (six verses remain) (Prop. 4.2.57). The poem ends with a literary inscription that could double as an inscription on a statue of Vertumnus:[58]

> STIPES ACERNVS ERAM, PROPERANTI FALCE DOLATVS,
> ANTE NUMAM PAUPER PAVPERE IN URBE DEVS.
> AT TIBI, MAMURRI, FORMAE CAELATOR AËNAE,
> TELLVS ARTIFICES NE TERAT OSCA MANVS,
> QUI ME TOT DOCILEM POTVISTI FVNDERE IN VSVS.
> VNVM OPVS EST, OPERI NON DATVR VNVS HONOS.
> (Prop. 4.2.59–64)
>
> I used to be a maple trunk, hewed by the hastening sickle,
> Before Numa I was a pauper god in a poor city.
> But for you, Mamurrus, engraver of the bronze form,
> may the Oscan land not wear down your artisan hands,
> you who were able to put forth me, easily taught, into so many uses.
> There is one work, the honor given to the work is not just one.

This inscription plays on past and present, situating the statue within the broader history of Vertumnus in the city. In addition, the mention of "stipes acernus" (maple trunk) prefigures an epigraphic moment in Ovid: when he converts his writing tablets into an inscribed votive offering, he quips on the inscription "AT NUPER VILE FUISTIS ACER" (and just now you were cheap maple) (Ovid *Am*. 1.11.28).[59] In both cases, the glory of the artist lies in his ability to transform the maple into something greater. In the case of the Vertumnus inscription the artist,

[58] Goold remarks that "The six verses are an imaginary inscription on the pedestal of Vertumnus' statue" (1990: 327n28).

[59] Cf. discussion of this passage on pp. 95-96 below.

the mythical and acclaimed Mamurrus named on the inscription, creates a bronze statue.[60] In the case of the tablets, Ovid glorifies them by calling them his faithful ministers, and by doing so also glorifies his own amatory writing. In both cases the inscribed identity of the artist is meant to place the art in higher esteem. Furthermore, this inscription also resembles inscriptions that list individual occupations, such as this inscribed marble altar from Rome honoring the wife of another *caelator*:

> L(ucius) Furius / L(uci) l(ibertus) Diomedes / caelator de / sacra via / Corneliae L(uci) f(iliae) / Tertullae uxori (CIL VI 9221=ILS 7694)[61]
>
> Lucius Furius Diomedes, the freedman of Lucus, the engraver from the *sacra via*, made it for his wife Cornelia Tertulla, the daughter of Lucus.

In addition, the phrase "tellus ne terat" may recall a well-attested convention of Roman funerary inscriptions. As Keppie notes in his discussion of funerary inscriptions, "The inscription may end with the formula *sit tibi terra levis* (abbreviated S T T L), 'may the earth lie lightly upon you'" (Keppie 1991: 107). In fact, we see this convention on an inscription honoring a *caelator* from Mauretania Caesariensis:

> Vitulus argentarius / caelator ann(orum) XXIIII / hic situs est / cura conlegi(i) fabri argentar(ii) / et conlegi(i) Caesariensium crescent(es) / terra ti<*b*>i levis sit (CIL VIII 21106= ILS 7286)[62]
>
> Vitulus the silver sculptor of twenty-four years. He is laid to rest here by the care of the guild of silversmiths and the guilds arising from Caesariensis. May the earth lie lightly upon you.

Propertius may be appropriating subtly and tweaking epigraphic conventions that appear on funerary inscriptions in his inscribed tribute to Vertumnus and his creator. This transformation of epigraphic conventions is appropriate to a god known for his own shape-shifting

[60] Ramsby notes that "In 4.2 the dedication on the statue of Vertumnus gives praise to the artist who is, within the poem, Mamurrus, the fabled bronze-smith of the eleven shields made to match the one that dropped from heaven during the reign of Numa" (2007: 63).

[61] EDCS-19000670 (January 28, 2014). Date unknown (?).

[62] EDCS-27600340 (January 28, 2014). Date unknown (?).

transformations.[63] In addition, as Ramsby has observed, the inscription draws attention to Propertius' own poetic art, memorializing him along with Vertumnus and Mammurus.[64] This self-memorialization may reflect Augustus' predilection for inscribing and memorializing his own persona on inscriptions.

The Augustan epigraphic habit also influenced Horace's portrayal of his poetic persona, and this is perhaps most clear in his *sphragis*:

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius
> regalique situ pyramidum altius,
> quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
> possit diruere aut innumerabilis
> annorum series et fuga temporum.
> (Hor. *Carm*. 3.30.1–5)
>
> I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze,
> more lofty than the regal ruin of the pyramids,
> which neither destructive rain nor the uncontrollable North Wind
> is able to destroy, nor the countless series of the
> years and the flight of time.

The epigraphic nature of Horace's *sphragis* has of course long been recognized.[65] In this passage, Horace not only presents his own poetry as a *monumentum*, but also speaks to the durability of inscriptions.[66] Nelis-Clément and Nelis have observed that "for a Roman reader of this text it will have been obvious that an essential element in the poem's internal logic will have been the fact that there was an inscription carved on the bronze. It is the realization that a Roman reader would immediately have thought of an inscribed monument that reveals an

[63] Cf. Ramsby 2007: 63 and DeBrohun 2003: 173.

[64] Ramsby notes: "The inscription at the poem's end grants emphasis to the artist of the marvellous statue, which makes Propertius identifiable not only with the statue, but also with the admired artist. The inscription to Mamurrus is homage to those who by their skill render such nuance and mutability within their medium that it performs a variety of *personae* (personalities, faces, characterization) for the viewer" (2007: 63).

[65] Cf. Woodman 1974.

[66] Cf. Cooley: "The use of bronze set the *RGDA* on a par with Roman legal and other important official documents, and evoked ideals of sacrosanctity and durability. By choosing bronze, Augustus was implicitly elevating his account of his achievements, evoking the moral authority usually enjoyed by texts inscribed on bronze ... " (2009: 3).

essential element in the comparison with Horace's poetic achievement. While the inscription will be worn away in the end by the forces of nature, the *Odes* will endure forever" (2013: 332). And in fact, epigraphic evidence for Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* speaks to both the durability of his verse and Augustus' recognition of the power of poetry and epigraphy to support the imperial agenda. An Augustan inscription names Horace as the author explicitly:

> sacrificioque perfecto puer(i) [X]XVII quibus denuntiatum erat patrimi et matrimi et puellae totidem / carmen cecinerunt eo[dem]que modo in Capitolio / carmen composuit Q(uintus) Hor[at]ius Flaccus....
> (CIL VI 32323 = ILS 5050 = EAOR 1.42 = AE 1892 1 = AE 2002 192)[67]
>
> When the sacrifice was finished twenty-seven boys whose fathers and mothers were living and just as many girls sang the hymn that had been ordered. And in the same way [they sang] on the Capitoline. Q. Horatius Flaccus composed the hymn ....

Recent studies on the *Carmen Saeculare* (Putnam 2000, Thomas 2011) have treated Horace's verses in detail. Here I will only mention that Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* is a prominent example of the intersection between epigraphy, the Augustan program, and the work of an Augustan author, in which (as in the *sphragis*) the *persona* of the poet figures prominently. These are just a handful of the many examples of how Augustan authors appropriate epigraphic language and thought in their work.

Previous Scholarship

This project has benefitted from previous scholarship on Latin epigraphy and Augustan literature, and it will be useful to contextualize it with other work on these topics. As Ramsby has noted (cf. 26n70 below), Stein's 1931 study on epigraphy and ancient literature, which is not limited to the Augustan era, offered an early treatment of epigraphy and Latin literature. Secondary studies on the intersection between epigraphy and Augustan literature are rare,

[67] EDCS-41100033 (January 28, 2014). This inscription is Gordon 12. Cf. CIL VI 877, CIL VI 32324, and Friggeri 2001: 71.

although the topic is receiving increased attention, as evidenced by Nelis-Clément and Nelis' new study (2013) "Furor Epigraphicus: Augustus, the Poets, and Inscriptions." Building upon Alföldy's (1991) seminal article on Augustan epigraphy, which introduces the term "furor epigraphicus" and surveys various Augustan inscribed monuments, Nelis-Clément and Nelis argue that "the Augustan poets do indeed seem to have reacted in typically interesting ways to those trends described by Galinsky as 'a tidal wave of inscriptions' leading to 'the creation of an epigraphic culture'" (Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 318).[68] Nelis-Clément and Nelis discuss examples from Virgil, Ovid, and Horace, addressing issues of periodization and intertextuality. Although there is some overlap between my study and theirs, there are also several points of difference. We agree on the notion that Augustus used epigraphy to control his own image, and that Augustan innovation should be contextualized within broader traditions, but differ as to how we prove that this is the case. In some instances we use different evidence, and in others we use the same evidence in different ways. For example, whereas Nelis-Clément and Nelis discuss CIL VI 40931 (the *elogium* for Aeneas from the Augustan forum) in the context of the parade of ancestors in Virgil's *Aeneid*, I discuss it in the context of Livy's death notices. In addition, whereas Nelis-Clément and Nelis give more space to issues of periodization, I devote more discussion to individual epigraphic conventions, using comparative evidence from inscriptions with verbal parallels to Augustan texts. Of course, the most noticeable difference is that whereas Nelis-Clément and Nelis focus on Augustan poets, I also look at this phenomenon in Livy, with the goal of shedding some light on how we see epigraphic appropriation in both poetry and prose.[69]

[68] Cf. Galinsky 1996: 385 and Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 318n7.

[69] Nelis-Clément and Nelis clearly delineate the scope of their paper while at the same time recognizing that there is room for examination of additional authors. They remark, "In this chapter we will concentrate on the poets, but it is noteworthy that recent scholarship on Livy has made much of his imagery of monumentality and revealed the

Similarly, Ramsby (2007) has examined epigraphic language in Augustan elegists, drawing on some comparative evidence from Ovid's *Metamorphosis* (2007: 131–42).[70] Ramsby gives more space to Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus in the interest of tracing the development of literary epitaphs in the elegiac genre. We both examine Ovid, but there is little overlap between our evidence and interpretations. For example, while we both discuss the epitaph of Phaethon, I focus on its subversive nature and how it mirrors inscriptions that portray the premature deaths of children. In this case, Ramsby gives more space to mourning and the emotions of Phaethon's female relatives (2007: 132–34). Similarly, Ramsby emphasizes assertion of female agency on epitaphs, comparing the epitaph of Dido with the epitaph of Phyllis. I focus on how Dido subverts conventional commemorative practices by naming herself and Aeneas on the stone, instead of memorializing herself in connection with her husband Sychaeus or leaving the task to her sister Anna. I also treat *Amores* 2.6, a poem that Ramsby does not discuss, examining specific epigraphic conventions and comparative verbal evidence from inscriptions. In short, this dissertation and these recent useful studies by Ramsby and Nelis-Clément and Nelis are complementary in many ways, and illustrate not only that there are multiple ways to approach this vast and fruitful topic, but also that there is more work to be done.

Having surveyed major works on epigraphy and Augustan literature, it will now be useful to discuss scholarship relating to Livy, Ovid, and Virgil specifically. Again, studies of epigraphy in these authors are comparatively rare, and there is still more to be done. There is no general comprehensive study of epigraphy in Livy, although several scholars have treated the topic

---

ways in which the writing of his history amounts on one level to a monumental rebuilding of Rome in a manner that is in dialogue with the Augustan discourse" (Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 325n49).

[70] Ramsby also gives a useful survey of previous scholarship on Latin inscriptions and poetic epitaphs (2007: 15–21). She cites Armstrong 1910, Purdie 1935, and Lattimore 1942 (for personal identity expressed on Latin inscriptions), Stein 1931 (for inscriptions in Latin literature), Lissberger 1934 (for the influence of Latin poetry on inscriptions) and Yardley 1996 (addressing the potential influence of the epigraphic habit on poets). For epigraphic language in Virgil she cites Barchiesi (1979), Kyriakidēs (1998), and Dinter (2005).

directly or indirectly. Langslow (2013) treats Livy in his study of archaic inscriptions in Greek and Latin literature. Jaeger (1997) has discussed history as *monumentum* in Livy as well as Hannibal's inscribed monument and its placement in Livy's narrative (2006). I extend this interest in location to discuss topographical location, discussing the ways in which Livy describes the placement of individual inscriptions within buildings. These descriptions would have resonated with readers' conceptions of the contemporary city and Roman historical memory. I also address Livy's familiarity with epigraphic sources and his skepticism of their historical value in light of the growing Augustan program. For example, I use epigraphic evidence (AE 1985 47) to argue that although as Syme (1959) and Luce (1965) have pointed out, it is implausible that the inscribed corselet of Cossus that Augustus claimed to have found in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius was authentic, similar conventions are present on a Tiberian inscription. Hence, the inscription and its conventions might not have seemed so implausible to a contemporary audience, but Livy might have noticed the chronological slip. I also build upon previous scholarship that has addressed Livy's engagement with monuments, including Ogilvie 1965, Kraus and Woodman 1997, and Bodel 1997. In addition, I have compiled data about where Livy references inscriptions, as well as how he references them, which I include in an appendix to the Livy chapter. Although Livy has the reputation for being an armchair historian who was not always diligent about consulting his sources, I believe that his careful and varied treatment of epigraphic sources reveals a familiarity with the epigraphic tradition, and that his failure to cite inscriptions more frequently stems from his skepticism of their truthfulness and reliability as source material than from his lack of interest in examining them. Study of Livy is foundational to my study of Ovid and Virgil because it illustrates the flexibility of epigraphic material: even when epigraphy seems to be "evidence" it can be subjective, overlapping with

fiction and skewing the portrayal of individual people and events. It is this very property of epigraphy as both authoritative and malleable that the Augustan poets exploit in accordance with their own authorial purposes and the genres in which they write.

Studies of epigraphy in Ovid are rare, although, as Ramsby has observed, he is the Augustan elegist who uses the most literary inscriptions (2007: 89). In addition to her aforementioned book, Ramsby also wrote an article on Ovid's funerary inscriptions (2005). Nelis-Clément and Nelis (2013) also treat several examples from Ovid. In addition, Hardie (2002a) has discussed epigrams and the absent presence in Ovid, and Lissberger (1934) and Yardley (1996) have written on the Roman elegiac genre and epigram. Epigraphic resonances have also been recognized *ad loc.* in individual poems by Booth (1991), Knox (1995), and McKeown (1998). In addition, my work engages with previous scholarship on the poetic persona in Ovid, including Cahoon 1984 and Boyd 1987. Hinds' 1998 study of allusion and intertextuality, as well as several of his other pieces on Ovid (including Hinds 1987a, 1987b, 1992 and 2005), have influenced my interpretation of Ovid's engagement with his epigraphic and literary predecessors.

There is a longstanding, albeit limited, tradition of scholarship on epigraphy in Virgil, but it tends to focus more on Virgil's impact on later inscriptions than on the possibility that he might himself have appropriated epigraphic conventions. Hoogma's seminal 1959 study *Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina latina epigraphica: eine Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrisch-technischen Grundsätze der Entlehnung* includes listings of inscriptions with verbal parallels to specific passages of the *Aeneid*. More recently, Trout (2013) has examined the impact of Virgilian language on later Latin inscriptions. Work has also been done on Virgil's literary epitaphs, with Thomas (1997, 1998) and Dinter (2005) discussing how Virgil responds to

the language of sepulchral epigram when describing the deaths of individual characters. Hardie (1994) has recognized the presence of epigraphic language in the Nisus and Euryalus episode, and the Caieta episode has been examined by Barchiesi (1979) and Kyriakidēs (1998). Nelis-Clément and Nelis also treat Virgil in their study, focusing on Aeneas' dedication at Actium (*Aen*. 3.286–88) and the parade of ancestors in *Aeneid* Book 6 (2013: 467–72). Breed (2006) treats inscriptions in the *Eclogues*, focusing on the role of mimetic voice. What has not been recognized is that Virgil's subtle appropriation of epigraphic language leaves the nuances of individual character to the interpretive powers of his audience, reflecting both his subjective style (Heinze 1915, Otis 1964, Pöschl 1950, Lyne 1987, Conte 2007) and the prominence of the epigraphic habit at the time when he was writing. I use epigraphic evidence to argue that in addition to Virgil influencing later inscriptions, inscriptions also influenced Virgil.

This project has also benefitted from a wealth of scholarship on Latin epigraphy, and the resources outlined here are by no means exhaustive. Useful guides to Latin epigraphy by Gordon (1983), Bodel (2001), and Cooley (2012) provide general orientation as well as specific technical information. Studies of the *Res Gestae* by Cooley (2009) and of the Forum of Augustus by Geiger (2008) have also proven useful. Susini's "Compitare per via: antropologia del lettore antico: meglio, del lettore Romano" (1988) is a good foundation for examining issues of reader response to inscriptions. Lattimore (1942) has discussed themes in Greek and Roman epitaphs, and Rawson (2002) treats the concept of the *funus acerbum*, which I discuss in the chapters on Ovid and Virgil. In addition to the seminal studies by Alföldy and MacMullen, I have also found studies by Saller and Shaw (1984), and Woolf (1996) useful for thinking about the role that inscriptions played in Roman culture. For discussion of certain individual inscriptions, I have found Friggeri, Cecere, and Gregori's 2012 guide to the epigraphic collection

at the Baths of Diocletian useful. In some cases the bibliography on an individual inscription is vast, as is the case for the *Laudatio Turiae*, for which I have consulted studies by Wistrand (1976), Horsfall (1983), Gowing (1992), and many others. In other cases less is known about individual inscriptions, or there is room for much more exciting work to be done. Numerous printed corpora and the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby have proven indispensible, and I will now turn to discussion of these resources in connection with my methodology.

Methodology

In this dissertation, I have made use of the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby (EDCS) in two distinct ways: to determine (to the extent that it is possible to do so) roughly how many extant Latin inscriptions contain certain words or phrases, and to find and cite specific examples of Latin inscriptions. The first usage requires caution, since figures given here will no doubt change as new inscriptions are uncovered and databases are updated. As mentioned earlier, the accident of survival can also skew the data. Although we cannot necessarily draw definitive conclusions about a phrase that appears frequently on inscriptions included in the database, that information might be helpful to us as we consider the extent to which a convention might have been part of the epigraphic habit. The second usage is perhaps more straightforward. I used the database to search for individual verbal parallels between Augustan literature and inscriptions. I have found that it is effective and very worthwhile to cross-check examples found using the database with printed corpora because in many cases specific printed corpora provide insights that do not appear in other sources. For example, EDCS-19100569 is cross-referenced as CIL VI 9437, CLE 403, and ILS 7710, but only the ILS observes that the phrase "sine nomine corpus"

parallels Virgil *Aen*. 2.557–58.[71] Thus, although the database provides new opportunities for epigraphic research, it does not render printed guides obsolete.[72]

For example, printed sources will often provide theories as to the dates of inscriptions and more precise information about their archaeological contexts. I have endeavored to be as precise as possible about the dates and locations of individual inscriptions, while at the same time recognizing the limitations of the evidence. In many cases the original location of an inscription is unknown or disputed. For example, in his recent study "Republikanische CLE aus Rome: eine Topographie" (2007) Faßbender suggests that an inscribed stone reportedly found on Tiber island may in fact have been reused, and might not have originally been located there after all (2007: 186). The inscription (CIL VI 25369 = CIL I 1215 = CLE 59 = CLENuovo p. 98 = AE 1990 25 = EDCS-13801621), which I will discuss in more detail in the Virgil chapter, is widely thought to pre-date the Augustan period. Lattimore (1942) dated it to the age of Julius Caesar, and Massaro also includes it in a 2007 study of republican inscriptions. In this case I cite all three, arguing that a pre-Augustan dating is secure, and that the conventions of the inscription might have been familiar to Virgil and his readers.

In other cases the date of an inscription is disputed or unknown. In cases for which I have found no indication of a date, I use the designation "date unknown(?)." In the case of a disputed date, I note and discuss the chronological issue. For example, there is a dispute as to the date of the epitaph of Nepos (also discussed in the Virgil chapter) (CIL VI 25369 = CIL I 1215 = CLE 59 = CLENuovo p. 98 = AE 1990 25 = EDCS-13801621). Hoogma (1959) conjectures a first century B. C. E. date, qualifying it with a question mark. The CIL suggests

[71] Cf. Bodel noting that "individual corpora and collections frequently vary in their elaboration of details" (2001: 153).

[72] Cf. Bodel noting in 2001 that "the new electronic resources will supplement rather than replace the more conventional, reasoned indexes of subjects and themes" (155). Since then more progress has of course been made, but it is still the case that electronic resources have not rendered printed guides obsolete.

that the lettering could be Augustan, and also suggests that the inscription "imitates" Virgil and other authors. Alternatively, the CLE suggests a Flavian date. In cases like these we should of course be cautious about the chronology, but we should not rule out the possibility that inscriptions which might post-date the Augustan era feature epigraphic conventions that could have also been visible on earlier inscriptions that are no longer extant. In addition, later inscriptions that seem to imitate Virgil and other authors may illustrate the suitability of certain passages by Augustan authors to an epigraphic context. Not only did Augustan authors imitate epigraphic language and thought, but these imitations continued to resonate in later inscriptions. In fact, later inscriptions that engage with these literary and epigraphic intertexts illustrate the power of epigraphic conventions to shape enduring memories. The modern inscription on the 9/11 memorial, which features Virgil's memorializing words to Nisus and Euryalus (*Aen*. 9.447), is evidence that the memory of epigraphic conventions in Augustan literature continues to speak to us today.[73]

The texts printed in this dissertation are from the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss-Slaby (EDCS), at times with minor modifications and notes about differences between editions. When citing the inscriptions, I have followed the EDCS and Cooley's 2012 *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy* by listing equivalent references joined by equal signs (=). Although this risks appearing cumbersome at times, epigraphic study requires precision, and it is better for the reader to have at hand more references rather than fewer. That being said, I do deviate from the EDCS by omitting the additional references marked with "+" in the initial citations, since their relevance to the individual inscriptions varies. At times I may discuss or reference them in footnotes, and I also cite separately some publications referenced by the EDCS along with the various corpora (such as Friggeri, Cecere, and Gregori 2012). I encourage readers who are

[73] I thank Richard Thomas for first pointing this out to me.

interested in individual inscriptions to check the database for additional references, and then check as many of those references as possible and practical firsthand.

Since I used the EDCS to collect much of the data for this dissertation, I have followed its abbreviations, at times modifying the citations slightly for stylistic reasons. For example, I omit the commas after volume number, as well as leading zeroes before individual numbers (with the exception of EDCS numbers, since in this case the database is the original source of the convention). I also use the conventional abbreviation "ILS" for Dessau's *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* whereas the EDCS uses the abbreviation "D." A full list of abbreviations used in the database may be found on the "Abbreviations" page of the EDCS. A list of abbreviations used in this dissertation may be found on p. vi.

Chapter 1: Rogo te, Lector: Livy's Epigraphic *Monumenta*

Livy's Epigraphic *Monumentum*

At the beginning of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, Livy outlines a program that parallels the creation of an inscription. He compares history to a monument inviting the viewer to interpret and make moral judgments about the material inscribed upon it:[74]

> Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; indi tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites. (*Praef.* 10)
>
> This is more than anything else beneficial and fruitful in the study of history, that you look at precedents of every example placed on an illustrious monument: thence for you and for your state you may choose what to imitate, thence what to avoid, that which is disgraceful in the undertaking and disgraceful in the outcome.

Kraus and Woodman have offered a detailed analysis of the *monumentum* mentioned in the preface, arguing that "the metaphor implies that Livy's narrative will be clear, immediate, vivid, and make us 'see' the events in our mind's eye; it also implies that we will feel the emotions and understand the thoughts and motives of the actors from inside, as it were. This clarity and immediacy are not simply decorative, however. This monument is there explicitly to be useful, to be 'healthy and fruitful'— and not just for anyone, but for *you*" (1997: 55). The visual accessibility and utility which Kraus and Woodman suggest characterize the *monumentum* could certainly apply to many inscriptions, which would have been visible for inspection by those passing by them.[75] Livy integrates *monumenta* throughout his work, and this programmatic

[74] Ogilvie argues that in this case *monumentum* refers to "history as such, the history of a nation" (1965: 28n10). For Livy's invitation to the reader cf. Chaplin, who describes Livy's introductory words as "a call to action" (2000: 4).

[75] For inscriptions and the passersby cf. Susini 1988. Of course, Livy does not specify that his *monumentum* is inscribed, and certainly monuments might have pictorial representations inviting moral judgments. For example, the Ara Pacis is not inscribed with texts, but is decorated with visual representations of the imperial family and golden age motifs (cf. Zanker 1988: 174). However, a history is a textual representation, and thus parallels monuments with inscribed text.

statement suggests a mode of interpretation that parallels individual responses to inscriptions.

It was very common for Roman inscriptions to exhibit the exemplary virtues of the honoree, and in some cases inscriptions also address viewers directly in order to influence their interpretations of those virtues, just as Livy addresses his readers in the second person.[76] The monument to the pearl dealer Gaius Ateilius Euhodus along the Via Appia is an exemplary case:

> Hospes resiste et hoc ad grumum ad laevam aspice ubei / continentur ossa hominis boni misericordis amantis / pauperis rogo te viator monumento huic nil male feceris / C(aius) Ateilius Serrani l(ibertus) Euhodus margaritarius de sacra / via in hoc monumento conditus est viator vale / ex testamento in hoc monumento neminem inferri neque / condi licet nisei eos lib(ertos) quibus hoc testamento dedi tribuique.
> (CIL VI 9545 = CIL I 1212 = CLE 74 = ILS 7602 = ILLRP 797)[77]
>
> Visitor, stop and look here, to the heap of earth to the left, where the bones are contained of a good man, compassionate, kind to the poor. I ask you, traveler, that you do nothing bad to this monument. Gaius Ateilius Euhodus, freedman of Serranus, a dealer in pearls, is buried in this monument. Goodbye, traveler. In accordance with the will nobody is allowed to be brought into this monument nor to be buried in it except those freedmen to whom I gave and bestowed it by means of this will.

Much in the way that Livy invites his readers to choose what to imitate and what to avoid, this inscription asks readers to respect the admirable qualities of the deceased and to avoid disturbing the monument. Jaeger discusses the ways in which individuals interact with monuments, and notes that a *monumentum* has "a meaning determined jointly by the reminder, its physical context, and the circumstances of each viewer" (1997: 18). This observation highlights the degree of control that both the creator and interpreter of a monument have over its content. Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* resembles an inscription that invites readers to engage actively, and to make judgments about the examples set forth.

---

[76] For the virtues of the deceased on inscriptions see Lattimore 1942: 290–300. For inscriptions addressing the viewer cf. Bodel 2001: 16–19. For Livy's second person address to his readers cf. Moles 2009: 70–71.

[77] EDCS-19200258 (August 20, 2013). This inscription has been cited for its designation *amans pauperis* as "l'un des rares témoinages de sollicitude envers les pauvres" (AE 2007 126). [One of the rare testimonies of care towards the poor.] This is one of the positive qualities of the deceased that the inscription emphasizes. Lattimore dates this inscription to "before the time of Caesar" (Lattimore 1942: 297).

In this chapter, I will examine Livy's usage of epigraphic material, which reflects his conception of history as *monumentum*. As is the case for many monuments referenced in the *Ab Urbe Condita*, the full extent of Livy's familiarity with epigraphic material is uncertain.[78] The degree to which Livy might have culled from original inscriptions when writing his text is unknown, but he would surely have been familiar with them as part of the Roman epigraphic landscape. Epigraphic sources had long been part of the Roman historiographical tradition. The *Annales Maximi* were an important source for early Roman historians, and it was not until the consulship of Publius Mucius Scaevola in 133 B. C. E. that these epigraphic records were transferred to scrolls (Mehl 2001: 37–38).[79] We also know that Cato read inscriptions, with an extant fragment expressing his displeasure with the content of the inscribed records of the *pontifices* (HRR Cato F.77 = CC / FRH 4.1 = Schönberger F. 77) (Mehl 2001: 37).[80] Other epigraphic sources, such as *fasti* and inscribed triumph notices, would also have been readily

[78] For example, in the case of an inscribed altar dedicated by Hannibal (Livy 28.46.15–16), Jaeger notes that "Livy does not say how he learned of this monument, whether he saw it himself, or read about it, or saw it and read about it" (Jaeger 2006: 393). The monument will be discussed in more detail below (pp. 56-57).

[79] Mehl suggests that the version written on scrolls superseded the epigraphic one c. 115 B. C. E., with the result that historians writing after this point might have relied on it instead of the original epigraphic sources (Mehl 2001: 38). It is likely that Scaevola drew upon a variety of different sources when preparing the *Annales*, with the result that they were not a direct copy of the original inscribed version. Nevertheless, they might have retained some of the conventions and character of the original epigraphic material, and Scaevola may also have consulted inscribed *fasti* (Mehl 2001: 39).

[80] The fragment reads: "Verba Catonis ex originum quarto haec sunt: Non lubet scribere, quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit" (Gell. 2.28.6) (HRR Cato F. 77). [These are the words of Cato from the fourth book of his *Origines*: It is not pleasing to write what is on the inscription at the place of the pontifex maximus, how often grain was dear, how often fog or some such thing obstructed the light of the moon or sun.] Cf. Walter 2004: 203 and Cato FRH 3. 2. 28: "Lucum Dianium in nemore Aricino Egerius Baebius Tusculanus dedicavit dictator Latinus, hi populi communiter: Tusculanus, Aricinus, Lanuvinus, Laurens, Coranus, Tiburtis, Pometinus, Ardeatis Rutulus" (Prisc. Gramm. 4. p. 129 H = Prisc. Gramm. 7 p. 337 H (F 58 Peter)) (FRH 3.2.28). [Egerius Baebius as Latin dictator of Tusculum dedicated a shrine of Diana in the Arician grove. These peoples jointly dedicated it: the inhabitants of Tusculum, Aricia, Lanuvium, Laurentum, Coranus, the Tibur, Pometinus, and Ardeatis Rutulus.] FRH notes that "Wegen der genauen Aufzählung nimmt Rosenberg (1921) 164. 166 an, dass Cato hier die Weihinschrift wiedergibt" (Cato FRH 3. 2. 28, p. 190). [Because of the precise enumeration Rosenberg (1921: 164–66) took it that here Cato quotes a dedicatory inscription.]

available for consultation by those writing history.[81] Furthermore, it is notable that many of the different uses of epigraphy in Livy are consistent with the types of inscription that would have been of interest to the emperor Augustus and those writing in his service.[82] This may lead us to wonder to what extent Augustan epigraphy, and the increased epigraphic activity of the Augustan era, influenced Livy's descriptions of epigraphic evidence for earlier periods of Roman history. By gaining a better understanding of how Livy engages with the epigraphic habit, we can better understand not only his own methodologies, but also how Augustan cultural sentiments might have influenced his work.[83]

Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* contains many references to inscriptions of various types, ranging from inscribed tablets to inscribed twin chests allegedly containing the remains of Numa and his books (Livy 40.29.3–4). A full list of references is detailed in the appendix, which shows the vast range of information that Livy provides about different types of inscriptions. The details that he gives about inscriptions reveal his interest in them as potential sources as well as his careful and selective treatment of them. In this chapter, I will examine Livy's usage of epigraphic material, which reflects his conception of history as *monumentum* and his program of selective imitation and avoidance. First, I will discuss the death notices in the first book of Livy, which parallel inscriptions, including ones in Augustus' forum. Then, I will examine epigraphic resonances in Livy's descriptions of exemplary characters, using the Scipios, notable for their prominence in Livy and for their elaborate tomb, as a case study. Next, I will examine Livy's

[81] For the *fasti* cf. Feeney 2007. For Livy's use of triumph notices, including the *fasti triumphales* see Phillips 2009, also addressing the influence of the *Annales Maximi*. For a Roman epigraphic parallel to Livy's triumphal language see Kraus 1994: 108n4.1 and discussion below (58n138).

[82] For Augustus' inscriptions cf. Alföldy 1991.

[83] For Livy's relationship to the Augustan age see Deininger 1985: 266, Galinsky 1996: 280–87, Kraus and Woodman 1997: 70–74, and Grant 1970: 231. Syme notes the difficulty of characterizing Livy's work as Augustan, observing that "Livy was a grown man long before the new dispensation came into force," and raising the question of "what is meant by 'Augustan'" (1959: 28). For the challenges inherent in delineating the Augustan age see Eder 1990: 72 and Conte 1994: 249. For the paucity of direct references to the *princeps* in Livy see Mensching 1967: 12.

more direct references to epigraphy, discussing how he may have used different types of inscriptions as source material. I will also consider why certain types of inscriptions, such as the ones accompanying ancestral *imagines*, as well as ones placed in certain locations, might have been of interest to Livy. I will end by addressing how Livy's varying treatment of inscriptions may reflect his knowledge of the epigraphic tradition, as well as his skepticism of Augustus and his activities.

Death Notices

Like the creator of an inscription, Livy uses epigraphic language to control the ways in which individuals are memorialized in his history and to assert more authority over his account of early Rome.[84] When describing the final resting place of Aeneas, Livy uses epigraphic commonplaces which give his account memorializing and authoritative qualities:

> Situs est, quemcumque eum dici ius fasque est, super Numicum flumen: Iovem indigetem appellant. (Livy 1.2.6)
>
> He is laid to rest, whatever it is just and lawful for him to be called, above the river Numicus: they call him Jove Indiges.

Livy begins with the epigraphic convention "situs est" or "situs" which occurs frequently on inscriptions.[85] Consider these examples from Rome:

> L. Cornelius Cn(aei) f(ilius) Cn(aei) n(epos) Scipio magna sapientia / multasque uirtutes aetate quom parua / posidet hoc saxsum quoiei uita defecit non / honos honore is hic situs quei nunquam / uictus est uirtutei, annos gnatus XX is / l[oc]eis mandatus ne quairatis honore / quei minus sit mandatus.
> (CIL VI 1289 = CIL VI 37039e = CIL I 11 = ILLRP 312 = CLE 9 = D 7 = CSE 5)[86]

[84] For epigraphic authority see 14n36 in the introduction (citing Ramsby 2005: 366). Although Ramsby's focus is on Ovid's poetry, her observations about the authority of epigraphic material are also applicable to Livy's history. Epigraphic authority extends across genres.

[85] A search of the EDCS for "situs est" yielded 11,991 inscriptions (August 20, 2013). For the convention cf. Church 1901 and Lissberger 1934, with 39n89 below.

[86] EDCS-17800194 (August 20, 2013). The CIL prints "L...EIS" and Massaro prints "l[---]eis" in *Epigraphica* (2008: 33). Cf. AE 2003 178

> Lucius Cornelius Scipio son of Gnaeus, grandson of Gnaeus. With great wisdom, and with a small age this stone possesses many virtues. For he who was lacking in flaws, not in honor, is laid to rest here with honor, who was never defeated in virtue. Born twenty-two years ago, he was consigned to the casket. Do not look for one who was consigned with less honor.
>
> C(aius) Iulius divi Aug(usti) l(ibertus) / Cozmus spec(u)laria(rius) / Agrippianus hic situs est / C(aius) Iulius Cosmi l(ibertus) / Sabinus (CIL VI 5202 = ILS 1778)[87]
>
> Gaius Iulius freedman of divine Augustus, Cozmus Agrippianus maker of mirrors, is laid to rest here, Gaius Iulius Sabinus freedman of Cosmus.

The first example comes from the tomb of the Scipios, which interested Livy, and which will be discussed in more detail below. Coarelli dates this inscription to c. 190–170 B. C. E. (1972: 48). The latter example refers to Augustus, and comes from a columbarium near the tomb of the Scipios which makes several references to the imperial family.[88] These are only two of very many inscriptions with the phrase, and it is clear that "situs est" was an epigraphic commonplace that was used on funerary inscriptions during the republic and the empire, and possibly even earlier. In fact, Cicero comments on how Ennius used the phrase to describe the burial of Scipio Africanus: "declarat enim Ennius de Africano: 'Hic est ille situs.' vere; nam siti dicuntur ii, qui conditi sunt" (Cic. *Leg*. 2.22.57). [Ennius declares about Africanus: "Here that man is laid to rest." Rightly so; for those are called "laid," who are "buried."][89] By using this phrase, Livy gives his description of Aeneas a memorializing quality, and adds closure to his account of the Aeneas story. In addition, the convention marks continuity of tradition, suggesting that a phrase

[87] EDCS-18700555 (August 20, 2013).

[88] According to the CIL, this inscription was found in a columbarium near the Via Appia in close proximity to the tomb of the Scipios (CIL VI p. 939). The convention "divus Augustus" can be used to determine a *terminus post quem* for the inscription (CIL VI p. 941). The CIL also notes the presence of inscriptions for slaves of Caligula and Tiberius, suggesting that the urns were filled during their reigns or shortly thereafter (CIL VI p. 941). Hence, the inscription might be Tiberian, but the exact date is unknown.

[89] Church cites the Ennius passage as "Den frühesten Beleg" (the oldest record) of the situs formula, and notes that Cicero comments on it (1901: 10). He also observes that "Wie weit der allgemeine Gebrauch der Situsformel zurückreicht, lässt sich wegen der Spärlichkeit der chronologisch bestimmbaren Inschriften nicht genau feststellen" (Church 1901: 10). [How far the common use of the "situs" formula goes back cannot be ascertained precisely on account of the paucity of chronologically determinable inscriptions.] Cf. Lissberger 1934: 132.

well-attested on funerary epitaphs visible to Livy's readers is also applicable to the death of a mythical early Roman historical figure. This sort of historical continuity, reinforced by epigraphic continuity, would have been of interest to Augustus, who tried to connect his own family lineage to Aeneas and the early origins of Rome.

Livy's death notices of the kings include the phrase *regnavit annos*, which also occurs on inscriptions from the Augustan forum:[90]

> Aen[e]a[s primus] / Latin[orum rex] / regnav[it annos III].
> (CIL VI 40931 = AE 1934 149 = InscrIt 13.3.1 = AE 1999 177)[91]
>
> Aeneas the first king of the Latins ruled for three years.
>
> Ro[mulus rex] / M[artis filius] / ur[bem Romam condidit] / [regnavit ann(os) XXXVIII].
> (CIL VI 40937)[92]
>
> King Romulus the son of Mars founded the city Rome. He ruled for 38 years.

This convention resembles the common phrase *vixit annos*, which appeared frequently on Roman funerary inscriptions. A search of the EDCS for "vixit" and "annos" yielded 40,734 inscriptions (May 31, 2014), demonstrating the common epigraphic usage of this phrase.[93] The phrase *regnavit annos* is similar to other recurring epigraphic formulae, such as *vixit annos* or *Dis*

[90] The CIL suggests that there are between seven and nine "elogia regum" that were found in the Forum of Augustus. Since many of them are very fragmentary, it is difficult to say how many actually included the phrase *regnavit annos*. Other inscriptions from the forum of Augustus which are reconstructed with similar language include ones in honor of Quartus Aeneas Silvius (CIL VI 40932 = AE 1934 148 = AE 1999 178 = InscrIt 13.3.2 = EDCS-01000045), Sextus Alba Silvius (CIL VI 40933 = InscrIT 13.3.3 = InscrIT 13.3.31 = AE 1999 179 = EDCS-01000046), Calpetus Silvius (CIL VI 40934 = AE 1999 180 = EDCS-01000047), Proca Silvius (CIL VI 40935 = EDCS-01000048), and M. Atius Balbus (CIL VI 40936 = InscrIT 13.3.38 = AE 1999 185 = EDCS-01000049). The CIL notes the possibility that CIL VI 40937 was a "titulus honorarius" instead of one of the "elogia regum." As mentioned on p. 16, there are also inscriptions in honor of Aeneas (CIL X 808 = CIL 10 8348 = EE 8.1.311 = EE 8.1.854 = InscrIT 13.3.85 = ILS 63 = EDCS-11400892) and Romulus (CIL X 809 = InscrIT 13.3.86 = ILS 64 = EDCS-11400893) with similar language that were found in Pompeii, perhaps indicating that these epigraphic representations extended beyond the Augustan forum. According to AE, there could be a connection between the Pompeiian inscriptions, as well as another found at Mérida in Spain (apparently part of a replica of the Augustan forum) (AE 1996 864), and the *elogia* placed under the statues in the Augustan forum (AE 199 177).

[91] EDCS-01000044 (August 20, 2013). For the inscription cf. Geiger 2008: 130.

[92] EDCS-01000050 (August 20, 2013). For the inscription and additional theories about its restoration and original location cf. Geiger 2008: 137–38. AE 1941 60 is a different earlier reconstruction of the same inscription.

[93] EDCS (May 31, 2014).

Manibus, which cue the reader to recognize the epigraphic genre, but then may be upstaged by compelling descriptions of memorialized individuals.[94] The recurring, formulaic nature of the convention *regnavit annos* shifts the focus to the more variable aspects of the notices: the characteristics and achievements of the deceased kings. In the case of the death notices for the kings, the city continues to be a point of focus along with the qualities of the rulers.

Livy's uses *regnavit annos* on the shared death notice of Romulus and Numa, which sets the stage for his death notices of subsequent kings:

> Ita duo deinceps reges, alius alia via, ille bello, hic pace, civitatem auxerunt. Romulus septem et triginta regnavit annos, Numa tres et quadraginta. Cum valida tum temperata et belli et pacis artibus erat civitas.
> (Livy 1.21.6)
>
> Thus two kings in succession, each one by a different path, the former in war, the latter in peace, built up the community. Romulus ruled for thirty-seven years, Numa for forty-three, at that time when the strong community had been regulated by the arts of both war and peace.

Livy chooses to memorialize Romulus and Numa together, portraying them as instrumental to Rome's early foundation and development. This pairing has Augustan resonances, and as Galinsky has argued, "Augustus, who was both Numa and Romulus, brought back the *remedia* of both religious restoration and expansion of the empire by foreign conquests" (Galinsky 1996: 282). Here Livy highlights both differences and similarities between Romulus and Numa: both built up the city, but one did so in war, and one did so in peace. The verb *auxerunt* may remind us of Augustus, who also built up the city of Rome.[95] While this death notice characterizes

[94] Cf. Dinter's discussion of "epigraphic markers" in Latin poetry (2011: 7–18) and (2013). Thomas has noted usages of *vixi* to introduce sepulchral epigrams (1998: 219, 221). Cf. 126n309 below. For the formula *Dis Manibus* see Lissberger 1934: 71–72 and Lattimore 1942: 90–95.

[95] Luce has noted that "One theory maintains that the historian strove to use the adjective *augustus* in significant contexts flattering to the emperor, while another study has shown that he neglected so many opportunities to use the word in this way that the hypothesis is untenable" (Luce 1965: 239). He cites Taylor 1918: 158–61, Scott 1925: 82–105, and Stübler 1941: 10–17 for use of the adjective to flatter the emperor, with Erckell 1952: 19–25 making the opposing argument. Cf. Luce 1965: 239n88. I thank Stephen Hinds for drawing this particular instance to my attention.

Romulus and Numa, it also characterizes the *civitas* and memorializes the way that it used to be in the past. This might reflect a desire on Livy's part to portray the city as a central persona of the narrative, which mirrors the exemplary individuals detailed throughout the history.[96] Livy's usage of "cum tum" coupled with the pluperfect passive emphasizes that this positive characterization of the Roman community applies to the past, not the more recent moral decline that Livy outlines in the preface (Livy *Praef*. 9). The death notice is not only for the two kings, but also for the earlier version of Rome that they helped to create.

Livy's death notice for Ancus is generic and formulaic, much like many inscriptions that use conventional language to describe the deceased.

> Regnavit Ancus annos quattuor et viginti, cuilibet superiorum regum belli pacisque et artibus et gloria par. (Livy 1.35.1)
>
> Ancus ruled for twenty-four years, his glory equal to any of the preceding kings in the arts of war and peace.

The convention *regnavit annos* invites us to compare this death notice with the one for Romulus and Numa, who excelled in war and peace respectively. Whereas their death notice makes a strong distinction between war and peace, and suggests that they each set a precedent for development in their respective domain, this death notice synthesizes the two spheres of influence. Livy constructs Ancus as a continuation of the traditions begun by Romulus and Numa, not outstanding, but equal to any of the preceding kings. Livy highlights a period of relative continuity that occurs in the monarchy after Romulus and Numa. By establishing this continuity, he is able to accentuate the subsequent moral decline that occurs after the reign of Servius Tullius, whom he identifies as the last of the just and legitimate kings (Livy 1.48.8).

[96] Marincola has made a similar observation about Athens and Sparta as "characters" in Thucydides' work (1997: 22).

Although the dating of Livy's first pentad is problematic, it is very likely that the passages from Livy pre-date the inscriptions from the Forum of Augustus.[97] Hence, if there is a direct correlation between Livy's language and the language of these inscriptions, it is likely that Livy was the model rather than the reverse.[98] What is important is not who influenced whom, but rather the fact that both of these instances represent memorials to important individuals which emphasize their roles as exemplary kings. It is striking that the *elogium* for Romulus might include the phrase "ur[bem Romam condidit]." If this reconstruction is correct, it is not dissimilar to Livy's characterization of Romulus, which references the city directly with the phrase "civitatem auxerunt" (Livy 1.21.6). This inscription might also remind us of the title of Livy's narrative, *Ab Urbe Condita*, and the centrality of the city to Roman history. Augustus wanted to connect himself to earlier Roman rulers through his monumental forum, and the verb *regnavit* emphasizes the power of the figures whom Augustus honored in connection with himself.[99] Hence, like the creator of an inscription, Livy uses epigraphic language to control the ways in which individuals are memorialized in his history. Livy invites the reader to compare subsequent rulers to Romulus, and by using similar language to portray Romulus in his own forum, Augustus invites readers of the inscriptions to consider how he compares with his

[97] For the chronology of Livy's first pentad see Luce 1965 and Burton 2000. For a comparison of Livy and the forum, including discussion of how the two differ see Luce: 1990. For differences see Flower 1996: 233. The Forum of Augustus and temple of Mars Ultor were apparently dedicated in 2 B. C. E. Augustus had vowed to create the temple during the battle of Philippi, and the forum might have been opened before the official dedication (Platner and Ashby 1929: 220). Cf. p. 13n35 above. For the chronology of the temple cf. Kockel 1995: 289. The CIL also suggests that these inscriptions were composed based on catalogues written earlier in the age of Augustus, including ones at Livy 1.3.1–11, Ovid *Fast*. 4.41–56, and Ovid *Met*. 14.609–22. Cf. Geiger 2008 for possible Roman models for the Forum of Augustus, including literary ones. Cf. Chaplin for the chronology of the Forum of Augustus (2000: 174n26). For the similarity between Livy's descriptions of heroes and the individuals in Augustus' forum cf. Grant 1970: 227.

[98] Augustus or those writing in his service might have had similar goals to Livy when composing inscriptions for the forum. As Chaplin has observed, "... Augustus might be manipulating the past and writing his own exemplary history into the *elogia*" (2000: 184).

[99] Geiger has suggested that the display of statues of the Julians and *summi viri* was "an important manifestation of a changing attitude to the personality and its artistic impact" (2008: 1). For a comparison of the *monumentum* in Livy's preface to a Roman forum see Kraus and Woodman 1997: 57–58.

predecessors as well.[100] Epigraphic language allows Livy to construct Romulus as a positive figure, at least at this moment focusing on his positive exemplarity rather than on his more negative qualities.[101] In the case of both Livy's death notices and the inscriptions in the forum, it is up to the reader to decide if Augustus truly follows the *exempla* with which he associated himself.

The Exemplary Scipios

Livy's accounts of exemplary figures are not limited to kings. Many others are also worthy of imitation, including the Scipios, who receive considerable attention in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. The Scipios are also exemplary in the epigraphic record, of which Livy might well have been aware.[102] Livy's apparent interest in the Scipios (he describes their tomb at 38.56.3–4) suggests that in this case he might have been more zealous than usual in engaging with the material record, and in particular material evidence for funerary honors. As Bodel has noted, "The historian Livy is not known for his devotion to research, but he nonetheless felt compelled to inspect the site of Scipio's villa personally in order to verify the conflicting reports of his sources concerning the place of the general's death and burial" (Bodel 1997: 6). The Scipios clearly interested Augustus, too, since several members of the family were honored with statues

[100] Cf. 13n34 (citing Frisch 1980 and Luce 1990: 127).

[101] For the tensions surrounding Romulus and how they might have affected the emperor's choice of the name "Augustus" rather than "Romulus" see Syme 1959: 55.

[102] Of course, it is not possible to know if Livy was familiar with the inscriptions inside the tomb of the Scipios, and Flower has argued that "...the tomb was kept closed, so that the inscriptions were not designated specifically for a public audience. In this sense the epitaphs represent a true family tradition, composed by and for the family to preserve their personal self-image" (1996: 160). Cf. Eck, noting that "In many cases the intended onlookers [of inscriptions] were not the general public but a smaller, circumscribed group of persons" (1984: 135). Cf. also Eck 1984: 132 and discussion by Flower (1996: 160n6). Although it seems likely that the general public would not have been familiar with the epitaphs, it is possible that the tomb could have been open to elite viewers allowed entrance by the Scipio family. Cf. Syme's discussion of the *acta senatus* as one of Livy's potential sources, usually off limits but perhaps available for consultation by "an approved person such as Livy" (1959: 66). See Grant 1970: 22 for Livy's reputation, and for his acquaintance with Augustus see Ogilvie 1965: 2 and Luce 1990: 124.

and inscriptions in his forum.[103] Geiger notes that extant epigraphic evidence for the *elogium* of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus references his indictment of two tribunes, an assertion of authority which he views as representative of Augustan ideology (Geiger 2008: 148).[104] In addition, Ennius wrote literary epitaphs in honor of Scipio Africanus, which suggest that there was also literary precedent for using epigraphic conventions to memorialize the Scipios in writing.[105] The Scipios and their ancestral imagines also take center stage in Cicero's *Republic*, most notably in the *Somnium Scipionis* (Book 6), and perhaps it is no coincidence that Livy references the *imagines* of the Scipio family, marking the continuation of an interest in the family and its *imagines* between republic and empire.[106]

Of course, limited evidence makes it difficult to assess Livy's familiarity with epigraphic models. Like Livy's history, what remains of the tomb of the Scipios is fragmentary. Nevertheless, we are fortunate to have not only literary evidence for the tomb and its location, but also some material remains, including inscriptions.[107] The tomb and its contents provide valuable evidence of how the Scipios memorialized and portrayed members of their family. As

[103] The members of the Scipio family thought to have been included in the forum are P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (possibly CIL VI 40948 = EDCS-01000061), L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus (CIL VI 40950 = CIL VI 31607 = CIL I p. 194 = AE 1891 11 = InscrIt 13.3.15 = EDCS-01000063), and P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (possibly CIL VI 40949 = AE 1999 189 = InscrIt 13.3.20 = EDCS-01000062). Cf. Geiger 2008: 147–533. All of these inscriptions are very fragmentary. Flower notes of the inscriptions in Augustus' forum: "The traditional nature of the two-part *elogia* from the forum, including separate label and *cursus*, reminds us of the epigraphical habits found in the tomb of the Scipios ... In displaying his own version of past careers, Augustus offered an alternative to the traditions preserved by the annalists and by Livy" (1996: 233). Cf. Flower 1996: 233n44.

[104] For this incident Geiger references Livy 38.50.1, 38.56.3, and 45.38.7.

[105] Cf. Ramsby 2007: 25–27. For the epitaph written by Ennius cf. Cicero *Leg*. 2.22.57 and discussion above on p. 39.

[106] Cf. Flower noting that "Augustus' use of iconography associated with the *imagines* enabled him to match and reshape the nature of aristocratic family self-advertisement, which had been a traditional base of political and social power throughout the Republic" (1996: 236). Furthermore, Eder notes that Cicero compares Augustus with Scipio (*Phil* 5.8.23, 19.53, and 17.48), and he also poses the question of Ciceronian influence on Augustan portraiture and the *summi viri* (Eder 1990: 91).

[107] For the literary evidence, in addition to Livy 38.56.3–4 see Cicero *Tusc*. 1.6.13 (mentioning the tomb's location outside of the Porta Capena); Cicero *Leg*. 2.22.57 (quoting Ennius; see pp. 39 and 45n105); Cicero *Arch*. 9.22, Plin. *HN* 7.114, and Val. Max. 8.14.1 (for the statue of Ennius in the tomb of Scipios); and Ovid *Ars*. *am*. 3.409–10 (noting that Ennius deserved to be placed next to Scipio). For detailed descriptions of the tomb of the Scipios and plans see Flower 1996: 160–80 and Richardson 1992: 359–60. Cf. also Platner and Ashby 1929: 484–86, and Nash (vol. 2) 1968: 352–56, Richardson 1992: 359–60, Zevi 1993, and Coarelli 2007: 367–73.

mentioned earlier, Livy reveals that he visited a tomb site of Scipio himself, apparently recognizing its value as a potential source, or at least curious about it. He notes that there is uncertainty as to whether Scipio was buried at Rome or Liternum, and offers descriptions of both sites:

> alii Romae, alii Literni et mortuum et sepultum. Utrobique monumenta ostenduntur et statuae; nam et Literni monumentum monumentoque statua superimposita fuit, quam tempestate disiectam nuper vidimus ipsi, et Romae extra Portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuae sunt, quarum duae P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse, tertia poetae Q. Ennii. (Livy 38.56.3–4).
>
> Some say that he died and was buried at Rome, some say at Liternum. In both places monuments and statues are displayed; for at Liternum there was both a monument and a statue placed on top of the monument, which I myself saw not long ago scattered by a storm, and at Rome outside the Porta Capena there are three statues on [or in] the monument of the Scipios, of which two are said to be of Publius and Lucius Scipio, the third of the poet Quintus Ennius.

The extant remains of the tomb do not allow us to confirm or refute Livy's account of the statues. Page notes that "No inscriptions to Publius or Lucius Scipio and no identifiable statue of either has been found in the Scipio tomb. The bust which some suppose to be that of Ennius exists in the Vatican Museum" (Page 1958: 196n1).[108] There is much to learn from the tomb of the Scipios, but much of the evidence is also damaged or missing.[109] Livy himself seems to have been aware of the problem. Marincola notes that "Atypically, Livy's autopsy does not improve the record; if anything, it is a complaint that autopsy can contribute nothing to the problem" (1997: 102n198).[110] Livy inspected the site of the tomb, but could not resolve the issue. What is clear is that he was interested in the tomb, and so might also have been interested in the inscriptions.

[108] Cf. Briscoe 2008: 197–98n38.56.4.

[109] Flower, citing Coarelli 1972: 41 and 60, notes that "The grave apparently contained nearly all the family members who died during the third and second centuries BC, in over thirty burials, yet we can supply only half that number of names from our record of office-holders" (Flower 1996: 161).

[110] Cf. Briscoe 2008: 197n38.56.3.

Like Livy's history, the inscriptions in the tomb of the Scipios invite the reader to make judgments about individuals, and in some cases they make the exemplary character of the deceased very clear. Consider, for example, the epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio, son of Barbatus:

> L(ucius) Cornelio(s) L(uci) f(ilius) Scipio / aidiles co(n)sol ce(n)sor // honc oino ploirume cosentiont R[omane] / duonoro optumo fuise viro / Luciom Scipione filios Barbati / consol censor aidilis hic fuet a[pud vos] / hec cepit Corsica(m) Aleria(m)que urbe(m) / dedet Tempestatebus aide mereto[d] (CIL VI 1287 = CIL VI 37039c = CIL I 9 = ILLRP 310b = CLE 6 = ILS 3 = CSE 3b)[111]
>
> Lucius Cornelius Scipio son of Lucius, aedile, consul, censor. // Most Romans agree that this man alone was the best of good men. Lucius Scipo son of Barbatus. This man was consul, censor, aedile among you; he captured Corsica and the Alerian city, he deservedly dedicated a temple to the storms.

This epitaph presents a general consensus and expects the reader to agree with it: nine out of ten Romans agree (and you should, too) that L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus was the best.[112] The role of the reader in response to this and other inscriptions in honor of the Scipios has been noted by Habinek, who (as discussed above) views the readers as crucial to the continuation of the tradition (Habinek 1998: 52).[113] This invitation to evaluate the tradition is one that Livy extends to his audience as well through numerous references to the Scipios as exemplary figures.[114] Perhaps it is no coincidence that representations of the Scipios on inscriptions and in Livy portray them as important figures in a continuing tradition of exemplarity which extended from

[111] EDCS-17800192 (August 21, 2013). The EDCS gives regularizations of archaic spellings in triangular brackets (i. e., "a<e=I>dles"). I have retained the original spellings in order to preserve the archaic character of the text. The first two lines are painted on the lid of the sarcophagus (Coarelli 2007: 369), and I have added "//" to distinguish them from the rest of the text. The CIL cites the first two lines as CIL VI 1286. Cf. Kruschwitz 1998 and Massaro 2008: 32.

[112] Cf. Eck's caveat that "Above all, one must stick to the point that a considerable portion of all monuments whose existence we may infer from the inscriptions were erected not for the living but for persons already dead. This being so, such texts could not serve to advertise the persons named in them, but, at the most, their family" (Eck 1984: 135). Such inscriptions might also advertise the memory of the deceased, turning it into an *exemplum* to be interpreted and contextualized by the viewer along with the family.

[113] Cf. p. 4 above. Also see Ramsby 2007: 23 and Flower, noting that "At the heart of both the *atrium* and the tomb was the memory of the family's past record as it was constructed, tended, and reconstructed over the generations" (1996: 160).

[114] Cf. Kraus and Woodman 1997: 55 and discussion on p. 34 above.

republic to empire.[115] Further probing of Livy's references to the Scipios in comparison with epigraphic material will reveal parallels, and will also shed light on how Livy carries out the program outlined in his *Preface*.

The aforementioned inscription in honor of L. Cornelius Scipio portrays him as an individual honored collectively by the Roman people, and this is similar to a sentiment expressed by Marcius, who voices a need to follow the example of the Scipios:

> Praesto est enim acerba memoria et Scipiones me ambo dies noctesque curis insomniisque agitant et excitant saepe somno, neu se neu invictos per octo annos in his terris milites suos, commilitones vestros, neu rem publicam patiar inultam, et suam disciplinam suaque instituta sequi iubent et, ut imperiis vivorum nemo oboedientior me uno fuerit, ita post mortem suam, quod quaqua in re facturos illos fuisse maxime censeam, id optimum ducere. Vos quoque velim, milites, non lamentis lacrimisque tamquam extinctos prosequi—viuunt vigentque fama rerum grestarum—sed, quotienscumque occuret memoria illorum, velut si adhortantis signumque dantis videatis eos, ita proelia inire. Nec alia profecto species hesterno die oblata oculis animisque vestris memorabile illud edidit proelium, quo documentum dedistis hostibus non cum Scipionibus extinctum esse nomen Romanum et, cuius populi vis atque virtus non obruta sit Cannensi clade, ex omni profecto saevitia fortunae emersurum esse.
> (Livy 25.38.5-10)
>
> For a bitter memory is at hand, and the Scipios vex me both day and night with cares and with sleeplessness, and they often rouse me from sleep, that I endure neither themselves nor their soldiers undefeated in these lands for eight years—your fellow soldiers—nor the state unavenged. And they order me to follow their teaching and their precepts and, as nobody was more obedient than me alone to their commands while they lived, so after their death it is best to follow what I most think they themselves would have been about to do in any given situation. I would like for you also, soldiers, to follow them not with laments and tears as though they are dead—they live and thrive by the reputation of their accomplishments—but, whenever the memory of them comes up, just as if you see them urging you on and giving the signal, go into battle thus. Nor did another image at hand shown to your eyes and minds yesterday give rise to that battle, by which you taught the enemies a lesson, that the Roman name was not extinguished with the Scipios, the strength and virtue of whose people was not crushed by the slaughter of Cannae, and surely will bounce back from every severity of fortune.

Marcianus' message is similar to the message of the inscription, exhorting the Romans to recognize and follow the *exemplum* of the Scipios. This passage encourages Roman audiences

[115] Although the date of L. Scipio Barbatus' death is unknown, Coarelli estimates that the inscription dates to c. 230 B. C. E. (2007: 369). Cf. Coarelli 1972: 48 and Flower 1996: 171n45.

(both Marcianus' audience and Livy's audience) to see themselves as instrumental to the continuation of the tradition. By connecting the continuation of the Roman name to the Scipios directly, Marcianus exhorts Romans to carry on in accordance with their example, and presents this as a national duty. This exhortation also reflects the agenda outlined in Livy's preface, and here he presents the Scipios as men worthy of imitation. Furthermore, Marcianus makes himself exemplary when he says that he was their most obedient follower. Hence, Romans should not only imitate the Scipios, but also Marcianus' dutiful adherence to their teachings.[116]

Livy also portrays the Scipios as exemplary at the end of Book 35, discussing how Africanus' name impacted ancestral *imagines*:[117]

> primus certe hic imperator nomine victae ab se gentis est nobilitatus; exemplo deinde huius nequaquam uictoria pares insignes imaginum titulos claraque cognomina familiarum fecerunt. (Livy 30.45.7)
>
> To be sure this general was the first raised in rank by the name of the race conquered by him; then by his example ones by no means equal in victory made distinguished inscriptions for their *imagines* and illustrious names for their families.

By ending the book on this note, Livy memorializes Scipio indirectly, placing him against the backdrop of other inscriptions accompanying ancestral *imagines*. By doing so, he honors Scipio in a way that is not entirely different from extant epigraphic tributes to the family, including the aforementioned tribute to L. Cornelius Scipio. In this case Scipio is not only exemplary for his achievements, but is also an example for subsequent inscriptions, which sport titles in honor of individuals who (according to Livy) were less distinguished than the one who started the trend.

---

[116] In addition to having epigraphic resonances, this appeal to the example of the Scipios is also a powerful rhetorical technique, and as Flower has noted, it was a technique that was not uncommon in Roman society (1996: 150). She notes that "In a highly conservative society any advocate could further his cause by trying to show it was in harmony with the practices of the ancestors. Outside of the formal setting of the *laudatio*, ancestors had a standard role to play in many other branches of oratory, notably in political and legal speeches" (1996: 150).

[117] Flower has observed the importance of the *imagines* for the memory of the Scipio family, noting that "The family is remembered for those of its members who had the rank to be represented by *imagines* after their death while the others, especially wives and children who died young, lived in their shadow. They all kept company together in a private context inside the tomb" (Flower 1996: 161). Livy also references the *imago* of Publius Scipio Nasica in connection with the distinction of being chosen to greet the Idaean Mother (Livy 36.40.8–9).

By making this statement, Livy invites his readers to think of Scipio when they read or remember inscriptions accompanying ancestral *imagines*, emphasizing Scipio's impact on them. With this gesture, Livy finds his own way to memorialize Scipio, co-opting other *imagines* as indirect memorials to him. Considering that *imagines* would have been very visible to Livy's readers, this is a powerful move, and it demonstrates Livy's awareness of both the authority and malleability of inscriptions.[118]

Inscriptions and Authority

Livy's references to the *imagines* are not limited to the Scipios. In fact, Livy comments earlier on the authority of the *imagines* as sources, suggesting that families falsified them in order to claim additional honors:

> Nec facile est aut rem rei aut auctorem auctori praeferre. Vitiatam memoriam funebribus laudibus reor falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familiae ad se quaeque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallente mendacio trahunt; inde certe et singulorum gesta et publica monumenta rerum confusa. Nec quisquam aequalis temporibus illis scriptor exstat quo satis certo auctore stetur. (Livy 8.40.3–5).
>
> It is not easy to give precedence to one history or author over another. I think that memory was impaired by funeral eulogies and the false inscriptions of *imagines*, while each of the families by means of a deceiving lie drew to themselves the glory of deeds and high offices. Hence certainly both the deeds of individuals and public monuments of affairs have been confused. Nor does there exist any writer of the same age as those times by whom it may be sufficiently settled with a fixed authority.

This passage suggests that Livy was aware of the potential value of inscriptions accompanying *imagines* as sources, and that he might have consulted, or at least considered consulting them. Since he comments here explicitly on the difficulty of taking the sources at their word, it is clear that he recognizes the problems inherent in the epigraphic record. This also raises important questions about Livy's attitude toward Augustan inscriptions. He might have taken a similarly

[118] For the *imagines* cf. Flower 1996.

skeptical view of the inscriptions in the forum of Augustus, discussed above in connection with Romulus (i. e. Augustus could have been one of the less deserving Romans who followed in Scipio's epigraphic footsteps).[119] Augustus' attempts to link his own family to Aeneas and Venus are not entirely dissimilar to these instances of familial embellishment of ancestral *imagines*.[120] If Livy considered the images of *summi viri* and their accompanying inscriptions "falsis imaginum titulis," there may be subversive undertones in his account of a city that becomes "augustior" (*Praef*. 7), but also experiences great decline.[121] It is possible that for Livy, Augustan dishonesty harkens back to republican dishonesty, and the *imagines* with their misleading inscriptions provide a visual link between republic and empire, illustrating decline and continuing corruption. Livy in fact bolsters the authority of his own (unfortunately no longer extant) account of the Augustan age by suggesting that a contemporary author of the time period would be an authoritative source against which he could check the accuracy of the inscribed *imagines*. By making this claim, Livy suggests implicitly that the authority of his own historical account supersedes the authority of contemporary epigraphic sources. His history, characterized by epigraphic selectivity, is more reliable than the inscriptions created by the emperor and those writing in his service. This is an important claim which suggests that Livy was aware of Augustus' increasing usage of inscriptions as propaganda, and positioned his own work to be more authoritative than contemporary inscriptions.

---

[119] For Augustus and the *imagines* cf. Flower 1996: 223–55. She notes that "Augustus' adopted family, the patrician Julii, did not furnish sufficient *imagines* to match other office-holding houses; hence his decision to use the ancestors of the traditional ruling oligarchy" (1996: 232). This ancestral résumé-padding is similar to the embellishment of *imagines* criticized by Livy. Cf. also Rowell 1940 (responding to Weber 1936) for possible connections between the representation of individuals in Augustus' forum and the *imagines* of relatives and non-relatives displayed in his funeral procession.

[120] For connections between Augustus' family and Aeneas and Venus see Zanker 1988: 195.

[121] Cf. Grant, noting that Livy "seems to have been conscious of the need for care" (Grant 1970: 231). For possible subversion cf. Kraus and Woodman 1997: 73. For the adjective "augustus" see p. 41n95 above.

Livy gives a concrete example of this type of ancestral embellishment in the case of Fabius, noting that the inscription connected with his *imago* makes it seem like he was a true dictator instead of an acting one:

> Omnium prope annales Fabium dictatorem adversus Hannibalem rem gessisse tradunt; Coelius etiam eum primum a populo creatum dictatorem scribit. Sed et Coelium et ceteros fugit uni consuli Cn. Servilio, qui tum procul in Gallia provincia aberat, ius fuisse dicendi dictatoris. Quam moram quia exspectare territa tanta clade civitas non poterat, eo decursum esse ut a populo crearetur qui pro dictatore esset; res inde gestas gloriamque insignem ducis et augentes titulum imaginis posteros, ut qui pro dictatore creatus erat fuisse dictator crederetur facile obtinuisse. (Livy 22.31.8–11)
>
> The annals of nearly all pass down the information that as a dictator Fabius acted against Hannibal; Coelius even writes that he was the first appointed dictator by the people. But it escapes Coelius and the rest that the power of declaring a dictator belonged to the one consul Gnaeus Servilius, who then was far away in the province of Gaul. Because the citizens, terrified by such a disaster, were not able to wait for such a delay, there was recourse that one who would be in the place of a dictator would be elected by the populace; hence the accomplishments, the distinguished glory of the leader, and the descendants augmenting the inscription for the *imagines* easily prevailed so that it was believed that one who had been elected in place of a dictator had actually been a dictator.

In this case, Livy cites epigraphic evidence in order to explain how the tradition surrounding Fabius' title has been corrupted. By doing so, he increases his authorial credibility, and also shows awareness of the epigraphic habit.[122] This might lead us to wonder if he consulted epigraphic sources directly, or knew of the epigraphic material secondhand. In addition, "augentes" could remind us of Augustus.[123] This explanation of how Fabius' not entirely deserved title became part of the epigraphic record puts one in mind of Augustus' own ancestral embellishments.

In fact, Livy's ambiguous treatment of a more explicitly Augustan epigraphic moment, Augustus' account of the inscribed linen breastplate indicating that Aulus Cornelius Cossus

[122] Foster suggests that the inscription included the phrase "II dictator " or "bis dictator," which would have made it appear that Fabius had been made dictator instead of merely given the powers of an acting dictator (1957: 306–7n2).

[123] Cf. pp. 41n95 and 51 above.

brought the *spolia opima* to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius when he was a consul (rather than a military tribune) has received considerable attention. This was a politically charged issue for Augustus, since he wanted to ensure that there was no precedent for M. Licinius Crassus to dedicate the *spolia opima*.[124] Livy claims initially that A. Cornelius Cossus brought the *spolia opima* to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius when he held the rank of military tribune (Livy 4.20.5). Then, he reports hearing that Augustus saw the linen breastplate accompanying the spoils, which featured an inscription indicating that A. Cornelius Cossus was consul (Livy 4.20.7–8). He then equivocates, first saying that it is a matter of opinion, and then asserting that the man himself testified in front of Jupiter and Romulus when he placed the *spolia opima* and inscription indicating his consulship in the temple (Livy 4.20.11).[125] There has been much debate about why Livy writes the account in this way, and whether he presents the two sides of the argument equally. It should have been clear to Livy's Augustan readers, who were familiar with inscribed material of varying degree of durability, that Augustus' report was dubious, if not completely false.[126] What were the odds that without the benefits of modern advancements in textile preservation a linen breastplate would have survived long enough for Augustus to clearly read the inscription and settle the issue?[127] If we accept that this is unlikely, we might ask if

[124] Kraus and Woodman sum up the issue nicely: "At the time of writing, the rank of the previous dictators was of immediate political relevance, as Augustus had just blocked M. Licinius Crassus' claim to have the right to make a similar dedication, basing his refusal on the fact that Crassus was not fighting under his own auspices and did not have the same status as his three predecessors. It is therefore inescapable that in citing Augustus only to disagree with him (however generously) Livy is declaring his independence from the wider political authority that the *princeps* could potentially—and on rare occasions, later, would actually—wield, even in the sphere of literature" (Kraus and Woodman 1997: 72).

[125] For a concise summary of Livy's treatment of the issue cf. Kraus and Woodman 1997: 72.

[126] Cf. Livy's account of records written on stone for eternal preservation (Livy 39.37.16). Augustan awareness of the durability of certain materials is also clear from Horace's claim to have erected a monument more lasting than bronze (Hor. *Carm*. 3.30.1).

[127] Syme has noted that "The opportune discovery of important documents in sacred edifices tends to happen when political morality—and paleographic science—are at a low level" (1959: 45). For the implausibility of the linen corselet's survival cf. Bishop 1948 (with 55n131 below), Ogilvie 1965: 563n4.20.5–11, and Luce 1965: 215, all noting that the fallen roof would have exposed the corselet to the elements, with Luce citing Nepos *Att*. 20.3 for Octavian's restoration of the temple. Miles, citing the others, adds the potential caveat that "The ancient magistrates'

Augustus, like those who falsify inscriptions accompanying *imagines*, was responsible for fabricating a false inscription.[128] Livy may subvert the emperor's claim by presenting the dubious account as if it were a real point of contention, trusting that the absurdity of the matter will be clear to all of his readers, and hence bolstering his own authority without blatantly refuting the emperor.[129]

It is in fact possible that there was a false inscription that allowed for alternate reconstructions of "COS." Syme and others have cited an appealing idea which could account for a false reconstruction resulting from the deterioration of the linen: "One scholar has in fact devised an explanation. The *cognomen*, *Coso*, he suggests, was barely legible: Octavianus read it as *cos*. But here too a question arises. Would *cognomina* have occurred on early documents?" (Syme 1959: 45).[130] Syme suggests that on an authentic official document Cossus would have been called *praetor* instead of *consul* (1959: 44). Luce makes the same argument, and also notes that *cognomina* did not regularly appear on inscriptions at this time (Luce 1965: 215). Bishop has also suggested that perhaps the original inscription did not have "COS," but the designation

---

books, whose authority the narrator will acknowledge in the next sentence, are also described as 'linen'" (1995: 43). However, Livy notes that those were deposited in the temple of Moneta and cited by Licinius Macer (Livy 4.20.8), and elsewhere he expresses clear skepticism of information transmitted by Licinius Macer (Livy 7.9.3–6). Furthermore, Livy does not say that the original linen books survived. Ogilvie notes that "It is no doubt true that the *libri lintei* are not likely to have survived since the fifth century, but, like the *spolia opima* of Cossus, with which they may be compared as inscribed linen relics alleged to have survived from the earliest times, there is nothing to prevent them having been 'restored' or compiled in the second century or earlier (1958: 46). So in fact, by drawing attention to Licinius Macer's citation of the linen books, Livy may actually give the reader additional cause for skepticism in the case of the linen corslet.

[128] For the idea of Augustus creating a false inscription see Sailor 2006: 341 and 341n38. Cf. Miles, noting that "When he suggests, for example, that Cossus would not have falsified his rank on the inscription because Romulus and Jupiter would have been witnesses to his fraud, Livy tacitly acknowledges the possibility that such falsification was in theory possible" (Miles 1995: 57). Furthermore, if Augustus did indeed create a false inscription, Livy also reminds him (and Augustan readers) that Jupiter and Romulus have been watching him, too. For Augustus' concern for protecting his own status see Sailor 2006: 333.

[129] For the possible irony see Syme 1959: 44, Miles 1995: 43 and 43n35, and Bayet suggesting that "La flatterie n'est pas sans ironie, à en juger par le criticisme sceptique de ce qui suit" (Bayet 1954: 35n3). [The flattery is not without irony, judging from the skeptical criticism of that which follows.] For the lack of a direct refutation of Augustus see Grant 1995: 35.

[130] The scholar is Hirschfeld 1913 (Syme 1959: 80n88). Cf. Ogilvie 1965: 563n4.20.5–11, also citing Rutgers 1618. Also cf. Luce: 1965: 215n15.

was added during a later restoration (Bishop 1948: 190–91).[131] It does seem unlikely that an authentic inscription dating back to the time of Cossus would have either "consul" or "Cossus," but such wording might well have been possible during the Augustan era. Consider this example from Rome:

> Cn(aeo) Lent[ulo Cossi f(ilio)] / Ga[etulico] / co(n)s(uli) XV[vir(o) sacr(is) fac(iundis)] / [---] / Ti(berii) Ca[esaris Aug(usti) ---]
> (AE 1985 47)[132]
>
> To Gnaeus Lentulus Gaetulicus son of Cossus,
> consul, quindecimvir sacris faciundis ...
> of Tiberius Caesar Augustus.

Both the name Cossus and the abbreviation for "COS" are visible on this Tiberian inscription from the Palatine, which was probably on a statue base (AE 1985 47). Hence, although it is unlikely that an authentic inscription in honor of A. Cornelius Cossus would have included the "COS" designation, the idea that an inscription which allowed for these two possible readings existed in the early empire should not be dismissed so quickly. It is possible that a damaged linen corselet with the letters "COS" was fabricated.[133] It would then be possible to claim that

[131] Bishop argues that "Restoration probably occurred in 222 B. C. when Marcellus made his dedication. The original linen was probably replaced since it would scarceley survive in the Roman climate and in its immediate surroundings. The corselet which Augustus saw was the replacement, by this time so weathered that he could not have told whether or not it was the original" (1948: 191). Luce dismisses this view, arguing that "The attempt to claim the inscription as genuine by postulating a later restoration at the time when M. Marcellus dedicated the *spolia opima* and when COS was added in the light of Cossus' later consulship would invite belief were it not for the providential coincidence that Augustus found exactly what he needed to combat the claim of Crassus at exactly the moment he needed it" (1965: 215).

[132] Here I follow the text of the AE, which I prefer to EDCS-08300009 (August 20, 2013). The name on this inscription allows us to be fairly precise about the date: "Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, dont le gentilice n'est pas indiqué, a été consul en 26 p. C. avec Caluisius Sabinus. Il a été nommé *XVuir s. f.* par Tibère soit entre 27 et 30, soit à la mort de son père aux environs de 35. Le *cognomen* Gaetulicus a été introduit dans la famille en 4 p. C. quand le père du dédicataire, Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, qui avait été consul en 1 a. C., eut remporté des succès sur les Gétules pendant son proconsulat d' Afrique (Velleius Paterc. II,116,2)" (AE 1985 47). [Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, the name of whose *gens* is not indicated, was consul in 26 C. E. with Caluisius Sabinus. He was named *quindecimvir sacris faciundis* by Tiberius either between 27 and 30, or at the death of his father around 36. The *cognomen* Gaetulicus was introduced in the family in 4 C. E. when the father of the one honored with the dedication, Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, who had been consul in 1 B. C. E., had been successful over the Gaetulians during his proconsulship of Africa (Vell. Patr. II,116,2).]

[133] Later forgeries of Latin inscriptions have been discovered, and there is no reason why the emperor could not have made or commissioned one as well. For forgeries cf. Gordon 1983: 8 and 75–76. It has also been argued that

the fragment referred to Cossus or his role as consul, and it would have been unlikely that anyone would have been able to produce evidence that refuted the reconstruction, although many might have been skeptical. In fact, it might be the case that only someone deeply familiar with epigraphic conventions from different time periods would notice the difference, and if contemporary audience members were used to seeing "COS" on inscriptions, they might not have made the connection that proved the corselet a fraud. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that Augustus himself would not have noticed the chronological slip, but Livy might have, and we will later discuss the possibility that he was familiar with epigraphic conventions from different time periods.

Of course, if Augustus was a fabricator of inscriptions, Livy was, too, in some senses, although he was also careful about how he used epigraphic evidence.[134] He references several inscriptions in his narrative which he must not have seen firsthand. This raises a number of issues about his authority as an author and his use of sources. If we examine Livy's usages of inscriptions, we will see that in many cases he talks about them in general terms, focusing on their appearance, location, or general content rather than their actual wording. This is not necessarily a weakness of his narrative, and in fact can be a powerful gesture. One example is his description of Hannibal's inscribed altar:

> Propter Iunonis Laciniae templum aestatem Hannibal egit, ibique aram condidit dedicavitque cum ingenti rerum ab se gestarum titulo Punicis Graecisque litteris insculpto. (Livy 28.46.16)

Augustus or those writing in his service honored Cossus with an inscription in the Augustan forum (possibly the very fragmentary CIL I 40947, see Geiger 2008: 139–40), so this may not have been the only inscription for Cossus composed by the emperor or those writing in his service, and the representation in the forum might have reinforced the image of Cossus that Augustus was trying to create.

[134] Although as Luce notes, "Livy's integrity in adapting his sources has drawn words of praise from many quarters. Unlike so many of his Roman predecessors he seldom stooped to outright fabrication, and when in rare instances he did, it involved small and nonessential items" (1977: 151).

> Hannibal spent the summer near the temple of Juno Lacinia, and there he established and dedicated an altar with a large inscription of his accomplishments carved in Punic and Greek letters.

As Jaeger observes of Livy's account, the lack of detail about the text of Hannibal's inscribed monument allows Livy to assert control over the authority of his narrative:

> Livy's text directs attention to and commemorates a source with tremendous authority, Hannibal himself, eyewitness *and* participant in events, the Thucydidean-Polybian ideal. Yet by indicating that the inscription contains *res*, without quoting any of Hannibal's *verba*, Livy's text causes readers thinking about Hannibal's achievements to fall back either on their own memory of what the monument says, or on the version of those *res gestae* most ready to hand, Livy's own. It superimposes, as it were, their memory of Books 21–28 on Hannibal's inscription. (Jaeger 2006: 392)

Thus, by referencing but not quoting this and other inscriptions, Livy avoids competing with them for narrative authority.[135] He also appropriates this particular inscription for his own historic *monumentum*, giving it a prominent position at the end of Book 28.[136] Location matters for Livy on multiple levels: not only does he give the inscription a prominent place within his own narrative, but he also gives information about the location of the inscription near the temple of Juno Lacinia. This is not the only instance in which Livy mentions the location of an inscription, and this interest in placement reflects not only his conception of history as *monumentum*, but also the heightened visibility of strategically placed monuments erected by the emperor Augustus. I will now turn to some of those inscriptions, with an eye toward how they might reflect Livy's familiarity with the Roman epigraphic landscape.

[135] Cf. Liddel and Low 2014: 16–17.

[136] Cf. Jaeger, arguing that "Located on the boundary between Books 28 and 29, the monument indicates the end of Hannibal's success in Italy, separating the past, which belonged to Hannibal, from the future, which will be Scipio's" (2006: 390). Cf. Liddel and Low 2014: 16 citing Burck 1971: 22 and Levene 2010: 29.

Inscriptions, Location, and Rome

The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline plays a central role in Livy's narrative as well as in the Augustan program, and it is no coincidence that Livy gives precise information about the placement of golden dishes with the inscribed name of Camillus in the temple:[137]

> Camillus in urbem triumphans rediit, trium simul bellorum victor. Longe plurimos captivos ex Etruscis ante currum duxit; quibus sub hasta venumdatis tantum aeris redactum est ut, pretio pro auro matronis persoluto, ex eo quod supererat tres paterae aurae factae sint, quas cum titulo nominis Camilli ante Capitolium incensum in Iovis cella constat ante pedes Iunonis positas fuisse. (Livy 6.4.1–3)
>
> Camillus returned to the city triumphing, as a victor of three wars at the same time. He led before the chariot by far the most captives from the Etruscans, for whom sold under the spear so much money was paid that, when the price for the gold of the matrons was paid, from what remained three golden dishes were made which, it is established, with an inscription of Camillus' name, were placed in Jove's chamber before the feet of Juno before the Capitoline burned.

Parallels between Camillus and Augustus have been recognized, and it is significant that like Octavian, Camillus celebrates a triple triumph.[138] Furthermore, Kraus has recognized an epigraphic parallel embedded in this passage, noting that "The language echoes official reports, cf. *CIL* VI 331. 4–5 *Romam redieit triumphans*" (Kraus 1994: 108n4.1).[139] She has also noted that the way in which Livy describes the burning of the Capitoline invites comparison with more contemporary events: "By marking the date in this way L. makes a glancing allusion to recent troubles and invites a contrast between C.'s empire-building and the destructive behaviour of the

[137] For the Capitoline see Platner and Ashby 1929: 95–98, Nash 1968: 530–33, and Richardson 1992: 68-70 and 221–24.

[138] Cf. Kraus, noting that "for those who believe C. imitates Augustus, this triple triumph recalls the most famous one in recent memory, that of Augustus in 29 ... but L. never explicitly compares Augustus to *any* republican hero; moreover, the early books of the *AVC* were written well before Augustus' propaganda of images was fixed" (Kraus 1994: 108n4.1). Although Kraus is correct to be cautious about the chronology, there are certainly clear similarities between Camillus and Augustus. For parallels between Camillus and Augustus cf. Gaertner 2008. For a dissenting view, see Walsh 1961: 16–17. For Augustus' political usage and restriction of the triumph cf. Hickson 1991.

[139] This inscription marking Lucius Mummius' triumph will be discussed in more detail below (65-66). For Livy's triumph notices see Phillips 2009.

last century" (Kraus 1994: 109n4.3). Livy could have a similar motive for providing such detailed information about the placement of the statue in the Capitoline.[140]

Livy's attention to location, and the presence of authoritative deities on the Capitoline, may also parallel Augustan activities. In addition to being the destination of triumphs, the Capitoline was a center of ritual activity, and Augustus boldly transferred some of that activity to his own forum. Feeney has noted that Augustus adapted the timekeeping ritual of the annual addition of a nail to the door of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus to his own forum, ordering a new nail to be added to the temple of Mars Ultor at the end of each *lustrum* (period of five years).[141] In addition, after he built the temple of Mars Ultor, Augustus moved the Parthian standards from the Capitoline to the new building in his forum (Platner and Ashby 1929: 330).[142] This, together with his reinvention of the ritual of the Capitoline nail, suggests that he attempted to adopt and shift visual rituals associated with the Capitoline to his new forum. The golden bowls are placed in the temple along with the inscribed name of Camillus, a precursor to

[140] The precise information about the location of the inscription is a bit problematic. The temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was thought to contain three *cellae*, each with a statue of one member of the Capitoline triad, and evidence from Livy suggests this arrangement. Cf. Tagliamonte: "La cella di destra del tempio era dedicata a Minerva (Liv. 7.3.5), quella di sinistra a Iuno (CIL VI 32329.9); con tutta probabilità le due divinità avevano una propria statua di culto (fata da Vulca?) e un proprio altare (v. Varro in Serv. *Aen*. 3.134)" (1996: 146). [The *cella* on the right of the temple was dedicated to Minerva (Liv. 7.3.5), the one on the left to Juno (CIL VI 32329.9); in all likelihood the two goddesses had their own cult statues (made by Vulca?) and their own altars (v. Varro in Serv. *Aen*. 3.134).] If that is the case, it is intriguing that according to Livy the inscription was placed in the *cella* of Jupiter at the feet of *Juno*. Kraus, citing Bayet, suggests that the Juno statue "seems to have been an additional one perhaps set next to the cult image of Jove" (Kraus 1994: 109n4.3).

[141] Summing up the significance of this adaptation, Feeney observes that "Instead of the temple of Jupiter, there is now the temple of Augustus's Mars; instead of a tradition of annually successive eponymy, there is a new tradition of five-yearly cyclical repetitions of the same name, 'Augustus.'" (Feeney 2007: 176).

[142] There has been some debate as to where on the Capitoline the standards were placed. See Richardson, arguing that "A temple supposed by Mommsen to have been built by Augustus on the Capitoline to hold the standards that had been recovered from the Parthians immediately after their recovery in 20 B. C. (Cass. Dio 54.8.3) is now generally believed to be imaginary. The standards were in all probability deposited in the Temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus between their recovery and the building of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum (Horace, *Carm*. 4.15.6–8)..." (1992: 245–46). Although the evidence for an additional temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitoline is certainly not secure, the possibility should not be ruled out completely. A temporary temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitoline would have allowed Augustus to capitalize on the publicity afforded by the standards as symbols of vengeance right away, and a subsequent move to his own forum would have further emphasized his roles not only as avenger, but also as restorer and rebuilder of Rome.

Augustus, an emperor who inscribed his own name in large letters in his new forum.[143] But unlike Augustus, Camillus left objects associated with his triumph where they belonged: in the Capitoline temple, the rightful center of Roman religion, under the watchful eyes of Jupiter and Juno. This placement of the inscription of the Capitoline should be contextualized with Livy's other references to it as a place of great significance for the Romans, including Camillus' references to it in his speech entreating the Romans not to move to Veii.[144] If we read this epigraphic detail against Augustan activities, Augustus seems to follow Camillus' *exemplum*, but he also deviates from this early Roman model in bold ways.[145]

Shortly after this passage, the Capitoline makes another appearance along with detailed information about the placement of an inscribed tablet. We learn that Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus also placed an inscription in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus:

> ... Romam revertit triumphansque signum Praeneste devectum Iouis Imperatoris in Capitolium tulit. Dedicatum est inter cellam Iouis ac Mineruae tabulaque sub eo fixa, monumentum rerum gestarum, his ferme incisa litteris fuit: 'Iuppiter atque divi omnes hoc dederunt ut T. Quinctius dictator oppida novem caperet' .... (Livy 6.29.8–10)
>
> He returned to Rome, and during his triumph he bore into the Capitoline the statue of Jupiter Imperator conveyed from Praeneste. It was dedicated between the chamber of Jove and Minerva and a tablet was affixed below it, a monument of his accomplishments, and it was inscribed with approximately these letters: Jupiter and all the gods granted this, that Titus Quinctius the dictator should take nine towns.

---

[143] Cf. Ovid *Fast*. 5.567–68 and discussion on p. 1.

[144] Livy underscores the significance of the Capitoline temple on several occasions. He describes portents indicating Rome's future grateness that surfaced when the foundations of the temple were put in place (1.55.3–6). In addition, in Livy's account of the slave uprising and envasion of the Capitoline led by Appius Herodinus, Publius Valerius refers to the Capitoline as "augustissimam illam domum Iouis optimi maximi" (That most revered home of Jupiter Optimus Maximus) (3.17.5). In addition, when Camillus entreats the Romans not to move to Veii, he asks "Et ne omnia generatim sacra omnesque percenseam deos, in Iouis epulo num alibi quam in Capitolino puluinar suscipi potest" (5.52.6–7) [And lest I count out all sacred things individually and all gods, in the feast of Jupiter is the couch ever able to be taken up elsewhere than on the Capitoline?] He also references the earlier Roman defense of the Capitoline from Gallic invasion (5.39.10–11).

[145] Of course, it is important to be mindful of chronological considerations (cf. 58n138). Luce has argued that "Instead of searching for Augustan allusions in Livin history, it might be more profitable to investigate to what extent Augustan policy was influenced by the Livian concept of the Roman past" (1965: 240). If that is the case, then Augustus' shifting of activities from the Capitoline marks a bold deviation from earlier precedents detailed in the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

Here once again we see the official triumphal language recognized by Kraus.[146] In this passage, too, Livy provides detailed information about the placement of the inscription, noting that Titus Quinctius positioned it between the *cellae* of Jupiter and Minerva. This would allow contemporary readers to envision the exact location of the inscription in a place with great significance, and would help them to realize the symbolic value of Titus Quinctius' action. Interestingly, in this case Livy also provides information about the content of the inscription, which suggests that Jupiter and the other gods authorized Titus Quinctius to take nine towns. The language looks official, but does not match the wording of extant Roman inscriptions.[147] We have no way of knowing if Livy saw an actual inscription which inspired this account, but we do know that he qualifies his account with "ferme," suggesting that he is offering a paraphrase rather than a direct quotation.[148] If Livy did not refer to an actual inscription, and instead wrote a literary version which could pass for the real thing, then this passage could be an excellent example of the *variatio* which characterizes his style. Livy's *variatio* has been recognized by Kraus and Woodman, noting that he combines conventional military language "with language that looks conventional but which in fact seems to be made up of Livy's own invented military 'clichés'" (Kraus and Woodman 1997: 68). In this case, Livy may combine the conventional language of Roman inscriptions (such as "triumphans"), with language which appears conventional but is in fact of his own invention. This raises questions about Livy's familiarity with epigraphic source material. Was he familiar enough with the words which were

[146] Cf. p. 58 and 58n138 above. In this case she notes that "the language, esp. the abls. absolute, is characteristic of an official military report (3.10n.) or a dedicatory inscription (von Albrecht 60, cf. *CIL* III 14147)" (Kraus 1994: 254n29.8). Cf. von Albrecht 1989.

[147] A search of the EDCS for "Iuppiter" and "divi omnes" yielded nothing, as was the case for "divi omnes" and "hoc dederunt" (August 21, 2013).

[148] Cf. Kraus: "the *tabula* has its own indeterminability, like the speeches L. 'reproduces' (26.4n.). Inscriptions and other documents lend precision (*acribeia*) to historical narratives (Fehling 133–40, 170–4), while *ferme* can be code for scholarly care (cf. 20.6n.: the adv. is generally taken to indicate that L. has abbreviated this inscription (so W-M) or is giving a traditional version of it)" (1994: 254n29.9). Cf. Fehling 1989 and Weissenborn and Müller 1880–1911.

actually *incisa* on inscriptions to produce authentic imitations that were *ferme incisa*? Interestingly, when Livy cites another inscription from the Capitoline, which he might have seen *in situ*, he does not qualify his statement with "ferme."[149] This might suggest that he makes a distinction when he is able to be more (or less) precise about the content of individual inscriptions.

Livy's account of duplicate inscriptions placed in the forum at Praeneste and in the Temple of Fortune is also characterized by emphasis on location and adaptation of epigraphic language:

> Statua eius indicio fuit, Praeneste in foro statuta, loricata, amicta toga, velato capite, [et tria signa] cum titulo lamnae aeneae inscripto, M. Anicium pro militibus qui Casilini in praesidio fuerint votum solvisse. Idem titulus tribus signis in aede Fortunae positis fuit subiectus. (Livy 23.19.18)
>
> There was as evidence a statue of him, erected in the forum of Praeneste, covered with a cuirass, cloaked in a toga, with covered head, with an inscription inscribed on a bronze plate, that Marcus Ancius had fulfilled his vow for the soldiers who were in the garrison at Casilinum. The same inscription was placed underneath three statues erected in the temple of Fortune.

Livy's detailed description of the statues and the placement of the inscriptions allows his readers to envision them, much in the way that they envision the *exempla* outlined in the preface. The phrase "votum solvisse" resembles the epigraphic commonplace "votum solvit." A search of the EDCS for "votum solvit" yielded 7,426 inscriptions, whereas a search for "votum solvisse" yielded none (August 20, 2013). The phrase is typically abbreviated "v. s." or "vot. sol." on inscriptions, and in accordance with the syntax editors typically expand the abbreviated verb to "s(olvit)" or "s(olverunt)." Livy adapts an epigraphic commonplace into indirect discourse with

[149] Livy writes, "seiuges in Capitolio aurati a P. Cornelio positi; consulem dedisse inscriptum est" (Livy 38.35.4). [A guilded six-horse chariot was placed on the Capitoline by Publius Cornelius; it was inscribed that the consul had given it.] Page notes that "The use of *consul* in such inscriptions would not mean that the donor was consul at the time of the dedication, but merely that he had held the office. The inscription may have existed in Livy's time" (1958: 115n5).

an accusative and infinitive construction, offering a variation based on the conventional usage. Livy follows conventional word order in his adaptation, since variants of "votum solvit" usually occur at the end of the inscription. Livy integrates epigraphic language with his description of the locations of the inscriptions to create a vivid account of the prominent placement of these monuments.

Livy also offers a very detailed description of an inscription placed in the temple of Mater Matuta:

> Eodem anno tabula in aede Matris Matutae cum indice hoc posita est.: "Ti. Semproni Gracchi consulis imperio auspicioque legio exercitusque populi Romani Sardiniam subegit. In ea provincia hostium caesa aut capta supra octoginta milia. Re publica felicissime gesta atque liberatis sociis, vectigalibus restitutis exercitum salvum atque incolumen plenissimum praeda domum reportavit; iterum triumphans in urbem Romam redit. Cuius rei ergo hanc tabulam donum Iovi dedit." Sardiniae insulae forma erat, atque in ea simulacra pugnarum picta. (Livy 41.28.8–10)
>
> In the same year a tablet was placed in the temple of Mater Matuta with this inscription: "By the command and auspice of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus the legion and the army of the Roman people subdued Sardinia. In this province over eighty thousand of the enemy were slain or captured. With the state having been most successfully administered and the allies freed, with the revenues restored, he brought home from war an army safe and unharmed and very rich in booty; triumphing again he returned to the city of Rome. Because of this he gave this tablet as a gift to Jove." The form was of the island of Sardinia, and on it were painted images of battles.

The location of the inscription in the temple of Mater Matutua is significant, and in fact the temple makes several other earlier appearances in Livy's narrative in connection with important figures from Rome's early history.[150] Livy tells us that Servius Tullius had originally dedicated the temple, and that Camillus vowed to restore and rededicate it if he took Veii (Livy 5.19.6). The significance of Servius Tullius, portrayed by Livy as the last of the good Roman kings, and of Camillus, a parallel to Augustus, have been discussed above.[151] Livy also mentions the

[150] For a history of the temple and literary sources for it see Platner and Ashby 1929: 330–31.
[151] Cf. p. 42 for Servius Tullius and 58–60 and 58n138 for Camillus.

temple elsewhere in his narrative, noting that it burned down in 213 B. C. E. (Livy 24.47.15), and that the following year officials were elected to restore the temple along with others that had burned (Livy 25.7.6).[152] The temple was a place closely associated with Rome's history, which the Romans saw fit to restore, following the example of the initial restorer, Camillus. By placing a tablet in this location, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus added his own achievements to a place with longstanding historical significance, situating the record of his own substantial capture inside the temple vowed by Camillus in hopes of capturing Veii.[153] The temple's location in the forum Boarium (Livy 33.27.4; Ovid *Fast*. 6.477–79) inside the Porta Carmentalis (Livy 33.27.4) in close proximity to the temple of Fortuna (Livy 33.27.4) would have made it a very visible part of the Roman topographical landscape, and one which might have been familiar to Livy's readers. In fact, the unusual level of detail that Livy gives about the images and the text make one wonder if it was still visible during the Augustan era, and if Livy's audience could have seen it in the temple. If so, Livy invites his readers to remember several layers of Roman history associated with the temple, and to read Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus' inscribed capture against the backdrop of Camillus' triumph over Veii. This would be consistent with his invitation, outlined in the preface, to examine *monumenta*.

Of course, we have no way of knowing if Livy or his readers could have seen the inscription, but it is striking that the words that Livy attributed to the inscription include several epigraphic conventions. The epigraphic resonances of *triumphans* have been discussed, and perhaps it is no coincidence that the inscription emphasizes Gracchus' triumphant return to the *urbem Romam* in a temple closely associated with Rome's history. The prominence of the city in

[152] Cf. Livy 33.28.4 for building of arches in front of the temples of Mater Matuta and Fortuna.

[153] The act of building a temple in fulfillment of a vow is one which would have resonated with Augustan readers. As mentioned above (13n35 and 43n97), Octavian construct the Temple of Mars Ultor in fulfillment of a vow. Cf. Luce 1990: 123.

the inscription might have sparked the interest of Livy, who gives the city top billing in his *Ab Urbe Condita*. In addition, *donum dedit* is an epigraphic commonplace, appearing on many Roman inscriptions.[154] Furthermore, a variation of *imperio auspicioque* appears on an inscription honoring another great Roman conqueror, triumphator, and dedicator:

> L(ucius) Mummi(us) L(uci) f(ilius) co(n)s(ul) duct(u) / auspicio imperioque / eius Achaia capt(a) Corint(h)o / deleto Romam redieit / triumphans ob hasce / res bene gestas quod / in bello voverat / hanc aedem et signu(m) / Herculius Victoris / imperator dedicat. (CIL VI 331 = CIL I 626 = ILLRP 122 = CLE 3 = CLENuovo p. 95 = ILS 20 = CSE 9)[155]
>
> Lucius Mummius son of Lucus consul with military command, under his auspice and authority, with Achia having been captured, with Corinth having been destroyed, returned to Rome triumphing on account of these deeds carried out well, as an emperor he dedicated this temple and statue of Hercules Victor which he had vowed in the war.

This inscription has several verbal and thematic similarities with Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus' inscription, and the fact that it records the dedication of a temple in fulfillment of a vow resonates with the vow and dedication of Camillus which was an important aspect of the temple of Mater Matuta's history. Interestingly, the Livy passage about the Sardinia inscription describes the events of 174 B. C. E., and Lucius Mummius is thought to have dedicated the temple of Hercules Victor in 142 B. C.[156] Hence, the inscription honoring Lucius Mummius'

---

[154] A search of the EDCS for "donum dedit" yielded 1,224 inscriptions (August 21, 2013).

[155] EDCS-17300540 (August 20, 2013). Cf. Kruschwitz 2001: 154–55.

[156] This inscription was discovered on the Caelian hill, and suggests that the temple was vowed in 145 B. C. E. and dedicated in 142 B. C. E. by Mummius while he was a censor (Platner and Ashby 1929: 256–57). Cf. Richardson 1992: 189. The location of the temple is uncertain, and Ziolkowski argues that it was located not on the Caelian where the inscription was found, but instead in the Forum Boarium, identifying it with a round temple at Porta Trigemina along the Tiber (Ziolkowski 1988: 316). He argues that "The form of the inscription, the variation of the letters' dimensions from line to line to an extent not found in any other known official Republican inscription, the fact that some lines would have been utterly unintelligible from the ground if the inscription had been placed *supra valvas templi*, as custom dictated—all this leads to the conclusion that the inscription belonged not to the temple but to one of the lesser monuments set up by Mummius" (Ziolkowski 1988: 316). He notes that other scholars after Bücheler 1895 have suggested that the inscription "is a poor copy of the original" (Ziolkowski 1988: 316n32). Furthermore, he suggests that "The inscriptions placed on all monuments set up for a single deity by a general would have borne the same verse" (Ziolkowski 1988: 312). Gordon thinks that the argument that the inscription is a copy "seems to fail on epigraphical, palaeographical, and other grounds" (1983: 87). Regardless of where the inscription or the temple were located, it is possible that Livy could have used the inscription as a model.

dedication is roughly contemporary with Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus' inscription. In addition, we know from the extant *Periocha* of Book 52 that Livy wrote about the destruction of Corinth by Lucius Mummius, and Syme has suggested that Livy might have conceived of that book, with its treatment of the triumphs of Mummius and others, as "the end of an epoch" (1959: 30). Lucius Mummius interested Livy, and it is not inconceivable that he read this inscription. The similarities between the inscriptions could suggest that Livy saw the actual inscription in the temple of Mater Matuta, or that he was familiar with epigraphic conventions of the first century B. C. E. in general and strove to make his account epigraphically authentic. Elsewhere Livy does not go into as much detail when describing the content of an inscription, and the fact that he did so in this case suggests that he found a source which facilitated writing about it.[157] It is notable that whereas, as discussed above, he indicates that he is paraphrasing the inscription dedicated by Cincinnatus (6.29.8–10), here he claims to be quoting the actual text. The parallel language on the Lucius Mummius inscription echoes the precision that Livy displays in his detailed description of the inscription's content and appearance.

Livy might also have had an epigraphic source for his account in Book 24 of a painting on the temple of Liberty. Moore has conjectured that the closing words of Livy 24.16 might have been taken from an inscription adorning the temple (Moore 1958: 226n2). The identification of the temple of Liberty and its location has been disputed in recent years, thus

---

In fact, if copies of the inscription were placed around the city, the odds that Livy saw and imitated them would be higher.

[157] In addition to examples discussed here, Livy's account of a bronze tablet placed in the temple of Castor and Pollux is sparse. He remarks only that it marked the Campanian equites' receipt of Roman citizenship (8.11). Elsewhere Livy is less specific about location, perhaps when precise information about it is unavailable. For example, he remarks that the inscribed twelve tables were erected "in publico," but does not offer further details about their location (Livy 3.57.10). Cf. Appendix.

making topographical arguments about it problematic, but further probing of the passage will reveal that there are clear epigraphic parallels:[158]

> Digna res uisa ut simulacrum celebrati eius diei Gracchus, postquam Romam rediit, pingi iuberet in aede Libertatis quam pater eius in Auentino ex multaticia pecunia faciendam curavit dedicavitque. (Livy 24.16.19).
>
> The matter seemed worthy that Gracchus, after he returned to Rome, ordered that an image of his celebrated day be painted on the Temple of Liberty which his father, from money exacted as a fine, took care to have built and dedicated on the Aventine.

The phrase "faciendam curavit" is conventional, although the surviving epigraphic record suggests that it was more common in the provinces than in Rome itself.[159] Perhaps more importantly, a variation of "ex pecunia" and "faciendam curavit" is present on epigraphic fragments from Ostia marking the construction of the temple of Bona Dea:[160]

> M(arcus) Maecilius M(arci) f(ilius) [.]urr[...], duovir, / aedem Bonae Deae ex sua pecunia fac(iundam) cur(auit) / idemq(ue) probauit (AE 1968 80).[161]
>
> Marcus Maecilius [.]urr[...] son of Marcus, duovir, took care and likewise approved that a temple to Bona Dea be built from his own money.[162]

---

[158] It was once thought that an identification of this temple of Libertas with the temple of Iuppiter Libertas on the Aventine was plausible (cf. Platner and Ashby 1929: 296–97). It has since been argued that the two temples are not the same (Richardson 1992: 221). Furthermore, it seems that an Augustan rededication of a temple called "Iuppiter Liber" was recorded epigraphically at *Fast. Arv. ad. Kal. Sept.*, CIL I. 2. p. 214, 328, CIL VI 2295= 32482 (Platner and Ashby 1929: 297). The *Fasti Arvales* refer to "Iovi Libero Iunoni Reginae in Aventino" (CIL VI 32482). Richardson writes that "apparently this is a mistake" (1992: 221). The identification of this temple and its location remain unknown.

[159] A search of the EDCS for "faciendam curavit" yielded thirty-three inscriptions (August 20, 2013). None of them are identified as being from Rome. A search of the EDCS for "curavit" and "dedicavit" yielded 220 inscriptions (August 20, 2013), with only one (CIL VI 41318 = CIL VI 1708 = CIL VI 31906 = ILS 1222 = AE 2005 186 = EDCS-01000445) which dates to the reign of Constantine (Buonocore 2003: 221–22) identified as being from Rome.

[160] Evidence of five marble inscriptions which appear to be identical were found at Ostia. One was discovered at a sanctuary for Bona Dea, and fragments of the other four were found reintegrated into other parts of the town (Bakker , <http://www.ostia-antica.org/index.html>, here and elsewhere in this chapter accessed August 20, 2013). The lettering is large, of high quality, and likely Augustan. Compare the similar lettering on the inscription in honor of Caecilia Metella (CIL VI 1274) which is more securely dated to the Augustan era. Cf. Gordon 1983: 99.

[161] Zevi joined two previously published fragments of the inscription (CIL XIV 5411 and CIL XIV 4679) to allow for the reading published in Epigraphica 1968 and AE 1968. The AE also notes that there seems to have been more than one copy of the same dedication (AE 1968 80), and Bakker says that there were four inscriptions. CIL XIV 4679 is the right part of the marble tablet, with "O VIR" and "C CVR." CIL XIV 5411 includes the letters "CILI," "M BON," and "IDE." Cf. AE 1946 221 and Zevi 1968: 81–88.

[162] Brouwer reconstructs "Furr ..." with the help of other inscriptions (cf. Brouwer 1989: 63–67 and 63n114). For discussion of various possible reconstructions of the missing name cf. Brouwer 1989: 64.

This is significant because it shows that very similar language to Livy's was used on an extant inscription marking a temple dedication. Furthermore, the inscription is thought to date to the early Julio-Claudian period (Brouwer 1989: 272), and hence could be roughly contemporary with Livy's work.

Two sanctuaries of Bona Dea have been found in Ostia. The sanctuary where one of the Marcus Maecilius inscriptions was found originally dates to the first half of the first century C. E. (Bakker). The other sanctuary was constructed during the republican period, and rebuilt during the Augustan era (Bakker).[163] An inscription mentioning a dedication by Valeria Hetaera to Bona Dea was found there (Meiggs 1960: 352):[164]

> Valeria Hetaera / dat Bon(ae) Deae / Opiferae sacr(um)
> (Brouwer 1989: 67)[165]
>
> Valeria Hetaera gives the shrine to Bona Dea Opifera.

Brouwer identifies this inscription as Augustan (1989: 67). Bakker suggests that Valeria Hetaera might have been inspired by Augustus' wife, arguing that "Her activity is probably an echo of Livia's predilection for Bona Dea, her personal protective deity" (Bakker).[166] Livia restored the temple of Bona Dea on the Aventine hill (Brouwer 1989: 270–71, cf. Ovid *Fast*. 5.157–58), and her involvement reflects Augustan building and rennovation activities. Brouwer has noted of Augustus that "Manifestations of his desire to be considered the preserver of the old traditions are no doubt the restoration of the temple of Mater Magna (by himself), and that of Bona Dea (by his wife). This activity of Livia, by descent as well as by former marriage an outstanding

[163] Cf. Meiggs, who attributes this temple at the end of the Via degli Augustali to the Augustan period, noting that "The wall enclosing this area has been rebuilt in neat reticulate, but the lowest section of the wall in the south-east corner is much earlier; the large irregular tufa blocks suggest a date early in the second century B. C. It is possible therefore that the Augustan building replaces a much earlier temple on the site" (1960: 352).

[164] Cf. Bakker.

[165] Brouwer discusses the text of the inscription and variant readings, offering his own justification for the *opifera* reading (Brouwer 1989: 66–67). For the inscription cf. AE 1961 45 and Brouwer 1989: 425–27.

[166] For the possibility that Livia viewed Bona Dea as her "personal patroness" cf. Brouwer, arguing that this is likely but cannot be proven based on the evidence (1989: 266).

representative of the old nobility, notably of the patrician Claudian family, fits in excellently with Augustus' ambitious plans" (1989: 238). Hence, it is probable that restoration of the sanctuary in Ostia during the age of Augustus would have called to mind imperial activity and its underlying symbolism.

In addition, an inscription which Brouwer (1989: 69) dates to between 85 B. C. E. and the age of Julius Caesar was found there:

> Octavia M(arci) f(ilia) Gamalae (uxor) / portic(um) poliend(am) / et sedeilia faciun(da) / et culina(m) tegend(am) / D(eae) B(onae) curavit. (Brouwer 1989: 69; Ostia Inv. No. 11.821)
>
> Octavia, daughter of Marcus, wife of Gamala, took care that for Bona Dea the portico be polished, benches be made, and the kitchen be sheltered under a roof.

The presence of *curavit* on this inscription resembles Livy's usage of the verb as well as the usage on the inscription (AE 1968 80) from the other sanctuary. This earlier inscription suggests that the cult of Bona Dea had an epigraphic presence in Ostia before the age of Augustus, and hence Augustan restorations would indeed have marked continuity and revitalization of traditional religion. It is possible that Livy would have been aware of this sort of epigraphic *exemplum*. Whether or not Livy worked from an inscription on the temple of Libertas, as Moore suggests, is unknown and further complicated by the aforementioned uncertainty about the temple's identification, but it is clear that Livy uses well-known epigraphic conventions which also appear on inscriptions marking the dedication of a temple that was visible in Ostia during the Augustan era. In this and other instances Livy draws attention to the location of the inscription, inviting his readers to envision the *monumenta* firsthand and to consider the significance of various buildings to Roman history and to the Augustan era. In many cases the placement of the inscription inside of a temple makes the account more vivid, as Livy calls upon his readers to envision Roman topography and picture an inscribed *monumentum* within a

monumentum. Livy also invites readers to consider Augustus, and specifically his building program, against the backdrop of earlier dedicators and buildings. Hence, it is unlikely that the details which Livy gives us about inscriptions and their locations are frivolous or arbitrary, and it is likely that Livy's descriptions of individual inscriptions are based on careful consideration of the sources available to him as well as his knowledge of Roman topography.

Conclusion: Livy's Selective Imitations

In conclusion, Livy's variable treatment of epigraphic sources should not necessarily be attributed to the irregular methodology of an armchair historian. In fact, at times Livy seems to be very familiar with the epigraphic tradition, incorporating epigraphic conventions into his narrative in a way that reflects not only his use of *variatio* in other contexts, but perhaps also a familiarity with epigraphic conventions from different time periods. He acknowledges the limitations of the evidence, drawing attention to false inscriptions, and commenting on the lack of a certain authority in some cases. Although the full extent to which Livy drew upon inscriptions remains unknown, he was certainly familiar with them, and was living at a time when they were becoming an increasingly visible part of the Roman landscape. As an author writing about the *Urbs* and its topographical landscape, it would have been hard for Livy to ignore the growing presence of inscriptions, which formed a visual link between the early days of Rome and the changing Augustan times, promoting the emperor and his impact on the city. This marked increase in epigraphic activity no doubt influenced Livy's engagement with both contemporary inscriptions and ones that dated to earlier time periods.

In addition to promoting the Augustan program, inscriptions also fit nicely within the program outlined by Livy at the beginning of the *Ab Urbe Condita*. Livy shows an awareness of

the power of visual *monumenta* right from the start, and it is significant that he references both examples that should be imitated and examples that should be avoided. Throughout his narrative Livy engages in a process of imitating and avoiding various aspects of the traditions that he follows, at times seeming to adhere closely to his sources, and at other times avoiding them or viewing them with skepticism. It is likely that this methodology influenced the ways in which Livy referenced inscriptions in his work. In some cases he seems to be familiar with specific inscriptions, and in others he offers little information about what was inscribed on the stones. He views some inscriptions, including the ones accompanying the *imagines* and the one on the linen corselet of Cossus, with wary skepticism, at times calling into question their truthfulness. It is likely that this skepticism stems from Livy's own views as an author writing at a time when Augustus was using inscriptions and other *monumenta* to craft his own imperial *exempla*, changing the character of the city while illustrating visually what should be imitated and what should be avoided in accordance with his own interests. As an author writing during an increasingly "Augustan" era marked by epigraphic activity, Livy was keenly aware of the power of the inscribed word. Although he did not challenge the imperial program directly, he does seem to have viewed it with a certain degree of skepticism. One can imagine that if Livy had stopped to read inscriptions addressing and exhorting the passerby, such as the aforementioned monument along the Via Appia, he would have read carefully, and decided for himself what to imitate and what to avoid.

Chapter 2: Ovid's Imitator Poetic Persona: Epigraphic *Exempla* and Innovation

In this chapter, I will suggest that Ovid is the Augustan author who most exemplifies the spirit of creative innovation blended with traditionalism that inspired Augustan authors to integrate epigraphic conventions into their work. Just as he pushes the traditional boundaries of literary genra in his work, he also pushes the boundaries of epigraphic conventions, experimenting with creative ways to integrate inscriptions into his poetry. Ovid's debt to inscriptions has been noted, with Ramsby observing that Ovid uses the most literary inscriptions of any of the Augustan elegists (Ramsby 2007: 89). Furthermore, it has long been recognized that Ovid took inspiration from the visual culture of Augustan Rome.[167] Augustan visual culture portrayed the emperor in different roles, and similarly, Ovid uses epigraphic conventions to convey different aspects of personae, including his own.[168] Latin inscriptions are one of several influences that shape Ovid's persona, and he creates layers of cultural and literary imitation with clusters of words that suggest both epigraphic language and the language of his literary predecessors. In addition to signaling cultural and literary imitation, the epigraphic resonances also signal creative, distinctly Ovidian innovation.

I will examine several Ovidian usages of different types of inscriptions across genres (literary and epigraphic). First, I will discuss Ovid's portrayals of Dido, which are remarkable not only for their imitation and innovation on the Virgilian tradition, but also for the prominence of epigraphic conventions. Second, I will discuss instances of *funera acerba* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, focusing on the deaths of Phaethon and Icarus, which reflect portrayals of

[167] Tarrant has remarked that, "His [Ovid's] creative synthesis of diverse traditions has analogies in Augustan architecture, historiography, and political ideology" (2002: 20).

[168] There are many instances in which Ovid engages with Augustan visual culture. His works are full of topographical references to various buildings and places in Rome. For discussion of the significance of the Augustan building program cf. Zanker 1988, Favro 1996, and Haselberger and Therin 2007.

premature death on Roman funerary inscriptions. Next, I will examine Ovid's creative imitations of epigraphic writing, suggesting that he pushes the boundaries of epigraphic genera much in the way that he pushes the boundaries of literary genera in his work.[169] Finally, I will examine epigraphic conventions in Ovid's representations of himself, focusing on his portrayal of the poetic persona in *Amores* 2.6, and then turning to portrayals that reflect his literary career.

Reinscribing Dido: The Epigraphic and Virgilian Traditions

Ovid's portrayal of Dido will furnish an excellent case study for how he makes use of epigraphic language while innovating on the Virgilian tradition. Ovid portrays Dido three times: once in the *Fasti*, once in the *Heroides*, and once in the *Ars Amatoria*. The portrayals in the *Fasti* and the *Heroides* both include literary epitaphs. The one in the *Ars Amatoria*, although not a literary epitaph, parallels the other two. I will begin by discussing the episode in the *Fasti*, in which Ovid offers a "sequel" to the Dido and Aeneas episode in his discussion of the March festival of Anna Perenna.[170] The name of Dido's sister Anna becomes a creative etymological explanation for the name of the festival, celebrated on the Ides of March, the date of Julius Caesar's assassination and hence a date of great interest to Augustus and the imperial family.[171] In fact, Ovid mentions the assassination explicitly (*Fast*. 3.697), claiming that Vesta told him not to pass it over (3.698–99), and emphasizing Augustus' role as avenger of his father at Philippi (3.710). The most explicitly epigraphic moment in the episode occurs when a question about the identity of Anna Perenna leads to the story of Dido and her epitaph:

[169] For genre in Ovid cf. Hinds 1992 and Harrison 2002. Harrison summarizes previous scholarship on genre in Ovid, citing in addition to Hinds 1992 Barchiesi 2001, Conte 1994, Farrell 1992, Hardie 1995, Heinze 1960 (first published in 1919), Hinds 1985, Hinds 1987, Hintermeier 1993, Jacobson 1974, Knox 1986, Myers 1994, Nicoll 1980, and Williams 1994.

[170] For the idea of the Ovidian "sequel" in this episode cf. Hinds 1992: 108. For parallels with Virgil cf. McKeown 1984: 170–71.

[171] For the *Fasti* and Augustus cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1987, Hinds 1992, and Barchiesi 1997.

quae tamen haec dea sit quoniam rumoribus errat,
fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo.
arserat Aeneae Dido miserabilis igne,
arserat extructis in sua fata rogis;
compositusque cinis, tumulique in marmore carmen
hoc breve, quod moriens ipsa reliquit, erat:
PRAEBVIT AENEAS ET CAVSAM MORTIS ET ENSEM.
IPSA SVA DIDO CONCIDIT VSA MANV. (Ovid *Fast.* 3.543–50)

Nevertheless since rumors vary as to who this goddess is,
my proposition is to not conceal any tale.
Miserable Dido had burned with fire for Aeneas,
and she had burned on the pyres constructed for her fates;
the ash was arranged, and on a marble tomb there was this short poem,
which she herself dying left behind:
Aeneas provided both the cause of death and the sword.
Dido herself fell having used her own hand.

In this passage, Ovid shifts the focus from Anna Perenna to Dido. The fact that Dido made this inscription for herself speaks to her isolation at the end of her life, as well as to her desire to control how she will be remembered. Dido could have died without leaving behind a funerary monument, trusting that her sister Anna, who dutifully mourns and attends to Dido at the end of her life (Virgil *Aen*. 4.672–87), would memorialize her beloved sister in a fitting way.[172] But Dido does not wish to leave this task to a family member, instead preferring to have the last word herself. This is consistent with Virgil's portrayal of her character, which will be discussed in connection with its epigraphic resonances in the next chapter.[173]

Aeneas receives a prominent place on the stone, and at first it might even seem like he is the honoree or the one responsible for building the monument. Then, the jarring "causam mortis" and "ensem," appear, shifting our perception of Aeneas from dutiful epigraphic honoree

[172] Although the epigraphic record suggests that it was more common for spouses to dedicate epitaphs, there are also examples of dedications by sisters (Saller and Shaw 1984: 136). A search of the EDCS for "soror" yielded 2,075 inscriptions, many of which are epitaphs which memorialize sisters. In some cases, the sister is named explicitly as the maker of the monument. A search for "soror fecit" yielded forty-two inscriptions. In these instances and the others in this chapter, the EDCS was consulted on September 15, 2013 unless otherwise noted.

[173] For differences between Virgilian and Ovidian portrayals of Dido cf. Tarrant 2002: 197.

to the cause of Dido's death.[174] A search of the EDCS for "praeb%" yielded eighty-two inscriptions (on the EDCS, "%" can be used in a search to take the place of any number of characters). The verb does not appear to be a convention of funerary inscriptions, but instead, as one might expect, appears on dedications. This has the potential to add an additional layer of surprise to the inscription. Depending on what Dido's tombstone looked like, the reader of the inscription (outside of the text of the poem) might not initially realize that it was a tombstone at all. The element of surprise could heighten the dramatic effect of the words that follow on the stone. The second line emphasizes Dido's own personal agency; however, instead of saying that Dido made the memorial, the inscription emphasizes that she died (*concidit*) by her own hand. She attempts to broadcast for posterity that Aeneas was the cause of her death, hence constructing her persona as a victim who reclaimed personal agency by taking her own life. Epigraphy provides a medium in which she can attempt to control how she is remembered.

The epitaph is subversive for its reversal of the close relationships between family members which are a commonplace on epitaphs that name the honoree along with the maker. Consider, for example, the epitaph of Prima (CIL VI 25010), which names the brother and husband as the makers of the monument:

> D(is) M(anibus) / Primae / sorori piissim(ae) / vix(it) ann(os) XXX / fecerunt /
> Genethlius / frater et / Hermes coniunx
> (CIL VI 25010)[175]
>
> To the spirits of the dead, Prima, a most pious sister, lived for thirty years.
> Genethlius the brother and Hermes the husband made (this).

[174] Here Ovid also echoes Virgil, since Aeneas asks Dido's shade about the cause and the sword at *Aen*. 6.456–58. As Knox has noted in connection with the *Heroides*, Ovid's rewrite of Dido has already answered Aeneas' question, making his responsibility and her action clear in epigraphic words (Knox 1995: 233n195).

[175] EDCS-13801263. Date unknown (?).

Perhaps even closer parallels are inscriptions erected by spouses, such as the epitaph of Antonia Maura (CIL VI 12056 = CLE 1026), which will be discussed in the next chapter, and which describes the *pietas* of the wife and her devotion to her husband, who erected the monument.[176] If Dido and Aeneas had been married, she and Aeneas could have been memorialized together as loving spouses. In Virgil's account, Aeneas says explicitly that he has not entered into a formal marriage with Dido (Virgil *Aen*. 4.338–39), even though their relationship appeared to Dido to be like a marriage (Virgil *Aen*. 4.170–72).[177] Ovid's Dido creates a tombstone which mirrors the appearance of a traditional memorial provided by a husband for a wife, even going so far as to name both herself and Aeneas on the stone. Her monument is a jarring subversion which dramatizes her fate while allowing her to construct how her death and relationship with Aeneas are memorialized. She portrays herself as an unfortunate victim who arranges her death and her monument *ipsa sua* and *sua manu*.[178]

The same inscription appears in the epistle of Dido to Aeneas in Ovid's *Heroides*. In this account Dido speaks in her own voice, composing the epitaph which appears in the *Fasti*, and acknowledging that her sister will see to her last rites.[179] She contrasts the tragic inscription

[176] EDCS-14800276. Cf. discussion on p. 119.

[177] In fact, earlier in her epistle to Aeneas, she refers to herself as his *coniunx decepta* (Ovid *Her*. 7.69).

[178] Dido's final words could also be read as a feminist statement, giving voice to her final act to reclaim personal agency by taking matters into her own hands. Ramsby, examining the parallels between the epitaphs of Dido and Phyllis (Ovid *Her*. 2.147–48) in the *Heroides*, suggests that Dido displays more personal agency on her epitaph (Ramsby 2007: 116).

[179] It is important to note the distinction in time between these two episodes. The account in the *Fasti* occurs well after the action of the *Aeneid*, and the letter from Dido to Aeneas is set before her death. For Ovid's use of foreshadowing in Dido's letter to Aeneas see Kennedy 1984: 420. Ovid does not offer us an account that occurs at the same time as Virgil's account, and hence avoids re-covering the exact same ground. Cf. Hinds' discussion of the *Metamorphoses*: "wherever Virgil is elaborate, Ovid is brief, and wherever Virgil is brief, Ovid elaborates" (Hinds 1998: 106).

which commemorates her death with another alternative which might have been: an inscription that memorializes her as the wife of Sychaeus:[180]

> Anna soror, soror Anna, meae male conscia culpae,
> iam dabis in cineres ultima dona meos.
> nec consumpta rogis inscribar Elissa Sychaei,
> hoc tantum in tumuli marmore carmen erit:
> Praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem;
> ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu. (Ovid *Her*. 7.191–96)

> Anna sister, sister Anna, badly conscious of my fault,
> now you will give the last gifts to my ashes.
> Having been consumed by the pyre I will not be inscribed Elissa wife of Sychaeus,
> only this poem will be on the marble tomb:
> Aeneas provided both the cause of death and the sword;
> Dido herself fell having used her own hand.

Dido's use of the first person passive form *inscribar* underscores the close connection between her persona and the inscription that will memorialize her. If she had not met Aeneas, she might have been inscribed as the wife of Sychaeus (the genitive *Sychaei* underscores her possessiveness).[181] Instead, she will receive an inscription which constructs her persona in relation to Aeneas, who supplied the cause of her death.[182] This reconfiguring of her epitaph is doubly tragic. Not only is it tragic for the jarring dramatization of Dido's death, but also because it stands in place of an epitaph that would memorialize her in connection with her husband. An epigraphic portrayal of the close relationship between husband and wife, which as discussed above is subverted in response to Aeneas' denial of marriage to Dido, would be possible if Dido were memorialized together with Sychaeus, who was her real husband, not just one who appeared to be fulfilling that role. Dido tragically contrasts the epitaph that might have been

[180] Lindheim observes, "Dido refuses the appellation *Elissa Sychaei* ("Elissa, wife of Sychaeus," 193) on her funeral monument but rather hopes that her tombstone will stand as a testament for all time, managing to bring together in language two characters whom the plot has separated" (2003: 97).

[181] Dido also uses possessive language earlier in the epistle, proclaiming to Sychaeus: "venio tibi debita coniunx" (I come as your wife owed to you) (Ovid *Her*. 7.103). Kennedy sees parallels between *Heroides* 7.99–104 and *Aen*. 4.457–61 and 6.473–75 (1984: 420).

[182] Lindheim, citing Ovid *Her*. 7.167–68, has noted that, "Ovid's Dido, in the face of her abandonment ... reveals a powerful yearning to hold on, virtually at all costs, to her position as object of Aeneas' desire" (2003: 96).

with the one which will come to pass, underscoring her own authorship by proclaiming Anna's ignorance and her imminent role as the performer of Dido's last rites. Knox has observed an epigraphic parallel to "ultima dona," citing "huic coniunx ultima dona dedit" in CLE 1302 (Knox 1995: 232n192).[183] Anna will give the last gifts to Dido, but Dido has composed her own epitaph ahead of time.[184] Hence, she prevents herself not only from being portrayed as "Elissa Sychaei," but also as "Elissa soror Annae." The fact that she gives Aeneas precedence over other family members reflects the intensity of the emotions that she feels towards him, as well as her ardent desire to have the final say on how their relationship is constructed. Her epitaph becomes a tool in *sua manu* for casting blame on Aeneas and underscoring her tragic end.

Aside from the clear epitaph at the end of the poem, Dido also uses epigraphic language elsewhere in the epistle. When she speaks about the possibility that a child of Aeneas could die along with her, she foreshadows the final epitaph and also uses language that is present on Roman funerary inscriptions:

> Forsitan et gravidam Didon, scelerate, relinquas,
> parsque tui lateat corpore clausa meo
> accedet fatis matris miserabilis infans,
> et nondum nato funeris auctor eris,
> cumque parente sua frater morietur Iuli,
> poenaque conexos auferet una duos. (Ovid *Her*. 7.133–38)
>
> Perhaps you even leave behind pregnant Dido, accursed one,
> and part of you lies hidden enclosed in my body.
> And the miserable infant will meet the same fate as the mother,
> and you will be the originator of death to a son not yet born.
> And with his parent the brother of Iulus will die,
> and one punishment will carry away the two joined together.

[183] He also notes the parallel "mater et in cineres ultima dona tulit" in Ovid *Am*. 3.9.50 (Knox 1995: 232n192).

[184] Knox has noted parallels to the brief epitaph in Propertius 2.1.72 and Ovid *Am*. 2.6.59–62 (Knox 1995: 233n194). The latter will be discussed in more detail below (pp. 105-6).

The phrase *pars tui* might remind us of Horace's "multaque pare mei / vitabit Libitinam" (Horace *Carm*. 3.30.6–7), and the epigraphic resonances of this poem have been discussed in the introduction. Since Dido is not Aeneas' *coniunx*, and in fact acknowledges this at *Her*. 7.167–68, she attempts to construct the role of *mater* in order to forge a more insoluble connection to him.[185] Dido's construction of a strong connection between Aeneas and the unborn child might strike an emotional chord with him. Virgil portrays Aeneas as emotionally invested in the future of his own son as well as of his surrogate son, Pallas. Dido also references the fates, which, as will be discussed in the next chapter, have epigraphic resonances in Virgil. The conflation of the fate of the parent with the fate of the child might also be a nod to the epigraphic tradition. Roman tombstones often portrayed the grief of parents who lost their children, and specific examples will be discussed in the Virgil chapter.

Dido also uses epigraphic language when she suggests that Aeneas transfer his house to Carthage instead of rebuilding a city elsewhere:

> si tibi mens avida est belli, si quaerit Iulus,
> unde suo partus Marte triumphus eat,
> quem superet, ne quid desit, praebebimus hostem.
> hic pacis leges, hic locus arma capit.
> tu modo, per matrem fraternaque tela, sagittas,
> perque fugae comites, Dardana sacra, deos,
> sic superent, quoscumque tua de gente reportas,
> Mars ferus et damni sit modus ille tui,
> Ascaniusque suos feliciter inpleat annos,
> et senis Anchisae molliter ossa cubent!—
> parce, precor, domui, quae se tibi tradit habendam! (Ovid *Her*. 7.153-63).
>
> If your mind is eager for war, if Iulus seeks it,
> whence a triumph may go born from its own Mars,
> we will provide an enemy, whom he may overcome, lest anything be lacking.
> Here are the laws of peace, this place captures arms.
> You only, by the mother and brotherly weapons, arrows,
> and by the gods companions of flight, the Trojan sacred objects,

[185] For discussion of Dido's persuasive technique cf. Lindheim 2003: 109 and Jacobson 1974: 77.

> thus may they survive, and whatever you carry back from your race,
> let that fierce Mars be the limit of your penalty,
> and let Ascanius happily fill up his years,
> and let the bones of old Ascanius lie softly!—
> Spare, I pray, your home, which entrusted itself to you for safekeeping!

Dido appropriates the language of Roman funerary inscriptions in order to contrast a peaceful future in her city with a more tumultuous one elsewhere.[186] Her reference to the bones of Anchises also has epigraphic parallels. A search of the EDCS for "molliter" and "ossa" (September 8, 2013) yielded seven inscriptions, including a Roman one with the phrase "molliter ossa cubent":[187]

> Molliter ossa cubent dicat rogo quis<*q*>ue viator / sic tibi defuncto dicere di iubeant (CIL VI 36656 = CLE 1458)[188]
>
> I ask that whoever you are, traveller, thus the gods order you to say to the deceased "May the bones lie softly."

It is clear that Dido's language in *Heroides* 7 resonates with the language of Roman funerary inscriptions. Dido describes a situation in which Ascanius lives a full life, and Anchises rests in peace. She seems to imply that this might not be the case if Aeneas were to leave her city and transfer his home elsewhere. Furthermore, the phrase "quae se tibi tradit habendam" (which entrusted itself to you for safekeeping) emphasizes that the future of Aeneas' house is in his own hands. Much in the way that Dido used epigraphic language to suggest that Aeneas might be threatening his own unborn child, here she uses it to suggest that he should stay with her in order to assure a peaceful future for himself, his city, and his family. She uses the language of

[186] Barchiesi has noted that, "In the *Aeneid*, after Mercury reproached Aeneas he lamented that by staying in Carthage he was going to deprive Iulus of great conquests (*Aen*. 4.354ff.). The dialogic nature of Ovid's text incorporates this argument. In reply, Ovid's Dido offers both the peace which the wandering Trojans desire so much and also, in an amusing agnostic gesture so typical of Ovid's erotic ideology, as many wars and triumphs as he wishes" (Barchiesi 2001: 13–14).

[187] For the phrase "molliter ossa cubent" cf. Ovid *Am*. 1.9.108. Knox has noted that "this sentiment is common in funerary inscriptions, such as *CLE* 428.15, 1458.1; cf. *Am*. 1.8.108 *ut mea defunctae molliter ossa cubent*, *Trist*. 3.3.76. But this particular formulation with *molliter* is first found in Virgil *Ecl*. 10.33 *molliter ossa cubent*, in the speech of the love-poet Gallus, whose poetry O. might be imitating here" (Knox 1995: 228n162).

[188] EDCS-23801361 (September 8, 2013).

inscriptions in order to make emotional appeals to Aeneas; however, although with the help of epigraphic language she can control the content of her epitaph, she cannot control him.

In the *Ars Amatoria* Ovid does not quote an inscription in honor of Dido directly, but he uses similar language when he mentions the queen's death:[189]

> quaere, Novem cur una Viae dicantur, et audi
> depositis silvas Phyllida flesse comis.
> et famam pietatis habet, tamen hospes et ensem
> praebuit et causam mortis, Elissa, tuae.
> quid vos perdiderit, dicam: nescistis amare;
> defuit ars uobis: arte perennat amor. (Ovid *Ars am*. 3.37–42)

> Ask why nine roads are called one, and hear
> that the woods with their leaves having been laid down wept for Phyllis.
> And he has fame for his piety, nevertheless the guest provided the sword
> and the cause of your death, Elissa. I will say what destroyed you: you did not know
> how to love; you lacked art: by art love lasts forever.

In addition to reminding us of Horace's usage of "aere perennius" in an epigraphic context (Horace *Carm*. 3.30.1), the verb *perennat* resembles the name *Anna Perenna*. The proximity of this echo to "Praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem" suggests that Ovid is being self-referential in his portrayals of Dido. In fact, it is even possible that he knew he would portray Dido in his account of Anna Perenna in the *Fasti*, and chose the verb in order to emphasize the parallel.[190] Here Ovid suggests that the "causa," which readers of the *Heroides* (and later the

[189] Knox has noted that "O. recasts the epitaph once more with some variation at *Ars* 3.39–40" (Knox 1995: 233n195–6).

[190] Although the chronology of Ovid's works is uncertain, the *Heroides* passage is probably the earliest of the three, considering that Ovid includes Dido in his catalogue of heroines featured in the *Heroides* at *Am*. 2.18.21–26 (McKeown 1998: 386), and the first book of the *Amores* was published c. 22–21 B. C. E. (McKeown 1987: 75). Gibson notes that "*Ars* 3 has traditionally been dated to the years between 2 BC and 2 AD," with the caveat that the date is not secure, and is in fact based on references in Ovid's other didactic works. A reference in *Ars am.* 1 to a battle with a more secure date of 2 B. C. E. establishes that as a likely terminus post quem. Furthermore, the *Remedia* includes references to the Parthians (continuing references to the campaign against them mentioned in *Ars am*. 1.177–228), but does not mention the 2 C. E. conclusion of the campaign. Thus, 2 C. E. is a logical terminus ante quem for *Ars Am*. 3, which must be earlier than or roughly contemporary to the *Remedia Amoris* (Gibson 2003: 37–38). As for Ovid's *Fasti*, McKeown has noted that "... it seems unlikely that both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, which together account for rather more than half of his poetic output before his relegation, should have been composed entirely in the brief period from A. D. 2 (i. e., after the *Remedia*) to A. D. 8. Ovid may have begun one or both of those major works rather earlier, breaking off for a final period of love-elegy in c. 2 B. C.–A. D. 2, during

Fasti) are left to assume from the epitaphs and knowledge of the Virgilian tradition was Aeneas himself, is Dido's lack of skill in the art of love. Ovid surprises his readers by subverting their knowledge of Dido's persona, and by doing so in his own voice as "Naso magister" (Ovid *Ars am*. 3.812). Tarrant has observed of the *Ars Amatoria* that "Its basic strategy draws the serious associations of didactic poetry into a clash with the situations of erotic elegy, evoking humour at the expense of both" (Tarrant 2002: 19). In this case I would suggest that Ovid also "draws into clash" not only this characterization of Dido and the Virgilian one, but also his own portrayals of Dido across genres. The persona who seems to have the last word in the *Heroides* and the *Fasti* does not receive it here, and Dido's voice gets trumped by Ovid's own, complete with self-referential signposts which steer the reader toward understanding the subversion. In the other two instances, by allowing Dido to have the last word in her own epitaph, Ovid not only references Virgil's portrayal of her character and desire to control the memory of her own persona, but also less directly allows *himself* to have the last word on the portrayal of Dido's persona. This is a bold response to Virgil's rich portrayal of Dido, wherein epigraphy serves as a valuable tool for Ovid, working within the elegiac genre, to reinscribe Dido in his work.[191]

Funera acerba: Epigraphy and the Deaths of Phaethon and Icarus

Having discussed Ovid's different responses to Virgil's Dido, I will now turn to Ovidian portrayals of premature deaths (*funera acerba*) in connection with their Virgilian and epigraphic

which time he seems to have published the *Ars* in its final form, the *Remedia* and, posssibly, the double *Heroides*" (1987: 78). Hence, although the chronology is uncertain, Ovid might have already begun work on the *Fasti* when he wrote this passage in the *Ars am*. For the chronology of Ovid's works see Hinds 2003: 1085. For "the *Fasti* outside the *Fasti*" see Hinds 2005: 208–13.

[191] As Barchiesi has noted, Virgil's portrayal of Dido in the *Aeneid* includes mixing of genres and personae (2001: 118). Cf. Barchiesi 1993: 352–53.

predecessors.[192] In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid writes about several premature deaths, describing not only the virtues of the deceased, but also how grief affects their parents. I will focus on the deaths of Phaethon and Icarus, which, since they are characterized by strong emphasis on relationships between fathers and sons, make a good case study for examining the ways in which funerary monuments that portray children along with their grieving parents influenced Ovid's work.[193] Phaethon receives a clear literary epitaph, which has been discussed by Ramsby (2007: 132–34).[194] Although Ovid does not write an explicit literary epitaph for Icarus, he does describe his unusual tomb, and also uses epigraphic language in his account of the boy's death and the father's reaction.

Phaethon's epitaph memorializes him in his ill-fated role of charioteer. Its language and motifs parallel Roman funerary inscriptions, and it also contributes to the development of his character.[195] Phaethon aspires to follow in his father's footsteps, and thus to solidify the link between the two of them. His epitaph records his partial success and partial failure:

> HIC·SITVS·EST·PHAETHON·CVRRVS·AVRIGA·PATERNI
> QUEM·SI·NON·TENVIT·MAGNIS·TAMEN·EXCIDIT·AVSIS.
> (Ovid *Met*. 2.327–28)
>
> Here lies Phaethon, the charioteer of his father's chariot.
> Even if he did not hold onto it, still he fell while daring great deeds.

[192] For epigraphic evidence for the Roman concept of the *funus acerbum* see Rawson 2002 and discussion in the next chapter (112n278).

[193] For "lineage" and "paternity" in the Phaethon episode and other myths cf. Boyd 2012: 104. Also cf. Boyd 2012 for the similarity of Euripides' account of Phaethon, a possible model for Ovid, to Ovid's accounts of Daedalus and Icarus (106–8). For other versions of the Phaethon myth cf. Boyd 2012: 106n1, citing Diggle 1970 and Gantz 1993.

[194] Ramsby's thorough discussion of the grief of Phaethon's mother and sisters, as well as the "association of the body with his monument" (Ramsby 2007: 132) makes it unecessary to elaborate these issues here. Instead, I will focus on how the Ovidian epitaph parallels Roman ones, and how Ovid uses epigraphic conventions to construct Phaethon's *persona*.

[195] Phaethon's relationship to his father is of central importance to the episode. When Epaphus challenges Phaethon's boasts that his father is the sun (Ovid *Met*. 1.750–54), Phaethon seeks his father directly to prove his lineage (Ovid *Met*. 1.745–49).

The epitaph portrays Phaethon in close connection with his father, and the first line of the inscription would lead one to believe that he achieved his goal of becoming a charioteer of his father's chariot.[196] It is very similar to traditional Roman inscriptions which memorialized the deceased in connection with their family members. Consider this example which has language similar to the Ovidian epitaph:

> D(is) M(anibus) / hic situs (es)t C(aius) Cl(audius) / Helius qui / vixit annis / XVII [...] mensibus / sex diebus I[...] / [...]V Claudii / Helius et [...] / Hermione / parentes / filio dul / cissimo. (CIL VI 15089a)[197]
>
> To the spirits of the dead, here is laid to rest Gaius Claudius Helius who lived for seventeen years, six months ... days. Helius and Hermione the parents of Claudius made it for their sweetest son.

It was also common for the occupation of the deceased to be listed after the name on the epitaph, much in the way that Phaethon is identified as a "charioteer." Here is an example from Rome which dates to the late first century B. C. E.–early first century C. E.:

> L(ucius) Uttedius Hermias / gemmarius sculptor / ann(os) vix(it) XLV. (CIL VI 9436 = ILS 7709)[198]
>
> Lucius Uttedius Hermias the jewelery engraver lived for forty-five years.

The first line of Ovid's literary epitaph displays similar language and content to these and other Roman funerary inscriptions, but in the second line Ovid subverts the portrayal of Phaethon as his father's charioteer. In true Ovidian fashion he begins by paying tribute to the tradition, and then turns to offer his own innovative version of an epitaph for a *funus acerbum*. It is likely that Augustan readers who were familiar with Roman epitaphs would have found the second line jarring and subversive. It looks epigraphic, but does not parallel extant Roman inscriptions closely. The verb "excido," which means not only to fall, but also "to escape the memory, be

[196] There is precedent for this connection earlier in the narrative. Boyd has noted that, "The youth's name appears for the first time in the text preceded by that of his father: *Sole satus Phaethon* (751)" (Boyd 2012: 105).
[197] EDCS-16100138 (September 5, 2013). From Rome; date unknown (?).
[198] EDCS-19100658 (September 5, 2013).

forgotten" (OLD, "exido" 9b) appears on only five inscriptions, none of which are from Rome.[199] Although it has associations with memory, and seems fitting for an epitaph, it does not appear to be a Roman epigraphic convention. Ovid makes a clever pun on the two meanings of *excido* that fits the context of the literary epitaph. Furthermore, the second line of Phaethon's epitaph plays with the metaphor of life as a chariot race which children who die too soon are not able to complete, a common theme on children's sarcophagi.[200] Phaethon is literally a charioteer who dies prematurely, but his attempt to live up to his father's lofty example ends in disaster. The record of his failure stands in stark contrast to inscriptions that memorialize the good qualities of youths like Gaius Claudius Helius who would have made their parents proud by continuing along the natural course of life. Furthermore, Phaethon's "daring deeds" seem more arrogant than admirable, especially considering how Ovid develops his character earlier in the episode. He is boastful to his peers (Ovid *Met*. 1.751–54), and stubbornly refuses to listen to his father's advice about the dangers of the chariot (Ovid *Met*. 2.103–4). Ovid's literary epitaph is a fitting memorial for a son who defies conventions and expectations, behaving in a manner that does not befit a good Roman son. The epigraphic parallels would have been very clear to Augustan readers.

The tragic story of Icarus parallels the story of Phaethon, and is also characterized by epigraphic resonances. However, whereas Phaethon receives a literary epitaph, Icarus does not. Instead, Ovid uses epigraphic language to develop the character of Daedalus after the death of his son:

> at pater infelix nec iam pater 'Icare' dixit,
> 'Icare' dixit, 'ubi es? qua te regione requiram?'
> 'Icare' dicebat: pennas aspexit in undis

[199] EDCS (September 8, 2013).

[200] As Rawson has observed, "Where the charioteer is a child, who falls from the chariot during the race, the symbolism may be that of the tragedy of those who die young, before their course has been completed" (2003: 354).

devovitque suas artes corpusque sepulcro
condit; est tellus a nomine dicta sepulti. (Ovid *Met*. 8.231–35)

And the unfortunate father no longer a father said, "Icarus,"
"Icarus," he said, "where are you? In what region should I seek you?"
"Icarus," he kept saying: He caught sight of the wings in the waves
and he cursed his arts and buried the body in a tomb. The land
is called from the name of the one buried there.

Hardie has observed the ways in which this episode reflects a shift in personae.[201] What has not been recognized is that in this passage Ovid also uses language that is present on funerary inscriptions. Consider the following example:

C(aio) Clodio Fabricio Numisio / Victorino pra[e]torio viro / Numisius Victorinus v(ir) p(erfectissimus) infelix / pater. (CIL VI 1381)[202]

To Gaius Clodius Fabricius Numisius Victorinus, a praetorian man,
Numisius Victorinus, a man most perfect, the unfortunate father (made it).

Ovid's "infelix pater" would be familiar to Roman readers from epitaphs, and once again Ovid makes a jarring innovation. This *infelix pater* is now no longer a father, and has thus lost the part of his identity that would traditionally be recorded for posterity on a Roman tombstone.[203] By adding this detail, Ovid underscores the intensity of Daedalus' feelings of loss and change. He is not the typical bereaved parent of traditional epitaphs. In fact, this changed Ovidian persona

[201] Icarus' name becomes attached to the places named for him after he dies (Hardie 2002a: 246) and "Daedalus too, like his son, has become detached from his 'name' of father (*patrium nomen*), leading to a division of personal status expressed in line 231 through the division of sense of *pater* in the twofold repetition of the word" (2002a: 246–47).

[202] EDCS-17900057 (September 5, 2013). The stone has "praltorio." Cf. CIL VI 1381 for the "pra[e]torio" reading. The CIL notes that this inscription appears to be from a marble sarcophagus with lettering which dates to the second or third century C. E. There are also several other inscriptions with similar wording.

[203] Hollis thinks that this echoes the Greek phrase πατὴρ ἀπάτωρ, and cites Fordyce on Catullus 64.83 for comparable phrases (1970: 62n231). Ovid also uses this phrase in his account of the death of Icarus at *Ars Amatoria* 2.93–96. For the episode in the Ars Amatoria cf. Gärtner, highlighting Daedalus' tragic situation: "Offenkundig kam es Ovid in der *Ars amatoria* mehr als in den *Metamorphosen* darauf an, die tragische Zwangslage eines hochbegabten Menschen herauszustellen, die diesen dazu zwingt, seine Fähigkeiten in einer extremen, sogar göttliche Sphären verletzenden Weise zu bewähren, und zu riskanten Maßnahmen treibt, deren Gefahr er sehr wohl kennt (wie seine nachdrückliche Unterweisung des Icarus beweist)" (2005: 652). [It is evident that Ovid in the *Ars Amatoria*, more than in the *Metamorphoses* after it, exposes the tragic predicament of a highly gifted man, who in addition forces this, his capability, into an extreme, even offending divine spheres to prove the way, and rushes to risky measures, of which he knows the danger very well (as his emphatic instuction of Icarus demonstrates).]

may remind us of an *infelix* Virgilian figure who is an example of a *funus acerbum*, and who is characterized by intense emotion and personal loss:

> *infelix* Dido, verus mihi nuntius ergo
> venerat exstinctam, ferroque extrema secutam? (Virgil *Aen*. 6.456–57)[204]
>
> Unfortunate Dido, does this mean that a true message had come to me
> that you were dead, having followed out your last moments by means of a sword?

If we look at this episode in comparison with Daedalus' discovery of Icarus' wings, we will uncover a number of parallels. First, both Aeneas and Daedalus see evidence of the tragedies that was obscured by murkiness before: Daedalus sees the wings *in undis* and Aeneas sees Dido's shade *per umbras*. Then, they both make the startling discovery that they were the cause of the deaths of people who were close to them. Finally, they both experience closure and a symbolic final loss of a meaningful relationship: Daedalus buries Icarus, and Dido ignores Aeneas and retreats to the shade of her husband Sychaeus (Virgil *Aen*. 6.469–74).[205] Ovid's readers would be familiar with both the epigraphic and Virgilian parallels to the death of Icarus, and their associations would contribute to the emotional resonances of the episode and their interpretation of Daedalus' *persona*.[206] In his accounts of the deaths of Phaethon and Icarus, Ovid appropriates epigraphic conventions associated with premature death. In both instances he plays on the expectations of the readers, subverting their knowledge of epigraphic conventions in Phaethon's provocative epitaph, and synthesizing Virgilian and epigraphic portrayals of personal loss in the tragic story of Icarus.

---

[204] Cf. discussion of this passage on pp. 102 and 129–30.

[205] The parallel might seem less clear since Aeneas describes Dido as *infelix* and in Ovid's account Daedalus is the one who is *infelix*. However, Aeneas cries when he addresses Dido (*Aen*. 6.455), and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that he chooses to call Dido *infelix* because he is feeling *infelix* himself.

[206] Cf. Virgil *Aen*. 6.14–37 and Putnam 1995: 73–99. For discussion of how Virgil's account may have influenced Ovid's see Pavlock 1998.

Breaking Epigraphic Habits: Unconventional Writing in Ovid

It is clear from the preceding examples that Ovid frequently uses language and motifs borrowed from inscriptions, which his readers would have recognized as borrowed. But Ovid does not limit himself to mere borrowing: I will suggest that in some instances he deliberately and unconventionally breaks epigraphic habits.[207] It has long been recognized that Ovid was a generic innovator, and thus far we have surveyed several Ovidian appropriations of epigraphy across genres. Now I will suggest that at times Ovid invites us to reconsider rigid classifications of epigraphic "genre" as well. Much in the way that we divide literature into categories (epic, history, elegy, etc.) we tend to identify and classify inscriptions according to type (tombstone, dedicatory altar, etc.), and it is worth considering the extent to which inscriptions and literature both adhere to and deviate from formal conventions.[208] While Ovid pushes the boundaries of literary genres, he also experiments with pushing the boundaries of epigraphic ones. He does so by describing writing that resembles epigraphy and graffiti, but deviates from the normal conventions. These instances of writing include flatteries traced in wine (Ovid *Ars am*. 1.569–72), words carved on a tree (Ovid *Her*. 5.21–30), a votive dedication of wooden tablets (*Am*. 1.11.27–28), and the lettering traced by Io's hoof (Ovid *Met*. 1.649–50). In some cases it is debatable whether the writing produced should be considered epigraphy at all, and Ovid plays on

[207] For the Roman epigraphic habit see MacMullen 1982 and discussion in the introduction (pp. 16-19).

[208] Woolf uses the term genre to describe inscriptions in his discussion of how early imperial ones differ from later imperial ones (1996: 22). He has also observed the tension that may characterize collective study of inscriptions of different genres, noting the potential criticism that inscriptions of different types should be studied along with related uninscribed objects instead of being lumped together as epigraphic material (1996: 24).

inherent tensions of genre and definition.[209] He innovates playfully on the epigraphic tradition, and this approach is similar to how he engages with his literary predecessors.[210]

In the *Ars Amatoria*, the *Heroides*, and the *Amores* Ovid describes the use of wine as a medium for writing.[211] These instances may be interpreted as creative imitations of Roman graffiti. Cooley notes that graffiti is "defined as texts scratched upon a hard surface" (Cooley 2012: 211). Baird and Taylor argue for a broader definition of graffiti, noting that "The English word graffiti comes from the Italian verb *to scratch*, and in its simplest sense, graffiti are simply markings scratced onto a surface, whether of texts or pictures. But graffiti themselves can be made by a number of means besides scratching: these include inscribing, using charcoal, ink, or paint" (2011: 3).[212] Defining and classifying different examples of ancient Roman writing is a tricky business, and any attempt to suggests that Ovid imitates graffiti must address the inherent challenges to classification. Ovid may play on these tensions in order to craft his own creative, unconventional response to the "graffiti habit."[213]

Ovid may in fact innovate on both literary and epigraphic precedents in his account of words written in wine in the *Ars Amatoria*:

> hic tibi multa licet sermone latentia tecto
> dicere, quae dici sentiat illa sibi
> blanditiasque leves tenui perscribere vino,
> ut dominam in mensa se legat illa tuam. (Ovid *Ars am*. 1.569–72)

Here it is allowed for you to say many things lying hidden with secret speech,

---

[209] Cooley discusses definition and categorization of epigraphy extensively (2012: 117–220). Cf. Bodel 2001: 2–5 and Gordon 1983: 3–4.

[210] Tarrant has noted that "innovation for him [Ovid] consisted less in free invention than in seeing richer possibilities in existing material" (Tarrant 2002: 18–19). This is consistent with how he imitates and also breaks epigraphic habits.

[211] Ovid may in fact reverse content and medium by describing words written with wine. Although it is odd to write in wine, it is not so unusual to find epigraphic references to drinking. A search of the EDCS (April 11, 2013) for "bibe" yielded ninety-two inscriptions, and a search for "vinum" yielded 135.

[212] They also note that "painted marks are usually termed *dipinti* and sometimes considered as a category of graffiti; see Kruschwitz 2010: 157, with n. 4)" (Baird and Taylor 2011: 3).

[213] For the "graffiti habit" cf. Cooley 2012: 111.

which she may understand are said to her,
write out light flatteries in a very small quantity of wine,
so that she may read herself as your mistress on that table.

This description of letters written in wine is remarkable for its play on the aesthetics of poetry and graffiti. The words *leves* and *tenui* suggest the Callimachean aesthetic, and they might also remind us of finely scratched graffiti.[214] The reference to *sermone tecto* may be interpreted as self-referential: Ovid uses secret speech, too, in this case embedding Callimachean and epigraphic language into his remark. Furthermore, in the *Tristia* (2.454) Ovid claims that Tibullus communicated with his mistress by making a mark on the table.[215] Hence, he aligns himself with Tibullus as well.[216] In addition to having literary resonances, this instance of writing also resembles the content of Roman graffiti. Cooley has noted that, "Many graffiti ostensibly addressed specific individuals by name, with messages of greetings or love. A typical example from Pompeii is a message like *Secundus / Prim(a)e suae ubi / que isse salute(m) / rogo domina / ut me ames*" (Cooley 2012: 113).[217] This graffito, which addresses a *domina*, not only parallels Ovid's usage of *dominam*, but is also in line with the playful tone of Ovid's amatory poetry. The name "Secundus" suggests that the writer may be constructing his *persona* as second to the mistress "Prima," and thus casts himself in the role of the elegiac lover.[218] Furthermore, in both the Ovidian passage and the graffito the goal seems to be that the mistress will see the writing and read her own *persona* as the writer's mistress; however, we cannot say for certain that it is the writer's goal or intention that the graffito will be read. Cooley notes that "Even where an individual is addressed ... the writer is not necessarily expecting the addressee

[214] Cf. the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia* 23–24. See Clausen 1964 and Hunter 2006 for the reception of Callimachus in Latin authors. For *tenuis* see Clausen 1964: 193–94, noting a Virgilian usage (*Ecl*. 1.2).
[215] Cf. Hollis 1977: 126n571–72.
[216] Ovid also aligns himself with Tibullus in *Am*. 3.9, which includes a passage which imitates Roman funerary inscriptions. Cf. Ramsby 2007: 34.
[217] CIL IV 1852 (Cooley 2012: 113n349).
[218] Cf. discussion below of the relationship between mistress and lover in *Am*. 2.6 (pp. 104–5).

actually to read the message" (Cooley 2012: 113). The act of writing with wine readily available at the dinner table is also in line with what Cooley has called the "immediacy" of graffiti, noting that "no intermediary is required to create them, they cost nothing, and they can be done on the spot" (Cooley 2012: 114). Finally, the table is not typically used as a canvas for amatory writing, and Cooley has also noted that graffiti "were written upon a surface not intended for writing" (2012: 12). Hence, there are several parallels between the act of writing with wine on the table and the act of creating graffiti.

Similarly, in *Amores* 1.4 Ovid describes letters written in wine which are part of a series of contrived signals. He instructs his mistress to give and read these signals at a dinner party that she will attend with her husband, and the mock didactic tone makes this poem resemble the *Ars Amatoria*:

> me specta nutusque meos vultumque loquacem:
> excipe furtivas et refer ipsa notas.
> uerba superciliis sine voce loquentia dicam;
> verba leges digitis, verba notata mero. (Ovid *Am*. 1.4.17–20)
>
> Watch me and my nods and telling face:
> receive stealthy signs and return them yourself.
> I will say telling words without voice by means of eyebrows;
> You will read words with your fingers, words marked in wine.

Here the act of inscribing in wine is one of many departures from normal conventions. The narrator cannot communicate with his mistress in typical ways because her husband will be present. Instead, the lovers must hide signs of affection masked in a series of unusual gestures and actions that the woman's husband will not notice.[219] These include the use of wine to write a

[219] Ovid also references a similar situation in the *Heroides*, quoting the actual word written in wine, and underscoring transgressions of the laws of hospitality along with transgressive writing (Ovid *Her*. 17.87–91). Helen expresses her disbelief, and it is ambiguous whether she is incredulous of Paris' written word or of the act of writing itself, which he carries out under the eyes of her husband, just like the narrator of *Amores* 1.4. Ramsby has treated this passage together with one describing Paris' writing for Oenone, which will be discussed below (Ramsby 2007: 123–29).

message on the table. This, too, is consistent with the nature of graffiti, which can be less visible than inscriptions carved on stone. In some cases it might not be readily apparent to those who are not expecting it or looking for it. One example is the image of a man with a laurel crown carved onto the wall of the Villa of the Mysteries (CIL IV 9226). Although its location is known to many, a casual visitor easily might pass through the room without noticing it. In her discussion of dialogues between text and images in graffiti, Benefiel has noted that without the accompanying text, "Rufus est," the image would have received less attention (2011: 32).[220] The nature of the medium makes it conducive to less conspicuous writing, and Cooley has noted that "Very rarely a graffito serves almost as a public notice ... but in general a graffito is not a suitable medium for displaying a message prominently, and a painted notice is the usual format" (Cooley 2012: 113).[221] Here Ovid emphasizes the more private purpose of the writer wishing to produce covert material, which is consistent with how the ancient Romans used graffiti. Ovid might in fact play with epigraphic genre here as well, since, as is the case in the other two Ovidian passages, in some ways the form and material of the writing in wine resemble a painted message, but its content, context, and the motivation behind it are more in line with how Romans used other types of graffiti.[222] Furthermore, as has been noted above, the creation of a clear divide between painted and non-painted graffiti is problematic. Ovid, as an author interested in tensions between literary genres, also might have been interested in tensions between epigraphic ones, and his accounts of words written in wine provide an opportunity to blend literary and epigraphic traditions.

[220] For this graffito see Cooley 2012: 111 and Jashemeski and Meyer 2012: 120.

[221] Of course, we must be cautious about sharply delineating content and medium, and Cooley has noted that "the medium chosen for an inscription does not necessarily limit its function" (2012: 119).

[222] For painted notices see Cooley 2012: 12–17.

Ovid also includes unconventional graffiti in *Heroides* 5, in this case describing a tree which Paris carved with Oenone's name:[223]

> incisae servant a te mea nomina fagi,
> et legor OENONE falce notata tua,
> [populus est, memini, fluviali constita rivo,
> est in qua nostri littera scripta memor.][224]
> et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt.
> crescite et in titulos surgite recta meos!
> populе, vive, precor, quae consita margine ripae
> hoc in rugoso cortice carmen habes:
> CUM PARIS OENONE POTERI SPIRARE RELICTA,
> AD FONTEM XANTHI VERSA RECURRET AQUA.
> (Ovid *Her*. 5.21–30)

> The inscribed beech-trees preserve my names from you,
> and I am read, "Oenone," marked by your sickle,
> [there is a poplar, I remember, planted on a river bed,
> on which the writing mindful of me is written]
> and as much as the trunks grow, so my names grow.
> Grow, and rise straight up into my titles!
> Poplar, live, I pray, you who on the conjoining edge of the bank
> have this verse in wrinkled bark:
> When Paris will be able to breathe with Oenone left behind,
> the water of the Xanthus turned about will run back to the source.

In this case, the form of the writing is consistent with the aforementioned definition of graffiti as "scratched upon a hard surface" (Cooley 2012: 211). *Incisae* and *falce notata* reference the act of carving, which might remind us of words carved on inscriptions or graffiti etched on walls. *Legor* emphasizes the act of reading.[225] In addition, *crescite* resembles Horace's use of *crescam*

[223] Ramsby, noting the presence of graffiti in Ovid *Heroides* 5.21–4 and 29–30 and 17.88, has observed that "there are considerable literary precedents to keep in mind when addressing these instances, such as Acontius' inscription on trees for Cydippe in the *Aitia* of Callimachus (fr. 67 and 75 Pfeiffer)" (Ramsby 2007: 37).

[224] These lines may be interpolated. Cf. Knox 1995: 147n23–24.

[225] Cf. discussion below (pp. 107-8) of Ovid *Met*. 15.878. Ovid might also play on tensions of epigraphic genre here. As Cooley has noted (2012: 113–14), and as has been discussed above, graffiti was not always meant to be read. We cannot know Paris' intentions in this case. Cf. Cooley's observation that "Most graffiti are 'traced upon some hard substance,' but not '*for the sake of* durability.' Durability here implies something about monumentality and permanence, and raises the tricky prospect of having to assess the original writer's intention before deciding whether something counts as epigraphy or not" (2012: 119).

in his epigraphic poem (*Carm*. 3.30.8). Virgil also expresses the sentiment that words carved on trees have the power to grow:

> certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
> malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
> arboris: crescent illae, crescitis, amores.
> (Virgil *Ecl*. 10.52-54)
>
> I am sure that in the woods among the caves of the wild beasts
> it is better to suffer and to inscribe my loves on tender trees;
> Those trees grow, you grow, loves.

Furthermore, the narrator of Virgil's tenth *Eclogue* proclaims that his love for Gallus will grow (*crescit*) "quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus" (as fast as the green alder shoots up when spring is young) (Virgil *Ecl*. 10.74–75). This poem, in which the elegiac poet Gallus figures prominently, blends pastoral and elegiac motifs, and it has clear parallels with the Ovidian passage.[226] The act of inscribing the tree might also remind us of Mopsus' inscribed song for Daphnis, which he carved on a tree (Virgil *Ecl*. 5.13–15).[227] At first glance, Paris' words are a powerful epigraphic tribute, and the nature of the medium (tree bark) allows for the possibility not only of longevity, but also of continual growth for Oenone's inscribed name. However, Oenone has been deprived of the very honor which she would like to see grow on the tree.[228] Her name may grow, but the love that inspired the act is gone, and she clings to the inscribed word with a possessiveness reminiscent of Dido's attachment to her former role as the wife of

[226] I thank Stephen Hinds for drawing this to my attention.

[227] Breed has noted that "By writing out his Daphnis song on a tree, Mopsus creates the definitive pastoral inscription. The objectification of a song and a voice as a text makes for a fair representation of procedures of the *Eclogues* themselves with respect to represented voice. The tree as the physical location on which a pastoral song is inscribed stands in for the text of the book itself. Nor is Mopsus' Daphnis song alone in the *Eclogues* as a physical objectification of a pastoral song, that supposedly exclusively oral art" (2006: 58).

[228] Ramsby, noting a parallel with the sisters of Phaethon reading his inscription, observes that Oenone "reads and re-reads her problematic monument that on the one hand promises to commemorate her, yet reminds her constantly of her heartbreaking loss" (2007: 133).

Sychaeus.[229] Furthermore, Ovid may suggest the subversiveness of this memorial by referencing the trees that were cut down to make the fleet which Paris used to sail away from Oenone (*Her*. 5.41–43). The medium that memorializes Oenone also betrays her, and the growing monument to her honor is more vulnerable than she imagines. This is in fact consistent with the "essentially temporary" nature of ancient Roman graffiti (Cooley 2012: 212). Oenone attempts to elevate her former lover's ephemeral words to the status of a more enduring, significant monument. By playing on the conventions of epigraphic genre, Ovid heightens her tragic disillusionment.

Ovid also references words inscribed on wood in *Amores* 1.11, calling attention to the way in which writing transforms the medium. In this case, inscribed writing tablets become a votive dedication:

> quid digitos opus est graphio lassare tenendo?
> hoc habeat scriptum tota tabella 'veni.'
> non ego victrices lauro redimire tabellas
> nec Veneris media ponere in aede morer.
> subscribam: VENERI FIDAS SIBI NASO MINISTRAS
> DEDICAT. AT NUPER VILE FUISTIS ACER. (Ovid *Am*. 1.11.23–28)
>
> What need is there for the fingers to tire from holding the writing utensil?
> Let the whole tablet have this written: "Come."
> I will not delay from wreathing the victorious tablets with laurel,
> nor from placing them in the middle of the temple of Venus.
> I will write in addition: Naso dedicates his faithful ministers to Venus.
> And just now you were cheap maple.

The reference to a *graphium*, a tool that could be used to produce graffiti, should not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the "graffiti habit" has a presence in this passage, but several other factors strengthen the case for epigraphic resonances.[230] This description of an epigraphic dedication is unconventional in several ways. First, Ovid downplays the significance of the

[229] Ramsby has argued that "Oenone's desire for Paris transfers also to the preservation of the texts that confirm her past and her former place in Paris' heart" (Ramsby 2007: 126). Cf. Jacobson 1974: 189, also cited by Ramsby (2007: 124).

[230] Cf. Keegan Table 9.1 for the "Total Number of Graffiti and Dipinti in All Media at Pompeii According to M-type," which includes the category "graphio inscripta" (2011: 167).

written message itself, suggesting that a simple word from the mistress is worthy of a victor's crown.[231] Secondly, he places the tablets as a dedication in the middle of the temple of Venus.[232] In addition, he draws attention to the ways in which both of these unconventional acts (the terse inscribing and the placement in the temple) have elevated the status of the original maple. The wood has undergone a transformation from lowly tree to venerable object worthy of a place in the middle of the temple. Finally, Ovid writes an unconventional version of his own persona into this inscription, naming himself as the one who dedicates the "fidas ministras" to Venus. By doing so, he is able to construct not only the portrayal of the tablets, but also his own identity as a faithful minister to Venus. Ovid's creative appropriation of epigraphic language in this unconventional context allows him greater freedom to construct his identity as an elegiac lover and poet writing in the service of Venus. In addition, his act of writing his *persona* onto the tablets, which are placed in the middle of the temple, is also in line with the context of examples of ancient graffiti, which may give the author's name a presence in a place where it would not ordinarily be written.[233] Furthermore, Ovid plays with genre, with the wood also reminding us of the material on which he inscribes his own poem, which features innovative writing constructed within innovative writing.[234]

---

[231] Barsby notes that he places the crown "in imitation of the dispatches (*litterae laureatae*) of victorious generals to the Senate, an ingenious extension of the military metaphor" (Barsby 1973: 133).

[232] According to Barsby, "it was a common enough practice to make such dedications to an appropriate diety in the hour of success (or retirement) and both Horace and Propertius had made their offerings to Venus, but Ovid does add a pun of his own (on the two senses of *tabella*, writing-tablet and votive tablet) and a note of impudence by insisting on placing his offering right in the middle of the temple (*media in aede*)" (1973: 133).

[233] Cf. discussion in the conclusion (pp. 160–62) of the perhaps unexpected presence of lines from the *Aeneid* at a fullery in Pompeii (CIL IV 9131). Baird and Taylor have observed that "Graffiti have been implicitly defined by scholars of the Greek and Roman world as texts or images which appear in unexpected places, where they do not obviously belong" (2011: 4). They also note that this is problematic, cautioning that "this definition can only take us so far, and we must question whether these marks *are* in fact unexpected and why *we* consider them so" (2011: 4–5).

[234] Hardie has noted that "The interchangeability of wood and words is expressed in the history of the word *caudex* (*codex*), originally 'trunk, stem' of a tree, but well established by Ovid's time in the sense 'book' of wooden tablets, and later of other materials" (2002a: 245). For discussion of this phenomenon in Virgil's fifth *Eclogue* cf. Breed 2006: 62–63 and discussion above (94n227).

Another unconventional reference to epigraphy written in an unusual medium occurs in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, when Io scratches letters in the dust in order to reveal her identity to her father:

> illa manus lambit patriisque dat oscula palmis,
> nec retinet lacrimas et, si modo verba sequantur,
> oret opem nomenque suum casusque loquatur.
> littera pro verbis, quam pes in pulvere duxit,
> corporis indicium mutati triste peregit.
> (Ovid *Met*. 1.646–50)

> She licks her father's hand and gives kisses to his palms,
> nor does she hold back tears and, if only words would follow,
> she prays for help and tells her name and her downfalls.
> In place of words lettering, which her foot dragged in the dust,
> carried out the sad indication of the changed body.

Ovid underscores Io's sadness as she struggles to express herself, and the epigraphic resonances of this passage increase the pathos. She is not only deprived of a voice, but must also resort to an inhuman and unconventional mode of writing, dragging her hoof through the dust to form letters. This act replaces the act of speech, and it also replaces more conventional acts of writing.[235] Io cannot use a *graphium* like the one referenced in *Amores* 1.11, and in fact she cannot even use her hand to write her name on a surface which would be better suited to the written word. As has been discussed above, one characteristic of graffiti is its appearance on surfaces not meant for writing, and Io's writing fits that definition; however, it also has an urgency and severity that stand in stark contrast to more casual writing, and it is certainly meant to be read. Here Ovid once again plays with tensions of epigraphic genre. Furthermore, Io's father reacts with great grief, much in the way that a parent might react to the death of a child (Ovid *Met*. 1.651–55). Her writing becomes a sort of crude substitute for a funerary inscription, recording her name and signifying not her tragic death, but her tragic transformation from human form. This

[235] Wheeler has argued that "More often than not, the act of writing [in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*] is associated with women, the loss of speech, and memorializing the dead" (1999: 57). Cf. Ramsby 2007: 131.

unconventional breaking of the epigraphic habit allows Ovid to underscore the tragedy of Io's transformation. Similarly, Ovid plays upon epigraphic conventions in constructions of his own persona, which also changes, but remains distinctly Ovidian.[236]

Epigraphic Parroting: The Poetic Persona in *Amores* 2.6

Having discussed Ovid's creative and at times unconventional responses to epigraphy and his literary predecessors, I will now suggest that in *Amores* 2.6, a poem which includes a clear literary epitaph, Ovid encodes into his writing embedded references to epigraphy, which carry with them associations with Virgil's response to the epigraphic habit. A close reading of this poem will shed light on Ovid's construction of his own poetic persona in connection with his literary and epigraphic predecessors.

In *Amores* 2.6, Ovid describes the funeral of a parrot that is a programmatic reflection of the poetic persona, and infuses the poem with imitations of epigraphy and poetry.[237] Ovid's first epigraphic and literary synthesis comes at the beginning of the poem, when he introduces the *imitatrix ales*:

> PSITTACVS, Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis,
> occidit: exsequias ite frequenter, aves. (*Am*. 2.6.1–2)
>
> Parrot, the imitatress bird from the eastern Indies,
> has died; go in droves to the funeral, birds.

The word *imitatrix* has programmatic significance for the poem, since here and elsewhere Ovid creates several layers of literary, epigraphic, and cultural imitation. The *Psittacus*, who will later be described as eloquent, stands in for the poet, and is a literary imitation of Ovid and of other

[236] In fact, the blending of change and consistency is characteristic of how Ovid portrays transformations in the *Metamorphoses*. Individuals who have changed often retain characteristics of their previous form. Cf. Ovid *Met*. 1.612. Thus, it is not surprising that Ovid would also be sensitive to change and consistency in his own persona.

[237] For similarities between the parrot and the poet cf. Cahoon 1984 and Boyd 1987.

elegiac poets. Hinds has argued that the parrot imitates Catullus' sparrow. He also raises the question, "Will Ovid's poem be a paradigm of creative imitation, or is there a danger that it will just 'parrot' its predecessor?" (Hinds 1998: 5).[238] Ovid is himself *imitator*, and he draws upon Alexandrian and Roman literary motifs.[239] Furthermore, the word *imitatrix* also introduces a strain of epigraphic language that pervades the poem, and becomes explicit with the poetic epitaph at the end. It also reflects the ways in which Ovid's birds imitate participants in Roman funerals, thus participating in a literary representation of a Roman cultural ritual.[240] The result is a poem which portrays the *poeta persona* as a creative imitator of a variety of literary and cultural influences, including epigraphy.

Ovid introduces embedded epigraphic resonances at the very beginning of the poem. The opening line of *Amores* 2.6, with its use of the adjective *imitatrix*, resembles a Roman occupational inscription. It is a common characteristic of the Roman epigraphic habit to see the suffix *-trix* as part of an occupational title. These occupational titles tend to come after the name of the individual who is being commemorated on the stone. Consider this inscription which, according to the CIL, is one of many which was found in a *columbarium* between the Via Salaria and Via Pinciana:

> Pamphila / ornatrix / Antoniae s(erva) / have
> (CIL VI 33370a = ILS 1785 = AE 1971 52).[241]
>
> Pamphila, the hairdresser, servant of Antonia, Farewell.

The CIL identifies the inscriptions in this *columbarium* as ones for the family of Octavia the sister of Augustus and her daughter Antonia.[242] Hence the chronology of this inscription and its

[238] Cf. Hinds 1987: 7 and Myers 1990: 368.
[239] For Alexandrian motifs in the poem see Boyd 1987 and Hardie 2002b: 38.
[240] For the ways in which the birds imitate mourning ritual see Booth 1991: 124n3–5.
[241] EDCS-09700517 (September 5, 2013).

connection to the imperial family make it very relevant to our discussion of the Augustan epigraphic habit. This inscription is just one of many examples, and the suffix *-trix* appears on more than 1,000 inscriptions.[243] A search of the EDCS for "ornatrix" yielded thirty-four inscriptions. Ovid also uses the word *ornatrix* himself at *Am*. 1.14.16. In *Amores* 2.6, *Psittacus* stands in for the name of the individual on the stone, and *imitatrix* corresponds to the occupational title. This raises several issues about how Ovid engages with the epigraphic habit. First of all, if *imitatrix* corresponds with an occupational title, it suggests that it is the parrot's job to imitate. And if the parrot stands in for the poet, then the poet views his occupation as *imitator*. This sheds light on the way in which Ovid wants to portray his poetic *persona*, and reflects his goals as a writer and his interest in establishing a place for himself within the broader literary tradition. Given Ovid's interest in engaging with the visual culture of Augustan Rome, it is not surprising that he would want to create a literary imitation of the epigraphic material that was a part of that culture. His epigraphic interests also reflect his desire to shape and memorialize his own identity.

As was discussed above, Ovid's literary imitation includes a desire to place himself within the Virgilian tradition, which also involves imitation of the ways in which Virgil uses poetic epitaphs and epigraphic language.[244] In his description of the bird, the *imitator* poetic persona creates layers of cultural and literary imitation with a cluster of words that suggest both the Virgilian tradition and epigraphic language:

quid tamen ista fides, quid rari forma coloris,

[242] Cf. Gatti 1905: 156. He cites CIL VI 33368-33391 as inscriptions honoring their servants (1905: 156n4). More recently for the necropolis at the Via Salaria see Cupitò 2001 and 2007. For Ovid's usage of *ave* and possible parallels with *h(ave)* cf. *Am*. 2.6.62 and Booth 1991: 131n62.

[243] A search of the EDCS for "trix" yielded 1,364 inscriptions (April 22, 2013).

[244] Tarrant has noted that "Ovid specifically responds to Virgil's canonical status with a variety of self-assertive manoeuvres. One of these is shameless appropriation of Virgil's language" (Tarrant 2002: 24). Furthermore, O'Hara has suggested that Ovid offers "learned 'commentary'" on Virgil by employing Virgilian etymological wordplay, and that by doing so he acts like an "Alexandrian scholar-poet" (O'Hara 1996: 256).

quid vox mutandis ingeniosa sonis,
quid iuvat, ut datus es, nostrae placuisse puellae?
infelix avium gloria nempe iaces. (Ovid *Am*. 2.6.17–20)

However what good does this good faith do, what good this appearance of rare color,
what good the voice clever at changing sounds,
what good does it do that you were given to please our girl?
To be sure you lay to rest, the unfortunate glory of birds.

First, I will examine the Virgilian resonances of this passage, and then I will argue that both the Ovidian and Virgilian passages include embedded references to Roman epigraphic culture.

Virgil uses variants of *forma* and *fides* in his literary accounts of deceased individuals. His literary epitaph of Daphnis, which appears at the end of *Eclogue* 5, describes the deceased as *formosior* than the herd that he watched:[245]

et tumulum facite et tumulo superaddite carmen:
Daphnis ego in silvis, hinc usque ad sidera notus,
formosi pecoris custos, *formosior* ipse. (Virgil *Ecl*. 5.42–44)[246]

And make a tomb and to the tomb affix the verse:
Daphnis I was in the woods, known from here all the way up to the stars,
the guardian of a handsome herd, I myself handsomer.

Interestingly, this epitaph is written in the first person, and is thus similar to the first person epitaph that appears at the end of *Amores* 2.6, and which will be discussed in more detail below. The words *forma* and *fides* also appear in Virgil's account of Marcellus, which comes at the end of a parade of ancestors in the underworld:[247]

egregium *forma* iuvenem et fulgentibus armis. (Virgil *Aen*. 6.861)

A youth remarkable for his appearance and with gleaming arms.

heu pietas, heu prisca *fides* invictaque bello

[245] McKeown has also noted the parallel between Ovid *Am*. 2.6 and Virgil *Ecl*. 5 (McKeown 1998: 143n57–58).
[246] Emphasis mine in this passage and the three that follow it.
[247] For the similarities between the parade of ancestors and the Roman *pompa funebris* see Flower 1996. For discussion of *egregium forma* cf. Reed 2007: 151, citing Brenk (1986: 224) for comparison with the epitaph for L. Scipio Barbatus. Turnus is also described as "egregium formae" (*Aen*. 7.473). Cf. Thomas 1998: 283 for the connection between this passage and the L. Scipio Barbatus inscription, with discussion by Reed (2007: 48 and 151). Turnus will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter (pp. 140–45).

dextra! (Virgil *Aen*. 6.878–89)

Woe *pietas*, woe long-standing good faith and right hand undefeated by war!

And once again, *infelix* invites comparison with Dido:[248]

infelix Dido, verus mihi nuntius ergo
venerat exstinctam, ferroque extrema secutam? (Virgil *Aen*. 6.456–57)

Unfortunate Dido, does this mean that a true message had come to me that you were dead, having followed out your last moments by means of a sword?

These Virgilian *exempla* share the common theme of being used within funerary contexts. They also suggest a sense of lost potential, which calls to mind the Roman concept of the *funus acerbum*. Daphnis' death brings with it the lost potential of creative poetic output, the death of Marcellus represents the lost potential of an imperial heir, and the death of Dido brings with it the lost potential to continue building a new city. Ovid shows a conscious awareness of the *funus acerbum* with his phrase "raptus es invidia," which suggests that the parrot was taken before its time (*Am*. 2.6.25).[249]

Furthermore, these *exempla* are not merely Virgilian, but also reflect a double layer of epigraphic imitation. Both Virgil and Ovid appropriate language associated with Roman epitaphs, which tend to underscore the virtues of the deceased.[250] McKeown has noted that "moral and physical qualities are often praised together in this context" and cites the epitaph of Lucius Scipio Barbatus (McKeown 1998: 118n17–18).[251] The epitaph describes Barbatus as

[248] Cf. discussion above (pp. 86–87) of Ovid's use *infelix* in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met*. 8.231–35) as well as discusison of "infelix Dido" in the next chapter (pp. 124–30).

[249] McKeown points out the similarity to CLE 1014: "quem prima ferentem / aetis Pluton invidus eripuit" (McKeown 1998: 120n25–26). CLE 1014 = CIL VI 6314 = EDCS-19300357. The epitaph of Bassa (CIL VI 7898 = CLE 1058 = EDCS-18700323), which like CIL VI 6314 is currently in the epigraphic collection of the Museo Nazionale Romano at the Baths of Diocletian, also has similar language, rendered in elegiac verse. Cf. Limón, suggesting a date in the second half of the first century C. E. (2012: 554).

[250] Booth has noted the parallel between the virtues that Ovid describes and funerary inscriptions (Booth 1991: 126n17–42). Cf. Lattimore 1942: 294–95.

[251] Cf. discussion of the Scipios on pp. 44–50 of the Livy chapter. For a study of the tomb of the Scipios in connection with Roman elegy see Ramsby 2007: 22–24.

"fortis vir sapiensque, quoius forma uirtutei parisuma fuit" (a strong and wise man, whose appearance was equal to his virtue).[252] Another epigraphic parallel is the epitaph of Geminia Agathe, which is currently part of the Capitoline collection in Rome, notable for the details that it gives about the visual appearance of the deceased:

> ... ingenio docili forma pulchra ac veneranda rufa coma tonso capite pos{t}trema remisso ... (CIL VI 19007 = CLE 562)[253]
>
> ... With malleable talent, with a beautiful appearance, and with venerable trimmed red hair, let down behind the head ...

The detailed description of the deceased's hairstyle is striking. In both the Virgilian and epigraphic examples, *forma* is closely linked not only to the visual appearance but also to the identity of the deceased. The presence of these details suggests that the hairstyle of Geminia Agathe was distinctive, and that others might have recognized or remembered this aspect of her appearance. In the case of the *psittacus* the *forma* is notable since it is a form of rare color.[254] It is a feature of the deceased parrot that stood out and distinguished it from others, and it is also a programmatic literary word, which would have had significance for Ovid as a poet interested in the manipulation of form and genre. These manipulations occur on both a literary and a mythological level for Ovid, and at the beginning of his *Metamorphoses* he discusses the ways in which he will describe bodies changed into new forms: "In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora" (the spirit intends to tell of bodies changed into new forms) (Ovid *Met*. 1.1–2).

---

[252] There are numerous references for this famous inscription in various publications: CIL VI 1284 = CIL VI 1285 = CIL VI 31587 = CIL VI 31588 = CIL VI 37039a = CIL I 6 = CIL I 7 = ILLRP 309 = CLE 7 = ILS 1 = CSE 2 = AE 1991 71 = AE 1997 129 = AE 2005 196 (EDCS-17800190).

[253] EDCS-12100916 (September 5, 2013). This inscription, which was featured on a sarcophagus, is likely post-Augustan. Whereas cremation was typical until the end of the first century C. E., inhumation became the norm at the turn of the century (Toynbee 1971: 33–34). Although this inscription likely post-dates Ovid's poem, it illustrates how inscriptions may be used to portray distinct individual characteristics.

[254] The colorful nature of the bird is consistant with what we know about ancient parrots. Toynbee notes that "Pliny, Solinus, and Apuleius all give, in much the same terms, minute descriptions of the parrot's appearance and habits. It is completely green apart from a red-gold (*miniatus*, *puniceus*, *mineus*) band of feathers forming a kind of collar (*torques*) round its neck" (1973: 248). Cf. Pliny *HN* 10.58, Solinus 52.43–45, and Apuleius *Flor*. 12.

The *mutatas formas* represent not only the bodies of the individuals who undergo metamorphosis, but also the changed forms of genre and myth that Ovid interweaves into his work. Hence, *forma* encodes both Virgilian and epigraphic associations, and it also reflects back on Ovid's *persona* as an imitator and manipulator of various literary and cultural references.

Ovid also mixes references when, as mentioned above, he discusses the status of the bird as pleasing to the *puellae*:

> Quid iuvat, ut datus es, nostrae placuisse puellae? (Ovid *Am*. 2.6.19)
>
> What good does it do that you were given to please our girl?

This phrase invites associations with both the elegiac mistress and master / slave relationships on Roman epitaphs. McKeown comments, "Epitaphs for slaves / freedmen conventionally praised them for pleasing their masters / patrons" and he cites an epigraphic parallel: "viro et patrono placui" (CLE 86) (McKeown 1998: 120n19–20).[255] This parallel is consistent with Boyd's argument that Corinna, the recipient of the gift, is the bird's elegiac *domina* (Boyd 1987: 206).[256] It also suggests that the parrot, and by association the elegiac poet, is in a subservient position to his mistress. Bradley has discussed the social relationships between masters and slaves, and notes that "From a legal point of view the Latin words for power (*potestas*) and slave-ownership (*dominum*) could be regarded as synonymous, which means that, above all, slave owning was an expression of power" (Bradley 1994: 24). Here the *puella* has power and ownership over the *psittacus*, just as a master has power over a slave. Similarly, Corinna as elegiac mistress has power over the elegiac poet. The literary and epigraphic associations encode cultural

[255] McKeown has also noted that this line recalls Catullus 3.3 ff "passer mortuus est meae puellae, / passer, deliciae meae puellae, / quem plus illa oculis suis amabat" (my girl's sparrow has died, sparrow, the delight of my girl, whom she loved more than her own eyes) (McKeown 1998: 120n.19–20). Booth also notes that there are other epitaphs that mention "an owner's affection for a pet" (Booth 1991: 131n61).

[256] Boyd writes, "The parrot of *Am* 2.6 sees itself as an elegiac lover; its words at death and its epitaph cast Corinna into the role of the bird's elegiac *domina*" (Boyd 1987: 206).

associations, which contribute to defining the relationship between the poetic persona, the parrot, and the *puella*.

The relationship of the parrot-poet to the *domina* is reiterated with the first person poetic epitaph at the end of the poem. In fact, Ovid interweaves several strands of literary and epigraphic imitation into this passage:

> ossa tegit tumulus, tumulus pro corpore magnus,
> quo lapis exiguus par sibi carmen habet:
> COLLIGOR EX IPSO DOMINAE PLACVISSE SEPVLCRO.
> ORA FUERE MIHI PLVS AVE DOCTA LOQVI. (Ovid *Am*. 2.6.59–62)
>
> A tomb covers the bones, a tomb great in proportion to the body on which a small stone has a verse equal to itself: From the tomb itself I am reckoned to have pleased the mistress. My mouth was more skilled at speaking than a bird.

The phrase *dominae placuisse* echoes *nostrae placuisse puellae* (*Am*. 2.6.19), and both phrases echo Roman epitaphs.[257] Ovid's Hellenistic and elegiac influences are also clear, and the reference to the small size of the tombstone recalls the language of Callimachus and of Roman inscriptions (Booth 1991: 131n59–60) as well as Hellenistic pet-epitaphs and the Alexandrian conceit of smallness (Boyd 1987: 202).[258] It encodes associations with both poetic works and epigraphy, and is another way in which Ovid uses nuanced vocabulary to blend different traditions. Boyd has observed that "the epitaph itself illustrates birds' artistic eloquence, taking the form of a perfect elegiac couplet" (Boyd 1997: 178).[259] It also has structural significance

[257] As Boyd has observed, the adjective *docta* recalls the Alexandrian literary tradition (Boyd 1997: 178). In addition, *docta loqui* appears on a Roman funerary inscription for a rhetorician which might date to the third c. C. E. (CIL VI 33904 = CLE 1251 = ILS 7773). EDCS-24100418.

[258] McKeown has also noted that it was common for pet epitaphs to refer specifically to the tomb (McKeown 1998: 143n59–60). For Ovid's Callimachean program cf. Myers 1990. For Hellenistic animal epitaphs cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 54–55 and 60–68. Gutzwiller's claim that Ante, a writer of epitaphs for animals, "may have been the first epigrammist to project a distinct literary persona" (1998: 55) is relevant to our discussion of how Ovid constructs his own literary persona.

[259] For the loquaciousness of this and other birds cf. Lazenby, who notes that "The green Indian parrot was the talking bird *par excellence* among the Romans" (1949: 299). We might also think of Pliny's account of a talking bird who greeted people at the rostra and received elaborate funerary honors after his death (Pliny *HN* 10.121–23). Cf. Toynbee 1973: 274–75 and Bodel 1999: 262.

since it functions as a poem within a poem, and draws attention to the way in which the parrot and the poet define themselves through the *carmen*.[260]

Ovid's poetic persona in *Amores* 2.6 is shaped by a number of different influences, including Latin inscriptions. Ovid's shaping of his poetic persona imitates the commemorative purpose and production process of tombstones, which shape, define, and memorialize the identity of the deceased. The content usually reflects select factual details (or details that might not be factual but are presented as fact) about the life and character of the deceased. Just as Ovid presents the fact that the parrot is by nature *imitatrix*, an inscription that identifies an individual as *ornatrix* presumably reflects the reality of that person's occupation. Furthermore, both Ovid and the creators of Roman epitaphs have a certain degree of creative control over the process of commemoration.[261] As mentioned in the introduction, John Bodel has argued in his discussion of bibliographical themes in Greek and Roman epitaphs that "The most informative examples are funerary poems (*carmina funeraria*), which tend to combine greater freedom of expression with a propensity to articulate not only personal vicissitudes but individual attitudes and values, aspirations and regrets" (Bodel 2001: 39).[262] Ovid's creative shaping of the poetic persona in the poem is also autobiographical, and expresses his own interests and attitudes. He is interested in inscriptions, Augustan culture, and diverse literary traditions, and the poem reflects those interests. Furthermore, he is also very conscious of the ways in which form can represent

[260] McKeown has also observed that the word *carmen* is often used of inscriptions (McKeown 1998: 144n59–60).

[261] The tombstone of John Keats in the non-Catholic cemetery in Rome exemplifies the combination of factual information and creative control. The stone reads, "This grave contains all that was mortal, of a YOUNG ENGLISH POET, who, on his Death Bed, in the Bitterness of his Heart at the Malicious Power of his Enemies, Desired these Words to be engraven on his Tomb Stone. Here lies one whose name was writ in water." Keats had expressed a desire for his tombstone to include only the last line, but his executor Charles Brown requested that the preceding content also be added to the stone. The inscription is notable for the mixture of factual information about the poet's age and occupation as well as the perceived factual (but probably at least to some degree influenced by individual impressions) content about his emotions and attitude towards his enemies. In this case, both Keats and the executor contributed to the process of shaping the way in which he was memorialized (Keats-Shelley Memorial Association 2005: 28).

[262] Cf. discussion on p. 3.

multiple layers of content, and engages in wordplay and mixing of genres. These influences shape how he conceives of himself, and this conception corresponds to how he wants to project and memorialize his poetic persona. It is a distinctly Roman persona, and a distinctly Ovidian one.

Conclusion: Inscribing Ovidian Personae

In this chapter, I have examined different ways in which Ovid makes creative use of epigraphic conventions. He pushes the boundaries of epigraphic genres, and appropriates epigraphic material in his constructions of personae. Ovid's portrayals of his own persona vary in accordance with his authorial goals and status as an exile, but are also relatively consistent. I will end by examining portrayals of Ovid's persona that offer a sense of closure to periods of his life and literary career. In the concluding book of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid proclaims that his work will bring him eternal fame. This message of immortality comes in the form of a *sphragis* noted for its parallels to Horace's *Ode* 3.30, a poem which has already been discussed in connection with its epigraphic resonances:[263]

> Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis
> nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas.
> cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius
> ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi;
> parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis
> astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum;
> quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris
> ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama
> (si quid habent veri vatum praesagia) vivam.
> (Ovid *Met*. 15.871–79)
>
> Now I have completed the work, which neither the anger of Jove nor fire
> nor iron nor devouring old age will be able to destroy.

[263] See Wickkiser 1999: 113n2 for a summary of scholarship on this connection, including Due 1974: 33–35; Galinsky, also noting a parallel with Callimachus (1975: 24–25); Knox 1986: 78–80 (also noting the Callimachean parallel); Barchiesi 1994: 262–64; and Bömer 1986: 488–89n15.871.

> While it flies, that day, which has no law except of this body,
> it finishes the extent of my uncertain age; nevertheless with the greater part of me I, enduring, will be carried above the high stars, my name will be indestructable;
> wherever Rome lies powerful in defeated lands, I will be read
> by the mouth of the populace, and through all the ages by my reputation
> (if the presentiments of the poet-prophets have anything of the truth) I will live.

In his *sphragis*, Ovid synthesizes material that he read and wrote earlier. Wickkiser has shown that this passage includes language which mirrors material from earlier in the *Metamorphoses* and from Virgil (including Virgil's discussion of fate) (Wickkiser 1999). Furthermore, *legar* parallels Oenone's *legor* (Ovid *Her*. 5.21), the epigraphic resonances of which have been discussed above (93). Due sees this statement as a defiant assertion of popularity in the face of "the lack of official recognition" from the emperor (1974: 35). The parallel with Oenone supports this reading, since she makes the assertion that she is read in reaction to Paris' rejection of her. In the case of Ovid's *sphragis*, the claim rings truer since his work did bring him considerable fame, whereas Oenone's assertion reflects her tragic disillusionment. Ovid's final word, *vivam*, reflects his optimistic claim to immortality, a claim that he made before his exile.[264]

In the *Tristia*, Ovid offers a much more sobering portrayal of his *persona* which reflects how it has changed as a result of exile. This epigraphic passage, written later in Ovid's career, resembles Ovidian epigraphic material discussed earlier in this chapter.[265] Hence, it is a fitting end not only to Ovid's portrayal of his *persona*, but also to this chapter:

> atque ea cum foliis et amomi pulvere misce,
> inque suburbano condita pone solo;
> quosque legat versus oculo properante viator,
> grandibus in tumuli marmore caede notis:
> HIC · EGO · QVI · IACEO · TENERORVM · LUSOR · AMORVM
> INGENIO · PERII · NASO · POETA · MEO

[264] Galinsky, arguing for the "triumph of the narrator" and his prominence throughout the epic, writes that "*Vivam* thus is fittingly the last word of the *Metamorphoses*. The poem on transformations culminates with the one exemplar that is impervious to change: the poet's achievement" (1975: 24).

[265] Ramsby has noted that this epitaph also recalls the epitaphs of other elegiac poets, including Tibullus (Tibullus 1.3.49–56) and Propertius (Ramsby 2007: 111).

AT · TIBI · QVI · TRANSIS · NE · SIT · GRAVE · QVISQVIS · AMASTI
DICERE · NASONIS · MOLLITER · OSSA · CVBENT
hoc satis in titulo est. etenim maiora libelli
et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi. (Ovid *Tr*. 3.3.69–78)

And mix these with leaves and the dust of an eastern spice plant,
and place them buried in soil close to the city;
and verses which a traveller may read with a hastening eye,
cut on a marble tomb with large letters:
Here I lie who am the player of tender loves,
I, Naso the poet, perished by my own genius,
and for you who cross let it not be troublesome, whoever loved,
to say, "may the bones of Naso lie softly."
This is enough on the inscription. For my little books are greater
and more long-lasting monuments.

Perii contrasts with Ovid's usage of *vivam* in the *Metamorphoses*, and marks a change in how Ovid portrays himself. The epigraphic tribute that Ovid envisions for himself here resembles the earlier tributes that he wrote in the voice of Dido. While Dido perished "sua manu," Ovid portrays himself as dead "ingenio meo." Furthermore, just as Ovid identified the parrot in *Amores* 2.6 as "imitatrix," here he designates his occupation as "tenerorum lusor amorum."[266] It is interesting that here he does not identify himself as "Ovid, writer of a great epic which will ensure longevity," but instead opts for "Ovid, player of tender loves" and "Naso poeta." Ramsby has also raised this important issue regarding the epitaph, noting that "it is curious that Ovid's memorial makes no mention of his other, considerably more serious works" (2007: 111–12).[267] Although Ovid does not mention the *Metamorphoses* explicitly, he might recall it subtly with *maiora*, which parallels his description of the poem in *Tristia* 1.7.11-14:[268]

... sed carmina maior imago
sunt mea, quae mando qualiacumque legas,
carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas. (Ovid *Tr*. 1.7.11-14)

[266] In the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid twice charactertizes his persona in connection with his role as the author of a didactic poem, naming himself "Naso Magister" (*Ars*. *am*. 2.742–43 and *Ars*. *am*. 3.809–12). Cf. Ramsby 2007: 106–11.
[267] Cf. Green 1994: 238 (Ramsby 2007: 178n52).
[268] I thank Stephen Hinds for bringing this point to my attention.

> ... But my poems are a greater *imago*,
> which I bid you to read for whatever they are worth,
> poems telling of changed forms of men.

Whereas in *Tr*. 1.11 Ovid gives the *Metamorphoses* top billing as a greater representation of him than his own *imago*, in *Tr*. 3.3 the epic is in the background while Ovid's identity as "tenerorum lusor amorum" takes center stage. I suggest that there are two reasons for Ovid's choice to portray himself in this way in the latter poem. The first reason is his exile, which he attributes to "carmen" and "error" (Ovid *Tr*. 2.207).[269] Ovid makes it clear that his poetry is a cause of his ruin, and the juxtaposition of the lighthearted "tenerorum lusor amorum" with the more weighty epigraphic material that follows expresses the contrast between the cause of his exile (a playful poem) and the serious result.[270] In addition, "tenerorum lusor amorum" and "Naso poeta" are fitting epitaphs for Ovid, since he remains in those personae throughout his work. Although not all of his poems would be classified as amatory, he does play with the notion of love in all of the works discussed in this chapter, experimenting with how to portray it accross genres, and then bemoaning the consequences in his exile poetry, while also proclaiming that his works will function as *monumenta*. By inscribing his persona in this way, Ovid creates a tragic memorial that sums up the various different portrayals of his persona that he crafts throughout his works. Hence, he mixes the sobering reality of his present situation with the more positive vision of lasting fame that he wrote in the *Metamorphoses*. In short, Ovid creates a dramatic final monument that allows him to have creative control over his own persona, just as he used epigraphic conventions to shape and control other personae in his works. Epigraphy is a powerful tool in the hands of Naso poeta.

---

[269] For the *carmen* and *error* cf. Green 1982.

[270] Ramsby argues that "By claiming that he, an artist, died because of his poetic talent, he points to the fact that political and artistic freedom were undergoing permanent change, change which would soon silence the independent voices of the elegiac movement" (2007: 142).

Chapter 3: Inscribing Fate: Memory and Epigraphy in Virgil

Servius remarked on *Aen*. 11.24: "sane cum hortatur socios ut sepeliantur occisi, ipse defunctis velut epitaphion dixit" (Servius *ad Aen*. 11.24) [Certainly when he (Aeneas) urged his companions that the dead be dealt with in the proper fashion, he himself spoke an *epitaphion*, as it were, for the deceased.] His comment illustrates his awareness that epigraphic language might have influenced Virgil's portrayal of Aeneas, and Rawson (2002) has found parallels between this passage and the language of Roman funerary inscriptions.[271] Given the marked increase in epigraphic activity that occurred during the Augustan era, inscriptions must have been visible and accessible sources at the time when Virgil was writing, and might have appealed to his interest in Roman visual culture.[272] The influence of Virgilian verse on Latin inscriptions has long been recognized, with studies by Hoogma (1959) and more recently Trout (2013). We should also consider the possibility that in addition to influencing later inscriptions, Virgil himself might have been influenced by epigraphic conventions. The possibility that Virgil himself appropriated epigraphic conventions has received little notice, although the topic is receiving increased attention, with recent studies by Thomas (1997 and 1998), Dinter (2005), and Nelis-Clément and Nelis (2013). In this chapter, I will use evidence from inscriptions to argue that Virgil makes both direct and indirect references to epigraphic conventions in the *Aeneid*.

Virgil includes a literary inscription in his account of Aeneas' dedication of the temple of Apollo (*Aen*. 3.286–88), which recently has been discussed by Nelis-Clément and Nelis, who note its similarities to an extant Roman inscription erected at Actium.[273] In addition, the

[271] Cf. discussion on pp. 139–40.

[272] For the increase in epigraphic activity during the age of Augustus see Alföldy 1991 and Bodel 2001: 7–8, as well as discussion in the introduction. Virgil's interest in visual culture has been recognized, with Smith (2005) arguing that the *Aeneid* reflects the increased prevalence of visual communication in the Augustan era.

[273] Cf. Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013: 326–27 and 327n54 citing Murray and Petsas 1989, Zachos 2003: 76, AE 2007 1286, and Kantiréa 2007: 89–93.

epigraphic resonances of Virgil's description of Caieta and her final resting place (*Aen*. 7.1–4) have been noted.[274] What has not been recognized is that Virgil also appropriates epigraphic language and thought in subtle ways that reflect the emotional depth and subjectivity of the epic. His subtle epigraphic appropriations leave the nuances of individual character to the interpretive powers of his audience, reflecting both his subjective style and the prominence of the epigraphic habit at the time when he was writing.[275] By appropriating conventions of Roman inscriptions (particularly funerary epitaphs), Virgil also appropriates their emotional resonances. His epigraphic appropriations provide added insight into the emotions of individual characters, and also contribute to the development of a suspenseful, melancholy mood.

In this chapter, I will explore Virgil's subtle appropriations of epigraphic conventions in the *Aeneid*, focusing on how he uses epigraphic language to shape character and emotion.[276] I will begin by examining epigraphic resonances in the programmatic first book of the *Aeneid*. My discussion will include a consideration of the role of fate, which has a strong epigraphic presence and also has programmatic significance to the epic.[277] Next, I will examine a series of characters who die prematurely, arguing that their deaths reflect the Roman concept of the *funus acerbum* (premature death), a concept which, as noted in the Ovid chapter, the Romans often referenced on inscriptions.[278] The presence of *funera acerba* in the *Aeneid* has been recognized, and Rawson notes that Virgil uses this terminology to describe the premature deaths of infants

[274] Cf. Barchiesi 1979 and Kyriakidēs 1998.

[275] For Virgil's subjective style see Heinze 1915: 295–97, Otis 1964: 41–97, Lyne 1987: 227ff., Smith 2005 *passim*, and Conte 2007: 50.

[276] A full study of Virgil's appropriation of epigraphic langauge would also need to examine epigraphic resonances in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. I will not treat these works in detail here, but will refer to them occassionaly because comparative study can enhance our undertanding of how Virgil uses inscriptions. For inscriptions and the *Eclogues* cf. Breed 2006, with discussion on pp. 29, 94n227, 96n234, and 116n287.

[277] For fate in the *Aeneid* see Commager 1981, Williams 1983, Lyne 1987, O'Hara 1990, and Conte 2007 *passim*. Still useful are MacInnes 1910, Heinze 1915, Bailey 1935, and Carrlson 1945.

[278] Rawson has noted that epigraphic evidence suggests an association with unripe fruit, citing CIL VI 7574: "quo modo / mala in arbore pendunt / sic corpora nostra / aut matura cadunt aut / cito acerva ruunt" "Our bodies are like apples hanging on a tree: they either fall when they are mature (*matura*) or come tumbling down too soon when they are unripe (*acerua*)" (Rawson 2002: 272). For the equivalence of *acerva* to *acerba* cf. Rawson 2002: 271–72.

(*Aen*. 6.429) and the death of Pallas (*Aen*. 11.28) (Rawson 2002: 272). It was common for funerary inscriptions referencing fate and *fuenra acerba* to express feelings of personal loss, portraying the grief of those who were close to the deceased while memorializing personal relationships. Throughout the epic Aeneas experiences personal losses that contribute to the development of his character. Virgil appropriates epigraphic conventions in ways that allow readers familiar with epigraphic conventions to interpret the subtle nuances of Aeneas' character, as well as of characters who are close to him. Inscriptions may be subjective in the same way that Virgil is subjective, with terse, formulaic language speaking volumes about private grief and emotion, and leaving the full resonances of the text to the interpretive powers of the reader. Hence, Virgil's *Aeneid* furnishes an excellent case study for exploring memory and epigraphic intertext in Augustan literature, and we should consider the possibility that he used inscriptions as a source when writing the epic.

Programmatic Beginnings: Inscribing Fate in *Aeneid* Book I

Virgil characterizes Aeneas as "fato profugus" before introducing him by name (*Aen*. 1.2).[279] This is the first of Virgil's many references to fate, and the fates are also a convention of Roman funerary inscriptions.[280] The role of the fates as a controlling and limiting force is well attested on Roman epitaphs, and the fates play a similar role in the *Aeneid*. In many cases epigraphic references to fate are infused with the pathos and possessiveness that have long been recognized as central to the *Aeneid*.[281] Virgil makes several references to the fates at the beginning of the epic, using the terms *fata* and *Parcae*, which both appear on Roman

[279] For Virgilian characterization cf. Laird 1997, Griffin 1985: 183–97, Lyne 1987, and Reed 2007 *passim*. For characterization of Aeneas in this passage cf. Williams 1972: 157n2 and Conte, noting that Aeneas "represents a viewpoint that defines him, but he also represents the will of the Fate that he is to enact" (1986: 175).

[280] For references to the fates on funerary inscriptions cf. Lattimore 1942: 146–58 and discussion below.

[281] For Virgilian pathos see Heinze 1915, Pöschl 1950, Parry 1963, Johnson 1976, Putnam 1995, Reed 2007, and Conte 2007, who has also noted Virgil's "epigraphic solemnity" (2007: 40).

inscriptions.[282] The fates and the *Parcae* are both prominent in his description of Juno's desire for Carthage to be an exemplary city, a desire at odds with Aeneas' destiny:

> si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque.
> progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
> audierat, Tyrias olim quae verteret arces;
> hinc populum late regemque belloque superbum
> venturum excidio Lybiae; sic volvere Parcas.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 1.18–22).

> Already then the goddess aims and favors this to be the kingdom for the nations,
> if in any way the fates would allow. But in fact she had heard that a race was being
> established from Trojan blood, which one day would overturn the Tyrian citadels;
> hence a people ruling far and wide and exceptional in war
> was about to come for the destruction of Lybia; thus the fates unrolled.

The *Parcae*, also mentioned in the Virgilian passage, are often referenced as playing a similar role to the fates.[283] Lattimore has discussed these two terms, citing a Roman inscription thought to pre-date the Augustan era, and hence one with conventions that might have been familiar to Virgil and his readers:[284]

> [Heic est sep]ul<*t*>a Quincti Ranci feilia / [Quincti le]iberti Proti quoi fatum grave / [crudeles] Parcae ac finem vitae statuerunt / [vix quom ess]et bis decem anneis nata indigniter / [nam quod c]oncepit leiberum semem duplex / [quom recte] pareret patrono aux{s}ilium ac decus / [expertam mul]ta commoda atque incommoda / [inmitis] mors eripuit sueis parentibus / [nunc illi s]ummo in luctu ac sollicitudine / [prae deside]rio gnatae fletus in dies // edunt sibei esse ereptam talem filiam / pater mei et genetrix germana oro atque o[bsecro] / desinite luctu questu lacrumas fundere // sei in vita iucunda vobeis voluptatei fuei / viro atque ameiceis noteisque omnibus / nunc quoniam fatum se ita tolit animo vo[lo] / aequo vos ferre concordesque vivere / quas ob res hoc

[282] Cf. Bailey noting that "The idea of Fate is all-pervading in Virgil, and especially of course in the *Aeneid*. In it the words *fatum* and *fata* occur some 120 times, besides several instances of the derivative adjective *fatalis*. To these must be added the *Parcae*, the personification of the Fates, together with many instances in which in one sense *fortuna*, in another *numen* and *iussa deum* are in various contexts tantamount in Virgil's mind to *fatum*" (1935: 204). A full study of Virgil's references to fate is beyond the scope of this chapter.

[283] Lissberger notes that "Die Parzen übernehmen von den fata die Aufgabe, das Leben der Menschen zu begrenzen" (Lissberger 1934: 25). [The *Parcae* take upon themselves the task of the fates, to mark off the lives of men.]

[284] Lattimore dated this inscription to the age of Julius Caesar, identifying it as "one of the earliest instances in inscriptions" of *fatum* and *Parcae* (1942: 156). In addition, the CIL notes that "Patronus Q. Rancius videtur esse is qui adfuit scribendo senatusconsulto de Oropiis a. d. XVII kal. Nov. a. u. c. 681 (Mommsen in Hermae vol. 20 p. 284)" (CIL VI 25369). [The patron Q. Rancius seems to be the one who was present at the *senatusconsultum de Oropiis* that was written seventeen days before the kalends of November in 73 B. C. E. (Mommsen in Hermae vol. 20 p. 284)]. Cf. Faßbender 2007 and Massaro 2007.

monumentum aedificavit [pater] / suae gnatae sibeique uxori hanc constituit [domum] / aeternam ubei omnes pariter aevom degen[t]
(CIL VI 25369 = CIL I 1215 = CLE 59 = CLENuovo p. 98 = AE 1990 25)[285]

Here is buried the daughter of Quinctus Rancus, the freedman of Quinctus Protus, for whom the cruel *Parcae* determined a heavy fate and the end of life when she had been born scarcely twenty years, unjustly, since she conceived a double progeny, which rightly she bore as a help and glory for her patron. Having undergone many opportune and inopportune things, bitter death snatched her away from her parents. Now they are in the greatest grief and disquiet of mind, faced with longing for their daughter they fill their days with tears. They say that a daughter of such exceptional character was snatched away from them. I ask and entreat you, my father, mother, and sister, refrain from grief, from lament, and from shedding tears. I was a pleasure in pleasing life for you, for my husband and friends, and to everyone I knew. Now, since thus fate bore it, I want you to bear it with a calm mind and to live in harmony. On account of these things the father built this monument to his daughter and himself and his wife. He built this eternal home where they all will pass the time together.

This inscription portrays the *Parcae* as limiting forces, and Virgil also portrays them in an active role as the agent of "volvere."[286] In the *Aeneid*, the fates and the *Parcae* mark out the boundaries of personal and national success, bringing about the destruction of Carthage and the rise of Rome, and delineating Aeneas' course of action. Epigraphic conventions serve as a valuable tool for Virgil as he develops the character of Aeneas, propelled by fate because of Juno's anger. And in fact, early in the epic the gods themselves discuss the impact of the fates on Aeneas, with Jupiter reassuring Venus that he will eventually achieve a great destiny:

parce metu, Cytherea, manent immota tuorum
fata tibi; cernes urbem et promissa Lavini
moenia, sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli
magnanimum Aenean; neque me sententia vertit.
(Virgil *Aen*. 1.257–60).

Refrain from fear, Venus; the fates of your people remain unmoved for you;
you will see the city and the promised walls of Lavinium,

[285] EDCS-13801621 (November 14, 2013). The EDCS gives regularized spellings, but I have kept the orthography that is on the stone in order to preserve the archaic character of the text. The EDCS and the CIL restore "sepulta" for "ulia," with the CIL noting that it is difficult to find a *cognomen* ending in "ulia" that would fit the verse (CIL VI 25369). The CLE retains "ulia" and suggests possible *cognomina*.

[286] Austin notes *ad loc.*: "*volvere* may suggest the turning of the Fates' spindles, or simply the 'unrolling' of their plans" (1971: 37n22). Cf. Servius *ad loc*. and Williams, noting that "The three Parcae were Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos; the image in *volvere* is from spinning, or perhaps from unrolling a volume" (1972: 160n22).

> and you will carry lofty noble Aeneas to the stars of heaven;
> nor has an opinion swayed me.

The future which Venus envisions, and which Jupiter had promised, will come to pass, and she will carry Aeneas "ad sidera caeli" (*Aen*. 1.259).[287] In addition to characterizing Aeneas as noble and having a great destiny, Jupiter's statement in the *Aeneid* also has an epigraphic parallel on an inscription which might date to the Augustan period, and which also references the *Parcae*:[288]

> Memoriae M(arci) Luccei M(arci) f(ilii) Nepotis Sex(tus) Onussanius Sex(ti) f(ilius) Com[...] / Quum praematura raptum mihi morte Nepotem / flerem Parcarum putria fila querens / et gemerem tristi damnatam sorte iuventam / versaretque novus viscera tota dolor / me desolatum me desertum ac spoliatum / clamarem largis saxa movens lacrimis ... / o me ad sidera caeli / ablatum quereris desine flere deum.
> (CIL VI 21521 = CIL VI 34137 = CLE 1109= CCA III 334)[289]
>
> To the memory of Marcus Lucceus son of Marcus Nepos, Sextus Onussanius son of Sextus Com[...]. I was weeping for Nepos who was stolen away from me by premature death, grumbling at the overripe threads of the *Parcae*, and I was groaning at the youth condemned by sad lot, and a new grief was stirring all my entrails ... I whom you lament have been carried to the stars of heaven, at last stop weeping.

Both this inscription and the *Aeneid* emphasize the fulfillment of a great, divinely influenced destiny, but both are also laced with emotion and angst, with Jupiter calming Venus' fear and the inscription describing the grief that accompanies personal loss. O'Hara has noted that "The *Aeneid* perhaps allows the reader to think that the reward of deification makes up for all of

[287] Cf. Austin 1971: 101n259 for parallels with Ennius' comparable, but not identical, "unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli / templa" (*Ann*. 65 f.) and Ovid's "unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli" (referring to Romulus) at *Met*. 14.814 and *Fast*. 2.487. The CIL notes a parallel between the Ennian line and the phrase "in caeli lucida templa tulit," which appears later in this same inscription, as well as "caeli lucida templa" at Lucretius 1.1013 (CIL VI 21521). We might also compare Virgil's "Daphnin tuum tollemus ad astra; / Daphnin ad astra feremus" in *Eclogue* 5 (51–52), which also references the fates, portraying them as a limiting force that carried Daphnis away, bringing about his cruel death ("crudeli funere") (*Ecl*. 5.20). For inscriptions and the *Eclogues* see Breed 2006 (cf. pp. 29, 94n227, 96n234, and 112n276). For astral imagery in later Latin epitaphs cf. Trout 2013: 18–20.

[288] Hoogma, who noted the resemblance between this inscription and the Virgilian passage, listed a first century B. C. E. date, qualifying it with a question mark (Hoogma 1959: 222). Cf. the CLE, suggesting a later date. The CIL notes that this inscribed marble tablet has lettering that could be Augustan (CIL VI 21521). It also suggests that the phrase "illa quies," which appears in the tenth verse of the stone, imitates Virgil *Aen*. 3.173. Although the date of the inscription is uncertain, we should not rule out the possibility that in addition to being a subject of imitation, Virgil himself imitated epigraphic conventions like these.

[289] EDCS-12600586 (September 16, 2013). Cf. AE 2008 150.

Aeneas' pain, and for the deception of him by the gods that contributes to that pain, but the poem does not insist upon that view" (O'Hara 1990: 116). Fate is central to Aeneas' character and his destiny, and Virgil's programmatic description of Aeneas and his fate in *Aeneid* Book 1 parallels the conventions of Roman inscriptions.[290] A reading of the Virgilian lines in the context of epigraphic conventions enhances the complexity of an already nuanced character.

Coniunx Creusa

Virgil's description of the loss of Creusa illustrates his subtle appropriation of epigraphic conventions to convey character. Aeneas describes the loss of Creusa much in the way that a husband might describe his deceased wife on a tombstone:

> heu misero coniunx fatone erepta Creusa
> substitit, erravitne via seu lassa resedit,
> incertum; nec post oculis est reddita nostris.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 2.738–40)

> Alas, it is uncertain whether my wife Creusa stopped short,
> snatched away from me by miserable fate, or wandered from the path or,
> fatigued, sat down; afterwards she was not returned to our eyes.

It was quite common for Roman inscriptions to reference a spouse in the way that Aeneas references Creusa.[291] We might compare the epitaph for the daughter of Quinctus Rancus discussed above, with its usages of *eripuit* and *ereptam*, which parallel Virgil's *erepta*. Hoogma (1959) noted several epigraphic variations of the phrase that parallel the Virgilian passage, including one from Rome which describes the deceased as snatched away by the fates:

[290] Jupiter also reiterates the sentiment in his final conversation with Juno (*Aen*. 12.795), reminding her that she cannot control fate. Cf. O'Hara 1990: 114.

[291] For Roman tombstones dedicated by spouses see Saller and Shaw 1984: 124–56 and Lattimore 1942: 277–80.

> L(ucius) Nonius Rogatus / sibi et suis emit / L(ucius) Nonius Felix fil(ius) v(ixit) a(nnos) V et / L(ucius) Nonius Felix fil(ius) v(ixit) a(nnos) IIII / erepti fatis h(ic) s(unt) c(onditi) atris (CIL VI 23036 = CIL VI 23037 = CIL VI 34143a = CLE 810)[292]
>
> Lucius Nonius Rogatus bought it for himself and for his family. Lucius Nonius Felix the son lived for five years and Lucius Nonius Felix the son lived for four years. Snatched away by the black fates, they are buried here.

Aeneas names fate as the force that snatched Creusa away, creating links to the programmatic references to fate in Book 1 of the *Aeneid*, and subtly inviting readers to recall the intense pathos that would be familiar to them from Roman funerary inscriptions.

In addition, Creusa's words from the threshold reflect the use of epigraphic language to create tension and suspense:

> si periturus abis, et nos rape in omnia tecum;
> sin aliquam expertus sumptis spem ponis in armis,
> hanc primum tutare domum.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 2.675–77)
>
> If about to die you go away, also snatch us away into all things with you;
> But if from experience you place some hope in arms having been taken up,
> first guard this house.

Creusa's usages of *si* and *sin* reflect her uncertainty about her husband's decision to avenge Troy and about their future. Her strong imperative command, "hanc primum tutare domum" (first guard this house) contrasts with her uncertainty about the benefits of going off to fight. Grillo has suggested that this passage reflects Creusa's identity as a dutiful Roman wife, citing a common epigraphic convention used to describe wives as dutiful: "*Domum servavit lanam fecit* (CIL I 1211)" (Grillo 2010: 57). [She watched over the house, she made wool.] Furthermore, Creusa's words are laced with epigraphic and funerary resonances which foreshadow her fate. *Periturus* is jarring when coupled with the second person singular *abis*, since in reality it is

[292] EDCS-13300231 (November 19, 2013). The EDCS qualifies the c(onditi) expansion with a question mark. For the alternative "c(oncordibus)" see Hoogma 1959: 246, CLE 810 and, for discussion of both readings, CIL VI 34143a. Date unknown (?).

Creusa, and not Aeneas, who will die. *Nos rape* also hints at the future, and might remind us of epitaphs which make use of the word *rapio* to suggest that the deceased was snatched away prematurely.[293] Creusa's death, as we have shown, is portrayed as a *funus acerbum*. The Roman epitaph for Antonia Maura, which underscores the relationship between husband and wife, features similar language and thought:

> D(is) M(anibus) / Antoniae L(uci) f(iliae) Maurae / maritae piissimae dulcissimae / rarissimae castissimae / suique amantissimae / Ti(berius) Claudius Speratus maritus / infelicissimus v(ixit) a(nnos) XXIII d(ies) XXXIX / Itala me rapuit crudeli funere tellus / dum foveo assidua sedulitate virum / in fronte p(edes) V in ag(ro) p(edes) VIII (CIL VI 12056 = CLE 1026)[294]
>
> To the spirits of the dead, to Antonia Maura daughter of Lucus, a wife most pious, most sweet, most rare, most chaste, and most loving of her husband. Tiberius Claudius Speratus her most unfortunate husband made it. She lived for twenty-three years, thirty-nine days. The Italian land snatched me away in cruel death, while I pampered my husband with constant painstaking attention. In the front five feet, in the field eight feet.

In the inscription and in the Virgilian passage *rapio* suggests forceful change, and also hints at the inability of mortals to control their situations.[295] Creusa is suggesting the impossible: she wants Aeneas to do the snatching that is usually done by fate. In fact, as mentioned earlier, at *Aen*. 2.738 Aeneas will underscore that fate snatched Creusa away from him, describing his loss much in the way that loved ones describe *funera acerba* on Roman tombstones.

---

[293] Bodel has noted that this verb "is the standard term used in Latin funerary inscriptions to describe the sudden removal of a soul from life" (1994: 248).

[294] EDCS-14800276 (September 16, 2013). Date unknown (?). Cf. p. 76.

[295] *Rapio* has several different meanings, many of which indicate force, including "to take away (property, etc.) by force, carry off as plunder" (OLD, *rapio* 2) "to carry off (and violate), to ravish" (OLD, *rapio* 4), "to possess oneself of by constraint, seize" (OLD, *rapio* 6), "to cause to go along (by the use of physical force or other forms of coercion), hurry along or away" (OLD, *rapio* 7), "(of physical force) to carry or sweep along" (OLD, *rapio* 9), and "to impel forcibly or irresistibly" (OLD, *rapio* 11). The first meaning listed, "to seize and carry off, snatch away" (OLD, *rapio* 1), and the meaning applicable to death and fate "to carry off" (OLD, *rapio* 5) could also have forceful connotations in certain contexts.

When Aeneas prepares to leave Troy, Creusa's shade speaks to him, revealing an increased cognizance of his new destiny, shaped by the fates which will not allow her to accompany him:

> quid tantum insano iuvat indulgere dolori,
> o dulcis coniunx? non haec sine numine divum
> eveniunt; nec te comitem hinc portare Creusam
> fas, aut ille sinit superi regnator Olympi
> . . . . . .
> sed me magna deum genetrix his detinet oris.
> iamque vale et nati serva communis amorem.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 2.776–89).

> What good does it do to indulge so much in mad grief,
> oh sweet husband? These things do not come about without the divine will of the gods;
> it is not lawful for you to bring Creusa from here as a companion,
> nor does that ruler of Olympus above allow it ...
> but the great mother of the gods holds me back on these shores.
> Now farewell, and mind the love of our common son.

In this passage epigraphic conventions allay the suspense and tension that they helped to build earlier, and add closure and consolation to Creusa's death. Creusa's reference to *fas* might remind us of the role of the fates that snatched her away. In fact, Servius has pointed out this connection, remarking that *fas* is "pro fato" (in place of fate) (Servius *ad loc*.).[296] In addition, Creusa's usage of *dulcis coniunx* has several epigraphic parallels.[297] Furthermore, Creusa's exhortation to her husband to stop grieving parallels Roman inscriptions that make similar requests, consoling loved ones who are mourning for the deceased. Giovagnoli has noted that the exhortation to not lament "di fronte all'iniquità del destino" (in the face of unjust fate) appears on several inscriptions, and is thought to be "un tema epigrafico peculiare di Roma" (an epigraphic theme particular to Rome) (Giovagnoli 2012: 548). Giovagnoli cites as examples of this theme in addition to CIL VI 7872 (discussed below), CIL I 1223, CIL VI 34130, and AE

[296] Cf. Horsfall 2008: 779. Putnam has noted similar phrasing at *Aen*. 6.135 (1965: 44–45).
[297] Cf. Hoogma 1959: 246–47. Putnam has also noted parallel language at *Georgic* 4.465 (1965: 44).

1990 99.[298] Epigraphic instances of this motif often provide closure and resolution to the melancholy portrayals of grief and loss that precede them. This is exemplified by a Roman epitaph from a columbarium along the Via Salaria that was probably in use during the age of Augustus:[299]

> Octavia L(uci) et |(mulieris) l(iberta) Arbuscula / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXIII et mense{n}s X / Tuccia |(mulieris) l(iberta) Urbana mater eius // Terminus est vitae nostrae tertius et vicensimus / annus cum me florentem mei combussere parentes / vixi ego dum licuit superis acceptior una / quoi nemo potuit verb<*o*> maledicere acerbo / crudele pater funus nati vidisse videris / et pia complexu mater spoliata senescens / at tu dulcis soror exstincto me (con)solare parentes ... desine iam frustra mater mea desine fletu te / miseram totos exagitare dies / namque dolor talis non nunc tibi contigit uni / haec eadem et magnis regibus acciderunt (CIL VI 7872 = CLE 971).[300]
>
> Octavia Arbuscula, freedwoman of Lucus and his wife, she lived for twenty-three years and ten months. Tuccia Urbana her mother, the freedman of the wife, (made it). The turning post is the twenty-third year of my life, when my parents cremated me when I was blossoming. I lived while it was permitted, I was a believer in the gods above in concert with them, I to whom no one was able to speak with a harsh word. Father, you seem to have seen the cruel death of a child, and pious mother, robbed of an embrace, growing old. But you, sweet sister, since I have died, console the parents ... Now refrain, my mother, refrain from tears and from stirring up misery through all of the days, for such grief has not touched you alone—these same things have happened to great kings.

In the inscription and in the Virgilian passage the language of consolation changes the mood, allaying the strong emotions that were conveyed earlier. By using this language to speak to Aeneas, Creusa speaks in the voice of a deceased epigraphic honoree, consoling family members

[298] AE 1990 is a fragmentary epitaph for a woman named *Crinusa*, which reads: "[ ]Crinusa soror eius / [...] vix(it) ann(os) X / [...]ata desine luctu te miserum toto[s] / [...] per Manes miserae precor ultima / [...] regibus acciderunt" (AE 1990). The AE entry notes that the inscription may date to the first half of the first c. C. E., and that the name *Crinusa* is rare (AE 1990 99). Although the similarities between the names *Crinusa* and *Creusa* may be coincidental, it is worth considering the similaities between the epitaph and the Virgilian passage.

[299] According to the CIL, one of the names on an inscription unearthed at the site, *Marcia* (Fabii) *Maximi* on CIL VI 7884 (cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.5) suggests that the columbarium was in use during the age of Augustus, and other names confirm that it continued to be used during the first and second centuries. For the dating cf. Giovagnoli 2012: 548: "In base al contesto archeologico di appartenenza l'iscrizione è databile verosimilmente nella prima metà del I secolo d.C. (diversamente Massaro 1990, p. 201, nota 32, che propende per il II secolo d.C." (Giovagnoli 2012: 548). [Based on the archaeological context of membership, the inscription is evidently datable to the first half of the first century C. E. (conversely Massaro 1990, p. 201, note 32, who favors the second century C. E.).] For the inscription cf. Hoogma 1959: 330. The stone has "verbis" instead of "verbo." Rawson cites this inscription as one of two examples of "verbo acerbo" meaning "with a harsh word" (2002: 275).

[300] EDCS-18700297 (September 16, 2013).

from the grave. And in fact, as has been noted, it is Creusa's shade that speaks to Aeneas, echoing the absent presence that speaks from inscribed epitaphs.[301]

Epigraphic parallels to Virgil's characterization of Creusa as a dutiful Roman wife have been noted. What has not been recognized is that these parallels add nuance to her character and emotional depth to Aeneas' account of their separation. In fact, it has been argued that epigraphic parallels to Creusa's parting speech to Aeneas are symptomatic of limited characterization, with Heinze writing, "How little Creusa's farewell words (2.776) tell us about the relationship between her and her husband: nothing, except that he is her *dulcis coniunx* [sweet husband], she is his *dilecta Creusa* [beloved Creusa], and they shared a love for their son (*nati serva communis amorem* [guard the love of the son whom we share])—that is more or less what an inscription on a Roman tomb would say about any parents" (Heinze 1993: 319). Grillo adds that "the same attitude, words and ideal can be found in the *Laudatio Turiae*" (Grillo 2010: 58n54). What has not been recognized is that epigraphic conventions can have strong personal and individual meaning on Roman epitaphs. This is in fact exemplified by the *Laudatio Turiae*, which as Gowing has noted, juxtaposes the *clementia* of Julius Caesar with the *crudelitas* of Lepidus, shaping character and inviting readers to reflect on how the *clementia* of Augustus reflects the *clementia* of his predecessor (Gowing 1992: 296).[302] The author of the inscription

[301] Cf. Perkell noting that "the vision which Aeneas experiences of Creusa's shade, with its deceptively positive prophecy, does not restore to life the living woman who felt endangered and abandoned" (Perkell 1981: 361). For discussion of the "absent presence" in Ovid cf. Hardie 2002a *passim*.

[302] Gowing has argued that the interaction between Turia and Lepidus detailed on the stone must have taken place betwen 42 and 41 B. C. E. Cf. Wistrand 1976: 9 and Evangelisti 2012: 243. Gordon identifies the inscription as Augustan, noting that it is "generally thought to be of ca. 8–2 B. C." (Gordon 1983: 103). Cf. Friggeri 2001. Evangelisti places the death of the honoree c. 9 B. C. E. (2012: 243), citing Giraud 1870, Kierdorf 1980, Flach 1991, Ramage 1994, and Alföldy in the CIL. For the inscription cf. also Fowler 1905, Lemosse 1950, Horsfall 1983, Cutolo 1983–84, Durry and Lancel 1992, Kruschwitz 1999, and Hemelrijk 2004.

also notes that he must be brief, since a long document would not do justice to the virtues of his beloved wife, who predeceased him by fate:[303]

> ... quid hac virtute efficaciu[s] praebere Caesari clementia[e locum et cum cu] / stodia spiritus mei not[a]re inportunam crudelitatem [Lepidi firma tua] / patientia / sed quid plura parcamu[s] orationi quae debet et potest e[sse brevis ne maxu] / ma opera tractando pa[r]um digne peragamus ... praecucurristi fato ...
> (CIL VI 41062 = CIL VI 1527 = CIL VI 31670 = CIL VI 37053 = EDCS-01000178)
>
> What was more effective than this virtue, to present an opportunity for *clementia* to Caesar and, with the preservation of my life, to mark the unfavorable *creudelitas* of Lepidus by steadfast endurance? But why say more? Let me be sparing of speech, which ought and is able to be brief, lest by discussing your very great deeds I render them too unworthily ... You predeceased me by fate.

Left to the interpretive powers of an Augustan audience accustomed to reading epigraphic language, a seeming lack of characterization has the potential to carry added power when considered against the backdrop of the Roman epigraphic habit.[304] Heinze suggests that at times the onus is on the reader of Virgil to construct an understanding of the relationships between characters, and this may in fact be the case for Virgil's epigraphic appropriations (Heinze 1993: 319). The account of Aeneas' loss of Creusa reflects not only Virgil's subtle, subjective style, but also the power of epigraphic conventions to convey emotion and characterize individuals. Read together with epigraphic parallels, the character of Creusa is more nuanced than it might at first appear, and her death marks a personal loss that Aeneas experiences at the hands of fate.[305]

[303] CIL VI 41062 = CIL VI 1527 = CIL VI 31670 = CIL VI 37053 = ILS 8393= AE 1899 95 = AE 1951 2 = AE 1951 247 = AE 1978 14 = AE 1992 81 = AE 1993 119 = AE 1993 120 = AE 1994 106 = AE 1999 235 = EDCS-01000178. Cf. Wistrand 1976: 19–22.

[304] Epigraphic conventions may in fact function similarly to Virgil's literary allusions, eliciting an emotional reaction from the reader. As Griffin has noted "We do not simply enjoy the pleasure of recognition of a source, but we are guided in our emotional response by Virgil's use of that recognition" (1985: 197). Cf. Lyne 1987: 102n2 as well as his argument that the limited description of Aeneas' relationships are in fact characterizing: "lack of colour is colour" (Lyne 1987: 167).

[305] Putnam has noted that with Creusa's death at the end of Book 2, "at last Aeneas' emotional attachment to Troy must be relinquished and denied" (Putnam 1965: 24).

Infelix Dido

Epigraphic conventions are also present in Virgil's account of the relationship between Dido and Aeneas. Dido describes Aeneas as tossed about by fate (*Aen*. 4.14), echoing Virgil's characterization of him at the beginning of the epic.[306] When Dido first speaks to her sister, Anna, about her feelings for Aeneas, she also references the fate of her husband and how his death has affected her:

> Anna (fatebor enim) miseri post fata Sychaei
> coniugis et sparsos fraterna caede penatis
> solus hic inflexit sensus animumque labantem
> impulit. agnosco veteris vestigia flammae.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 4.20–23).
>
> Anna, (for I will come out and say it), after the fate of my miserable husband
> Sychaeus and the household gods sprinkled with fraternal slaughter,
> this man alone has bent my senses and my slipping mind.
> I recognize the traces of the old flame.

Dido's language has a memorializing quality. By refusing to take another husband after the death of Sychaeus, she preserves herself in the eternal role of his *coniunx*, a relationship that she lists together with his name, just as it might be listed together with an individual memorialized on stone. *Post fata* also appears on inscriptions, with Hoogma noting several parallels (1959: 255).[307] Still suffering the effects of the unkind fates, Dido is not ready to limit her relationship with Sychaeus to the past. The insight which this reference to the fates offers into Dido's character is similar to insights which the fates offer into the character of Aeneas, revealing personal emotion and feelings of loss. By contextualizing Dido and Aeneas with Roman epigraphic conventions, we can better understand their characters and their relationship.

[306] In fact, she is herself characterized as "fati nescia Dido" (*Aen*. 1. 299). Cf. Commager 1981: 105–6 and Feeney 1991: 141 and 181.

[307] Cf. CIL VI 9437 = CLE 00403 = ILS 7710 = EDCS-19100659 (discussed below on pp. 145-46).

When Aeneas bids farewell to Dido, he calls attention to the ways in which his relationship with her has affected him:

> ... nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae
> dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus.
> pro re pauca loquar. neque ego hanc abscondere furto
> speraui (ne finge) fugam, nec coniugis umquam
> praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera ueni.
> me si fata meis paterentur ducere uitam
> auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas,
> urbem Troianam primum dulcisque meorum
> reliquias colorem, Priami tecta alta manerent,
> et recidiuia manu posuissem Pergama uictis.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 4.335–44)

> For it will not displease me to have remembered Elissa,
> while I myself am mindful of myself, while the spirit rules these limbs.
> Let me say a few words on behalf of this business. Neither did I hope to conceal
> flight stealthily (do not make that up), nor did I ever hold out the torches
> of a bridegroom nor did I enter into these contracts.
> If the fates should allow me to lead life by my auspices and to arrange cares
> by my own volition, first I would tend to the Trojan city and the sweet remains
> of my people, the lofty house of Priam would remain,
> and by my own hand I would have put in place renascent Pergamum for the defeated.

Aeneas has resolved to remember Dido favorably for as long as he lives. He also refuses to accept the role of her *coniunx*, emphasizing that he never entered into a formal marriage with her. He says that the fates have prevented him from leading his life in the way that he would prefer to lead it, and that if he had his way Troy would still be standing. This comment reiterates the effect that the fall of Troy and the loss of his previous home, underscored by his tragic separation from Creusa in the story that he told Dido in Book 2, has had on him. The word *reliquias* underscores his attachment to lost people and places, and might remind us of the epigraphic use of *reliquiae*.[308] Keenly aware of these losses, Aeneas feels the need to take constructive action to fulfill his destiny. He mentions to Dido that a messenger from the gods has commanded him to leave, and that he does not do so willingly (Virgil *Aen*. 4.356–61). He

[308] A search of the EDCS for "reliquiae" yielded seventy-six inscriptions (March 10, 2014).

attempts to control how their relationship will affect him in the future by planning how he will remember her. Dido does not accept this, and takes control of memory into her own hands.

Right before Dido falls upon the sword, thus bringing about her own death, she offers some parting words which, as Thomas (1998) has shown, are reminiscent of inscriptions:

> dulces exuuiae, dum fata deusque sinebat,
> accipite hanc animam meque his exsoluite curis.
> vixi et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi,
> et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago.
> urbem praeclaram statui, mea moenia vidi,
> ulta virum poenas inimico a fratre recepi,
> felix, heu nimium felix, si litora tantum
> numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 4.651–58)

> Sweet spoils, while the fates and god were allowing,
> receive this spirit and release me from these cares.
> I have lived and, the course which Fortune had given me, I have fulfilled,
> and now my great image will go under the ground.
> I founded a distinguished city, I saw my walls,
> having avenged my husband I exacted penalties from my enemy brother.
> Fortunate, alas! Too fortunate, if only the Trojan keels had never touched our shores.

Thomas has established the inscriptional quality of this passage, observing that "What we in fact have here is a (self-)dedicatory epigram (651–2) followed by a sepulchral epigram" (Thomas 1998: 219).[309] In addition, Dido's reference to fate as a limiting force parallels Roman inscriptions. Like someone commissioning an inscription, Dido attempts to control how she is remembered, underscoring the impact of the fates and her relationship with Aeneas on her character.[310] Here there is an echo of the earlier "si qua fata sinant" (if in any way the fates would allow) (*Aen*. 1.18), reminding us of how the fates that delineate the course of Aeneas' life

[309] Thomas also notes that *vixi* "is elsewhere used to introduce funerary epigrams" (Thomas 1998: 219). Cf. 41n94 above. Also see Austin 1955: 188n653ff. and Page 1964: 391n653–56.

[310] Laird has noted: "Were it not for her fate Dido would not be remembered at all" (1997: 292).

also impact the relationship between Dido and Aeneas.[311] Both Dido and Aeneas describe the fates as limiting forces, and their portrayals of fate parallel epigraphic ones.

In fact, Virgil names fate as the force that caused Dido's death in a passage that also has epigraphic resonances:

> Tum Iuno omnipotens, longum miserata dolorem
> difficilisque obitus, Irim demisit Olympo,
> quae luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus.
> nam quia nec fato, merita nec morte peribat,
> sed misera ante diem subitoque accensa furore,
> nondum illi flavum Proserpina vertice crinem
> abstulerat Stygioque caput damnaverat Orco.
> ergo Iris croceis per caelum roscida pinnis,
> mille trahens varios adverso sole colores,
> devolat et supra caput adstitit: "hunc ego Diti
> sacrum iussa fero teque isto corpore solvo";
> sic ait et dextra crinem secat; omnis et una
> dilapsus calor atque in ventos vita recessit
> (*Aen*. 4.693–705)

> Then all-powerful Juno, having pitied her prolonged grief
> and difficult death, sent down Iris from Olympus,
> who would release the struggling soul and bound limbs.
> For since she had perished neither by fate nor by a deserved death,
> but miserable, before her day, suddenly enflamed by fury,
> Proserpina had not yet carried away the blonde hair from her head
> and condemned her life to Stygian Orcus.
> Therefore dewy Iris soars down through the sky on saffron wings,
> trailing a thousand varegated colors with the sun turned aside,
> and took a stand above her head: "I having been commanded to bear
> this sacrifice to Dis and I release you from this body";
> Thus she speaks and with her right hand cuts the hair; and together
> all warmth subsides and life withdraws into the winds.

Because Dido perished neither by fate nor by a deserved death, Iris must cut a lock of her hair so that her shade may enter the underworld. The combination of *fato* and *peribat* may in fact

[311] Aeneas himself emphasizes the impact of the fates first when Dido confronts him about his departure (*Aen*. 4.340–44), and then when he encounters Dido's shade in the underworld (*Aen*. 6.455–60). In both instances Aeneas emphasizes to Dido that it was not his own will, but the fates, that influence the course of his life. For the ambiguity of the latter reference to fate see O'Hara 1997: 249 and Knight 1944.

resemble the language of Roman funerary inscriptions, but this death is clearly not conventional. We see the phrase *fato periit* on a fragmentary Roman epitaph:

> Fortuna [...] / septenos aetas vix [ter superaverat annos] / [quam] fato peri(i)t....
> (CIL VI 30155= CLE 1019)[312]

Fortuna ... scarcely had her age surmounted fourteen years, when she perished by fate....

In addition, *subito* appears on Roman funerary epitaphs commemorating the premature deaths of those who were snatched away too soon.[313] Virgil may in fact appropriate epigraphic language in a way that parallels Ovid's later subversions of epigraphic conventions, as discussed in the previous chapter. The phrase "misera ante diem" (miserable, before her day) suggests that Dido's death was a *funus acerbum*, and the presence of *subito* in this context would not be unexpected. What is jarring is that in this case *subito* is part of the phrase *subitoque accensa furore*, naming Dido's *furor* as the cause of her death. Virgil's subtle usage of epigraphic conventions in this context creates sympathy for Dido while at the same time underscoring the detructive power of *furor*, which like fate, is capable of bringing undeserved premature death. Virgil recalls these words when Aeneas kills Turnus before his time, describing the man who was himself *fato profugus* (*Aen*. 1.2) as *furiis accensus* (*Aen*. 12.946).[314] The deaths of Dido and Turnus are more horrible than deaths attributed to fate because they were undeserved and preventable. Instead of the conventional saddness and grief caused by fate, the reader is confronted with the destructive power of *furor*, which requires divine intervention to achieve a concilation that is not entirely satisfying. Virgil's juxtaposition of fate and *furor* in the context of epigraphic conventions nuances the complex emotional undertones of Dido's death.

---

[312] EDCS-17202257 (February 24, 2014).

[313] One example is the Roman epitaph of the freedman Clytius: "hic Clytius carus cunctis iustusq(ue) piusq(ue) / est situs et subito tempore raptus abi(i)t..." (CIL VI 7243 = GLIStone 12 = CLE 1089). [Here Clytius is buried, dear to all and just and pious, and suddenly snatched away he departed.] EDCS-14801999 (February 27, 2014). Date unknown (?). The CLE notes parallel language at Ovid *Her*. 8.4.

[314] Cf. discussion on p. 144–45.

Aeneas also uses language with epigraphic resonance when he encounters Dido's shade in the underworld:

> demisit lacrimas dulcique adfatus amore est:
> 'infelix Dido, verus mihi nuntius ergo
> uenerat exstinctam ferroque extrema secutam?
> funeris heu tibi causa fui? per sidera iuro,
> per superos et si qua fides tellure sub ima est,
> invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi
> . . . . . .
> quem fugis? extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est.'
> (Virgil *Aen*. 6.455–66).

> He shed tears and spoke to her with sweet love:
> 'Unfortunate Dido, therefore had a true message come to me
> that you were killed and followed out your last by means of the sword?
> Alas, was I the cause of your death? By the stars I swear,
> by the gods above, and if there is trust anywhere under the deep earth,
> unwilling, queen, I left from your shore ...
> Whom do you flee? Because of fate this is the last thing which I say to you.

Aeneas calls Dido *infelix*, but the adjective could also be used to describe him at this point.[315] He cries, asks if he was the cause of her death, and says that this is the last thing which fate (*fato*) allows him to say to her.[316] Aeneas feels unfortunate himself, and the adjective *infelix* recalls epigraphic instances that reflect both the saddness of the deceased's situation and the saddness of the bereaved. Consider the epitaph of Fortunata, which even goes so far as to repeat the adjective twice:

> D(is) M(anibus) / Fortunatae / v(ixit) an(nos) IIII m(enses) VIIII d(ies) XXVII / pater infelicissimus / filiae piissimae / sed infelici (CIL VI 18566).[317]

> To the spirits of the dead, to Fortunata, she lived for four years, nine months, twenty-seven days. The very unfortunate father made it for his very pious but unfortunate daughter.

[315] Cf. 87n205.

[316] They will not meet again after Aeneas dies since he will not go to the section of the underworld reserved for lovers. Feldherr cites Servius *ad Aen*. 6. 466 on this point (Feldherr 1999: 85). Feldherr also addresses the parallel between this passage and Catullus 66.39 (1999: 108). For the ambiguity of how to translate this reference to fate see O'Hara 1997: 249 and Knight 1944.

[317] EDCS-10200766 (September 16, 2013). Date unknown (?).

In the inscription and in the Virgilian passage the adjective reflects the *persona* of both the deceased and the person who has experienced loss. *Infelix* reflects the development of Dido's character along with the character of Aeneas. Both are influenced by fate, which Aeneas references when he speaks to Dido. She ignores him, and thus prevents him from exerting control over memory. She returns to her role as the faithful wife of Sychaeus (*Aen*. 6.472–74), and refuses to remain *infelix* Dido.

Nisus and Euryalus

Virgil also uses epigraphic language to describe Nisus and Euryalus, who become frozen in time as eternal *exempla* of loyalty and devotion.[318] Like Aeneas, who asks if he was the cause of Dido's misfortune, Nisus blames himself for the premature death of Euryalus. Unlike Aeneas, he is more ready to take responsibility for the death of his dear friend:

> me, me adsum qui feci, in me conuertite ferrum,
> O Rutuli! mea fraus omnis, nihil iste nec ausus
> nec potuit; caelum hoc et conscia sidera testor;
> tantum infelicem nimium dilexit amicum.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 9.427–30)

> Me, me, I am here who did it, turn the sword against me,
> oh Rutulians! It's all my fault, this one neither dared nor had the power;
> I bare witness by this sky and the knowing stars;
> He only loved his unfortunate friend too much.

Hardie remarks on, "The last words spoken by either of the two (and *amicum* is the last word), having something of the quality of an epitaph" (Hardie 1994: 149n430). *Infelix* echoes an earlier usage by Nisus when he had lost sight of his friend, "Euryale infelix, qua te regione reliqui?"

[318] Virgil says explicitly that he would like his portrayal of them to last for all time (Virgil *Aen*. 9.446–49). Reed calls these words, "a blessing that links both men indissolubly to the Roman future" (1997: 39). This passage will be discussed in more detail below (p. 132).

(Unfortunate Euryalus, in what direction did I seek you?) (*Aen*. 9.390). This instance of *infelix* at *Aen*. 9.430 reminds us of Aeneas' parting words to Dido's shade, but the nuances are different. Whereas Aeneas asks if he was the cause of Dido's death, and attempts to absolve himself of responsibility by saying that he left unwillingly, Nisus attempts to protect his friend by claiming full responsibility. This speaks to Nisus' good character as well as to the strength of their relationship. The transgression against the Rutulians blurs into the transgression against Euryalus, and Nisus' "adsum qui feci" is a declaration of guilt for both actions. The phrase *qui fecit* is also an epigraphic convention that underscores the role of the person who has erected the monument. In some cases it is the deceased himself who has made the funeral arrangements, and in others a family member is the maker of the monument. Consider this example from Rome:

> D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Iuli Athenodori / qui fecit se vibo sibi / et Iuliae Felicissimae / coniugi dulcissimae / quae vixit mecum sine ulla / querella annis XXXVII
> (CIL VI 35536)[319]
>
> To the spirits of the dead, to Gaius Iulius Athenodorus who made it for himself living and for Iulia Most Fortunate, the sweetest wife, who lived with me without any complaint for thirty-seven years.

By naming himself as the maker, Gaius Iulius Athenodorus underscores his close relationship to the deceased and his proper dischargement of funerary ritual.[320] A sense of responsibility is reflected in both the epigraphic examples and Nisus' words, and alongside of these epigraphic resonances, the Virgilian passage may foreshadow the deaths that follow.

Nisus stands in stark contrast to Aeneas, who is reluctant to take responsibility for the death of Dido. Nisus embraces responsibility, and dies avenging the death of his friend (*Aen*. 9.441–45). The two are exemplary for their friendship and devotion towards one another, and that may be why Virgil chooses to honor them himself:

[319] EDCS-23500523 (September 16, 2013). Date unknown (?).
[320] For Roman the role of family members in Roman funerary ritual see Toynbee 1971.

> Fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
> nulla dies umquam memori uos eximet aevo,
> dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
> accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 9.446–49)
>
> Fortunate both! If my songs have any power,
> no day will ever remove you from the mindful age,
> while the house of Aeneas will live near the immovable rock of the Capitoline
> and the Roman father will have ruling authority.

Like the maker of a tombstone who chooses memorializing words for the deceased, Virgil chooses how to commemorate Nisus and Eurylaus through his poetry. He calls them fortunate, but as Hardie has observed, "the reasons for this commendation are made no clearer than the exact respect in which the two are declared to be *fortunati*" (Hardie 1994: 24). It is notable that he chooses to memorialize them together, much in the way that family members might be honored together on the same tombstone. In fact, Hardie refers to this passage as "the four-line 'epitaph' in the mouth of the poet" (Hardie 1994: 24) and notes that "perpetual fame is also a stock consolation of the funerary epitaph, of which in a sense these four lines are an example (Lattimore 241–3)" (Hardie ad. *Aen*. 9.446–49). This joint memorial allows Virgil to underscore the intimacy between Nisus and Euryalus, which is evident from his earlier portrayals of the two companions.[321] Furthermore, Edwards comments on the presence of the Capitoline as a symbol of durability in this passage and in Horace *Carm*. 3. 30. 7–9 (Edwards 1996: 88). The presence of the Capitoline in this passage underscores the enduring monumentality of Virgil's words.

Interestingly, whereas Nisus called himself *infelix*, Virgil describes the two companions as *fortunati*. He has the final word on how they are memorialized. In fact, Virgil's poetic memorial parallels this epigraphic one with similar language:

> Si quis forte velit tumuli cognoscere fatum / et quorum maestus contegat ossa lapis / accipiat paucis ne sit mora longior aequo / si tumulus teneat quem vocat ipsa via / hic

[321] Cf. *Aen*. 5.293-96 and *Aen*. 9.176–82.

situs est annis plenus vitaque beatus / et laetus omni morte Rhodanthion / nec sit mirum quod comis quod dulcis amoenus / in vita fuerit nomine floris erat / hunc coniunx talem nimio dilexit amore / inque diem vitae una fide coluit / et postquam fatis morientia lumina solvit / supremisque suis reddidit obsequium / invita hoc munus coniunx Victoria fecit / quodque virum vicit aegra dolore fuit / sed quoniam fatis nulli est obstare potestas / quin teneant cursum quem statuere semel / quod solum licuit coniunx fidissima fecit / post illum nulli fas violare toros / servatamque diu vitam habitamque pudice / post mortis casum pertulit ad tumulum / namque simul posita est fatoque tenetur eodem / quodque modo potuit morte secuta virum / haec est sancta fides haec sunt felicia vota / amplexus vitae{i} reddere post obitum / fortunati ambo si qua est ea gloria mortis / quos iungit tumulus iunxerat ut thalamus (CIL VI 25427 = CLE 1142)[322]

If by chance anyone wishes to know the fate of the tomb and whose bones the sad stone covers, let him receive it in a few words lest the delay be longer than what is fair. If the tomb holds he whom the road itself calls, here Rhodanthion is laid to rest, full with years and blessed in life and happy with all death, nor let it be a wonder that because he was kind and sweet and pleasant in life he had the name of a flower. This man so great his wife loved with too much love, and in life she tended to him with one faith, and after he loosened his dying eyes by the fates and returned compliance to his last, unwilling his wife Victoria made this gift. And because sickness conquered her husband she was with grief, but since there is power to stand in the way of no fate, but that they might hold the course which they put in place, at the same time the most faithful wife did what was permitted for her alone. After that one it is lawful to violate the couches of no one, and a life preserved for a long time and held chastly after the downfall of death she conveyed to the tomb, for at the same time she was placed and is held by the same fate, and in whatever way she was able having followed her husband in death. This is sacred faith, these are fortunate vows, to return the embraces of life after death. Fortunate both if there is any glory of death, those whom the tomb joins thus the marriage bed had joined.

The phrase *fortunati ambo* appears in an emphatic position at the end of the tombstone, after a relatively long description of the close relationship between the husband and wife. It functions in a similar way to the Virgilian verse, offering the final memorializing word after a detailed description of the close relationship between the two honorees. Furthermore, the marriage bed parallels the final position of Nisus and Euryalus:

tum super exanimum sese proiecit amicum
confossus, placidaque ibi demum morte quieuit.
(Virgil *Aen*. 9.444–45).

[322] EDCS-13801679 (September 16, 2013). Date unknown (?). Hoogma lists the inscription, but does not conjecture a date (1959: 316). The CLE notes the parallel with *Aen*. 9.446. It is possible that the inscription recalls the Virgilian passage, and if so it illustrates the enduring power of Virgil's words. Regardless of the date, it illustrates that the same phrase is suitable for an epigraphic context.

Then having been pierced he flung himself on his dead friend,
and there at last he found rest in calm death.

Reed compares this moment to "a last embrace," and observes that, "Even here we share Nisus' mind: the final phrase seems to reflect the satisfaction of his own desperate desires ..." (Reed 2007: 25). The two lay at rest together, joined in death like individuals joined by a common tomb, with epigraphic verses commemorating their devotion to each other. Virgil suggests that the words "Fortunati ambo" will transcend time, and the inscription illustrates how the same phrase can experience generic and contextual mobility. It is equally at home in the Virgilian passage and on the inscription, in both cases reflecting a subjective style that expresses both the individuality of the devoted pairs and the universality of human emotion.

Pallas

The death of Pallas has a great impact on Aeneas, and Virgil uses epigraphic language to foreshadow the boy's death and heighten the emotional poignancy of his funeral. Evander says that he would like to continue living as long as the fates keep Pallas unharmed (*Aen*. 8.575), underscoring his emotional investment in the boy. Roman inscriptions often indicate the emotional investment of parents in their children, underscoring the tragic nature of premature death at the hands of the fates. Virgil uses epigraphic language to describe Pallas, beginning with the moment when Evander entrusts his son to Aeneas:

hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,
Pallanta adiungam; sub te tolerare magistro
militiam et grave Martis opus, tua cernere facta
adsuescat, primis et te miretur ab annis.
(Virgil *Aen*. 8.514–17).

Moreover I will join to you this Pallas, our hope and our solace;

> with you as teacher let him grow accustomed to endure
> the duties of a soldier and the harsh work of Mars, let him grow accustomed
> to look at your deeds, and let him admire you from his first years.

Evander's words are laced with the sort of emotional investment that is detailed on Roman tombstones commemorating the premature deaths of youths with great potential. Evander hopes that someday Pallas will become a successful warrior just like him, and just as Anchises helped Evander to reach maturity as a warrior (*Aen*. 8.160–68), it is Aeneas' responsibility to make sure that Pallas successfully makes the same transition.[323] A well-known inscription which is part of the Vatican collection, and which has also been included in the collection of plaster casts displayed in the EUR museum, also mentions *spes* and *solacia* to memorialize a child in connection with the hopes of his parents:[324]

> Hoc ego sum tumulo Marcianus redditus aevo / nondum Persephones sperabam visere regna / consulibus tunc natus eram iteroque Severo / et Fulvo pariter quo coepi dulcis haberi / sextus ut excessit coepi languescere in annum / apstulit o saeva lux nona parentibus orta / planctibus heu miserae matris patrisque simitu / spes mihi quam magna fuerat si me mea / fata tulissent / Musae mihi dederant puero facundus ut essem / invidit Lachesis Clotho me saeva necavit / tertia nec passa est pietate(m) rependere matri / quam pie quam crebre venit sacra via tota / flevit et inmensa turba funusque secuta / dixerunt ferale(m) diem stationibus atris / quod tenerae aetati spes fallax apstulit annos / nec non omnigena passim vicinia venit / ut mecum florem fato moriente(m) viderent / tu reddas aeterne piis solacia semper / et vitam serves cunctis generisque piorum
> (CIL VI 7578 = CLE 422)[325]

[323] Reed has noted that, "An initiatory paradigm is relevant: Euryalus, Lausus, and Pallas are in transition from boyhood to manhood, learning to become adult warriors. Pallas' emotional departure from home at Aeneas' side, Lausus' defense of his father, and Euryalus' eagerness to participate in Nisus' plan are all emblematic of a boy's adherence to an older model, an attempt to *become* that model" (Reed 2007: 40). Cf. Petrini, who sees "a pattern of young men invested by the previous generation (and by men other than their fathers) with heroic ideals" (1997: 49–50).

[324] Cf. Rawson 2003: 84 (fig. 2).

[325] Cf. AE 2001 169. EDCS-18600290 (September 16, 2013). The CIL identifies the consuls named on the inscription as L. Catilius Severus and T. Aurelius Fulvus Boionius Arrius Antoninus. This supports a dating based on the consular *fasti* to approximately seven years after their consulship in 120 B. C. E. (Cooley 2012: 469). Although this is a post-Augustan inscription, comparative study with earlier inscriptions (such as CIL VI 25369, discussed above on pp. 114–15), illustrates well the continued presence of familial emotions and individual virtue on Roman funerary monuments over time, despite changes in convention and culture. As Kampen has observed, "Roman biographical funerary monuments are shown to have developed from prototypes of the late Republic and Early Empire, in eulogy, written biography and visual images" (1981: 47). We can add Virgil's *Aeneid* to this list of prototypes. Both Virgil and inscriptions such as these underscore the tragedy of premature death through the inclusion of biographical details about the deceased and their family members.

> I, Marcianus, am in this tomb, consigned to the ages, I not yet hoping to see the kingdoms of Persephone. I was born in the consulships of Severus (for the second time) and Fulvus, from which time I began to be held dear. When the sixth year passed, in the next year I began to grow weak. Oh harsh ninth day which having risen snatched me away from my parents with miserable mother and father lamenting at the same time. How great my potential would have been if the fates had allowed. The muses had granted to me, still a boy, that I be eloquent. Lachesis envied me, harsh Cloth killed me, and the third did not suffer me to reciprocate my mother's devotion. How piously and in droves the whole Via Sacra came, and a huge crowd wept and followed the funeral procession. In their mourning stations they called the day ill-omened because deceiving hope had stolen away years from a tender age. The neighborhood—all kinds from all directions—came to see my flower dying because of fate. You, for all time return solaces to the dutiful and watch over the lives of them all, and of the descendants of the dutiful.

This inscription and the iconography of this monument emphasize the lost potential of the boy who died prematurely. The inscription goes into great detail about the grief of the parents and community members, and is accompanied by a depiction of the boy with a book satchel (Rawson 2003: 168n51). This scholastic portrait coupled with the description of Marcianus' early eloquence reflect his parents' desire to commemorate his lost potential for success. The sentiments of these parents are not dissimilar to those of Evander, who also has high hopes for his son's future.[326] The word *solacium* often implies relief from sorrow or consolation for a disappointment (OLD, "solacium" 1 and 2). When we compare this usage to *solacia nostri*, Evander's words seem grim and foreboding. Evander seems to be aware of the possibility that his son's involvement with Aeneas could lead to tragedy. Virgil underscores this awareness with the language of tombstones, creating a dark and foreboding undertone that foreshadows a *funus acerbum*.

Evander's words are also eerily similar to the language of Euryalus' bereaved mother, and the reaction of Euryalus' mother to the premature death of her son also has epigraphic

[326] There are also other parallels between this inscription and Pallas. For *florem* cf. Virgil *Aen*. 11.68 and also Reed (2007: 21–22). A large crowd also attends Pallas' funeral (Virgil *Aen*. 11.61).

resonances.[327] Hardie has recognized the parallel with *Aen.* 6.307–8, noting that, "She has to endure the sight of her son's head paraded on a spear before her very eyes, a cruel twist on the motif of the funeral of children *ante ora parentum*" (Hardie 1994: 25). Hence, it is not surprising that she reacts in a way that parallels epigraphic portrayals of parents whose children have died prematurely:

> hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio? tune ille senectae
> sera meae requies, potuisti linquere solam,
> crudelis? nec te sub tanta pericula missum
> adfari extremum miserae data copia matri? (Virgil *Aen*. 9.481–84).
>
> Is this you who I see, Euryalus? You that late respite from my old age,
> were you able to leave me alone, cruel one?
> And with you having been sent to undergo such dangers
> was an opportunity not given to your mother to say a last word?

Euryalus' mother mourns the loss of her son, calling him cruel because he left her alone. Reed has noted that "Euryalus' mother (9.473–502) and Pallas' father (11.139–66) react at pathos-inspring length to their sons' deaths" (2007: 40).[328] Their language is similar to the language of funerary inscriptions which express the loneliness of the dedicator, some of which also reach "pathos-inspiring length." The precedent of Euryalus' death and the grief of his mother foreshadows the loss of Pallas and the grief that it causes Evander and Aeneas.

In fact, Evander articulates more clearly his uncertainty about the fate of his son as the boy prepares to depart for battle:

> si numina uestra
> incolumem Pallanta mihi, si fata reseruant,
> si uisurus eum uiuo et uenturus in unum,
> uitam oro, patior quemuis durare laborem.
> sin aliquem infandum casum, Fortuna, minaris,
> nunc, nunc o liceat crudelem abrumpere uitam,

[327] Petrini has noted that the presence of Euryalus' mother and emphasis on the relationship between mother and son contributes to the "metaphor of childhood" which emphasizes Euryalus' youth (1997: 22–23).

[328] Reed also remarks that, "In this emphasis we can see a tragic inversion of the poem's vision of generational progress and of national destiny as an inheritance ..." (2007: 40).

dum curae ambiguae, dum spes incerta futuri,
dum te, care puer, mea sera et sola uoluptas,
complexu teneo, gravior neu nuntius auris
uulneret. (Virgil *Aen*. 8.574–83).

If your divine powers,
if the fates keep my Pallas unharmed,
if I live to see him and to come together,
I pray for life, I suffer to endure any labor.
But if, Fortune, you threaten some unutterable downfall,
now, now oh let it be allowed to break off cruel life,
while cares are marked by uncertainty, while hope of the future is uncertain,
while I hold you, dear boy, my late and sole delight, in an embrace,
and may weightier news not wound my ears.

The *pathos* at which Virgil hinted with *solacia nostri* escalates to the point that we can predict the tragedy that will ensue. *Fortuna* and *fata* have not been very reliable so far, and we can sense that the *infandum casum* is going to occur.[329] The epigraphic resonances of *fata* and possessive pronouns have been discussed in detail already. Furthermore, *crudelem* might remind us of the Euryalus' mother and her sorrowful usage of *crudelis* in the next book (Virgil *Aen*. 9.483).[330] The death of Pallas parallels the death of Euryalus, and Virgil uses epigraphic language to portray it as a *funus acerbum*.[331]

When Aeneas sees the body of Pallas, he speaks words which parallel funerary inscriptions for children who died prematurely:

infelix, nati funus crudele videbis!
hi nostri reditus exspectatique triumphi?
haec mea magna fides? at non, Euandre, pudendis
vulneribus pulsum aspicies, nec sospite dirum
optabis nato funus pater. ei mihi quantum
praesidium, Ausonia, et quantum tu perdis, Iule!
(Virgil *Aen*. 11.53–58)

[329] *Infandum* is also used on the epitaph of the young boy Publius Aelius Pius (CIL VI 10764 = CLE 1535). EDCS-17200492 (March 18, 2014). Date unknown (?).

[330] Cf. Petrini 1997: 56.

[331] Virgil's *ekphrasis* of the sword belt of Pallas, with its description of young men killed on their wedding night (*Aen*. 10.495–99), is also an important aspect of his portrayal of the death as a *funus acerbum*. For a discussion of this *ekphrasis* see Putnam 1998: 189–207.

Unfortunate one, you will see the cruel death of a son!
Are these our returns, and our much-anticipated triumphs?
Is this my great pledge? But, Evander, you will not see him
beaten by disgraceful wounds, nor will you as a father
pray for a dreadful death because your son is safe. Ah me,
how great a protection you lose, Ausonia, and how great a protection you lose, Iulus!

Aeneas' lament that Evander must look on the cruel death of his son has an epigraphic parallel. The aforementioned Roman funerary inscription from a columbarium along the Via Salaria that was probably in use during the age of Augustus (CIL VI 7872 = CLE 971) also underscores the tragic sentiment that the father must look on the premature death of his child.[332] The fact that the parents have to look on the deaths of their own children makes premature death more tragic. When Aeneas orders his men to make funeral arrangements for Pallas at *Aen*. 11.24–28 he uses language reflecting the Roman concept of the *funus acerbum*, premature death, a concept attested on Roman funerary inscriptions:

ite,' ait, 'egregias animas, quae sanguine nobis
hanc patriam peperere suo, decorate supremis
muneribus, maestamque Euandri primus ad urbem
mittatur Pallas, quem non virtutis egentem
abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo.'
(*Aen*. 11.24–28)

"Go," he says, "the illustrious souls,
who brought into being this fatherland, decorate them with final gifts,
and let Pallas be sent first to the sad city of Evander,
whom not lacking in virtue
the black day snatched away and plunged into premature death."

Servius points out that here *acerbo* means “immature” or “unripe,” and that the concept is transferred from fruit (Servius *ad Aen*. 11.28). In fact, as Rawson has observed, there is epigraphic evidence that the well-attested convention of the *funus acerbum* is associated with

[332] Cf. p. 121 and 121n299.

unripe fruit.[333] Furthermore, as noted earlier, Servius observes that Aeneas' words are similar to the language of an *epitaphion* (Servius *ad Aen*. 11. 24).[334] The tragic, premature loss of Pallas is both national and personal, with the national loss underscored by *patriam*.[335] Aeneas grieves as a surrogate father to Pallas, and as the actual father of Iulus, who as an Ausonian will suffer from the loss of a youth with such great potential. Epigraphic conventions provide insight into Aeneas' character and emotions as he grieves over Pallas' tragic fate.

Turnus

Throughout the epic, Virgil uses epigraphic conventions to build tension and create a melancholy mood tinged by personal loss. His description of Aeneas as "fato profugus" is ambivalent, suggesting that he has a great destiny, but also hinting at the roll of the fates as a controlling and limiting force on Roman epitaphs.[336] Furthermore, he presents a series of *funera acerba* that dramatize the tragedy of premature death, culminating with the elaborate funeral for Pallas. I will conclude by arguing that these instances of *funera acerba* foreshadow the death of Turnus, which is also foreshadowed by epigraphic conventions.

The use of epigraphic language to describe Turnus's first appearance has been recognized by Thomas, who notes that, "Embedded epitaphs may function in the *Aeneid* as a means of instegating sympathy for characters whose actual deaths will then occur in the course of the poem. Almost from the moment we see Turnus, we know he is doomed" (Thomas 1998: 219).

---

[333] Cf. 112n278. Virgil also uses this terminology to describe the premature deaths of infants (*Aen*. 6. 429) (Rawson 2002: 272). Cf. Conte's discussion of "mors immatura" in the *Aeneid*, noting CIL IX 6315 = CLE 383 as an epigraphic parallel to the motif of premature death, and specifically death before marriage (1986: 190).

[334] Cf. p. 111. Servius also remarks that the phrase "quem non virtutis egentem" is from Ennius (Servius *ad*. *Aen*. 11.27), but it is worth considering the epigraphic parallels as well. The similarities between *Aen*. 11.27–28 and an inscription from Forum Popilii have been noted in the CIL (CIL X 4728 = CLE 813). Cf. Hoogma 1959: 329.

[335] Reed has noted that Pallas and other warriors who die prematurely fail "to continue national or family lines" (2007: 40).

[336] For Virgilian ambivalence cf. Thomas 1990: 66 and 2001: xii.

He cites Virgil's description of Turnus, which he identifies as "a tricolon *decrescens* which mimics an elegaic couplet" (Thomas 1998: 219):

> hunc decus egregium formae movet atque iuventae,
> hunc atavi reges, hunc claris dextra factis.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 7.473–4).
>
> The outstanding grace of form and of youth moves this one, the ancestor kings move this one, the right hand with distinguished deeds this one. (Thomas 1998: 219)

Thomas comments: "Elsewhere I have explored the relationship of this couplet to the Roman republican tradition of epitaph; I would say here simply that the effect of this approximation is to heroize the figure of Turnus precisely in terms of Roman republican heroic values" (Thomas 1998: 219).[337] Here Turnus' virtues are listed as they might be listed on an inscription, and this epigraphic portrait foreshadows his death at the end of the epic.

The interaction between Queen Amata and Turnus also foreshadows his death. Amata's words to Turnus echo the earlier sentiments of Euryalus' mother and of Evander:

> Turne, per has ego te lacrimas, per si quis Amatae
> tangit honos animum: spes tu nunc una, senectae
> tu requies miserae, decus imperiumque Latini
> te penes, in te omnis domus inclinata recumbit.
> unum oro: desiste manum committere Teucris.
> (Virgil *Aen*. 12.56–60).
>
> Turnus, I beseech you by these tears, if any honor for Amata
> touches your spirit: Now you are my only hope,
> you are the respite of miserable old age, the grace and ruling power of Latinus
> are in your hands, the whole house reclines turned towards you.
> I ask for one thing: cease from joining hands with the Teucrians.

[337] He refers here to his discussion of parallels with sepulchral epigram, in which he draws on comparative evidence from the tomb of the Scipios (1997: 283–4). In this same piece he also discusses how the *devotio* of Turnus (Virgil *Aen*. 11.440–42) served as a model for a later Christian epitaph (CLE 753) (1997: 284). He argues that, "At the moment of the *devotio*, regardless of whether it will be played out to its end, the Roman reader will have sensed republican military heroism" (1997: 285). For the *devotio* cf. Pascal 1990.

Amata expresses sentiments which are both personal and national. In addition to calling Turnus her only hope, she also suggests that he is the only hope of the Latins.[338] Her words echo Evander's "spes et solacia nostri" (our hope and out solace) (Virgil *Aen*. 8.514) and the words of Euryalus' mother: "tune ille senectae / sera meae requies" (you that late respite from my old age) (Virgil *Aen*. 9.481–82). The epigraphic parallels have been discussed above.[339] In addition, this passage is rife with personal pronouns (*ego*, *tu*, *tu*, *te*, and *te*) that indicate possesiveness. Virgil characterizes grieving parents in a similar way, and in the case of Evander and Amata possessiveness and anxiety foreshadow the *funus acerbum* of the youth. At this point we expect that Turnus is going to meet the same fate as Euryalus and Pallas, and we can read epigraphic resonances in Virgil's portrayal of him. In fact, Turnus' reply to Amata suggests that he will experience a *funus acerbum*, and that he does not have the power to change his fate. He says, "neque enim Turno mora libera mortis" (there is no free delay of death for Turnus) (Virgil *Aen*. 12.72–74). His words here echo earlier discussions of fates, including Aeneas' earlier claims that the fates did not allow him to lead life according to his own wishes (Virgil *Aen*. 4.350), and that he left Dido unwillingly (Virgil *Aen*. 6.459).[340] Turnus resembles Euryalus and Pallas, as well as Aeneas.[341]

Turnus also uses epigraphic language which foreshadows the *funus acerbum* that he suffers at the end of the epic. Before dismounting from a chariot driven by his sister, he speaks the following words to her:

> iam iam fata, soror, superant, absiste morari;
> quo deus et quo dura uocat Fortuna sequamur.
> stat conferre manum Aeneae, stat, quidquid acerbi est,

[338] Saces echoes these personal and national sentiments when he calls Turnus the "suprema salus," (final safety) and asks him to pity his people ("miserere tuorum") (Virgil *Aen*. 12. 653).
[339] Cf. pp. 136–37.
[340] Cf. pp. 125 and 129.
[341] For the similarities between Aeneas and other characters cf. Reed 2007: 15.

morte pati, neque me indecorem, germana, videbis
amplius. (Virgil *Aen*. 12.676–80)

Now now, sister, the fates remain, refrain from delaying;
where god and where harsh Fortune call, let us follow.
It is my due to aim a hand at Aeneas, it is my due, whatever of a bitter thing it is,
to endure in death, nor, sister, will you see me inglorious any longer.

The epigraphic resonances of *fata* have been discussed in detail above, and here Turnus recognizes the limits that fate places on him. He underscores the emminent nature of the consequences of the fates by repeating *iam*. We might envision the fates actively performing the action that is at hand. This serves to highten the suspense of the narrative, and also signals Turnus' growing awareness of the need to shape his own character in the face of impending doom. He says that he will endure whatever "acerbus″ thing he faces, and thus foreshadows his own *funus acebrum*. He will not be *indecoris*, and will face the fates that are closing in on him.

Although Virgil makes skillful use of epigraphic material to build up to the death of Turnus, he avoids using it where we might most suspect to see it: at Turnus' moment of death. There is nothing explicitly epigraphic about Turnus' death, which occurs within the space of two lines at the end of the epic:

ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.
(Virgil *Aen*. 12.951–52)

And his limbs are released from the cold
and with a groan his resentful life flees under the shadows.

Searches for epigraphic parallels to these lines yielded limited results.[342] The last lines which describe Turnus' death are not clearly epigraphic, and this is in fact very telling. We might

[342] *Membra* is fairly common on inscriptions, with a search for the term yielding 199 results on the EDCS and a search for *membr* yielding 220 (February 14, 2013). Putnam has made an important observation about the recurrence of this phrase in Virgil: "When the epic opened it was Aeneas' turn to shudder with cold as the winds, the first pawns of Juno's anger, threatened imminent death (*solvuntur frigore membra*: I, 92). Now, as the poem reaches its climax, it is one of Virgil's most bitter and cogent ironies that he uses this very phrase at the exact

expect Turnus to receive the sort of epigraphically inspired recognition that other characters in the epic received earlier, but his death is terse and anti-climactic. He dies reluctantly, and his final words are ones uttered in supplication, detailing his loss and Aeneas' victory (Virgil *Aen*. 12.931–38). This final instance of a *funus acerbum* is especially tragic given its sudden nature and the lack of a proper memorial. No ghost appears, no sad relative is shown mourning (with the exception of Juturna's premature mourning at *Aen*. 12.871), and Virgil refrains from using epigraphic language to describe Turnus' death.[343] The contrast with earlier episodes makes Turnus' death all the more jarring: he fits into the pattern of youths who die prematurely, but he also deveates from it. His death resembles the unconventional death of Dido, which happened quickly and was caused by *furor*.[344]

This is the last that we see of Turnus, but it is also the last that we see of Aeneas, and our final impression of him is a far cry from the man marked for *pietas* whom Virgil introduced at the beginning of the epic. As Putnam has observed, "By giving himself over with such suddeness to the private wrath which the sight of the belt of Pallas arouses, Aeneas becomes himself *impius Furor*, as rage wins the day over moderation, disintegration defeats order, and the achievements of history through heroism fall victim to the human frailty of one man" (Putnam 1965: 193–94.) In the end, Aeneas is "furiis accensus et ira terribilis" (Virgil *Aen*. 12.946–47), features which contrast with the more positive *pietas*. This recalls Virgil's earlier description of

---

moment Aeneas becomes the personification of avenging wrath and brings death to Turnus. The wheel has come full circle" (Putnam 1965: 200–1). For the Homeric resonances of "soluuntur frigore membra" see Galinsky 1988: 346, who also notes that these lines recall Virgil *Aen*. 1.92.

[343] Cf. Putnam for Juturna's reaction in comparison with Anna's response to Dido's death (Virgil *Aen*. 4.682–83). Putnam argues that Juturna's reaction comes at the same point in the action "at which Anna realizes the suicide of her sister and its meaning in the wider context of history ... That this remains unsaid in XII does not prevent the last moments of Turnus from having a particularly moving gravity and power" (Putnam 1965: 199). He also observes that when Turnus dies, "There is no weeping, no hymn of praise and sorrow, such as accompanied Hector's demise, nor is there any attempt to mitigate Aeneas' wrath or to draw him once again back into the world of the living, as Homer does for Achilles in *Iliad* XXIV" (Putnam 1965: 200).

[344] Cf. discussion on p. 128. For similarities between Dido and Turnus cf. Putnam's discussion of parallels between *Aen*. 4.1–5 and *Aen*. 12.4–9 (1965: 154–57).

Dido's death. At the end of the epic neither Aeneas nor Turnus deserves to be memorialized, and they contrast with other characters, such as Nisus and Euryalus, who do receive tributes inspired by epigraphic conventions. This speaks to the changes in Aeneas' persona which occur throughout the epic, culminating with the terrible and angry persona that dominates at the end. Turnus reluctantly becomes a final example of a *funus acerbum* at the hands of a man marked by *furor*. The final moment is far too sad and un-Roman for epigraphic commemoration, and it contrasts greatly with Anchises' vision and with Virgil's one spoken epitaph delivered in his own voice (the epitaph of Nisus and Euryalus). Virgil offers us a range of rich and nuanced inscribed personae throughout the epic, and ends with non-epigraphic honesty about the final actions of the central character.

Conclusion: Virgil's Epigraphic Appropriations

In short, Virgil uses epigraphic conventions throughout the *Aeneid*, and this appropriation contributes to the development of individual characters while also reflecting Virgil's subtle, subjective style. Virgil was clearly interested in Roman visual culture, and inscriptions would have been a visible and accessible source at the time when he was writing. In addition to being familiar sources to Virgil, inscriptions would also have been familiar to his audience, and like Virgil's text, they often invite reflection on character and emotion. One example is this inscription marking a *funus acerbum* which calls upon the passerby to shed tears for the deceased:

> D(is) M(anibus) / quicumque es puero lacrimas effunde viator / bis tulit hic senos primaevi germini<*s*> annos / deliciumque fuit domini spes grata parentum / quos male deseruit longo post fata dolori / noverat hic docta fabricare monilia dextra / et molle in varias aurum disponere gemmas / nomen erat puero pagus at nun<*c*> funus acerbum / et

> cinis in tumulis iacet et sine nomine corpus / qui vixit annis XII / mensibus VIIII diebus XIII ho(ris) VIII (CIL VI 9437 = CLE 403 = ILS 7710)[345]
>
> To the spirits of the dead, whoever you are, traveler, shed tears for the boy.
> This boy carried out twice six years of a spring sprout. He was the delight of the master, the pleasing hope of the parents, the parents whom he deserted badly to long grief caused by the fates. He had known how to make clever pieces of jewelry with his right hand, and to distribute soft gold onto varied gems. Pagus was the boy's name and now he lies a premature death, both ash in the tomb and a body without a name who lived for twelve years, nine months, thirteen days, eight hours.

This inscription not only portrays the fates as limiting forces, but also displays other conventions and motifs that are central to characterization in the *Aeneid*, including grief, premature death, and the dashed hopes of parents.[346] It calls upon the reader to reflect on and interpret the *persona* memorialized on the stone. Similarly, as Conte has noted, "... the Virgilian image seems intended to grow through the power of continuous reflection" (2007: 31). Inscriptions would have been an ideal tool for Virgil as he wrote his subtle, subjective epic because they were often infused with private emotional meaning, underscoring personal loss, possessiveness, and changes to personae and relationships over time, and inviting the passerby to reflect on these nuances. Simple, terse characterizations of individuals carved in stone may in fact speak volumes about private grief and emotion, and add insight into individual character. Virgil himself uses a similar style, which has been noted for its ambiguity and for the presence of "further voices" beyond the surface of the narrative.[347] Given the heightened visibility of inscriptions in the Augustan era and their power to convey character and emotion, it is perhaps no surprise that Virgil chose to describe Aeneas as "fato profugus." By appropriating epigraphic language and thought, he ingeniously gives a terse, allusive characterization which may have had vivid meaning for his

[345] EDCS-19100659 (September 16, 2013). Date unknown (?). The stone reads "germinit" and "nunt" instead of "germinis" and "nunc."

[346] And in fact, the ILS notes a parallel with *Aeneid* Book 2, where Priam is described as a body without a name. Cf. *Aen*. 2.557–58.

[347] Cf. Lyne 1987.

audience, and subtly introduces the emotional resonances that are central to Roman epitaphs and to the character of Aeneas.

Conclusion

Epigraphic Habits Across Genres

In the introduction to this dissertation I discussed the properties of inscriptions as repositories of memory, contextualizing Augustan literature with extant Augustan inscriptions, and arguing for "epigraphic intertextuality." I would like to end by suggesting that through these intertexts Augustan authors played a key role in the preservation, development, and increasing visibility of the epigraphic habit. By referencing extant inscriptions as well as fictional ones, Augustan authors added an additional layer of intertext to the collective (but also individualized) Roman epigraphic memory. Hinds has noted that in allusive discourse "No two readers will ever construct a set of cues in quite the same way" (1998: 47) and in the case of epigraphic intertexts individual responses depend on readers' knowledge of epigraphic and literary material, as well as on the nuances of individual interpretation. Some references to well-known inscriptions would have been clear and accessible to many Augustan readers, while other references would have required greater familiarity with the epigraphic tradition.[348] In addition, individual interpretations of less direct epigraphic intertexts would have varied based on knowledge of different inscriptions that featured the appropriated conventions. In short, Roman readers would not have viewed inscriptions and Augustan literature in isolation, but instead would have synthesized individual memories of literary and epigraphic *exempla*. Examination of epigraphic conventions across genres can enhance our understanding of the epigraphic habit and how Augustan authors were in dialogue with it.

[348] Cf. Vasaly noting that "while certain Roman monuments acquired a powerful symbolic significance closely identified with the function and meaning of the place where they stood, the importance of others must have been relatively inconsequential" (1993: 105).

The inscriptions in the Forum of Augustus furnish a perfect example of epigraphic intertextuality across genres and media. It is clear that Ovid intends for readers of his account in the *Fasti* (as quoted at the beginning of this dissertation) to recall the inscription on the Temple of Mars Ultor and its topographical context. In this case, the reference is very clear, and readers would have been likely to have seen the inscription firsthand.[349] Readers of Ovid who visited the Temple of Mars Ultor might have recalled his description of the temple, as well as his own description of the inscription that made the work seem "greater" with the name of Augustus (Ovid *Fast*. 5.568). In addition, readers of Ovid who had seen the inscription *in situ* would have been able to envision its context while reading the text. This context would have made the landscape seem more vivid, providing an authentic backdrop for the dramatically staged Ovidian spectacle of a mythological figure (Mars) visiting a site that is itself marked by blending of myth and reality. The forum invites readers to synthesize mythology, literature, and history while viewing images and inscriptions honoring the *summi viri* along with mythical figures.[350] This is just one of many examples of how literary and topographical backgrounds enhance epigraphic intertexts. Ovid and other Augustan authors contribute to constructing intertexts between inscriptions, city, and literature that in turn influenced how their readers might have interpreted Roman inscriptions.

Livy's references to the writing on individual inscriptions contribute to this development of epigraphic intertexts. In some cases Livy signposts his references or allusions to epigraphic

[349] The inscription has been reconstructed from one extant fragment (CIL VI 40311). Cf. Alföldy 1991 Tafel I, Alföldy 1992: 17–32, Ganzert 1996: 70–5 and 191–3, and Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2014: 331, 331n64, and figs. 15.6a and 15.6b.

[350] Nelis-Clément and Nelis have noted that "maius opus" (Ovid *Fast*. 5.568) may invite readers to recall Virgil's usage of the phrase at *Aen*. 7.45 (2013: 331). This is one example of how readers would have synthesized literature and epigraphy at the site.

texts with words or phrases that suggest quotation or paraphrase of the original inscription.[351] Hinds has noted the Roman tendency to make clear allusions by "signaling of specific allusion by a poet through seemingly general appeals to tradition and report, such as 'the story goes' (*fama est*), 'they relate' (*ferunt*), or 'it is said' (*dicitur*)" (Hinds 1998: 1–2).[352] In the case of epigraphic appropriation, we see similar nods to the epigraphic tradition with expressions like "ferme incisa fuit" (Livy 6.29.8), "scriptum erat" (Livy 34.61.13), and "inscripta erat" (Livy 40.29.3). For example, Livy's description of a dedicatory inscription honoring T. Quinctius begins with the signpost "his ferme incisa litteris fuit" (6.29.8–10), indicating that his version of the inscription is an indirect reference to the original source, similar to a literary allusion beginning with "dicitur." Hinds has noted that in these cases of specified allusion "the poet portrays himself as a kind of scholar" (1998: 2) and this seems to be what Livy is doing when he cites inscriptions. Livy signposts his literary rendering of the inscription as his own scholarly "rewrite" of the original model, and this begs the question of what source he was using. Further probing of Livy's epigraphic intertexts suggests that his scholarly interests extended to epigraphy, and in fact overlapped with the interests of modern epigraphers.

In some cases, it is possible that Livy created his own epigraphic intertexts by borrowing the language of extant inscriptions to describe contemporary ones that he might not have seen firsthand. For example, he gives a detailed description of an inscription honoring Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (41.21.8–10), which has verbal parallels with a roughly contemporary (if authentic) inscription honoring Lucius Mummius (CIL VI 331).[353] It is possible that, as

[351] Cf. Hinds' discussion of allusion and reference (1998: 21–25), responding to Thomas 1986. I think that in the case of Livy both of these terms apply, since in some instances he may "reference" an original inscription, much in the way that a modern scholar might give a reference to an exant inscription. In some cases, his references may be enhanced by allusion to other epigraphic conventions. At times he also alludes to epigraphic conventions (such as "situs est") less directly.

[352] Hinds has also noted the similarity of this practice to the "Alexandrian footnote" (1998: 1).

[353] Cf. pp. 63–66.

discussed in the Livy chapter, Livy either saw the original inscription (or a copy of it) and quoted it or tried to make his own "authentic" version of it by appropriating language found in a contemporary source. In the former scenario, he referenced a known inscription in his narrative, creating an intertext that requires knowledge of a material source in order for the reference to have its full impact. In the latter scenario, he created an additional intertext between the extant Lucius Mummius inscription and his version of the Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus inscription by alluding to the latter. By appropriating conventions found in a known (and perhaps prominently visible) inscription, Livy would have made his own rendering of the inscription more authentic. In both cases Livy would have called upon attentive readers to recognize his usage of a material source that might have been well-known. Thomas has argued that in the case of Virgilian "references" Virgil "is not so much playing with his models, but constantly intends that his reader be 'sent back' to them, consulting them through memory or physically, and that he then return and apply his observation to the Virgilian text" (Thomas 1986: 172n8). Hinds has noted that in these cases "The author is serious about the business of controlling his models ... and the reader (including the modern philological interpreter) is guaranteed a reward for being correspondingly serious about recognizing and applying those models (cf. West and Woodman's 'patient scholarship')" (1998: 22).[354] In the case of Livy's references to inscriptions, the rewards are offered not just to the philological reader, but also to the reader of inscriptions or the modern epigrapher. This may in fact illuminate why, as discussed in the appendix to the Livy chapter, he gives details about non-textual aspects of inscriptions (aspects that are also of interest to modern epigraphers). And in fact, if he "reconstructs" inscriptions based on known *exempla*, he

[354] Hinds also notes that allusion may be less direct, and may be characterized by "the teasing play which it defines between revelation and concealment" (1998: 23).

participates in the sort of process that modern epigraphers undertake when they attempt to "reconstruct" missing pieces of individual inscriptions based on comparable models.[355]

But Livy's epigraphic interests are not limited to referencing and reconstructing inscriptions. He also creates epigraphic intertexts that extend beyond text with the details that he gives about the appearance and location of individual inscriptions. Livy often gives information about the appearance of an inscription, in some cases naming the material, and in the case of the Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus providing details about painted images accompanying the inscription.[356] These details enhance the intertexts by inviting readers to consider not only the text of the inscription, but also its appearance and context. In fact, readers may be able to conjure visual images of the inscriptions based on knowledge of similar types of inscription that they might have encountered previously. Livy also gives details about the locations of individual inscriptions frequently, inviting readers to envision their topographical contexts.[357] For the Romans, place and memory were closely linked, as evidenced by the Roman oratorical technique of describing a place in detail in order to allow the audience to envision it.[358] Livy uses a similar tactic, portraying inscriptions as placed prominently in significant topographical locations. By doing so, he invites readers to tap into their memories of the history of individual places (which he may in fact reinforce in his own narrative by describing the prominence of *monumenta* such as the Capitoline Temple throughout history) and to imagine inscriptions as part of the Roman

[355] Keppie notes that "This is one of the chief activities of the epigraphist, and requires knowledge of parallel or similar texts, enabling him to attempt a restoration" (1991: 21–22). Cf. Bodel 2001: 52–55.

[356] For examples see Tables 2 and 3 in the appendix.

[357] For examples see Table 4 in the appendix.

[358] Vasaly has noted that "Of particular use to the orator who intended to speak at length about a place or monument neither seen by nor familiar to his audience was the material in the rhetorical handbooks referring to a particular kind of description in which the reader was advised to use concrete details in order to create a 'visual image' in the minds of his listeners" (Vasaly 1993: 90).

topographical landscape.[359] In Livy, the city of Rome serves as a canvas for representing visual and literary epigraphic intertexts that readers can contextualize based on their knowledge of the city. And this is in fact a very Augustan approach, since the emperor himself used inscriptions to give his family a prominent, visible, and lasting place in the Roman topographical landscape.

Ovid also extends his epigraphic intertexts beyond text, in some cases providing details about the medium and location of individual inscriptions. In the Ovid chapter, I discussed how Ovid breaks epigraphic habits by describing acts of unconventional writing that resemble Roman epigraphic activities. In fact, he sometimes draws attention to the unusual material used to make the inscription, subverting expectations about epigraphic media. For example, in *Amores* 1.4 he begins a line with "verba leges digitis" (you will read words with your fingers) and ends with "verba notata mero" (words noted in wine) (1.4.20).[360] The meter reinforces the contrast, with the main caesura dividing these two parts of the pentameter. Similarly, he ends his dedication of writing tablets in the temple of Venus with "AT NUPER VILE FUISTIS ACER" (and just now you were cheap maple) (*Am*. 1.11.28).[361] By describing the placement of the tablets in the temple of Venus he casts them in the role of a votive dedication. With the second line, he offers a witty reminder of the absurdity of the fictional scenario that he envisions. In this case, the epigraphic intertext may be enhanced by more sincere descriptions of inscriptions placed in temples, such as the ones that Livy offers in the *Ab Urbe Condita*. Ovid subverts these with his transformation of the tablets into an unlikely votive inscription.

[359] Cf. Vasaly noting that "It is surely true that statues and monuments long familiar to a Roman audience, woven over the decades into the very fabric of the city, would have acquired a complex and powerful set of associations" (Vasaly 1993: 104).
[360] Cf. p. 91.
[361] Cf. p. 95.

Ovid's innovative appropriation of inscriptions may be best exemplified by his description of his own epitaph in the *Tristia*, which was discussed in the Ovid chapter.[362] Ovid straddles the boundary between reality and fiction by envisioning the inscription and its location.[363] In fact, he imagines the whole funerary ritual, beginning with the mixing of his bones with eastern spices, and ending with the words inscribed on the tomb (Ovid. *Tr*. 3.3.69–78). He specifies that his bones should be sent back to Rome (so that his exile will end with his death) (Ovid *Tr*. 3.3.65–66), and that his tomb should be placed in "suburbano solo" along a road, so that it will be visible to those passing by it (Ovid. *Tr*. 3.3.70–71).[364] After giving the text, he remarks "hoc satis in titulo est. etenim maiora libelli / et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi" (Ovid *Tr*.77–78). [That is enough on the inscription. For my little books are greater and more long-lasting monuments.] Ovid describes an inscription that resembles a real one, but stops short of being truly real. In fact, his conclusion that his works are greater monuments may in fact subvert the authority of the epigraphic tradition, suggesting that he has surpassed the power of the genre in his own writing. And in fact, Ovid more than any other Augustan author transforms the epigraphic genre, creating inscriptions that pay tribute to the tradition while also deviating from it. Perhaps Ovid considers his works to be greater than an inscription because they include his own groundbreaking innovations on the epigraphic tradition. Whereas earlier, he noted that Augustus's Temple of Mars Ultor seemed "maius" with his name read on the inscription (Ovid *Fast*. 5.567–68), here he identifies his own little books as "maiora" than an inscription with his own name. He identifies with Augustus' epigraphic example, while at the same time subverting and superseding it.

---

[362] Cf. pp. 108–10.

[363] It is notable that the location of this fictional epitaph is not overly specific. Ovid specifies that the inscription should be in Rome and close to the road, but does not offer further details about the topographical context.

[364] This is consistent with the Roman epigraphic habit, as inscriptions often were placed along the road to be more easily read. Cf. Susini 1988.

Virgil also shows awareness of epigraphic intertexts that extend beyond text, while at the same time appropriating inscriptions in ways that are more subtle and subjective. He gives details about the placement of an inscribed shield on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Actium (*Aen*. 3.286–88), allowing readers to envision the prominent placement of the inscription. Nelis-Clément and Nelis have observed, "It has been pointed out that there is a further poetic element, a form of *mise en abyme*, as in Vergil's epic we see Aeneas composing a hexameter verse which contains the word *arma*, the author of which is the *vir* of the poem's famous opening verse, *arma virumque cano*" (2013: 469). This epigraphic intertext suggests that Virgil's words are worthy of prominent placement on a temple, and allows the reader to envision them there. Elsewhere Virgil is less direct when he appropriates epigraphic conventions. By using epigraphic conventions in ways that are more subtle, Virgil opens the door to more personal and individualized reactions to his text. His references to fate may remind readers of inscriptions erected for members of their own families, which could invite sympathy for the Virgilian characters and their emotions.[365] In these cases, it may be less effective to draw attention to location and material because that would limit the possibilities for epigraphic intertext. Virgil writes about emotions that are simultaneously universal and personal, and by recalling epigraphic conventions subtly he avoids limiting his intertexts to specific inscriptions, but rather leaves to the reader the task of making connections with their own memories of various inscriptions.

[365] Conte has noted that, "Virgil, as a 'pathetic' poet of feeling, *reflects* on the impression which things make upon him: this gesture of reflection is the focus of the emotion that he himself experiences and conveys to the reader. Things, that is objects, events, speeches and words, are associated with an idea, and their poetic force depends entirely on this association" (2007: 31). In addition, this association can be individualized, enhancing the subjectivity that Virgil creates.

Tradition, Innovation, and Genre

The depth of thought and creativity that underlies all of these unique appropriations of epigraphic conventions reflects the visibility and versatility of inscriptions in the age of Augustus, as well as the continuing influence of the epigraphic tradition. In the introduction, I discussed some of the ways in which Augustus innovated on the epigraphic tradition, changing the style and appearance of inscriptions, and integrating his own persona into the Roman epigraphic landscape. I have also shown that Augustan authors appropriated certain longstanding epigraphic conventions that pre-date the Augustan era, continuing an existing tradition. Earlier authors also appropriated epigraphic language and thought. Thomas (1998) has discussed the evolution of sepulchral epigram in the literary tradition, beginning with early Greek literature and extending into the age of Augustus. Examining sepulchral language in Homer (*Il*. 7.87–91) and its clear parallels on military epitaphs from the seventh and six centuries, Thomas discusses how the tradition undergoes poetic refinement in Hellenistic epigram, followed by innovations at the hands of Roman poets. Fundamental to Thomas' study is the idea of "generic mobility": sepulchral epigram, which can be considered a genre, moves across genres and in fact contributes to the evolution of other genres (Thomas 1998: 205).[366] Augustan authors would have synthesized the different literary and epigraphic sources that are part of this process of "generic mobility" rather than viewing them in isolation.

In my discussion of *Amores* 2.6, I addressed how Ovid synthesizes conventions of Roman epitaphs with Virgilian and Alexandrian language. We can see in this poem "generic mobility" between Hellenistic pet epitaphs, Roman epitaphs, and the epitaph for Ovid's poet-

[366] For the evolution of the genre of sepulchral epigram, Thomas cites Kroll 1924: 207–8. He also notes that the genre of sepulchral epigram was "originally barely of the status of a genre" (1998: 205).

parrot. Several writers of Hellenistic epigram wrote epigrams in honor of animals.[367] As Gow and Page observed, "The animal-epitaphs are so written that, given a grave, they could be inscribed on one" (1965: 91). We do not know if these epigrams were ever inscribed, but we do know that their content would have been well-suited to epitaphs. Ovid continues this tradition by writing a literary epitaph for a bird that bears striking similarities to a Roman funerary inscription. In fact, the phrase "docta loqui," which appears on Ovid's animal epitaph (*Am*. 2.6.62), appears on a later (possibly third century) Roman funerary inscription, and his usage of "ave" in the same line parallels instances of "(h)ave" on Roman inscriptions.[368] Ovid blends what Thomas has called "functional" and "literary" epigrams (1998: 205), creating a literary inscription that parallels a "functional" Roman inscription that could have existed and honored a real person.[369] In fact, the blurring between "Hellenistic pet epitaph" and "Roman epitaph" may in fact mirror the blurring between "parrot" and "poet" that pervades the poem. The parrot is not real, but the poet is, and he uses the parrot to convey distinct aspects of his own character as represented through his poetic persona.

It has been noted that in *Amores* 2.6 Ovid creates a literary and epigraphic tribute to a bird who "parrots" Catullus' sparrow while at the same time being innovative and exceptional.[370] We can also observe how Virgil builds upon Catullan epigraphic and literary synthesis. For example, Virgil may in fact combine Catullan and epigraphic intertexts in Dido's opening words to her sister Anna, which were also discussed in the Virgil chapter:[371]

---

[367] We know examples of such epigrams written by Ante, Tymnes, Aristodicus, Leonidas, Simias, Mnasalces, Nicias, Phaennus, Simias, and Meleager (Gow and Page 1965: 91).

[368] The inscription is CIL VI 33904 = CLE 1251 = ILS 7773 (EDCS-24100418). For the convention *(h)ave* cf. CIL VI 33370a = ILS 1785 = AE 1971 52 and p. 100n242 above.

[369] According to Thomas, "functional" epigrams "are destined for epigraphic ends" and literary epigrams "at best only pose as doing so" (2008: 205). He also cautions that these categories may be hard to distinguish and that the distinction is not always apt (2008: 207).

[370] Cf. Hinds 1998: 5 and discussion on pp. 98-99 above.

[371] Cf. p. 124.

Anna (fatebor enim) miseri post fata Sychaei
coniugis et sparsos fraterna caede penatis
solus hic inflexit sensus animumque labantem
impulit. agnosco ueteris uestigia flammae.
(Virgil *Aen*. 4.20–23).

Anna, (for I will come out and say it), after the fate of my miserable husband
Sychaeus and the household gods sprinkled with fraternal slaughter,
this man alone has bent my senses and my slipping mind.
I recognize the traces of the old flame.

In the Virgil chapter, I discussed how Dido's reference to fate parallels references to fate in Roman epitaphs. In addition, "fraterna caede" parallels Catullus' "fraterno fletu":[372]

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus
advenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias,
ut te postremo donarem munere mortis
et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem,
quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsum,
heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi,
nunc tamen interea haec, prisco quae more parentum
tradita sunt tristi munere ad inferias,
accipe fraterno multum mananatia fletu,
atque in perpetuum, frater, ave atque vale. (Catull. 101.1–10)

Having traveled through many peoples and seas
I have come, brother, for these miserable funerary rites,
in order to bestow upon you in your death a parting gift,
and console the silent ash in vain,
inasmuch as Fortune stole you away from me,
alas, miserable brother undeservedly taken away from me,
but now, meanwhile, these things, which were handed down
in the ancient way of the ancestors, with a sad tribute to the dead,
receive them drenched with a brotherly tear,
and for all time, brother, hail and goodbye.

Thomas has established that this poem forms a sepulchral epitaph, and has also noted that Catullus embeds the language of this epigram elsewhere in poem 68 (Thomas 1998: 215).[373] In fact, further probing of this poem in comparison with Virgil will reveal additional epigraphic intertexts:

[372] I thank Richard Thomas for bringing this to my attention.
[373] Cf. Ramsby for epigraphic resonances in Catullus 68 (2007: 48–49).

sed totum hoc studium luctu fraterna mihi mors
abstulit. o misero frater adempte mihi,
tu mea tu moriens fregisti commoda, frater,
tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus,
omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra,
quae tuus in vita dulcis alebat amor. (Catull. 68.19–24)

But the death of my brother snatched away all of this zeal from me in grief.
Oh brother snatched away from miserable me,
you dying, brother, shattered my advantages,
with you our whole house was buried at once,
with you all of our joys perished at once,
which your sweet love fostered in life.

In addition to paralleling the language and thought of Catullus 101 with the phrases *luctu fraterna* and *frater adempte mihi*, this poem also resembles another Virgilian passage that was discussed earlier in connection with its epigraphic resonances:[374]

ite,' ait, 'egregias animas, quae sanguine nobis
hanc patriam peperere suo, decorate supremis
muneribus, maestamque Evandri primus ad urbem
mittatur Pallas, quem non virtutis egentem
abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo.'
(*Aen*. 11.24–28)

"Go," he says, "the illustrious souls,
who brought into being this fatherland, decorate them with final gifts,
and let Pallas be sent first to the sad city of Evander,
whom not lacking in virtue
the black day snatched away and plunged into premature death."

Catullus' *mors abstulit* parallels Virgil's later *abstulit atra dies*, and both passages parallel epigraphic language used to portray *funera acerba* on Roman tombstones. The Catullan and epigraphic resonances contribute to Virgil's portrayal of Aeneas' grief for Pallas, which parallels epigraphic and literary tributes to family members. In short, Virgil and other authors synthesize literary and epigraphic sources in their works, interweaving different intertexts that would have

[374] Cf. pp. 139–40.

been familiar to their audiences, and contributing to the development of "generic mobility" in the context of epigraphic appropriations.

Epigraphic and Virgilian Mobility: Tensions of Genre and Place

This generic and epigraphic mobility is not only visible in texts, but also extends to placement of verse in physical contexts, as illustrated by literary graffiti.[375] It has long been recognized that Virgil was a popular subject of imitation on Latin inscriptions. For example, Virgil's programmatic opening words, "Arma virumque cano," (I sing of arms and a man) were adapted, imitated, and rewritten throughout the Roman empire. Vestiges of this trend of imitation, which like the art of Virgil himself reflect both traditionalism and innovation, are still visible today. For example, remains of one of many epigraphic renderings of the introductory words of the *Aeneid* were found in the port town of Ostia: "Arma virum / que ca[no]" (I sing of arms and a man) (CIL XIV 2034).[376] The hand that inscribed these lines adhered closely to Virgil's program, but other instances deviate more from their Virgilian model. Perhaps the most famous example is the graffito found near a laundry facility at Pompeii, which reads: "fullones ululam[qu]e cano, non arma virumq(ue)" (I sing of fullers and an owl, not arms and a man) (CIL IV 9131). Cooley notes that "The humorous character of the graffito is enhanced by its location, since the entranceway is flanked by paintings of Romulus and Aeneas, with the classic scene of Aeneas leading Anchises and Ascanius into safety from Troy; in this way, the graffito's location is integral to its meaning and humor" (2012: 115–16). Furthermore, the reference to an owl seems to be a pun on the name of the fuller, Ululitremulus (Cooley 2012: 115). The author of this graffito paid tribute to Virgil's voice, but also rejected it in favor of a new programmatic

[375] For literary verse in graffiti cf. Franklin 1991: 88 and Milnor 2009 and 2014.
[376] A search of the EDCS for "arma virumque" yielded twenty-seven results (June 9, 2014).

focus.[377] The arms and the man are present in the graffiti, but they take second stage to fullers and an owl, who steal the scene in this witty parody, which draws attention to tensions of genre and literary register.[378]

Virgil might have been surprised to find his lines outside of the epic register, not to mention at a laundry facility. In fact, this instance of "generic mobility" might remind us more of Ovid's famous rejection of epic in *Amores* 1.1–4 than of Virgil's work. However, the graffito is also remarkably Virgilian for its attention to landscape and audience while transitioning between literary registers. Consider, for example, the opening of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*:

> Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!
> non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae;
> si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae.
> (Virgil *Ecl*. 4.1–3).

> Sicilian Muses, let us sing things a little bit greater!
> The copses and humble tamarisks are not pleasing to all;
> if we sing the woods, the woods might be worthy of a consul.

At the beginnings of both the fourth *Eclogue* and the *Aeneid* Virgil, like his Pomepian imitator, uses first person forms of *cano* to declare his literary program. The introduction to *Eclogue* 4 and the graffiti are marked by tensions between high and low registers and conflicting landscapes.[379] The consuls do not ordinarily belong in the woods, and Virgilian epic does not ordinarily belong at the fullery.[380] However, these tensions are not insurmountable, and Virgil

[377] The CIL notes that the beginning of the line seems to be juxtaposed with Virgil, but in the second line the inscriber gives preference to another song, possibly one which was known among the fullers. Cf. Franklin noting that the Virgilian line "was reworked ... to refer to the distinctive noise of fullers" (1991: 88).

[378] Milnor has observed "poetic competition" in the similarity of the hexametrical verse to the Virgilian lines and its placement underneath another hexametrical *graffito* (2009: 301).

[379] For an analysis of "similar tension" of urban and pastoral landscapes in the first *Eclogue* see Putnam 1970: 137.

[380] The archaeological record makes it difficult to know how common it was to see Virgil at the laundry, although Kellum has noted that this fullery, with the *graffito* and accompanying wall painting depicting Aeneas with his son and father, may be imitating the nearby building complex of Eumachia, the Pompeian patroness of fullers. The building complex included statues and inscriptions honoring Aeneas and Romulus, which imitated the ones in the Forum of Augustus (Kellum 1997: 173). In Pompeii references to owls in connection with fulleries were relatively common in graffiti and wall-painting (Bradley 2002: 40). Bradley has noted that the owl could have both positive

shows us that conflicts of register, landscape, and genre can be reconciled and synthesized into new art that transcends the boundaries of genre. Perhaps Virgil would have been pleased to see his imitator breaking epigraphic boundaries as well as poetic ones, since he explores these boundaries himself with his epigraphic intertexts in the *Aeneid*.

Augustan Literary and Epigraphic *Monumenta*

In conclusion, comparative study of Livy, Ovid, and Virgil in the context of Latin epigraphy reveals similarities between their epigraphic appropriations, as well as distinct differences. They all call upon readers to recognize and contextualize epigraphic appropriations with their own knowledge of inscriptions, in some cases appropriating inscriptions in ways that transcend genres and media. In addition, all three authors appropriate epigraphic conventions in ways that are both traditional and innovative, playing on the horizon of expectations. The idea of the persona is central to epigraphic appropriations in all three authors, and they all use inscriptions to shape character. This use of epigraphy to shape and present character parallels Augustus' own epigraphic activities, including his careful presentation of his own persona. In short, there are distinct similarities between how these authors use inscriptions in ways that might reflect the prominence of inscriptions during the Augustan era, but their epigraphic intertexts also reflect their unique styles and authorial purposes.

Discussion of genre has been central to this dissertation, and in the Ovid chapter I discussed the tensions underlying sharp division of epigraphic material into different genres. I revisited this idea in the preceding discussion of Virgilian graffiti. I would like to end by emphasizing that tensions of genre are present not only in categorizations of epigraphic material

---

and negative associations as the bird associated with Minerva, the patron deity of the fullers, and as an ill-omened bird associated with funerary lament (Bradley 2002: 40). Tensions surround the owl at the fullery, and the Virgilian allusion adds another layer of generic tension.

and literature, but also in categorizations of "inscriptions" and "literary inscriptions."[381] Literary inscriptions lack the materiality of "inscriptions," but in some cases (as in many of Livy's references) the materiality of inscriptions is mentioned, inviting the reader to synthesize the literary reference with knowledge of actual inscriptions made of bronze, stone, or other material. In some cases, the texts of literary inscriptions would certainly be at home on "real" inscriptions, and it is only the reader's awareness and memory of the literary context that separates the "real" inscriptions from the "literary" ones. Hence, we should think not just of "epigraphic *monumenta*" and "literary *monumenta*," but of "epigraphic *and* literary *monumenta*." The literary inscriptions created by Augustan authors may in fact have colored readers' impressions of "the epigraphic habit," and they certainly would have reflected the increasing visibility of inscriptions in the Augustan era. In short, epigraphic intertexts not only extend across literary genres, but also break the boundaries between "genres" of inscriptions and literature, and contribute to the collective (but also individualized) memory of the epigraphic habit. Epigraphic intertexts, although not limited to the Augustan era, are characteristic of Augustan writing across genres.

[381] As mentioned earlier (157n369), Thomas makes a useful distinction between "functional" epigrams "that are destined for epigraphic ends" and literary epigrams "that at best only pose as doing so." He also notes that "Often it will be hard to tell the difference since the fiction of functionality is part of the essence of the developing epigrammatic genre" (1998: 205).

Appendix: Livy's Epigraphic Evidence

The following tables outline different ways in which Livy uses inscription in his work. The first table gives citations and descriptive information that Livy provides about individual inscriptions. The additional tables below provide information about the different ways in which Livy references inscriptions with attention to material, location, etc. In order to facilitate comparison between the tables, I have assigned each entry an "inscription number" that is used in all of the tables in which it is listed. The first table also lists references to the inscription in the other tables. I have endeavored to be as thorough as possible about cataloguing instances in which Livy uses inscriptions, but there are some challenges inherent in categorizing epigraphic appropriations in this format. Certain decisions about categorization (i. e. type of inscription) can be subjective, and I have also shown in this chapter that Livy sometimes references and appropriates epigraphic conventions in his work without describing an actual inscription. My goal is not that these tables will be exhaustive, but rather that they will shed light on the broad range of ways in which Livy used inscriptions in the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

The tables provide insight into the sort of information that Livy gives about inscriptions, and interesting trends emerge from the data. For example, when Livy provides details about an inscription, it is most common for him to identify the type. In fact, he provides some identifying information about the type of inscription (i. e. altar, inscribed object, inscriptions accompanying *imagines*) in every instance included in Table 1. Perhaps more surprisingly, the second most common piece of information that Livy gives about inscriptions is their location, perhaps reflecting the interest in space and place that he displays throughout the narrative with references to Roman topography. He varies the level of detail that he gives, in some instances giving general information, such as "in publico" (3.57.10) and in others giving highly specific details

about location. For example, in the case of a dedicatory inscription accompanying a statue of Jupiter (6.29.8–10), Livy tells us that it was located on the Capitoline between the *cellae* of Jupiter and Minerva.[382] The table outlines several instances in which Livy references inscriptions in or near specific temples, perhaps inviting the reader to envision the topographical context of the inscription and emphasizing the placement of the inscription in a significant location. Information about placement of an inscription in a temple or near statues of gods can add authority to the epigraphic evidence, and in fact Livy may show interest in the authoritative properties of inscriptions elsewhere. For example, of twelve instances in which Livy makes reference to specific material (Table 2), four specify that the inscription is bronze, perhaps emphasizing the authority and durability of the inscriptions. Conversely, he mentions that the corselet of Cossus was made of linen, emphasizing that it was not as authoritative as inscriptions on more durable material. Finally, Livy also gives details about inscriptions that mention individuals or groups of individuals by name. These instances may reflect not only Livy's interest in inscriptions as sources for discussion of historical figures, but also in how inscriptions can be used for self-fashioning. Livy's awareness of this property of inscriptions is clear from his discussion of the inscriptions accompanying *imagines* in several instances.

It is clear from the tables that in some ways Livy approached inscriptions like a modern epigrapher, paying attention not just to the inscribed words, but also to location, material, individuals named, and other properties that are crucial to a full understanding of epigraphic evidence. He is selective about which aspects of the epigraphic evidence he discusses, and as the tables illustrate, in some instances he elaborates some of these details but not others. In addition, in some cases he provides precise details about how he is citing inscriptions, providing information about the text or acknowledging that he is paraphrasing it. These details provide

[382] Cf. discussion on pp. 60–62.

valuable insight into how inscriptions impacted the composition of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, and illustrate Livy's epigraphic selectivity. Livy's varying treatment of epigraphic sources, as illustrated by discussion in Chapter 1 and in the following tables, reflects his critical awareness of inscriptions as sources and his selective usage of them as evidence.

Table 1: Inscriptions and Descriptive Information

Inscription number	**Citation**	**Descriptive Information**	**References in Other Tables (by table number)**
1	1.24.7–8	from these terms, as they have been recited from these tablets or wax, Romans will not defect first	2, 3
2	2.41.10–11	statue with inscription indicating that it was given from the proceeds of Cassius' property (after he was condemned to death)	3, 6
3	3.34.1–7	*decemvirs* set up ten tables and summoned people to read the laws written on them; when it seemed that they had been edited sufficiently, the *comitia centuriata* adopted the Laws of the Ten Tables; after this the general opinion was that two tables were lacking	3
4	3.37.4	after the greater part of a year two tables had been added to the ten	3

5	3.57.10	twelve tables inscribed on bronze and placed "in publico"	2, 3, 4
6	4.8.4	a motion was brought forth in the senate that there should be magistrates with their own clerks to assume care of the tablets ("tabularum") since the task was difficult and not appropriate for a consul	3
7	4.11.3–4	senate (prompted by consuls) decreed that colonists should be enlisted to defend Ardea from the Volscii; this was secretly recorded on tablets so that plebs and tribunes would not know about it	3
8	4.20.5–11	inscribed linen corselet of Cossus from temple of Jupiter Feretrius, saying that he was consul when he brought the *spolia opima* to temple	2, 3, 4, 6
9	6.1.10	one of the first decrees of the interregnum was to search for the treaties and laws (including the twelve tables); some of these were accessible to the people, but others were kept secret by the *pontifices*	3
10	6.4.2–3	three golden bowls inscribed with the name of Camillus; kept in Capitoline temple until it burned	2, 3, 4, 6

11	6.27.6	tribunes said that senate did not want witnesses and public records ("tabulas publicas") to be used as evidence because they would reveal the extent of debt	3
12	6.29.8–10	dedication accompanying statue of Jove; indicating divine approval for Titus Quinctius to take nine towns	3, 4, 5, 6
13	7.17.12	during the second interregnum, when tribunes objected to two patricians being named consuls, Fabius said that according to the Twelve Tables the vote of the people had the force of law	3
14	7.20.8	truce recorded on bronze tablet	2, 3
15	8.11.16	bronze tablet commemorating receipt of citizenship by Campanian *equites*	2, 3, 4, 6
16	8.30.8–9	after Fabius' victory enemy arms burnt; may have been to prevent dictator from inscribing his name on arms or carrying them in triumph (Fabius fought while the dictator was not present)	3
17	8.40.4–5	false inscriptions under *imagines* made records unreliable	3

18	9. 34.6	Sempronius (in speech against Appius) asks rhetorically if no one of the censors has read the twelve tables	3
19	9.46.2–3	certain annals report that Gnaeus Flavius put away a tablet and swore that he wouldn't write when he found out that he was being removed from consideration for being an aedile because he was writing things down; Licinius Macer says that he had actually stopped writing before that time	3
20	9.46.5–6	civil law put on calendar posted on white notice boards around the forum	2, 3, 4
21	10.7.11–12	Publius Decius Mus asks rhetorically if readers of inscriptions cannot endure the brightness if titles of *augur* and *pontifex* were added to *imagines* inscriptions identifying individuals as *consul*, *censor*, and *triumphator*	3
22	22.31.11	additions to the inscriptions accompanying Fabius' *imagines* made it seem like he had been made dictator instead of just acting dictator	3, 6

23	23.19.18	inscription on bronze plate under statue of Marcus Anicius in forum of Praeneste said that he had fulfilled his vow for the soldiers in the garrison at Casilinum; the same inscription was underneath three statues placed in the temple of Fortune.	2, 3, 4, 5, 6
24	24.18.7	censors culled names from tablets listing youths who had not served and did not have a legitimate exemption	3
25	25.10.9–10	Hannibal instructed the Tarentines to write their names on the doors of their houses; all other houses would be plundered, and anyone who wrote a name on a Roman house would be considered an enemy	3, 4
26	26.24.14	alliance terms set up at Olympia by Anatolians and on Capitoline by Romans	3, 4
27	26.25.13–15	Acarnaninas asked the Epirotes to bury all the men who died together in one mound with inscription saying they died fighting the Anatolians	3, 5, 6

28	26.36.11	rivalry among men to have their names among the first on the "publicis tabulis" (public records)	3
29	28.46.16	altar dedicated by Hannibal with inscription describing his achievements in Punic and Greek	3, 4
30	29.37.7	census lists were made to ensure that there would be a record in "publicis tabulis" of how strong twelve colonies were in soldiers and money	3
31	30.45.7	Africanus was the first to get his name from the place that he conquered; later the *imagines* inscriptions of less deserving people were embellished	3
32	31.44.4–5	Athenians declared that representations of Phillip or his ancestors and accompanying inscriptions be removed; places where inscriptions and memorials to him had been erected should be accursed	3
33	32.38.9	tyrant Nabis proposed measures that spurred revolutionists, including *tabulae novae* (cancellation of debts)[383]	3

[383] It is debatable whether references to "tabulae novae" should be considered epigraphic. Although the term refers to the cancellation of debts, it has its origins in the inscribed tablets that would have been used to make agreements. I have included several teferences to "tabulae" in this table since they have epigraphic resonances, with the caveat that the term can have a broad range of meanings and applications.

34	34.6.8	reference to laws written by decemvirs on the twelve tables	3
35	34.61.14–15	Aristo left written tablet in most frequented place in the city (over tribunal of magistrates)	3, 4, 5, 6
36	36.40.9	Publius Scipio Nasica would have enough honor and regard from the inscription accompanying his *imago* saying that he had been chosen by the senate to receive the Idaean mother, even if he did not receive another honor / office	3, 6
37	38.35.4	Publius Cornelius set up a six-horse golden chariot on the Capitoline with an inscription saying that a consul had dedicated it	2 (?), 3, 4, 5, 6 (?)
38	39.37.16	Lycortas gives a speech saying that enemies are trying to destroy things that were inscribed on stone for eternal memory (membership of Lacedaemon in the Achaean league) by making them liars	2, 3
39	40.29.3–5	inscribed stone chests with lids fastened by lead; inscriptions say that Numa was buried here, Numa's books are inside; found at Janiculum	2, 3, 4, 5, 6

40	40.52.4–7	tablet with inscription placed above the doors of the temple of the lares permarini (dedicated by the censor Marcus Aemilius); describes in detail victory of Lucius Aemilius, son of Marcus Aemulius, over King Antiochus; notes that because of his victory he vowed the temple; another tablet "eodem exemplo" was placed above the doors in the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline	3, 4, 5, 6
41	41.28.8–10	inscribed tablet in temple of Mater Matuta, says that Romans conquered Sardinia under the command of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus; had the form of the island of Sardinia; battles painted on it	3, 4, 5, 6
42	42.12.6	treaty with Perseus was inscribed in three locations: Thebes, Delium "augustissimo et celeberrimo in templo," Delphi	3, 4
43	42.13.9	Eumenes says that Perseus had won the loyalty of a band of debtors "spe novarum tabularum"	3
44	45.12.4–5	Popilius hands Antiochus wooden tablets (tabellas) with decree of the senate	2 (?), 3

Table 2: Inscriptions with material specified

Inscription number	Citation	Material
1	1.24.7–8	wood (?) or wax
5	3.57.10	bronze
8	4.20.5–11	linen
10	6.4.2–3	gold
14	7.20.8	bronze
15	8.11.16	bronze
20	9.46.5–6	white board (board material unspecified)
23	23.19.18	bronze
37	38.35.4	gold (?) (inscription itself not necessarily gold)
38	39.37.16	stone
39	40.29.3–5	stone and lead
44	45.12.4–5	wood (?) cf. "tabellas" OLD 6

Table 3: Inscriptions specified by type

Inscription number	Citation	Type of Object
1	1.24.7–8	treaty
2	2.41.10–11	dedicatory inscription accompanying statue
3	3.34.1–7	legal document / notice (ten tables)
4	3.37.4	legal document / notice (two tables added to ten tables)
5	3.57.10	legal document / notice (twelve tables)

6	4.8.4	legal documents / records
7	4.11.3–4	legal document / record (secret)
8	4.20.5–11	corselet
9	6.1.10	legal documents / treaties (twelve tables; also some kept secret)
10	6.4.2–3	golden bowls
11	6.27.6	legal documents / records
12	6.29.8–10	dedicatory inscription accompanying statue
13	7.17.12	legal document / notice (twelve tables)
14	7.20.8	truce record (tablet)
15	8.11.16	tablet (commemorative)
16	8.30.8–9	inscription on arms (prevented)
17	8.40.4–5	inscriptions accompanying *imagines*
18	9.34.6	legal document / notice (twelve tables)
19	9.46.2–3	writing tablets
20	9.46.5–6	legal notice; calendar / notice board
21	10.7.11–12	inscriptions accompanying *imagines*
22	22.31.11	inscriptions accompanying *imagines*

23	23.19.18	bronze plate / inscriptions accompanying statues
24	24.18.7	records
25	25.10.9–10	graffiti
26	26.24.14	treaty / alliance terms
27	26.25.13–15	funerary
28	26.36.11	public records
29	28.46.16	altar
30	29.37.7	records
31	30.45.7	inscriptions accompanying *imagines*
32	31.44.4–5	inscriptions (*nomina*) accompanying statues and *imagines* of Phillip
33	32.38.9	*tabulae novae* (cancellation of debts)
34	34.6.8	legal document/ notice (twelve tables)
35	34.61.14–15	tablet / notice
36	36.40.9	inscriptions accompanying *imagines*
37	38.35.4	dedicatory inscription accompanying golden chariot
38	39.37.16	decree / legal document
39	40.29.3–5	chests
40	40.52.4–7	tablet with inscription
41	41.28.8–10	tablet (commemorative)

42	42.12.6	treaty
43	42.13.9	*tabulae novae* (cancellation of debts)
44	45.12.4–5	tablet, decree / legal document (*senatus consultum*)

Table 4: Inscriptions accompanied by specific details about location

Inscription number	**Citation**	**Location**
5	3.57.10	"in publico"
8	4.20.5–11	temple of Jupiter Feretrius
10	6.4.2–3	Capitoline temple, in Jove's chamber before the feet of Juno
12	6.29.8–10	Capitoline temple, between *cellae* of Jupiter and Minerva
15	8.11.16	temple of Castor in Rome
20	9.46.5–6	"circa forum"
23	23.19.18	in forum at Praeneste; copies placed under statues in the temple of Fortune
25	25.10.9–10	on doors of houses
26	26.24.14	at Olympia and on Capitoline
29	28.46.16	temple of Juno Lacinia
35	34.61.14–15	Carthage; "celeberrimo loco" in the city, above the tribunal where the magistrates met
37	38.35.4	Capitoline
39	40.29.3–5	Janiculum

40	40.52.4–7	"supra valvas" of temple of *Lares permarini*; as well as another one "eodem exemplo" placed "supra valvas" of temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline
41	41.28.8–10	Temple of Mater Matuta
42	42.12.6	Thebes, Delium (in "augustissimo" and "celeberrimo" temple), and Delphi

Table 5: Inscriptions that appear to be quoted or paraphrased

Inscription number	**Citation**	**Indication of quotation / detailed description**
12	6.29.8–10	"his ferme incisa litteris fuit: 'Iuppiter atque divi omnes hoc dederunt, ut T. Quinctius dictator oppida novem caperet."
23	23.19.18	"cum titulo lamnae aeneae inscripto, M. Anicium pro militibus qui Casilini in praesidio fuerint votum solvisse."
27	26.25.13–15	"... adfigerentque humatis titulum: 'Hic siti sunt Acarnanes, qui adversus uim atque iniuriam Aetolorum pro patria pugnantes mortem occubuerunt.'"
35	34.61.14–15	"Scriptum erat Aristonem privatim ad neminem, publice ad seniores— ita senatum vocabant— mandata habuisse."
37	38.35.4	"consulum dedisse inscriptum est."

39	40.29.3–5	"Litteris Latinis Graecisque utraque arca inscripta erat, in altera Numam Pompilium Pomponis filium, regem Romanorum, sepultum esse, in altera libros Numae Pompilii inesse."
40	40.52.4–7	tabula cum hoc titulo fixa est: "Duello magno dirimendo, regibus subigendis, patrandae pacis causa haec pugna exeunti L. Aemilio M. Aemilii filio ... Auspicio imperio felicitate ductuque eius inter Ephesum Samnum Chiumque, inspectante eopse [*sic*] Antiocho, exercitu omni, equitatu elephantisque, classis regis Antiochi antehac invicta fusa contusa fugataque est, ibique eo die naves longae cum onmibus sociis captae quadraginta duae. Ea pugna pugnata rex Antiochus regnumque ... Eius rei ergo aedem Laribus permarinis vovit." [note: the ellipses indicate lacunae in the text, which is after Sage and Schlesinger 1957]
41	41.28.8–10	cum indice hoc posita est: "Ti. Semproni Gracchi consulis imperio auspicioque legio exercitusque populi Romani Sardiniam subegit ... iterum triumphans in urbem Romam redit. Cuius rei ergo hanc tabulam domum Iovi dedit."

Table 6: Inscriptions naming specific individuals or groups of individuals

Inscription number	Citation	Individual(s) named
2	2.41.10–11	Cassius
8	4.20.5–11	Cossus
10	6.4.2–3	Camillus
12	6.29.8–10	Titus Quinctius
15	8.11.16	Campanian *equites*
22	22.31.11	Fabius
23	23.19.18	Marcus Anicius
27	26.25.13–15	Acarnians
35	34.61.14–15	Aristo
36	36.40.9	Publius Scipio Nasica
37	38.35.4	Publius Cornelius (?) (Livy says that he erected it) [possibly Scipio Nasica; cf. Sage 1958: 115n4].
39	40.29.3–5	Numa
40	40.52.4–7	Lucius Aemilius, son of Marcus Aemilius; Antiochus
41	41.28.8–10	Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus

Bibliography

Texts and Editions

Apuleius. 1959. *Florida*. Helm, R., ed. Lipsiae: Teubner.

Callimachus. 1975. *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale, and Other Fragments / Musaeus: Hero and Leander.* Trypanis, C. A. and Gelzer, T., eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cato, M. P. 1980. *Vom Landbau. Fragmenta. Alle erhaltenen Schriften. Lateinisch-deutsch*. Schönberger, O., ed. Munchen: Heineran.

Catullus. 1958. *Carmina*. Mynors, R. A. B., ed. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Cicero. 1911. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Clark, A. C., ed. vols. 2. and 6. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Cicero. 1965. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae Manserunt Omnia Fasc. 44: Tusculanae Disputationes*. Pohlenz, M., ed. Stutgardiae: In Aedibus Teubneri.

Cicero. 2006. *De Re Publica, De Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*. Powell, J. G. F., ed. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Dio. 1924. *Dio's Roman History*. Cary, E., ed. vol. 7. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gellius, A. 1968. *Noctes Atticae*. vols. 1 and 2. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Hohl, E., ed. 1971. *Scriptores historiae augustae*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Horace. 1901. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Wickham, E. C. and Garrod, H. W., eds. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1974. *Ab Urbe Condita*. vol. 1. Ogilvie, R. M., ed. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*. vol. 2. Walters, C. F. and Conway, R. S., eds. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1929. *Ab Urbe Condita*. vol. 3. Walters, C. F. and Conway, R. S., eds. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1935. *Ab Urbe Condita*. vol. 4. Conway, R. S. and Johnson, S. K., eds. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1965. *Ab Urbe Condita*. vol. 5. McDonald, A. H., ed. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Livy. 1958. *Livy*. Sage, E. T., ed. vol. 10. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Livy. 1958. *Livy*. Sage, E. T., ed. vol. 11: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Livy. 1957. *Livy*. Sage, E. T. and Schlesinger, A. C., eds. vol. 12: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Livy. 2004. *History of Rome: Summaries, Fragments, Julius Obsequens*. Schlesinger, A. C. and Geer, R. M., eds.

Nepos, C. 1993. *Nepos, Life of Atticus*. Cynthia Damon, ed. Bryn Mawr, PA: Thomas Library, Bryn Mawr College.

Ovid. 1915. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri qvinqve, Ex Ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica; fragmenta*. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

Ovid. 1977. *Heroides; Amores*. Showerman, G. and Goold, G. P., eds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ovid. 1985. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*. Alton, E. H., Wormell, D. E. W., and Courtney, E., eds. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ovid. 1994. *Amores; Medicamina Faciei Femineae; Ars Amatoria; Remedia Amoris*. Kenney, E. J., ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Ovid. 2004. *Metamorphoses*. Tarrant, R. J., ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Pliny. 1956. *Natural History*. Rackham, H., ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Propertius. 2007. *Sexti Properti Elegos*. Heyworth, S. J., ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Propertius. 1999. *Propertius: Elegies*. Goold, G. P., ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Servius. 1884. *Servii Grammatici qvi fervntvr in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Thilo, G. and Hagen, H., eds. Lipsiae: Teubner.
Solinus. 1895. *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*. Mommsen, T., ed. Berolini: Weidemann.
Suetonius. 1958. *De Vita Caesarum Libi*. Ihm, M., ed. Stutgardiae: in aedibus G. B. Teubner.
Tibullus. 1915. *Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*. Postgate, J. P., ed. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
Velleius Paterculus. 1977. *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative (2.94–131)*. Woodman, A. J., ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Virgil. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera*. Mynors, R. A. B., ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Valerius Maximus. 1998. *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*. Briscoe, J., ed. Stutgardiae et Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri.
Varro. 1958. *On the Latin Language*. Kent, R. G., ed. vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Secondary Scholarship

Albrecht, M. von. 1989. *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius: Interpretive Studies*. Leeds: F. Cairns.
Alföldy, G. 1991. "Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation. Die Geburt der imperialen Epigraphik." *Gymnasium* 98: 289–324.
Alföldy, G. 1992. *Studi sull' epigrafia augustea e tiberiana di Roma*. Rome: Quasar.
Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Armstrong, H. H. 1910. *Autobiographic Elements in Latin Inscriptions*. London and New York: The MacMillan Company.
Austin, R. G. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Liber Primus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Austin, R. G. 1955. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bailey, C. 1935. *Religion in Virgil.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Baird, J. A. and Taylor, C. 2011. "Ancient Graffiti in Context: Introduction." In Baird, J. A. and Taylor, C., eds. *Ancient Graffiti in Context*. New York: Routledge.
Bakker, J. T. 2003. "Regio IV- Insula VIII- Santuario della Bona Dea IV, VIII, 3." *Ostia: Harbour City of Ancient Rome*. < http://www.ostia-antica.org/index.html>
Barchiesi, A. 1979. "Palinuro e Caieta: Due 'epigrammi' virgiliani (*Aen*. V. 870 sg.; VII. 1–4)." *Maia* 31: 3–11.
Barchiesi, A. 1993. "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*." *HSCP* 95: 333–36.

Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Trans. of Barchiesi, A. 1994. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovido e il discorso Augusteo*. Rome: Laterza].
Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. Fox, M. and Marchesi, S., ed. and trans. London: Duckworth.
Barchiesi, A. 2002. "Martial Arts. Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum: A Verbal Monument with a Vengeance." In Herbert-Brown, G., ed. *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–22.
Barsby, J. A., ed. 1973. *Ovid's Amores Book One*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Bayet, J., ed. 1954. *Histoire Romaine*. vol. 4. Paris: les Belles Lettres.
Benefiel, R. R. 2011. "Dialogues of Graffiti in the House of the Four Styles at Pompeii." In Baird, J. A. and Taylor, C., eds. *Ancient Graffiti in Context*. New York: Routledge. 20–48.
Bishop. 1948. "Augustus and A. Cornelius Cossus." *Latomus* 7: 187–91.
Bloch, H. 1962. "A Monument of the Lares Augusti in the Forum of Ostia." *HTR* 55.4: 211–23.
Bodel, J. 1994. "Trimalchio's Underworld." In Tatum, J., ed. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 237–59.
Bodel, J. 1997. "Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments." *JRA* 10: 5–35.
Bodel, J. 1999. "Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals." In Bergmann, B. and Kondoleon, C., eds. *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. Washington, D. C.: National Gallery of Art. 259–81.
Bodel, J., ed. 2001. *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History From Inscriptions*. New York: Routledge.
Bömer, F. 1969–1986. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
Booth, J. 1991. *Ovid: The Second Book of the Amores Edited with a Translation and Commentary by Joan Booth*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips.
Boyd, B. W. 1987. "The Death of Corinna's Parrot Reconsidered: Poetry and Ovid's 'Amores.'" *CJ* 82.3: 199–207.
Boyd, B. W. 1997. *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Boyd, B. W. 2012. "On Starting an Epic (Journey): Telemachus, Phaethon, and the Beginning of Ovid's Metamorphoses." *MD* 69: 101–18.
Bradley, K. R. 1994. *Slavery and Society at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bradley, M. 2002. "'It all comes out in the wash:' Looking Harder at the Roman *fullonica*." *JRA* 15: 20–44.
Breed, B. W. 2006. *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's Eclogues*. London: Duckworth.
Brenk, F. E. 1986. "Auorum spes et purpurei flores: The Eulogy for Marcellus in Aeneid VI." *AJP* 107: 218–28. [Reprinted in Brenk, F. E. 1986. *Clothed in Purple Light: Studies in Vergil and in Latin Literature, Including Aspects of Philosophy, Religion, Magic, Judaism, and the New Testament Background*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner. 76–86].
Bright, D. F. 1978. *Haec mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in His World*. Leiden: Brill.
Briscoe, J. 2008. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38–40*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Brouwer, H. H. J. 1989. *Bona Dea: The Sources and a Description of the Cult*. Leiden: Brill.

Buonocore, M. 2003. "Miscellanea epigraphica e Codicibus Bibliothecae Vaticanae. XVII." *Epigraphica.* 215–43.
Burck, E. 1971. "The third decade." In Dorey, T. A., ed. *Livy*. London: Routledge and K. Paul. 21–46.
Burton, P. 2000. "The Last Republican Historian: A New Date for the Composition of Livy's First Pentad." *Historia* 49.4: 429–46.
Cahoon, L. 1984. "The Parrot and the Poet: The Function of Ovid's Funeral Elegies." *CJ* 80: 27–35.
Cairns, F. 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Carlsson, G. 1945. "The Hero and Fate in Virgil's Aeneid." *Eranos* 43: 111–35.
Chaplin, J. 2000. *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Church, I. E. 1901. *Beiträge zur Sprache der lateinischen Grabschriften*. München: A. Buchholz.
Clausen, W. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *GRBS* 5: 181–96.
Clay, D. 1998. "The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 40: 9–40.
Coarelli, F. 1972. "Il sepolcro degli Scipioni." *DialArch* 6.1: 36–106.
Coarelli, F. 2007. *Rome and environs: an archeological guide*. Clauss, J. J. and Harmon, D. P. trans. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Commager, S. 1981. "Fateful Words: some conversations in Aeneid 4." *Arethusa* 14: 101–14.
Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Conte, G. B. 1994. *Genres and Readers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Conte. G. B. 2007. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cooley, A. E. 2009. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cooley, A. E. 2012. *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cupitò, C. 2001. "Riti funebri alle porte di Roma: la necropoli di Via Salaria." In Heinzelmann, M., Ortalli, J., Fasold, P., and Witteyer, M. eds. *Römischer Bestattungsbrauch und Beigabensitten in Rom, Norditalien und den Nordwestprovinzen von der späten Republik bis in die Kaiserzeit*. Weisbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert. 47–52.
Cupitò, C. 2007. "Il Territorio Nella Cartografia Storica e La Storia Degli Studi." In Cupitò, C., ed. *Il Territorio Tra La Via Salaria, L' Aniene, Il Tevere e La Via "Salaria Vetus": Municipio II*. Roma: "L' Erma" di Bretschneider. 37–187.
Cutolo, P. 1983–84. "Sugli aspetti letterari poetici e culturali della cosidetta laudatio Turiae." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Università di Napoli* 26: 33–65.
DeBrohun, J. B. 2003. *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Deininger, J. 1985. "Livius und der Prinzipat." *Klio* 67: 265–72.
Diggle, J., ed. 1970. *Euripides: Phaethon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dinter, M. 2005. "Epic and Epigram—Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *CQ* 55.1: 153–69.
Dinter, M. 2011. "Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Elegy." In Keith, A., ed. *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dinter, M. 2013. "Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Literature." In Liddel, P. and Low, P., eds. *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Due, Otto S. 1974. *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
Durry, M. and Lancel, S. 1992. *Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
Eck, W. 1984. "Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period." In Millar, F. and Segal, E., eds. *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. 129–68.
Eder, W. 1990. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire." In Raaflaub, K. A. and Toher, M., eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 71–122.
Edwards, C. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Elsner, J. 1996. "Inventing imperium: texts and the propaganda of monuments in Augustan Rome." In Elsner, J., ed. *Art and Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 32–53.
Erckell, H. 1952. *Augustus, Felicitas, Fortuna*. Götenborg: Elanders boktyrckeri aktiebolag.
Evangelisti, S. 2012. "*Laudatio* Funebre Per Una Donna." In Friggeri, R., Cecere, M. G. G. and Gregori, G. L., eds. *Terme di diocleziano: la collezione epigrafica*. Milano: Electa. 238–43.
Farrell, J. 1992. "Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13.719–897)." *AJP* 113: 235–68.
Faßbender, A. 2007. "Republikanische CLE aus Rom: eine Topographie." In Kruschwitz, P., ed. *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 169–98.
Favro, D. 1992. "'Pater urbis': Augustus as City Father of Rome." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. 51.1: 61–84.
Favro, D. 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Feeney, D. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California: Press.
Fehling, D. 1989. *Herodotus and his 'sources': citation, invention and narrative art*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
Fentress, E. 2000. "Introduction: Frank Brown, Cosa, and the Idea of a Roman City." In E. Fentress, ed. *Romanization and the City: Creation, Transformation, and Failures*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series Number 38. Portsmouth, Rhode Island. 9–24.
Flach, D. 1991. *Die sogennante Laudatio Turiae: Einleitung, Text, Ubersetzung und Kommentar*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Flower, H. I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Foster, B. O., ed. *Livy*. vol. 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Fowler, W. 1905. "On the New Fragment of the So-Called Laudatio Turiae." *CR* 19: 261–66.

Franklin, J. L. 1991. "Literacy and the parietal inscriptions of Pompeii." In Humphrey, J. H., ed. *Literacy in the Roman World*. JRA Supplement 3. Ann Arbor. 77–98.
Friggeri, R. 2001. *The Epigraphic Collection of the Museo Nazionale Romano at the Baths of Diocletian*. Milan: Electa.
Frisch, P. 1980. "Zu den Elogien des Augustusforums." *ZPE* 39: 93–98.
Gaertner, J. F. 2008. "Livy's Camillus and the Political Discourse of the Late Republic." *JRS* 98: 27–52.
Galinsky, K. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: an introduction to the basic aspects*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Galinsky, K. 1988. "The Anger of Aeneas." *AJP* 109.3: 321–48.
Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Ganzert, J. 1996. *Der Mars-Ultor Temple auf dem Augustusforum in Rom*. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern.
Gärtner, T. 2005. "Zur Bedeutung der mythologischen Erzählung über Daedalus und Icarus am Anfang des zweiten Buchs von Ovids "Ars Amatoria." *Latomus* 64.3: 649–60.
Gatti, G. 1905. "Sepolcri e memorie sepolcrali dell'antica via Salaria." *Bull. Com.* 33: 154–88.
Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Mnemosyne Supplements 295. Leiden: Brill.
Gibson, R. K., ed. 2003. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Giovagnoli, M. 2012. "L'Epitaffio in versi per una figlia." In Friggeri, R., Cecere, M. G. G. and Gregori, G. L., eds. *Terme di diocleziano: la collezione epigrafica*. Milano: Electa. 548–49.
Giraud, C. 1870. "L'éloge funèbre d'une dame romaine." *Journal des Savants*. 397–413, 515–23.
Gordon, A. E. 1968. "Notes on the Res Gestae of Augustus." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*. vol. 1. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 125–38.
Gordon, A. E. 1983. *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L., eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gowing, A. 1992. "Lepidus, the Proscriptions, and the Laudatio Turiae." *Historia* 41.3: 283–96.
Gowing, A. M. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gowing. A. M. 2013. "Afterword." In Farrell, J. and Nelis, D. P., eds. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Grant, M. 1970. *The Ancient Historians*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
Grant, M. 1995. *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*. London and New York: Routledge.
Green, P. 1982. "Carmen et Error: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the Matter of Ovid's Exile." *CA* 1.2: 202–20.
Green, P., ed. 1994. *Ovid: The Poems of Exile*. London: Penguin. [Revised edition 2005. Berkeley: University of California Press].
Griffin, J. 1985. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Grillo, L. 2010. "Leaving Troy and Creusa: Reflections on Aeneas' Flight." *CJ* 106.1: 43–68.
Gutzwiller, K. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Hardie, P. 1994. *Aeneid. Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hardie, P. 1995. "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean *Epos*." *CQ* 45: 204–14.
Hardie, P. 2002a. *Ovid' s Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hardie, P. 2002b. "Ovid and Early Imperial Literature." In Philip Hardie, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Harrison, S. 2002. "Ovid and genre: evolutions of an Elegist." In Hardie, P., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. 79–94.
Haselberger, L. and Therin, A. 2007. *Urbem Adornare: Die Stadt Rom und ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus*. *JRA* 64. Portsmouth.
Hesberg, H. von. 1996. "Mausoleum Augusti: Das Monument." In Steinby, E. M., ed. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. 234–37.
Heinze, R. 1915. *Virgils epische Technik*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
Heinze, R. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. *Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 71.7. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. [reprinted in R. Heinze. 1960. *Vom Geist des Römertums*. Burck, E., ed. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: G. B. Teubner. 308–403].
Heinze, R. 1993. *Virgil's Epic Technique*. Harvey, D., Harvey, H. and Robertson, F., trans. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Hemelrijk, E. A. 2004. "Masculinity and Femininity in the 'Laudatio Turiae.'" *CQ* 54.1: 185–97.
Hickson, F. V. 1991. "Augustus *Triumphator*: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Program of Augustus." *Latomus* 50: 124–38.
Hinds, S. E. 1985. "Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* I." *PCPS* 31: 13–32.
Hinds, S. E. 1987a. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hinds, S. E. 1987b. "Generalising About Ovid." *Ramus* 16: 4–31.
Hinds, S. 1992. "Arma in Ovid's Fasti Part 1: Genre and Mannerism." *Arethusa* 25.1: 81–112.
Hinds, S. 1992. "Arma in Ovid's Fasti Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome, and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 25.1: 113–153.
Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Hinds, S. E. 2003. "Ovid." In Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A., eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. rev. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1084–87.
Hinds, S. E. 2005. "Dislocations of Ovidian Time." In Schwindt, J. P., ed. *La représentstion du temps dans la poésie augustéenne / Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*. Heidelberg: Winter. 203–30.
Hintermeier, C. M. 1993. *Die Briefpaare in Ovids Heroides: Tradition und Innovation*. Palingenesia 41. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
Hirschfeld, O. 1913. *Kleine Schriften*. Berlin: Weidemann.
Hollis, A. S. 1970. *Ovid Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hollis, A. S. 1977. *Ars amatoria, book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hoogma, R. P. 1959. *Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina latina epigraphica. Eine Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrischtechnischen Grundsätze der Entlehnung.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
Horsfall, N. 1983. "Some Problems in the 'Laudatio Turiae.'" *BICS* 30: 85–98.
Horsfall, N. 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
Hunter, R. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jacobson, H. 1974. *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Jaeger, M. 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Jaeger, M. 2006. "Livy, Hannibal's Monument, and the Temple of Juno at Croton." *TAPA* 136.2: 389–414.
Jashemeski, W. F. and Meyer, F. G. 2002. *The Natural History of Pompeii*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jauss, H. R. 1982. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." In Nahti, T., trans. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Theory and History of Literature vol. 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kajava, M. 1995. "Some Remarks on the Erasure of Inscriptions in the Roman World (with Special Reference to the Case of Cn. Piso, cos. 7 BC). In Solin, H., Salomies, O. and Liertz, U.-M., eds. *Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsinigiae 3–6 sept. 1991 habiti* (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 104). Helsiki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
Kampen, N. B. 1981. "Biographical Narration and Roman Funerary Art." *AJA* 85: 47–58.
Kantiréa, M. 2007. *Les dieux et les dieux augustes. Le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens: études épigraphiques et archéologiques*. Athens: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaikēs Archaiotētos.
Keats-Shelley Memorial Association. 2005. *Keats and Italy: A History of the Keats-Shelley House in Rome*. Rome: Il Labrintino.
Keegan, P. 2011. "Blogging Rome: Graffiti as Speech-Act and Cultural Discourse." In Baird, J. A. and Taylor, C., eds. *Ancient Graffiti in Context*. New York: Routledge. 165–90.
Kellum, B. 1997. "Concealing / revealing: gender and the play of meaning in the monuments of Augustan Rome." In Habinek, T. and Schiesaro, A., eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 158–181.
Kennedy, D. 1984. "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's Heroides." *CQ* 34.2: 413–22.
Keppie, L. 1991. *Understanding Roman Inscriptions*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Kierdorf, W. 1980. *Laudatio Funebris: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede.* Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain.
Kleiner, D. E. 1992. *Roman Sculpture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Knight, J. 1944. *Roman Vergil*. London: Faber and Faber.
Knox, P. E. 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the traditions of Augustan poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
Knox, P. E. ed. 1995. *Ovid Heroides: Select Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kockel, V. 1995. "Forum Augustum." In Steinby, E. M., ed. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. vol. 2. 289–95.

Kraus, C. S. ed. 1994. *Livy Ab Urbe Condita Book VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kraus, C. S. and Woodman, A. J. 1997. *Latin Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kruschwitz, P. 1998. "Die Datierung der Scipionenelogien CLE 6 und 7." *ZPE* 122: 273–85.
Kroll, W. 1964. *Studien zum verstandnis der römischen literatur*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler. [2nd edition; first published in 1924].
Kruschwitz, P. 1999. "Zu 'Laudatio Turiae' 2, 6a." *ZPE* 126: 88–90.
Kruschwitz, P. 2001. "Zu einer chronologischer Präzision in Republikanischen Magistratsinschriften." *Epigraphica* 63: 154–57.
Kruschwitz, P. 2010. "Romanes eunt domus! Linguistic aspects of the subliterary Latin in Roman wall inscriptions." In Evans, T. V. and Obbink, D. D., eds. *The Language of the Papyri*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 156–70.
Kyriakidēs, S. 1998. *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid, the Frame of Book 6*. Bari: Levante editori.
Laird, A. 1997. "Approaching Characterization in Virgil." In Martindale, C., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 283–93.
Langslow, D. 2013. "Archaic Latin Inscriptions and Greek and Roman Authors." In Liddel, P. and Low, P., eds. *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 167–95.
Lattimore, R. 1942. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana-Champagne: University of Illinois Press. [Reprinted in 1962].
Lazenby, F. D. 1949. "Greek and Roman Household Pets." *CJ* 44.4: 245–52, 299–307.
Lemosse, M. 1950. "À propos de la <<laudatio>> dite de Turia." *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 28: 251–55.
Levene, D. S. 2010. *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Liddel, P. and Low, P. "Introduction: The Reception of Ancient Inscriptions." In Liddel, P. and Low, P., eds. *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–29.
Limón, C. 2012. "L'Epitaffio in Versi per una Faniculla." In Friggeri, R., Cecere, M. G. G., and Gregori, G. L., eds. *Terme di diocleziano: la collezione epigrafica*. Milano: Electa. 554–55.
Lindheim, S. H. 2003. *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Lissberger, E. 1934. *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den Carmina Epigraphica*. Tübingen: Druck der Buchdruckerei E. Göbel.
Luce, T. J. 1965. "The Dating of Livy's First Decade." *TAPA* 96: 209–40.
Luce, T. J. 1977. *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Luce, T. J. 1990. "Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum." In Raaflaub, K. A., Toher, M.,
and Bowersock, G. W., eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 123–38.
Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
MacInnes, J. 1910. "The Conception of *Fata* in the Aeneid." *CR* 24: 169–74.
MacMullen, R. 1982. "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire." *AJP* 103: 233–46.
Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Massaro, M. 1990. "Novità editoriali nel campo delle iscrizioni metriche latine." *Invigilata Lucernis* 12: 191–243.
Massaro, M. 2007. "Metri e rimi nella epigrafia latina di età repubblicana." In Kruschwitz, P., ed. *Die metrischen Inschriften der römischen Republik*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 121–68.
Massaro, M. 2008. "Questioni di Epigrafia Scipionica." *Epigraphica* 70: 31–90.
McKeown, J. C. 1984. "Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan Politics." In Woodman, A. J. and West, D., eds. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 169–87.
McKeown, J. C. 1987. *Ovid: Amores Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes*. vol. 1. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
McKeown, J. C. 1998. *Ovid: Amores Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes*. vol. 3. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
Mehl, A. 2011. *Roman Historiography: An Introduction to its Basic Aspects and Development*. Mueller, H., trans. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
Meiggs, R. 1960. *Roman Ostia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mensching, E. 1967. "Livius, Cossus und Augustus." *Museum Helveticum* 24: 12–32.
Mierow, C. C. 1934. "Hoc Monumentum Heredem Non Sequitur— An Interpretation." *TAPA* 65: 163–77.
Miles, G. B. 1995. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Milnor, K. 2009. "Literary Literacy in Roman Pompeii: The Case of Vergil's *Aeneid*." In Johnson, W. A. and Parker, H. N., eds. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 288–319.
Milnor, K. 2014. *Graffiti and the Literary Landscape of Roman Pompeii*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Moles, J. L. 2009. "Livy's Preface." In Chaplin, J. D. and Kraus, C. S., eds. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Livy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 49–87. [Reprint of Moles, J. L. 1993. "Livy's Preface." *PCPS*, n. s. 39: 141–68].
Moore, F. G. Ed. 1958. *Livy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Murray, W. M. and Petsas, P. M. 1989. *Octavian's Campsite Memorial for the Actian War*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
Myers, S. K. 1990. "Ovid's Tecta Ars: Amores 2.6, 'Programmatics and the Parrot.'" *EchCl* 34 n.s. 9: 367–74.
Myers, K. S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes. Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Nash, E. 1968. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London: Thames & Hudson.
Nelis-Clément, J., and Nelis, D. 2013. "*Furor Epigraphicus*: Augustus, the Poets, and the Inscriptions." In Liddel, P. and Low, P., eds. *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 317–47.
Nicoll, W. S. M. 1980. "Cupid, Apollo, and Daphne (Ovid *Met*. I. 452ff.)." *CQ* 30: 174–82.
Niebling, G. 1956. "Laribus Augustis Magistri Primi Der Beginn des Compitalkultes der Lares un des Genius Augusti." *Historia* 5.3: 303–31.
Ogilvie, R. M. 1958. "Livy, Licinius Macer, and the Libri Lintei." *JRS* 48: 40–46.
Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
O'Hara, J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Virgil's* Aeneid. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

O' Hara, J. 1996. "Vergil's Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay." *CJ* 91.3: 255–76. Reprinted in Knox, P. E., ed. 2006. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Ovid*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 100–22.
O'Hara, J. 1997. "Virgil's Style." In C. Martindale, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Otis, B. 1964. *Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Page, T. E. 1964. *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I–VI*. London: MacMillan & Co.
Parry, A. 1963. "The Two Voices of Virgil's 'Aeneid.'" *Arion* 2.4: 66–80.
Pascal, B. 1990. "The Dubious Devotion of Turnus." *TAPA* 120: 251–68.
Pavlock, B. 1998. "Daedalus in the Labyrinth of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.'" *CW* 92.2: 141–57.
Perkell, C. 1981. "On Creusa, Dido and the Quality of Victory in Virgil's *Aeneid*." In Foley, H. P., ed. *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers. 355–77. [Reprint of *Women's Studies* 8: 201–23].
Petrini, M. 1997. *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Virgil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Phillips, J. E. 2009. "Form and Language in Livy's Triumph Notices." In Chaplin, J. D. and Kraus, C. S., eds. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Livy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Platner, S. B. and Ashby, T. A. 1929. *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London: Humphrey Milford.
Pomeroy, A. J. 1988. "Livy's Death Notices." *G & R* 35.2: 172–83.
Pöschl, V. 1962. *The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*. Seligson, G. trans. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. [Trans. of Pöschl, V. 1950. *Die Dichtkunst Virgils; Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Wiesbaden: Rohrer.]
Purdie, A. B. 1935. *Latin Verse Inscriptions*. London: Christophers.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the Aeneid: Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1970. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1995. *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Putnam, M. C. J. 2000. *Horace's Carmen Saeculare: Ritual Magic and the Poet's Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Ramage, E. S. 1994. "The so-called Laudatio Turiae as Panegyric." *Athenaeum* 82: 341–70.
Ramsby, T. 2007. *Textual Permanence: Roman Elegists and the Epigraphic Tradition*. London: Duckworth.
Ramsby, T. 2005. "Striving for Permanence: Ovid's Funerary Inscriptions." *CJ* 100.4: 365–91.
Rawson, B. 2002. "The Express Route to Hades." In McKechnie, P., ed. *Thinking like a lawyer: essays on legal history and general history for John Crook on his eightieth birthday*. Boston: Brill. 271–88.
Rawson, B. 2003. *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Reed, J. D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Richardson, L., jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Rosenberg, A. 1921. *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur römischen Geschichte*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Rowell, H. T. 1940. "The Forum and Funeral Imagines of Augustus." *MAAR* 17: 131–43.
Rutgers, J. 1618. *Iani Rutgersii Variarum Lectionum Libri Sex*. Lugdunum Batavorum: ex Officinâ Elzeviriana.
Sailor, D. 2006. "Dirty Linen, Fabrication, and the Authorities of Livy and Augustus." *TAPA* 136.2: 329–88.
Saller, R. and Shaw, B. 1984. "Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers, and Slaves." *JRS* 74: 124–56.
Sandys, J. E. 1927. *Latin Epigraphy*, 2nd ed. rev. by S. G. Campbell. Cambridge.
Scheid, J. 2007. *Res gestae divi Augusti = Hauts faits du devin Auguste*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Scott, K. 1925. "The Identification of Augustus With Romulus-Quirinus." *TAPA* 56: 82–105.
Smith, A. 2005. *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Stein, A. 1931. *Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur*. Prague: Taussig.
Stübler, G. 1941. *Die Religiosität des Livius*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
Susini, G. 1988. "Compitare per via: antropologia del lettore antico: meglio, del lettore Romano / Spelling out along the road: Anthropology of the ancient reader, or rather, the Roman reader." *Alma Mater Studiorum* 1: 105–24. [Reprinted in Susini 1997: 193–7].
Syme, R. 1959. "Livy and Augustus." *HSCP* 64: 27–28.
Tagliamonte, G. 1996. “Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, Aedes, Templum (Fino All’ A 83 A. C.). In Steinby, E. M., ed. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. vol. 3. Roma: Edizioni Quasar. 144–48.
Tarrant, R. 2002. "Ovid and Ancient Literary History." In Hardie, P., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13–33.
Taylor, L. R. 1918. "Livy and the Name Augustus." *CR* 32: 158–61.
Thomas, R. F. 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the art of reference." *HSCP* 90: 171–98.
Thomas, R. F. 1990. "Ideology, Influence, and Future Studies in the *Georgics*." *Vergilius* 66: 64–70.
Thomas, R. F. 1997. "The Isolation of Turnus: 'Aeneid" Book 12." In Stahl, H.-P., ed. *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. 271–302.
Thomas, R. F. 1998. "Melodious Tears: Sepulchral Epigram and Generic Mobility." In Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker, eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen: Forsten. 205–23.
Thomas, R. F. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, R. F. 2011. *Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Toynbee, J. M. C. 1961. "The 'Ara Pacis Augustae.'" *JRS* 51: 153–56.
Toynbee, J. M. C. 1971. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Toynbee, J. M. C. 1973. *Animals in Roman Life and Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.
Trillmich, W. and Zanker, P., eds. 1990. *Stadtbild und Ideologie. Die Monumentalisierung hispanicher Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit.* Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Trout, D. 2013. "*Fecit ad astra viam*: Daughters, Wives, and the Metrical Epitaphs of Late Ancient Rome." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21: 1–25.
Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1987. "Time for Augustus." In Bramble, J. C., Whitby, M., Hardie, P., Whitby M., eds. *Homo viator: classical essays for J. Bramble*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. 221–30.
Walsh, P. G. 1961. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walter, U. 2004. *Memoria und res publica zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom.* Frankfurt: Verlag Antike.
Weber. W. 1936. *Princeps; Studien zur Geschichte des Augustus.* Stuggart: W. Kohlhammer.
Weinstock, S. 1960. "Pax and the 'Ara Pacis.'" *JRS* 50: 44–58.
Weissenborn, W. and Müller, M., eds. 1880–1911. *Titi Liui ab urbe condita libri*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Wheeler, S. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphosis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Wickkiser, B. L. 1999. "Famous Last Words: Putting Ovid's Sphragis Back into the *Metamorphoses*." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 42: 113–42.
Williams, G. D. 1994. *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Williams, G. W. 1983. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Williams, R. D. 1972. *Virgil: Aeneid Books I–VI*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
Wistrand, E. 1976. *The So-Called Laudatio Turiae. Introduction, text, translation, commentary*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
Woodman, A. J. 1974. "*Exegi monumentum*: Horace, *Odes* 3. 30." In Woodman, A. J. and West, D. eds. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. London: Cambridge University Press. 115–28, 151–56.
Woolf, G. 1996. "Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire." *JRS* 86: 22–39.
Yardley, J. C. 1996. "Roman Elegy and Funerary Epigram." *EMC* 40: 267–73.
Zachos, K. L. 2003. "The *tropaeum* of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim-report." *JRA* 16: 64–92.
Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Shapiro, A., trans. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Zevi, F. 1968. "Brevi Note Ostiensi." *Epigraphica* 30: 81–95.
Zevi, F. 1993. "Sepulcrum (Corneliorum) Scipionum." In Steinby, E. M., ed. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. vol. 4. Roma: Edizioni Quasar. 281–85.
Ziolkowski, A. 1988. "Mummius' Temple of Hercules Victor and the Round Temple on the Tiber." *Phoenix* 42. 4: 309–33.