Introduction

Matthew P. Loar, Sarah C. Murray, and Stefano Rebeggiani

This volume wades into the fertile waters of Augustan Rome and the interrelationship of its literature, monuments, and urban landscape, taking up a pair of questions that are by now familiar and important to all Classicists: how can we productively probe the myriad points of contact between textual and material evidence to write viable cultural histories of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds, and what are the limits of these kinds of analysis? Put differently, how should art and archaeological artifacts, buildings and structures, and landscapes and urban spaces be understood in relation to texts that either describe, refer to, or are part of the material world? Augustan Rome offers an ideal test case for pursuing these questions, not only because the unprecedented scope of Augustan construction and renovation transformed the urban fabric of Rome into a highly visible barometer of the seismic shifts happening within the political, social, and cultural landscape of the period, but also because the changing appearance of the city and the significance of these changes clearly registered with Augustan authors.[1] Almost every single Augustan author, in fact, engages in some form or fashion with the monuments and topography of Rome – past and/or present, real and/or imaginary – making clear that as Rome under Augustus swelled from *urbs* to *orbis*, the city occupied an increasingly prominent position in the activity of Roman self-mythologizing. Not only that, but as Dan-el Padilla Peralta explores in detail in his contribution to this volume, the Augustan period witnessed a marked *furor epigraphicus* that left the city of Rome not just frequently written *about*, but also heavily written *in* and *on*. It is the aim of this volume and its contributors, therefore, to ask what the texts in, on, and about the city of Rome tell us about how the ancients thought about, interacted with, and responded to the city during the transition from Republic to Empire. In the process, we hope to display methodological

[1] See e.g. Gros 1976; Zanker 1988; Favro 1996; Nelis and Royo 2014.

and heuristic techniques that all scholars of the ancient Mediterranean world will find compelling and useful.

The questions at the heart of this volume are hardly new, as the combination of words and things in Greek and Roman studies – though an ever-present reality of research in Classics – has posed problems since the very beginnings of the discipline, particularly because many of the roots of Classical archaeology, dating back to the eighteenth century, lay in just such inquiries.[2] Johann Winckelmann's aim, after all, was to discover and catalog *objets d'art* that are richly described in both written and inscribed ancient texts, on the assumption that what was described in literary *testimonia* represented a straightforward, one-to-one, non-complicated delineation of artistic and monumental *realia* that could be recovered and studied by the modern art historian.[3] However, the event and ensuing debate with perhaps the greatest significance for scholars writing on Augustan words and things came a century after Winckelmann, when Heinrich Schliemann dramatically discovered the purported remains of Troy at modern-day Hisarlik in Turkey. Schliemann's excavations, inspired by his own conviction that the events and places described in the Homeric poems reflected a historical reality, prompted further scholarly arguments over the precise relationships that might exist between finds from the archaeological record and the words in the textual record.[4] Was Homer's description of Troy based on the citadel at Hisarlik? Did the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* represent historical accounts of a war that had happened there? Or was the relationship between text and monument more complex? In other words, how did Homer's Troy relate to the built Troy uncovered by Schliemann, if at all?

At first, scholars generally considered Schliemann a crank for believing that there was any truth to what was at the time considered a wholly mythical epic cycle. Nevertheless, the existence of compelling parallels between objects described in Homer and artifacts uncovered in Hisarlik (Nestor's cup; the tower shield of Ajax; the towering Scaean Gates) ultimately forced even the most skeptical analysts to consider just how Homer's world could be brought into dialogue fruitfully with the emerging

[2] For a good survey of the historical development of this issue, see Martin 2008; Squire 2009: 1–195; Squire 2011: esp. 372–81.

[3] Winckelmann 1764, with response by Lessing 1984 (1766). More than a century later, Ernst Curtius showed a fine example of the early alignment of digging things out of the earth and *Altertumswissenschaft* in his excavations at Olympia (Curtius and Adler 1897).

[4] See Schliemann 1874 and 1875. For some beats in the earliest debates on whether Troy really represented Homer's world, see Jebb 1887; Schuchhardt 1891: 313; Botsford 1924: 43; Mahaffy 1890; Isham 1898: 3.

archaeological evidence shedding light on the world of prehistoric Greece before history.[5] The result was and continues to be a steady flow of scholarship that generally falls under the heading of "Homer and the monuments," and this particular approach to the Homeric poems and their relationship to the material record has subsequently informed how scholars of the Roman world have been thinking about Roman authors and the built environment of Rome in the past decades.[6] By 1998 Don Fowler could observe that, "'Virgil and the monuments' has become as popular a rubric for contemporary Virgilian scholarship as 'Homer and the monuments' was for an earlier generation of Homerists."[7] Indeed, the scholarly output on "Virgil and the monuments" has been undeniably prolific, mostly in the form of articles or chapters that tackle single monuments and their resonances within Virgil's works, the *Aeneid* chief among them.[8] In the last two decades, though, "Virgil and the monuments" has expanded to include other Augustan authors "and the monuments," with major works on Livy and Propertius, as well as a number of pieces on Ovid.[9]

Almost all of the recent work on these Roman authors, it should be noted, adopts a similar approach that is rooted in the methods of philology: careful examination of how ancient authors directly or indirectly write about individual monuments, and how these responses to the city reveal the authors' feelings about their zeitgeist. The process can even be reversed, such that the monuments that appear in these texts also disclose important insights into the meaning of the literary works: texts can interpret monuments as much as the monuments can interpret the texts. In most cases, the question of how an Augustan author engages with the city of Rome ultimately leads to further questions about how that author's responses to the city can operate as a proxy for his response to Augustus and the Augustan regime. As if by synecdoche, then, the city and its spaces can stand in for the emperor, imperial ideology, and Roman identity writ

[5] For a good summary of the pre-Schliemann consensus on the poems, see Grote 1846: 321.

[6] Some of the important position papers can be found at Snodgrass 1974; Morris 1986; Sherratt 1990. Despite a reigning skepticism over the relationship between Homer and any kind of real Bronze or Iron Age historical truth, archaeologists and historians continue to search for "Homeric X" in the real world of Greece, and articles and entire books continue to appear on this old debate (see e.g. Dakoronia 1993; Mazarakis-Ainian 2000; Latacz 2001; Kelly 2006; Petrakis 2006; Zavvou 2009; Kramer-Hajos 2012), especially concerning the Hittite characters mentioned in cuneiform tablets from Hattuša and elsewhere and their relation to individuals named in the Homeric poems.

[7] Fowler 2000: 155.

[8] A sampling: Wiseman 1984; Harrison 2006; Kirichenko 2013; Rebeggiani 2013a, 2013b; Loar 2017; cf. Edwards 1996: esp. 27–68; Barchiesi 2005a; Goldschmidt 2017: esp. 373–9.

[9] To cite just a few examples: On Livy, see Jaeger 1997. Propertius: Welch 2005. Ovid: Barchiesi 2002, 2009; Boyle 2003; Knox 2009; Farrell 2013.

large. To write about monuments and landscapes is thus always to write about something more than monuments and landscapes, and it is for this reason that the study of dialogues between texts and material *realia* seems an especially valuable point of entry for analyses of Augustan culture.

This last idea – that discussions of Roman monuments and/or landscapes in texts are never value neutral – found clear expression in two studies from the 1990s that continue to be important touchstones for scholarship on Roman texts and monuments, including a number of contributions in this volume: Ann Vasaly's *Representations* (1993) and Catharine Edwards' *Writing Rome* (1996). Vasaly, on the one hand, tackles the significance for Ciceronian oratory of Rome's "metaphysical topography" – the pre-existing meaning that Rome's monuments and topography had for Cicero's audience. As Vasaly argues, the latent symbolism of the built environment of Rome supplies Cicero with another powerful weapon in his rhetorical arsenal. The city, in other words, furnishes not just context for Cicero's speeches, but rather a storehouse of accreted meaning that the orator can tap into when excoriating Catiline, Verres, and the like. On the other hand, Edwards considers the evolving meaning of monuments diachronically, underscoring the susceptibility of existing significations to revision and renewal. If Vasaly's interest is in the static meanings already associated with the city and the ways that Cicero uses them in his oratory, Edwards' is in the ways that those meanings can be challenged, modified, and supplemented through literature.[10] The immediate potency of the city still lies in its historical symbolisms, Edwards argues, but its enduring power remains its ability to absorb and refract new meanings. Through a more panoramic approach that encompasses literature from a variety of periods and genres, therefore, Edwards is able to highlight the palimpsestic nature of the city, unraveling the double-vision that enables Roman authors to map onto the city of their day prior incarnations of Rome. The result of this process is a thick matrix of (sometimes contradictory) meanings, all of which effectively render the built environment of Rome a living text that can be read, re-read, and mis-read according to the imperatives of the time.

Each book thus articulates a slightly different relationship between Rome's texts and built landscape: for Vasaly, Cicero's engagement with Rome's monuments and topography neither represents a direct response to the city nor an effort to add new resonances to its structures; instead, Cicero is manipulating his audience's responses to their environment,

[10] Cf. Welch 2005.

exploiting old meanings for new purposes. In this case, then, the monuments of Rome are directly shaping the "text" of Cicero's speeches. Edwards, by contrast, posits an opposite order of operations: it is literature, according to Edwards, that wields the power to create, preserve, or revise the meaning of Rome's monuments. As such, Edwards' focus is on the "literary resonances of the city and also the city's resonance in literature" – that is, the ways that Roman texts shape the reception of Roman monuments and topography.[11]

As with the earlier scholarship on "Homer and the monuments," what all of the existing work on the Roman world from Vasaly and Edwards in the 1990s to the more recent scholarship of the late 2010s has in common is its strong literary focus. All of these studies, after all, consider texts that would qualify as "high" literature: epic, elegy, oratory, and history. One of this volume's key contributions will therefore be an expansion of what constitutes a "text" when speaking of dialogues between texts, monuments, and topography. Indeed, a number of this volume's authors have not limited themselves strictly to "literary" engagements with the built environment of Rome, but rather have turned to, among other things, calendars (Heslin), epigrams (MacDonald), epitaphs (Frampton), and monumental inscriptions (Padilla Peralta). Additionally, a few contributions look beyond the physical built environment of Rome to also consider monumental absences (Levene) and imagined – or at least symbolically constructed – monuments (Biggs, Frampton). Only one essay treads the well-worn path of seeking a one-to-one correspondence between a text and a Roman monument (Bassani and Berno, but cf. Heslin and MacDonald), though it significantly deviates from this scholarly trend insofar as the contribution is a collaborative effort by an archaeologist and a philologist to square the archaeological record with a monument's reception in Augustan literature. Ultimately, through the collected essays' varied topics and approaches, we hope that the volume as a whole raises important questions of materiality, textuality, and monumentality, while also underscoring the need to adopt an expansive approach to what these categories can mean.

The volume has accordingly been laid out in such a way to draw out these themes and questions, and thus readers are encouraged to work through the essays *seriatim*. The first two essays, by D. S. Levene ("Monumental Insignificance: The Rhetoric of Roman Topography from Livy's Rome") and Thomas Biggs ("*Cicero, quid in alieno saeculo tibi?* The 'Republican'

[11] Edwards 1996: 2.

Rostra between Caesar and Augustus"), share in their approach a focus on monumental absences and, relatedly, symbolically constructed (i.e. not historically "accurate") landscapes. Levene opens the collection by zeroing in on Livy's sparing inclusion of topographic detail in his history, arguing that Livy's construction of space is, in fact, primarily symbolic, an instance of a more general tendency by Livy to elevate the historical world as constructed by his text over the events which actually occurred. Biggs takes up a similar question in his essay, highlighting through his analysis of the Rostra's physical and ideological transformations from Republic to Principate – from Caesar to Augustus – the implications of omitting topographical detail and of creating a topography which, though not accurate, becomes a vehicle for symbolic value. Both contributions, then, far from seeking one-to-one correspondences between texts and monuments, emphasize instead a general willingness by certain Roman authors to sacrifice topographical accuracy in order to elevate monuments and places to symbols.

The volume's next two contributions, by Peter Heslin ("The Julian Calendar and the Solar Meridian of Augustus: Making Rome Run on Time") and Dan-el Padilla Peralta ("Monument Men: Buildings, Inscriptions, and Lexicographers in the Creation of Augustan Rome"), consider the interplay between ideologically loaded Augustan monuments and the monumental texts that are associated with them. Heslin proposes a new interpretation of the much-debated solar meridian of Augustus, arguing that one major purpose of the meridian was to demonstrate that the calendrical reform put into effect by Augustus as *pontifex maximus* – correcting his predecessor Lepidus' incorrect interpretation and implementation of Caesar's earlier calendrical adjustment – worked out. The meridian, in other words, monumentalizes and advertises Augustus' correction of a mistake in one of the governing texts of Roman daily life: the calendar. Following Heslin's chapter, Padilla Peralta likewise looks to how Augustus' monumental building program intervenes in and shapes a corpus of texts and, more importantly, an evolving textual tradition: lexicography (and, relatedly, epigraphy and orthography). Thus, whereas the first two chapters in the volume focus on how literature interprets the urban-monumental landscape, these next two chapters consider the inverse relationship – how the urban-monumental landscape conditions our (and the ancients') interpretation of certain texts and textual practices.

After Heslin and Padilla Peralta, the next two chapters, written by Maddalena Bassani and Francesca Romana Berno ("The Porticus Liviae in Ovid's Fasti (6.637–648), Part I: Things [Bassani]; Part II: Words [Berno]") and Carolyn MacDonald ("Greek Poets on the Palatine:

A Wild Cow Chase?"), veer, for the first time in the volume, into actual literary responses to actual, specific Augustan monuments and monumental decorations. The chapter by Bassani (an archaeologist) and Berno (a philologist) examines the Augustan Porticus Liviae, taking as its point of departure the passage in Ovid's *Fasti* (6.637–648) describing the monument's construction on the spot of Vedius Pollio's once expansive villa. Bassani opens the chapter by digging into the archaeological record of the site, setting the stage for Berno to turn her gaze to the many valences of the Ovidian passage in an attempt to reconcile Ovid's characterization of the Porticus' (*publica*) *magnificentia* with the Augustan aversion to – and rehabilitation of – *privata luxuria*. MacDonald similarly queries the reliability of ancient literary interpretations of the Augustan urban-monumental environment in her contribution, drawing attention to a number of Greek ekphrastic epigrams from the *Garland of Philip* that describe the famous cow(s) by Myron that adorned the complex of the Augustan Temple of Apollo on the Palatine. As MacDonald argues, the engagement by authors active in Rome with the Greek tradition about the limits of mimesis – a central concern for the epigrams on Myron's cow – becomes a reflection on the success or failure of Roman art and culture to live up to the standards of its Greek matrix, and on Roman poets' success in living up to the verbal acrobatics of their Greek epigrammatic predecessors. Both essays, in other words, are invested in highlighting how literary responses to the city of Rome can reflect and participate in larger cultural dialogues central to the Augustan period, with particular attention to the (re)appropriation and rewriting of space and cultural artifacts.

With the final paper of the collection ("Ovid's Two-Body Problem"), Stephanie Ann Frampton interweaves a number of themes and methods explored in the volume's earlier contributions. Frampton concentrates on Ovid's poetry from exile, detailing his reflections on the survival of his poetic legacy and highlighting the way this concern is intertwined with the poet's perception of the physical fragility of his books, especially when compared with monumental inscriptions erected by Augustus. Questions of media, material, and mobility loom large in Frampton's piece, which ultimately invites us to think not just about the relationship between texts and the urban-monumental landscape of Rome, but also about the place (and memory) of the authors of those texts – be they poets or emperors, living at home or abroad – in the rapidly changing city.

Despite the wide-ranging interests demonstrated by these chapters, it is not possible in this volume to consider all forms of interactions between texts, monuments, and Roman topography, and so there are inevitably

many other types of evidence that do not receive much, if any treatment. Rather than viewing this as a deficiency in the current study, however, it is our hope that the conclusions to be drawn from this volume may prompt further research on precisely the sorts of interdisciplinary dialogues that we have been unable to satisfactorily address here. For the sake of charting a tentative road map for the future, we suggest three categories of evidence deserving of additional research. These three categories, it is worth noting, closely align with Richard Martin's 2008 prescription for future work at the intersection of Greek philology and material culture, namely (to adapt Martin's line) texts "that exist *on; about; parallel to*; or *as*" material *realia*.[12]

(1) **INSCRIPTIONS**. Building on the ideas raised by Heslin, Padilla Peralta, and Frampton in this volume, there are two types of inscriptions that seem most likely to reward further study: dedicatory inscriptions and epitaphs. Both of these are instances where the text can occupy either of Martin's four possible relationships to a material artifact: typically found *on* or *parallel to* a monument, they often disclose information *about* it (e.g. its construction or the individuals interred within it), and sometimes by their size and placement can be viewed *as* monuments. Consider a text like the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* in Rome – a monumental inscription-cum-epitaph that stood before a monument (Augustus' mausoleum) and recorded, among other things, the construction and renovation of Roman monuments.[13] But what seems most striking about inscriptions like this is that they, perhaps more than any other texts, are invested in setting the terms of engagement with the monuments they accompany.

(2) **GRAFFITI**. In the vein of writing *on* or *parallel to* monuments, graffiti represent another form of textual response on/to one's built environment.[14] The great value of graffiti is their indiscriminate ubiquity: they could be written on virtually any surface, public or private, inside or outside the city. Much of the recent scholarship on graffiti has already begun examining the relationship between graffiti and the surfaces that they cover, and Rebecca Benefiel, in particular, has pioneered a dialogic approach to studying graffiti that encourages

[12] Martin 2008: 335–42 (emphasis original).
[13] For good recent work on the *Res Gestae*, see Cooley 2009.
[14] See e.g. Solin 1984; Benefiel 2008; Kruschwitz 2010; Zadorojnyi 2011; Morstein-Marx 2012. On graffiti in the city, see Suet. *Iul.* 80.2–3, *Aug.* 70.2, *Ner.* 45.2, *Dom.* 13.3; Plut. *De curios.* 520D–E, *Ti. Gracch.* 8.7, *C. Gracch.* 17.6, *Pomp.* 27.3, *Caes.* 62.4, *Brut.* 9.6–8; Dio Cass. 44.12.3, 62.16.2–3; App. *B Civ.* 2.16.112. Cf. Mart. 12.61; Plin. *Ep.* 8.8.7; Plut. *Gryllus* 990E; Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 62.

considering the dialogue "between graffiti and their spatial context."[15] Such dialogues reveal a great deal not only about how graffiti represented a response to their immediate environment, but also about how they could condition future engagements with the spaces they mark.

(3) **COINS**. For an example of evidence containing texts that are both *parallel to* and also nominally *about* monuments, one need look no further than the coins in one's pocket – hand-held artifacts that perfectly visualize the confluence of "texts and monuments in miniature."[16] More importantly, the circulation of coins, their non-centralized production, and their ability to convey messages – both written and symbolic – make them an ideal subject for further investigation. Indeed, what better way to advertise the inchoate homology of Rome as *urbs* and *orbis* than by minting and distributing coins emblazoned with Roman monuments and (potentially interpretive) legends?[17]

There are doubtless more examples and more varied modes of understanding the interrelationship of texts, monuments, and the cityscape of Rome in the Augustan period, and these three categories of evidence just go to show that there are still many additional directions to pursue on this topic. It is our hope that this volume, though far from comprehensive, is able to push the field further forward, stimulating new questions that will motivate additional research in the future.

[15] Benefiel 2010: 60; cf. Loar 2018. Other recent scholarship on graffiti includes Baird and Taylor 2011; Varone 2012; Milnor 2014; cf. Keegan 2014; Benefiel and Keegan 2016.

[16] At the original conference that prompted this volume, Scott Arcenas delivered a provocative paper of this title about the *Aedes Vestae* on Flavian coinage, which drew out precisely these sorts of relationships. While we have not been able to include his paper in the current volume, it is our hope that it will appear in print somewhere shortly.

[17] The recent publication by Elkins (2015) should exponentially simplify future work on how coins use both texts and monuments to interpret the built environment of Rome and the symbolism embedded in it. One key contribution of Elkins' book is that it carefully catalogues Roman coins according to architectural types, beginning with the earliest architectural coins from the late second century BCE and proceeding chronologically until the disappearance of these coin types in the fifth century CE. But rather than replicating prior numismatic methodologies and mining the coins for information about the physical appearance and architecture of Roman monuments, Elkins turns his attention instead to their historical and cultural context, privileging symbolism and iconography over mimetic representation. Elkins' valuable work should therefore enable subsequent scholars to more deeply probe not just the monuments miniaturized on the coins but also the texts that accompany them.

CHAPTER 1

Monumental Insignificance
The Rhetoric of Roman Topography from Livy's Rome

D. S. Levene[1]

In 260 BCE, during the First Punic War, the consul C. Duilius achieved a milestone in Roman military history: he defeated the Carthaginians in a naval battle at Mylae, and so became not only the first Roman general to win a major victory at sea, but also the first to celebrate a "naval triumph."[2] A monument to commemorate this was erected in the Forum: a so-called *columna rostrata*, a column decorated with the beaks of the captured enemy ships. This monument was of considerable ideological significance in Rome, especially at the time of Augustus, who had himself won a naval victory not far from Mylae, and who set up a column of his own close to Duilius'.[3] The inscription on Duilius' monument – which in large part survives (*CIL* 1^2.25 = *CIL* 6.1300 = *ILS* 65 = *ILLRP*^{2} 319) – was either re-inscribed or written in the early imperial period,[4] indicating that a substantial restoration took place then.

Yet for such a significant monument, it is remarkable how largely invisible it is within the literary record. It is mentioned in passing just four times in surviving literature: Plin. *HN* 34.20; Sil. *Pun.* 6.663–4; Quint. 1.7.12; and Serv. *ad Geo.* 3.29. This might not of itself seem especially surprising, since the First Punic War in general is not well documented. But what is more noteworthy is that another honor of Duilius is somewhat more widely recorded and often in somewhat more detail: that he was allowed to have a flute-player and torch-bearer accompany him home from dinner every day, in the manner that a magistrate would.[5] This is described

[1] My thanks to the participants in the Notre Dame conference for their illuminating discussion, and above all to the editors for their helpful and constructive comments on an earlier draft.
[2] On the distinction between a "naval triumph" and a regular one see Östenberg 2009: 46–50.
[3] Roller 2009: 221–3; Biggs 2017; cf. also Hölkeskamp 2001: 111–13.
[4] Most scholars (e.g. Wölfflin 1890; Frank 1919; Niedermann 1936; Degrassi 1937: 47–8; Bleckmann 2002: 116–25; Kondratieff 2004: 11–14) see it as a reinscription of Duilius' original, but some claim it to be an archaizing forgery (so e.g. Mommsen in *CIL* 1^2 p. 386; Fay 1920; Wachter 1987: 359–61).
[5] Mommsen 1887–88^3: 1.367, 1.423–4.