

ARS AND THE MAN: THE POLITICS
OF ART IN VIRGIL'S *AENEID*

SHADI BARTSCH

IT IS BY NOW A TRUISM to remark that Turnus' sudden death in the *Aeneid*'s last moments closes the epic with a dramatic illustration of Virgil's fascination with the human passions and their control. We could even say that the control of self and control over others are the twin goals of the poem's ideological trajectory towards the foundation of Rome, however disturbing it may seem that the *Aeneid*'s final spasm of fury undermines the one kind of control in the interest of violently accomplishing the other. Such issues of control and its breakdown into violence are nothing if not ideological here, and they have drawn the question of art into their orbit as well. Virgil's most famous *ecphrases*—Daedalus' relief, the temple of Juno, Aeneas' shield and Pallas' belt—all seem to play into an ideology that leaves us with a binary opposition between control and violence, and with other such oppositions—truth versus deception, empire versus chaos—in which one alternative, whatever its costs, implicitly asks to be valorized over the other.

Part of my project in this paper is to show just how the artworks of the *Aeneid* participate in this economy of values that sets control and containment against the consequences of an impassioned violence. This attribute of the Virgilian artwork is counterbalanced, however, by its repeated failure to fulfill such a task: unable to restrain violence, the artwork literally lets it spill out, like a troop of murderous Greek warriors issuing from the carved cavity of a wooden horse's womb. These two interpretive possibilities for the artifacts of the *Aeneid* (that is, the containment versus the release of violence) have had consequences for the poem itself as a piece of art, so that some readers have concluded pessimistically about Virgil's own poem that it, too, must participate in such a failure—as the Harvard school of critics identified by W. R. Johnson would say. Others have concluded optimistically that art has a powerful shaping role in the foundation of order, even if it must remain backstage to the real tools by which this is accomplished—and here I hear Aeneas' father Anchises, the architect of empire, cheering in the background, with a chorus of the so-called continental critics providing

This paper was delivered as the George B. Walsh Memorial Lecture at the University of Chicago. I would like to thank the Classics Department for all their kindness on this occasion, and for the discussion session that followed the paper.

Classical Philology 93 (1998): 322–342

[© 1998 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved] 0009-837X/98/9304-0003\$02.00

harmonic backup. My argument here, however, will be that art ultimately transcends these seductive but limiting readings of the poem, directing us to a place beyond such oppositions, and with refreshing implications for Virgil's own artistic masterpiece.

Book 1's first simile already introduces Virgil's thematic attention to the control of violence in the statesman simile of *Aeneid* 1.148–53, when Aeolus' winds rage furiously over the waters: as Neptune quells the winds and banishes them back to their imprisoning cave, he is compared to the man who soothes and controls the bestial mob with his *pietas* and his oratory (1.148–53):

ac veluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est
seditio saevitque animis ignobile vulgus
iamque faces et saxa volant, furor arma ministrat;
tum, pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem
conspexere, silent arrectisque auribus astant;
ille regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet.

The mob, like the winds themselves, must be checked and contained;¹ but as the orator speaks and the calming words fall from his lips, this confinement is accomplished at least in part with art, with skill in language, and not with a literal detention behind the walls of a prison—that is, the *clauso ventorum carcere* of the winds in 1.141. As a result, this simile linking oratory and incarceration is not only an example of what M. Putnam (1965, 60) has called “Vergil's fascination with the potentiality of violence, usually depicted through imagery of enclosure and release”; it is also one possible claim for the role of the arts in the world of politics. Is it art that soothes the savage beast?

Oratory is, of course, one of the *artes* Anchises speaks of in Book 6, where he is quite happy to concede future superiority in this and the plastic arts to the Greeks—a point I shall return to later in this paper. But the comparison of this particular *ars* to incarceration draws our attention to a much larger pattern: for when we turn to consider the other arts of the *Aeneid*, we find that the artwork regularly seems to work as a tool for the confinement of violence, just as we also find that often it is precisely the failure of that artistic confinement that leads to disaster for the epic's protagonists. For one, it is surely no coincidence that Aeolus originally restrains his winds with terms that recall the vocabulary of sculpting and painting (1.57): *mollit . . . animos et temperat iras*. *Tempero* is used for the mixing of paints and alloys, while *mollius* is a technical term in Roman art and criticism and also occurs in Anchises' description of Greek skill with bronze sculpture (6.847): *excudent alii spirantia mollius aera*,² so that it is not impossible to

1. On the imagery that links winds, mob, horses, and the figure of Furor, see the excellent study of Putnam 1965, 5–26. My debt to Putnam looms large in my consideration of this topic, inasmuch as the notion of furor and its containment has been the focus of much of his work on Virgil. On the Gigantomachic allusions in the description of Aeolus' winds, see Hardie 1986, 90–91.

2. See Hine 1987, 180 on *mollius*. Cf. also Vitruvius 4.14.2, Pliny *HN* 7.197, 34.97, *OLD* s.v. 6a, etc.

see a hint of Aeolus as a wielder of artistic skill as he checks and restrains the outburst of violent forces.³

Elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, this connection between art and the containment of forces detrimental to human society is taken up again in far less tenuous terms, and the association becomes literal rather than metaphorical. This is most obviously so in the description of the Trojan Horse, built by *divina Palladis arte*,⁴ filled to teeming with the furor of soldiers whom it contains and thus keeps back from deeds of violence until it, the horse, is breached and opened; its brood of Greeks slither down their rope to sack the city of Troy and murder Priam at the very altar. And the horse as a symbol for the artistic confinement of violence is an image doubly repeated on the doors of the temple of Cumaean Apollo: once in the figure of Pasiphae's cow, devised by Daedalian art literally to contain that particularly feminine species of furor, uncontrollable lust (see 6.24–26)⁵—when the cow's integrity is breached by the amorous bull, the results are, to say the least, destructive of normative social relations⁶—and, of course, secondly in the image of the labyrinth itself,⁷ built again by Daedalus to contain the outcome of Pasiphae's bovine indiscretion—that is, the Minotaur and his own hardly civilized snacks of choice Athenian youth.⁸ Indeed, if we turn to look at the most famous image of “furor contained” in Virgil's poem, a clever play on words points us in exactly the same direction. This is the description of Furor personified, who, with hands behind back, is finally confined in Augustus' day behind the gates of Janus (1.293–96):⁹

dirae ferro et compagibus artis
claudentur Belli portae: Furor impius intus
saeva sedens super arma et centum vinctus aenis
post tergum nodis frement horridus ore cruento.

Translators take *compagibus artis* to refer to the tightly joined frame of the gates of war, but *artis*, by dint of its metrically ambiguous position at line end, which renders its last syllable either long or short, also cries out

3. Putnam 1995b, 81 has anticipated the parallel I am drawing here without benefit of a detour through the idea of the *textum*: “Both cow and horse . . . can, even should, be viewed as Vergil's epic can be read.” But his conclusions on “terrible truths” hiding under idealized veneers are considerably more pessimistic than mine will be.

4. *Aen.* 2.15; and also by Ulyssean art: *artisque Pelasgae*, 2.106.

5. For the *Aeneid*'s representation of ἔφος as furor, see Hardie 1986, 163–65, Lyne 1987, 14–19 and Putnam 1995a.

6. Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 140–41 and Putnam 1995b, 81 well point out the similarities between cow and horse: both wooden, both with human life within, both built by artisans with the help of Athena, both marvelous to look at, both deceptive for the viewer. See also Doob 1990, 230–31 on the similarities between the Trojan Horse and the Cretan labyrinth: both representing *dolus*, both built by Greeks, both *textum*, both prisons.

7. On the labyrinth as artwork, see Doob 1990, 66–72: “the labyrinth generally functions *in bono* as a sign of complex visual or verbal artistry in the classical and early Christian periods” (66). On the Virgilian version of the Cretan labyrinth, see Boyle 1986, 136–42, Doob 1990, 25–33, Enk 1958, Fitzgerald 1984, Miller 1995, Paschalis 1986, Pöschl 1975, Putnam 1995b, Rutledge 1967 and 1971–72, and Zarker 1967.

8. On the labyrinth as symbol for the containment of the forces that threaten society, see Miller 1995, 234; W. F. J. Knight 1967, 204 and 207; Fitzgerald 1984, 56–60. Note that at *Georgics* 4.179 the bees, model for an orderly society, are housed in the *daedala tecta* of their hives.

9. On the close ties between the confinement of Aeolus' winds and the confinement of Furor, see Hardie 1986, 93.

for another interpretation: we cannot rule out a possible (even if only temporary, as readers readjust their expectations) reading of this form as not the ablative of *artus*, but the genitive of *ars*. The suggestion is that Furor, trussed up as he is behind the *belli portae*, is like the Greek soldiers, who are themselves *inclusi* (2.45, 258) behind *compagibus* (2.51); he is like the cooped-up Pasiphae, like the Minotaur in his labyrinth, like the mob to whom *furor arma ministrat* (1.150)—because all of these figures are similarly held back by the literal or metaphorical bonds of art. But of course, Furor is not yet held back by these bonds: the image is a prediction and not yet a reality in Aeneas' own time. What Jupiter's statement cunningly and optimistically hints at is that art's civilizing influence, by and in the time of Augustus, will effectively check the human impulse to yield to those forces that rend the fabric of society.¹⁰

This idea was not unfamiliar in the Augustan period. It occurs most strikingly in the idealized figure of the Augustan *vates*, who, in an adoption of the older Greek idea, was cast as a force with the potential to calm and contain man's more violent instincts.¹¹ The notion that "the poet has a serious contribution to make to the program of his society, and that poetry and music have a regulatory and civilizing effect" (Hardie 1986, 16)¹² is topical in the Augustan poets who would benefit from it. Horace for one assigns such responsibility to the *vates* in the *Ars Poetica*, where, in a passage on the poets of old, he reminds his readers that Orpheus taught wild men not to kill each other, Amphion built city walls with music, and in general poetry was responsible for taming human violence and sexual furor with its civilizing verses (*Ars P.* 396–99):

fuit haec sapientia quondam,
publica privatis secernere, sacra profanis,
concubitu prohibere vago, dare iura maritis,
oppida moliri, leges incidere ligno.

And if in the *Eclogues*, Virgil himself is pessimistic about the potential of this ideal poet-teacher to actually effect spiritual rebirth in post-civil war Rome, there are many readers for whom the didactic efficacy of the *Georgics* seems a conversion to a more optimistic point of view on the political power of poetry to civilize and instruct.¹³

If we return to the *Aeneid* itself, however, the *compages artis* (if I may continue the pun) are, of course, spectacularly unsuccessful in carrying out such a program, and, indeed, are often designed to further the interests of violence even as they literally hold it in. The horse, the cow, the

10. This complex of ideas, together with the *Lusus Troiae* and the Cretan labyrinth, seems to be linked to the ancient notion of circle magic. See Knight 1967, 110–11 on the walls of Troy and their breaching by the Trojan Horse, and the interesting observations on Roman walls, circles, and the shield of Aeneas in Hardie 1986, 190, 199–200, and 364–67; on new city walls in the Augustan period, see Zanker 1988, 328.

11. See J. K. Newman 1967.

12. See also Hardie's discussion of the Muses at Pind. *Pyth.* 1.13ff. (1986, 86), and the comments of Rutledge 1971–72, 115 on Daedalus as a provider of order and definition. (This is not to suggest that poets are never depicted as disruptive and untruthful, of course.)

13. For a sensitive discussion of these issues in Virgil, see Boyle 1986. The idea of the poet-teacher receives its most famous treatment in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, of course.

labyrinth are all breached, and the horse in particular abets the violent destruction of a city. This paradoxical failure of art to contain relies on the deception of the viewer (whether human or quadruped) in Virgil's text and points to concerns inherent in ancient notions of the workings of art. After all, in its mimetic striving, art is always already tainted with the dubious activity of evoking real human responses to unreal representations, a problem that loomed large for critics from Plato onward.¹⁴ Elsewhere in the poem, the Pelasgian arts of the trick horse are matched by Sinon's deceptive speech, also the product of *arte Pelasga* (2.152; also 2.195),¹⁵ and oratory in general fares ill as the self-interested product of skill in deception, what Turnus scornfully calls *artificis scelus* as he shoots down Drances at 11.407. We are all familiar with G. Highet's early observation that Virgilian speakers are masters of distortion (1972, 287–90); more recently, D. Feeney (1983, 216–18) has well pointed out the poem's association of *figere* in its negative connotations with human speech. Even ivory, the material for much Virgilian and Augustan art, is rich with possibilities for deception of a particularly artistic kind. There is no denying that Aeneas' exit from the Underworld through the ivory gates of false dreams casts an ominous pall over the *Aeneid*'s own artistic message and in particular over the ideologically laden scenes in the Underworld.¹⁶ Only the statesman simile stands as an exception to this cluster of problematic images.

This interplay of the features of deception and containment as the two sides of the artwork's potential, one good, the other bad, is best represented in the twin purposes of Daedalus' labyrinth on the gates of the Temple of Cumaean Apollo.¹⁷ Built to keep in the Minotaur, product of female sexual furor, the labyrinth has recently drawn critical attention for its symbolic function as a kind of container, "an image of the attempt to domesticate the chaotic powers associated with passion and the feminine" (Miller 1995, 228); it is also, of course, the perfect figure for human deception, a blind path of error and trickery (*parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque/mille viis . . . dolum* [5.589–90]). Let me add, too, that the description of the lab-

14. And even in the *Aeneid*, perhaps the *vivos vultus* and *spirantia mollius aera* of the Greek statuary to which Anchises refuses to lay claim are so called to emphasize that the deceptively lifelike products of such art are no worthy goal for Roman strivings (6.847–49; despite Vitruvius 7.5.4, "Neque enim picturae probari debent, quae non sunt similes veritati"). On this passage, see Feeney 1986, 14, Hine 1987, 179ff., Jenkins 1985, 68–69, Johnson 1976, 108, Lyne 1987, 214–16, Smith 1981, 28–29, and G. Williams 1983, 209. As several of these critics have pointed out, the paradox of denying artistic achievement to the Romans at the center of this great work of art is made all the more prominent by the Ennian echoes at 6.841–46. On these parallels, see especially Wigodsky 1972. But as Johnson would read this passage, it casts doubt "on the value and validity of the artistic process" (1976, 108) and so undermines the very ideological passage in which it is contained.

15. For parallels between Sinon and Furor, see Putnam 1965, 17.

16. And it is worth noting that the most famous mythical carver in ivory is of course Pygmalion, whose creation was lifelike enough that he could fall in love with it: here too, as Ovid tells the story, the living aspect of artistic creation is its most problematic aspect—and the one the Virgilian Anchises abjures in his famous lines of Book 6. On the linkage of ivory and deception in the Greco-Roman literary tradition, with an interesting discussion of Ovid's Pygmalion, see Elsner 1991, 162–64 and Hexter 1990, 123–24.

17. Paschalis (1986) in comparing the epiphraze of the temple doors to the similar description of the peplos in Catullus 64, points out that Virgil differs from his Catullan precedent in his attention to Daedalus and his inventions, Pasiphae and her bull, and the birth of the Minotaur: in other words, in precisely those details that draw attention to the themes of furor, art, and containment.

labyrinth and its dual function here have implications for Virgil's own text, in particular through the poet's use of the term *textum* and its concomitant idea of weaving. This term is used in the *Aeneid* of several of the artworks we have considered: the labyrinth (*parietibus textum caecis iter* [5.590]), the Trojan Horse (2.186), and Aeneas' shield (8.625, to be discussed later). It also occurs in the description of the *Lusus Troiae* at 5.577–95. Scholars have shown that this game of labyrinthine weavings, whose practitioners weave (*texunt* [5.593]) their paths, finds its probable etymology not in *Troia* but in *truia*, a word synonymous with Greek κρόκη and Latin *subtemen*, or woof.¹⁸ Moreover, it is possible, as J. Scheid and J. Svenbro (1996, 47) speculate in *The Craft of Zeus*, that this “woof game” serves to symbolically enact “the confrontations that menace the entire community” and in so doing, to check and contain them, to “produce the solid fabric of a city in harmony with itself.”¹⁹ As such, it would be yet another kind of woven or interwoven artifact—here a cultural institution rather than an actual object—designed to control the human potential for furor that forms so overt a concern in this poem.²⁰

To add to the significance of this term, the several contexts of this word *textum* render inadequate the simple translation “woven.” Those who view the *textum* of the labyrinth, as it appears for a second time in the epic on the doors of the temple at Cumae, are said to read it: *perlegerent* (6.34).²¹ The poet himself, confronting the *textum* of Aeneas' shield, calls it *non enarrabile* (8.625): it can't be narrated. This, although narrating and reading are qualities applied to “texts” in the English sense, not to woven or interwoven materials. It begins to seem that *texere* can evoke the written text.²² Although such a usage of the word in its nominal form, *textus*, is first attested in Quintilian *Inst.* 9.4.13, Scheid and Svenbro (1996, 138–45) have pointed out that already in Cicero and in the poet of the *Ciris* the verb *texere* is used

18. For the most recent discussion of the *Lusus Troiae* and the meaning of *truia*, see Scheid and Svenbro 1996, 41–49. For links between the *Lusus Troiae* and the labyrinthine dance Theseus was said to have established at Delos, see *ibid.*, 101–4.

19. On the *Lusus Troiae* as a ritual symbolizing the containment of the forces that threaten society, see Miller 1995, 235–39; Scheid and Svenbro 1996, 47. For its labyrinthine qualities, see Doob 1990, 26–30, 235–36. The seminal discussion of the Troy game in Knight 1967, 202–14 links it to the notions of shutting, inclusion, and protection that I have been associating with the artwork (like the Cretan maze, 188–201), specifically in the context of funerary and initiation rituals. Knight's treatment enables interesting parallels between the containing power of art and that of the “magic circle” (as of city walls): both fail when breached. The Trojan Horse, according to some versions of the legend, required the destruction of part of Troy's walls before it could enter the city.

20. The discussion in Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 40ff. of the Greek word δαίδαλος reinforces the connection I have been making between the work of that artisan and the idea of the *textum*: after Homer, the adjective commonly refers to textiles and is linked to artifice and deception; it is also found modifying defensive weapons (e.g., shields). The verb δαίδαλλω can refer to the creation of the poetic text itself; see especially Pindar *Ol.* 1.29, δεδαυδαμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι, and other texts at Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 73.

21. An unusual enough usage that Servius sees fit to explain it away by analogy to the Greek γράφαι. See also Leach 1988b, 309: “The fact remains that Latin did not customarily substitute *scribere* for *pingere* even though, conversely, *pingere* was a standard rhetorical designation for ornamental or highly colored speech.” (However, I obviously disagree with her claim that the use of the verb here is “no more than a simple syntagmatic substitution. . . . Vergil speaks of ‘reading’ these pictures because they depict a story.”)

22. See Cic. *Amic.* 9.21.1, *Leg.* 1.3.9, *Q Fr.* 3.5, *Cael.* 8.18.

of the author's act of writing—and Virgil's *textum* is, after all, a past participle in derivation.

Can the “woven” art of horse, labyrinth, and shield, with all their problematics of containment and deception, evoke the *textum* of the *Aeneid*?²³ Certainly Servius has no problem labeling the poem as such when he comments on the “totius libri textum” of Book 7 (*ad* 7.601), and the analogy between text and *textum* gains strength from Varro's fanciful etymology of *vates* from “a versibus viendis,” from the weaving of verse.²⁴ Indeed, a common ecphrastic motif is the woven tapestry or πέπλος that represents the poem that contains it: the best-known examples are the tapestry that Ovid's Arachne weaves in her competition with Minerva in *Metamorphoses* 6—a tapestry that features divine rapes and metamorphoses—and the πέπλος that Helen weaves in *Iliad* 3, a robe on which is represented the content of the *Iliad* itself, the fighting of the horse-taming Trojans and the bronze-clad Achaeans.²⁵

The *Aeneid* and the labyrinthine artworks it contains, then, seem to point to each other as parallel texts;²⁶ as Miller (1995, 234) would put it, the labyrinth “is analogous to the symbolic itself, the social realm of language and ideology.” The poem thus announces its status as the counterpart of the very forms of art it presents for readerly viewing.²⁷ But where does the poetry of the *Aeneid*, Virgil's own artistic *textum*, fit in relation to the complicated workings of both control and deception so characteristic of the *Aeneid*'s artworks?²⁸ Is it, too, like the *Lusus Troiae*, a *textum* that is meant to reenact and thus reject civic sedition? Does it, too, strive to “contain” violence (in the sense of checking it) by “containing” it (in the sense of representing it?). Or does it reduce us to error and *ambages*, as we read it without benefit of Theseus' unraveling thread? Does it underline the impossibility of art's ever checking political violence, even as it ends with the paradigmatic example of such violence? Is it thus, as M. Putnam has called it, a beautiful but deceptive artifact, one that would lull us into a false sense of security about the possibilities for its role in society were it not for the

23. Doob 1990, 228 would compare the *textus* of the poem itself to a labyrinth; see also at p. 246 for a discussion of the “labyrinthine aesthetic” of the *Aeneid*, marked as it is by ambiguity, wanderings, temporal windings, and complex symmetries.

24. “Antiquos poetas vates appellabant a versibus viendis,” *LL* 7.36. See discussion in Hardie 1986, 20, with application to Lucretius.

25. On the tapestries of Arachne and Minerva as “mirrors of the poem itself,” see Leach 1988a, 106. Thomas 1983, 179 has remarked that the ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield places the item featured in the middle of the work of art in the middle of the description itself and concludes that “this practice establishes an approximation between the work of art and the poem in which it appears.” Exactly, and all the more so since the shield, like the poem, is *textum*. See also his perceptive comments on the *peplum* at the center of the reliefs on the Temple of Juno, 180–81, and on Helen's πέπλος at *Iliad* 3.125–27. For similar comments on Catullus 64, see, e.g., Scheid and Svenbro 1996, 106 and Thomas 1983.

26. Art as text: consider also the Trojan Horse, whose makers *intextunt* . . . *costas* (2.16). More generally, of course, parallels between literary and artistic style were common in the ancient world: see, e.g., Hor. *Ars P.*, Dion. Hal. *On the Ancient Orators* and discussion in Zanker 1988, 247–48.

27. The analogy between text and labyrinth was explicit in the Middle Ages, as Doob 1990, 192–221 illustrates. For her treatment of the theme in Virgil, see 227–53 and 30.

28. I am not the first to ask this question: see Biow 1994, Johnson 1976, 99–114, O'Higgins 1995, Putnam 1995b, Segal 1981, Vance 1973a, all with essentially pessimistic answers. As Johnson says (1976, 100), “Vergil's judgment on the nature and function of art is not unlike his judgment on the nature and function of history: it comforts, yes, in a sense; but it also deceives and betrays.”

failure of art's power over nature that the poem depicts in its last lines?²⁹ What role, in short, does the *Aeneid* claim for art?

Now, there are many ways in which we can certainly read Virgil's poem as such a gesture towards the civilizing political function of the narrative artwork—as itself an artifact that is designed to check the impulse to violence, a production, in other words, of an idealized and idealizing *vates* of the Augustan period. I do not want to rehearse this well-worn theme at great length, especially since P. Hardie's important study on the Gigantomachic themes in the poem has well illustrated the way in which much of the poetry of the *Aeneid* is systematically associated with the restoration of order and the quelling of non-Olympian forces: from the storm in Book 1 to Aeneas' shield, the Hercules and Cacus episode, and the epic's final scene, Virgil repeatedly exploits the tradition of political Gigantomachic imagery to allude to the Augustan establishment of order after the furor of the civil wars (Hardie 1986, 85–158). The ideologically laden passages of Books 6 and 8, too, can easily invite—and often have—interpretation along similar lines. The so-called parade of Roman heroes that Anchises interprets for his viewing son in Book 6 summons up the great names of the Roman past to spur Aeneas to the foundation of empire; perhaps not coincidentally, the parade itself can lay claim to the status of art. Here as elsewhere in the poem, Aeneas is “a beholder of a sequence of images” (Johnson 1976, 107–8),³⁰ while his father is cast in the role of the interpreter of these images. The parade recalls the similar processions to be seen on Roman monumental friezes.³¹ And the north and south hemicycles of the Forum of Augustus featured statues of many of the same Roman heroes: the great Julii by the Temple of Mars Ultor, and in the opposite colonnade, Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Appius Claudius Caecus, and others, all with tituli giving their names and their services to the state.³² Virgil's parade of heroes, like the statuary of the Forum, seems devoted to aestheticizing the violence of Roman history through the restraining lens of epic patterns of thought. Not coincidentally, D. Feeney (1986) has shown that Virgil's underworld eschatology in this parade innovates significantly in the direction of the values of earthly rather than otherworldly life; that is, the parade attempts to give politics and history value in the face of, and in contradiction to, the meta-physical implications of the cycle of souls. Aeneas may protest that a return to earth seems unappealing, the Scipio in Cicero's version of the cycle

29. Putnam 1995b, 90: “The conclusion of the *Aeneid*, then, doubly uncloaks the deceptiveness of art. Aeneas cannot fulfill his father's idealizing, and therefore deceptive, vision of Rome, and Vergil, the artisan of his tale, cannot show him as so doing. Aeneas' final killing of Turnus differs from Daedalus' loss of Icarus essentially for being active instead of passive. Each demonstrates nature's final, Pyrrhic, triumph over art.”

30. On parallels between Anchises' speech and the shield of Achilles, see Hardie 1986, 70.

31. The comparison is commonly made: see R. D. Williams 1964, 59.

32. Zanker 1988, 201 and 211. See esp. his bibliography in n. 12 and the discussion at pp. 210–13. Apparently Augustus later based plans for the *imagines* at his own funeral on the arrangements in the forum and in *Aen.* 6. Hine 1987, 177–78 also links this parade to Roman statues and portrait masks, and argues that “it is plausible to assume that the parade of heroes would have reminded Vergil's readers of such native traditions of art. These traditions are later more clearly recalled by the wooden statues of ancestors that stood in Latinus' palace.” On the question of the relative dates of *Aen.* 6 and the erection of the statues in the Forum, see DeGrassi 1945, 88–103 and Zanker 1988, 213.

(*Rep.* 6.9–29) may urge his grandson to despise *gloria*, but Virgil's parade of heroes "begins, continues and ends with personal *gloria* and *nomen*" (Feeney 1986, 4).

And then there is Aeneas' shield, the product of Vulcan's *ars* (8.377, 401, 442) and itself a teleological *textum* (8.625) of Roman history, of *res Italas Romanorumque triumphos* (8.626);³³ here too, great individuals and Roman battles, all in historical sequence. Donatus' comment in his life of Virgil that the poet himself claimed to lick his poem into shape the way a she-bear does her cubs ("carmen se ursae modo parere dicens et lambendo demum effingere" [*Vita Donati* 22]) also suggests a parallel between shield and text, not only because Romulus and Remus are famously licked into shape on the shield by their adoptive wolf-mother (*illam tereti ceruice reflexa/ mulcere alternos et corpore fingere lingua* [8.633–34]), but because what Virgil himself is doing is licking into shape not only a story but Roman history itself, making it into an artifact via which he can aestheticize, again, the violence of the struggle to found an empire. Virgil, like the statesman and like Aeolus (both of whom are said to *mulcere* their unruly subjects [1.66, 1.153]; the verb is used of another Virgilian *vates*, the Orpheus of *Georgics* 4.510)³⁴ softens the unruly subject of history, and shapes, via his art, nothing other than a potential beast.³⁵

Finally, and most obviously, the shield's central representation of Actium, with its binary division of the forces of order, unity, and rationality against an array of barbaric peoples under a foreign queen, fits under the rubric of violence contained. This is a notion that D. Quint (1993, 31–46) has linked to the teleological form of epic narrative itself, so that the epic *textum* enacts a form of control over the chaotic forces of history. The triumph on the Actian picture of the shield, like the parade of heroes, and epic form itself, with its constraints of meter, narrative, and teleology, enforces the principle of order over disarray and furor, giving shape "not only to the political unity of the empire but also to a unified narrative that imperial conquest has conferred upon Roman history" (Quint 1993, 32). The epic

33. Note that around the shield's edge cavort dolphins (8.673), recalling those to whom the young performers of the *Lusus Troiae* are compared (5.594), and similar, too, to the movement of the shuttle evoked by that same "woof game." For further interpretation of the shield and its images, see Anderson 1969, 42–44, Becker 1964, DiCesare 1971, 154–57, DuBois 1982, 41–48, Griffith 1967–68, Gural 1988, 276–313, Johnson 1976, 111–14, Lyne 1987, 207–9, Putnam 1965, 147–50, Rowland 1968, Thomas 1983, West 1975–76, Wigodsky 1965, G. Williams 1983, 153–56, and R. D. Williams 1981 and 1987, 41–46. Hardie 1986, 104 draws important parallels between the poem's opening storm and the making of the shield, both of which episodes invoke the release of elemental/Gigantomachic forces in the upper world and the quelling of these forces by a god's intervention. See also Hardie's comments on the possible influence here of the shield of the Pheidias statue of Athena Parthenos in the Parthenon, illustrated with images of both Amazonomachy and Gigantomachy (99).

34. This is pointed out in Toll's sympathetic reading of the poem (1991, 12); she also well remarks that "Especially for a poet who composed orally, dictating to a secretary, 'to fashion with the tongue' was a good trope for 'to write poetry'" (1991, 11). Hardie 1986, 349–50 further links the image to the original shaping of the primordial elements, reintroducing the idea of order over chaos we have seen elsewhere.

35. Gural 1988, 282 remarks: "Both the cave (and the wolf) belong to the god of war. It is the creature of Mars who licks and fondles into shape the future founders of the Roman state." Romulus and Remus not only represent the origin of Rome; suckled by a she-wolf, they represent man's risk of growing up to be bestial.

textum, in both form and content, enacts the controlling role of the artwork:³⁶ or, to put it otherwise, the *textum* of the triumph is the triumph of the *textum*, and the triumph of everything the *textum* seems to stand for.

A similar performance of Roman ideology via artistic representation is a striking feature of trends in the plastic arts during the Augustan period. As is well known, the *princeps*' programmatic use of the imagery of victory and peace in the public statuary and reliefs of the years after Actium was oriented towards "the peaceful side of the Augustan achievement, the equilibrium as reached *after* the preliminary struggles. . . . The peaceful events of the present come to occupy a prominent place" (Hardie 1986, 133).³⁷ On the programmatic nature of Augustan art we have further still the testimony of Augustus' architect Vitruvius and his biographer Suetonius. The first book of Vitruvius' *De Architectura*, which starts with an apostrophe to Augustus and praises his interest in public building, emphasizes the link between official art and the didactic goals of the state in its aetiology of the Greek Caryatids, erected to hold up public buildings, and led, as it were, in a perpetual triumph as a warning to potential future traitors (1.5). Vitruvius provides a similar interpretation of the so-called Persian colonnade at Sparta (1.6; cf. Paus. 3.11.3), likewise set up as an exemplum to posterity; both kinds of statuary are there, at least on this view, because they can constrain and discourage the kinds of acts they refer to and inspire a certain kind of political loyalty; the architect, like the orator, is seen as a teacher of citizens.³⁸ Suetonius too, in his *Life of Augustus*, tells us that the *princeps* erected the heroic statues of the Forum Augusti so that they might be an exemplum, in the eyes of the citizens, of the standards he, Augustus himself, should maintain (*Aug.* 31.5). For this *princeps*, art and architecture were nothing if not politically didactic and in keeping with the goals of the principate.

It could be said that Augustan official art, much of which parallels the themes of the *Aeneid* and even of the *Aeneid*'s artworks, attempted to enact the very process of ideological containment and control that Virgil suggests may be art's role in the political world. There is frequent use of Gigantomachic imagery,³⁹ but always with an emphasis on the moment of victory

36. If we think of the shield as checking violence by "containing" or re-representing it ideologically and thus diminishing its threatening implications, it is worth noting in this context that the images on Aeneas' shield are both more violent and more historically specific than those of its Homeric counterpart; see Gurval 1988, 276–313 and Anderson 1969, 73; partly for this reason, Gurval and Rowland 1968 see much that is negative on the shield. In fact, several Virgilian texts represent scenes of violence or furor (see, e.g., 5.252, and cf. Catullus 64), a fact that corroborates the speculation of Scheid and Svenbro 1996 that the *textum* symbolizes the union of opposites into a stable "social fabric." Is the fact that the violence is woven, then, a feature that symbolically undoes the potential damage of such violence to society?

37. Hardie 1986, 135 argues, however, that the Virgilian presentation of nationalistic themes, unlike that of Augustan art, is concerned with conflict and struggle rather than the peaceful side of the Augustan achievement. On the link between art and violence in Virgil, see the discussion that follows above.

38. And has to undergo the same broad training as any orator; Vitruvius' prescriptions on this (1.7–18) sound rather like Cicero's in the *De Oratore*. On Vitruvius and Augustan ideology in general, see Elsner 1995, 49–63.

39. See Hardie 1986, 122–23 on the Gigantomachic themes shared by the ivory reliefs on the temple of Apollo on the Palatine and Aeneas' shield.

rather than of struggle; the losers at Actium are elided, the victors are shown in images of triumph and bounty, with the Olympian gods or with personifications of Victoria, Roma, and Terra.⁴⁰ The Temple of Janus, thrice closed by Augustus, figures in the *Aeneid*'s restraint of Furor, and I have already mentioned the statuary of the Forum Augustum. Even the statues of the Danaids that were featured in the portico attached to the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine—statues that might well seem to stand as the “ultimate symbol of fratricide and civil war,”⁴¹ and which show up elsewhere only on Pallas' baldric—are represented without their partners and enemies, their husbands, the slaughtered victims of such fratricidal furor, leading one recent critic to suggest that the statuary is the “politically correct” inverse of that baldric: the art minus the blood.⁴² Most striking among these parallels is the existence of a painted image of Furor with his hands tied behind his back, sitting on a pile of weapons; Servius tells us, in his note to Virgil's own passage on the Augustan chaining of *Furor impius*, that the picture was to be seen in a crowded part of the Forum (“non in aede Iani, sed in alia in foro Augusti introeuntibus ad sinistram, fuit bellum pictum et furor sedens super arma devinctus eo habitu quo poeta dixit” [Servius *ad Aen.* 1.294]);⁴³ Pliny, whose version of the story features Bellum rather than Furor, attributes the work to Apelles and its selection and placement to Augustus himself.⁴⁴ For the Augustan period, it is the furor of the civil war that has to be reshaped, contained, bound by the ideological straitjacket of art and forbidden to break out again.⁴⁵

But for all this, we cannot carry out this simplifying operation on Virgil's own textual art: the *Aeneid* will not support so clear-cut an interpretation

40. See Zanker 1988 and 1985, 207–8: “Vergil in his *Aeneid* selected topics which were reflected in Augustan art and architecture—the temple of Janus and its doors, the Forum Augustum, Augustus' Mausoleum, and on the Palatine the temple of the Magna Mater and the temple of Apollo.” See also Hardie 1986, 122–23, Kellum 1985, and Leach 1988b, 319. I was not able to obtain Horsfall's 1982 article on “Vergil, Varro's *Imagines*, and the Forum of Augustus,” in a journal listed as *Ancient Society* (vol. 10) that is not, however, the journal known as such in philological circles.

41. Kellum (1985, 173). Gurval 1988, 193ff. disagrees with her interpretation that the temple's artwork, including the statues of the Danaids and the ivory reliefs of Apollo as the slayer of the Niobids and the defender of Delphi, refers back to the Augustan victory at Actium; a similar view is taken by Zanker 1983. The temple was vowed in 36 B.C. and dedicated in 28 B.C.

42. See Spence 1991, who argues that the portico only showed the daughters and their fathers, and functioned as a symbol of the victory of Rome over Egypt (the bridegrooms were the sons of Aegyptus, after all). Evidence for the statuary comes from *Ov. Tr.* 3.1 and *Prop.* 2.31.

43. The Forum Augustum, which was the precinct for the temple of Mars Ultor, was not dedicated until 2 B.C., but it had been vowed by Octavian already at Philippi and perhaps planned in the interim; work on the temple itself began after the return of the standards by the Parthians in 20 B.C. Since the painting of Apelles presumably dated from the fourth century, issues of dating, priority, and direction of influence become all but impossible to answer.

44. Cf. *HN* 35.27: “Super omnes divus Augustus in foro suo celeberrima in parte posuit tabulas duas, quae Belli faciem pictam habent et Triumphum, item Castores ac Victoriam” and *HN* 35.93: “Belli imaginem restrictis ad terga manibus.” On the history of this image, see Pöschl 1962, p. 177, n. 8. Zanker 1988, 315–16 describes the altar of one P. Perellius Hedulus in the sanctuary of the *gens Augusta* at Carthage: it showed Rome herself, with Victoria, sitting on a pile of weapons: “Virtually a textbook summary of Roman official iconography.”

45. Quint 1993, 62: “The past must be both buried and forgotten, then reinvented in the ‘memory’ of the present. . . . As part of this propaganda, the *Aeneid* rewrites Roman history even more radically, placing the origins that legitimate Augustan rule farther and farther back in time, beyond history and prehistory.”

for the political success of art or the artist.⁴⁶ The restraining power of art often seems doomed to failure in this poem, and even elsewhere in Virgil the civilizing ideal of the *vates* is put under question—as when Orpheus' *amor* overcomes his *ars* in *Georgics* 4, and, in his journey back from Hades, he takes that fatal backward look.⁴⁷ Indeed, the other side of the binary opposition control/violence beckons seductively from the failed work of art. Consider another Virgilian metaphor for the civilizing role of art in the world of men, which—like the statesman simile—occurs specifically in the context of man as a “political animal” and an upholder of social order. I am referring to the stark imagery surrounding Latinus' scepter in Book 12: as Latinus and Aeneas swear to the terms of a treaty and sanctify their oaths by sacrifice, Latinus promises to honor the new terms as surely as the scepter he holds will never again bloom with shady leaves (12.208–11):

cum semel in silvis imo de stirpe recisum
matre caret posuitque comas et brachia ferro,
olim, arbos, nunc artificis manus aere decoro
inclusit patribusque dedit gestare Latinis.

The living branch which the scepter once was is strongly anthropomorphized: cut away from its mother, it yielded its hair and its arms to the cold blade of the knife, as if it were a human stripped of life; now the artisan's hands have enclosed it in decorative bronze and given it to the Latin elders to carry. Again the function of art here seems to be to contain and enclose the natural by means of the artificial, the living by means of the artifact (*nunc artificis manus aere decoro/ inclusit*); and if the image of the branch severed from its mother seems a far cry from the violence of the Greeks or the mob of the statesman simile, it nonetheless points to a world unshaped and unrestrained by the bonds of human convention and human civilization—to the opposite world from that of assemblies, elders, and pacts, all of which rely on the power of *mos* to subdue and contain the aggressive instincts of the individual. All the more significant, then, that when the scepter fails, it fails to contain the very forces of madness and aggression against which Latinus had invoked it. For Latinus has called upon the artistic and artificial nature of his scepter as proof that the pact cannot be revoked: the branch cannot bloom again, as surely as art has the power to contain and control the forces of nature. But Latinus is wrong: all too soon,

46. As Lyne 1987, p. 28, n. 55 sees already of the statesman simile: “The first simile of the poem, drawn strikingly from political life and suggesting a political interpretation of the poem's mythical events . . . opposes the statesman ‘pietate gravem’ to the seditious ‘vulgus’ among whom ‘furor arma ministrat.’ Jupiter's great prophecy then ends with a vision of ‘Furor impius’ in bonds. . . . But as the events of the *Aeneid* unfold, they teach us that a distinction along these attractive lines is not easily realizable in practice.” On this simile, see also Hine 1987, 177; Pöschl 1962, 19–21.

47. Further examples: Poetry is as powerless as doves ranged against eagles in *Eclogue* 9; Gallus in *Eclogue* 10 fails to bring to fruition the civilizing power of poetry because it cannot stand up to or contain “the furor of sexual love” (Boyle 1986, 72); and even Virgil himself is led astray by love for his subject in Hardie's interesting analysis of *G.* 3.285 (1986, 166). Boyle 1986, 13 goes on to tie this failure of poetry to the *pictura inanis* of *Aen.* 1.464 and to the *Aeneid* in general: “Text, picture, image . . . , in the area of human action and history, change substantially nothing.” See also Hine 1987, 182, arguing for “the negligible role of the poet himself in the military and political world of the *Aeneid*—and of Augustan Rome,” and Rutledge 1967, 310.

war has broken out again; Trojans and Italians fight with mad rage; Latinus flees with his defeated gods and undone treaty.

In fact, artistic representation in Virgil often has precisely an uncivilizing effect upon its audiences: it does not check violence, but spurs it. The viewer of artistic scenes of violence in particular suffers a kind of infection, as if he were driven to imitate furor in art by furor in life: so it is that Aeneas, seeing Pallas' baldric with its violent representation of rage and murder, is spurred to furor himself.⁴⁸ Forgiveness, in the form of Hypermenestra and the husband she spared, is absent from the baldric's representation of the daughters of Danaus,⁴⁹ and it is absent too from Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication. The baldric is thus doubly *saevi monimenta doloris*: its reminding function points both to Pallas' death and to its own imagery, a reminder of another, far older moment of savagery.⁵⁰ It is, in fact, a reminder *to* savagery.

Still further evidence points to a similar potential for narrative itself, most notably in Aeneas' own enchanting tale to Dido, a story of *infandum . . . dolorem* (2.3) that spurs its love-stricken listener to the enactment of her own and deadly form of *dolor*—for that is precisely what Dido calls her love and its betrayal (4.419, 474, 547, 679; cf. *infandum . . . amorem*, 4.85).⁵¹ In other words, "By evoking the violence stemming from an erotic transgression . . . , Aeneas tells a tale that in itself only becomes erotogenic, once again setting in motion the terrible cycle of history that will soon bring Dido, like Troy, to the flames of her pyre and her city Carthage to ruins."⁵² Some might see a similarity to Phoenix's tale of Meleager in *Iliad* 9—a tale which spurs Achilles to do exactly what is represented, and with the same disastrous results: he too refrains from fighting until it is all but too late, and fights only for Patroclus' sake, as Meleager did for Cleopatra.⁵³

We now see why the Sibyl rushes Aeneas away from the images of lust, furor, and death—the *Veneris monimenta nefandi* (6.26) carved on the walls

48. As Vance 1973b, 160 put it, "Symbolizing all that is irrational in man, Pallas' belt provokes in a moment of spontaneous contagion the obliteration of its bearer." Most commentators prefer to see the baldric, with its theme of *mors immatura*, as a foreshadowing of Pallas' death; see Conte 1986, 187–93 and Gillis 1983.

49. As O'Higgins 1995, 63 well remarks.

50. This is what DuBois 1982, 32 calls "Vergil's most significant innovation in the use of the *ekphrasis*. The narrator describes an object, then adds a further dimension to the epic scene by placing the hero, as mediator, between the object and the reader. . . . The belt is not just a discrete, material thing in the world; it is caught up in the web of the narrative, the psychological space of the moment." As several critics have noted, even Daedalus, trying to carve the *casus* of his son, lets his hand fall: one *casus* reenacts the other (*casus*, 6.32; *cecidere*, 6.33).

51. Needless to say, I must disagree with Conte's criticism (1986, 138, on Aristaeus and the story of Orpheus in *Georgics* 4) of those who see a mimetic cause-and-effect interaction between narrative art and its viewers/hearers. Biow 1994, 242 has already remarked on the repetition of *infandum* at 2.3 and 4.85.

52. As nicely put by Vance 1973a, 15. See further the interesting article of Biow 1994, which draws parallels between Aeneas' narrative and what Aeneas already knows of Dido's past life, as if the hero had tailored his story to spur empathetic identification in his listener. Aeneas remains unaware of the impact of his art even as he creates it, and unaware of the fatal imbrication of ἔπος and narrative in the work of a *vates*.

53. As Conte 1986, 194–95 points out, Aeneas meets Dido just as he is looking at the image of Penhesilea on the temple of Juno—with whom Achilles fell in love as he killed her. Here too, a picture of an erotic female death, caused by a male hero, seems to cause the same behavior in its viewer.

of the temple of Cumaean Apollo. Why indeed, unless in fear of the imitative pull of the representation of violence? In front of a later *monimentum*, the *saevi monimenta doloris* of Pallas' baldric (12.945), Aeneas was not dragged away as he looked, but rather drank in (*hausit*) the whole picture, with the results we know too well. We come away with an awareness of the growing complexity of Virgil's vision of the role of art and perhaps of the complexity of his own artwork in face of its reception.⁵⁴ All the more so since Virgil's story too is one of *dolor*, and rage, the passions of an enraged Juno. One violent work of representation seems implicated in the other; as E. Vance (1973a, 16) puts it, "Vergil . . . shows us the inherent dangers of epic (and perhaps Homeric) narrative by suggesting that epic actually nurtures violence within those cultures whose order its discourse purportedly preserves."

Let me now turn to Daedalus' relief, which caused the Sibyl such heartburn. This carving has garnered much critical attention for its own apparent failure, for the inability of its artist to put the finishing touches to an artwork constructed of his own past suffering (*dolor* [6.31]).⁵⁵ Daedalus cannot show Icarus' fall into the ocean; his own hand falls from the picture first, and his son is omitted from the frieze of the Cretan adventures (6.24–33):

Hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto
Pasiphae mixtumque genus prolesque biformis
Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae,
hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error;
magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem
Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resolvit,
caeca regens filo vestigia. tu quoque magnam
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,
bis patriae cecidere manus.

W. Fitzgerald (1984), in his sensitive reading of this passage, has suggested that it symbolically demonstrates how we all come to terms with the past: first by turning it into art to contain its pain, then, eventually, by having the strength to integrate it into our present. But others have seen here further proof of the impotence of art, its failure to render the past into an aesthetic experience and by so doing contain or transcend it;⁵⁶ or, alternately, its failure to teach its viewer, Aeneas, to put into practice the principles of pity and empathy to be learned from this record of

54. Putnam 1965, v, for one, has hypothesized that "Vergil may even have wanted us to mistrust artistry, even his own artistry. This possibility is suggested, for example, by Aeneas' narrative to Dido which, in telling of destruction, destroys."

55. On the Daedalus episode, see especially Anderson 1969, 55–56, Boyle 1972, 116–19, DiCesare 1971, 94–96, DuBois 1982, 35–41, Fitzgerald 1984, Paschalis 1986, Pöschl 1962, 149–50 and 1975, Putnam 1995b, Rutledge 1967 and 1971–72, Segal 1965, 642–45, and Zarker 1967. A common strand of interpretation has been to point out parallels between Aeneas' fate and Daedalus' or Theseus'. While Boyle 1972, 118 suggests that Daedalus' failure foreshadows the prospective failure of Aeneas to found the empire along Anchises' principles, Eichholz 1968, 110 sets Daedalus' failure against Aeneas' success in creating something great and lasting. On the myth of Daedalus in the ancient world, see Frontisi-Ducroux 1975.

56. See Conte 1986, 136–38 and Segal 1965, 642–45.

"human sacrifice and suffering."⁵⁷ Here too the figure of Icarus is crucial: A. J. Boyle (1972, 118), pointing out that both Aeneas and Daedalus fail through *dolor* at loss of a loved youth, suggests that Daedalus' failure foreshadows the prospective failure of Aeneas to found the empire along Anchises' principles. As a result, the parallel between artwork and poem leads these readers—and us—to wonder if, "like the works of art which it contains, the *Aeneid* is a cogent illustration of the uselessness of the artist's perceptions; it is itself a *pictura inanis*" (Boyle 1972, 143).

I beg to differ: I would argue that this *pictura inanis* is the very point of emptiness and suggestiveness at which the neat constructs I have been exploring in this paper all fall apart; the point of emptiness at which something that bursts the bounds of all ideological binaries suddenly appears on the scene. The readings I have just cited all elide what is for me the most important element of the Daedalian scene: namely, the way in which Icarus is *not* missing from this work. Another artist steps in to supply him, and that is Virgil, who apostrophizes him, and who, although Icarus is not on the frieze proper, brings him before us as reader-viewers via the same literary medium of epic as the rest of the frieze.⁵⁸ Indeed, as the interpretations of this passage inadvertently illustrate, Icarus does play a significant role (*magnam partem . . . Icare, haberes* [6.30–31]) in the ecphrasis by driving its critical reception, given that this reception has treated his "absence" from the ecphrasis as crucial to the poem's meaning. In addressing him, Virgil has assumed the position of an imaginative viewer of his own artwork: he supplies the picture (and us) with that which is not on its surface through a subjective act of interpretation. And this is a model for viewing that we have encountered neither in the optimistic and perhaps claustrophobic Augustan view of art as a force to contain political unrest, nor in the idea that art both deceives and potentially infects its viewer with a propensity to violent imitation.

Such a model for viewing, however, lies behind the very first ecphrasis of the poem, the description of the Temple of Juno at Carthage, and Aeneas' response to it.⁵⁹ Famously, the temple shows scenes of violence from the Trojan War that depict the Trojans as victims before the onslaught of Greek

57. As Boyle 1993, 100 puts it, "From the *Aeneid*'s three great works of art Aeneas learns nothing—at least nothing that lasts. Neither the imbalance between fame and its cost in the Dido frescoes nor the record of human sacrifice and suffering in the Daedalus reliefs, to both of which he responds most fully, in the end affect his behavior in history. . . . As a group, these three extant artefacts, products of *ars* and *labor*, seem designed to reflect on the artefact which extorts them, the *Aeneid*, constituting a poetic self-critique, in which the epicist locates his skepticism, if not pessimism, about the power of his own artefact to affect the Roman world." Segal 1981, 82 attributes to the poet a similar skepticism about whether "the supreme artistry of the fiction will ever be enough to prevent the recurrence of violence in history's cycles of vengeance and hatred."

58. Cf. Spence 1988, 41: "Virgil's art, in contrast to that of Daedalus, includes Icarus and makes us aware of the pain Daedalus felt."

59. On the reliefs (or frescoes) on the Temple of Juno, see Boyle 1972, 74–75, Clay 1988, Conte 1986, 194–95, DiCesare 1971, 12–15, DuBois 1982, 32–35, Johnson 1976, 99–105, Leach 1988b, 311–23, Lowenstam 1993, Lyne 1987, 207–9, Otis 1963, 66, Parry 1966, 122–23, Pöschl 1975, 119–23, Segal 1981, Spence 1988, 28–30, Stanley 1965, G. Williams 1983, 93–94, and R. D. Williams 1960. There is further bibliography in Spence 1988, 134–35.

savagery and that emphasize the brutality of Achilles in killing the young Troilus and dragging Hector's body around the walls of Troy.⁶⁰ Further, the ecphrasis dwells on episodes of the Trojan war that seem to have parallels in Virgil's own text: readers have seen Camilla as a second Penthesilea, Pallas as a second Troilus and Diomedes' deadly raid on Rhesus reflected in Nisus' similar raid on Rhamnes.⁶¹ And the parallel goes deeper: in looking at Juno's temple, Aeneas is viewing a history he participated in, a history that, although violent, is his own, just as Virgil's epic and Aeneas' shield within it also presented their Roman readers with a history of a struggle that was their own, the civil wars of the recent decades.

Equally famously, however, Aeneas' response is not one of horror or dismay, even though the temple is Juno's and the intention of the Carthaginian artist must have been to glorify her might as it manifested itself in favor of the Greeks at Troy.⁶² Instead, the poet chooses to emphasize the hero's own participation in the construction of what he is viewing: through his eyes we see, in no particular order, images that were originally arranged *ex ordine* on the temple (1.456), a process that draws attention to Aeneas' subjective reception of the images.⁶³ Through his eyes we hear an account of the images that becomes a lived reality, as the past tenses become present and verbs like "he saw" or "he recognized" give way to a seamless narrative of the events at Troy.⁶⁴ And in the end, his response to these images is supremely subjective. In what has struck many of Virgil's readers as a misreading of the temple scenes, Aeneas draws hope and comfort from these images, exclaiming that here are the rewards of fame; life spurs compassion, human suffering moves men (1.450–52, 461–65):⁶⁵

hoc primum in luco nova res oblata timorem
leniit; hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem
ausus et adflictis melius confidere rebus. . . .

"en Priamus. sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi,
sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem."
sic ait atque animum pictura pascit inani
multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine vultum.

60. Stanley 1965 well points out the emphasis on Greek savagery in the temple scenes; R. D. Williams 1960 draws our attention to their perfidy.

61. On these parallels, see Clay 1988, 203–4, Lowenstam 1993, and G. Williams 1983, 93–94. Lowenstam points out that the scenes on the temple seem to be in the order of those episodes they correspond to in the *Aeneid* rather than the *Iliad*, with the exception of the final Penthesilea image.

62. As many scholars have seen; cf. Johnson 1976, 103 and Spence 1988, 28.

63. On the participation of Aeneas as a subjective viewer of the ecphrasis of Juno's temple, see especially Clay 1988b, 202, Laird 1996, 89, Leach 1988, 318, and Segal 1981.

64. Segal 1981 has well illustrated how the scene "shifts from Aeneas' perception of the Trojan past to his increasing response to it as a lived reality."

65. For the translation of *sunt lacrimae rerum* see the various explanations of Boyle 1972, 75, Parry 1966, 122–23, Stanley 1965. Does Aeneas mean that the Carthaginians pity the Trojans, men pity suffering in general, or just that there is suffering in human life? *Mentem mortalia tangunt* would suggest one of the first two.

But he is said to feed his mind on an empty picture (*pictura inani*), an authorial comment that suggests the comfort and hope he draws from the picture are deceptive.⁶⁶

I would suggest not, or at least that this is not the point. Aeneas' interpretation of the Juno panels, instead, provides a third Virgilian model for the interaction between art and viewer, one that is concerned neither with the eruption of violence nor with its control. It not only gives him comfort and strength, but sets up a model for viewing that invites the participation of the viewer in making his own, positive meaning out of art.⁶⁷ We have already seen how Aeneas brings the *pictura inanis* to life as its viewer. Moreover, the parallels between Juno's temple and Virgil's own epic establish this first ecphrasis as a programmatic challenge to the reader to read the same way, to bring Virgil's art to life via a positive reading, despite the ending of the poem and Aeneas' own increasingly hampered creativity in interpretation—indeed, his final failure as he views Pallas' baldric. We have one other classical model for a viewer who brings art to life in his mind, and that is Pygmalion,⁶⁸ whose "delusion" about the reality of his own art, that enchanting ivory statue, finally results in the reality of the selfsame statue: here more than anywhere else, his art has become what he made of it. Virgil reminds us that we too have the choice that the Pygmalion story metaphorically represents: we can read *his* artwork, the *Aeneid*, as a tool in the service of political control; we can undermine its efficacy by emphasizing the deceptive nature of art; or we can realize it, give it life for ourselves, and find in it a meaning that will encourage us to forswear passivity and despair.⁶⁹ The ivory gates of deception leave it up to us: we can make what they contain real for ourselves or dismiss it as lies.

As I suggested at the beginning of this paper, the aim of ideology, political or otherwise, is often the creation of binary oppositions: pairs that we are taught it is natural to value positively and negatively. As readers of Virgil, our entrapment by the opposition of the simple pair "furor versus control" and the inevitable conclusion that the Virgilian artwork fails suggests that in some degree we are subscribing to the narrow lens of the

66. As Johnson 1976, 104–5 emphasizes. For other negative readings of the *pictura inanis* see Boyle 1972, 74–75 and p. 88, n. 55, Johnson 1976, 104–5, and DuBois 1982, 34, who remarks that "By framing Aeneas doubly, in graphic art, in verbal art, Vergil suggests the emptiness, the subjectivity, of such histories." Only Parry's reading (1966, 122–23) is a positive one: The images "remove one element of the nightmare: final obscurity and namelessness, partly because they mean that we have found a form in which we can see suffering itself clearly."

67. This reading is strongly supported by Leach's 1998 study of Roman continuous-narrative painting, which "is genuinely a *pictura inanis* whose essence lies not in completeness but in its incompleteness" (1988, 323). On the temple of Juno, she well comments that "the transformation of a record of Greek triumph into an expression of compassionate sympathy for Troy that is effected by the hero's subjective eye gives the paintings themselves the status of an incomplete communication" (1988b, 318). Leach suggests that the epic, too, presents such a paradigm of incomplete communication, although here she stresses the concomitant reduction of Virgil's authority as narrator.

68. Is it a coincidence that Daedalus, too, supposedly made statues that could see and walk, and that his statues were tied down to stop them from escaping? See Frontisi-Ducroux 1975, 100ff. On the figurative equation of Pygmalion's ivory statue and Ovid's poetry in the *Metamorphoses*, see Bauer 1962, 13, Elsner 1991, and Segal 1972, 491. Although Elsner 1991, 163 argues that Pygmalion is deluded in suspending his disbelief, I would suggest instead that the statue is a paradigm for the way art works: it literally is what you make of it.

69. And here again the phrases *vivos vultus* and *spirantia mollius aera* suggest that art becomes real.

Augustan artistic program. This is certainly a trap made more alluring by the poem's violent end: better to keep tight controls over what art can show, or the results may be grim indeed. But Virgil also shows us another alternative even as he acknowledges art's implication in the ideology of control and furor. He challenges us to make something more productive of his poem. What I believe Virgil is trying to do with the *Aeneid*'s reflections on the role of art in the political world is to banish the binary alternatives that ideology offers us, precisely by invoking the impossibility of dictating artistic interpretation even as Augustus begins his turn to an ideological artistic program at Rome. But there is also a warning here: the figure of Aeneas, and his transition as viewer in this poem from reactions of empathy to puzzlement (at the shield) to those of rage, may alert us to the costs of empire, the same costs that Virgil's poem itself as artwork militates against, opening up the fullness of interpretive possibilities in all their complexity.

Let us finally return to Anchises' prediction: the arts, whether verbal or pictorial, are precisely what the Romans will not excel at as they build their empire; the role of the artwork in politics is minimal. And indeed, this is how almost all Virgil's readers see the role of art in the *Aeneid* itself—as impotent in the face of political power, unable to effect change, an empty illusion that leads nowhere. But in so doing, these critics paradoxically reenact Anchises' banishment of art from Roman politics—ironically enough, even as they read a Roman artwork. This irony is not to be ignored.⁷⁰ If Anchises would banish the role of art from the political future, it is because he, better perhaps than Augustus, knows that it is impossible to dictate the interpretation of art, to stabilize it or to use it for a single purpose; his dismissal of art is an ideologically driven decision to leave it out of the Roman arts of empire. And as it happens, Anchises is right to attempt such a banishing: art does not work, can never work, solely for the purposes of the ideology that produces it, as the very text of the *Aeneid* makes clear.⁷¹ There is always leeway for individual interpretation, and always leeway for a reading that will strengthen and foster the beliefs of one particular individual rather than the state: that will, in other words, foster a new kind of subjectivity in its viewers rather than enforce an existing one.⁷² What the thriving industry of the interpretation of the *Aeneid* demonstrates is the success of the artwork at producing differing and ambiguous interpretations, even those that undermine its overt message—just what Anchises was afraid of. And this is cause to celebrate the failure of his prediction.

University of Chicago

70. As Lyne 1987, 218 well remarks, "Virgil's context and the irony it produces suggest that Vergil cannot be at one with his character in his view of art, government, and the Roman mission."

71. Elsner 1995, 209 draws attention to this instability in his discussion of such items of Augustan ideology as the Ara Pacis: art offers viewers "the possibility to look not only in collusion with the prevailing ideology governing such images but also against its grain."

72. Hexter's excellent article on the Trojan Horse (1990) comes to similar conclusions via a different route: for him, the puzzling material of the horse reflects the *Aeneid* itself, "the text polished to serve as a mirror for interpreters, so that sooner or later interpreters see themselves in it." On the creation of new sensibilities via art, see Elsner 1995, 87, with comments on Clifford Geertz.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anderson, W. S. 1969. *The Art of the Aeneid*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Arnheim, R. 1971. *Entropy and Art: An Essay on Order and Disorder*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Bauer, D. F. 1962. The Function of Pygmalion in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. *TAPA* 93: 1–21.
- Becker, C. 1964. Der Schild des Aeneas. *WS* 77: 111–27.
- Binder, G. 1971. *Aeneas und Augustus: Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 38. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Biow, D. 1994. Epic Performance on Trial: Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Power of Eros in Song. *Arethusa* 27: 223–46.
- Boyle, A. J. 1972. The Meaning of the *Aeneid*: A Critical Inquiry, Part I. Empire and the Individual: An Examination of the *Aeneid*'s Major Theme and Part II. *Homo Immemor*: Book VI and its Thematic Ramifications. *Ramus* 1: 63–90, 113–51.
- . 1986. *The Chaonian Dove: Studies in the "Eclogues," "Georgics" and "Aeneid" of Virgil*. Leiden.
- . 1993. The Canonic Text: Virgil's *Aeneid*. In *Roman Epic*, ed. A. J. Boyle, 79–107. London and New York.
- Breen, C. C. 1986. The Shield of Turnus, the Swordbelt of Pallas and the Wolf: *Aeneid* 7.782–92, 9.59–66, 10.497–77. *Vergilius* 32: 63–71.
- Brooks, R. A. 1966. *Discolor Aura*: Reflections on the Golden Bough. In Commager 1966, 143–63.
- Clay, D. 1988. The Archaeology of the Temple to Juno in Carthage (*Aen.* 1.446–93). *CP* 83: 195–205.
- Commager, S., ed. 1966. *Virgil: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Vergil and Other Latin Poets*. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 44. Ithaca, NY.
- Davies, S., ed. 1995. *Art and its Messages: Meaning, Morality, and Society*. University Park, PA.
- DeGrassi, A. 1945. Virgilio e il Foro di Augusto. *Epigrafica* 7: 88–103.
- DiCesare, M. A. 1971. *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Vergil's "Aeneid."* New York.
- Doob, P. R. 1990. *The Idea of the Labyrinth From Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY.
- Drew, D. L. 1927. *The Allegory of the "Aeneid."* Oxford.
- DuBois, P. 1982. *History, Rhetorical Description, and the Epic*. Cambridge.
- Edgeworth, R. J. 1986. The Ivory Gate and the Threshold of Apollo. *C&M* 37: 145–60.
- Eichholz, D. E. 1968. Symbol and Contrast in the *Aeneid*. *G&R* 15: 105–12.
- Elsner, J. 1991. Visual Mimesis and the Myth of the Real: Ovid's Pygmalion as Viewer. *Ramus* 20: 154–68.
- . 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge.
- , ed. 1996. *Art and Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- Enk, P. J. 1958. De Labyrinthi Imagine in Foribus Templi Cumani Insculpta. *Mnem.* Ser. 4, 11: 322–30.
- Evers, J. D. 1992. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Feeney, D. C. 1983. The Taciturnity of Aeneas. *CQ* 33: 204–19.
- . 1986. History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld. *PCPS* 212: 1–24.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1984. Aeneas, Daedalus, and the Labyrinth. *Arethusa* 17: 51–65.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. 1975. *Dédale: Mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.

- Gabelmann, H. 1986. Zur Schlusszene auf dem Schild des Aeneas (Vergil, *Aeneis* 8.720–28). *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 93: 281–300.
- Gillis, D. 1983. *Eros and Death in the Aeneid*. Rome.
- Girard, R. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Tr. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore and London.
- Griffin, J. 1984. Augustus and the Poets: Caesar qui cogere posset. In *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, ed. F. Millar and E. Segal, 189–218. Oxford.
- . 1986. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. Chapel Hill, NC.
- Griffith, J. G. 1967–68. Again the Shield of Aeneas. *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 7: 54–65.
- Gurval, R. A. 1988. Actium, Augustus, and the Poets: A New Assessment of the Actian Victory in the Ideology and Literature of the Augustan Principate. PhD diss., Berkeley. In print, with changes, as *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor, MI: 1995.
- Hannestad, N. 1988. *Roman Art and Imperial Policy*. Aarhus, Denmark.
- Hardie, P. R. 1986. *Vergil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- Hexter, R. 1990. What was the Trojan Horse Made Of?: Interpreting Vergil's *Aeneid*. *Yale Journal of Criticism* 3: 109–31.
- Hight, G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's "Aeneid."* Princeton.
- Hine, H. 1987. Aeneas and the Arts (Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.847–50). In Whitby 1987, 173–83.
- Horsfall, N. 1973–74. Dido in the Light of History. *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 13: 1–13.
- Hunt, W. 1973. *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Vergil's "Aeneid."* Carbondale, IL.
- Jenkyns, R. 1985. Pathos, Tragedy, and Hope in the *Aeneid*. *JRS* 75: 60–77.
- Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's "Aeneid."* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Kellum, B. 1985. Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine. In Winkes 1985, 169–76.
- Knight, W. F. J. 1967. *Vergil: Epic and Anthropology*. London.
- Laird, A. 1996. *Ut figura poesis*: Writing Art and the Art of Writing in Augustan Poetry. In Elsner 1996, 75–102.
- Leach, E. W. 1988a. Ekphrasis and the Theme of Artistic Failure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. *Ramus* 3: 102–42.
- . 1988b. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton.
- Lowenstam, S. 1993. The Pictures on Juno's Temple in the *Aeneid*. *CW* 87: 37–49.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1983. Vergil and the Politics of War. *CQ* 33: 188–203.
- . 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's "Aeneid."* Oxford.
- Miller, J. F. 1993. The Shield of Argive Abas at *Aeneid* 3.286. *CQ* 43: 445–50.
- Miller, P. A. 1995. The Minotaur Within: Fire, the Labyrinth, and Strategies of Containment in *Aeneid* 5 and 6. *CP* 90: 225–40.
- Newman, J. K. 1967. *The Concept of the Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Coll. Latomus 89. Brussels.
- O'Higgins, D. 1995. The Emperor's New Clothes: Unseen Images on Pallas' Baldric. *Hermathena* 58: 61–72.
- Otis, B. 1963. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.
- Parry, A. 1966. The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*. In Commager 1966, 107–23.
- Paschalis, M. 1986. The Unifying Theme of Daedalus' Sculptures on the Temple of Apollo Cumanus (*Aen.* 6.20–33). *Vergilius* 32: 33–42.
- Perkell, C. 1994. Ambiguity and Irony: The Last Resort? *Helios* 21: 63–74.
- Poduska, D. M. 1970. *Ope barbarica or bellum civile?* *CB* 46: 33–34, 46.
- Pöschl, V. 1962. *The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*. Tr. G. Seligson. Ann Arbor, MI.
- . 1975. Die Tempeltueren des Daedalus in der *Aeneis*. *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 1: 119–23.
- Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the "Aeneid."* Cambridge, MA.

- _____. 1995a. Possessiveness, Sexuality, and Heroism in the *Aeneid*. In *Vergil's "Aeneid": Interpretation and Influence*, 27–49. Chapel Hill, NC and London.
- _____. 1995b. Daedalus, Vergil, and the End of Art. In *Vergil's "Aeneid": Interpretation and Influence*, 73–99. Chapel Hill, NC and London.
- Quint, D. 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Vergil to Milton*. Princeton, NJ.
- Rowland, R. J. 1968. Foreshadowing in Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.714–28. *Latomus* 27: 832–42.
- Rutledge, H. C. 1967. Vergil's Daedalus. *CJ* 62: 309–11.
- _____. 1971–72. The Opening of *Aeneid* 6. *CJ* 67: 110–15.
- Scheid, J., and J. Svenbro. 1996. *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric*. Tr. C. Volk. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Segal, C. 1965. *Aeternum per saecula nomen*, the Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part I. *Arion* 4: 617–57.
- _____. 1966. *Aeternum per saecula nomen*, the Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part II. *Arion* 5: 34–72.
- _____. 1972. Orpheus and Augustan Ideology. *TAPA* 103: 473–94.
- _____. 1981. Art and the Hero: Participation, Detachment, and Narrative Point of View in *Aeneid* I. *Arethusa* 14: 67–83.
- Smith, R. R. R. 1981. Greeks, Foreigners, and Roman Republican Portraits. *JRS* 71: 24–38.
- Spence, S. 1988. *Rhetorics of Reason and Desire: Vergil, Augustine, and the Troubadours*. Ithaca, NY and London.
- _____. 1991. Cinching the Text: The Danaids and the End of the *Aeneid*. *Vergilius* 37: 11–19.
- Stahl, H.-P. 1990. The Death of Turnus: Augustan Vergil and the Political Rival. In *Between Republic and Empire*, ed. K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher, 174–211. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
- Stanley, K. 1965. Irony and Foreshadowing in *Aeneid* I, 462. *AJP* 86: 267–77.
- Thomas, R. F. 1983. Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces. *HSCP* 87: 175–84.
- Todd, F. A. 1931. Virgil's Invocation of Erato. *CR* 45: 216–18.
- Toll, K. 1991. The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*. *Helios* 18: 3–14.
- Vance, E. 1973a. Augustine's *Confessions* and the Grammar of Selfhood. *Genre* 6: 1–28.
- _____. 1973b. Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's *Aeneid*. *QUCC* 15: 111–61.
- West, D. A. 1975–76. *Cernere erat*: The Shield of Aeneas. *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 15: 1–7.
- Whitby, M., P. Hardie, and M. Whitby, eds. 1987. *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Bristol, England and Oak Park, IL.
- Wigodsky, M. 1965. The Arming of Aeneas. *C&M* 26: 192–221.
- _____. 1972. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden.
- Williams, G. 1983. *Technique and Ideas in the "Aeneid."* New Haven and London.
- Williams, R. D. 1960. The Pictures on Dido's Temple (*Aeneid* 1.450–93). *CQ* 10: 145–51.
- _____. 1964. The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*. *G&R* 11: 48–63.
- _____. 1981. The Shield of Aeneas. *Vergilius* 27: 8–11.
- _____. 1987. *The Aeneid*. London.
- Winkes, R., ed. 1985. *The Age of Augustus*. Interdisciplinary Conference Held at Brown University April 30–May 2, 1982. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.
- Zanker, P. 1983. Die Apollontempel auf dem Palatin: Ausstattung und politische Sinnbezüge nach der Schlacht von Actium. *ARID* Suppl. 10: 21–40.
- _____. 1985. Augustan Art and Architecture in Vergil's *Aeneid*. In Winkes 1985, 197–208.
- _____. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Tr. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Zarker, J. W. 1967. Aeneas and Theseus in *Aeneid* 6. *CJ* 62: 220–26.
- Zinserling, G. 1985. Die Programmatik der Kunstpolitik des Augustus. *Klio* 67: 74–80.