GÉRARD GENETTE’S PARATEXTS will provide the scaffolding to build an argument about arma virumque, “arms and the man,” in Virgil’s Aeneid and its tradition. The English translation Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation expands on the original French title Seuils, or “thresholds.” “More than a boundary or a sealed border, the paratext is, rather, a threshold, or—a word Borges used apropos of a preface—a ‘vestibule’ that offers the world at large the possibility of either stepping inside or turning back.”¹ Borges’ building metaphor might have appealed to Virgil himself, who envisaged the Aeneid as a poetic temple, and reputedly joked about the half-lines in the unfinished epic as compositional struts that held up the poetic work until solid columns should replace them.²

The paratext is on the margins of the text but it affects our interpretation of the whole text. It may include (to draw on Genette’s table of contents) the author’s name, the publisher’s blurb, the cover and typeface, the publication series, the title, dedication, epigraph, or preface, and finally the “epitext,” such as interviews with the author or private comments on the work, for example, in authorial correspondence. Clearly some paratexts are contained within the volume itself, while others are more detached, circulating in the publication culture. Fewer ancient paratexts survive, but they are no less relevant to appreciation and interpretation. They include prose prefaces to poetic works; verse prefaces (authorial and editorial) to plays or poetry collections; the sphragis, manuscript and papyrus headings; epigraphic and material paratexts; scholarly paratexts such as marginal notes; and biographical stories. One of these, to which I will turn shortly, is the “pre-proem” of the Aeneid (Ille ego . . .), which captured Genette’s interest as a forerunner to titles that indicate the genre of a literary work.³ Some ancient
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paratexts are more authorial than others, and it is clear that subject to the ingenuity and enthusiasm of the paratextual critic the list could be lengthened to embrace more of our ancient scholarly apparatus and more material data about writing and book culture in antiquity.

Readers may assess these phenomena with or without reference to Genette or the idea of the paratext, and the choice may be a matter of personal taste or critical tradition. It is hardly accidental that one of the most extensive and sophisticated explorations of paratextuality in ancient literature was conceived in Genette’s own stomping ground: I refer to the conference volume entitled *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*, edited by Jean-Claude Fredouille and others. Similarly, Alain Deremetz invokes Genette in relation to Plautine prologues as statements of literary self-positioning. At the other end of the spectrum, David Butterfield discusses the genesis and value of the capitula (section headings) in Lucretian manuscripts without recourse to the Genettian rubric. A recent collection of essays on the uses of epigraphy in Greek and Latin literature addresses many topics that might have (but have not) been termed “paratextual.” By contrast, a collection of essays edited by Laura Jansen, *The Roman Paratext*, reclaims as paratextual many features that have often been discussed without reference to Genette.

What value does Genette’s *Paratexts* add to the study of ancient literature and its reception? Genette writes with a wry smile, and his mildly satiric approach is congenial to the study of many ancient authors and their rhetorical self-positioning, whether earnest or ludic. A central focus of his study is how modern authors’ and publishers’ paratexts comment on publication, republication, responses to criticism, and so on, which has obvious relevance to ancient literary culture. In addition to being elegant, insightful, and wide-ranging, Genette’s study has the advantage of grouping together as a federation textual features that mediate between texts and their contexts, material, literary, and human. Moreover, his approach is helpfully systematic, and so may ensure coverage of some paratexts that might otherwise evade scrutiny as such. The great differences between Genette’s target publications (mostly nineteenth- and twentieth-century novels) and ancient writing culture, far from invalidating the application of the term “paratext” to antiquity, actually draw attention to significant dimensions of ancient literary discourse. One of these is the difficulty of drawing any clear distinction between ancient text and paratext: for Aristophanes, Terence, Catullus, and others, the responses to criticism and poetic commentary become embedded in the poetry itself. Sometimes this is done explicitly, as in Callimachus’ *Aetia* prologue, Horace’s *Satires*, or Ovid’s *Tristia*; at other times the commentary is imma-
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nent, veiled in narrative, figure, or allusion, such as Virgil’s shield of Aeneas, or authorial surrogates in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Genette’s paratext is a liminal category that can help to focus attention on the ways in which ancient texts interact with their own performance or reception contexts, or the material circumstances of their production. Under the sign of Genette, Laura Jansen’s recent collection, *The Roman Paratext*, makes a significant contribution to the study of Roman paratextuality, addressing a wide range of paratexts including the material book, indices, intertitles, prefaces, the sphragis, and the covers of modern editions, and even expanding the concept beyond Genette’s treatment to embrace visual texts, “paraintertextuality,” and the relationship between paratext and intertext. A hermeneutic principle of these essays is that while reflecting on the status of their paratexts they all make the paratext central to interpretation. The collection contains no major treatment of titles. The present article shares much of the outlook of *The Roman Paratext* and is partly a response to it.

2. TITLE AND INCIPIT

I edge now closer to the central subject of this paper, Virgil’s *arma virumque* as an identifying tag for the *Aeneid*. One might almost venture to call it a title or quasi-title on the authority of Servius, who attests that ancient poets often began their poems with titles, these giving an indication of the poem’s theme. But this seems an awkward claim, since Servius has already stated that the title of the poem was *Aeneis*, and indeed this is how the poem is universally cited by ancient scholars. The contradiction between different notes about the poem’s title derives from the stratified nature of the Servian commentary, a hotch-potch of different views, and points to different titular conventions in antiquity. There are a number of related issues here which will remain in play throughout this article: the history or development of titles, in particular, the difference between an authorial title and one conferred by tradition; the difference between an official title and less formal means of identifying the work; and the impact in turn of these questions on interpretation. Contrast with Genette’s target texts is instructive: modern writings always have titles that are generally conferred by authors and rarely change, while many ancient works had no title at all, or the same work could be referred to by different titles. This is because a title is not necessarily needed at the point of a text’s first reception, such as performance, and only becomes necessary in a culture of citation or reference. The different ancient conventions of Homeric citation attest to a spectrum of possibilities. The earliest citations are by episode title. In one chapter (2.116) Herodotus refers separately to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aristeia of Diomedes*, a content-describing
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episode title. Later papyri give a final title at the end of a book roll, for example, with the subscription formula “ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΧΕΙ ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Ι” at the end of Book 3. The indirect tradition cites Hesiod’s *Theogony* in a wide variety of ways, suggesting that the title had not been stabilized. Many ancient poems, especially lyric poems, did not have their own titles; but lyric collections could be cited or labeled by genre and book number, and we have papyrological examples of “ΣΑΠΙΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΩΝ” followed by a book number and “ΒΑΣΧΥΛΙΔΟΥ ΔΙΘΥΡΑΜΒΟΙ.” Technical works in Greek and Latin were often titled by subject, which sometimes led to significant variation in citation conventions, as the same work could be described by a variety of synonymous terms; thus Cato’s work on farming is sometimes referred to as *De agriculutra*, and sometimes as *De re rustica* or *De rebus rusticis*. This titular variety and instability is a world apart from Genette’s culture of publication and fixed authorial titles.

For Genette the title matters to interpretation: “limited to the text alone and without a guiding set of directions, how would we read Joyce’s *Ulysses* if it were not entitled *Ulysses*?” And quoting Jean Giono, “A title is needed because the title is the sort of banner one makes one’s way toward; the goal one must achieve is to explain the title.” The same holds for Genette’s many forebears in *titrologie*. A title may identify or describe the work, carry stylistic connotations, indicate the genre, and tempt or repel the reader. “A title,” for Umberto Eco, “unfortunately, is in itself a key to interpretation. We cannot escape the notions prompted by *The Red and the Black* or *War and Peace*.”

Ancient Virgil criticism concurs, at least to judge by the Suetonian-Donatan biography and comments by Servius. A corollary of this principle is the phenomenon of the untitled artwork, for which, presumably, the artist does not wish to dictate any interpretative directions. As we shall see, part of the point of *arma virumque* is for the reader to map the words’ changing meaning onto the *Aeneid* as it develops.

So what then is the status of *arma virumque*? Literary works are often referred to by their opening words, and this seems particularly true of the *Aeneid*, especially in poetic allusions. The practice has good pedigree within the Virgilian
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corpus: at Eclogues 5.85–87 Menalcas identifies himself as the composer of the second and third Eclogues by garbled quotation of their opening lines. In formal citations, ancient poems were often referred to only by author and their opening words introduced with a formula such as οὗ ἡ ἀρχή or οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ἀρχή, especially in the case of lyric poems, which generally had no titles.28 Virgil will have known Callimachus’ Pinakes, which sometimes identified a work by author, genre, and opening words.29 Against this backdrop Virgil will have expected readers to identify the Aeneid with arma virumque. This is not quite the same as a title in the formal sense, but as we have seen, the distinction is not as fixed in antiquity as in modern publication culture.30

Evidently either title or incipit could suffice to identify a work, as a passage from Ovid’s Tristia indicates (2.259–62):

sumpserit Annales—nihil est hirsutius illis—
facta sit unde parens Ilia, nempe leget.
sumpserit “Aeneadum genetrix” ubi prima, requiret,
Aeneadum genetrix unde sit alma Venus.

If she picks up the Annals—there’s no shaggier work—then she’ll definitely read about how Ilia became a parent. The moment she picks up “Mother of the Aeneadae,” she will ask how it was that nourishing Venus became a mother.

Here different styles of citation coexist side by side: Ennius’ Annales is cited by title and not by its opening words (Musa, quae pedibus), while Lucretius’ De rerum natura is cited as Aeneadum genetrix, doubtless because Ovid wishes to exploit the sexual connotations of genetrix. Furthermore, Ovid’s idiom sumpserit Annales, sumpserit “Aeneadum genetrix,” implies that the title or incipit can stand in for the physical book, which one might take from a shelf. The title or incipit thus has a synecdochic quality: to pick up the title is to pick up the work itself. Behind this image of a reader selecting a book roll we glimpse the whole material history of titles on book rolls, which is a large subject unto itself.31 How would the reader know which roll to choose? Curiously, more often than not, titles are found at the end rather than the beginning of papyrus rolls. In other cases a title is found in the first column before the beginning of the text, and in other cases still it seems that the title was inscribed on a label. In Alexis’ Linus, Herakles is invited to select a book, and goes for what he thinks is a cookery book, judging by what the title says.32 Cicero thanks Atticus for arranging the provision of labels (sittyboi or sillyboi) on papyrus rolls in the reorganization of one of his libraries (Att. 4.5.4.5, 4.8.2.4). The reaction suggests the newness of the invention, at least for Cicero. Ovid writing from exile imagines the titles of his own works visible (presumably) on shelves.33 We even have depictions
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of titles, and sometimes of labels, on papyrus rolls from classical Greek vase painting to Italian wall painting. Although several examples of these labels survive, we have none for the Aeneid. So how was the Aeneid labeled, both as a whole and the individual books? We know that Aeneid books circulated individually: Gellius reports having seen a very old copy of Aeneid 2 that was reputed to be a corrected author’s copy. On the other hand, Martial famously marveled at a one-volume codex edition of Virgil’s works (14.186). For what it is worth, the earliest surviving Aeneid manuscripts are inscribed with Aeneis or Aeneidos and the book number. This may well go back to earlier use of the formal title on papyrus rolls. Nonetheless, even though Aeneis is indubitably the poem’s official title, arma virumque has such potent status that much of what Genette says about the title as a guide to reading might apply equally to the incipit.

3. ILLE EGO QUI

I have been referring to arma virumque as the incipit, but to most Virgilian scholars the incipit would be the four-line introduction to the Aeneid, a paratext if ever there was one, preserved by Servius and in the ancient Life of Virgil. In the Suetonian-Donatian biography (42) we read that "Nisus the grammarian used to say that he had heard from older men that Varius . . . corrected the beginning of the first book by removing these lines:

Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
ut quamvis avido pararent arva colono,
gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis
arma virumque cano . . . "

I am he who once warbled my song on a slender reed, and emerging from the woods compelled the neighboring fields to obey the husbandman, however greedy, a work that pleased farmers; but now, of the bristling arms of Mars and of the man I sing . . .

This first-person pronouncement amplifies the implied subject of cano by summarizing Virgil’s previous poetic achievements, while its closing words qualify arma. Scholarship on the lines has focused mainly on their authenticity and function, on ancient parallels for epigraphic prefaces, and on the dissemination of the lines. Servius believed they were by Virgil, as did La Cerda, Philipp Wagner (in disagreement with Heyne), Albert Forbiger (tentatively), and James Henry (fervently). Conington and Nettleship regarded them as spurious. Scaliger admired the lines and considered them authentic, but was aware of the controversy over authorship. Priscian cited them as Virgilian, but began his com-

34. See Dorandi 1984; Caroli 2007, 28–52, 83–127.
35. NA 2.3, with Birt 1882, 45.
36. On titulature in Virgil manuscripts, see Lowe 1925 and 1928; Oliver 1951; Munk Olsen 1997. One twelfth-century manuscript gives Incipit arma virum primus liber Aeneidorum; see Munk Olsen 1997, 521.
mentary on the *Aeneid* with *arma virumque*. Against those who believe that the lines belong at the start of the *Aeneid*, it may be observed that the phrasing in the ancient *Life* that precedes the quotation is distancing and circumspect about their authenticity. In contrast with Renaissance editors, few today print the lines as genuine, on stylistic as well as textual critical grounds.

In his discussion of poetic beginnings and endings, Scaliger associates the *ille ego* lines closely with the autobiographical sphragis of the *Georgics* (4.563–66). He suggests that Virgil inserted his own name there in fear of plagiarists; thus, those who remove the *ille ego* lines make the *Aeneid* their own rather than Virgil’s. Genette acknowledges the lines’ apocryphal status but also connects them with the *Georgics* sphragis. He recognizes the *ille ego* incipit as a forerunner to titles as genre indicators, which modulate into a notice of other works by the same author (usually on the cover or title page). Andrew Laird argues that the lines dramatize the presence of the poet who speaks or sings *cano* and the poem that follows. Irene Peirano compares them to other paratexts that buttress the authority of the speaker. A popular view, which goes back to Edward Brandt, is that the lines are an epigraphic preface designed to stand at the head of an edition of the *Aeneid*, perhaps under a portrait of Virgil. This would be unprecedented for Virgil’s time, not least as the four lines are not a self-contained semantic unit like other epigraphic prefaces, but rather depend for completeness on *arma virumque cano* and what follows, which of course renders the lines especially liminal.

The *ille ego* preface implies confusion among Virgil’s early readers over the precise interpretation of *arma virumque*, “so ambiguous that commentators have never yet been able to agree” on its meaning. Servius reports vigorous debate over the meaning of the phrase, and why Virgil began his poem with *arma.* Are the *arma* to be read as literal or figurative? It seems inelegant and imbalanced that the relative clause, *qui primus ab oris*, should only pick up on the second half of *arma virumque*, and that *arma* should remain unadorned by any epithet. If *arma* looks forward to the Iliadic battles of the epic’s second half, why is it placed before the Odyssean *virum*? And what anyway is the relationship between *arma* and *virum*? Most readers nowadays would agree that it is a dynamic relationship, a hendiadys that serves to question the relationship between arms and the man: the man and his armor. What happens to the hero
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when he dons armor? The words horrentia Martis placed before arma would remove any ambiguity, specifying the meaning of arma as warfare, and excluding the possibility of a hendiadys. Ille ego irons out certain difficulties, but also removes the poetic polysemy of arma virumque.

4. ARMA VIRUMQUE IN THE POETIC TRADITION

One good reason to reject ille ego qui is that the entire literary tradition recognizes arma virumque as the beginning of the Aeneid. Even though the words are not a title, they quickly establish themselves as a detachable tag and vehicle of allusion, often with generic resonances that look to the words’ Homeric pedigree. Sometimes, as within the Aeneid itself, the case endings vary. I briefly review some of the most interesting literary instances. From the corpus of elegy, a genre which is constituted by its oppositional relationship to epic, Ovid pens perhaps the most polemical arma virumque joke, at Tristia 2.533–34:

et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor
contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros.

And yet that happy author of your Aeneid brought “arms and the man” [or “the man and his manhood”] to a Tyrian bed.

As above with sumpserit “Aeneadum genetrix,” Ovid is keen to highlight the scandal that was everyone’s favorite part of the Aeneid, to put his own lovers’ manual in a less scurrilous light. Interestingly, the epic is cited by both title and opening words. In the case of arma virumque, there may be a specific allusion to the modified recurrence of these words at Aeneid 4.495, where Dido instructs Anna to place Aeneas’ arms, arma viri, on what will become her own funeral pyre: and so we move from arma viri thalamo [quae fixa reliquit] to arma virumque toros, both of which locate arma virumque in the midst of sexual union—an erotic deflation of heroic valor. Aeneas took arma virumque—“the man and his manhood,” but also by synecdoche the Aeneid itself—to bed with Dido. Since the epic was about ancestry and Augustus’ descent from Aeneas, the attendance of arma virumque at Aeneas’ dalliance is quite undignified, especially if Dido did in fact become pregnant with Aeneas’ child, as is suggested in the Heroides. The epic may have “belonged” to Augustus (tuæ . . . Aeneidos), but Ovid has put his own spin on it by radically subverting a quintessential Virgilian term. After Virgil it becomes a game for epic poets to allude to arma virumque, often to evoke the Sturm und Drang of battle. Many of these references have metaliterary import. Thus when Statius’ Mars “conjures up the arms of men and the thrusting of horses,” et arma virum pulsusque imitatur equorum (7.120), he is channeling the Aeneid just as much as Statius is imitating, imita-
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Arma virumque signals Virgil’s use of Homer, while also pointing to Augustus and Roman history. It would seem from the evidence of Propertius 2.34 that Roman literati knew Virgil was writing a Homerizing epic about Trojan Aeneas before the poem appeared. Moreover, purported correspondence between Augustus and Virgil makes reference to Virgil’s “Aeneas” and Aeneid.54 Arma and virum correspond to the Iliad and Odyssey respectively, and to the approximate bipartite division of Virgil’s epic into an Odyssean half (with Iliadic episodes) and an Iliadic half (with Odyssean ones).55 Phonetically, arma may hark back to Odyssean ἀνδρός,56 and virum repeats the first word of Livius Andronicus’ version of the Odyssey. But if arma virumque is a hendiadys, the dynamic relationship between the two elements points to Virgil’s integrated allusion to both Homeric epics. Such a view is consistent with the recent findings of Edan Dekel in Virgil’s Homeric Lens, who argues that Virgil does not allude separately to the two Homeric poems, now to one, now to the other, but rather in a way that recognizes how the Odyssey, already itself an intertextual epic, acquires much of its charge by reacting to the Iliad.57 The question remains why Virgil put arma first. The order may suggest that the hero is defined by warfare: the opening theme is not the pair arma and virum as discrete terms, but rather both coexisting inseparably, with the extra layer that the vir is conditioned by arma.

Apart from alluding generally to the Iliad and Odyssey, I suggest that arma virumque cano alludes specifically to Achilles singing in his tent at Iliad 9.189, ἀειδε δ’ ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν.58 (Even though virum is accusative and ἀνδρῶν gen-
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itive, Virgil will go on to echo *arma virumque* with *virum* in the genitive.) At this point of the *Iliad* Achilles might be read as a figure for the poet himself, conspicuously singing about the glorious deeds of men rather than performing them; it is appropriate and piquant that Virgil should echo this moment. Alfred Bloch endorses the link between *arma virum* and κλέα ἀνδρών, describing the phrases as a “heroisches Leitmotif.”

Scholars since Eduard Norden have wished to hear an Ennian echo in *arma virumque*. The phrase is not attested in our fragments of the *Annales*, even though Horace tells us that Ennius never rushed to sing of *arma* unless drunk (*Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma / prosiluit dicenda, Epist. 1.19.8*). Nonetheless, Gian Biagio Conte’s view that for Virgil and his public *arma virumque* “probably means Ennius, or at least the traditional Roman national epic justifying Roman arms” is plausible and attractive. The annalistic Shield of Aeneas is the most Ennian stretch of Virgil’s epic, and is *inter alia* a meditation on the relationship between Aeneas, the shield’s bearer, and the military history of his descendants. The Parade of Heroes contains Virgil’s “most celebrated Ennian borrowing.” It is preceded by an echo of *arma virum* as Aeneas admires from a distance the heroes’ armor and their empty chariots (*arma procul currusque virum miratur inanis*, 6.651). The Parade of Heroes also contains another echo of the theme phrase as Tullus Hostilius once again rouses the Romans to warfare after the peace of Numa’s reign (*residuesque movebit / Tullus in arma viros*, 6.813–14). Numa had notably used the shields received from heaven (*lapsa ancilia caelo*, 8.664) as symbolic objects rather than weapons.

Beyond any Homeric and Ennian or historical models, Virgil’s fusion of *arma* and *vir* has Augustan resonances. The prologue to Virgil’s third *Georgic* will have primed expectations of an epic about Caesar, with some connection to the Trojan foundation. Where would the balance lie between Homer and history? *Arma virumque cano* is also a palinode of Virgil’s recusatio in the sixth *Eclogue* (*cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem / vellit*...), which earlier implied a turning away from direct treatment of politics and recent warfare. Augustus the *vir* in the Parade of Heroes (*hic vir; hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis*, 6.792) seems to look back to *virumque* of the poem’s opening. Hartmut Froesch has described an allusion to the beginning of the name Augustus in the initial letters of *Arma virumque cano* (reading *u* and *v* as equivalent, and allowing for coalescence of c and g). Finally, Augustus himself had been using armor for symbolic and even propagandistic value at least since his receipt of the *clupeus virtutis* in 27 BCE. The shield celebrated Augustus’ *virtus, clementia, iustitia*, and *pietas erga deos patriamque*, and continued
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to appear on imperial coinage long after his death. Much of the scholarship on
the shield examines the extent to which Augustus did in fact espouse these vir-
tues; he began to do so once his power had been established. The clupeus,
then, emphasizes Augustus’ later peaceful aspect after his bloody rise to power.
We may conclude that the words arma virumque seem to evoke multiple frames
of reference, literary and historical, even before they have been echoed within
the work.

6. ARMA VIRUMQUE THROUGHOUT THE AENEID

Virgil inherited from Homer the trick of meaningful repetition of the poem’s
opening. Μηνιν recurs sparingly in the Iliad, but when it does, it always refers
to the wrath of Achilles or of a god.67 Ahuvia Kahane has argued that “in the
Odyssey, verse-initial (accusative) attestations of άνδρα carry a subliminal refer-
ence to ‘Odysseus.’”68 Irene de Jong has suggested that the opening “theme
word or phrase” of the Homeric epics fulfills “the function of the title” in terms
of Genette’s paratextuality.69 She notes that this phenomenon is replicated on a
smaller scale in the songs of Phemius and Demodocus.70 The Homeric epics are
celebrated for their unity, and it is significant that the opening words strike the
keynote of each epic, conditioning listeners’ expectations.71 The situation with
arma virumque is more complex. Critics at least as early as Servius Danielis
have observed how the phrase or its morphological variants are embedded
throughout the Aeneid.72 In this respect Virgil follows Homeric practice. Occa-
sionally these repetitions seem without particular point beyond being appropri-
ate to a martial context.73 In themselves these cases are interesting, as they show
Virgil imitating a signature style of formulaic repetition that gives the Aeneid a
Homeric feel.74 Most repetitions, however, seem more marked: as the echoes of
arma virum ricochet around the Aeneid, the dynamic relationship between the
two elements changes and develops. Some of them offer, to quote Ellen Oliensis,
“cameo[s] of martial heroism” or “authenticating self-reflexivity.”75 The remain-
der of this article will mostly present close readings of the recurrences of arma
virumque in the Aeneid.76

I turn first to the cluster found scattered throughout the first movement of the
poem, lines that are often read as highly programmatic. The first of these occurs
in Juno’s storm, woven into a tapestry of allusions to epic beginnings. It is now

70. See 1.326: ο ἄρχαν νόστον ἄεις; 8.75: νείκος Ὀδυσσής καὶ Πηλεῖδω Αχιλής; 8.267: ἀμφ’ Ἀρεως
φιλότητος ἐὕστεφάνου τ’ Ἀφροδίτης; 8.492–93: καὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἄεισον / διαρατέου.
72. See Serv. Dan. ad Aen. 1.1 ARMA alii ideo “arma” hoc loco proprio dicta accipiant [ ... ] quod prope
73. E.g., at 2.668, 11.696.
74. See Barchiesi 2015, 110–18 on Virgil’s Homeric repetitions as imparting an epic savor.
76. Scholarship on arma virumque in the Aeneid includes Anderson 1969, 5–10; Bloch 1970; Conte 1986,
somewhat widely accepted that Juno begins her wrathful soliloquy with a sonic quotation of \( \mu\eta\nu\nu\), the first word of the *Iliad* (*Aen.* 1.36–37).\(^{77}\)

\[
\text{cum Iuno aeternum servans sub pectore vulnus haec secum: ‘mene incepto desistere victam . . .}
\]

when Juno, nursing the eternal wound in her heart, soliloquized as follows: “For *me* to be beaten and to give up what I have *begun* . . .”

Her *mene* is elided into *incepto*, a word that flags the allusion by calling up the idea of beginnings. On a metaliterary level, Juno wishes to thwart an *Aeneid*, a kistic epic about the origins of Rome. She first tries to divert the *Aeneid* into an *Iliad*. It is as if she makes herself the addressee of Homer’s \( \mu\eta\nu\nu\) àςιδε \( \theta\eta\alpha\), taking charge of the role of muse to enunciate her own \( \mu\eta\nu\nu\). She quickly devises a catastrophic Trojan *nostos* plot, persuading her subaltern Aeolus to unleash the winds. Amid this storm, Aeneas’ own first speech act also looks back to the *Iliad*, to the duel in which he was saved from the hand of Diomedes (*Aen.* 1.94–101):

\[
‘o terque quaterque beati, quis ante on patrum Troiae sub moenibus alis contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis Tydide! mene Iliacis occumbere campis non potuisse tuaque animam hane effundere dextra, saevus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis scuta virum galeasque et forta corpora volvit!’
\]

“O thrice and four times blessed, those whose lot it was to fall before their parents’ eyes beneath the walls of Troy! O son of Tydeus, bravest of the Greek race! Alas that I could not have fallen down dead on the *Ilian* plain and gasped out this breath of life by your right hand where savage Hector lies dead by Achilles’ spear, and great Sarpedon, where the Simois rolls so many *shields of men* plundered under its *flow*, and helmets and courageous bodies.”

Aeneas gives us *mene Iliacis* (97), a nod to Juno’s quotation of Iliadic \( \mu\eta\nu\nu\). On the one hand, his exclamatory wish in alignment with Juno’s plan: if he had died at Troy along with many others, there could be no *Aeneid*. On the other hand, his response to Juno’s *mene incepto* is a kind of protest that lays counter-claim to authority over epic beginnings. Insisting that this will be his epic after all, Aeneas cements his claim to authority over beginnings with *scuta virum*, a close relative of *arma virum*. While Juno had tried to engineer a rerun of the post-Iliadic *Nostoi*, Aeneas and the Trojans will star in an *Iliad Redux* that reverses their defeat at the hands of the Greeks.\(^{78}\) Aeneas’ responses to Juno’s apertural rhetoric already anticipates this process. (A parenthetic observation: having attempted to secure his Iliadic inheritance, Aeneas will later refrain from wearying his mother with the “annals” of Trojan misfortunes at *Aeneid*.

---


\(^{78}\) Quint 1993.
1.373. Annalis may allude to the title of Ennius’ epic, another nod to a poetic “road not taken.”

In the meantime Juno’s efforts are not without effect, and as her storm continues to rage, Orontes’ ship is upended and the captain whirled around. In the vast whirlpool isolated swimmers appear, and throughout the waves men’s armor, arma virum, and planks and Trojan treasure (Aen. 1.118–19):

apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto,
arma virum tabulaeque et Troia gaza per undas.

Swimmers appear scattered in the vast whirlpool, men’s weapons, and beams [or paintings, or writing tablets] and Trojan treasure throughout the waves.

The echo of arma virumque is unmistakable, despite the case shift of virum from accusative singular to genitive plural. It is all the more conspicuous since, as La Cerda points out, helmets and breastplates would not float. Oliensis supplies the most textured interpretation: Juno has just about managed to shipwreck the Aeneid, with arma virum floating in the tide. Tabulae, which can also mean writing tablets, supports the metapoetic allusion. In the picture too is Horace Odes 1.3, which implicitly compares Virgil’s composition of the Aeneid to a perilous sea voyage. Rari nantes introduces to the scene a sense of Lucretian material dissolution. The Aeneid bobs adrift, with arma virum acting as a synecdochic tag, floating like the tabulae between material and literary signification. A metapoetic explanation along these lines can only gain support from the context that I have sketched, in which there is a pattern of epic incipits involving a struggle for control over the Aeneid’s plot. The embedding of these allusions in speeches should sensitizes us to the potential significance of later focalizers of arma virum(que), and their rhetorical purpose in echoing the tag.

The next instance occurs in the poet’s voice as the storm is calmed. Virgil compares Neptune restraining the winds to a statesman quelling civil unrest (Aen. 1.148–53): Here, as Damien Nelis has observed, arms and the man are presented in opposition to one another

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

And just as when often among a large populace civil strife has arisen and the faceless mob is wild with rage, and now torches and rocks are flying, madness supplying armor; then if by chance they catch sight of a man who is respected for his dutiful character, they fall silent and stand to attention, pricking up their ears; he controls their anger with his words and calms their hearts . . .

80. See Barchiesi 1997b, 275.
82. Genette’s idea of “focalization” from Narrative Discourse (1972) subtends many of the readings in this article.
Here, as Damien Nelis has observed, arms and the man are presented in opposition to one another: “The implied relationship expressed in the poem’s opening words, ‘the arms and the man’ here gives way to an adversative relationship, which may be expressed as ‘the arms but the man.’” Nelis is not unusual in reading the simile as pointing to both Augustus and Aeneas as statesmen; but he also suggests that it invites the reader to connect the statesman’s pacifying words—ille regit dictis animos—with the words of the Aeneid itself and their didactic message to the Roman people about the pressing issues of the time. Another way of looking at the opposition is to see arms and the man as following in sequence in different narrative frames: “arms then the man,” or even as alternatives: “arms or the man.” Against the poem’s historical context this arrangement could easily be seen as an allusion to Augustus’ quelling of civil war: arms then Augustus, who as Galinsky argues, calms the mob with his auctoritas. But if arms and the man are presented as distinct phases of a historical process, the simile does not allow us to forget that the statesman’s auctoritas depends to a large extent on his military past. Even when arms and the man are presented disjunctively, there is still an intimate relationship between them.

A proliferation of characters in the Aeneid do their best to turn the plot in one direction or another to their own advantage. The most architecturally devious of these is Juno, but she quickly meets her match in Venus. Sometimes these manipulating characters cite earlier poetic traditions in biased or rhetorically expedient ways, such as when Juno dredges up the Iliad and Nostoi. In other cases characters tendentiously quote arma virumque in an effort to make the plot do their bidding. One monumental example of this is Vulcan’s arma acer facienda viro (8.441) as he prepares to make Aeneas’ armor. Vulcan in turn is responding to Venus’ request, arma rogo genetrix nato (8.383), which echoes the beginning of the Aeneid (arma) and of Lucretius’ De rerum natura (Aeneadam genetrix). The magnificent arms themselves will enshrine Aeneas as the alius Achilles of Virgil’s Patrocleia. They have the strongest possible claim to be the titular arms of arma virumque understood as “the man and his armor,” even though paradoxically Aeneas himself has no awareness of the significance of the pictures on the shield. One of these pictures shows shields fallen from heaven (lapsa ancilia caelo, 8.664), a sign of divine favor like the present object; and another has Augustus inspecting triumphal dedications affixed to the doorposts of the temple, which are likely to have included shields. Gifts of arma for another man descended from Venus.

Along such lines the plot of the Aeneid is structured around the machinations and countermachinations of Juno, Venus, and Jupiter. Book 12 is a case in point,
with Juno engineering *mora*, and Aeneas receiving assistance from Venus and Jupiter to bring things to a close. Venus’ mediated healing of Aeneas is a counterstroke to Juno’s (equally mediated) disruption of the treaty, which has led to Aeneas being wounded. Venus is called *genetrix* (412) as she gets the plot moving again. She stands behind Iapyx as he administers the cure and then echoes the incipit (*Aen.* 12.425–29):

‘*arma* citi properate *viro!* quid statis?’ Iapyx
conclamat primusque animos accendit in hostem.
[. . .]
maior agit deus atque opera ad maiora remittit.’

“Quick, get *arms for the man!* What are you standing there for?” Iapyx shouted, and was the first to inflame their hearts against the enemy. “. . . A greater god drives you on and is sending you back to greater tasks.”

The speech also ends with a self-reflexive tag, since *opera ad maiora remittit* alludes to Virgil’s *maius opus moveo* (7.45), inaugurating the epic’s second and more Iliadic half.

I turn now to some less obvious instances of plot manipulation on the human plane which feature tendentious repetitions of *arma virumque*. Dido dupes Anna into building her funeral pyre. She gives her sister instructions which she pretends to have received from a priestess, designed either to restore Aeneas to her or to free her from loving him (*Aen.* 4.494–98):

‘*tu secreta pyram tecto interiore sub auras erige, et arma viri* thalamo quae fixa reliquit
impius exuviasque omnis lectumque iugalem,
quo peri, super imponas: abolare nefandi
cuncta viri monumenta iuvat, monstratque sacerdos.’

“You set up an open-air pyre all by yourself within the palace grounds, and place on top of it the *armor of the hero* which the wicked man left hung up in the bedroom, and all mementos and the marriage bed on which I gave up my life; it is my pleasure to obliterate all reminders of the unspeakable man, and the priestess shows the way.”

The first items to be placed on the pyre are *arma viri*, which Aeneas had left hung up, *fixa*, in the bedroom. We have already seen how Ovid recalled these lines in the *Tristia* to exploit the *Aeneid*’s erotic dimensions, but even in Virgil they confer more than a whiff of *militia amoris* on the amour of Dido and Aeneas, especially in light of the juxtaposition of *arma viri* with *thalamo*.89 If the idea of the warrior in the bedroom has comic potential, the outcome is tragic, since Dido will use Aeneas’ sword as her suicide weapon, just as Ajax had used the sword of Hector, a guest-gift not acquired for this purpose, *non hos quaesitum munus in usus* (4.647).90 Considering *arma virum* as a title-identifier opens up new interpretative possibilities. Dido had tried and failed to turn the *Aeneid* in a direc-

---

89. For the erotic connotations of *figere* in the Dido–Aeneas love story, see 1.687 and 4.70.
tion that would favor herself and Carthage. Having failed to sequester arma
virumque to her own ends, and unable to overturn Aeneas’ decision to make for
Rome, she will now symbolically destroy arma virum along with herself on the
funeral pyre, by destroying herself with arma vīri. In addition she wishes to abol-
ish the memory of Aeneas: his monumenta, which can also refer to poetic works,91
are to be burned. Rather than being commemorated in his own epic, Dido finds
him unspeakable (nefandi). Comparable with how Juno tried to turn the Aeneid
into an Iliad, Dido will use arma virum as an instrument to turn the Aeneid into
a tragedy, bloodied by her tragic suicide. In this attempt Dido has some success,
as her suicide continues to reverberate throughout the remainder of the Aeneid,
often allusively in the stories of Amata and Turnus, but also when her gifts are
mentioned (9.266; 11.72–75). Dido’s interweaving of the Aeneid’s beginning into
her own death scene is a reminder that the demise of Dido spells the beginning of
enmity between Rome and Carthage, which will reach its full horror with Hanni-
bal in the Second Punic War, glimpsed in prospect in Dido’s dying curse (4.625),
and the subject of Ennius’ arma.

While repetitions of arma virumque are unevenly scattered throughout the
poem, four of them are found in Book 9.92 Three of these have a bearing on
Turnus’ performance as a general and soldier and all of them represent signif-
icant slants on the poem’s opening words. The first is in free indirect discourse,
focalized from the perspective of Turnus and the Latins. Turnus gives a rous-
ing speech and hurls his javelin into the air. His speech is favorably received
(Aen. 9.54–57):

clamorem excipiunt socii fremitoque sequuntur
horrisono; Teucrum mirantur inertia corda,
non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre
arma viros, sed castra fovere.

His companions hear his shout and follow it up with a horrific-sounding roar; they marvel at
the Trojans’ lazy hearts, how they weren’t committing themselves to the open plain, how the
men were carrying no arms against them, but instead clinging to their camp.

They marvel at what it suits them to consider the Trojans’ inertia, and the men’s
failure to fight with their weapons, non obvia ferre / arma viros. The echo of
arma virum strengthens the negative sense of unheroic behavior which would be
present even without the echo of the incipit, but the slur represents the Latins’
spin on things.

As the vir is away procuring arma from both Evander and Venus, the Latins
enjoy a temporary sense of entitlement, which Turnus exploits. On the morn-
ing of his aristeia he rouses his men to arms, himself girt in arms (Aen. 9.461–
63):

iam sole infuso, iam rebus luce retectis
Turnus in arma viros armis circumdatus ipse
suscitat:

91. OLD, s.v. monumentum 4, 5.
Now that the sun had poured in and things had been revealed by light, Turnus rouses his men to arms, himself girt in arms:

With the artfully patterned Turnus in arma viros armis circumdatus ipse there is almost an overdetermination of heroic prowess as Turnus prepares to infiltrate the Trojan camp, excessively desirous of his own poetic immortality, and wishing to live on in the mouths of men, volitans vivos per ora virum.

During the aristeia Ascanius will fire his first martial bowshot, killing Numanus Remulus, a kinsman of Turnus’ through recent marriage (9.594). Numanus provokes Ascanius’ ire with tumescent rhetoric, a disparaging contrast between hardy Italians and lily-livered Trojans that ends with an injunction to leave arms to men (Aen. 9.619–20);

‘... tympana vos buxusque vocat Berecyntia Matris Idaeae: sinite arma viris et cedite ferro.’

‘... the tambourine is calling you, and the Berecynthian flute of the Trojan Mother: leave arms to men and yield to the iron.’

Numanus has already imputed effeminacy to the Trojans based on their clothing (614–16), he now derides their worship of the Idaean Mother. His sinite arma viris builds on the aspersion of unmanliness, while also echoing Hector’s request to Andromache to return to her weaving and leave war to men (Il. 6.490–93). This reminiscence from the penetralia of besieged Troy is consistent with Numanus’ rhetorical insistence that the Iliad is being replayed, with the Trojans now walled up a second time (iterum ... bis capti Phryges, 598–99). Ascanius undermines Numanus’ construction of events, repeating bis capti Phryges (635) before shooting him through the temples. Despite Ascanius’ martial début, he is not quite a vir, and it is a sign of his relative immaturity that he presides over the council which sanctions the doomed mission of Nisus and Euryalus. Apollo underlines Ascanius’ youth with macte nova virtute, puer (9.641), and once again when, disguised as Butes, he commands him to refrain from war, ‘... cetera parce, puer, bello’ (9.656). Following so closely after Numanus’ arma viris, Apollo’s puer, bello reads like a variation on the titular theme, especially as the previous line ends with armis. Still a boy, Ascanius must be saved for the future, and cannot afford to risk enmeshing himself more actively in arma virum.

The last victim of Turnus’ aristeia is the poet Cretheus, lamented in an obituary that concludes a catalogue (Aen. 9.774–77): et Clytium Aeoliden et amicum Crethea Musis, Crethea Musarum comitem, cui carmina semper et cithareae cordi numerosque intendere nervis, semper equos atque arma virum pugnasque canebat.

93. For Roman epic as the domain of men, see Keith 2000, 8–35. Curtis (2017, 20) finds significance in the close proximity of canentem (9.621) to arma viris (9.620).
94. For a different slant on this arma-puer nexus, see Wilfred Owen, Arms and the Boy (1965).
95. See Hardie 1986, 59; Hine 1987, 182; Gale 2003, 343, 348; Fratantuono and Faxon 2013; Curtis 2017, 21–23; Power 2017. Perhaps following Servius (ad Aen. 9.771), La Cerda (1619, 3: 401) suggests that Cretheus may be a lyric as well as an epic poet, based on his instruments as well as his subject matter.
and Clytius, son of Aeolus and Cretheus, friend to the Muses—the Muses’ companion Cretheus, whose heart’s pleasure were songs and the lyre and plucking rhythms on the strings; he was always singing of horses and the arms of men and of battles.

As with earlier instances of arma virum the word patterning is mannered, with epanelepsis of Crethea, anaphora of semper, and chiastic framing of the poet-warrior’s name (amicum Crethea Musis, / Crethea Musarum comitem). These make for a plangent effect. The echo of the incipit is strengthened by the presence of -que canebat. The lavish style of the poetry strongly suggests that this instance of arma virum is focalized by Virgil rather than Turnus. There is more than a hint of sympathy with a vulnerable fellow poet and the uselessness of his songs on the battlefield. Beyond this, it is as though Turnus wishes to remove the Trojan poet, obliterate the memory of Trojan heroes’ deaths, and leaving them uncommemorated. Immediately after the death of Cretheus, Mnestheus and Serestus marshall their fellow Trojans to drive Turnus off. In the end, despite his victories, he fails to prevail against the men and their weapons, per tela virrosque (9.796). Turnus escapes by diving into the Tiber, and on his retreat the book draws to a close.

As well as dramatizing characters’ manipulations of the incipit, the Aeneid also gives us characters’ reactions to arma virumque and its variants. These reactions form an important part of the poem’s commentary on its relation to the Homeric epics. One of these occurs in the Underworld. Virgil’s Odyssean framework follows Homer’s Nekyia in accommodating reference to Iliadic heroes. Before Aeneas meets Deiphobus, he passes among those who had won renown in war, Thebans, Trojans, and Greeks. Iliadic notes are sounded by the heroic cast with their sonorous names. Consider line 6.483, ingemuit, Glaucumque Medontaque Thersilochumque, which is almost a transliteration of Iliad 17.216, Μέσθλην τε Γλαυ ̃κόν τε Μέδοντα τε Θερσίλοχόν τε. Or take line 6.489, at Danaum proceres Agamemnoniaque phalanges, with its Greek-sounding Danaum and phalanges and adjectival Agamemnoniae. We turn now to the reaction of these Homeric Greeks (Aen. 6.489–93):

at Danaum proceres Agamemnoniaque phalanges
ut videre virum fulgentiaque arma per umbras,
ingenti trepidare metu; pars vertere terga,
ceu quondam petiere rates, pars tollere vocem
exiguam: inceptus clamor frustratur hiantis.

But the chiefs of the Danaans and the phalanxes of Agamemnon, when they saw the hero and his armor agleam in the gloaming, they trembled with immense dread; some turned and ran as once upon a time they had made for the ships; some squeaked and gibbered, their gaping cries stuck.

As they catch sight of Aeneas and his gleaming armor through the gloom (virum fulgentiaque arma per umbras), they quake with fear. Some heroes turn to flee,

97. Over one book later, Drances addresses Aeneas in terms that vest the eponymous Aeneas rather than Turnus with title to arma virumque (11.122–25): tum senior semperque odís et crímine Drances / infensus iuventi Turno sic ore viceissim / orsa refert: ‘o fama ingens, ingentior armis, / vir Troiane . . .
as once they had fled to the ships, repulsed by Hector and Apollo in Iliad 15, a scene in which Aeneas took no part. Here, quondam is the mark of memory, pointing to a specific poetic retelling of the event.98 Others squeak and gibber like the voiceless shades of Odyssey 11. Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey tremble at the gleaming Aeneid, represented by its amalgam of virum (Odyssey) and arma (Iliad). At the beginning of the Aeneid, arma and virum occur in the order of mythical chronology, Iliadic warfare followed by the hero’s wandering. It was noted by Servius and Macrobius that this runs counter to the order of Virgil’s narrative: Odyssean wanderings followed by Virgil’s Iliad.99 Here in 6.490, as Virgil prepares to pass from his Odyssey to his Iliad, the Aeneid’s narrative order is restored, first virum then arma.

Poetic memory is in play in all these recurrences of arma virum, either on the level of the poet’s allusion to Homer or of his characters’ recollections of Homeric narrative.100 On yet another level memory is a fundamental concern of epic, a genre that aims to celebrate κλέα ἀνδρῶν. Occasionally characters within the Iliad imagine their future fame, most acutely Achilles, who has chosen to pay the price of a short life for undying renown, κλέος ἄφθιτον (II. 9.413).101 Arma virumque, which may be seen as a Latin echo of κλέα ἀνδρῶν, sometimes features in the Aeneid’s commemorative moments. At the funeral of Misenus, Aeneas places the hero’s armor on his tomb (Aen. 6.232–35):

\begin{verbatim}
  at pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum
  imponit suaque arma viro remunque tubamque
  monte sub aërio, qui nunc Misenus ab illo
dicitur aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen.
\end{verbatim}

But dutiful Aeneas set up a tomb with an immense mound, and on the hero his armor and his oar and his trumpet at the foot of the high mountain, which is now called Misenus after him, and it keeps its name throughout the ages.

The gesture has an epitaphic quality to it, especially since it involves a place-name aetiology.102 The recall of the incipit points, I think, to the commemorative function of epic.103 Later in the same book Aeneas expresses regret to Deiphobus that he was unable to find his body on leaving Troy and that he accordingly erected a cenotaph with the hero’s name and armor. Here in the absence of Deiphobus’ body we have not arma virum, but nomen et arma locum servant (6.607), with the name standing in for the hero.

Dedication of enemy spoils involves a related but contrasting kind of commemoration. At the beginning of Book 11 Aeneas consecrates the armor of Mezentius to the god of war. The breastplate has been perforated twelve times, which suggests that further wounds were inflicted on the armed corpse after the

---

98. Cf. Conte 2007, 28 for a reading of poetic memory in Aen. 2.503, quinquaginta illi thalami, spes tanta nepotum, “where illi is the mark of memory.”
99. Serv. ad Aen. 1.1: ARMA VIRUMQUE figura usitata est ut non eo ordine respondeamus quo propius
   sumus; nam prius de erroribus Aeneae dicit, post de bello. Macr. Sat. 5.2.6, with Dekel 2012, 8–27.
100. For poetic memory, see esp. Conte 1986.
102. For epitaphs in the Aeneid, see Dinter 2005.
103. For suaque arma as those of Aeneas himself, see Weber 1995, 29–30.
hero’s death, one for each book of *arma virumque*. The arms, then, disclose the fate of the man. The description contains some phrases that resonate with *arma virum: fulgentiaque induit arma* (11.6) and *telaeque trunca viri* (11.9), *trunca* being transferred from the hero to his armor. This last implies a collapsing of boundaries between the *vir* and his *arma*: normally one would expect the hero’s body rather than his armor to be described as *truncus*.

Arms may also be dedicated on occasions other than after death in battle. Aeneas dedicates the shield of Argive Abas after the Actian games in Book 3. The gesture is remarkable, since one does not usually dedicate victors’ arms (*Aen*. 3.286–88):

>aere cavo clipeum, magni gestamen Abantis, postibus adversis figo et rem carmine signo: AENEAS HAECE DFS DANAEEIS VICTORIBVS ARMA.

a shield of hollow bronze, which great Abas carried, I fasten on the front of the doorposts and seal the dedication with a verse: AENEAS [SET UP] THESE ARMS FROM THE VICTORIOUS GREEKS.

As Jocelyne Nelis-Clément and Damien Nelis point out, the act looks forward both to the representation of Actium on the shield of Aeneas within the *Aeneid*, and also to Augustus’ setting up an inscription at Actium.104 The epic *vir* dedicates *arma* with a line that begins with his own name. John Miller and Stefano Rebeggiani have also explored the potential significance of the Argive Abas as the previous owner of this shield, arguing that the dedication looks forward to the Roman conquest of Greece.105 In several ways, then, this dedication looks to the future by commemorating the past.

In all of these commemorative dedications *arma* are used to represent the *vir*. This suggests that the hero is intimately associated with, if not defined by, his armor. This can lead to humor, as when the Etruscan Tarchon snatches up the Latin Venulus, arms and all, and carries him off, *arma virumque ferens* (11.747),106 with a hint too that Tarchon is taking charge of the poem on behalf of his Trojan allies after the ravages wreaked by Camilla. The identification of men with their arms also informs two important narrative patterns in the *Aeneid*. The first of these is the symbolic relevance of the designs on a hero’s armor to that hero’s fate or role in the poem. Turnus, Aeneas, and Pallas all bear armor with images that foreshadow the development of their fates, either within the poem or in Aeneas’ case beyond it.107 The second narrative pattern is structural: the series of appropriations, generally failed or attempted, of another hero’s armor. The important issue here is the degree of success with which one hero manages to wear another’s armor. There are some important Iliadic precedents for this motif. Paris has to borrow his brother Lycaon’s breastplate for the duel with Menelaus which will be aborted (3.332–33). As Patroclus dons Achilles’ armor he leaves behind the spear that only Achilles was able to wield (16.140–42): the scene is set for ca-

---

105. Miller 1993; Rebeggiani 2013.
106. For the humor, see Horsfall 2003, ad loc.
tastrophe. Just before Achilles kills Hector, the poet has him spy a vulnerable spot on Hector’s neck that is unprotected by the armor that Hector had stripped from Patroclus on the battlefield (22.322–23). To turn to the *Aeneid*, the Trojans suffer disaster when wearing Greek armor as a ruse in Book 2 (396, 402). Euryalus is killed when betrayed by Messapus’ stolen helmet (9.366, 374), glinting in the moonlight. Camilla is killed in a moment of distraction while eyeing Chloreus’ armor (11.778–82). Finally, the closing books of the *Aeneid* are built around Virgil’s *Patrocleia*. This involves a contest over who will play the role of Achilles, including an allusive replay of the death of Hector. During Pallas’ brilliant aristeia, before he kills Halaesus, he prays to the god of the Tiber for success and promises to dedicate the victim’s arms to him (*Aen.* 10.421–23):

‘da nunc, Thybri pater, ferro, quod missile libro,
fortunam atque viam duri per pectus Halaesi.
haec arma exuviasque viri tua quercus habebit.’

“Now, Father Tiber, grant fortune to the weapon which I’m aiming, and a path through tough Halaesus’ chest. Your oak tree will have these arms and the spoils stripped from the hero.”

The poem’s incipit sounds again, qualified by the idea of the dead hero: *arma exuviasque viri*. I suggest that this particular instance looks forward to Aeneas’ killing of Turnus. Turnus is soon to kill Pallas and despoil his corpse. Virgil sounds a gong at the despoliation, and predicts a day when Turnus will regret his excessive act in a well known passage which begins *nescia mens hominum* (10.501–5). The reference is, of course, to Aeneas’ killing of Turnus. Aeneas is motivated to the poem’s last act on seeing the swordbelt of Pallas, which Turnus had failed to dedicate but rather wore himself. Aeneas might have spared the *vir*, had he not seen the *arma*.

7. Conclusion

Genette’s paratextuality has provided a way into a consideration of *arma virumque* in the *Aeneid*. Though not a paratext in the strict sense of existing outside the text, *arma virumque* sits on the margins, occupying a nodal point linking Virgil’s epic models, the theme of the *Aeneid*, Roman history, and different aspects of the poem’s reception. As was often the fate of opening words, later poets and readers adopted *arma virumque* as a kind of second title for the *Aeneid*, a term of reference. There is good reason to believe that Virgil will have expected his poem to be known by the words *arma virumque*. The detachability of the phrase outside the poem picks up on and prompts reexamination of the echoes of the phrase within the *Aeneid* itself. These are found to be complex, operating at different levels of discourse and focalization, reflecting on the *Aeneid*’s relationship with its epic models, but also on rhetorical aspects of powerplay between characters within the narrative who battle over entitlement.

How would we read the *Aeneid* if it did not begin with *arma virumque*? For many readers, especially in the Italian Renaissance, this question simply did not arise, as they were eased into *arma virumque* by an autobiographical preface that stated the transition from Virgil’s earlier works and smoothed out the challenging but poetically effective hendiadys. The most pointed later engagements with *arma virumque* (notably Ovid’s) respond to the polysemy of the phrase already within the *Aeneid*, and presuppose that *arma virumque* stood at the head of the poem.

The many variations on the *arma virumque* theme within the *Aeneid*, a feature of the title which Genette does not explicitly discuss, confirm Virgil’s highly self-reflexive poetic style. On the one hand this ludic repetition, which has its roots in Homeric practice, point in an almost Ovidian direction. On the other hand it is far from frivolous. Armor is the hero’s last bulwark before the fatal wound. Beyond the Homeric optic of life and death, Virgil’s *arma virumque* keeps discreetly on its horizons the bloody cost of Augustus’ ascendancy and his consolidation of power. The theme matters far beyond Augustus. Rome’s history is at one level a catalogue of *arma virum*, a narrative of military expansion, and this may account for the many combinations of *arma* and *viri* in the surviving books of Livy.

Genette briefly notes the sphragis of the *Georgics* and the *ille ego* proem to the *Aeneid* as forerunners to titles that indicate a work’s genre. What else is *arma virumque* if not a marker of genre that states the poem’s complex epic theme, indicating the relationship with Homer, suggesting links with its Roman context, and setting up its own repetitions within and beyond the epic. But it is also an epic building block that points to the material circumstances of book production while claiming a material status for the text of the *Aeneid*, its Homeric sources, and its Roman subject matter.
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