Roman Presences

Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945

This collection of essays explores aspects of the reception of ancient Rome in a number of European countries from the late eighteenth century to the end of the Second World War. Rome has been made to stand for literary authority, republican heroism, imperial power and decline, the Catholic church, the pleasure of ruins. The studies offered here examine some of the sometimes strange and unexpected places where Roman presences have manifested themselves during this period. Scholars from several disciplines, including English Literature and History of Art, as well as Classics, bring to bear a variety of approaches on a wide range of images and texts, from statues of Napoleon to Freud's analysis of dreams. Rome's seemingly boundless capacity for multiple, indeed conflicting, signification has made it an extraordinary fertile paradigm for making sense of – and also for destabilising – history, politics, identity, memory and desire.

Catharine Edwards is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Bristol. From 1993 to 1996 she was Senior Research Fellow in the University of Bristol's Leverhulme-funded research project 'Receptions of Rome in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries'. She is the author of *The politics of immorality in ancient Rome* (1993) and *Writing Rome: textual approaches to the city* (1996). With Michael Liversidge she edited *Imagining Rome: British artists and Rome in the nineteenth century*.

Roman Presences

Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945

---

edited by
Catharine Edwards

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA http://www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Times NR 10/12 pt [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 59197 X hardback

Contents

List of illustrations *page* vii
List of contributors ix
Preface and acknowledgements xi

Introduction: shadows and fragments 1
CATHARINE EDWARDS

1 A sense of place: Rome, history and empire revisited 19
DUNCAN F. KENNEDY

2 Envisioning Rome: Granet and Gibbon in dialogue 35
STEPHEN BANN

3 Napoleon I: a new Augustus? 53
VALÉRIE HUET

4 Translating empire? Macaulay's Rome 70
CATHARINE EDWARDS

5 Comparativism and references to Rome in British imperial attitudes to India 88
JAVED MAJEED

6 Decadence and the subversion of empire 110
NORMAN VANCE

7 The road to ruin: memory, ghosts, moonlight and weeds 125
CHLOE CHARD

8 Henry James and the anxiety of Rome 140
JOHN LYON

9 'The monstrous diversion of a show of gladiators': Simeon Solomon's *Habet!* 157
ELIZABETH PRETTEJOHN

10 Christians and pagans in Victorian novels 173
FRANK M.TURNER

11 Screening ancient Rome in the new Italy 188
MARIA WYKE

12 A flexible Rome: Fascism and the cult of *romanità* 205
MARLA STONE

13 The Nazi concept of Rome 221
VOLKER LOSEMANN

14 Ruins of Rome: T. S. Eliot and the presence of the past 236
CHARLES MARTINDALE

Bibliography 256
Index 275

Illustrations

(*between pp. 148 and 149*)

1. François-Marius Granet, *Choir of the Capuchin Church, Rome*, 1817. National Museum and Gallery, Cardiff.
2. J. M. Gandy, *Soane's rotunda of the Bank of England as a ruin*, 1832. By courtesy of the Trustees of Sir John Soane's Museum, London.
3. François-Marius Granet, *The crypt of San Martino*. Musée Fabre, Montpellier. Photo: Frederic Jaulmes.
4. François-Marius Granet, *View of Santa Francesca Romana through an arch of the Coliseum*. Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence. Photo: Bernard Terlay.
5. François-Marius Granet, *Godefroy de Bouillon deposits in the church of the Holy Sepulchre the Trophies of Ascalm* (engraving after).
6. François-Marius Granet, *The interior of the Church of Santo Stefano Rotondo at Rome*. Musée Granet, Aix-en-Provence. Photo: Bernard Terlay.
7. Antonio Canova, *Napoleon*, 1806. Courtesy of the V&A Picture Library.
8. Antoine-François Callet, *L'arrivée du premier consul à Lyon*, *c*. 1804. Courtesy of Musée historique de la Ville de Lyon.
9. Charles Meynier, *Entrée de S. M. l'Empereur et Roi dans Berlin*, 1810. Versailles et Trianon. Photo: RMN-Arnaudet.
10. François-Henri Mulard, *S. M. l'Empereur fait présent d'un sabre au chef militaire de la ville d'Alexandrie en Egypte*, 1808. Versailles et Trianon. Photo: RMN-Arnaudet.
11. Guillaume François Colson, *Trait de clémence du Général Bonaparte envers une famille arabe lors de l'entrée de l'armée française à Alexandrie*, 1812. Versailles et Trianon. Photo: RMN-Arnaudet.
12. P. F. Poole, *The Goths in Italy*, 1851. Copyright Manchester City Art Galleries.
13. Thomas Couture, *Les romains de la décadence,* 1847. Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Copyright photo RMN.
14. 'Tomb of Cecilia Metella'. An engraving in James Hakewill, *A Picturesque Tour of Italy, from drawings made in 1816–1817* (London 1820).

15. Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, *Madame de Staël as Corinne at Cape Miseno*, 1807–8 (oil on canvas, 140x118 cm.). Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva.
16. Richard Wilson, *The Coliseum by moonlight* (black chalk with stubbing and sepia with white highlights on grey coloured laid paper, 13.7 × 20.6 cm). Biblioteca Vaticana.
17. 'Fountain of the Nymph Egeria', from J. Merigot, *A Select Collection of Views and Ruins at Rome* vol. I (aquatint and watercolour). Yale Centre for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.
18. Simeon Solomon, *Habet!*, 1865 (oil on canvas, 122 × 101.5 cm). Private collection (on loan to Bradford Art Galleries and Museums, West Yorkshire).
19. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Bocca baciata*, 1859 (oil on panel, 32.2 × 27.1 cm). Courtesy of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (gift of James Lawrence).
20. Simeon Solomon, *The toilette of a Roman lady,* 1869 (oil on canvas, 113 × 97 cm). Private collection (photograph courtesy of Sotheby's).
21. Simeon Solomon, *Heliogabalus, High Priest of the Sun,* 1866 (watercolour, 47 × 29.2 cm). The Forbes Magazine Collection, New York (all rights reserved).
22. 'The Roman mosaic discovered at Ain-Zara' from *L'Illustrazione Italiana* (14 January 1912).
23. The home of Cabiria's father in Sicily, from *Cabiria* (1914). Courtesy of BFI Stills, Posters and Designs.
24. The sacrifice of children in the temple of Moloch in Carthage, from *Cabiria* (1914). Courtesy of BFI Stills, Posters and Designs.
25. Otello Chiti, *La partenza*, 1936. ASAC – Venice.
26. Filippo Sgarlata, *It is the plough that draws the sickle but the sword which defends it*, 1938. ASAC – Venice.

Contributors

STEPHEN BANN is a Professor at the University of Kent at Canterbury, where he is director of the Centre of Modern Cultural Studies and chair of the Board of Studies in History and Theory of Art. His books include *The clothing of Clio*, *The inventions of history*, *Romanticism and the rise of history* and, most recently, *Paul Delaroche: History painted*.

CHLOE CHARD teaches history of art at Wimbledon College of Art. She is the author of *Pleasure and guilt on the Grand Tour* and the editor (with Helen Langdon) of *Transports: travel, pleasure and imaginative geography 1600–1830*.

CATHARINE EDWARDS is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Bristol. Her work includes *Writing Rome: textual approaches to the city* and (edited with Michael Liversidge) *Imagining Rome: British artists and Rome in the nineteenth century*.

VALÉRIE HUET teaches archaeology and history of art at the University of Paris VII. She has published a number of articles on the reception of Roman monuments.

DUNCAN F. KENNEDY is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Bristol. He is the author of *The arts of love: five studies in the discourse of Roman love elegy* and is completing a book on Lucretius and the rhetoric of natural science.

VOLKER LOSEMANN teaches ancient history at the University of Marburg. His numerous publications are concentrated on the modern reception of classical antiquity and include *Nationalsozialismus und die Antike. Studien zur Entwicklung des Faches Alte Geschichte*.

JOHN LYON is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of English at the University of Bristol, who works on Shakespeare, the novel and aspects of influence. He has edited Henry James's *The Sacred Fount* (Penguin 1994) and is currently working on an edition of James's short stories (Penguin).

JAVED MAJEED teaches in the South Asia Department at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. He is the author of *Ungoverned imaginings: James Mill's* The history of the British in India *and orientalism*.

CHARLES MARTINDALE, Professor of Latin at the University of Bristol, is the editor of *Virgil and his influence*, *Ovid renewed*, *Horace made new* (with David Hopkins) and, most recently, *The Cambridge companion to Virgil.* He is also author of a book on the importance of reception theory for classicists, *Redeeming the text: Latin poetry and the hermeneutics of reception*.

ELIZABETH PRETTEJOHN teaches history of art at the University of Plymouth. She contributed substantial sections to the exhibition catalogues *Imagining Rome: British artists and Rome in the nineteenth century* and *Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema 1836–1912*. She is also the author of *Rossetti and his circle*.

MARLA STONE is Assistant Professor of History at Occidental College, Los Angeles, California. In addition to a number of articles on Fascist culture and politics, she is the author of *The patron state: art and politics in Fascist Italy*.

FRANK M. TURNER is the John Hay Whitney Professor of History at Yale University where he served as Provost from 1988 to 1992. He is the author of *Contesting cultural authority: essays in Victorian intellectual life* and editor of *John Henry Newman, the idea of a university*.

NORMAN VANCE is Professor of English at the University of Sussex. His works include *The sinews of the spirit* and *The Victorians and ancient Rome*.

MARIA WYKE is Senior Lecturer in Classics at the University of Reading. She has published widely on Roman love poetry and co-edited a volume of essays on *Women in ancient societies.* She is also the author of *Projecting the past: ancient Rome, cinema and history*.

Preface and acknowledgements

The essays in this interdisciplinary book set out to explore some of the ways, often strange and unexpected, in which ancient Rome's presence may be traced in a range of European cultural contexts from the late eighteenth century to the end of World War Two. The idea of Rome can be made to stand for both permanence – which may be reassuring or oppressive – and vertiginous discontinuities. But however it is understood, Rome with its weighty past remains a potent place in Europe's symbolic landscape.

This collection of essays developed out of a series of seminars which formed the central part of a three-year research project (funded by the Leverhulme Trust) on receptions of Rome in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, carried out from 1993 to 1996 in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Bristol. First thanks are due to the Leverhulme Trust itself, without whom the project would not have been possible. We would also like to express our gratitude to Professors J. B. Trapp and T. P. Wiseman who wrote in support of our application for funding. Many people from a wide range of disciplines and geographical areas participated in these seminars and the resulting collection should be seen as very much a collaborative effort. In particular, thanks should go to the Leverhulme Project Steering Committee which included: Derek Duncan, Ted Freeman, Duncan Kennedy, Michael Liversidge, Peter McDonald, Charles Martindale (Project Director), John Whittam, Martin White (all of the University of Bristol), Susanna Morton Braund (now at Royal Holloway, University of London), Thomas Wiedemann (now at the University of Nottingham) and our external advisers Christopher Stray (University of Wales, Swansea) and Maria Wyke (University of Reading). A very significant complement to the research project was the exhibition *Imagining Rome: British artists and Rome in the nineteenth century* organised jointly by the University's History of Art Department and the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery (with accompanying catalogue edited by Michael Liversidge and Catharine Edwards).

The early stages of editorial work, to establish the focus of the volume, were carried out by an editorial committee which included, besides myself, Charles Martindale, Duncan Kennedy and Peter McDonald. Others have played an important part in the debates from which this volume developed, as well as (in a number of cases) contributing more practical assistance. In addition to the contributors themselves, it gives me great pleasure to thank Robyn Asleson, Mary Beard, J. W. Burrow, Anthony Copley, Linda Dowling, Wolfgang Ernst, Rowena Fowler, Phil Freeman, Thomas Habinek, Richard Jenkyns, Ellen O'Gorman, Thomas Osborne, Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani, Sam Smiles, Christopher Stray, Jennifer Wallace, Tim Webb, Dick Whittaker and Romke Visser. Jo Kear, Eleanor Tollfree and Jennifer Oster made valued contributions to the smooth running of the seminars. Conversations with Elizabeth Speller prompted me to rethink a significant part of the introduction to the present collection of essays.

Chloe Chard would like to thank the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research at the Australian National University, Canberra for paying some of the photograph and permission fees for illustrations to her essay. The Arts Faculty Research Fund of the University of Bristol also contributed to the cost of illustrations for this volume.

Particular thanks are due to Charles Martindale whose enthusiasm for and expertise in receptions of Rome gave the research project its initial impetus and did much to sustain it over its three-year duration. As director of the project he deployed his customary intellectual rigour to ensure high standards of debate in seminars and beyond. His vigilant critical eye has been invaluable in the final stages of the book's composition. Pauline Hire of Cambridge University Press has, as ever, been wonderfully supportive and encouraging.

1 A sense of place: Rome, history and empire revisited

Duncan F. Kennedy

A 'sense of place' is, I suspect, a notion more often invoked than investigated, but Rome seems a pre-eminent case for consideration. Rome has been seen as the destination *par excellence*, and all roads proverbially lead there. The entry under *voyage* in the French *Encyclopédie* of 1765 observes that one makes a journey to Paris, but one makes *the* journey to Italy; it is definitive.[1] The fervour expressed by travellers to Rome like Goethe or Henry James is one of desire and expectation fulfilled, presented to us as at least in part intellectual, and figured as *re*cognition as much as cognition. Goethe exclaims: 'All the dreams of my youth have come to life; the first engravings I remember – my father hung views of Rome in the hall – I now see in reality, and everything I have known through paintings, drawings, etchings, woodcuts, plaster casts and cork models is now assembled before me. Wherever I walk, I come upon familiar objects in an unfamiliar world; everything is just as I imagined it, yet everything is new' (*Italian Journey*, p. 129).[2] Goethe goes on to allude to the story of Pygmalion's statue of Galatea to suggest the way that Rome was for him fashioned as the destination of his desire through representation before it achieved 'reality' (figured as coming to life) in the fulfilment of that desire. The evocation of place often involves an appeal to authenticity, but authenticity is evoked precisely in and through notions of representation and recognition. Rome visited is always in some sense Rome revisited. Though we may fashion fables of an originary visit to virgin ground (Virgil's narrative of Aeneas' visit to the site of the future Rome in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* aspires to something of that quality), depictions of place are always already implicated in structures of representation, and often overtly appeal to them. As Jonathan Culler has remarked, 'the existence of reproductions is what makes something an original, authentic, the real thing'.[3] But the logic shuttles both ways, for the 'reality' no less serves to authenticate the representation, and its mode. On his first evening in Rome, Henry James wrote to his brother William: 'At last – for the first time – I live! It beats everything: it leaves the Rome of your fancy – your education – nowhere. It makes Venice – Florence – Oxford – London – seem like little cities of pasteboard. . . . The effect is something indescribable.' But describe it is what he does: 'For the first time I know what the picturesque is.'[4]

---

[1] Van Den Abbeele (1992) vii.

[2] Page references for Goethe are to the translation of Auden and Mayer (1970).

[3] Culler (1988) 160.

James' biographer, Leon Edel, describes his exuberant rhetoric as understandable: 'the romantic spirit was strong in him, and to be in Rome was to visit History itself, to feel not only his own passion at the moment but the passions of the centuries'.[5] Such sentiments occur to many travellers to Rome, and the convention straddles travel literature and fiction. Goethe remarks: 'the entire history of the world is linked up with this city' (p. 148) and later explains:

> What I want to see is the Everlasting Rome, not the Rome which is replaced by another every decade. . . . It is history, above all, that one reads quite differently here from anywhere else in the world. Everywhere else one starts from the outside and works inward; here it seems to be the other way around. All history is encamped about us and all history sets forth again from us. This does not apply only to Roman history, but to the history of the whole world. From here I can accompany the conquerors to the Weser and the Euphrates, or, if I prefer to stand and gape, I can wait in the Via Sacra for their triumphant return.

Rome not only has a history but is identifed with History, and Rome visited is always in some sense History revisited. 'After the brief narrow experience of her childhood', George Eliot's Dorothea Brooke in Chapter 20 of *Middlemarch* 'was beholding Rome, the city of visible history, where the past of a whole hemisphere seems moving in funeral procession with strange ancestral images and trophies gathered from afar'. Travel is a metaphor for thought, and 'investigation' involves following in the footsteps of those who have gone before, a search that is at the same time *re*search. More generally, of course, theories of meaning and interpretation are framed in spatial terms. A conceptual destination often revisited is a *locus communis* or *topos*, a commonplace; a 'convention' is a textual point at which many come together. Citation is the textual counterpart of travel and shares its characteristics. Conversely, therefore, descriptions of places may be seen as encoding assumptions of various sorts; more precisely, 'place' will be configured in particular discourses by the particular epistemological interests involved. In his *Essai sur l'étude de la littérature* of 1761, Edward Gibbon wrote of the philosophical spirit that it 'consists in the power to go back [*remonter*] to simple ideas, to seize and combine first principles. The view [*coup d'oeil*] of one who possesses it is accurate but at the same time extensive. Placed on a height, he takes in a vast stretch of countryside, forming an image both distinct and unique, while minds as accurate but more limited discern only a part.'[6] In a famous account to which I shall return, Gibbon was to describe himself as climbing a particular hill, the Capitoline in Rome, and there conceiving the idea of writing the decline and fall of the city. If space exists in three dimensions, place, perhaps, can only exist in four. The evocation of a sense of place is, arguably necessarily, implicated in a sense of history and of time, and this is one of the factors that transforms 'space' into 'place'.

---

[4] James (1974) 160. [5] Edel (1977) 256.

But history, and time, can be configured in more ways than one. The past is a foreign country, we are told, at least by those investigators to whom history means difference and discontinuity rather than similarity and continuity. If descriptions of place encode assumptions about the past and its relationship to the present, a city of seven hills can afford a variety of prospects, none of which is self-evidently superior to the rest. At the beginning of 'Civilisation and its discontents', Freud offered a summary of what 'historians tell us' about the phases of physical development of Rome, but then spins a fantasy of what Rome would be like if it were not a physical entity but a psychical one, 'in which nothing that has once come into existence will have passed away':

> This would mean that in Rome the palaces of the Caesars and the Septizonium of Septimius Severus would still be rising to their old height on the Palatine and that the castle of S. Angelo would still be carrying on its battlements the beautiful statues which graced it until the siege by the Goths, and so on. But more than this. In the place occupied by the Palazzo Caffarelli would once more stand – without the Palazzo having to be removed – the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; and this not only in its latest shape, as the Romans of the Empire saw it, but also in its earliest one, when it still showed Etruscan forms and was ornamented with terracotta antefixes. Where the Coliseum now stands we could at the same time admire Nero's Golden House. On the Piazza of the Pantheon we should find not only the Pantheon of today, as it was bequeathed to us by Hadrian, but, on the same site, the original edifice erected by Agrippa; indeed, the same piece of ground would be supporting the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the ancient temple over which it was built. And the observer would perhaps only have to change the direction of his glance or his position in order to call up the one view or the other.[7]

Malcolm Bowie sets this amongst the many appeals Freud makes to archaeological images as a favourite means 'whereby this redoubtable theoretician of a timeless unconscious sought to endow his discoveries with the resonance and prestige of history'.[8] We should resist the temptation to be seduced by Freud's contrast of his image with what 'historians tell us' and his disclaimer that his fantasy 'leads to things that are unimaginable and even absurd'. Freud's configuration of a Rome in which there is no sharp or categorical distinction between past and present, rather than being ahistorical, can be viewed as a meditation on history, and I shall suggest that the topographical simultaneity of Freud's fantasy is precisely correlated to psychoanalysis' projection of its master analytical terms and methods *as* timeless and transcendent. The associations of Rome with timelessness and transcendence are crucially relevant to the impact of Freud's fantasy, and I shall analyse these associations in due course. But first, let us pursue the implications of the boundaries, or lack of them, between past and present – and future.

---

[6] Cited and translated by Carnochan (1987) 48–9.

[7] Freud (1930/1985) 257–8.

[8] Bowie (1987) 17–18.

In a poem dated February 1837, 'A l'Arc de Triomphe', Victor Hugo writes of the landmark, planned by Napoleon for his new Rome but only recently completed, that three thousand years hence, when people will talk of Napoleon in the same way as they now do of Cyrus, when the Seine will be choked with stones, and all Paris except Notre Dame, the Vendôme column and the Arc de Triomphe has fallen into ruin, a man resting on a hill at dusk when the mists have begun to fall will be lost in wonder at the scene and then the monument will truly at last have what it now lacks.[9] Hugo's appeal to authenticity mobilises conventions of representation familiar, for example, from Claude's capricious depiction of the Arch of Constantine and the Colosseum standing isolated in an idyllic landscape. We might think also of Hubert Robert's 1796 depiction of the Great Gallery of the Louvre in ruins a full century-and-a-half before the building was completed, or John Michael Gandy's picture of Soane's rotunda of the Bank of England as a ruin (1832) *(fig. 2)*. The convention persists, arrestingly for the modern viewer, in the sequence *Scenes of the future* by the Soviet emigré artists Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid (1974–84), in which buildings such as the TWA terminal at Kennedy Airport, Dulles Airport, the Guggenheim Museum and the Museum of Modern Art are depicted ruined against idealised landscapes.[10] Although appropriated for Paris, London, New York and Washington, the convention seems particularly associated with Rome. As Mme de Staël's heroine Corinne prepares to leave Rome, she goes up to the cupola of St Peter's to bid farewell to the city:

> As she drew near, her first thought was to picture the building as it would be when its turn came to fall into ruin, an object of admiration for centuries to come. She imagined the columns now standing, half lying on the ground, the portico shattered, the vault open to the sky. But even the obelisk would still reign over the new ruins, for the Egyptians who created it laboured for eternity on earth.[11]

Similar thoughts occur to Walter Pater's Marius as he listens to Marcus Aurelius addressing the Senate:

---

[9] Hugo (1967–70) V 573–83.

[10] See Ratcliff (1988) 93.

[11] De Staël (1987) 286.

> There was a certain melancholy grandeur in the very simplicity or triteness of the theme: as it were the very quintessence of all the old Roman epitaphs, of all that was monumental in that city of tombs, layer upon layer of dead things and people. . . . The grandeur of the ruins of Rome, – heroism in ruin: it was under the influence of an imaginative anticipation of this, that he [Marcus Aurelius] appeared to be speaking. And though the impression of the actual greatness of Rome on that day was but enhanced by the strain of contempt, falling with an accent of pathetic conviction from the emperor himself, and gaining from his pontifical pretensions the authority of a religious intimation, yet the curious interest of the discourse lay in this, that Marius, for one, as he listened, seemed to forsee a grass-grown Forum, the broken ways of the Capitol, and the Palatine hill itself in humble occupation (p. 147).[12]

These representations, both verbal and visual, involve the superimposition of *a* 'future' on *a* 'present'. What a place means, they suggest, is what it will have meant. Such a narrative device occurs also in Book 8 of Virgil's *Aeneid* in the description of Aeneas' 'originary' visit to the place where the city of Rome will one day stand. Aeneas is guided across a site described to him by its present inhabitant, the Arcadian king Evander, in terms of its past history, but the epic narrator's voice superimposes on the site terms of description which cannot be known to Aeneas, but are familiar to the narrator and his audience:

> hinc ad Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia ducit
> aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis.
>
> From here [Evander] leads [Aeneas] to the Tarpeian seat and the Capitol, golden now, but in other times bristling with forest thickets.
> (8.347–8)
>
> talibus inter se dictis ad tecta subibant
> pauperis Euandri, passimque armenta videbant
> Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis.
>
> Conversing thus amongst themselves, they approached the dwelling of the humble Evander, and they saw the cattle everywhere, lowing in the Forum of Rome and the chic Carinae. (8.359–61)

The narrative's 'present' is the time of Aeneas, centuries before the foundation of the city, but these lines look 'forward' to a 'future' which also happens to be the narrator's 'present'. What we have here is a narrative transposition to the 'past' of the idea that what a place means is what it will have meant, involving the simultaneous projection of of a view 'forwards' from one point in time to another accompanied by a view 'backwards' from the latter point to the former. Character and narrator each have their 'present', which from each other's perspective will be regarded as the

---

[12] Page references are to Pater (1985).

‘future’ or the ‘past’. Thus Marius’ ‘future’, a grass-grown Forum, is the narrator’s ‘present’; and in a similar, though slightly more complex fashion, Corinne momentarily takes on the role of narrator as, in a comparable moment of imaginative anticipation, she projects a ‘future’ which an implicit character, an observer of the ruined St Peter’s, will inhabit as the ‘present’, and from which he or she will view Corinne’s time as the distant ‘past’.

The effect is to see the same place at two different times, in the cases we have been looking at, times enormously separated, and the place is observed by two sets of eyes. However, narrative time is infinitely elastic. An enormous span of years can be embraced in a single utterance (‘three thousand years hence’). Conversely, a single moment can be expanded infinitely, and the boundaries between times designated ‘past’, ‘present’ or ‘future’ can be manipulated in all kinds of ways, or even collapsed entirely, as Freud collapses multiple ‘pasts’ into a moment of simultaneity experienced as the ‘present’. Those eyes may belong to the same person, but be viewing a scene again after an interval of time, as the narrator Charles Ryder does in the prologue to the novel significantly entitled *Brideshead Revisited*:

> ‘There’s a frightful great fountain, too, in front of the steps, all rocks and sort of carved animals. You never saw such a thing.’
> ‘Yes, Hooper, I did. I’ve been here before.’[13]

Indeed he had, ‘first with Sebastian more than twenty years ago on a cloudless day in June’.[14] The house and park of Brideshead are disfigured by its wartime occupation by the army, and as Ryder now surveys the scene, his elegiac description is framed as the superimposition of a ‘past’ (though not, in this case, his past) on the ‘present’:

> The woods were all of oak and beech, the oak grey and bare, the beech faintly dusted with green by the breaking buds; they made a simple, carefully designed pattern with the green glades and the wide green spaces – Did the fallow deer graze here still? – and, lest the eye wander aimlessly, a Doric temple stood by the water’s edge, and an ivy-grown arch spanned the lowest of the connecting weirs. All this had been planned and planted a century and a half ago so that, at about this date, it might be seen in its maturity.[15]

Ryder’s description conjures up a character, the planter and planner of a century and a half ago, who looks forward from his present to a future which is the present from which the narrator looks back to a moment emphatically characterised as one of vision and inception. The sense of fulfilment, the park seen in its planned maturity, gives to this picture a powerfully teleological effect. The house has, in Hooper’s words, ‘a sort of R.C. Church attached’,[16] reopened during the war by an evacuated priest, and the attendance of troops at it ('surprising lot use it'),[17] and the 'small red flame'[18] burning once more in the art-nouveau lamp before the altar are a glimmer of hope in the midst of spiritual darkness. Brideshead is thus the repository of a faith that transcends time and ruin and bears the name of 'Rome'. Other aspects of Brideshead carry associations of place that are, in some sense, 'Roman'. In Virgil's narrative, what preceded Rome was a settlement peopled by migrants from Arcadia. That important primal visit to Brideshead, more than twenty years ago, is narrated in a section entitled 'Et in Arcadia Ego'. The fountain carries some of those associations of Arcadia and Rome as well: 'such a fountain as one might expect to find in a piazza of Southern Italy, such a fountain as was, indeed, found there a century ago by one of Sebastian's ancestors; found, purchased, imported and re-erected in an alien but welcoming climate'.[19] Frank Kermode has suggested that, even from these early moments in the novel, the house becomes an emblem of the Augustinian City of God,[20] and we might recall at this point the way that 'Rome' has been inscribed into providential models of history, both pagan and Christian. Conventions of representing a sense of place, no less than the fountain at Brideshead, have survived their translation, freighted with associations that are not so much topographical as expressive of particular ideological configurations of history.

---

[13] Waugh (1962) 22. [14] *Ibid.* 23. [15] *Ibid.* 21–2. [16] *Ibid.* 22.

What a place means, I have suggested, is what it will have meant. A phenomenon gains historical shape, order and meaning only when it can be viewed from the vantage point, the *coup d'oeil*, of the point deemed to be its end. 'End' may be figured principally as a moment of fulfilment, as in the cases of that first visit to the site of Rome by Aeneas, or the park envisioned by the planter and planner of Brideshead, or as demise, as in the pictures of Robert, Gandy and Komar and Melamid. Typically, however, there is a dialectic of fulfilment and demise, of persistence and change, and of eternity and transience. Thus for Hugo, the Arc de Triomphe achieves its fulfilment in the ruin of the city around it; and for Corinne, the obelisk would still reign over the new ruins of St Peter's, 'for the Egyptians who created it laboured for eternity on earth'. For one enmeshed in time and circumstance, for one in history, any phenomenon can only be historicised by just such an imaginative anticipation of its end. The end, it should be noted, is not a historical date, but the prerequisite for something's becoming history. As of places, so of ideas. The prerequisite for the historicity of the Roman empire is its end (which, it may be stressed once more, is not a historical date), and ancient texts offer various adumbrations of that end. A Sibylline oracle written in Greek detects Rome's end in its name:[21] 'Samos too will be a pile of sand (*ammos*), and Delos will disappear (*adelos*), and Rome (*Rome*) will be a narrow street (*rume*);[22] for all oracles come to fulfilment.' The very name (*nomen*) of Rome is a foreshadowing (*omen*) of its end This topos occurs often elsewhere. In his apocalyptic sixteenth *Epode*, written in the midst of Rome's civil wars, Horace foresees the destruction of the city, and associates the name of Rome with the Latin verb *ruere*, etymologically the source of the word 'ruin':

---

[17] *Ibid.* 326. [18] *Ibid.* 331. [19] *Ibid.* 78–9. [20] Kermode (1962) 172.

[21] *Sibylline Oracle* 3: 363–4, cited by Siegert (1994) 303, to whom some of the following points are indebted. The Greek text of the oracle may be found in Geffcken (1902) 67.

> Altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas,
> suis et ipsa *Roma* viribus *ruit*.
>
> A second generation is being worn down by civil wars, and Rome herself through her own strength is tottering. (1–2)

Within this convention, the conferring of a name inscribes a deferral that gives a space its identity as place only in virtue of its prospective end. That end may be figured as demise, but also as goal, as *telos*. Against these pessimistic fantasies which work to foreground end as demise, Virgil's *Aeneid* offers an image of the end of the Roman empire as fulfilment, fulfilment infinitely deferred, figured in Jupiter's prophecy to Venus in Book 1 as power (*imperium*) without boundaries of space and time:

> his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:
> imperium sine fine dedi.
>
> On [the Romans] I place neither limits of realm nor time: I have granted dominion without end. (278–9)

This historicisation of the Roman empire seeks to make it synonymous with history itself. Its end infinitely deferred, it offers no point beyond from which it may be viewed. The role of the historian, however, is one of determination, of imposing boundaries, beginnings and ends. Where stands, then, the historian of the Roman empire thus defined? The only position is one of transcendence, outside history, a God's-eye view. If the end of empire is a prerequisite of its historicity, but its end is infinitely deferred, then its demise (and indeed its inception) cannot be a date in history, nor *a fortiori* can the causes of its decline and fall be historical. Within this definition of empire, an event such as the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 CE marks not demise of empire, but opens up the discursive opportunity to speak of Rome as a historical episode within the continually and ever-receding horizon of empire. Rome, from being identified, perhaps, with that empire, becomes, by the postulation of that (or any other) event as a historical date signifying rupture or discontinuity, its type or *figura*. This underlies the doctrine of *translatio imperii*, whereby Rome acts as a figure for whatever now represents this notion of empire, whether it be its identification with the City of God by St Augustine or with secular formations which seek to describe themselves as 'empires'. When empire is transferred in this way, what Rome is thought to represent historically is felt to be more authentically experienced elsewhere, whether it be Napoleon's Paris or London at the zenith of the British empire. Henry James alludes to this sensation on the opening page of *The Golden Bowl:*

---

[22] The meaning of *rume* is uncertain. Macleod (1979) 220–1 argues for the sense 'ruin'.

> The Prince had always liked his London, when it had come to him; he was one of the Modern Romans who find by the Thames a more convincing image of the truth of the ancient state than any they have left by the Tiber. Brought up on the legend of the City to which the world paid tribute, he recognized in the present London much more than in contemporary Rome the real dimensions of such a case. If it was a question of an *Imperium*, he said to himself, and if one wished, as a Roman, to recover a little the sense of that, the place to do so was on London Bridge, or even, on a fine afternoon in May, at Hyde Park Corner.

Such transference can invoke and set against each other the two aspects of empire, the one transcendent and so eternal, the other secular and so subject to demise, and Rome can be the type of both. It is thus for those enmeshed in time, circumstance and history that Brideshead in its decay can represent the City of God, and so Macaulay, in reviewing Ranke's *History of the Popes*, can conjure up a scene of the future reminiscent of those we have looked at so as to meditate upon the durability of the Roman Catholic church: 'and she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St Paul's'.[23] 'Rome n'est plus à Rome', as Baumgarten famously remarked; but if Virgil's definition of empire seeks to make 'Rome' synonymous with history, then the historian would be well advised to return to 'Rome', and to Virgil.

Historical accounts often represent themselves as going over the ground again, as investigation, as research, as review. Narratives and the analyses made of them characteristically operate by invoking a distinction between 'story', an idealised sequence of events in a notionally sequential order, and 'narrative', the emplotment of those events in an actual telling. An easy assumption is that 'story' definitively pre-exists its 'emplotment' in 'narrative'; indeed, a word such as 'emplotment' already presupposes this order. However, this relationship emerges as more complex, and open to manipulation. Virgilian narrative seems to offer itself as the representation, the telling, of a pre-existing story. The famous plunge *in medias res* (the storm which shipwrecks Aeneas on the shores of Carthage provides the narrative with its opening incident) and the consequent flashbacks, such as

---

[23] Macaulay (1898) IX 288. Macaulay's responses to Rome are discussed further by Edwards later in this volume.

Aeneas' own retrospective account of the fall of Troy, constitute the narrative's 'present' as the wanderings of Aeneas and his arrival in Italy, and help to create this sense of the 'story' the poem tells as itself already determined, as simply a matter of report or passive transcription. The effect is to suppress the agency of the narrator: the narrative is represented as already there, and simply handed down to the poet, rather than as being shaped by him, as is signalled in the poet's appeal to the Muse to 'recount to me the causes' (*Musa, mihi causas memora*, *Aen.* 1.8). In the *Aeneid*, however, as well as flashbacks from the narrative's 'present', a view 'forwards' from that 'present' into the 'future' is provided by means of the supernatural, primarily prophecy in various guises. Jupiter's speech to Venus in Book 1 foretelling for the Romans empire without limits of time or space is one such scene which looks 'forwards' from the moment chosen as the narrative's 'present' beyond the incident with which the narrative closes, the death of Turnus, to the age of Augustus as its end, in the sense of both finishing-point and goal, its fulfilment or *telos*. For a character within such a narrative (Aeneas, for example), events will appear contingent, their shape or goal, their *end*, uncertain. When Aeneas is shipwrecked, Venus prompts her father's prophecy by demanding 'what end do you set to these travails, great king?' (*quem das finem, rex magne, laborum?*, *Aen.* 1.241). No such character can normally see into the future, and for that reason, the view 'forwards' is usually occluded in most narratives (although we should not make the mistake of believing that it is therefore absent). It is the explicit representation in the person of Jupiter within the narrative of the poem of the view 'forwards' (of the 'future' from the narrative's 'present' as *known*, its significance already *determined*) that has made the *Aeneid* the paradigm of teleological narrative; and the association of the view 'forwards' with the god Jupiter makes the view not only prospective but, in the fullest sense of the term, providential. Unlike the other characters, Jupiter enjoys a point of view from which he can view the end of these events, precisely a god's-eye view. Knowing the end of the sequence of events he prophesies, he can view that sequence not only prospectively but retrospectively at the same time as well. From this we get the trope of destiny, when the end is achieved which has been foreseen from the moment of vision and inception, when the sequence of events can be seen to have reached its anticipated destination. But that destination, of course, is the narrator of the *Aeneid*'s own time, and it is he who has chosen the story elements and constructed the sequence, its beginning and end points and order of presentation, and thus furnishes the narrative with its view 'forwards'. The view 'forwards' from the *narrative's* 'present' thus corresponds to the the view 'backwards' from the *narrator's* 'present'. The 'story' which the *Aeneid* purports to narrate emerges as a suprapersonal, providential order of history, named in the

Aeneid as *fatum* ('an utterance'), and articulated in the utterances of Jupiter. It is thus no less possible to view fate, destiny or history as an *effect* of narrative and the narrator's agency than, as the narrator of the *Aeneid* seeks to suggest, to see it as its *cause*.[24]

A major implication of what I have been saying is that *all* narratives (indeed, all utterances) have a teleological and a providential aspect *by virtue of having a narrator,* although this will only be apparent if the view 'forwards' is in some way rendered explicit, as it is in the figure of Jupiter in the *Aeneid*, or of the planter and planner of the park at Brideshead in Ryder's account; and if the end is a vital constitutive element in the act of historical understanding, no less so is the moment chosen as the beginning, the moment of forward vision, the moment of planting and planning. For there to be a shape or order to history, the 'future' (seen from whatever constitutes the narrative's 'present') must, at some level, be *known*. 'How it was' always involves 'how it was-to-be': we are asked not only to look back to a point in the past, when that point was the 'present', but also to look forward from that point to the *telos* of the moment which is the focus for the interests and desires which motivate the narrative act, and which the narrative act seeks to satisfy. It is from this shuttle, simultaneously backwards and forwards, that historical representations derive their sense of closure and fulfilment. What I have analysed as the view 'backwards' and the view 'forwards' are totally separable in theory, never in practice. However, the *Aeneid*, which identifies Empire and History and simultaneously sees itself as a type of both, can serve as a dramatic allegory of the act of narration and of historical understanding. The complex of perspectives involved in any act of historical narration are resolved into, and enacted by, the poem's characters, and Jupiter, the one character who enjoys perspectives both forwards and backwards, who knows the significance of the story he is telling because he knows its end, becomes the type or figure of the narrator, the epic poet transcribing history – even down to the description he offers of his own articulation of fate in terms of reading a book already written: 'I will unroll and bring to light the secrets of fate' (*volvens fatorum arcana movebo*), he says (*Aen.* 1.262), as he reveals the 'future' to Venus.

Whilst the view forwards to the future is normally associated with the supernatural, the narrator of the *Aeneid* himself explicitly provides the prospective view to his own present in the scene in Book 8 in which Aeneas makes his inaugural visit to the site where Rome one day will be. Just as a place means what it will have meant, so events have meaning only if their significance is simultaneously already, but not yet, known – already to Jupiter, or the narrator, not yet to Aeneas. In more conventional historical representations, the retrospective aspect is explicit, whilst the prospective view from the moment chosen as the narrative's present to the narrator's present, which gives to the act of historical judgement its teleological character, is occluded. The scenes from the future gain their surprise from the way they render explicit this prospective aspect of any historical representation. When Pater's Marius is travelling to Rome in Chapter 10 of *Marius the Epicurean*, he journeys through a landscape which from Marius' perspective seems headed towards demise: 'Meantime the farms were less carefully tended than of old: here and there they were lapsing into their natural wildness: some villas were also partly fallen into ruin' (p. 126). The narrator's next comment suggests a different perspective: 'The picturesque, romantic Italy of a later time – the Italy of Claude and Salvator Rosa – was already forming, for the delight of the modern romantic traveller.' Already for Pater; not yet for Marius, who cannot see the new end of fulfilment which the narrator has substituted for Marius' sense of impending demise. When Marius seems to forsee a grass-grown Forum, the broken ways of the Capitol, and the Palatine hill itself in humble occupation, it is the narrator's backward glance from the end which gives to this 'imaginative anticipation' its sense of historical fulfilment. The character Marius is represented as looking forward over a sequence of events to the end from which the narrator looks back. The effect is to place Marius 'within' history, trying to historicise the phenomena he experiences by imagining their ends, and the narrator, from the vantage point of the end, 'outside' it, enjoying that god's-eye view which can see events in terms of their ends, which may (whence a sense of inevitability) or may not be (whence irony) the ends which those 'within' history have envisaged.

---

[24] These points are explored further in Kennedy (1997).

When a scene is revisited, a textual topos re-employed, a citation enacted, or all of these, a further perspective is superimposed. In his *De varietate fortunae* of 1448, Poggio Bracciolini depicted himself and a companion climbing the Capitoline hill in a self-conscious reprise of the tour of Evander and Aeneas. In Gibbon's account of the passage in the final chapter of his *Decline and Fall*, they 'reposed themselves among the ruins of columns and temples' and what they viewed from 'that commanding spot' was 'the wide and various prospect of desolation'.[25] The previous end, the Virgilian narrator's 'present', becomes in the new account the 'past', and Poggio's 'present' supplies a new 'end' beyond the previous one, suggesting that the perspective Virgil offered is now superseded. The 'wide and various prospect' afforded by relating past to present from that 'commanding spot' now looks not towards fulfilment, but 'desolation'. Rather than being the transcendent view of history from 'outside' it had claimed to be, the

---

[25] Cited from the edition of Womersley (1994) III 1062.

Virgilian perspective is now relocated within the history the new account offers, and from narrator, Virgil has become character – like his Aeneas, consigned to his own 'present', and afforded a view of the past only from the perspective of that 'present'; and if he has any inklings of the future, they can only be in the nature of an 'imaginative anticipation', without that sense of fulfilment that only the retrospective view from the end can give. From the new narrator's privileged perspective, the past is reconfigured in the light of the new end, and a new order is imposed on history. The effect is to create a series of typologies. Frank Kermode explains:

> Strictly speaking, a type is distinguished from a symbol or allegory in that it is constituted by an historical event or person (as Christ makes Jonah the type of his resurrection, and St. Paul the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites a type of baptism). A type can therefore be identified only when fulfilled by its antitype, a later event in a providentially structured history; the Old Covenant is a type of the New. . . . Types are essentially what Auerbach has in mind when he speaks of *figurae*, events or persons that are themselves, but may presage others. Their purpose, to put it too simply, is to accommodate the events and persons of a superseded order of time to a new one.[26]

Thus we have seen how 'Rome' can become the type of empire, made such in various narratives by whatever is asserted to be its antitype, say, the British empire or the City of God. However, as we have seen, all narratives have a providential aspect by virtue of having a narrator. In the case of Poggio's narrative, typologies can be seen to operate on at least a couple of levels. Poggio makes Aeneas the type of his visit to Rome, but also makes Virgil the type of narrator, presaging Poggio's own role as the narrator of the history of Rome.

Gibbon's citation of Poggio serves to enclose his narrative in turn within one with a further end, forging one more link in this chain of typologies and making Poggio in turn the type of the historian of Rome. But there is one further dimension we must observe. In the stories we tell about ourselves, we are *both* character and narrator: we create a character in a narrative 'present' which is never entirely identical to the narrator's present, and whose perspective on events from within the story is never quite the same as that of the narrator, who can view them in the light of their 'end'. In a letter, Gibbon described his *Decline and Fall* after its completion in terms of a journey: 'I look back in amazement on the road which I have travelled, but which I should never have entered had I been previously apprized of its length'.[27] From the narrator Gibbon's position at the end, the character Gibbon's imaginative anticipation 'within' history is seen to fall far short of what transpired. If the end is a vital constitutive element in the act of historical understanding, not least in the narratives we tell of ourselves, no less is the moment chosen as the beginning, the moment of forward vision, the moment of planting and planning, the moment at which we set out in the direction of our anticipated destination. In Gibbon's own account, this road notoriously began in Rome. A couple of the variant versions of the conception of his great work Gibbon gave in his *Memoirs* will bear another citation.[28] Draft 'C' reads as follows:

---

[26] Kermode (1983) 89–90.

[27] Cited from the edition of Norton (1956) III 107.

> Yet the historian of the decline and fall must not regret his time or expence, since it was the view of Italy and Rome which determined the choice of subject. In my Journal the place and moment of conception are recorded: the fifteenth of October 1764, in the close of evening, as I sat musing in the Church of the Zoccolanti or Franciscan fryars, while they were singing Vespers in the Temple of Jupiter on the ruins of the Capitol.

We have a particularly striking example of the collapse of the distinction between past and present here as the Church of the Zoccolanti friars – the name redolent of the 'enthusiasm' and 'barbarism' which for Gibbon were crucial factors in the decline and fall of the Roman empire – occupies the same space on the Capitol as the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The Capitol was, of course, the symbolic centre, and Jupiter the sovereign god, of the Roman empire.[29] The modern archaeological consensus is that Gibbon was mistaken in his belief about the exact location of Jupiter's temple on the hill, but since he is unembarrassed to speak of ruins on the Capitol (true perhaps in Poggio's day, though not in his own), realism of topographical representation seems hardly the main concern of this description. Draft 'E' of the *Memoirs* points this up even more clearly:

> It was at Rome on the fifteenth of October 1764, as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol while the barefooted fryars were singing Vespers in the temple of Jupiter, that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the City first started to my mind.

The friars are still there, though the references to their order and their church have disappeared; but the Temple of Jupiter amidst the ruins of the Capitol preposterously persists, the more to emphasise the simultaneity in the present of a number of pasts. David Womersley points to an interesting parallel to the phraseology of the *Memoirs* in the final volume of the *Decline and Fall*:

> It was on the twenty-seventh of July, in the year twelve hundred and ninety-nine of the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia, and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster.

---

[28] Cited from the edition of Bonnard (1966) 136. Gibbon's various accounts of the conception of *The Decline and Fall* are also discussed by Bann later in this volume.

[29] See Edwards (1996a) 69–72.

Womersley points out the ironic resonances this has for the expansion of Gibbon's history beyond its planned dimensions (it was, we may recall, to be a history of the *city*), and he comments: 'The singular accuracy of the date of the conception of *The Decline and Fall* may also disclose if not foresight, at least retrospective knowledge of the history's rapid and destructive, but also enriching and emancipating, growth.'[30] Retrospective knowledge (from the narrator's perspective at the end) *and* foresight (from the character's viewpoint), I should say, and the irony emerges in the mismatch of the two. Gibbon's narrative of the conception of his work presents us with a character who, at the moment of setting out, looks forward in the direction of the destination from which Gibbon the narrator looks back. The effect is discreetly teleological, and the coincidence of character and narrator serves to occlude the providential aspect of the narration. It has become a commonplace to describe Gibbon's historical perspective as 'Olympian'.[31] But as Gibbon presents himself as musing on that memorable spot where Aeneas stood and Poggio spoke (of the vicissitudes of Fortune, a configuration of history that would seek to eschew the notion of providence), the presence of the Temple of Jupiter is a typological reminder of the divine narrator of an exploded 'providential' history of a city expanding into an empire without boundaries of space or time which this historian of the Roman empire claims to supplant.

This by no means exhausts the typological functions of Jupiter. As we have seen, it is only from 'outside' history that factors such as 'decline' and 'fall' can be plotted. Configuring this position 'outside', the 'god's-eye view', with its capacity to look forwards, as well as backwards, from any moment designated 'the present', is one in which (unlike for those 'within' history) there is no firm boundary between 'past', 'present' and 'future'; and in which factors (like decline and fall) or terms of analysis (like Freud's unconscious) are projected as historically transcendent, and not subject to the same historical determination as the phenomena which they are used to explain. Simultaneities of past and present, as in Gibbon's or Freud's configurations of Rome, are explicit signs of the claim to that position of transcendence implicit in, and constitutive of, any historical utterance, from which the historian can range over time and space, and texts (of whatever 'date'), at will, and make the past, or many pasts simultaneously, 'present'. Conversely, to represent history 'realistically' or 'archaeologically' (in Freud's phrase 'as historians do') is to occlude, though not to escape, this position; Rome can never be simply a physical entity, it must be a psychical one also. That position of transcendence may be represented in terms of space no less than of time. Goethe seeks to capture in the imagery of imperial conquest the shuttle there and back again which constitutes (in a structure which is typological no less than topological) the points thereby joined as the ‘margins’ and the ‘centre’ – the movement out to the boundaries, and then back again in a triumphal procession that leads along the Via Sacra and up the Capitoline Hill to the Temple of Jupiter. It is a space so configured that provides the commanding spot from which one can see the Everlasting Rome, and not just the Rome which is replaced by another every decade.

---

[30] Womersley (1988) 227.

[31] See the passages assembled by Carnochan (1987) 51–2.