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HERE IS hardly a purpler patch in Vergil’s *Aeneid* than the underworld “Review of Heroes” that closes Book 6. It is so much a classic, however, that we may forget what is so strange about it: not only the perspectival play that W. H. Auden labeled “hindsight as foresight,” but also, specifically, the fact that the dead here imitate the aristocratic funeral procession designed by the living. Trying to imagine a modern writer’s depiction of a state funeral set in heaven (or hell) enforces the point. On reflection, this aspect of Vergil’s ghostly procession prompts a more general question about the “Golden Age” Latin literature of the first century BCE. Why do the dead in these texts act so much like the living? Elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, we see ghosts handing down Troy’s sacred objects and engaging in philosophical discussion; we are asked to imagine them taking an interest in love affairs and city-founding. In other authors of the period, we find dead ancestors reproaching their living descendants for aberrant sexual conduct, dead statesmen returning to take part in contemporary politics, dead wives and mistresses addressing courtroom-style speeches to their surviving partners. We cannot ascribe such scenarios simply to the Romans’ well-known obsession with ancestry and the emulation of illustrious Romans of the past, *imitatio maiorum*. Indeed, at issue here is not only imitation of ancestors but also something we might paradoxically term *imitatio posteriorum*: the
dead’s “imitation of those who come after.” This peculiarly Roman fantasy never manifests itself to the same extent in later Latin literature and there is no precedent for it in Greek literature, where, conversely, the activities of the dead are usually imagined in far less elaborate terms.

In this book I explain the Roman dead’s literary life by developing a view of Latin literature’s interaction with Roman culture. The evocation of the dead, I argue, is a means for Roman authors of the late Republic and early Principate to engage strategically with Roman cultural performances centered on the dead and their world—not only the aristocratic funeral reimagined in Aeneid 6 but also a number of others. The technique has a changing political purpose specific to Rome’s transition from Republic to Principate, hence its prominence in the authors of the first century BCE. Republican literature, that is, draws upon this cultural context for the ends of political competition among the clan-based Roman elite, while the literature of the new Principate seeks to restage the republican practices so as to recuperate them for Augustan society, in which the earlier type of intra-elite competition was no longer feasible.¹

I have derived my understanding of literature’s interaction with cultural performance from modern performance theory. Two concepts above all are key to my discussion. First, orature, a term itself borrowed by Joseph Roach from the Kenyan novelist and director Ngugi wa Thiong’o. For Roach, orature signifies the interdependence of the oral and the literary by foregrounding the degree to which the two have produced one another interactively over time. Since all ancient literary texts were commonly voiced by their readers, whether alone or before an audience, the idea of viewing literature as a script for performance—and hence a record of it as well—is already at home in Roman studies. But orature follows cultural forms such as “gesture, song, dance, processions, storytelling, proverbs, gossip, customs, rites, and rituals” from body and voice to text and back again, without positing the former as originary or the latter as a mere artificial reproduction of it. The oral is, in all but truly preliterate societies, “produced alongside or within mediated literacies of various kinds and degrees” and the literary is always already refashioning it, reframing it, to the extent that its traces in literature “may be usefully studied under the rubric of performance.”² Literature tends to imply orature: the performance that either occasions is, for Roach, “surrogation,” in the sense that “performance stands in for an elusive entity that it is not but that it must vainly aspire both to embody and to replace.”³ As the word “vainly” here intimates, Roach views this as a fundamentally anxious activity, dogged by emotions “ranging from mildly incontinent sentimentalism to raging paranoia,”⁴ and riven by its simultaneous grounding in the corporeal and the incorporeal, the present and the past, the self and the other. Yet it
is precisely by going beyond conventional categories that Roach’s concept of orature facilitates the reading of Latin literary texts, with their curious blend of ambition and nostalgia, universality and local knowledge. This implementation of patterns drawn from the wider field of cultural activity is what interests me here.

The interdependence of orature and literature is a focal point in Roach’s study of circum-Atlantic culture with special reference to London and New Orleans, sites linked by their common colonial history in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But the example of orature Roach uses to illustrate its historical importance—one chosen from the contemporaneous events of the American Revolution—resonates closely with my own emphasis, in the opening chapters of this study, on Ciceronian oratorical texts that both recreate or imagine an original performance and refer to a broad context of performance traditions, some far outside the official civic culture sponsored by the Roman elite. The American Declaration of Independence, Roach notes, was in fact a text meant to be declaimed: a script for oratorical performance. Jeffrey himself, moreover, characterized its elocutionary force as comparable to that of the expressive speech associated with Native Americans and Africans, performances that would seem, at first, vastly removed from the primal utterance of the nascent American colonial power. For Roach, “that the chant of the Declaration of Independence” thus “calls on the spirits of Jefferson’s Anglo-Saxon ancestors to authorize his claims” renders it comparable in turn to still other seemingly disparate performance events, such as a freedom ritual of the Haitian Revolution, an act of political empowerment accomplished through both voodoo incantations and more familiar kinds of prayer: spoken words, which the revolutionaries “then took the trouble to write down.”

Examining Cicero’s published orations, we will see him summoning ancestral figures through techniques that point similarly to the magical and the arcane while advancing judicio-political agendas of the most established and recognizable sort.

My second key concept is Richard Schechner’s restored behavior, a view of performance that, while it informs and is to some degree subsumed by Roach’s own views, nevertheless sets forth performance’s surrogate nature with an emphasis especially appropriate to the period of the early Augustan Principate, the focus of my last two chapters. For Schechner, performance “has at its core a ritual action,” a restoration of behavior, which may manifest itself in various fashions and to various degrees, depending on the type of mimesis involved. At a basic level, a performer engages in an imaginative extension (and so, in a limited sense, a restoration) of his or her own particular self: “I” becomes “someone else.” At an extreme, performance may pretend to the exact duplication of historical situations or events, with the
understanding that the performers are doing something in their world by bringing aspects of the past alive. The reproduction not only of the event itself but also of a type of action, of tradition or cultural history, becomes as important as the verisimilitude of the represented acts. Performance, in Schechner’s view, is not strictly reproductive of past actions but is nevertheless strongly predicated on some understanding, conscious or unconscious, of repeated, customary, or habitual types of actions—behaviors—which it transforms according to the concerns of performer and audience. What is ultimately at stake in all such rituals is identity, whether of the performers, their audience, or an entire community.

A notion of cultural restoration is essential to the rise of the Augustan Principate, the chief historical event underlying the poetry of Propertius and Vergil I treat in chapters 4 and 5. It may be that the evidence does not permit us to speak of the “restoration of the Republic” unless in terms of the attempted moral restoration that left such a strong impression on Augustus’ contemporaries. Together with moral renewal, however, Augustus encouraged a flowering of literature and the arts (“high culture” in the form of poems, historical treatises, paintings, sculpture, architecture, etc.), while carefully monitoring less specialized types of cultural activity (assemblies, trials, funerals, and the like) for signs of their conformity to the new ethos. Augustan literature responds to the idea of sweeping change in both morality and cultural practice and uses its own imaginary universe to model such change, as Vergil does in his version of ancestral funeral ritual. Sensitivity to the performance of Augustan poetry as restored behavior can thus deepen our appreciation of its ties to the wider culture. Augustan authors, that is, tap into something basic to performance—its ritual refashioning of culture itself—and exploit it as an intrinsic part of their creative endeavor.

This book close-reads one republican and two Augustan authors for the mimicry of cultural performance explaining the dead’s characteristically Roman behavior in their work. Although the actual performances of the Romans are, of course, entirely lost to us, we are well-informed enough about their fundamentals for historical reconstruction to serve as the basis of such an approach. The aristocratic funeral procession to which Vergil alludes in Aeneid, Book 6 made a deep and lasting impression on Roman viewers. Before the body walked actors wearing wax masks (imagines) of the deceased’s illustrious ancestors. The actors were chosen for their physical resemblance to the actual personages they portrayed, and were accompanied by props evocative of political achievement, such as the fasces. Music and dancing accompanied the procession, and could take the form of parodic behavior by dancers dressed as satyrs. Hired mourners were also in attendance, magnifying the mourning of the family, which would officially last
until the ninth day after the funeral. Young men were especially encouraged to watch the proceedings, so as to be fired by ambition to imitate the achievements of the noble dead, but the admiration for distinguished Romans of the past was something in which all present could share.

Having reached the forum, the procession stopped and the masked actors, together with the corpse, formed an audience at the rostra (speaker’s platform), which a member of the family, preferably a son of the deceased, ascended to deliver the laudatio funebris (funeral oration). The laudatio, unadorned in style, included lists of offices and achievements, not only of the person being buried but the earlier family members as well. Upon completion of the laudatio, the body was taken to the gravesite, typically in a family burial ground along one of the main roads leading out of the city, and the final rituals of interment were carried out. The grave was marked with an inscription meant to be recited aloud. On the ninth day the family returned to the gravesite to mark the completion of full mourning.

By the late Republic, theatrical games would regularly accompany a large funeral. Some of the plays put on at such events were probably historical dramas (fabulae praetextae) depicting the achievements of the deceased or famous ancestors, since the praetexta could bring the full resources of the stage to the funeral’s emphasis on res gestae and the actors’ performances in the pompa funebris. But Latin comedies as well as tragedies modeled on the mythological theater of the great Greek dramatists Aeschylus, Sophocles, and especially Euripides were also popular among Roman audiences. The staging of Hellenic tragedy in particular, whether at funerals or on other occasions, has a strong claim to be regarded as a practice “centered on the dead,” since, with its frequent use of ghosts and harrowing Furies, it offered a vivid, if troubling, way for audiences to imagine the interaction of the dead and the living, whatever the actual beliefs of any particular audience member.

Cicero makes it clear that the Furies repeatedly turned up as characters in the plays of his day (Rosc. Am. 67; Pis. 46) and our fragments of Roman mime and tragedy preserve ghost-scenes as well.

The republican aristocratic funeral developed into the funerals held for dead emperors, which, in spite of their importance as cultural events, occurred outside the time-frame of this book. Julius Caesar’s funeral and posthumous glorification, however, which occurred within this time-frame, were key to this transition. Although the surviving accounts present a confusing picture, we can be relatively certain of some basic components. M. Antonius acted as Caesar’s laudator (probably to underscore his claim to be Caesar’s heir), delivered an unconventional funeral oration, and led ritual laments. A man acted the part of Caesar himself and a movable wax effigy of Caesar’s wounded body was displayed for the benefit of the crowd. The
ceremony ended in the unplanned cremation of the body in the Forum. After Caesar’s funeral he became the object of ostentatious religious observances on the part of Antonius, Octavian (the future Augustus), and a figure known to historians as Pseudo-Marius. These events and their timing are central to my argument in chapter 3 and I will recount them in detail there.

The aristocratic funeral with its associated events was a public spectacle of the highest order. More private and less spectacular was the actual cult of the di Manes (spirits of the dead), for which families gathered at the grave and in the home to feast, offer prayers, and perform other religious observances. The principal festivals of the dead were the Parentalia (February 13–21), which centered on the grave and culminated in the Feralia on February 21, and the Lemuria (May 9, 11, and 13), which involved the cleansing of ancestral ghosts from the home. As much as they were family matters, these, like other major rites, were traditionally seen as crucial to the well-being of the state. As state-sponsored cult, the Parentalia addressed the dead in their role as benefactors of the community and so aligned them implicitly with Romulus as a mythic prototype. The Lemuria was intended in part to obviate communal problems caused by restless ghosts. In his etiological poem on the Roman calendar, the Fasti, Ovid derives the name of this festival from “Remus”: it was instituted, he says, in honor of Romulus’ dead brother and first known as Remuria (5.479–80).

In spite of Ovid’s etiology (which is probably his invention), there was no festival officially designed to cleanse Romans of the primal guilt of Remus’ murder. Nevertheless, the practice of invoking Remus to explain Rome’s history of civil conflict became ingrained in Roman society, and it is prominent in Latin literature following the period of civil wars that brought Augustus to power. It must, however, be more than simply literary in origin, since the emergence of Remus as a figure in Roman myth is most plausibly dated further back even than that of Latin literature itself in the third century BCE, and can be associated with conflicts between Romans from a similarly early date. Thus literary references to and depictions of Remus, like those we will study below, are properly treated as part of a wider—and older—cultural field that had become essential to Roman identity by the time the literary record begins.

The primary means of addressing the communal problem of murder was the murder trial, as carried out in the Forum in standing courts devoted to the purpose. Here spectacle again played a large part, and regard for the facts and the finer points of law often took second place. The relatives of parties involved might appear in full mourning garb. The speeches for the accusation and the defense were designed to thrill, terrify, and entertain both the judges and the crowds that would gather for such occasions as much as
to present a reasoned argument. Orators would often “call up the dead” to speak for themselves and in general tried to construct a fair verdict as what was due to the victim. Important trials attracted great attention and could inspire riots and civic mayhem. Such events lived on in the popular memory long after verdicts had been passed down and punishments exacted.

Outside the officially sanctioned realm of state-sponsored cult and legal procedure existed a thriving world of magic in which the dead were likewise central figures. The dead might be invoked in curses, whose words were often scratched on tablets and deposited in graves, or they might be consulted in necromancy, particularly at sites such as Lake Avernus, thought to be openings to the underworld. Along with the practice of magic itself, moreover, grew up a series of invective tropes used to stigmatize it, and this often makes it difficult to judge what constitutes the trace of a real ritual and what is purely an imaginative construct. Indeed, accusations of illicit rites involving the dead can be regarded as just as much of a cultural performance as the rites themselves. They often served the needs of politicians and their factions or found their way into invective poetry with a political edge. But magical rituals (or at least the fear of them) represented enough of a threat to warrant legislation during the period in question.

Philosophical discussions took account of the dead, not only in the consolatio (consolation) addressed to the bereaved but also in the theorization of the soul’s posthumous existence. While one of the two most popular philosophical schools at Rome, Epicureanism, denied the soul’s existence after death, the other, Stoicism, at least entertained the possibility of a celestial realm in which souls subsisted. Such notions might inspire imagined journeys to the world of the dead, like that represented in Cicero’s “Dream of Scipio,” and visions of the dead in otherworldly locales, which had an old tradition extending back to Plato, the Presocratics, and Homer, allowed for the idealization of philosophical dialogue itself. An otherworldly setting, that is, could provide an ideal backdrop for discussion of arcane matters because the dead could be thought to possess knowledge inaccessible to the living.

The means by which Roman authors integrated such practices into literature are manifold, but I will emphasize one technique above all that accounts for the dead’s “imitation” of the living in literary fantasy: prosopopoeia or fictio personae, the “mask-making” by which ancient authors spoke in the voice of nonpersonal things and the dead, whether through direct speech or the descriptive introduction of a personified thing. Roman rhetoricians identified mortuos ab inferis excitare (calling up the dead from the underworld)—a subtype of oratorical prosopopoeia—as an effective trope for stirring up strong emotions in the audience of a legal or political speech, but it is related intrinsically to the much older and broader phenomenon of
adopter the persona of a ghost in poetic performance. *Prosopopoeia* allows Roman authors to have the dead speak and act in a manner suggestive of the practices outlined above. Indeed, the very act of “summoning” the dead or “bringing on stage” a Roman from the past can itself recall performances such as magic and drama. Quintilian illustrates the other descriptive sort of literary *prosopopoeia* with Vergil’s *Fama*, the personification of rumor that stalks Dido’s Carthage in the *Aeneid* (Quint. Inst. 9.2.36). In the texts under discussion, I will be especially interested in the *Furiae*, mythical avengers of murder victims and embodiments of the dead’s curse upon the living, the madness (furor) that drives the guilty to their destruction. *Prosopopoeia*, of course, cannot account for every passage that will be important to my study—literary laments, eulogies, and prayers, for example, have their place as well. It underpins, however, the primary instances of the phenomenon with which I am concerned.

The first three chapters treat Ciceronian oratory. Chapter 1 focuses on Cicero’s manipulation of the topos *mortuos excitare* in the *Pro Caelio* and the *Pro Milone*. The topos’ very name, “calling up the dead,” indicates a connection in the Roman imagination between oratory and magic. Although he denied the efficacy of magic himself, Cicero nevertheless understood the figurative magic of evoking the dead in a speech to offer considerable advantages to an orator and his client. The *prosopopoeia* of Appius Claudius Caecus in the *Pro Caelio* exploits the visualization of the dead to assimilate oratorical performance to a series of other, elite-sponsored performances, including funeral ritual, historical drama, and moralizing *carmina* (songs), meant to display the illustrious past with which Cicero seeks to be identified. The technique helps Cicero repackage scurrilous gossip about the notorious Clodia: connotations of elite performance, that is, authorize the rumors that Cicero purveys in Appius’ persona. While instrumental in Caelius’ defense, the shaming of Clodia also furthers Cicero’s attack, in the same speech, on his political enemy, P. Clodius Pulcher. The *Pro Milone*, conversely, directs the connotations of magic inherent in the topos toward the stigmatization of the very figure, the dead Clodius, it is used to evoke. Through the opposition it creates between superstitious views of the afterlife and their more enlightened philosophical counterparts, this kind of magic helps Cicero relegate a dead enemy to the past rather than simply bring him alive.

Chapter 2 argues that Cicero’s oratorical references to the Furies represent an appropriation of mythological tragedy for the purposes of characteristically late-republican political competition and thus represent a counterpart to his politically motivated use of *mortuos excitare*. As the embodiments of the dead’s curse upon the living, the Furies were associated with tragic narratives of murder, madness, and vendetta-style violence, together with power-
ful emotions of fear, guilt, and religious awe. Cicero turns these associations to his advantage by allowing the motif not only to inform the imagery and characterization of his speeches in a deep and subtle fashion but also to lend coherence to the presentation of pressing civic issues on diverse occasions. The Furies help Cicero frame discussions of the aftermath of civil war, the recurrence of violence across generations, the exile of leaders, the return of tyranny, and the mismanagement of Rome’s empire. In view of this dual function of the motif, the chapter begins with a detailed analysis of Cicero’s early speech Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, before turning, in briefer fashion, to a series of later orations.

In Chapter 3 I argue that the Second Philippic, a text written and circulated—but never delivered—during the final months of Cicero’s life, characterizes oratory’s traditional evocations of the dead as a preferable alternative to Julius Caesar’s emergent cult. As he attacks his enemy, Antonius, on political grounds, Cicero also makes the literary representation of oratory into a means of resistance to changes in Roman culture portending the monopolization of power by a sole emperor. The ambivalent laudatio of Julius Caesar near the end of the Second Philippic constructs this cultural dichotomy directly, but its full rhetorical force emerges only by tracing Cicero’s ongoing opposition of oratory to Antonius’ behavior toward the dead in general. At earlier moments in the speech, Cicero decries Antonius’ attempts to profit from Caesar’s death, his selfish consumption of the dead Pompeius’ possessions, and his failure to mourn those who had died in the recent civil war. The later Philippics, which were delivered in something close to their written form, confirm the centrality of this opposition within Cicero’s idea of Roman culture.

Propertius’ Elegies 4.7 and 4.11, spoken by the ghosts of Cynthia and Cornelia, respectively, are the focus of chapter 4. Although often studied from the perspective of the poetic tradition, these poems, I argue, adapt the republican oratorical trope of mortuos excitare. And we understand Propertius’ technique best by thinking of his poetry as restored behavior in the Schechnerian sense. While orators like Cicero had evoked the dead in actual trials so as to have them speak for themselves, here an Augustan poet calls up the dead in the circumstances of imagined trials. Propertius’ poems, however, illustrate the new political purpose behind the evocation of the dead in Augustan literature. For Propertius’ elegiac use of a republican rhetorical technique represents an appeal to the concerns of his Augustan audience, whose interest in assimilating republican cultural institutions to the changed political circumstances of the Principate is attested in other areas. Elegies 4.7 and 4.11 reflect, in however ambiguous and humorous a fashion, the Augustan “restoration” of the res publica and the Princeps’ suppression of
the ruinous political competition that overshadowed Cicero’s career. Further, I explain the uniqueness of Elegies 4.7 and 4.11 (no other Latin poems depict dead women delivering elaborate speeches of this kind) by showing how they also restore Propertius’ particular set of poetic postures vis-à-vis the dead in elegy as distinct from those of his republican predecessor, Catullus, and Augustan contemporaries Tibullus and Ovid. The poems suggest a heightened sensitivity, fostered by the traumatic experience of civil war, to the problems and importance of commemorative performance itself.

Propertius’ restaging of familiar republican performance finds a far grander analogue in Vergil’s Aeneid 1–6, the focus of chapter 5. In spite of the ambivalence toward Augustus that scholars have often discerned in the epic, its evocations of the dead suggest Vergil’s ambition to craft the central Augustan literary and cultural text. Here the evocation of Rome’s curse, the corrupt murder trial, the stigmatization of magic, the rituals of the Parentalia, the idealization of philosophical dialogue, and, finally, the aristocratic funeral procession, all reemerge in forms at least outwardly compatible with Augustan society. While Vergilian epic rivals the republican oratory of Cicero for the sheer scope and variety of such techniques, the two authors’ works underscore the central contrast of this book. With republican politics becoming a mere memory, Vergil grounds the Aeneid in the visible, bodily expression of what it means to be a Roman citizen under Augustus. He offers a mythic precedent for Augustan culture as it was lived by its participants.

Finally, an additional note about precedents and posterity. In some way, all prosopopoeia of the dead in Latin literature owes a debt to one of the founding acts of Roman literary production, Ennius’ evocation of Homer at the opening of the Annales. Ennius reports a dream in which Homer’s soul appeared and informed him that it had entered Ennius’ body. Our fragments preserve words from Homer’s speech, including his recollection of having first become a peacock, a detail inspired in some fashion by the philosophy of Pythagoras. Insofar as the Annales bear the traces of characteristically republican political quarrels between the aristocratic clans from which Ennius drew his patrons, the poet’s bravado piece of literary self-promotion is also a political act, comparable to a passage such as Cicero’s evocation of Appius Claudius Caecus in the Pro Caelio. Just as Ennius, drawing on philosophical tradition, makes himself the new Homer, worthy to sing the praises of a M. Fulvius Nobilior or M. Porcius Cato and elevate them above their political opponents, Cicero, drawing on a series of elite-sponsored performance genres, fashions himself as a new Appius, a figure of both political authority and literary renown, and a fitting defender of the young M. Caelius in the face of the decadent Clodii. Indeed, ideas of literary and familial ancestry must have been closely linked from the first
in the republican imagination, since Latin literature itself emerged in part as a vehicle for aristocratic self-promotion focusing especially on military and political achievements worthy of the ancestors. The notion, however, of poetic inspiration through the ghosts of literary forefathers carried over easily into the circumstances of Augustan cultural experimentation. We will see Propertius calling for inspiration from the spirits of Callimachus and Philetas, Hellenistic poets embodying his aesthetic ideals, and Vergil’s evocation of Hector, who confers the legacy of Troy upon the dreaming Aeneas, clearly bears some relation to the Ennius passage as well. While Ennius’ dream makes us aware of how much we may have lost in terms of precedents, it also justifies this book’s emphasis on prosopopoeia of the dead as a central Roman cultural gambit.19

Post-Augustan authors frequently evoke the dead in what might seem, at first glance, merely a continuation of Augustan techniques. Lucan, Seneca, and Statius, for example, revel in lurid portrayals of murdered ghosts and their Furies, and many such passages allude to similar moments in earlier literature. As I argue in the conclusion, however, “Silver Age” literature does not so much depict the dead’s “imitation” of the living as the living’s imitation of the dead: not the emulation of illustrious ancestors valued so highly in all periods of Roman history, but mimesis of the dead as the dead, an unsettling fantasy tied to growing anxieties over the imperial abuse of power. In Ovid’s poetry we discern the transition from one attitude to the other taking place. Moving from Ovid’s Metamorphoses to the Fasti to the poems from exile, we watch the Roman literary imagination coming to regard the dead past as a set of reified institutions through which to assess the imperial present.
CONCLUSION

The Living as the Dead

Looking from Cicero, Propertius, and Vergil to their successors, we are struck at once by the change in the Roman literary imagination where the dead are concerned. Where the earlier authors portray the “imitation” of the living on which this book has focused, later writers have a greater tendency to depict the living’s imitation of the dead—not the noble emulation of ancestral achievement denoted by the phrase *imitatio maiorum*, but a more sinister kind of mimesis we might term *imitatio mortuorum*: imitation of the dead as the dead. The description of such behavior centers on the notion of an ancestral curse, a phenomenon we have seen operative previously but which is now portrayed as irresistible and all-consuming. Lucan, for example, frames the civil war between Caesar and Pompeius, a conflict that engulfs the Roman world, as a regression into a pattern of hostility set out by Romulus and Remus but anticipated more directly by Sulla and Marius, whose ghosts appear near the outset of Lucan’s narrative to warn of the coming disaster (Luc. 1.580–83). At the opening of Seneca’s *Thyestes*, a Fury drives the ghost of Tantalus to curse his descendants with madness that will assure they imitate his crimes (1–121). In *Agamemnon*, the spirit of Thyestes expresses his desire for vengeance on the line of his brother, Atreus. Here, the ghost looks forward to the killing of Atreus’ son, Agamemnon, by Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, whose murderous act, the basis of the plot, marks the fulfillment of vengeance (1–56). In Statius’ *Thebaid*, the ghost of Oedipus’ father, Laius, inflicts the curse of intrafamilial conflict upon his grandchildren, Eteocles and Polynices (2.102–24), while Oedipus himself, hovering in a living death, likewise
curses his sons (1.56–87). Later, in the midst of war between the brothers, the prophet Amphiarraus makes a violent descent while still living into the underworld, whose inhabitants are amazed at his having become one of the dead before actually dying (7.818–23; 8.1–20). “Silver Age” works provide still other instances of this inverse phenomenon to add to those we have seen in their “golden” precursors.¹

What has changed in Roman society to account for this transformation of literary fantasy? At least part of the answer lies in the consolidation of the political and cultural order around the figure of the emperor. With the firm establishment of the Principate, Rome’s republican past becomes less a source of traditions to be transformed than a reified set of institutions through which to assess the imperial present. And assess it Romans did, for good or ill. Tacitus’ bitter insistence that the slavishness fostered by Augustus himself had destroyed the Roman character of old (Ann. 1.2.1; 4.1) can stand for the “Republican” strain in imperial political critique, while the younger Pliny’s Panygyricus finds in Trajan’s Rome an exemplary illustration of republican libertas.² Indeed, while the benefits of stable regimes were obvious to many, Romans remained perpetually wary of falling into the worst mistakes of the past, above all, the abuse of absolute power that had led to the civil strife of the late Republic. Hence imperial authors’ obsession with curses, tyrants, war between kin, and living death. In these circumstances, the literary evocation of the dead becomes, more often than before, a way to warn about the possibility of such failure or to imply that it has already occurred. It presumes a ruinous collapse of the distance between past and present, the very distance presupposed by the culturally transformative gestures of earlier literature.

In the poetry of Ovid, a transitional figure in so many ways, we can watch the change from one attitude to the other taking place. Consider the approach to change itself in Ovid’s Metamorphoses. While in the Aeneid, Vergil had stressed the possibility of rebirth out of death’s finality and despair, Ovid emphasizes the theme of change that elides death altogether, a posture that helps him avoid, at least outwardly, some of the thornier problems surrounding the consolidation of Augustus’ rule. This theme is important in a great many of Ovid’s stories from Greek mythology, but it takes on a marked political charge when he begins to recount the history of Rome. Indeed, the whole concluding segment of the Metamorphoses represents an exposition, in Roman terms, of a dictum Ovid attributes to the philosopher Pythagoras, whose journey to archaic Rome he recounts in Book 15: nihil interit (nothing dies) (165). In the previous Book, Ovid had told of Aeneas’ transformation into the god Indiges (14.581–608) and Romulus’ deification as Quirinus (805–28). Shortly after Pythagoras’ disquisition, Julius Caesar undergoes his
own fabled deification (15.745–851), the basis for Augustus’ reputation for divinity while he lived and precedent for the formal emperor worship established upon his death. It is significant that the ghosts of the *Aeneid*, symbols of loss and violence haunting the present, are all but absent from Ovid’s brief version of Aeneas’ wanderings (13.623–14.608). Still more telling is Remus’ total absence from the story of Romulus (14.778–828), with whom, as with Aeneas, Augustus had identified himself. The contrast with Vergil’s *Aeneid* could not be more evident: as we have seen, Vergil, who makes no secret of Remus, finds a cultural alternative to recent emphasis on Remus’ curse in the transferral of a positive legacy from the ruined Troy to Rome. However much Ovid’s silence about Remus might have helped him emphasize Augustus’ strengths, Ovid nevertheless constructs an imperial mythology vulnerable to the criticisms of the past on charges of ideological amnesia.

In the *Fasti*, unfinished at the time of his exile in 8 CE, Ovid takes a different approach to the Remus story: he actually summons the ghost of Remus in a dream-appearance to Faustulus and Acca so as to have Remus deny that Romulus killed him (5.457–74). Could Ovid really have imagined that this outright denial of the legend’s dominant version would have the force to erase its inconvenient details? Would contemporary audiences simply have applauded the blunt exculpation of Augustus’ legendary counterpart? The obvious potential for failure inherent in Ovid’s gesture has led scholars to suspect subversive intentions. Indeed, Remus’ account appears to be contradicted by the very words of reproach that Ovid, as narrator, has addressed to Romulus earlier in the *Fasti*: te Remus incusat (remus accuses you) (2.143). At the least, the apparent self-reversal of Ovid’s text sounds a note of uncertainty about the harmonious relationship of past and present, a sentiment that later authors would take up and magnify to a far greater pitch. Whatever Ovid’s intentions, his very attempt to provide absolution for the Augustan regime carries the seeds of its own undoing.

In his poetry from exile, Ovid constructs his condition as a living death in which true death, while desired, nevertheless eludes him. Indeed, in *Tristia* 1.3.21–24, he portrays his departure into exile as a funeral. In *Tristia* 3.11, he describes himself as a ghost (*umbra*), his body already reduced to ashes and buried in a tomb (25–26), while in *Ex Ponto* 1.9.55–56, he exhorts his friend Maximus to number him with the dead. In *Tristia* 3.2.21–24 Ovid casts himself in the role of traditional erotic elegy’s excluded lover (*exclusus amator*) knocking in vain on the door of death; in 3.3 he looks forward to death, since it will mean his longed-for return to Rome, once his wife has transferred his bones there (65–66). Ovid’s exile poems are a testament to the consolidation of Augustus’ power. Indeed, in their expressions of dependency on the Emperor’s mercy and frank acknowledgment of his authority,
they even provide a model of imperial subjection itself. But the ghostly Ovid who speaks here also points to the possibility of the dead’s indictment of tyranny. The closer Ovid gets to death, whether figurative or literal, the more he encourages his readers to weigh the gravity of his transgressions, which he never names outright, against the severity of his punishment. While Ovid himself cannot make accusations of despotism, his sepulchral voice is nevertheless a warning, an admonition to consider how the circumstances of tyranny might in fact be met. As a prophet (vates) now gone to his “death,” the exiled Ovid prefigures the prophetic ghosts who populate later literature and decry tyrannical behavior on the part of absolute rulers.

As Ovid anticipates a change in the literary evocation of the dead, so his work also suggests avenues for future inquiry based on the methods of this study. To take the example just cited—Ovid’s self-portrayal as a ghost—how, we might wonder, did the status of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* as orature render this tactic all the more poignant and tension-prone? In the context of oral delivery at Rome, the poems would have recalled not only earlier Roman elegy as a literary tradition with which Ovid engaged in characteristically allusive play but also performance occasions when Ovid was a popular figure in the capital. An awareness of the distance that the physical manuscripts of the exile poems would have traveled in order to be read in Rome would have highlighted the contrast between these earlier occasions, when Ovid either performed himself or a reader intoned the verses of the Roman poet, and the experience of reciting poetry whose author could actually have died without news of the event having yet become common knowledge. Imagine the chill of reading aloud a poem such as *Ex Ponto* 1.9, with its concluding exhortation to consider Ovid as already dead, and wondering whether one were in fact reciting the words of a dead poet, lost now from the circumstances of living performance and yet also tenuously present in the poetry as performed. In becoming, momentarily, Ovid’s ghost, was one also enacting a style of performance that was now only a historical throwback, its most illustrious—and notorious—*auctor* dead?

Passages in Ovid’s poetry like those to which I have referred do not so much restage cultural traditions as suggest all but untenable distortions of them. For the living to become the dead means taking on behaviors that literally do not belong in the present; Ovid’s distant voice is the echo of Ovidian erotic elegy excluded from Augustan Rome. Following up the implications of Ovid’s later work, one might ask how subsequent authors, rather than emphasizing the socially regenerative effects of orature and restored behavior, focus instead on their disquieting counterpart: the sense of alienation or nostalgia arising from the reenactment of practices whose original
social and political context is now a historical memory. Thus one might turn to a passage such as the reminiscence of the aristocratic *pompa funebris* following the death of Opheltes in Book 6 of Statius’ *Thebaid* (268–95).  

Statius’ description of the procession strikes a tone of reverence for ancestral glory, but the pitiful occasion of the funeral itself, the apparently random death of the infant Opheltes from a snake bite, undercuts deeply the sense of purposefulness that might arise from such display. Troubling, too, is the reminder of the enmity between the brothers Aegyptus and Danaus that accompanies the mention of their images (291–93). In a rite observed by the followers of Polynices, who are themselves engaged in a self-consuming war between brothers, the expectation of fraternal conflict that the images arouse stands unredeemed by immediate hope for resolution. Again, contrast Vergil, whose “Review of Heroes,” the passage with which our study began, couches its anxiety over civil war in expressions of hope for the Augustan future. What does it mean for Statius to retroject the *pompa funebris* into a violent episode from the Greek mythological past, whereas Vergil had cast its prototype in Elysium? Statius’ adaptation of the ritual under Domitian frames it in significantly different terms from those of the Augustan poet a century before.  

Latin literature both reflects and helps determine Rome’s changing relationship with a past at once silent and speaking, bodiless and embodied, dead and living. Cicero’s ghostly ancestors, murder victims, and war heroes, even as they point to a comforting and familiar sense of solidarity with the dead, unsettle any secure notion of history as a seamless progression of events. But their staging of practices threatened by disjunction or reaffirmed through an emphasis on continuity functioned as a powerful political tool at a moment when the traditional structure of the Roman state was in fact breaking down and aristocratic clans vied ruthlessly for power. In the early Augustan Principate, literature had an important part in voicing both the hopes and anxieties of a new elite looking for revised models of subjecthood and citizenship. In Propertius and Vergil, the dead act out new versions of traditional roles, whether through the gender play of erotic elegy or epic’s grand rediscovery of Roman prehistory. Thus in the first century BCE the forces acting on and through literary production at Rome resulted in something not seen to the same degree before or since: the culture of the living reenacted through the ghosts of the past.
Introduction

1. As Paul Allen Miller has recently observed, Augustan literature, in contrast to its republican precursor, was less a form of self-assertion than a complex negotiation of categories such as Romanitas (Romanness) and nobilitas (nobility) under the circumstances of subordination to a single central authority (Miller 2004: 75 comparing Fear 236–37; Habinek 1998: 121; Wallace-Hadrill 22; Conte 251, etc.). In this book I respond to growing interests both in the relationship between literature and performance at Rome and in the changing political motivations behind Romans' literary and cultural relations to the dead. On Latin literature and performance culture see, e.g., Skinner 1993; Valette-Cagnac; Feldherr 1998; Gamel; Habinek 1998; Wachter; Wyke; Habinek 2005b. Further bibliography in Habinek 2005b: 261, n1. For recent perspectives on cultural aspects of the dead in Latin literature, see Feldherr 2000; Littlewood; Bernstein 2003, 2004, 2005. More examples of both scholarly trends are cited in the chapters to follow.

2. Roach 11–12 citing Ngugi 61. For the appropriateness of viewing ancient Rome as one such society, see Habinek 2005b: 261–62 n1, with bibliography.


4. Ibid., 2.

5. Ibid., 12 citing Fliegelman 98, 192.

6. Ibid., citing James 87.


9. An illuminating example of the phenomena on which Schechner bases his views is the recreation of the past involved in the “restored village” theme parks so popular in the United States (see Schechner 1985: 79–94). Here actors dressed in period costumes perform historically specific activities for the benefit of park visitors. The actors, in persona, even encourage the audience to engage in dialogue, often meant to call attention to the changes in social mores that mark the difference between an earlier time and the present. The total experience, however, is intended not only to highlight difference but also to show how people “back then” were in some ways very much “like us,” a claim that may take on various sorts of resonance (humanistic, patriotic, aesthetic) depending on how it is made and who is listening.

11. I say this fully aware that any discussion of “Roman performance” is no more than a further textual mediation of behaviors already highly mediated though ancient texts and material artifacts. That is, I knowingly deal in a “rhetoric of reality” like that described by Duncan Kennedy in his study of Roman erotic elegy (Kennedy 1993; cf. Edmonds 4 on Habinck 2005a). In my view, however, the careful implementation of such a rhetoric can have the salutary effect of undoing the historical tendency to treat Latin literature as a phenomenon isolated from the broader culture (see Habinck 1998: 23–33). But, although I think the historical record is sound, the degree to which we can trust its testimonia, which are heavily skewed to an elite perspective, ultimately matters less to me than the correspondences between the Romans’ perceptions of various performance traditions and aspects of their literature.

12. Readers will find full citation of sources and scholarship on the Roman practices discussed here in the individual chapters below.

13. Cf. Wiseman 1998: 52. There were numerous other occasions, besides funerals, available for the performance of praetextae. By the Augustan period, the Roman calendar included fifty-six days set aside for ludi scaenici (theatrical games) (Wiseman 1998: 17).

14. On Greek tragedy’s “fascination with the dead,” see Johnston 23–30.


16. A focus on prosopopoeia has helped me to narrow down what might otherwise be an ungovernably large mass of material. It might be argued, for example, that the entire genre of historiography constitutes a series of “evocations of the dead.” In fact, most ancient rhetoricians distinguished between prosopopoeia, which could be used to have the dead speak as the dead (in which case it was sometimes called eidolopoeia [“ghost-making”]), and ethopoeia or sermonciniatio, the technique for introducing the speech of natural persons. See Lausberg 370.


19. Ennius used the technique at least once more in the Annales, in Aeneas’s appearance to the dreaming Ilia (44–46 Vahlen; although the dead Aeneas was, by this time, a god).

Chapter One

1. Lysias asserts that the dead are listening to the court proceedings, will recognize the jurors when they cast their ballots, and will consider the extraction of justice to have been carried out on their behalf (Lys. 12.100). Andocides asks his audience to envision his own ancestors pleading for him (And. 1.148). Isocrates asks the audience to imagine that the dead perceive what is happening in the world of the living; the possibility, however, is hypothetical (Isoc. 14.61; 5.105, 137; 6.110). Demosthenes uses a similar formulation (see Jost 231 on D. 19.66; 20.87; 23.210; cf. Jost 152–53). Antiphon’s Tetralogies refer to the avengers of the dead (see the following chapter).

2. On the topos mortuos [or defunctos] ab inferis excitare, see Cic. de Orat. 1.245; Orat. 85; Top. 45; Quint. Inst. 4.1.28, 9.2.31, 12.10.61; Rutulus Lupus 2.6; Aquila Romanus 3; cf. Quint. Inst. 9.2.36.

3. Cic. de Orat. 1.245 (Antonius to Crassus): patrem eius, ut soles, dicendo a mortuis excitasses; statuisses ante oculos; complexus esset filium, flensque eum centumviris com-
mendasset (through your eloquence, as you are accustomed, you would have conjured his
father up from the underworld, you would have set him before the eyes of all; he would
have embraced his son and, weeping, have commended him to the centumviri). Cf. Cic.
Scaur. 49 and the performance Cicero ascribes to his colleague P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus
at Red. Sen. 25–26 and Sest. 130–31 (passages discussed in detail below). Note that at
Brutus 322, Cicero implies that no other orator used the technique the way he did.

4. On the relation of Cicero’s published speeches to those he actually delivered, see
Humbert; Stroh 1975: 31–54; Narducci 157–73; Powell and Patterson 52–57. In what
follows, I assume that the published speeches, whatever the extent to which they actually
reproduce Cicero’s words on a given occasion, approximate the conventions of live speech
closely enough to be regarded as records and/or models of actual oratory.

5. Cf. the poetic description of Lake Avernus Cicero quotes at Cic. Tusc. 1.37 (Inc.
trag. 76–77 Ribbeck): unde animae excitantur obscura umbra opertae ex ostio / Altae
Acheruntis, salso sanguine (whence spirits, shrouded in dark shadow, are summoned up
from the blood-splattered portal of deep Acheron). For more on the ancient association
of rhetoric with magic, see De Romilly; Covino.

Many other studies of ancient magic are now available, e.g., Faraone; Johnston passim;
Graf; Gager; Faraone and Obbink. On the political significance of magic directed toward
the dead in Rome, see Habinen 2005b: 220–56.

7. For the individual charges and their division among Cicero and M. Licinius
Crassus, Cælius’ other patronus, see Austin 152–54. On the case for the prosecution, see

8. Craig 108–9 provides a useful summary of, and a balanced solution to, the debate.
As also noted there, Heinz 1925: 228, 245–48 and Stroh 1975: 269–73 argue for and
against general knowledge of the affair respectively, while Reitzenstein 1925: 32 and
Austin 86 maintain that Cicero could not have been the first to mention in court a cir-
cumstance as potentially damaging to Cælius’ standing (cf. Drexler 25; Classen 1973: 76
n74; Wiseman 1985: 74). Craig sees Cicero playing to both informed and uninformed
members of the audience, although he admits that embracing either perspective on
Cicero’s persuasiveness requires a “leap of faith” (Craig 109).

9. For Cicero’s manipulation of female stereotypes, see Geffcken 27–43; Lefkowitz
32–40; Skinner 1983.


11. See Geffcken 18–19, 34; Vasaly 172–90, esp. 174–75, 181. Scholars following
Geffcken’s emphasis on humor include Skinner 1983, May 105–16; Rigsby 97–105 (but
cf. Wiseman 1985: 84; May 116). For more on comedy in the Pro Cælio, see Leigh. While
I depart from the current tendency to describe the Appius passage’s dramatic effects
primarily in comic and/or trivializing terms, I certainly do not mean to deny the comic
qualities of the speech, but rather to follow in a direction suggested by Salzman, for
whom the speech’s evocation of drama functions also as an attack upon the unconven-
tional religious behavior of the Clodii (a further subject of gossip behind those I discuss
here). The broad civic context recalled by Salzman suggests the benefits of widening the
horizons of our interpretation beyond the specific festival circumstances of the Ludi
Megalenses.

12. Here “system” suggests the organized, even ritual process of information transmis-
ion in the judicial context, while “network” refers to a set of interrelations not necessarily
defined by such organization (although, admittedly, views of the informality of gossip
I assume a common definition of “gossip” as “idle talk; trifling or groundless rumour” (OED) and so do not adopt a binding distinction between gossip and rumor (cf. Rosnow and Fine 81–93; Bergmann 70). I am further indebted to Reumaux for my understanding of gossip and rumor as social phenomena and topics of critical concern. Discussions of Roman gossip are few. Laurence documents the importance of rumor to the overall functioning of the Roman political system. Millar 13–48 discusses a key Roman information network in examining the crowd’s experience of the judicio-political system in the Roman Forum. Richlin 81–104 describes interchange among the informal discourses of graffiti, gossip, lampoons, and rhetorical invective (hardly institutionalized in the manner of judicial oratory). For the ethical basis of Roman political invective and its associations with slander, see Corbeill passim. It is worth noting that the social aspects of gossip often emphasized by scholars of Greco-Roman antiquity—namely, the definition and enforcement of societal norms (cf. Hunter 96–119 with bibliography)—are not the only ones relevant to a full appreciation of the Pro Caelio in its socio-cultural context. While helping to police society in this way, gossip may also have a more creative function, in that formal societal institutions such as judicial oratory feed off informal practices and draw their strength partly from their ability to co-opt them without seeming to. Indeed, for John Schotter, “humanly adequate social orders . . . can only be created, sustained, and transformed” by “drawing upon” activities such as gossip, “usually dismissed as a waste of time” (Schotter 150). Formal institutions, in other words, may explicitly deny the power of the informal practices they co-opt; they betray, however, their dependence on the informal in their attempt to redefine practices such as gossip into a shape that is amenable to their own ends, namely, the support of the existing power structure. Both Schotter and Lorraine Code have called our attention to the way that informal, disorderly social activities are not only threatening but also valuable because of their “resistance to paradigmatic summing-up,” their disassociation from an answerable source (Code 104; cf. Schotter 150). It is this very resistance that allows Cicero to benefit from the “creative” potential of gossip to such a remarkable degree in the Pro Caelio. In the place of an anonymous vox populi, Cicero easily substitutes Appius Claudius Caecus, an arresting figure from Rome’s public world of traditional aristocratic spectacle and display.

13. On the centrality of elite-sponsored spectacle within Roman society, cf. Dupont 1985; Feldherr 1998; Kyle. The ambiguity of the Latin term fama suggests that evocation of the illustrious dead was an especially effective way to manage gossip at Rome. Sermo and rumor regularly signify gossip as a means of information transmission as well as specific topics gossiped about (OLD sermo 4, 5; rumor 2); opinio and fama commonly refer to reputation, with fama used in particular for rumor, hearsay, and public opinion (OLD opinio 5; fama 2, 4, 5, 6). Fama however, can also be synonymous with gloria, and so stands at once for the vagaries of informal speech and its transformation into the institutionalized reputation of the dead (OLD fama 7). As does Cicero’s Appius Claudius Caecus.

14. On the importance of Pro Caelio 6 for our understanding of republican political invective, see Corbeill 17–18.

15. Cicero’s claim may strike us as odd in light of the fact that the republican judicial system did not have formal rules of evidence (Zumpt 245–46; Greenidge 274; Strachan-Davidson 121–24). Rhetorical topoi governing Cicero’s claim are discussed below.

16. Rhet. Her. 2.12: Contra rumores dicemus . . . si . . . aut iniquos nostros aut homines natura malivolos et maledivos confinxisse dicemus . . . aut verum rumorem preferemus qui
[s.c. adversariis] aliquid turpitudinis adferat, neque tamen ei rumori nos fidem habere dicemus, ideo quod quivis unus homo possit quamvis turpem de quolibet rumorem proferre et conflictam fabulam dissipare (We will speak against rumors . . . if . . . we say that our enemies or men by nature malevolent and slanderous invented them . . . or produce a true report carrying some disgrace [to our adversaries] and yet say that we have no faith in it because any person at all can produce and spread any disgraceful rumor or fictitious story about any other person). The same passage offers arguments for rumores in separate circumstances. See further Quint. *Inst.* 5.1.1, which locates rumores among the proofs not invented by the orator (cf. A. *Rh.* 1355b 35–38). *Rhet. Her.* 4.47 describes the duty of a witness as to say “what he knows or what he has heard” and opinio is one of the adiuncta to the trial that can be useful as a prooimial locus (Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.31 referencing Cic. *Ver.* 1). Cicero frequently claims to reproduce the common gossip about individuals as a means of stigmatizing his enemies and opponents (above all, Clodius); cf. Richlin 83–86; Laurence 64. For my discussion of rhetorical theory I have relied especially on Lausberg.

17. Cicero admits to having himself been taken in by Catiline before he achieved an unobstructed perception of Catiline’s true nature—before he could rely, that is, on his own eyes to confirm the opinio surrounding Catiline’s acts (*Cael.* 14). On the importance of a young man’s public associations, cf. Vasaly 184.

18. Indeed, in a notorious sexual double standard, the example of Roman public figures helps Cicero excuse Caelius’ involvement in the affair with Clodia while holding Clodia morally accountable for the same affair. Many, Cicero insists, of the most illustrious Roman men, even in the times of the ancestors, fell victim to cupiditas and libido in youth, only to have their virtus emerge in full force during their careers as adults (43). Clodia’s virtue as a woman is not subject to a similar recuperation once undermined.


21. Although he first asks whether she has not seen that her father was a consul (*Cael.* 33).

22. On the scurrilous connotations of Clodia’s “unchaste” use of water, see Butrica and Bruun.

23. On Appius and the Via Appia, see MacBain.


26. On Lake Avernus as a nekuomanteion, see Ogden 61–74.

27. Direct reference to tragedy also has a place in Cicero’s denunciation of Clodia, since it is very much in keeping with the nature of Roman moralizing to treat the chastisement of an errant member of the familia as a solemn event, worthy of the pathos of tragedy even if open to the humor intrinsic in blame and invective. The *Pro Caelio* as a whole is not without serious, even tragic, effects, as memorably in Cicero’s digression on the death of Q. Caecilius Metellus (*Cael.* 59).

28. Cf. Gaffney 428. On Cicero’s use of the prosecution’s arguments more generally, see Gotoff. Appius shields Cicero from the kind of criticisms Cicero directs at Herennius because Cicero can thereby transfer some of the responsibility for what he says to Appius (cf. *Cael.* 33, where Cicero ironically suggests that Appius will speak for him so that Clodia won’t become angry with him). Part of Cicero’s effectiveness is in distinguishing between those who act like stern fathers in disciplining someone else’s child (i.e., the prosecution) and paternal figures who appropriately discipline their own offspring.
(Appius, and the lenis father from comedy in Cael. 38) or someone for whom they have a responsibility (Cicero himself as he disciplines Caelius in Cael. 37).


30. For the identification of these persons as Stoics, see Austin 104. The passage as a whole divides attitudes toward pleasure into Epicurean, Academic/Peripatetic, and Stoic camps.

31. Gossiping old men, we may observe, are a paradigmatic butt of Greco-Roman comedy generally.

32. Nicolet treats the various formal and informal venues, including the theater, funerals, contiones, and more casual meeting-places, available for the expression of popular opinion at the close of the Republic. See especially “Escorts and demonstrations” (356–61), “Games, festivals, and theatres” (361–73, detailing Cicero’s sensitivity to the responses of theater crowds), and “Trials and lawsuits” (373–81).

33. On the imagines and the pompa funebris, see Drerup; Lahusen; Lucrezi; Dupont 1987; Flower 1996; Walter 89–112. The ancient locus classicus is Plb. 6.52–54.

34. Diodorus Siculus (31.25.2) suggests the actors’ imitation of the dead’s bearing and appearance, but neither he nor any of our other sources mention verbal imitations as a part of the republican pompa. But cf. Flower 1996: 104 on the speaking actor who played the part of the emperor Vespasian at the latter’s funeral.

35. Cf. Flower 1996: 129 n5, who observes that it is possible to interpret Appius’ address as “a reversal of the dramatic action of the eulogy,” in which a family member addressed an audience of actors wearing the imagines.

36. On the laudatio funebris, see Vollmer; Durry; Kierdorf; Flower 1996: 128–50.

37. Cicero himself doubted the credibility of Roman laudationes (Cic. Brut. 62). His vehement expression of such doubt, however, suggests the extent to which funeral eulogy was in fact regarded as truth.

38. Cf. Cic. Tusc. 4.4 and [Sall.] Rep. 1.1.2. On the fragments of Appius’ carmina, see below.

39. Ancient texts were commonly meant to be read aloud, but the stylistic features of many carmina, including alliteration, assonance, and figura etymologica, made them particularly suitable for oral delivery (see Williams 1968: 693). On carmen and performance more broadly, see Habinek 2005b. The association of epitaphs with performed carmina is underscored by their early adoption of the Saturnian verse form, used likewise for hymns and epic poetry. On the scope of Saturnians, cf. West 1973: 175. On the association of epitaphs and laudationes, see Flower 1996 passim.

40. Appius Claudius Caecus, fr. 1–3 Blänsdorf. For interpretation and commentary, including the metrical debate, cf. Ballaira; Tar; Giardina; Stoessl; Marini.

41. Fest. p. 48 in Lindsay’s Teubner edition. We do not know, of course, whether Appius’ work was actually performed in public. Performance, however, attaches to him as a public figure and author of carmina (cf. Habinek 2005b: 49). Appius’ reputation as a persuasive orator adds further to the authority he is able to bestow on Cicero’s own speech. The Pro Caelio alludes to a specific speech of Appius, his argument against the peace with Pyrrhus, that helped establish Appius’ reputation as a persuasive public speaker (cf. Cael. 34). A version of this speech was circulating in Cicero’s day and available for him to consult. In spite of his skepticism about the charm of Appius’ oratory, Cicero concludes that Appius must have been disertus (a ready speaker) because he was able to sway the opinion of a senate leaning toward peace (cf. Cic. Brut. 55, 61; Sen. 16).

42. On the praetexta see Zehnacker; Manuwald; Feldherr 1998: 172; Wiseman 1998;
Walter 75–83. The frequency which these plays were actually produced is debated by scholars. For the controversy, see Flower 1995; Wiseman 1998: 1–16.

43. Cic. Brut. 322 recommends a knowledge of Roman history, ex qua . . . [sc. orator] ab inferis locupletissimos testis excitaret (from which . . . [the orator] may call up the most reliable witnesses from the underworld).

44. Cf. Geffcken 17 following Austin 94–95.

45. Cf., e.g., Geffcken 17–18 on Quint. Inst. 11.1.39.

46. Cf. Salzman 301.


48. For the topos, see above, n2. It is possible that the necromancy apparently practiced by Clodia’s other brother, Appius Claudius Pulcher, somehow lies behind Cicero’s use of mortuos excitare in the Pro Caelio (cf. Ogden 150–51). Cicero and Appius Claudius Pulcher were not always on good terms, although Appius receives a favorable mention at Pro Milone 75 (another speech, interestingly, in which Cicero uses mortuos excitare to attack Clodius: see below).

49. The conventional emphasis also seems to have been on those who had died fairly recently (but cf. Cicero’s suggestion that P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus evoked long-dead Metelli [Red. Sen. 25; Sest. 130]).


52. In the circumstances of Caelius’ trial, Cicero’s unconventional, self-conscious exploitation of the topos could also generate a useful ambivalence. If the audience regards Cicero as an experienced orator employing a rhetorical topos in its known form, this will help them view Appius as a feature of oratorical gravitas and institutional “truth.” If, however, the audience is listening more closely for rhetorical parody (Cicero has by this point already described Caelius’ accusers as overly ‘censorious’), then Cicero’s signaling of Appius as an irregular example of the topos adds to the sense of parody in his remarks. Of course, both effects are simultaneously possible and beneficial to Cicero’s case. Given Cicero’s use of the topos elsewhere in his speeches, we may even hear mild self-parody in his introduction of Appius as ab inferis excitandus. The benefit of such self-parody would be further to distance Cicero from his opponents’ type of censure, delivered in full seriousness (and, apparently, in propria persona) against Caelius.


54. Most scholars have assumed a considerable gap between the spoken and published versions of the Pro Milone. See Humbert 189–97; Lintott 1974: 74; Stone; Crawford 1984: 210–218; Marshall; Dyck 2002; Powell and Paterson 55. Settle, however, dismisses the evidence for a major discrepancy as inconclusive. In what follows I will assume that the extant Pro Milone, whatever the differences between it and the speech Cicero actually delivered, can and should be read as a response to the actual circumstances of the trial. Asconius himself may be suggesting as much in saying scripsit vero hanc quam legimus ita perfecte ut iure prima haberi possit (Yet he wrote this [speech] which we read so perfectly that it can deservedly be considered the original) (Asc.p. 42 in Clark’s Oxford
edition) and Milo’s ironic remark (D.C. 40.54.3) that he would not be eating the mullets of Massilia, his place of exile, had Cicero delivered the speech in its published form, points to a similar understanding of the text. A speech with little relation to the original circumstances would have undermined any benefits of publishing the *Pro Milone* for an audience familiar with events.

55. Many accounts of the period are available. For a concise chronology of events leading up to the trial see Ruebel; cf. Gruen 1974: 233–39.

56. Milo had been instrumental in Cicero’s recall from exile in 57 BCE and the two had collaborated in political trials in 56. For the history of their relations see Lintott 1974.

57. On Milo’s own history of violence, including his organization and deployment of armed gangs, see Lintott 1999: 60 ff., 83–85, and *passim*.


59. See above, n53.

60. Plu. *Cic.* 35.4.

61. Ancient rhetorical theory recognized the *constitutio adsumptiva*, of which sections 72–91 of the *Pro Milone* are a clear example, as the shoring up of a weak argument through the insertion of material not strictly relevant to the case. *Rhet. Her.* 1.24: *Adsumptiva pars est cum per se defensio infirma est, adsumpta extraria re conprobatur* (The assumptive issue is when the defense is weak in itself but is proven by the introduction of extraneous matter); cf. Quint. *Inst.* 7.4.7. The designation *extra causam* comes from Cicero’s own words in Mil. 92: *Sed iam satis multa de causa, extra causam etiam nimis fortasse multa* (But now I have said a sufficiently great amount concerning the case, and even perhaps too much outside the limits of the case). Cf. Stone 95–96.

62. It is tempting to see (with Stone 96–97) a jab at Pompeius lurking in this passage. Cicero may be suggesting that it is hypocritical of Pompeius to have ordered a special inquiry into Clodius’ death when even he would not wish Clodius to return to life. The question remains open as to whether Cicero actually risked making this suggestion at Milo’s trial. For the argument that he did not, see Stone 98ff.

63. Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.91: *tu . . . illas faces incendisti . . . quibus semustilatus ille est* (you [Antonius] . . . kindled those torches . . . with which that man [Julius Caesar] was scorched).


65. Elsewhere, Sallust, Livy, and Cicero himself express similar views. Sallust, for example, describes how the *gloria* of figures from the past incites outstanding men to achieve a similar renown (Sal. *Jug.* 4.6; cf. Cat. 11.2). Livy reports the zeal with which the heroic M. Valerius sought to emulate the *gloria* of his house by killing the young T. Tarquiniius, son of L. Tarquiniius Superbus, the last king of Rome (Liv. 2.20.1). Cicero declares that the Romans surpass other nations in their desire for *gloria* (Cic. *Man.* 7; cf. *Tusc.* 1.91). Further parallels in Knoche and Leeman.


68. For Cicero’s reactions to Clodius’ adoption, cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.7.2; 2.9.1; 2.12.1–2; 8.3.3; *Dom.* 34–42; *Har.* 44–45. Clodius arranged the adoption in order to stand for the office of Tribune for 58 BCE, to which he was elected.
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69. See above, n2.
71. See D.C. 49.43.5 on Agrippa’s bill expelling astrologers and witches from the city (cf. 52.36.1–3; Dickie 155, 192). For more on constraints against magicians in Rome, see Dickie 142–61.
73. Suet. Aug. 33.1 relates that Augustus tired to help an accused man avoid punishment in the culleus (sack) by asking him a leading question. The Romans traditionally punished condemned parricides by first enclosing them in the culleus with a dog, a cock, a snake, and a monkey, then throwing them into a river or the sea.

Chapter Two

2. Cicero professes disbelief in the Furies of myth and interprets them in psychological and symbolic terms (Cic. Leg. 1.40; cf. Rosc. Am. 67; Pis. 46). Thus they are appropriately viewed as instances of descriptive prosopopoeia in his oratory. Greek oratory suggests, on the one hand, efforts to engage with traditional beliefs in the Erinyes as actual divinities (see Gagarin 23 on Antiphon’s Tetralogies) and, on the other hand, signs of a similar skepticism (Aeschin. Tim. 190–91).
3. Cicero’s technique reflects the politicization of Roman tragedy itself, on which see Nicolet 366–73; Gruen 1992: 183–222.
4. For Cicero’s discussion of pathetic techniques in oratory, see esp. de Orat. 1.17, 53, 60, 2.178, 215; Brut. 276, 279, 322; Orat. 69, 128; cf., e.g., Quint. Inst. 6.2.8 and esp. 6.2.20: πάθος . . . tragediae magis simile (pathos . . . is more similar to tragedy).
5. For the pathetic display routinely engaged in by the accused in Roman lawsuits, who appeared in mourning garb, see Dyck 2001: 120.
6. For fear and pity as the emotions appropriate to tragedy, the locus classicus is Arist. Po. 1449b24–28.
7. By contrast, Rosc. Am. 45–51 portrays the young Roscius as a paragon of old-time Roman virtue and familial piety. On Cicero’s bonus rusticus stereotype, see Vasaly 157–72.
8. The political argument of the Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino has been a subject of considerable interest and debate; I do not seek to offer new insight into this problem per se. In general, I agree with Gruen 1968: 265–71 that the speech we possess constitutes a harsh critique of the Sullan regime but was probably modified somewhat for publication. Cf., e.g., Kinsey 1975 and 1982; Seager. The problem of the two versions was phrased in extreme terms by Humbert 100–11. Subsequent critics have not shared his views. Buchheit 1975b provides a good introduction to the indirect and ironic means through which Cicero makes his criticisms felt.
9. On the rhetorical importance of this section to the overall effect of the speech, see esp. Stroh 1975: 55–79.
10. Aeschines insists that the origins of misfortune are not only to be found in the gods’ actions but also in mankind’s own depraved nature. It is not the case, he suggests, that those who have committed impiety are hounded by the Furies as in plays, but rather that men’s own licentiousness and insatiability are the Furies that drive them to commit criminal acts (Aeschin. Tim. 190–91).
11. The *Pro Roscio Amerino* is notable for its dramatic reversal of the charges onto parties linked to the prosecution. For the *remotio criminis* as a technique, see Cic. Inv. 1.15, 2.71, 86–94. On Cicero’s handling of the charges in general, see Butler 14–23. On the details of the case and the possibility that Roscius may in fact have been guilty, see Kinsey 1980 and 1985; Alexander 149–72; Dyck 2003.

12. For more on Cicero’s portrayal of Chrysogonus and use of *ethos* in the *Pro Roscio Amerino*, see Buchheit 1975a; May 21–31.

13. Still further correspondences emerge between Cicero’s descriptions of Roscius’ accusers and his portrait of the parricide in general. The parricide outdoes the wild beasts in his *immanitas* (savageness) (63). So, too, Chrysogonus displays a worse than bestial *immanitas* in his relentless pursuit of Roscius’ life (150). The parricide has polluted all human and divine laws (65). Chrysogonus has committed ritual pollution in breaking the sacred bond of *fides* incurred by an embassy, while T. Roscius Capito has contaminated himself with every imaginable *maleficium* (112–13, 116). The parricide is permanently stained by the parental blood he sheds and harried night and day by the consciousness of his crimes (66–67); Roscius’ persecutors are perpetually involved in bloodshed and are guilty of untold murders (81: note the repetition of the phrase *dies noctesque* here and at 6 and 67).

14. Cf. Lenaghan 156 and below on Cicero’s characterization of Clodius as a Fury in the *De haruspicum responso*.

15. On the Erinies and blood, see Moreau 72 and passim. Cf. Cicero’s characterization of Sex. Naevius in the *Pro Quinctio* (39: *sanguinem vitamque*; 46: *vitam et sanguinem*).

16. This is Madvig’s emendation, adapted in Clark’s Oxford text, of a slightly different wording in the manuscripts.

17. E.g., at A. Eu. 304–5.


19. Cicero here goes well beyond the narrow technical sense of the word *periculum* as a “danger” incurred by a defendant or plaintiff (OLD 3).

20. See OLD, s.v. *domesticus*.

21. Dramatic tradition anticipates Cicero’s configuration of the Furies, *crudelitas*, and *nefas*. The connection between the Furies and *crudelitas* finds a close parallel in Euripides’ *Orestes*. Here, the Furies are described as both divinities susceptible to prayer and figments of Orestes’ fevered imagination. The Chorus, for example, prays devoutly to the Eumenides to cease their torments of Agamemnon’s son and heir, while Electra tries to convince her brother that he sees none of the things he thinks he sees (E. Or. 259). In response to Menelaus’ question, “What sickness (*νόσος*) is destroying you?” Orestes responds, “Conscience, for I am conscious of having committed terrible acts” (395–96). The figuration of Orestes’ guilty conscious as a *νόσος* recalls an earlier passage in which Electra describes her brother as *σύριφα σωτηρικεῖς νόσοι* (wasted by savage illness) (34). Orestes’ *σύριφα νόσοι* makes him like a beast—a colt—who chafes at going under the yoke. Indeed, the adjective *σύριφα* suggests life in the fields, that is to say, at the opposite topographical extreme from civilized, law-abiding life of the polis. In its savageness, Orestes’ illness is thus locatable in a tradition of ancient medico-political discourse, from which the *crudelitas* of Cicero’s *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* also draws. Should *crudelitas*, Cicero insists, afflict the minds of Cicero’s jury, *inter feras*, he insists, *satius est aetatem degere quam in hac tanta immanitate versari* (it would be better to live among the wild beasts than to be in the midst of such great brutality as this) (150). The roots of
Cicero’s imagery extend still further back to Euripides’ own paradigm, the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus. Aeschylus repeatedly likens the Erinyes to savage beasts and wild animals (A. Eu. 131–32, 193–94, 644; etc.). They are described as δυσπαρίγγοι (hard to appease) (384) and, before being forced by Athena to accept their new cult status, they threaten to let loose “every kind of death” and to disregard the claims of parents against murderous children (502, 508–516). Athena warns them not to “establish in my citizens war among kin, its insolence directed toward one another,” a condition that she likens to the spirit of fighting cocks (861–863; cf. 976–87). Once their change has been effected, the Eumenides pray that insatiable stasis not βρέμειν (thunder) in the polis (976–79). Cf. Cicero’s fear that crudelitas harden the minds of the jury and wipe out their misericordia (pity), a condition that would make them impervious to appeasement and so renew civil strife (Cic. Rosc. Am. 150). Men’s insolent desires, Cicero warns, may prorumpere (burst forth) to such a degree that murders will be committed among the very benches of the court (12). *Crudelitas* has within it the evil that has destroyed so many citizens (154). The animal, bloodthirsty desires of Roscius foes are virtually insatiable (150).

22. See chapter 1, n73.
23. Similarly, although with somewhat less irony, Cicero concludes that the victory of the nobiles in the recent civil war was achieved deorum voluntate, studio populi Romani, consilio et imperio et felicitate L. Sullae (by the will of the gods, with the enthusiasm of the Roman people, and through the planning, the command, and the good fortune of Lucius Sulla) (136).
24. Although Cicero names Sulla honoris causa (with honor), and later insists that Sulla was ignorant of Chrysogonus’ actions (6, 25, 131–132), the doubts about their relations are a part of the speech’s overall strategy, and Cicero’s claims that Sulla was unaware have been read as ironic (e.g., Buchheit 1975b: 588).
25. For the trial and its context, see Gruen 1974: 283–85; Berry 14–42.
26. Catiline himself had killed M. Marius Gratidianus at the tomb of Q. Lutatius Catulus during Sulla’s march on Rome in 82 BCE.
28. This is especially so since a “tragic” styling of Clodius’ killing seems to have occurred to others involved in Milo’s trial: at one point Cicero professes to be astounded that Clodius’ death on the Via Appia, the road built by his ancestor Appius Claudius Caecus, has stirred up such tragedias (tragedies) among those on the opposing side (18). More significant, Cicero maintains, is the fact that Clodius fell near Mount Alba in Latium, an area he had defiled (85). It is also appropriate that the killing took place near a temple of the Bona Dea, whose rites Clodius had desecrated (86). Such details prove, for Cicero, that Clodius’ death was actually ordained by a divine force acting for the good of Rome. Anthony Corbeill suggests to me the interesting possibility that the Clodians might actually have styled themselves as Furies (through dress, props, etc.).
30. See Clark and Ruebel and chapter 1.
31. On manipulation of the legal system as a feature of tyrants, see Clark and Ruebel 64.
32. The corresponding identification of Clodius with the dead Clytemnestra seems less surprising the more we take into account Cicero’s overall feminization of Clodius in his invective. See Dyck 2001: 126–27; Leach. The story of Orestes, who killed his mother
to avenge his father, has an added relevance to Milo’s defense insofar as Milo’s accusers emphasized that his killing of Clodius on the Via Appia was an affront to the Claudian gens. Through the figure of Orestes, Cicero compares Milo to one who upheld familial traditions while appearing to disrupt them. Cicero thus opens the door to seeing Milo as a champion of a cause the Claudii themselves might embrace, namely, patriotism in service of a familial legacy. Clytemnestra, of course, undermined the illustrious house into which she married through murder and adultery. Clodius, Cicero insists, was likewise unworthy of the illustrious family into which he was born, while Milo is actually more worthy to be associated with the good name of the Claudii. Cicero is careful to point out that Clodius’ own brother, Appius Claudius Pulcher, shares with Milo his victimization at the destructive Clodius’ hands (75).

33. Brunt 63.
36. The passage in fact echoes Verg. A. 7.299–303, where Juno, about to summon the Fury Allecto from the underworld, complains that the Syrtes, Scylla, and Charybdis have failed to stop the Trojans in their journey (another mythical prototype for Roman imperial expansion).
37. For more on Cicero’s rhetorical representation of Romans in the provinces, see Steel 21–74.
38. The second actio of the trial of Verres never took place due to Verres’ flight into exile. Cicero retains, nevertheless, a semblance of oral performance in the material he published as his “speech.” See Narducci 169–71; Butler 61–84.
39. Cicero distinguishes here between the avengers of the innocent dead, the Poena, and those of the damned, the Furiae; cf. Cic. Clu. 171; Pis. 91.
40. See Dugan 55–74 for a recent discussion of In Pisonem as “a literary intervention into the political realm” (61). For more on the tragic qualities of Piso’s madness, see Kubiak.
41. Suet. Aug. 33.1. [Longin.] Subl. 15.8, however, suggests that the motif persisted in some form in imperial delamation. Cf. Petr.1. On the disappearance, under Augustus, of publicly performed tragedy itself, see Coffey; Goldberg.
42. Mankin 109, 301. Cf. below, chapter 5, p. 103.

Chapter Three

1. Cf., conveniently, the inscriptions included in Appendix B of Flower 1996 (326–30): ILLRP 309 = ILS 1; ILLRP 310 = ILS 2 & 3; ILLRP 311 = ILS 4; ILLRP 316 = ILS 6; etc. On the laudatio funebris in general, see chapter 1.
2. Plin. Nat. 7.43.140 (= ORF³ no. 6 fr.2): voluisse enim primarium bellatorum esse, optimum oratorem, fortissimum imperatorem, auspicio suo maximas res geri, maximo honore uti, summa sapiencia esse, summum senatorum haberi, pecuniam magnam bone modo invenire, multos liberos relinquere et clarissimum in civitate esse. Haec contigisse ei nec ulii aliui post Romam conditam (for [Q. Metellus said that] he wanted to be the most outstanding of warriors, the best orator, the bravest commander; he desired the greatest deeds to be accomplished under his auspices, and he himself to enjoy the greatest honor, to possess the utmost wisdom, to be considered the leading senator, to acquire great wealth by honest means, to leave behind many children, to be the most eminent man in
the state. These things he attained and not any other man in Rome’s history). Metellus’ eulogy was delivered in 221 BCE.

3. Most obvious is the asyndeton that marks Cicero’s catalogue of Caesar’s virtues and achievements. Metellus’ list of his father’s achievements, for example, almost entirely lacks connectives, as do many similar passages in the inscriptions associated with the tomb of the Scipios as well as the later “Laudatio Turiae” and Laudatio Murdaiæ. With the alliteration and cumulative structure of Phil. 2.116 cf. esp. Laudatio Murdaiæ (CIL VI 10230 = ILS 8394, lines 27–30. The abstracts cogitatio and diligentia recall the funereal emphasis on sapientia, while ingenium is a term applied to the Scipios and others. The repetition of the adjective magnus echoes its repetition (often in the superlative) in the Metellian laudatio. Finally, even the very phrase with which Cicero begins his praise of Caesar, Fuit in illo, suggests funereal texts such as the Scipionic inscriptions for the prominence of the perfect form of esse and the close conjunction of this verb with the demonstrative pronoun (ILLRP 310 = ILS 3, lines 2, 4: duonoro optumo auise viro / . . . consol, censor, aidilis hic auet [pud vos]; ILLRP 309 = ILS 1, lines 2–4: fortis vir sapiensque, / quoius forma virtuei parinuxa fuit; / consol, censor, aidilis quei fuit apud vos; cf. the epitaph of A. Atullus Caiatinus, which Cicero himself quotes in another context: hunc unum plurimae consentiunt gentes populi primarium fuisse virum [Cic. Sen. 61; cf. Fin. 2.116; Tusc. 1.13]). In general, the economy of expression demonstrated by Cicero’s praise of Caesar in the Second Philippic is in keeping with Cicero’s own prescriptions for the Roman laudatio: delivered in the forum as a testimony to character, it has brevitationem . . . nudam atque inornatam (a bare and unadorned brevity); composed specifically as a funeral speech, it is ad orationis laudem minime accommodata (least suited to a display of oratorical excellence) (Cic. de Orat. 2.341).

4. For Cicero’s attitudes, see, e.g., Mitchell 252–66.

5. Cf. Dugan, who argues for Cicero’s Pro Archia as a “pre-mortem laudatio funebris” for Cicero himself, allowing “Cicero’s self-presentation . . . to assume the perspective of ultimate monumentality and the authority of a narrative that has reached its final conclusion” (43) especially in contrast to the narrative of illegitimacy and failure he uses to characterize L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in In Pisonem (cf. my discussion of similar aspects of this speech in chapter 2 and cf. chapter 1 on the adaptation of laudatio funebris in the Pro Caelio). For another recollection of laudatio funebris earlier in the Second Philippic, see below on Phil. 2.69 and, for Antonius’ devotion to Caesar’s species, on Cic. Phil. 13.46.

6. On Cicero’s expressed reasons for silence, and his circulation of the written text, first to Atticus and then to a wider audience, see Ramsey 158–59; Shackleton Bailey 1986: 31. There has been some debate over the Second Philippic’s exact date of “publication”; however, as Ramsey observes, the prevailing theory is the most likely: the speech, which had already been sent to Atticus for comment and accordingly revised (cf. Cic. Att. 16.11), “was put into circulation not long after Antony left Rome for Cisapline Gaul on the night of 28/29 Nov.” (158). The threat posed by force of arms to the practice of free oratory had been among Cicero’s preoccupations during his withdrawal from politics under Caesar’s dictatorship, and a belief in the impossibility of oratory as he had known it was responsible in part for his return to study, and the burst of creative activity that produced the rhetorical works Brutus and Orator in 46 BCE. In the Brutus, Cicero recalls it as one of his great disappointments that at a time (the outbreak of the civil war) when the authority and oratory of a good citizen could have wrenched the weapons from the hands of irate citizens, men’s error or fear made the advocacy of peaceful measures impossible (7).
A similar theme recurs in the Second Philippic itself, as at section 108, near the speech’s conclusion, when Cicero recalls that already on the Kalends of June, 44 BCE, the Senate was prevented from meeting by Antonius’ show of arms.

7. On the Second Philippic as a contentio dicendi, see Craig 154; cf. Butler 117–23, who rightly points out that Cicero is also aware of the text of the Second Philippic as a document for posterity.

8. For Bourdieu’s theory of “objectification” and “embodiment,” see n27 below.

9. For a full account of the events pertaining to Caesar’s divinization see, above all, Weinstock, with the review by North. See further Taylor; Dobesch; Gesche; Alfoldi 1973 and 1985.

10. For the divine qualities of the illustrious dead, cf., e.g., Cic. Scaur. 50 (on Scaurus’ animus [spirit]); Cic. Rab. Perd. 29–30 (on great men’s mentes [minds]); etc.

11. On the cult and the temple, see Weinstock 385–410.

12. On his identity, see Meijer. His activities are the source of much uncertainty. Cicero’s suggestion of a funeral monument accompanied by a column must be taken together with the indication of an ara (altar), apparently described by Brutus and Cassius in a letter complaining to Antonius that Caesar’s veterans planned to rebuild it. See Weinstock 364 on Cic. Phil. 1.5; 1.30; 2.107; Att. 14.15.1; 14.16.2; Fam. 9.14.1; 12.1.1; Lactantius, Divinae institutiones 1.15.30. D.C. 44.51.1 refers to a ἀρχόμενος (altar) and Appian actually ascribes the erection of a ἄρα (altar) to Pseudo-Marius (see App. BC 2.148.616, 3.2.3, 3.3.7). Suet. Jul. 85 reports that sacrifice at a columna went on “for a long time”; Weinstock 365 assumes this to be a column set up by Octavian after Dolabella’s destruction of Amatius’ monument. Weinstock understands Cic. Phil. 2.107 to suggest “that there was no column in September or that there was a different one with which Antonius was not connected” and proposes that Amatius began building an altar that remained unfinished and unused before being destroyed by Dolabella and later restored by Octavian (365).


14. This is the title by which scholars have assumed the games were known in 44, their name having been altered from ludi Veneris Genetricis; reassessing the evidence, however, Ramsey and Licht argue that “the festival is likely to have continued to be called the ludi Veneris Genetricis for some years after [July of 44], becoming only later, in the early Augustan age, the ludi Victoriae Caesaris” (8).

15. Although we are also told by Pliny (Nat. 23.94) that he privately interpreted the comet as “born for his own sake and himself as born in it.” Gurval 1997: 41–42 convincingly maintains that the comet “may be better understood as a construction of Augustan politics, an ideological myth whose origins and development are more complex than an immediate and full embrace of an astronomical phenomenon and may, in fact, belong to a period significantly later than the games in July of 44.”

16. For discussion and bibliography on the sidus Iulium or Caesaris astrum motif, see esp. Zanker 33–37; cf. Weinstock 370–384.

17. Weinstock 365.

18. See Weinstock 385; but cf. Gesche 74–79. On supplicationes, see Halkin and following note.


20. In each reference to Caesar in the dative (through the repeated noun mortuo and then through the pronoun ei) Cicero introduces ambiguity, still unresolved in modern discussions, as to whether the ceremonies in question would simply be in Caesar’s honor, actually take him as their object, or, still more remarkably, identify him with the high
gods (cum deorum immortalium religione). Gesche 74–78, for instance, differentiating between “normal” supplicationes and those proposed for the dead Caesar, suggests that the supplicationes were directed to Caesar as a god, but that Antonius himself did not, in fact, propose them. Weinstock 385, however, speaks of supplications “for” Caesar; cf. Ker 33; Alföldi 1973: 114; Lacey 238; Shackleton Bailey 1986: 13 n23. Supplicationes could be offered in honor of a living man, as they had been for Caesar, Cicero, and others and would be later for Antonius and Octavian (see Halkin 15–76; for Cicero’s pride in this honor, see esp. Cic. Cat. 3.15ff.). In fact, Cicero’s words allow for more than one possibility. The very addition, for instance, of a day in honor of Caesar could be construed as admitting “religious taints” into the state and associating a dead man with the worship of the gods (cf. Ramsey 110). On the other hand, one could understand Cicero’s words to mean that Caesar was to be numbered among the “immortal gods” as a recipient of supplicationes. What we can reconstruct of Antonius’ own actions exacerbates rather than relieves our doubt. Antonius pursued a cautious policy with regard to Caesar’s divinity (see above, pp. 58–59). At the time of the delivery of the Second Philippic, he had not yet put into effect all of the measures glorifying Caesar with apparently divine honors, an omission that Cicero regards as inconsistency.

21. As Ramsey notes, Cicero “seems to be thinking of the lesson to be learned from putting too much trust in Caesar. Caesar’s success in imposing tyranny should cause the Roman people to be on their guard against all future politicians who pursue the path taken by Caesar and who have charisma” (334).

22. Somewhat contradictory reports survive as to the exact nature of Antonius’ eulogy for Caesar. Appian’s account has Antonius reading the honors decreed for Caesar and the oaths sworn for his safety, then gesturing to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline and stating that he was ready to avenge him; after the oration proper, Antonius intones a hymn to Caesar, recites his achievements, and weeps, then uncovers Caesar’s body and engages in a choral lament with the audience. However many of the details of Appian’s account they accept, scholars are in general agreement that the ceremony was “not . . . a traditional Roman funeral laudation” (Kennedy 1968: 105; cf. Kierdorf 153; Weinstock 352). Even for Antonius, as consul, to deliver it, was an innovation, since a family member was the normal choice. Cicero certainly expresses doubt about the legitimacy of Caesar’s funeral as a whole: si illud funus fuit (if funeral it was), he remarks (Phil. 2.90).

23. It is of interest that the new senators appointed by Antonius on the basis of Caesar’s purported documents were known popularly as orcivi or perhaps orcini, the epithet used for slaves set free “thanks to Orcus,” i.e., by the terms of their masters’ wills (Suet. Aug. 35.1; cf. Plu. Ant. 15.3). Not unrelated in theme are Cicero’s repeated references to Caesar’s own entourage of disreputable politicians as ἐκκυκλιτος (conjuring of the dead) (Att. 9.10.7; 11.2; 18.2; cf. Powell 85).

24. Metellus’ son praised his dead father for being a great orator and a great general as well as for leaving behind many children (see above, n2).

25. A famous example is the epitaph of A. Attilius Caiatinus, which Cicero himself quotes in another context (see above n3); cf. ILLRP 310 = ILS 3, line 1: Honc oino ploirume consentient . . . . In a related manner, the Laudatio Murdiae declares, consittit . . . ergo in hoc sibi ipsa ut . . . post decessum consensi civium laudaretur (She was self-consistent, with the result that . . . after death she was praised by consensus of the citizens) (CIL VI 10230 = ILS 8394, lines 14–17). The laudator of L. Caecilius Metellus recognizes public opinion in a different way by stating that the deceased wanted summum senatorem haberi (to be thought the most eminent senator) (see above, n2).
26. *ILLRP* 310 = *ILS* 3, line 2: *duonoro optumo fuise viro*; cf. the epitaph of A. Atilius Caiatinus quoted above, n3.


29. Ibid., 170.

30. On Cicero’s discussion of honors for Sulpicius in this speech and its connection to his defense of the *res publica*, see Kröner.

31. It is significant that Cicero probably alludes here to the gilded statue of Octavian on horseback that was voted to him on January 2 of 43 BCE (on the image, see Zanker 37–39).

32. Liv. fr. 120 draws the connection between the display of Cicero’s hands and head and his writings and speeches against Antonius.

33. On the Greek character of Cicero’s proposed eulogy, see Loraux 384 n. 96 and Sordi, who likewise argues for Cicero’s innovation in this regard. Cicero envisions an elaborate public funeral and a common grave that would be, in effect, an altar to *Virtus* (*Cic. Phil.* 14.34).

34. Allowing the state to “speak” for itself is, we may observe, a quintessentially republican act. Cicero had introduced a *prosopopoeia* of the *res publica* in the conclusion of *In Catilinam I* to magnify the sense of the danger posed by Catiline and his followers (*Cat.* 1.27–29).

35. On the much-studied question of Demosthenic influence, see Weische 100–104, 166–94, and *passim*; Stroh 1982 and 1983; Wooten; Schäublin.


37. Cf, e.g., Galinsky 45–47, 73–74 with bibliography. Galinsky rightly points out the naïveté of the traditional picture “of the young Octavian learning about the value of republican principles at Cicero’s knees in 44–43 B.C.” (73).


40. Cf. Habinek and Schiesaro xv–xvi. As they point out, the change of this period is hardly “revolution” from a Marxist standpoint in that it did nothing to alter the agrarian, slave-dependent economic base of Roman society. Syme’s view bears a superficial resemblance to Marxism, however, in interpreting culture as secondary to more basic shifts in power.

41. Cf., e.g., Galinsky 9. The distinctive aspect of Augustan culture, in Galinsky’s view, is its gradual inspiration by ideas, ideals, and values that found expression across a wide range of cultural activity.

42. E.g., at *Phil.* 2.108.

Chapter Four

1. For recent bibliographies of both Prop. 4.7 and 4.11, see Janan 100–13, 146–63. I make no attempt here to provide an exhaustive account of the vast scholarship on these two famous poems. For the purposes of this chapter, seminal studies include (on 4.7) Yardley and Warden; (on 4.11) Williams 1968: 387–400; Reitzenstein 1969; Hallett 1985; (on the two poems together) Hallett 1973; Lange; Janan; Wyke 78–114; cf. the commentaries of Camps and Richardson. Additional works cited in the individual analyses of the poems below.

3. The Augustan aristocracy was very different in composition from that of the Republic, many members of old families having died in the civil wars of the 40s and 30s BCE, and a new elite drawn from the Italian municipalities predominant by 19 BCE. This new elite prided itself to some extent upon inherent *virtus* and *industria* rather than the privilege inherited from old *nobilitas*. And yet fascination with claims of exemplary ancestry, and the practices through which these claims became public knowledge, remained.

4. The declaimers’ topics included the questions of whether Cicero should seek absolution from Antonius (Sen. *Suas.* 6), whether he should burn his books in exchange for Antonius’ sparing of his life (*Suas.* 7), and whether Cicero’s purported killer, Popillius, had acted wrongly in view of the fact that Cicero had once successfully defended him on a charge of parricide (*Controv.* 7.2). The social, cultural, and political implications of imperial declamation are a topic of growing interest among scholars. See Bloomer; Beard; Kaster; Gunderson. On the Cicero declamations, see recently Dugan 70–74, esp. 71: “The *suasoriae* re-stage Cicero’s death and, by extension, the republican oratorical traditions that disappeared with him, with a compulsiveness that indicates the trauma of this event, as they seek to achieve mastery over this original loss.” Further bibliography in Gunderson 1–25.

5. See chapter 1, n2.

6. Wyke 182.


9. Performance has been little emphasized, until recently, in Propertian criticism, partly through the influence of views like that of Quinn 142: “the [Augustan] poet thinks of himself as a writer rather than a performer.” Ovid, however, recalls that Propertius “was accustomed often to recite his fiery loves / according to the obligation of fellowship that joined him to me” (*saepè suos solitus recitare . . . ignes / iure sodalicii, quo mihi iunctus erat* [Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.45–46]) and even Quinn admits that “the written text continues to be felt as no more than the basis for a performance” with the “normal route of access to a work,” usually “a private reading by the author to a small group” (Quinn 144–45), i.e., the *recitatio*. Interpretations of Propertian elegy in performance include Gamel and Wyke, both of whom focus on aspects of gender-representation. For Wyke, Propertian elegy, “as a form of poetry recited before an audience of the Roman elite, . . . was part of an institutionalized system of representation—a social technology—through which gender was performed and, therefore, constructed at Rome” (189). Gamel emphasizes the implications of performance for isolating the meaning of elegiac texts. Gamel 79: “A reader/performer invests more—physically, emotionally, and intellectually—in interpretive choices than a silent reader does. Selecting between alternatives makes a performer more conscious of choices: reading as performance makes those choices more precise and more vivid, and the implications—psychological, social, ethical—of such reading/performance become clearer to both performer and audience” (93–94). For more on Latin poetry in performance, see, e.g., Skinner 1993 on Catullus; Gold 1998, Reckford, and Walters on Roman satire; Markus on imperial epic; cf. chapter 5 with bibliography on Vergil’s *Aeneid*.

10. This passage would have been well known to Propertius’ elite audiences, for whom rhetorical training was a mainstay of education. For Cic. *Cael.* 33–34 as a textbook
example of mortuos [or defunctos] excitare, see Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.61; Aquila Romanus 3.


12. The preposition _sub_ in line 95 also has “a legalistic flavor” (Richardson 462).

13. Cf. Warden 37; Guillemin 190–91. The familiarity of poisoning as a charge in rhetorical school declamation (on which see Krokowski 95; Warden 37) would have made it all the more likely for Propertius’ audience to draw a connection between Prop. 4.7 and the republican oratorical tradition.

14. Warden 37. Yardley further ties Prop. 4.7 to a Roman context of commemoration through noting its echoes of the sepulchral epigram, while Janan 100–13 illuminates the affinities and tensions between the elegiac discourse of Prop. 4.7 and that surrounding the _mos maiorum_ (custom of the ancestors). For Appius’ monologue as _laudatio funebris_, see chapter 1, pp. 25–26.

15. Cf. Cicero’s account of Servilius’ evocation of the dead Metelli in *Red. Sen._ 25–26 and _Sest._ 130–31. V. Max. 6.2.8 describes Helvius Mancia Formianus’ description of the illustrious Roman dead, victims of civil war, he claims to have seen in the underworld.

16. The reading of all MSS; for the translation, see Richardson 455. In spite of comparanda such as Hor. _Carm._ 2.1.17, I am unable to understand _murmur_ as the sound of a trumpet here, and so cannot adopt, with Goold (356), _tubae for viae_. The whole point of Cynthia’s complaint in verses 25–34 is that her funeral lacked the trappings of an elaborate ceremony (even a proper head-rest for her corpse [26]) that would have included musical accompaniment. Propertius’ Cornelia, by contrast, was escorted to the grave with _tubae_ (4.11.9). Cf. Dimundo 104–5.

17. Cf. the conventional address, _Siste, viator_ (Halt, wayfarer), so prominent in the sepulchral tradition that likewise forms a background for Prop. 4.7 (Yardley 83–84).

18. Richardson 455.

19. Ibid.

20. Cf. Flaschenriem, who notes as well that Cynthia’s grave is located “at a perceptible distance from the imaginative and aesthetic world regularly inhabited by the Propertian _ amat_” (56).


24. Janan 100–113. Cf. Flaschenriem, who calls attention to the Cynthia of Prop. 4.7 as “a maker of ‘texts’ that emphasize her autonomy from the poet-lover” (49).


26. Cf. Flaschenriem’s account of Cynthia as an “authorial figure” in Prop. 4.7: “like the Propertian lover, [Cynthia] too is preoccupied with the problem of constructing a poetic persona, and with how this ‘self’ will be perceived in the public realm” (55–56).

27. For oratory and funeral ritual in Prop. 4.11, see, e.g., Reitzenstein 1969; Williams 1968: 390–400; Hallett 1985; Janan 146–163; Wyke 109, 113.

28. As Hallett reminds us, Augustus had also honored Cornelia’s ancestress, the daughter of Scipio Africanus the Elder, by placing a bronze statue of her in a colonnade honoring Augustus’ own sister (Hallett 1985: 82–83 citing Plin. *Nat._ 34.14.31). Caesar’s wife’s father, we should recall, was not a Scipio, but L. Cornelius Cinna (cos. 87) (Cornelia’s father is an unidentified Cornelius Scipio). On the Roman custom of _laudationes_ for
women, and the extant “Laudatio Turiae” and Laudatio Murdiae (which probably belong to a context of private eulogy rather than the public one recalled in Prop. 4.11), see Durry; Kierdorf 112–16; Flower 131–32.

29. Quint. **Inst.** 12.6.1; Suet. **Aug.** 8.1; Nic. Dam. **FGrH** no. 90 fr. 127.

30. On Q. Claudia, see Bömer 1964 and Scheid 2001. The Vestal Virgin of Cicero Cael. 34 is another Claudia, while Prop. 4.11.53–54 is usually taken to refer to a certain Aemilia (cf. Camps and Richardson *ad loc.*), although Scheid 2001: 23 seems to suggest that this is also Claudia the Vestal.


33. For Augustus’ close relationship to the Corneli, see Hallett 1985: 82–83. Her reading of Prop. 4.11 as a precursor to and even influence on Augustus’ *Res Gestae* illustrates all the more how the poem can be understood as belonging to an Augustan rather than a republican commemorative context.

34. See Richardson 485 for the possible criticism of Paulus’ censorship at Prop. 4.11.41 (*me neque censurae legem mollisse* [that I did not cause the censor’s law to be relaxed]). On Paulus’ censorship itself, see Vell. 2.95.

35. For references, see Janan 210 n2.

36. La Penna 1951: 86–88; Hallett 1973; Hubbard 145–49; Sullivan 44; LaPenn 1977: 94–95. See Janan 147 for a useful summary of additional scholarship, including Stahl 1985: 262 (who finds in Prop. 4.11 a capitulation to Augustan ideology; cf. Wyke 111–12); Highet 98–105; Luck 1959: 115; and Reitzenstein 1969 (who read the poem as a tribute to marital virtues). For the intersection of Cornelia’s virtues with Augustan moral ideology, see Williams 1968: 388–400.

37. Richardson 481; Janan 159–63.


40. Except, that is, obliquely in v. 57: *laudor . . . urbisque querellis* (and I am praised . . . by the city’s lamentations).

41. Cf. Kennedy 1972: 301–4, although I am less inclined than Kennedy to see Augustan oratory as imbued with a sense of inhibition, anxiety, or frustration (cf. Kennedy 1972: 303). Prop. 4.7 and 4.11 suggest the extent to which the vibrancy and popularity of imperial declamation and judicial oratory could be turned toward the inspired transformation of its republican heritage.

42. In Schechner’s terminology, Prop. 4.7 and 4.11, somewhat like Japanese Noh drama (see Schechner 1985: 44–45), hover between the restoration of a historically verifiable “event” (e.g., the speech that Cicero’s *Pro Caelio* supposedly records) and a “nonevent” (a reconstructed idea of republican oratory in general).

43. Janan 4. Janan 4–6 emphasizes the tensions and contradictions in aspects of the Forum’s iconography, which would allow Augustan audiences to bring an “intensified awareness of their culture’s internal contradictions to their reading of the Propertian corpus” (4). Zanker (*passim*) remains the fundamental discussion of the Forum’s imagery. For an illuminating discussion of Propertius’ poetic engagement with Augustan monuments, see Welch 2005.

44. From this perspective, we might group Propertius’ poetic genealogies (e.g., 2.34.85–94, 3.1.1–4) together with Prop. 4.7 and 4.11 as products of a similar response to the Augustan context. Cf. below on Prop. 3.1.

45. The Appius passage of the *Pro Caelio* is only one among many places in Cicero’s speeches where he promotes the imitation of the exemplary dead (*imitatio maiorum*)
as a practice in which all true Romans engage. Cf. Cic. Clu. 196; Flac. 101; Red. Sen. 25; Sest. 130; Phil. 1.13, 2.26, 3.25, 13.29; etc. On Cicero’s conception of *imitatio maiorum*, see Cic. Off. 1.116, 121.

46. For a wider discussion of *exempla* and exemplarity in Propertius, see Gazich, who likewise suggests a connection between elegy and oratory in this respect.

47. Stahl 1985: 197, for example, calls Propertius’ pose in Prop. 3.9 “cheeky”; cf. Sullivan 17. For the poem as a self-deprecatory celebration of Maecenas, see Bennett; Shackleton Bailey 1967: 165–66.

48. Although Propertius goes much further than Cicero in imagining himself declared a “god” (3.9.46).

49. On praise for the audience as a feature of the *prooemium* aimed at inducing benevolentia, see Cic. Inv. 1.22; Quint. Inst. 4.1.16; cf. Hor. Carm. 1.1.1 for Horace’s address to Maecenas the scion of kings.

50. In rhetorical terms, Prop. 3.9.21–34 corresponds to orator’s use of historical exempla, which are both plausible and true (cf. Rhet. Her. 1.13). Quintilian defines *exemplum* as *rei gestae aut ut gestae utilis ad persuadendum id quod intenderis commemoratio* (the recollection of a deed performed or as though performed for the purposes of persuading [the audience] of that which you are claiming) (Quint. Inst. 5.11.6).

51. On the relation of *mores* to *ethos* see Quint. Inst. 6.2.8.

52. For the *duplex ratio* of the peroration (*in rebus* and *in affectibus*), see Quint. Inst. 6.1.1.


54. E.g., Rosc. Am. 23, 113; Mil. 104; Phil. 1.13; etc.

55. Cf. Tibullus’ hope that the retinue who accompanies Messalla on his journey across the Aegean will, like Messalla himself, remember him (Tib. 1.3.2): o *utinam memores ipse cohorsque mihi* (oh, would that you and your cohort may remember me). Propertius’ *iace verba* (77) in fact suggests unguarded speech of the kind that may be reported elsewhere. Cf. Cic. Cat. 4.14: *iaciuntur . . . voces quae perveniunt ad auris meas* (remarks are being thrown about that reach my ears).

56. As James Zetzel points out, “The fact that poetry is immortal and can share that immortality with its subject is itself a reversal of the traditional Roman roles of patron and client” (Zetzel 1982: 101).

57. Kierdorf 111.

58. Thus my account of the poems accords well with recent critics’ varying interpretations of Book 4’s relation to the earlier books. For Miller, “the elegiac subject has become definitively displaced [in Book 4], no longer speaking as if it were the poet. . . . Instead, we have a figure that sometimes represents Propertius . . . but who has no discernible location and seems oddly separate from the first-person speaker of books 1–3” (2004: 187). For DeBrohun, conversely, “Propertius does not ultimately present a complete about-face in Book 4; to do so would have required a complete exposure and destruction of his former ego, an aspect of his elegiac identity the poet was not prepared to abandon altogether. . . . Propertius’ final book is aetiological in two competing senses, as the elegist simultaneously explores the present and past both of Rome and of his own elegiac poetry” (23).

59. Heiden (161–62) documents many of the interpretive questions the poem has raised for scholars and goes on to propose a new scenario possibly arising from the undefined relationship between Gallus, his addressee, and the “sister” of line 6. Goold (97) interprets Gallus as already dead when he speaks in Prop. 1.21.

61. Putnam 1976 remains an excellent introduction to this feature of Prop. 1.22. Cf., more recently, Stahl 1985: 99–129; Janan 50–52. The poem’s status as Book 1’s sphragis (seal) suggests to the reader that Prop. 1.22 is especially indicative of Propertius’ general concerns.

62. For a different perspective on images of death in Propertius and Tibullus, see Müller. I am grateful to Rachel Sternberg for allowing me to read her unpublished paper on a similar theme.

63. An image of death’s barrenness also punctuates Tib.1.10 (33–38).

64. The six surviving poems of Lygdamus (included in the spurious Book 3 of Tibullus) include one that looks forward to private commemoration of the dead poet by his wife and her mother ([Tib.] 3.2). It concludes with an epitaph that the poet hopes will be in celebri fronte (on the face [of a stone] viewed by many) (28). This suggests Propertius’ concerns to some extent, but commemoration hardly receives the same emphasis here as in Prop. 2.1. In [Tib.] 3.5, Lygdamus, sick, expresses his hope that his friends will remember him, but goes no further. The poems of Sulpicia ([Tib.] 3.13–18) offer no significant points of comparison with Propertius’ in this regard.

65. More typical of Ovid are self-confident assertions that his fame will live on through his work (Am. 1.3.25–26; 1.15; etc.)

66. The lines are perhaps a parody of Propertius in particular. For the concluding epigram as a Propertian device, see Richardson 218.

67. See Dufallo 2005.

Chapter Five

1. Propertius himself may have been inspired by the Vergilian precedent. For the Aeneid as a subtext to Elegy 4.11, which postdates it, see Wyke 113; Williams 1968: 395–400.

2. For the idea of cultural “alternatives” I employ here, I am particularly indebted to Andrew Feldherr’s discussion of Livy’s History as an “alternative of drama” that “differentiates the ‘spectacles’ his own text offers from other, less beneficial, forms of visual display” (1998: 165). To the extent it also recuperates past performance traditions from an Augustan perspective, Livy’s text can be seen as the Aeneid’s great prose counterpart in the terms I develop.

3. While all ancient poetry was written to be read aloud (cf. the previous chapter), we possess a series of testimonia pertaining to special performances of Vergil’s work. For a compilation of the evidence, see Quinn. The vita Donati relates that Vergil recited Aeneid 2, 4, and 6 for Augustus (32). This is the source of the famous story that Octavia fainted when she heard Vergil name her recently dead son, Marcellus, among the spirits of Roman heroes. Servius, too, mentions Vergil’s reading of Book 4 before Augustus and a small group, and we hear of still other performances before different audiences as well (Serv. A. 4.323; cf. vita Donati 33). During Vergil’s lifetime, his works were adapted for performance in the theater and became a feature of recitations in school curricula (Suet. Gram. 16; Serv. Ecl. 6.11; vita Donati 26; cf. Quinn 151–54). See Markus on important differences between these kinds of performance. For the “oral mindset” and “rich oral residue” of the Aeneid as a text, see Campbell.
4. For a similar emphasis in recent criticism, see Bell, who, examining the *Aeneid’s* “popular poetics and politics,” argues that the poem casts the figure of the leader in a popular image as preeminent at public spectacles; Feldherr 1995 considers *Aeneid* 5 and Augustan circus spectacle; see further Pomathios. On the popular audience of the *Aeneid* in antiquity, see also Horsfall 1995: 251–52.

5. Williams 1967: 35; cf., e.g, Williams 1983: 105.

6. Ovid seems to have remarked on the affinities between the Remus story and Vergil’s Hector in modeling account of Remus’ ghost (*Fast.* 5.457–76) on the Vergilian passage (Hinds 146 n46; Bömer 1958 *ad* Ov. *Fast.*. 5.460). In Nicoll’s view, Vergil reworks the story of Remus’ death again in the death of Palinurus at the close of *Aeneid* 5 (Nicol 466–70).

7. *Aeneas’* dream has clear antecedents in the Greco-Roman epic tradition reaching back to Homer, but such scenes are less than fully adequate as explanatory models. The main precedents are Ennius’ dream of Homer at the beginning of the *Annales* and Achilles’ dream of Patroclus at *Iliad* 23.65–101 (e.g., Clark 833–34; Wigodsky 73–74). Hector, however, is not easily assimilable either to a Greek poet or to the unburied ghost of Achilles’ close companion. Remus, it should be noted, was not alone among mythical figures whose actions and deaths were said to have contributed to ongoing Roman suffering. Vergil himself points to another such tradition in his recollection of the curse of Hector’s own grandfather, Laomedon, at the end of *Georgics* 1 (501–502).


9. *Aeneas’* wife Creusa was one of Hector’s sisters. In Latin terms, Aeneas would be Hector’s *sororius*. Aeneas calls attention to the relationship between Hector and himself at A. 12.439–40: *te animo repetentem exempla tuorum / et pater Aeneas et avunculus excitet Hector* (both your father Aeneas and your uncle Hector will inspire you as you recall models among your family), and the same connection is made by Andromache at 3.342–43. Aeneas’ closeness with Hector is all the more noteworthy since stories of archaic Roman families tended to stress the opposition between a harsh father and an indulgent or protective *avunculus* (uncle [lit. “little grandfather”]). See Bettini 1991: 39–66.

10. In a brilliant revisionist argument, Wiseman 1995 associates the creation of the Remus story with plebeian aspirations in the fourth century BCE and links the death of Remus to foundation-sacrifice in 296 BCE, when Rome was threatened by alliance of Etruscans, Samnites, and Gauls (Wiseman 1995: 117–25). (The conventional date for the emergence of Latin literature is 240 BCE, when Livius Andronicus produced his first play.) Other scholars would make the Remus legend even older. See Wiseman 1995: 18–42, 89–102 with bibliography.

11. Cf. DuQuesnay 20–21. For the dating of Horace’s *Epodes* and their association with the historical context of the late 30s BCE, see Mankin 10–12. The collection may have been published as a whole in 30 BCE. On Horace’s response to civil war in the *Epodes*, see further Oliensis 64–101.

12. See chapter 2, n42.


14. On the potential ambiguity of the passage, see the conclusion, p. 125.

15. Many other passages in Augustan poetry express distress over Rome’s history of
civil war without referring directly to Remus. See Gurval 1995, esp. chapters 3–6 on Horace, Propertius, and Vergil.


17. The Trojans are of Italian descent through their ancestor Dardanus (cf. A. 3.94–96, 163–68, 7.240–42, etc.).

18. As Mackie points out, moreover, Dido and Turnus are distant cousins through their common Argive descent; the conflict between the Greeks and the Trojans thus repeats itself, to some extent, in Aeneas’ encounters with them. For further implications of this connection, see Hannah.

19. For the “exorcism” of the Carthaginian component of Dido’s curse, see Williams 1972: 513.

20. On the problem of the parva Troia, see Grimm; Bright; Quint 53–65; Bettini 1997.


23. Quint 53–65. Serv. ad A. 3.46 explains that Vergil drew the idea for the growing spears that transfix Polydorus from the tradition that Romulus, after the augury confirming him as ruler of Rome, scaled the Palatine and there planted his spear, which took leaf and became a tree. H. P. Stahl, too, thinks that the episode helps identify Aeneas as “king” of the Trojans: “If [Aeneas] acquired his position by default, it is highly desirable that the death of Priam’s last surviving son is confirmed, of the son whom the king of Troy has spirited away when the city’s situation began to turn hopeless.” But, like Quint, Stahl detects a reference to the context of civil war. Aeneas’ situation, for Stahl, mirrors that of Octavian faced with Antonius’ claim to guardianship of Julius Caesar’s son, Caesarion, whom Octavian was quick to have assassinated after the fall of Alexandria. Aeneas, for Stahl, “is placed in a more humane position: he only has to take care of a decent burial” (Stahl 1998b: 43–44).

24. Vergil’s debt to Euripides’ Hecuba in the Polydorus episode of Aeneid 3 has been evident to scholars at least since Heinze (1957: 105 n1) remarked a series of verbal echoes between Vergil’s text and two passages in Euripides’ play: the prologue spoken by Polydorus’ ghost and the trial of Polymestor near the drama’s conclusion.

25. See chapter 1, n72.


27. In the course of the play, Hecuba has also lost her daughter Polyxena, who has become a human sacrifice to the ghost of Achilles.

28. Polymestor’s prophecy (1259ff.) further undermines Hecuba’s judicial success in looking forward to her renewed suffering when, transformed into a bitch, she will fall from a ship’s mast at sea.

29. It is perhaps worth recalling that Thrace, a troublesome region for Augustus, did not become a Roman province until 46 CE.

30. Cf. Putnam 1980: 3 on Aeneas as “the symbolic cannibal who wrenches the body beneath the ground and as such becomes himself a form of corrupter.” But contra Putnam, see Stahl 1998b: 43 n18. On Aeneas’ action as a religious violation, see also Dyson 35–38.
32. For the debate over remembrance and forgetting as attitudes toward the past advocated in the *Aeneid*, see Bleisch.
33. D.C. 49.43.5; cf. 52.36.1–3. See Dickie 155, 192, and, for more on constraints against magicians in Rome, 142–61.
34. See above, n12.
35. Khan emphasizes the tradition of curse-literature, including the poetry of Horace, for its capacity to illuminate a pattern of curses and dreams at the end of *Aeneid* 4; but Vergil’s engagement with the traditions illustrated by Horace includes not only curses per se, but also the larger stigmatization of the magical practices (necromancy, love spells, etc.) of which such curses formed a part. For more on magic in *Aeneid* 4, see Eitrem; Tupet 232–66; Dickie 138–39.
36. For parallels between the Massylian priestess of *Aeneid* 4.483ff. and Apollonius Rhodius’ Medea, see Pease *ad loc*; for Homeric precedents, see Kaiser 197–208; cf. Hexter. For the influence of the Roman elegists, see Cairns 144–46. The stigmatization of magic from a political perspective was engrained, before Vergil and Horace, in invective oratory. Cf. Cic. *Vat.* 14; *Pis.* 16. Imperial declamation continues to handle charges of magic as a theme (e.g., at [Quint.]*Decl.* 10.2, 6–8, 16, 18).
37. See Welch 2001: 184–89. As she suggests, Horace here identifies the witches Canidia and Sagana with the marginal space of Rome (the Esquiline cemetery before Maecenas’ restoration of it) only to expel them from this space as he relates its recuperation as a pleasant and accessible part of the city. For Welch, however, this makes the gardens an uncomfortable place for satire, since Horace, through the witches, to some degree identifies himself with the Lucilian tradition of invective even as he claims to transform it. Other scholars, as Welch notes (187), have read the poem as posing “a contrast between present and past” and exposing “the fissures in the new order.” Cf., e.g., Anderson, who finds optimism in Horace’s outlook, and Zetzel (1980: 71), who emphasizes the embarrassment to Maecenas the poem must have caused.
38. On Horace’s witches as a cultural other, see further Oliensis 68–90.
39. On the episode as *parentatio*, see Scheid 1993, who summarizes and reconsiders the earlier views of Bailey 291–93; Bömer 1943: 12–14; Bayet, and Boyancé 146–51. Among the central questions to which interpreters of the passage have sought answers is the identity of Vergil’s serpent (see below) and the extent to which the ritual represents an amalgam of the traditional Roman rite with elements of other traditions, especially Greek hero cult (cf., e.g., Bayet’s conclusions at 381). Scheid (1993: 192ff.) de-emphasizes both questions in favor of interpreting the passage with the “official” Augustan version of *parentatio* performed for the dead L. Caesar and recounted on the first *decretum* of Pisa (*ILS* 139).
42. Views summarized at Scheid 1993: 190–92.
43. See Boyce; Bayet 374–77; Dumézil 60–61, 305, 367, 443, 502–3.
44. The parallel was recognized already by Macrobius. The basic modern study is Norden 47–48; cf. Lamacchia. In what follows, I have also benefited from Hardie 69–83.
45. Similarly, Plato’s *Er* overhears other souls’ discussions of conditions in the heavens and on earth (*Pl. R.* 614e–615a), although he does not engage in dialogue himself. Further Roman instances of the tradition include Ennius’ dream of Homer at the beginning of the *Annales* as well as his *Epicharmus*, where the poet relates a dream in which, having died, he learns the truth of nature and the elements, probably from Epicharmus himself.
The Greek author Heraclides Ponticus' well-known Vision of Empedotimus belongs in the same genre (Hardie 81), which can also be said to have precursors in the inspired visions of the Presocratic philosophers and, ultimately, in the Homeric nēkūia. Plato’s “Myth of Er” and Cicero’s “Somnium Scipionis,” we may note, are easily grouped as performances alongside the more obviously performance-based works of Vergil and Ennius, since in both Plato and Cicero, the revelation takes the form of a story told (complete with audience reactions) by one of the dialogue's participants. Habinek 1989 encourages us to interpret the formal qualities of Aeneid 6 as a key to its adaptation of cultural patterns expressed in philosophy by illuminating Vergil's reproduction of the twofold emphasis within Roman moral discourse on the scientific and the hortatory (present also in Cicero and Seneca).

46. For a summation of topics and bibliography pertaining to the “political” interpretation of Cicero's De re publica, see Zetzel 1995: 27–28.
47. On the doubtfulness of Vergil’s underworld, with special reference to a number of the details on which I concentrate in this chapter, see the sensitive treatment in Reed 2001: 165–67 and 2007. The latter promises to revise substantially our perspective on Vergil's handling of Augustan ideology as it relates to Roman identity both in Book 6 and in the Aeneid as a whole. Cf., e.g., Tarrant; West 1987; Zetzel 1989: 272–76; O’Hara 170–72.
48. For the scene as poma funebris, see Skard; Burke; Novara; Bettini 1991: 144–50; Flower 1996: 109–14. The funeral procession, of course, does not exhaust the passage's cultural resonance, which also extends to commemorative statuary, inscriptions, and coinage (see Horsfall 1976: 84). For literary precedents and influence, see Grebe.
51. Ibid., 10–11.
52. Ibid., 11–14.
53. Similarly, the physical distance between the figures in the procession becomes a sign of Vergil's cultural gesture in bringing together disparate elements: note procul at 808 and 824.

Conclusion

1. For an illuminating discussion of ancestral curses in imperial literature, see Bernstein 2003.
2. Cf. Gowing.
3. For the claim that Remus’ very presence in a supposedly celebratory poem is suspect, see Hinds 143; cf. Newlands 119–21. In Barchiesi’s view (251–56), Ovid, as a poet, is necessarily implicated here both in the promotion of Augustan ideology and in a certain resistance to it. On Romulus' ambiguity in the Fasti, see further Harries; Stok; Boyd. For the case that Augustus’ own associations with Romulus would not have been felt strongly enough by the time of the later regime to make the negative connotations of Remus’ murder significant as a political critique, see Herbert-Brown 60–62 and passim; cf. Littlewood.
4. For a recent discussion of the motif in Ovid’s exile poems, see Miller 2004: 210–36,
who notes its familiarity from ancient philosophy (Miller 2004: 223 citing Claassen 20, etc.).


6. For the passage as a reminiscence of the Roman ritual, see Miedel 51–52; Fortgens 133; Vessey 211.

7. For perspectives on the politics of the Thebaid (a topic of much recent debate), see Coleman with bibliography.
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