Building in words : representations of the process of construction in Latin literature

Reitz, B.L.

Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20862 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Reitz, Bettina
Title: Building in words : representations of the process of construction in Latin literature
Issue Date: 2013-05-08

Chapter III

Writing Cities, Founding Texts:
The City as a Poetological Metaphor

1. Introduction

The previous two chapters focussed on the possible relations between descriptions of construction and actual buildings and monuments in the physical world. I considered how telling the story of a structure's creation can be a means of influencing the viewer-reader's response to or evaluation of that structure. In the second part of this study, I turn to a more text-immanent question. I ask how descriptions of the construction process impact on the reader's evaluation not of something *outside* the text, but of *the text itself*. I argue that describing construction can be a means of encouraging readers to consider the making of the text itself. This can happen very explicitly, for example when the two processes are compared, but also subtly and implicitly.

Architecture is one of the most common images for text.[1] We may immediately think of such prominent examples as Horace's claim to have erected a *monumentum aere perennius*, a 'monument more permanent than bronze' (*Carm.* 3.30.1), or of Vergil's poetic temple at the beginning of the third book of his *Georgics*, but much less elaborate architectural images, often used unconsciously, permeate human discourse about text – everyday speech and prose of all kinds just as much as artful poetry. In the previous chapter, I used (without meaning to do so) a number of architectural metaphors.[2] Talking about text in terms of architecture is not

---

[1] In fact, the word *text* derives from an Indo-Iranian root found in Avestian and Vedic (taks-) and meaning 'to put together' in the context of building with wood or stone (the Latin *texere* – 'to weave', represents a narrowing of the original, broader meaning): Darmesteter (1968), 28-9.

[2] E.g. '**on the basis** of the meagre archaeological remains …', (p. 70), '[**b]uilding on** the previous chapter's conclusions about the representational strategies of different media …', (p. 72), 'the two-part **structure** of the Fucine Lake passage' (p. 87), 'drawing on a wide range of texts to **support** a convincing argument' (p. 64, n. 5).

exceptional, it is entirely normal.[3] Does that mean that such 'standard' instances and unconscious uses of metaphor are meaningless? Far from it: since the groundbreaking work of Lakoff and Johnson on 'conceptual metaphors', it has been recognised that such uses of metaphor are highly meaningful, through what they reveal about the way we conceptualise and mentally structure the world around us.[4] By talking of texts in terms of buildings, even if we do so unconsciously, we conceptualise them as possessing certain qualities, while lacking others.[5] For example, talking about a text as a building suggests that it is an ordered whole, made up of smaller parts such as words or sentences, and that it is produced following a 'plan', with an intended result (a built structure) in mind. If I were to call a text a 'river', on the other hand, I would be conceptualising it as something natural, forceful, externally inspired or potentially uncontrollable.[6]

Although these features of human language and thinking are by no means irrelevant to my investigation, I address a different set of questions. My thesis deals with representational strategies, and in the chapters that comprise its second part, I will specifically be concerned with the literary strategies that motivate and inform the use of architectural imagery. I therefore focus on instances of conscious, often elaborate and (usually) highly marked use of architectural metaphor in literary texts.[7] I analyse in what way the link between construction and text production is

---

[3] Construction as a metaphor for the putting together of words and sentences is already well attested in the earliest Indo-Iranian languages: Darmesteter (1968) finds in Avestan and in Vedic Sanskrit close parallels for the early Greek phrase ἐπέων τέκτων. See also Nünlist (1998), 99 and the more extensive list of Asper (1997), 191 n. 254. The metaphor is however also found in the early texts from entirely different language families (e.g. in Egyptian and Hebrew: Nünlist (1998), 103, quoting the Old Testament (1 *Kings* 2.4) and Lichtheim (1976), 153 and 185 n.1). This seems to confirm that thinking, and thus talking, about human utterances, spoken and written, in terms of architecture is a form of expression deeply embedded in our languages and our imagination.

[4] Lakoff and Johnson first introduced their influential theory of 'Metaphors we live by' in Lakoff/Johnson (1980), republished in 2003 with a new afterword by the authors. A clear and up-to-date introduction to conceptual metaphor theory is now Kövecses (2010). See also Steen (2011), who argues for a broader approach to metaphor theory that expands on this cognitive linguistic approach to include the study of metaphor in communication. Sjöblad (2009) applies a cognitive linguistic approach to an ancient text in his investigation of '*Metaphors Cicero lived by*', analysing the role of metaphor and simile in Cicero's *De senectute.*

[5] See Lakoff and Johnson (1987), ch. 9, on the notions of 'highlighting' and 'hiding'.

[6] Cf. the term 'stream of consciousness' for a particular type of writing.

[7] The metaphor of construction as an image for literary production has been the object of several large-scale studies. Hamon (1988) presents a broad and imaginative reflection on the connections between architecture and text. For more specific investigations of the building-as-text metaphor, see for example Cowling (1998), ch. 5 on French medieval and early modern

achieved, why construction is used as an image for writing in a particular text, and how exactly the author represents construction to achieve a certain effect.[8]

After a short introduction to the history of the building metaphor in archaic and classical Greek literature, I devote this and two subsequent chapters to considering construction as a poetological metaphor from three different perspectives.[9] In this chapter I look at a selection of texts in which city-building and text-production are linked to each other, focussing on this particular image to explore in depth the mechanisms of its usage. In chapter four, I focus on one author and set of texts, analysing the specific, anti-Callimachean aesthetic of construction which Statius develops in his *Silvae*. Finally, in chapter five, I examine the literary functions of the myth of Amphion, the Greek hero who built the walls of Thebes, moving the stones by playing his lyre.

2.   Architectural Poetics in Greece: A Short History

Since the earliest Greek poetry, the language of craftsmanship (often not specific enough to be clearly attributable to a *particular* profession, such as construction) is commonly found in poetological remarks: for example, the making of song can be described by the word τεύχειν, or the placing of elements in a particular kind of order expressed as θέσις or τιθέναι.[10] Metaphors which are clearly and specifically drawn from the sphere of building and construction are attested in early Greek poetry as well. As mentioned earlier, we cannot always be sure that the metaphor

---

literature. Cf. also Eriksen (2001), who proposes an architectural reading of Renaissance literature and adduces numerous ancient sources (some unfortunately misprinted and mistranslated) to support his interpretations.

[8] The use of metaphors in poetic texts can be exceptional in a number of ways: see Lakoff/Turner (1989), Kövecses (2010), ch. 4. Metaphorical expressions there tend to be less clear, though richer in meaning, than metaphors used in speech or non-fiction (Kövecses (2010), 49-52). Kövecses (2010), 53-5, identifies and explains the strategies by which metaphors tend to be manipulated in literary texts (extending, elaboration, questioning, and combining).

[9] I shall continue to use the term 'metaphor' in its broad sense to refer to all linguistic expressions that articulate an idea drawn from one domain (target domain) in terms of one drawn from a different domain (source domain), rather than to a specific type of imagery distinct from, say, metonymy or comparison (except where I specifically draw attention to such distinctions in my discussion).

[10] Nünlist (1998), 85-98 notes especially the sophisticated use of the metaphor of metal-working in the making of the shield of Achilles, which, as he argues, functions also as a metaphor for the making of a text. Nünlist stresses the focus on the process of *making* in this scene: not a 'Schildbeschreibung' but a 'Schildherstellung' (84-5).

was felt as such, especially where it consists of only one word.[11] The poems of Pindar, however, show a highly developed use of construction metaphor. Justly famous and very influential for later poets is the opening of his 6th *Olympian* (1-4):[12]

> Χρυσέας ὑποστάσαντες εὐ-
> τειχεῖ προθύρῳ θαλάμου
> κίονας ὡς ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον
> πάξομεν· ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον
> χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγές.

> We shall set up golden columns to support the well-walled porch of the chamber, as when we construct a wondrous palace; for when a work is begun, it is necessary to make its front shine from afar.

In this self-conscious opening, Pindar boldly extends the building metaphor to stretching point. The poem first appears to be a chamber (θάλαμος). The proem is its well-walled porch (εὐτειχεῖ προθύρῳ) supported by golden columns, it is also a far-shining front of the building (πρόσωπον). The poet's activity is to set up (πάξομεν) these columns, an activity compared to the setting up of an admirable palace or hall (θαητὸν μέγαρον).[13] The metaphor is suggestive in two different ways. It primarily relates to the aesthetics of the poem, linked to those of a palatial building, the impact of which largely rests on a strong first impression. But at the same time, it is suggested that such poetic architecture should also be solidly constructed, with one element securely based on another: the columns have to be able to support the porch that rests on them. All these desirable assets of a good poem are expressed in terms of the process of its construction – it is in the placing

---

[11] Cf. for example the two uses of ὀρθῶν of a poem, in Pind. *Ol.* 3.3 and Pind. *Isthm.* 3/4.56, with Nünlist (1998), 105. See also Nünlist's remarks in his introduction, 7-10 on 'lebende' and 'tote' metaphors, which cannot be distinguished when working with such a limited corpus of poetic texts from a period where we have almost no access at all to comparable 'everyday' use of language.

[12] On the architectural imagery in this passage see e.g. Bowra (1964), 20-21, Steiner (1986), 55, Bonifazi (2001), 104-12, and ch. 9 of the forthcoming study by Morgan.

[13] Because of the apparent shift between different types or architecture within the metaphor (in *Ol.* 6.27, a 'gate of hymns' further complicates the picture), it seems best to conclude, as Morgan does, that 'the architectural metaphor is not specific' (agreeing with Bonifazi (2001), 105) but rather combines associations of treasury, palatial building and even temple.

of the golden columns, in making the front shine, that the poem's opening comes into existence.[14]

There are numerous further instances of architectural metaphor in Pindaric poems.[15] For example, in *Pyth*. 6.10-18, the song is called a treasure house of hymns (ὕμνων θησαυρός, 7-8), which will withstand the onslaughts of wind and weather (10-14) and, like the palace of *Ol*. 6, present a shining πρόσωπον (14) to the world. The architectural metaphor is employed to combine aesthetic impact with endurance, an important feature of Pindaric self-presentation, and a striking image that has influenced one of Horace's most famous poems.[16]

Of the tragedians, Euripides is particularly engaged in using language and images drawn from the sphere of architecture, but from a recent thorough investigation of his use of architectural imagery, it appears that architecture is not regularly used as an image for poetic production.[17] In old comedy, on the other hand, architecture is regularly used as a poetological image. For example, Aristophanes says of himself in *Pax* 749-50:

> ἐποίησε τέχνην μεγάλην ἡμῖν κἀπύργωσ' οἰκοδομήσας
> ἔπεσιν μεγάλοις καὶ διανοίαις καὶ σκώμμασιν οὐκ ἀγοραίοις

---

[14] It may also be significant that the porch of a building would not be the first, but one of the last elements of the construction process. Perhaps the implication is also that a shining porch, i.e. proem, is added to an already advanced poetic composition as a fitting and impressive entrance into it.

[15] Nünlist (1998) cites a number of passages in Pindar (101-5): poets are called τέκτονες (builders) in *Pyth*. 3.113 (although in *Nem*. 3.3-5 apparently performers of the song are called the τέκτονες); a poem or speech has a κρηπίς, a foundation, in *Pyth*. 7.1-4, *Pyth*. 4.138, fr. 194.1-3. A treasury of songs (ὕμνων θησαυρός) features in *Pyth*. 6.5-9. A song is erected (ὀρθῶν) in *Ol*. 3.3, *Isthm*. 3/4.56.

[16] Bowra (1964), 21-2. The idea of the endurance of a building is famously taken up by Horace, who compares his work to a physical monument immune to erosion by wind and rain (*Carm*. 3.30). On the other hand, *Carm*. 3.1.45-6 may be interpreted as a more critical reaction, in defence of Horace's moral and aesthetic choices, to the opening of Pind. *Ol*. 6: *cur invidendis postibus et novo / sublime ritu moliar atrium?* – 'Why should I toil at a sublime atrium with enviable pillars and in a new style?'

[17] Stieber (2011) in ch. 1 examines the language of architecture in Euripidean tragedy. She argues that Euripides' use of the 'language of craft' is a feature of his realism and interest in the visual arts, but she does not devote as much space to the question of whether Euripides conceived of (his own) poetic activities as a 'craft' (though see 415-26 on the craftsman's σοφία). Cf. also a Sophoclean fragment, possibly from a *Daidalos* (a satyr-play?): *TrGF* 159: τεκτόναρχος μοῦσα.

He has created a great art for us, and built it up and raised it to towering heights with mighty words and ideas and with jokes that are not vulgar.

The metaphor, apparently already conventional enough at this stage to be parodied by Aristophanes, allows not only for positive but also negative value judgements.[18] It is for example used by the Hellenistic poet Theocritus in criticising excessive ambition in a poet. In his *Thalysia*, the mysterious poet-figure Lykidas praises Simichidas' modesty with the following simile (*Id.* 7.45-8):[19]

ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνῇ   45
ἶσον ὄρευς κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον Ὠρομέδοντος,
καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν
ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

How much I hate the craftsman who seeks to accomplish a house equal to the top of the Oromedon, and the cockerels of the Muses who toil in vain, crowing against the bard from Chios.

The meaning of the first part of the simile is explained in the second part, introduced by καί: Inferior poets (cockerels who only crow, not sing) should not attempt to rival the great Homer. This injunction is expressed through the image of the construction of a house that equals the height of the (unknown) mountain Oromedon.[20] Building a structure of excessive height serves as an illustration of the *hybris* of the overambitious poet.[21]

Sophisticated architectural metaphors thus have a long tradition in Greek poetry. A matching sophistication can be observed when a vocabulary of rhetoric and literary criticism begins to develop in technical prose texts. This terminology, too, is

---

[18] Cf. also Ar. *Ran.* 1004 referring to Aeschylus, and Ar. fr. 657 *PCG* (φθέγξαι σὺ τὴν φωνὴν ἀνατείχισας ἄνω). Pherecrates too uses an architectural metaphor in connection with Aeschylus (*Krapataloi* fr. 100 *PCG*: ὅστις <γ'> αὐτοῖς παρέδωκα τέχνην μεγάλην ἐξοικοδομήσας). On architectural metaphor in Old Comedy more generally, see Müller (1974b), 33-6.

[19] On this simile in the context of Hellenistic poetological metaphor, see Asper (1997), 191.

[20] On the significance of this particular mountain, see Krevans (1983), 208-9.

[21] Metaphors expressing poetic aesthetics also abound in the poetry of Theocritus' contemporary, the poet Callimachus: see Asper (1997). For example, the crowing cockerels are reminiscent of the braying donkeys of the *Aitia* prologue (fr. 1 Harder 30-2). Architectural metaphor, however, is not (clearly) attested in the works of Callimachus that have come down to us. Thomas (1983) argues, seductively, but without much textual evidence, for a metapoetic reading of a list of temples in an unplaced fragment of the *Aetia* (which he suspects stood at the beginning of the third book): see further p. 152-3.

frequently derived from architecture,[22] as is, for example, apparent from technical terms of composition such as κανών or ὕλη.[23] However, ancient theorists of language and composition also show their awareness of the details and implications of the use of this terminology to conceptualise language, and they employ it for argumentative and rhetorical purposes:[24] consider, for example, the detailed comparison between the builder of a house (οἰκόδομος) and someone who composes a text, used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to illustrate his theory of σύνθεσις.[25]

This short overview shows the versatility of the metaphor in Greek literature: architectural imagery is employed in order to comment on the structure, the aesthetics, the durability, the size or the ambition of the literary work, and thus the corresponding qualities of the poet or writer who produced it, in both positive and negative sense. We find a similar breadth of application in Roman literature – ranging from the fleeting use of construction vocabulary to extended similes and sustained, sophisticated metaphors. The specific images for literary constructs also differ widely in scale, from house-construction through temples and cities to the entire cosmos. The remainder of this chapter deals with one image at the upper end of this scale: the analogy between the building of a *city* and the making of a poetic text.[26] There are no known examples of this particular form of the building metaphor in the Greek literature before our period. Although the sheer amount of text that we have lost prevents us from drawing any definite conclusions, it is possible that this form of the metaphor represents an innovative modification of the already well-developed construction metaphor by the Roman authors I discuss.

---

[22] That is not to say that it does not make use of many other source domains, such as the body, or the universe. On these metaphors, and their combination with architectural metaphor, see also further p. 112-14 below.

[23] κανών: literally *the mason's rule* or *measure*; metaphorically *rule, standard* (e.g. of grammar). ὕλη: literally *timber*, or more generally *building material*; metaphorically *subject matter*. See van Hook (1905), 41 for these and further examples, and further p. 117 and p. 163-70 below on ὕλη.

[24] For useful collections of examples of architectural metaphor in rhetorical treatises see van Hook (1905), 40-1 and de Jonge (2008), 188 n. 63.

[25] This comparison is analysed by de Jonge (2008), 188-90.

[26] For a short introduction to the trope see Edwards (1996), 6-8.

3. The City and the Text

How do the Latin poets Manilius, Propertius and Vergil represent the process of city construction? What strategies are in play in their manipulation of the image? And how does the representation of construction as an image for text production affect the reader's response to their finished works? In moving from Manilius' *Astronomica* to Propertius' fourth book of *Elegies* to Vergil's *Aeneid*, we proceed in reverse chronological order. The latest text, Manilius, offers the most explicit connection between city building and poetry. I treat his simile first, since by tracing our way backwards through the tradition, we can then use his and Propertius' reading of the earlier *Aeneid* as a guideline for our own approach to the much more implicit connections to be found there. Incidentally, this reverse chronological process also takes us through the different stages of the building process in the right order: from the gathering of the building materials in Manilius, to the construction of walls in Propertius, to the contruction of the entire city in the *Aeneid*.

School, City, Body, Universe: Manilius' Mixed Metaphors

The poet Manilius, writing around the second decade of the first century AD, presents in the five books of his *Astronomica* descriptions of the universe, the constellations that surround the earth, and their influences on human beings.[27] In book 2, when discussing the complicated phenomenon of the *dodecatemoria* of the planets, the poet breaks off, announcing that in order to understand the whole, *totum corpus*, one first needs to understand its individual *membra* (2.752-3), and since the planets have not yet been treated, the discussion of this combination of zodiacal and planetary influence is postponed (and never resumed).[28] The poet's

---

[27] About Manilius himself we know absolutely nothing besides what we can infer from the *Astronomica*, which is very little. See Volk (2009), ch. 1, for a discussion of the (lack of) evidence, and an attempt to render this biographical blank productive for interpretation.

[28] On the *dodecatemoria*, see Volk (2009), 87-8. The *dodecatemoria* are subdivisions of each sign of the zodiac into twelve sections of 2.5°, which are again assigned to the twelve signs of the zodiac (so that for example Aries has an Aries-section, followed by a Taurus-section, etc.). These tiny sections can then be further subdivided into five parts (of 0.5° each), which in turn are assigned to the five planets (Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury). Here Manilius breaks off, since the planets have not yet been treated in any detail, and in fact, they will not be, in the extant *Astronomica*. On this puzzle, see most extensively Volk (2009), esp. 48-57 and 116-26, and Goold (1983), who posits a large lacuna after 5.709 that, according to him, dealt with the planets.

method of first presenting different aspects of the universe individually, before connecting them into a complex explanation of the whole, is then justified by a methodological double simile.[29] The didactic strategy is compared first to the way in which children are taught to read and write, and then to the way in which a city is built. The school-teaching simile (2.755-71) prepares for the city-building simile and will therefore be considered first:[30]

ut rudibus pueris monstratur littera primum	755
per faciem nomenque suum, tum ponitur usus,	
tum coniuncta suis formatur syllaba nodis,	
hinc verbi structura venit per membra legendi,	
tunc rerum vires atque artis traditur usus	
perque pedes proprios nascentia carmina surgunt,	760
singulaque in summam prodest didicisse priora	
(quae nisi constiterint primis fundata elementis,	
effluat in vanum rerum praeposterus ordo	764
versaque quae propere dederint praecepta magistri),	763
sic mihi per totum volitanti carmine mundum	765
erutaque abstrusa penitus caligine fata,	
Pieridum numeris etiam modulata, canenti	
quoque deus regnat revocanti numen in artem,	
per partes ducenda fides et singula rerum	
sunt gradibus tradenda suis, ut, cum omnia certa	770
notitia steterint, proprios revocentur ad usus.	

Just as children who have not yet begun their lessons are first shown the shape and name of a letter, and then its value is explained; then a syllable is formed by the conjoining of its linkable elements; followed by the building up of the reading of a word by way of its component syllables; then the meaning of expressions and the rules of grammar are taught, and then verses come into being and rise up on feet of their own, and it benefits the final outcome that [the student] has mastered each of the earlier steps (for unless these are firmly founded on first principles, the badly ordered material will vanish into nothing, and the instructions that teachers have hurriedly given will be overturned) – so, as I wing my way in song throughout the whole universe, sing of fates drawn from deep-seated darkness, even tuning them to the Muses'

---

[29] It is also the 'ausgedehnteste Gleichnispartie antiker Lehrdichtung': Schindler (2000), 253. For a thorough discussion of the double simile in the context of similes on Latin didactic poetry, see Schindler (2000), 252-72.

[30] The text of Manilius is taken from Goold (1998²). Translations are (significantly) adapted from Goold (1977).

> rhythm, and summon to my art the power by which God rules, I too must by degrees win credence and assign each matter to its correct step, so that, when all the individual parts are grasped with sure understanding, they may be called upon for their proper uses.

The comparison is between the way children are taught, step by step, from recognising individual letters to the composition of whole poems, and the way in which the poet presents his material, bit by bit in the correct order, before the whole can be deployed and all elements taken together to work out a horoscope (a stage which Manilius does not actually reach).[31]

One feature of this simile is of special importance with regard to the city-building simile to follow. Although it seems to draw a straightforward parallel between two different spheres, didactic poetry and schoolteaching, a closer look reveals that it contains a whole range of images drawn from completely different areas, which cross-fertilise each other.[32] Within the 'dominant' teaching simile, the poet draws a number of metaphors from the language of the human body. Apart from the introductory remark about the *corpus* and the *membra* of the poem, which immediately precedes the simile,[33] the subjects of the lessons also take on a biological quality: syllables have *nodi*,[34] a word has *membra*, poems are born (*nascentia*) and rise up on their feet (*per pedes proprios … surgunt*). At the same time, another layer of metaphorical language is already prefiguring the next simile, taken from the realm of architecture: the building up of the reading of a word, the *structura verbi … legendi*, introduces architectural metaphor of language and text, continued by the argument being founded upon (*fundata*) first principles and the

---

[31] For a reading of the absence of the horoscopes from the *Astronomica*, see now Green (2009).

[32] Cf. also Schindler (2000), 256: 'Es fällt auf, daß Manilius die Verbindungen zwischen Buchstaben, Silben, und Wörtern, die im Elementarunterricht sukzessive erarbeitet werden, mit Metaphern aus verschiedenen Bereichen charakterisiert.'

[33] Man. 2.751-4: *nunc satis est docuisse suos ignota per usus, / ut, cum perceptis steterit fiducia membris / sic totum corpus facili ratione notetur / et bene de summa veniat post singula carmen* – 'now it is enough to teach new principles by demonstrating their uses, so that, when you have acquired confidence in your grasp of the elements (lit. *body parts*), you will be thus able by simple reasoning to mark the complete pattern (lit. *the whole body*), and my poem can fittingly pass on from details to deal with the whole'.

[34] The *OLD* s.v. *nodus* classes usage of the word in this passage under 6a as 'something which binds things together, a bond, tie', but the meaning abutting this one (6b) is the application of meaning 6a to the body ('joint, tendon,' etc.), and this also is possibly evoked here.

teachings being overturned (*versa*) if they were too hasty.[35] The rising of the poem could even be seen to combine anatomical and architectural metaphor, since *surgere* is regularly used of nascent building projects in Latin poetry, especially where a metapoetic dimension is involved (as in the following city-building simile: *surgunt … urbes*, 772, matched by *consurgit opus* in 782).[36] Finally, underpinning this simile and the entirety of Manilius' poem is the 'megametaphor' of Manilius' text as a small universe to match the large one he describes.[37] As Volk has argued, 'Manilius … throughout the *Astronomica* stresses the parallel between his song and his subject matter, beginning with his simultaneous worship at the altars of *carmen* and *res* in 1.21-2'.[38] By means of his learning-to-read simile, Manilius recalls the famous and recurring Lucretian simile of the atoms as letters.[39] He thereby suggests that the universe is, like the Lucretian cosmos, made up of the 'letters' he describes (atoms in the case of Lucretius, the individual elements of the universe for Manilius).[40] In the language of the learning-to-read simile, this 'megametaphor' flashes past in the phrase *primis fundata elementis*, the 'first principles' on which the *singula priora* have to

---

[35] Schindler (2000), 257, who also sees a possible reference to the house-building simile in Lucr. 4.507-21, where the house collapses because the foundations are not level. For a systematic analysis of the meaning of *structura* see Lieberg (1956).

[36] For *surgere* of the coming into being of a literary work, cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.111 and *Tr.* 2.559-60 (and cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.17, a play on the elegiac metre); cf. also Stat. *Theb.* 10.445 *mea carmina surgant inferiore lyra*. Instances where *surgit opus* is used of an architectural structure, but with a plausibly metapoetic significance: Ov. *Fast.* 4.830 with Barchiesi (1997), 69 and Fantham (1998), 247 *ad loc.*, Luc. 2.679 with Masters (1992), 34. Cf. also the metapoetic *surgit opus* in *Man.* 1.113. On the phrase see also Cowan (2002), 194, esp. n. 244, Masters (1992), 33. *surgere* with an exclusively architectural reference can refer both to the rising of ongoing construction (*OLD* 6a) and to the towering of a finished one (*OLD* 7). Volk (2002), 233-4, points to a more literal dimension of *surgere* in the *Astronomica*: stars and planets also 'rise' in the heavens (*OLD* 4a). See further p.123 below on Propertius' exploration of the polyvalence of *surgere*.

[37] 'Megametaphors' are metaphors that run through an entire literary text or large portions of it. They do not necessarily 'surface' explicitly in the text except in the shape of 'micrometaphors' which, taken together, reveal the presence of the megametaphor as an undercurrent. See Kövecses (2010), 57-9 and Werth (1994), who calls them 'extended metaphors'.

[38] Volk (2009), 195-6, partly summarising her more detailed argument at Volk (2002), 234-45, on the significance of *Man.* 1.20-2 for the whole of the *Astronomica*: *bina mihi positis lucent altaria flammis / ad duo templa precor duplici circumdatus aestu / **carminis et rerum*** – 'Two altars with flame kindled upon them shine before me; at two shrines I make my prayer, beset with a twofold passion, for my song and for its theme'.

[39] Schindler (2000), 259-60.

[40] Schindler (2000), 259-60 and Volk (2002), 239-40, show how Manilius hints at the fact that the letter-analogy actually makes more sense within a Stoic world view of an ordered cosmos, where the letters are deliberately arranged, than within the Epicurean parameters of random atomic collisions.

be based: *elementa* can mean both the letters which schoolboys have to learn as a first step and the elements which make up the universe.

The remarkable density of metaphorical language from three distinct areas (anatomy, architecture, nature of the universe) in a simile drawn from schoolteaching achieves a number of different purposes. Firstly, it combines different images that occur frequently throughout the entire work (the text as a body, the text as universe, and, more indirectly, the universe as a body).[41] The simile thereby creates internal coherence, tying together the different metaphorical spheres of the work in one overarching image. At the same time, this combination of several megametaphors from the entire didactic poem marks out this passage as a crucial point in the poet's self-reflection.

Secondly, the use of architectural metaphor in the didactic simile, combined with the extension of this image in the second simile, allows Manilius to explore what it might really mean to talk about language in terms of architecture. Architectural terminology is, as we saw above, a standard way of presenting theory of language.[42] However, this layer of metaphorical language, perhaps not even very noticeable in the first simile, is then deepened and thought through in much more detail than might at first have been expected, when the poet goes on actually to compare the writing of his poem to city-building, making the implicit, conventional metaphor of architecture explicit (2.772-87):[43]

> ac, velut, in nudis cum surgunt montibus urbes,
> conditor et vacuos muris circumdare colles
> destinat, ante manus quam temptet scindere fossas,
> fervit opus (ruit ecce nemus, saltusque vetusti   775

---

[41] The text as a body and the text as a *kosmos* are also well-known metaphors in rhetorical theory. For the metaphorical domain of the human body in rhetorical texts, see the list of van Hook (1905), 18-23. Cf. also de Jonge (2008), 188-9, on Dionysius' strategic use of organic versus architectural metaphor for organisation of subject-matter as opposed to stylistic composition (σύνθεσις). The idea of the text as a *kosmos* is first found in Democritus fr. 21 Diels-Kranz (but see Nünlist (1998), 90-1 on Hom. *Od.* 8.489 and 8.492-3). For further instances of the song or the poem as a *kosmos* (in the basic meaning of something that is well-ordered) in early Greek poetry, see Nünlist (1988), 91-4. On the further development in poetic theory of the text as a universe made up of the elements (στοιχεῖα), see de Jonge (2008), 52 and Armstrong (1995), 212-13. On the idea of the universe as a living organism in Manilius (possibly rooted in Stoic philosophy), see Volk (2009), *passim*, esp. ch. 6.

[42] See above, p. 108-9.

[43] On the 'Verklammerung' between the first and the second simile by means of close lexical parallels, see Schindler (2000), 262.

procumbunt solemque novum, nova sidera cernunt,
pellitur omne loco volucrum genus atque ferarum,
antiquasque domos et nota cubilia linquunt,
ast alii silicem in muros et marmora templis
rimantur, ferrique rigor per pignora nota   780
quaeritur, hinc artes, hinc omnis convenit usus),
tum demum consurgit opus, cum cuncta supersunt,
ne medios rumpat cursus praepostera cura,
sic mihi conanti tantae succedere moli
materies primum rerum, ratione remota,   785
tradenda est, ratio sit ne post irrita neve
argumenta novis stupeant nascentia rebus.

And as, when a city is being built on a bare mountainside and its founder plans to encompass the empty hills with walls, before his team attempt to cut trenches, work proceeds briskly; and see, a forest tumbles and ancient woodlands fall, beholding sun and stars unseen before; all tribes of bird and beast are banished from the spot, leaving the immemorial homes and lairs they knew so well; others, meanwhile, seek stone for walls and marble for temples and by means of sure clues search for sources of unbending iron; from their different sides skill and experience of every kind combine to help; and only when all materials are available in plenty does construction proceed, lest premature effort cause the project to break down in mid-course: so, as I strive to perform a mighty undertaking, must I first tell of the matter of my theme, withholding explanation, lest hereafter explanation prove ineffectual and my arguments be silenced at the outset before some unanticipated fact.

In this second simile, the mixing of metaphors has all but disappeared. While the first simile drew together strands of imagery from throughout the poem, the 'dominant' image of the second simile seems to stand alone. The building of a city is compared to the composition of the poem, or more precisely, the preparations necessary for the construction of a city are compared to the preparations necessary before explanation (*ratio*) can be attempted, namely to first present to the reader the bare facts, the *materies rerum*. Interestingly, the gathering of building materials corresponds to the *setting out* of the material in poetry, and not to its *gathering*: in the second half of the simile (the 'antapodosis') the *materies*, the (building) material, has to be presented, *tradenda*, as a first step.[44] In contrast to the first simile, the first

---

[44] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *tradere* 10a. I therefore disagree with Schindler (2000), who sees the second simile as representing the process of *inventio*, the first the *dispositio*. The subject of the second

part (the 'parabole') of the second simile becomes more independent from the argument. The city-foundation takes on a life of its own, and the poet vividly sketches the scene, or rather, the building site.[45] How is the process of preparing for construction represented? The simile's representation of the gathering of building materials activates as a model the literary giant of the previous generation, Vergil, with important implications for the author's self-presentation.

One of the most noticeable features of this second simile is the density of intertextual references to the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, and especially the multiple references to passages which form a point of contact between both works. Both *Aeneid* and *Georgics* are initially activated as intertexts by pointed references to programmatic passages at the beginning of each work. The clearest reference to the *Aeneid* comes in the antapodosis: *sic mihi conanti tantae succedere moli*, referring to *Aen.* 1.33: *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* – 'so vast was the effort to found the Roman people'.[46] Vergil's earlier didactic poem, the *Georgics*, is evoked in line 781 (*hinc artes, hinc omnis convenit usus*, recalling *Georg.* 1.133: *ut varias usus meditando extunderet artes* – 'so that practice, by taking thought, might hammer out different arts'), and in line 780 (*ferrique rigor*, recalling *Georg.* 1.143: *ferri rigor*).

Thus sensitised to the presence of the Vergilian intertexts, it becomes apparent that the simile especially evokes passages which link *Aeneid* and *Georgics*, alluding to both poems simultaneously. Most significantly, at the opening of the simile (*ac, velut, in nudis cum surgunt montibus urbes, / conditor et vacuos **muris circumdare colles** / destinat*), the surrounding of hills with a wall suggests the foundation of Rome (*Aen.* 6.781-3: *Roma … animos aequabit Olympo / **septemque** una sibi **muro circumdabit arces*** – 'Rome … shall let her pride equal Olympus, and with a single city's wall shall enclose her seven hills') in the prophecy of Anchises, with the epic *conditor* Aeneas (also alluded to in *Man.* 2.784) lurking in the background (*Aen.* 1.33 … *Romanam condere gentem*). Anchises' prophecy also already refers back to *Georg.* 2.534-5: *et rerum facta est pulcherrima **Roma / septemque una sibi muro circumdedit***

---

simile is still (as we learn in the antapodosis) the *presentation* of the material, although the focus has shifted away slightly from the ordering in logical steps. On *disponere* as an architectural and poetic activity, see further n. 55 below.

[45] Cf. Schindler (2000), 263, who compares this effect of 'Verselbständigung' of the parabole's subject to that of Homeric similes.

[46] See also p. 27 above for a reference to this famous line in the inscription of the Constantinian obelisk in Rome (*CIL* 6.1163).

arces.[47] The connection that Manilius constructs between city-building in the *Aeneid* and the making of his own poem suggests that we are to read his own poetic effort as rivalling that of Aeneas in founding Rome, and of Vergil in 'founding' his epic.[48]

The mention of the cutting down of the forest refers to *Aen.* 6.179-80 (the cutting down of the forest for the funeral pyre of Misenus): Manilius' *ruit ecce nemus, saltusque vetusti procumbunt* picks up Vergil's *itur in antiquam silvam, stabula alta ferarum; / procumbunt piceae*. Vergil's depiction of the wood as the former home of wild beasts (*stabula alta ferarum*) is also taken up by Manilius: *pellitur omne loco volucrum genus atque ferarum, antiquasque domos et nota cubilia linquunt*. However, this passage in the *Aeneid* also recalls the uncomfortable description of the *iratus arator* and his tree-felling in the second book of the *Georgics*, and Manilius' choice of words also activates this earlier passage (*Georg.* 2.207-10):

> aut unde iratus silvam devexit arator
> et nemora evertit multos ignava per annos,
> antiquasque domos avium cum stirpibus imis
> eruit
>
> … or [the sort of land] from which the angry ploughman has carried off the wood, and has felled groves that had been useless for many years, and torn up the ancient homes of birds together with their deepest roots …

This combined allusion to the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* carries special significance, for, as Hinds has famously argued, the tree-felling passage in the *Aeneid* does not only recall an Ennian description of tree-felling, but actually performs the poet's use of the raw material (*silva*/ὕλη) of his epic predecessor Ennius.[49] Cutting down trees thus becomes a context for epic poets' reflection of their (re-)use of ancient poetic 'wood'. Manilius, too, can play this game, introducing his simile with this epic marker of poetic forrestership. Also evocative of *Aeneid* and *Georgics* together is Manilius' mention of *marmora templis*: it reminds the reader of the temple of marble described at the opening of *Georgics* 3 (3.12: *templum de marmore ponam*), and

---

[47] Norden (1957), 320-1 *ad Aen.* 6.782 and 6.784.
[48] Cowan (2002), 193: 'Manilius aims to rival the parallel … achievements of Virgil in composing the *Aeneid* and Aeneas in founding the Roman people …'.
[49] Hinds (1998), 11-14 on Enn. *Ann.* fr. 175 (Skutsch). It is, however, surprising that the key word *silva* does not occur in Manilius' text.

through it also of the future *Aeneid* that this temple represents.[50] A final striking instance of simultaneous reference to *Aeneid* and *Georgics* is the result of seductive conjecture: *fervit opus* in line 775 for the *vertit opus* of the MSS produces a reference to *Georg.* 4.169 (*fervit opus*) and Vergil's description there of the hard work of the bees. There is an allusion to this passage in the *Aeneid*, where the Carthaginians building their city are compared to bees (*Aen.* 1.436: *fervet opus*).[51]

Why these references to Vergilian epic and didactic poetry, and especially to epic reworkings of didactic poetry? In a simile that deals with building materials, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* are evoked as different kinds of building material for the *Astronomica*: the *Georgics* in terms of genre and didactic technique, and the *Aeneid* in terms of literary ambition.[52] But the reference to epic via didactic also has a further significance. It is well known that Vergil's epic similes in the *Aeneid* often draw on (his own) didactic poetry in terms of sphere and subjects, subsuming the spheres of farming and cultivation into the larger epic cosmos of the *Aeneid*.[53] Manilius' reference to the *Aeneid*, and the *Georgics* within the *Aeneid*, in a didactic simile may therefore be read as an attempt to reclaim for didactic the classically epic subject of city-foundation. This theme of city-foundation drives the plot of the *Aeneid* through 12 books. Manilius' single simile here encapsulates it together with the didactic poetry which had already served as material for Vergil's own epic similes. Manilius thus uses this 'chinese-boxes' simile as a statement of his own poetic confidence, and the scope and inclusiveness of his poem about the universe.

<u>Walls of Milk and Verse: Propertius 4.1</u>

Propertius' fourth book of elegies, published in or shortly after 16 BC, opens with a pair of introductory poems, as has, in my view convincingly, been argued.[54] This

---

[50] On this poetic temple, see further below, p. 125 and p. 152-3.

[51] Housman prints *fervit*, Flores would like to retain *vertit*: see Feraboli/Flores/Scarcia (1996) 352 *ad loc*.

[52] On Vergil as a model for Manilius, see Volk (2009), 185-8, on *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, with more bibliography cited in 185, n. 21.

[53] See Briggs (1980) generally on the transferral of narrative from the *Georgics* to similes in the *Aeneid*, and 71-3 on the bee simile in *Aeneid* 1, mentioned above.

[54] For a summary of arguments in favour of dividing 4.1, see Heyworth (2007), 424-5; against division argue e.g. Macleod (1983), Hutchinson (2006), 61. I favour division, especially on the grounds of overall book design (on which see Günther (2006), 354-5). On the problem of poem-divisions more generally in Propertius, see Heyworth (1995). Since my investigation only

double introduction sets out the tensions which underlie the 'hybrid' fourth book. The whole of book 4 oscillates between the traditional themes of love elegy and the early history of Rome, thus widening and redefining the scope of elegy. While the elegiac genre in Rome had previously been dominated by erotic themes, Propertius' fourth book sets against poems for the most part observing these traditional thematic limits others dealing with historical and aetiological themes.[55]

In what is transmitted as lines 1-70, hereafter referred to as 4.1A, the speaker, guiding an unnamed *hospes* (1) around Rome, points to sites of modern (i.e. Augustan) Rome, using them to draw a contrast between the undeveloped site of the future city and Rome as it is at his time of speaking. The gap constructed between the then and the now opens up the question of how all of these changes came about: a question addressed from line 39 onwards, where the speaker turns to the Trojan past, to omens and prophecies regarding Troy's resurrection as mighty Rome and to the heroes of two Roman families (39-54).

I am here concerned with only one aspect of this complex poem: Propertius' strategic use of the metaphor of city-building for the writing of poetry.[56] Just after the prophecy of Cassandra, which concluded the section 39-54, the metaphor makes its first appearance (4.1.55-8):[57]

> optima nutricum nostris lupa Martia rebus,   55
>   qualia creverunt moenia lacte tuo!
> moenia namque pio coner disponere versu:
>   ei mihi, quod nostro est parvus in ore sonus!

---

deals with lines 1-70 (what is sometimes known as 4.1A), the question of division has no bearing on my argument.

[55] Hutchinson (2006), 7-16, offers a concise introduction to the redefinition of elegy in book 4, its preparation in book 3, and the activation of Callimachus' *Aitia* not only as an aesthetic but also a thematic model. Günther (2006) interprets 4.1A and 4.1B with special attention to their function for the book as a whole.

[56] Propertius' shifts between (often unusual) metaphors frequently render his texts extremely dense. The problematic transmission of his text makes interpretation even more difficult. Riesenweber (2007) tackles the daunting task of a thorough investigation of metaphor and other forms of 'uneigentliches Sprechen' in the work of Propertius.

[57] I quote the text of Fedeli (2006), except where otherwise indicated. The translations are my own, although they are partly inspired by Goold (1999) and Heyworth (2007). Heyworth (2007), 420-3, argues plausibly, I think, that the order of lines is confused here and elsewhere in the poem. However, any kind of reordering involves considerable speculation: see Hutchinson (2006), 22-3. I will treat the lines in the order in which they are transmitted.

> She-wolf of Mars, best of nurses for our community, what walls have grown up from your milk! For walls are what I would try to lay out in pious verse: poor me, that the sound from my mouth is so feeble!

In line 56, the walls are said to have grown, *creverunt*, because of the milk of the she-wolf, the nurse of Rome. This bold metaphorical phrase combines two separate images from earlier in the poem. First, the idea of the *growth* of built structures was already introduced in line 5, where the guide pointed out to the *hospes* the temples to the gods, first rustic as the gods themselves, now golden (4.1.5-6):

> fictilibus crevere deis haec aurea templa,
>   nec fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa;

> These golden temples have grown up for gods of clay, and a hut made without skill was no cause of shame.

The temples have grown like a living being – a plant, or an animal – a metaphor which elides specific human involvement, conveys the notion of organic development in accordance with nature, and of a small beginning and a steady (and one-directional) movement towards greatness.

The she-wolf and her nurselings, too, are referred to earlier in the poem, in lines 37-8:

> nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus:
>   sanguinis altricem non putet esse lupam.[58]

> The Roman nurseling (i.e. the Roman of today) has nothing from his forefathers except his name: he would never believe that the nurse of his blood was a she-wolf.

---

[58] The text of line 38 is difficult: I retain *putet*, transmitted in the majority of MSS, but plausible arguments can be made for the (likewise attested) *putat* (Heyworth) or *pudet* (the last is retained by Fedeli, but produces better sense if *nunc* is read instead of *non*: see Heyworth (2007), 419 *ad loc.*). Hutchinson (1984), 101 n. 25, tentatively suggests retaining *putet*, but reads *quis* for *non*. As Joan Booth has suggested to me, this would palaeographically be explicable via a glossing of *quis* with *nemo*, which could have made its way into the main text and then have been corrected to *non* for metrical reasons. *quis* would solve the problem of the *Romanus alumnus* as an awkward subject for *putet*, as well as producing good sense: 'who would believe that a she-wolf was the nurse of his blood?'.

The modern Roman is an *alumnus* of the she-wolf in the sense that she was the nurse, the *altrix*, of his blood, i.e. his race. In the myth, the she-wolf was the nurse of Romulus and Remus, the ancestors of the Roman race. Here, the twins are called the *sanguis* of the Roman – his blood, his origin. The wolf has thus fostered not only the twins but the whole people of Rome – every Roman is her *alumnus,* her nursling.

In neither of these passages is the imagery straightforward, but in 55-6, the expression becomes even bolder, as elements of both earlier images are united:

> optima nutricum nostris lupa Martia rebus,
>   qualia creverunt moenia lacte tuo!

> She-wolf of Mars, best of nurses for our community, what walls have grown up from your milk!

As in Manilius' first simile, the combination of different images familiar from elsewhere in the poem is used to create internal coherence. The walls have grown from the milk of the she-wolf. The milk of the she-wolf stands as a metonymy for the nurselings who enjoyed that milk, i.e. Romulus and Remus: without this milk, they would never have survived infancy and grown up to become the founders of Rome. *creverunt* is a metaphorical expression for 'were built', and even the walls may perhaps stand as *pars pro toto* for the entire city of Rome.

In the following couplet, however, we encounter a completely different conceptualisation of the making of a city 'wall' (57-8):[59]

> moenia namque pio coner disponere versu:
>   ei mihi, quod nostro est parvus in ore sonus!

> For walls are what I would try to lay out in pious verse: poor me, that the sound from my mouth is so feeble!

This phrase could be explained through reading *moenia* as a metonymy for the history of the walls: The speaker would like to construct in verse the history of the

---

[59] See Heyworth (2007), 422 *ad loc.* on the problems of the transition marked by *namque*. He opts for a radical solution, resituating lines 55-6 directly after lines 37-8, thus combining the two mentions of the she-wolf into one section. Hutchinson (2006), 71 *ad loc.* explains *namque* as linking the two instances of *moenia*, thereby providing a transition which allows the poet to 'at last gingerly steal … onto his plan'.

walls (i.e. the city) of Rome. The verb *disponere* straddles the domains of architecture and writing, encompassing both the idea of architectural construction and that of literary composition.[60] Unlike *crescere*, *disponere* suggests human agency and deliberate design. The word also implies that there are already separate pre-existing pieces (stones/words) which need to be fitted together or arranged in a systematic way.[61]

But this analysis does not yet capture the complete extent of the metaphor's significance. In Propertius' formulation, the verse of the poet is, by power of metaphor, turned into more than just lines on papyrus: if this verse can build *walls,* the poem really *is* equivalent to a city. The poetic *disponere* of the walls of Rome is a re-enactment of their original, mythical foundation, referred to in the preceding line. The poet inserts himself into a tradition of the founders of Rome and its walls. Aeneas, who is present in the poem from the very beginning (*Phrygem Aenean*, 2) and constantly in the background because of the strong echoes of his tour of the site of Rome with Evander in *Aeneid* 8, is activated as a founder-predecessor for the poet by the use of the word *pio*, recalling the *pietas* of his mission of founding a new Troy.[62] The walls of Rome themselves were built by Romulus, and the Rome that the *hospes* in the poem is shown is the one changed and remodelled by Augustus, the second Romulus. All these founders are the models which the poet sets himself up to emulate in founding these walls yet again, in song.[63]

---

[60] *disponere* can refer both to an architectural and a poetic activity (building the walls, and setting them out in verse). It can be used in a rhetorical context, specifically as the action of executing the *dispositio,* one of the five *membra eloquentiae, TLL* 5.1.1424.75-1425.24. *disponere* in architectual contexts (cf. *TLL* 5.1.1422.44-56) implies putting individual moveable elements into different places, separately, and in some kind of order. The two domains touch each other frequently: Vitruvius uses the term *dispositio* as a part of the discipline of architecture in a passage heavily influenced by the terminology of rhetorical theory (see de Jonge (2008), 191), while Quintilian compares the rhetorical *dispositio* to the putting together of building material (*Quint.* 7 pr. 1). See also n. 44 on p. 115 above.

[61] See also Fantham (1997), 129: 'Propertius makes [the] walls a symbol of his own ordering and constructive powers …'.

[62] The refoundation of Troy is also the theme of lines 39-54.

[63] On Aeneas, cf. Hutchinson (2006), *ad loc.*: 'The poet is another Aeneas … founding the imitation Rome of his book.' He also points to the fact that *versu*, which can also mean furrow, plays on the dragging of a furrow with a plough as part of the foundation ritual. For the sequence of founders, cf. Welch (2005), 26: '…the repetition of *moenia* … makes clear the parallel between Rome's first founder, its refounder, Augustus, and its latest founder, Propertius, each an architect of the city in his own way and with his own tools.' Fantham

Propertius again uses an architectural image to describe his poetry in the closing lines of 4.1A. Again, he uses the poetry-city metaphor to set himself up as a re-founder of the city (67-8):

> Roma, fave, tibi surgit opus: date candida, cives,
>   omina et inceptis dextera cantet avis!

> Rome, smile on me; my work rises for you: citizens, give me fair omens, and may a bird sing on the right for the work that I have begun.

The phrase *surgit opus* here recalls also two earlier uses of the word *resurgere* in the poem, both related to the city of Troy which rises again in the shape of Rome: *arma **resurgentis** portans victricia Troiae!* – '[Venus] carrying the victorious weapons of Troy rising again!' (47) and, in the prophecy of Cassandra: *Troia, cades et Troica Roma **resurges*** – 'Troy, you will fall and rise again as Trojan Rome' (87). While *resurgere* is there applied to the city of Troy, which (in a latent personification) rises up again when she has fallen, *surgit opus* refers to the new, Propertian city of verse. *surgere* is another word which, denoting originally 'getting up', 'getting to one's feet', is used quite regularly both of the architectural and the literary construct,[64] and an *opus* can of course be a building as well as a text.[65] However, the positive omens for which the speaker asks (silence from the people, the bird on the right hand side) confirm that what is described is a foundational ritual. The poem is a foundation to match the city of Rome. The earlier analogy of poem with city, poet with founder, writing with founding is thus continued.[66]

If we follow the sequence of metaphors of foundation and poetry throughout the poem, we follow a movement through different kinds of source domain. While the foundation of Rome is first framed in anatomical or biological terms, and strongly associated with natural growth and nurture (*crescere*, *lac*), the poet's activity is conceptualised in terms of architecture and structure (*disponere*). The final image of

---

(1997), 124, sees in this line an allusion to yet another founder figure, arguing that Propertius 'sees himself as another Amphion', who is mentioned already in Prop. 1.9.9-10 and 3.2.5-6. On Amphion in Propertius, see further p. 178-9 below.

[64] See p. 113, especially n. 36, above.

[65] See *TLL* 9.2.849.67-850.20.

[66] Cf. Hutchinson, (2006), 73 *ad loc*: 'The book is also an imitation Rome'. Hutchinson also explains the *candida … omina* as silence. He compares Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.88 (Romulus' foundation) for the foundation rituals. The auspicious bird omen is taken up again from 40.

the poem, of the rise of the new foundation (*surgit opus*) connects these two domains: *surgere* spans the anatomical (getting up) and biological (growth of plants) as well as the architectural sphere. The rise of the poetic *opus* thus appears both the result of a natural movement towards greatness, and of conscious poetic design – the best of two worlds.[67]

The city-building metaphor impacts on the reader's understanding of Propertius' manipulation of the elegiac genre in book 4 as well as of the poetic ambition of the book more generally. The vertical movement of the architectural metaphor has a poetological significance, in that it represents the generic ascent, the rise above the 'humble' love elegy that has gone before and the climb towards more ambitious themes and greater poetic fame. The choice of not just architecture, but city-building specifically, also relates to poetic ambition, just as in Manilius' simile. Propertius' and Manilius' use of the image of the city look very different at first sight: Manilius presents a clear, methodical comparison, Propertius a sequence of bold metaphors. But the two descriptions of city-building have an important element in common: both Propertius and Manilius tie their task to city-foundation as a means of staking out their ambition and the size of their project, and both link their task to city foundation in the *Aeneid*. In different ways, the poets thus suggest that their task is equivalent in ambition and in prestige to that of the city-founder *par excellence*, Aeneas – but also to that of the great poem-founder Vergil. The classically epic subject of city-foundation is reclaimed for their particular genre of choice.

However, an important difference between the two poets is that Propertius' subject matter *is*, in fact, (partly) the foundation of the city of Rome, while Manilius takes a larger conceptual step in using foundation (and foundation in and of the *Aeneid*) as an image for his own poetic activity, even though his poem's subject matter is far removed from the history of Rome. Considering that Manilius' poem postdates Propertius' by about a generation, it seems not at all impossible that Manilius' use of the foundation *topos* was building on earlier uses of the *topos*, such as that of Propertius.

Both Propertius and Manilius forged the link between their poetry and city-foundation via the *Aeneid* and the ultimate foundational *telos* of Vergil's epic. Manilius and Propertius thus read back into the *Aeneid* a poetic dimension to city-

---

[67] For a combination of *crescere* and *exsurgere* in a description of city-building, see Livy 4.6.

foundation and city-building. What does that mean for the *Aeneid* itself? There is certainly no *explicit* connection in the epic between the foundation of Rome and the making of the poem. But when we try to read the *Aeneid* with the eyes of Manilius and Propertius, an implicit connection between city and text appears possible.

Vergil's Epic Cities

In the *Georgics,* Vergil famously used the construction of a temple as an image for the composition of the future *Aeneid* (or, at any rate, a full-scale epic on a Roman national theme).[68] However, it is hardly surprising that any explicit use of the composition-as-building metaphor is absent from the epic itself, since the generic conventions of epic do not allow the narrator much leeway, beyond the proems, for stepping out of his role and explicitly commenting on his literary efforts.[69] Nevertheless, I argue that it is possible to read implicit connections between city and epic in the *Aeneid*, as do Manilius and Propertius, and that reading the *Aeneid* in such a way allows us a deeper understanding of Vergil's own poetic ambitions as well as those of Propertius and Manilius.

Kraus has interpreted Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* as 'the gradual, often experimental construction of a written Rome … As such, … the historian's project parallels/rivals Augustus' own building of a new Rome via (re)construction of its past.'[70] 'The "real" Rome grows as Livy's text does'.[71] Kraus argues not for an explicit metaphorical link between city and text, but rather reads the physical city of Rome (which grows and is built up in Livy's work) and Livy's work itself, the *Ab Urbe Condita*, as coincident, and is able to show on a textual level the ways in which Livy suggests and explores this analogy.[72] Would a similar reading also be

---

[68] *Georg.* 3.12-16. On this poem, see further below, p 135 and p. 152. See also especially Meban (2008) on connections between temple-building in republican Rome and Vergil's poem, and on the use of the temple metaphor as a means of conveying the poet's literary ambitions.

[69] On the proem (1.1-11) see e.g. Austin (1971) 25-34, Anderson (1969), ch. 1, Buchheit (1963), 13-58. On the 'proem in the middle' (7.37-45) see Kyriakidis (1998), 166-77.

[70] Kraus (1994a), 8.

[71] Kraus (1994a), 111 *ad* 4.6.

[72] See Kraus (1994a) *ad* 1.2, 1.11 and 4.6. Cf. also Kraus (1994b): 'Throughout the *Ab Urbe Condita* the historian draws attention to the overlap of the content of his city (the Urbs he is writing about) and its form (the *Urbs* he is writing)' (268). Cf. also Jaeger (1997), esp. ch. 1, who

possible for the *Aeneid*, which also deals with the foundation story of Rome?[73] Do textual and physical city coincide in Vergil's epic as they do in Livy's work?

In the *Aeneid*, such a connection between city and text, if it exists, cannot be straightforward, since the foundation of Rome, which is initially suggested as the *telos* of the epic (*dum conderet urbem*, 1.5), is not accomplished, or even so much as approached, within the main narrative. Instead of telling of the foundation of Rome, the *Aeneid* is full of other cities and foundations, all related in some way to the larger project of Rome, but none of them the 'real thing'.[74] I propose that it is rather the construction of *these* cities and their connection with the ever-visible project 'Rome' that relate to the poetic endeavour of the *Aeneid* itself.

In the course of the epic, *Aeneas* founds a number of settlements (with varying degrees of success) at the successive stages of his journey towards Italy and the foundation of Rome. But before I turn to analyse this sequence of foundations of would-be Romes, I first consider a different sort of Aenean foundation. The Carthage episode shows Aeneas actively participating in the foundation of what is decisively the wrong city. I suggest that this deviant Aenean foundation can be read as a reflection of the entire epic's derailment in the Carthaginian books.

In book 1, just cast ashore in Carthage after a storm, Aeneas climbs a hill and from above views the bustling building site of Dido's Carthage (1.421-9):[75]

>   miratur molem Aeneas, magalia quondam,   421
>   miratur portas strepitumque et strata viarum.
>   instant ardentes Tyrii: pars ducere muros
>   molirique arcem et manibus subvolvere saxa,

---

argues for parallels between the physical *monumenta* of the city of Rome and the textual memorials within the *Ab Urbe Condita*. See also Edwards (1996), 6-8.

[73] That it is possible is suggested (in passing) by Deremetz (2001), 161: 'Tout se passe comme si Énée effectuait pour fonder Rome ce que le poète effectue dans le présent de l'oeuvre pour fonder son épopée romaine.' I argue that while this more direct connection holds true for Propertius' poems, there is a more complex connection in the *Aeneid*.

[74] Morwood (1991) gives a useful overview of the role of cities in the epic (cities sacked, foundations aborted, misguided or doomed) as what he calls a *Leitmotiv* (216) in the poem (see esp. 212-16). He then argues that the 'vacuum suggested by the city theme' (221) is filled by the present Rome (re-)founded by Augustus. Carney's (1986) investigation has a similar scope. Unlike Morwood, he offers a 'pessimistic' reading of the absence of the foundation of Rome from the narrative and concludes that 'the cities would seem to represent possibilities lost or not realised but nonetheless regretted' (429).

[75] The text quoted is Mynors (1969).

> pars optare locum tecto et concludere sulco;   425
> iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque senatum.
> hic portus alii effodiunt; hic alta theatris
> fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
> rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora apta futuris …

> Aeneas is amazed by the size of it [i.e. the city], that had once consisted of mere huts; he is amazed by the gates, the noise, and the paved roads. The Tyrians are working eagerly: some of them are setting out the line of walls, toiling at the citadel and rolling up stones by hand, some are choosing the site for a house and enclosing it with a furrow. They draw up laws and elect magistrates and a holy senate. Here some are excavating harbours, there others are laying the deep foundations for their theatre and quarrying vast columns out of the rocks, suitable decorations for the stage to be.

When Aeneas first looks down on Carthage, *miratur molem Aeneas*. The city of Carthage is called a *moles*, and the Carthaginians are working hard (*moliri*) to bring it about. To Aeneas, it looks exactly like the kind of heroic venture that he has to accomplish, the foundation of a city and a people: *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* (1.33). This also fits with his exclamation (1.437): *o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt* – 'Happy ones, whose walls are already rising!', recalling the proem and the ultimate aim of the *altae moenia Romae* (1.7).

At this point, Aeneas is still looking on from the outside (the Carthaginians are *fortunati*, they have already accomplished their mission), but once he has descended to the building site of Carthage, he gradually begins to be drawn into the wrong city, and the epic project is derailed.[76] Aeneas becomes increasingly confused, thinking about Carthage more and more as *his* city and the destination of his mission. This is an understandable mistake to make, Vergil suggests, since the reader is at one point invited to make the same mistake: when the narrative proper of the epic begins, after the proem, with the words *urbs antiqua fuit* (1.12), a first-time reader would expect the words to refer perhaps to Troy, perhaps even to

---

[76] Bruck (1993), 26, suggests that the parallel between the foundation of Carthage and of Rome is already suggested through the use of *labor* in the bee-simile (1.430-6, *labor* in 431): 'Wie die Stadtgründung des Aeneas im Prooemium als *labor* angekündigt worden war, so bestimmt dieses Phänomen auch die Stadtgründung der Karthager.'

Rome – but the ancient city turns out to be Carthage, the 'wrong turning' on Aeneas' epic journey.[77]

The slipping into the wrong epic is a gradual one. The suggestion that Dido's founding mission is somehow parallel to that of Aeneas is evident in Ilioneus' words to Dido (1.522-3):

> o regina, novam cui condere Iuppiter urbem
> iustitiaque dedit gentis frenare superbas …

> O queen, to whom Jupiter has granted it to found a new city and to control proud tribes through justice …

On the one hand, these words recall Jupiter's prophecy to Venus earlier in book 1: *populosque feroces contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet* – 'and he [i.e. Aeneas] shall crush wild peoples and lay down laws and build city-walls for his men' (1.263-4). At the same time, they point forward to Anchises' formulation of Rome's mission, *debellare superbos* – 'to subdue those who are proud' (6.853).[78] Dido is set up as a possible role model for Aeneas, but she quickly becomes more than that. When she tells the Trojans that *urbem quam statuo vestra est* – 'the city that I am building is yours' (1.573), she is beginning to draw them into *her* epic. In book 4, after a joint walk through the city and a temporary disruption of the construction works,[79] we finally reach the point where Vergil has steered the epic most seriously onto the 'wrong' track: Hermes, sent by a justly worried Jupiter, comes upon Aeneas fully engaged in building the wrong city (4.259-61):

> Ut primum alatis tetigit magalia plantis,

---

[77] That the *urbs antiqua* should be Carthage is all the more striking, since Carthage in the *Aeneid* is a newly established city (in fact called *nova* several times: 1.298, 366, 522), and since the name Carthage was also etymologically explained as 'new city' in Rome (Cato *Orig.* fr. 37.4). See Reed (2007), 129-30 on the question of old and new Carthage. That the *urbs antiqua* of 1.12 is also meant to evoke Troy is confirmed in 2.363 where the fall of Troy is described by the corresponding phrase *urbs antiqua ruit*.

[78] Carney (1986), 428, also stresses the latter connection.

[79] See *Aen.* 4.74-5 (walking through the city together) and *Aen.* 4.86-9: *non coeptae adsurgunt turres, non arma iuventus / exercet portusve aut propugnacula bello / tuta parant; pendent opera interrupta minaeque / murorum ingentes aequataque machina caelo* – 'The towers that she had begun do not rise, the young men do not exercise in arms, or prepare harbours or safe bulwarks for war; the works are broken off and stand idle – the huge merlons of the walls and the crane soaring to the sky.' This interruption of the building works shows Dido's failings as a leader, in contrast to the proper epic hero who does not let himself be distracted (for long) from his aim of founding and building a city. On the meaning of *machina*, see p. 189, n. 55 below.

> Aenean fundantem arces ac tecta novantem
> conspicit.
>
> So soon as with winged feet he touched the roofs of the huts, he catches sight of Aeneas founding fortifications and building new houses.

The unusual word *magalia* recalls Aeneas' first view of the city, *magalia quondam* (1.421). But while he was then watching and admiring from outside, he has made Carthage his project now.[80] Hermes' accusations again highlight that Aeneas is engaged on the wrong epic mission (4.265-7):

> tu nunc Karthaginis altae
> fundamenta locas pulchramque uxorius urbem
> exstruis? heu! regni rerumque oblite tuarum!
>
> 'So now you are laying the foundations of high Carthage and building up a splendid city, wife-besotted as your are? Alas, you have forgotten your kingdom and your mission!'

Jupiter's question about Aeneas (quid *struit*? – 'What is he planning?'), repeated by Hermes when he scolds Aeneas (quid *struis*?), also takes on the meaning 'what are you building?' (especially since the word *exstruis* is used in the sense 'to build' only four lines earlier), stressing once more the parallel between Aeneas' mission and city building.[81]

When Aeneas has left Carthage and the unhappy Dido has committed suicide, the city's grief is suggestively likened, in a famous simile, to that attending the fall of the city (4.667-71):

> lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu   667
> tecta fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether,
> non aliter quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis
> Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes   670
> culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum.
>
> The palace rings with lamentation and groaning and women's wailing, and heaven echoes with loud wails. It is as though all Carthage or

---

[80] He is now the one being observed (*conspicit,* 4.261).
[81] Morwood (1991), 214.

> ancient Tyre has been invaded by enemies and is falling, and raging
> flames are rolling over the roofs of men and of gods.

The building and then abandonment and suggested destruction of the city of
Carthage can thus be read as analogous to the course the epic takes in the first four
books. When Aeneas builds the wrong city, the *Aeneid* threatens to turn into the
wrong sort of epic. In terms of subject matter, protagonists and generic influences,
the Carthaginian episode strains the limits of epic.[82] While Aeneas is engaged on
building Carthage, the epic also seems well on the way to becoming an epic for the
wrong nation.[83] The (envisaged) destruction of Carthage ends this particular
interlude, leaving Aeneas free to return to his mission of founding quite a different
city.

Aside from the Carthaginian detour, the *Aeneid* features a sequence of city
foundations by Aeneas, which mark successive stages of his journey towards Italy
and the foundation of Rome. The first of these four cities is founded in Thrace,
the Trojans' first stop after their flight from their native shores. Aeneas'
foundation here is only just begun before it is interrupted by a terrible omen. He
begins on the city-walls and gives the city a name (*Aen.* 3.16-18):

> feror huc et litore curvo
> moenia prima loco, fatis ingressus iniquis,
> Aeneadasque meo nomen de nomine fingo.

> To this place I sail, and lay out my first walls on the curved shore,
> beginning the task with fate against us. From my own name I fashion
> the name 'Aeneadae'.

---

[82] On the various generic influences in the Dido-episode, see Hardie (1998), 59-63 with a
helpful selection of bibliography. Book 3 of Apollonius' *Argonautica* is a crucial intertext (cf.
Servius' famous hyperbole that 'from there [i.e. the *Argonautica*] this entire book is taken over,
from the third book of Apollonius' (*in Aen.* 4 *praef* 2-4 Harv.)). Apart from Hellenistic (love-
themed) epic, other prominent presences are Catullus 64 and Ariadne's lament, but also entirely
non-epic genres, especially tragedy and love elegy: 'One way of viewing the situation in *Aeneid* 4
is as the interference of the values of the world of love elegy in the Roman (and epic) mission of
Aeneas' (Hardie (1998), 61-2).
[83] Hardie (1986), 272-3, Nelis (2001), 65-6.

Aeneas stresses that the walls of the city were the first, *prima*, in a whole sequence of his wall-foundations.[84] The city foundation gets no further than walls and a name: when Aeneas begins the sacrifices accompanying the foundation, a terrible omen forces the Trojans to abandon the place where their compatriot Polydorus had been brutally murdered. However, a kernel of the later foundation of Rome is already hidden even in this aborted attempt. Aeneas is drawn unconsciously (*feror*) towards Thrace,[85] which he calls a *terra … Mavortia* (3.13), and he uses his own name as a basis for the city's name. Both aspects are significant, since Jupiter in his prophecy in book 1 has predicted Romulus' foundation of Rome in the following terms (1.276-7): *Romulus … **Mavortia** condet / **moenia** Romanosque **suo de nomine** dicet* – 'Romulus shall found the walls of Mars and call the people Romans after his own name.' Aeneas unwittingly fashions himself as a less successful proto-Romulus.

The Trojans' second attempt at foundation, this time in Crete (where they sail due to a misinterpreted prophecy), at first shows more promise and advances considerably further (3.132-7):

> ergo avidus muros optatae molior urbis 132
> Pergameamque voco, et laetam cognomine gentem
> hortor amare focos arcemque attollere tectis.
> iamque fere sicco subductae litore puppes, 135
> conubiis arvisque novis operata iuventus,
> iura domosque dabam …

> Therefore, I eagerly toil at the walls of the longed-for city, call it Pergamum, and urge my people, who rejoice at the name, to love their hearths and to raise a citadel with roofs. And now the ships were just about drawn up on dry land, our young men were busy with marriages and new tillage, and I was giving them laws and houses …

---

[84] Horsfall (2006), 56, *ad loc.*, suggests that *prima* refers to Aeneas' constructions being the foundations of Aenus' future *moenia*. On the identification of this foundation and the location of Polydorus' grave as Aenus, and not Aeneia, see Horsfall (2006), 50-2 *ad* 13-68.

[85] On *feror* and its connotations of passivity as opposed to deliberate choice of destination, see Horsfall (2006), 47, *ad* 3.11. Cf. also *Aen.* 3.78.

The city already has a number of essential features: it has walls, a name, a citadel, and houses.[86] The people are working the soil, marrying and obeying laws. The word *moliri* appears again, linking this city to the great *moles* that Aeneas has to accomplish, and stressing the element of hard work necessary for success. On the other hand, its name, welcomed by its future inhabitants, expresses Aeneas' and the Trojans' reluctance to let go of the past and begin again.[87] The love they are to feel for their hearths and homes (*amare*) is rooted in nostalgia. This foundation, too, is cut short by expressions of divine displeasure: a plague breaks out among the Trojans, and a drought settles on the fields. Again, the city foundation is abandoned.

After the Carthaginian interlude, considered earlier, two more cities are founded. In Sicily, Aeneas takes aged Nautes' advice to found a city for the aged, weary and fearful, and to leave them there under the rule of Acestes. This time, a functioning city is founded, and the founder's duties are shared by Aeneas and Acestes, perhaps with a nod towards the joint foundation of Romulus and Remus (5.755-8):

> interea Aeneas urbem designat aratro
> sortiturque domos; hoc Ilium et haec loca Troiam
> esse iubet. gaudet regno Troianus Acestes
> indicitque forum et patribus dat iura vocatis.

> Meanwhile Aeneas draws the outline of the city with a plough and allots homes; this part he says should be Ilium and this area Troy. Trojan Acestes delights in his kingdom, appoints a site for the forum and lays down laws to the senate that he has summoned.

The joint foundation is concluded by setting up a shrine of Venus and decreeing rituals for Anchises' tomb. This city-foundation is successful, but despite the fact that it contains even more specific, obviously 'Roman', elements (the digging of the *primigenius sulcus*, the *forum*, and even senators), it is, yet again, a side-track. Iris, disguised as Beroë (the maddened Trojan matron who instigated the burning of

---

[86] Horsfall (1989), 26-7 provides a (sometimes incomplete) list of the different elements of city-founding and their occurrences in the *Aeneid*, including wall-building, the naming of the settlement and other elements such as houses, foundations, laws etc.

[87] Aeneas' nostalgic foundations can be compared to another city-foundation that remains caught up in the past: Andromache and Helenus, unable to let go of their Trojan past, have built a mini-Troy in Epirus, a barren enterprise, where the new 'Xanthus' runs dry (*arentem Xanthi cognomine rivum*, 3.350), and the tomb of Hector is empty (…). See Morwood (1991), 213 with n. 8.

the ships) had demanded: *nullane iam Troiae dicentur moenia?* – 'Shall no walls ever again be called Troy?' (5.633). In accordance with this demand, the city now founded is a surrogate Troy in name and nature. It is an ideal home for those who are afraid of the future. Leaving Acesta behind means that Aeneas has once again to let go of his epic (Trojan) past and sail on towards his new epic mission, a different city in a different land.

Aeneas' final city-foundation within the *Aeneid* occurs when the Trojans have reached their destination. While envoys are sent to King Latinus, Aeneas sets about founding a settlement for the Trojans (7.157-9):

> ipse humili designat moenia fossa
> moliturque locum, primasque in litore sedes
> castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit.

> Aeneas himself marks out the line of his walls with a shallow ditch and toils at the site and surrounds his first settlement on the shore, after the fashion of a camp, with battlements and a rampart.

The Trojans know that they have arrived at the place that is destined to be their new home, but in spite of Aeneas' renewed toil (*molitur*), this settlement has little permanence about it. The trench that Aeneas again draws to mark out the walls is shallow (*humili … fossa*), and the foundation has the characteristic features not of a city, as Acesta did, but of a military camp (*castrorum in morem*): a rampart (*agger*) and battlements (*pinnae*).[88] The foundation is thus suited to the second, 'Iliadic' half of the epic and its martial theme. The temporary status of Aeneas' construction is emphasised further by a direct juxtaposition with the ancient city of King Latinus, where the Trojan emissaries are headed (7.160-1):

> iamque iter emensi turris ac tecta Latinorum
> ardua cernebant iuvenes muroque subibant.

> The young men, meanwhile, had made their way there, and were in sight of the towers and high roofs of the Latins and drawing near to the city wall.

---

[88] For another description of the construction of a camp with these features (also set up in contrast to an old city), see Stat. *Theb.* 7.441-51, discussed in ch. 5, p. 190-2 below. Nisbet (1990), 384 sees in the passage an allusion to modern camp-building, which he interprets in the context of his reading of Aeneas as a Roman general.

That city has houses and walls – it is an established city full of (Roman-sounding) traditions.[89] The Trojans' foundation, by contrast, is once more preliminary, imperfect, and still only a pale reflection of *the* foundation that the *Aeneid* ultimately purports to be about.

This series of imperfect and problematic city-foundations presents us with a suggestive contrast. On the one hand, Manilius and Propertius set themselves up as following Vergil in founding the city of Rome in verse (Propertius) or comparing their 'foundation' of a poem favourably to Vergil's poetic foundation of Rome (Manilius). Within Vergil's epic, on the other hand, the foundation of Rome, while tantalisingly present as the goal of Aeneas' quest and the fulfilment of history, is never realised. There are numerous stories of foundations in which there is always something of Rome, but they are never the 'real thing'. How then can we (along with Manilius and Propertius), read Aeneas' city-foundations as related to the construction of Vergil's poem?

I propose that it is possible to read an analogy between the small city-foundations and Vergil's epic itself, since all these small cities, though imperfect, contain an increasingly large proportion of features of the future city of Rome. The series of foundations charts a journey towards a remote final destination, a development from floundering first attempts to the fulfilment of a divine plan. Rome itself is never founded in the epic – except through the glimpses of what Rome will be that we receive through those smaller foundations.[90] Precisely in this respect, the city-foundations can be read as analogous to the epic itself. Consistently, foundation upon foundation is connected with hard work, *moliri*, making it clear that these imperfect, toilsome foundations are precisely what Aeneas' project consists of: *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*.[91] The *Aeneid* is concerned with showing the

---

[89] See *Enc. Virg.* 3 s.v. *Latini*, 129-30, on this city, its (lack of a) name and its 'Roman' features. The description of Latinus' palace/temple in 7.169-91 bears a striking resemblance to Roman monuments such as those on the Palatine or the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus: see the detailed analysis of Horsfall (1999), 146-159, with literature quoted on 146, and Harrison (2006), 176-8 (who however confuses the palaces of Latinus and Evander and incorrectly locates the building described in book 7 at the future site of Rome). Cf. also the formulation in 7.61: *primas cum conderet arces*, said of Latinus: he, too, is a city founder (cf. Horsfall (1999) 86, *ad loc.*).

[90] Cf. the glimpses of Rome's future monuments through indirect references throughout the epic: see Harrison (2006).

[91] Besides the passages already noted, see also 4.233 (Jupiter is angry at Aeneas for not fulfilling his mission), 7.127 (Aeneas attributing to Anchises Celaeno's prophecy and rephrasing it to include the word *moliri*), and 7.290 (Juno justly worried about the promising foundational activities of the Trojans).

difficult journey rather than the happy ending. On the surface, at least, the *Aeneid* is neither an epic about the contemporary city of Rome nor an epic about Augustus (although of course it is very much an epic about both in a more oblique way). We have reason to believe that an epic about Augustus and the present glory of the Roman empire was what was expected of Vergil, and he himself had even suggested in the *Georgics*, perhaps inadvertently, that this was what he would be attempting: *in medio mihi Caesar erit* (*Georg.* 3.16).[92] Although there are glimpses of Augustus and his city in the *Aeneid*, the *Aeneid* refuses to be a straightforward nationalistic triumphal epic of Rome. In that sense, the series of small and imperfect city-foundations reflect what the epic as a whole is trying to achieve, and what it does not: Vergil shows the thorny, difficult, laborious path to glory, the *moles* of the would-be founder, rather than the triumphant arrival, and he refrains from fully satisfying the demands for a full-scale epic of national praise for Rome and its leader in depicting within the main narrative not the foundation of Rome but some of the many foundations that prepared the way to the final goal.[93]

This megametaphor of foundation, if it is one, is never made explicit.[94] It is perfectly possible to read the *Aeneid* without this extra layer in place. However, taking seriously Vergil's near-contemporary readers Propertius and Manilius opens up the possibility of a richer reading of city-foundation in the *Aeneid*, which can enhance understanding of the *Aeneid* as a whole, its ambitions and its self-imposed limits.

The responses of Propertius and Manilius to Vergilian city-foundation, too, appear in a different light when we consider how elusive the foundation of Rome really is in the *Aeneid*. When they announce that they will found Rome in verse, they set themselves up as completing what Vergil only tantalisingly holds before us but never quite carries through.[95] Both align their poetic achievements with the foundation of Rome, and they cast this double foundation in terms that recall

---

[92] On the expectations raised by the prologue to *Georgics* 3, and the reflection of these expectations by contemporary poets, see Robinson (2006).

[93] That Rome *is* this goal is also affirmed in the great passages of prophecy, where the foundation of Rome as well as the culmination of its power under Augustus is foretold: see 1.125-96, 6.756-886, 8.626-728. See Morwood (1991) on the presence of the Augustan city of Rome in the *Aeneid*.

[94] On megametaphors, which underlie the narrative without ever actually surfacing, see n. 37 above.

[95] On Propertius' use of the building metaphor as a means of staging a competition between his poetry and Vergil's, see also Richardson (2006), 205-6.

foundation in the *Aeneid*. By reading back into the *Aeneid* a poetic dimension to city-foundation, they therefore set themselves up as emulating Vergil while going further than he does at the same time.

4. Conclusion

While thinking of text in terms of architecture is a normal feature of human language and thought, the texts studied in this chapter make strategic and innovative use of this core metaphorical concept available to them. An analysis of three authors' use of the metaphor of city-building has shown how diverse their techniques of linking architecture to text are, but also that there is one aspect of the text-city analogy which all three exploit extensively: the (process of) the *foundation* of the city and the status that accrues to the writer whose composition represents an equivalent act of foundation. The primary impact of the text-city metaphor lies not in aesthetic or structural correspondences between text and city, but in the sheer achievement of *producing* (building, or writing) them and in the prestige that comes with effecting such a successful foundation.

Furthermore, the specific form each author gives to city-building in his respective text impacts on the way in which the reader envisages his poetic task: while Manilius exploits the metaphor to convey a sense of his mastery of the material and his organised presentation, Propertius stresses the organic growth and rise of his city and poem. At the same time, the authors' different versions of city-foundation engage with each other, and this engagement allows the poets to stake out their ambitions in relation to each other: Manilius and Propertius found Vergilian poetic cities that are, in a sense, more 'Roman' than the original.

The next chapter moves from the investigation of one particular metaphor to the investigation of one particular literary work and the 'aesthetics of construction' within it, although the questions at stake remain essentially the same: how does the author represent construction and how does he use it to influence the reader's reception of the literary edifice?