

## UNTITLED/*ARMA VIRUMQUE*

FIACHRA MAC GÓRÁIN

### 1. THRESHOLDS

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."<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> Some ancient

Thanks to Anna Chahoud, Lucio Del Corso, Carlotta Dionisotti, Denis Feeney, Elena Giusti, Laura Jansen, Ahuvia Kahane, Andrew Laird, Charles Martindale, Cillian O'Hogan, Donncha O'Rourke, Alessandro Schiesaro, Fabio Stok, Daniel Vallat, Cliff Weber, Pamela Zimm, the readers for *CP*, and audiences in Dublin, London, and Newcastle. I cite Mynors' 1972 text of Virgil, and translations are my own.

1. Genette 1997, 1–2.

2. *G.* 3.13, 16; *Vit. Verg.* 24; *alia levissimis versibus veluti fulsit, quos per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent.* For similar masonic terminology, see *Macr. Sat.* 5.2.8, *ubi ad ianuam narrandi venit*, with reference to *Aen.* 1.34–35.

3. Genette 1997, 99–100.

*Classical Philology* 113 (2018): 423–448

[© 2018 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.] 0009-837X/18/11304-0003\$10.00

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.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Alain Deremetz invokes Genette in relation to Plautine prologues as statements of literary self-positioning.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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."<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

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.<sup>9</sup> Sometimes this is done explicitly, as in Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue, Horace's *Satires*, or Ovid's *Tristia*; at other times the commentary is imma-

4. Fredouille 1997.

5. Deremetz 1995, 73–81; see also Jansen 2012a and 2012b; Peirano 2013; Martelli 2013, 13–18, 35–37; Kallendorf 2015, 25.

6. Butterfield 2013, 136–202.

7. Liddell and Low 2013; see one mention of Genette at p. 367; see Cooley 2014, 143–44. Without invoking Genette explicitly, Butler (2011) is concerned with the materiality of texts and its importance for meaning and interpretation.

8. Jansen 2014.

9. For Catullus, see Kennedy 2014.

ment, 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.<sup>10</sup> The present article shares much of the outlook of *The Roman Paratext* and is partly a response to it.

## 2. TITLE AND INCIPIIT

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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> In one chapter (2.116) Herodotus refers separately to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aristeia of Diomedes*, a content-describing

10. For introductory comments on titlature and interpretation, see Jansen 2014, 2–4.

11. Serv. *Aen.* 1. praef. 88–90: *sciendum praeterea est quod, sicut nunc dicturi thema proponimus, ita veteres incipiebant carmen a titulo carminis sui, ut puta "arma virumque cano."*

12. Serv. *Aen.* 1. praef. 61: *titulus est Aeneis, derivativum nomen ab Aenea, ut a Theseo Theseis*. For a history of the word *titulus*, see Castelli 2016.

13. On ancient titlature, see Horsfall 1981; Ballester 1990; Fredouille 1997; Tombeur 1997; Schröder 1999; Borgo 2007; Fioretti 2015.

14. For citation by episode title, Richardson (1993, 20) and Jensen (1999, 10) refer to Hdt. 2.116; Thuc. 1.9.4 and 1.10.4; Pl. *Cra.* 428C; *Ion* 539B; *Resp.* 614B; Arist. *Poet.* 1454b30, 1455a2; *Rh.* 1417a13.

episode title.<sup>15</sup> Later papyri give a final title at the end of a book roll, for example, with the subscription formula “ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΧΕΙ ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Γ’” at the end of Book 3.<sup>16</sup> The indirect tradition cites Hesiod’s *Theogony* in a wide variety of ways, suggesting that the title had not been stabilized.<sup>17</sup> 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 “ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΩΝ” followed by a book number and “ΒΑΚΧΥΛΙΔΟΥ ΔΙΘΥΡΑΜΒΟΙ.”<sup>18</sup> 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 agri cultura*, and sometimes as *De re rustica* or *De rebus rusticis*.<sup>19</sup> 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*?”<sup>20</sup> 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.”<sup>21</sup> The same holds for Genette’s many forebears in *titrologie*.<sup>22</sup> A title may identify or describe the work, carry stylistic connotations, indicate the genre, and tempt or repel the reader.<sup>23</sup> “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*.”<sup>24</sup> Ancient Virgil criticism concurs, at least to judge by the Suetonian-Donatan biography and comments by Servius.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> The practice has good pedigree within the Virgilian

15. Herodotus ascribes *Il.* 6.289–92 to *Diomèdeous Aristieîê*, the episode, title of *Iliad* 5. For the non-correspondence of Homeric books and episodes, see S. West and M. West in Jensen 1999, 68–69. For an ancient list of episode titles for the Homeric epics, including *Doloneia*, *Nekyia*, etc., see Ael. *VH* 13.14.

16. See Schironi 2010, 20–24.

17. See Muetzell 1833, 353–65.

18. See Schironi 2010, 61–75; Caroli 2007, 199; Prodi 2016; for tragedy, see Meccariello 2016.

19. On pre-Ciceronian titles in Latin, see Daly 1943.

20. Genette 1997, 2; on titles, see 55–105; 55 n. 1 on Genette’s predecessors in *titrologie*.

21. Genette 1997, 67.

22. See Genette 1997, 55 n. 1; on intertitles in *Amm. Marc.*, see Rees 2014.

23. See Whitmarsh 2005 for the expectations generated by the titles of ancient Greek novels.

24. Eco 1994, 2, quoted by Genette 1997, 93.

25. Serv. *Aen.* 1. *praef.* 1: *In exponendis auctoribus haec consideranda sunt: poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum, explanatio.* See also *Vit. Verg.* 47: *Ante opus titulus causa intentio. “Titulus,” in quo quaeritur cuius sit, quid sit.* For titles and the interpretation of ancient texts, see Fredouille 1997, 385–96.

26. See Jansen 2014, 2 for the interpretation of untitled artworks in galleries.

27. See Scaliger, *Poet.* 5: 17; Bentley 1825, 436–37 on *Hor. Sat.* 1.3.7; Jahn 1843, 103–4 on *Pers. Sat.* 1.96; West 1966, 150 on *Hes. Theog.* 1; Jocelyn 1967, 350 n. 4; Kenney 1970; Schröder 1999, 16–20; Borgo 2007.

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 ἐστὶν ἀρχή, especially in the case of lyric poems, which generally had no titles.<sup>28</sup> Virgil will have known Callimachus' *Pinakes*, which sometimes identified a work by author, genre, and opening words.<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup>

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 hirsutus illis—  
facta sit unde parens Iliā, nempe leget.  
sumpserit “Aeneadum genitrix” ubi prima, requiret,  
Aeneadum genitrix unde sit alma Venus.

If she picks up the *Annals*—there's no shaggier work—then she'll definitely read about how Iliā 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 genitrix*, doubtless because Ovid wishes to exploit the sexual connotations of *genitrix*. Furthermore, Ovid's idiom *sumpserit Annales*, *sumpserit “Aeneadum genitrix,”* 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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> We even have depictions

28. Nachmansohn 1941, 37–43.

29. See Callimachus frags. 436, 443, 444, 449 Pf.; Wendel 1949, 32–34; Pfeiffer 1968, 126–29; Holtz 1997, 470–74; for the antiquity of citation by incipit, see Holtz 1997, 474–77.

30. On the difference between title and incipit, see Wendel 1949, 29–34; Holtz 1997; Schröder 1999, 16–20.

31. See Dorandi 1984; Del Corso 2003; Caroli 2007; Schironi 2010; for MSS, see Fredouille 1997 and Fioretti 2015.

32. Athen. *Deipn.* 4.57.26–27: ὄψαρυς, ὅς φησι τοῦπίτυραμμα. See Arnott 1996, 409: “probably written on the back of the opening columns of rolls rather than as later attached on a parchment tag.”

33. *Tr.* 1.1.109–10: *cetera turba palam titulos ostendet apertos / et sua detecta nomina fronte geret.*

of titles, and sometimes of labels, on papyrus rolls from classical Greek vase painting to Italian wall painting.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> 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-Donatan 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 parent 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.<sup>37</sup> 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 titlature 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.

37. Ribbeck 1866, 90; Brandt 1928; Austin 1968; Kenney 1970; Bloch 1970, 206–7; La Penna 1985; Conte 1986, 84–87; Koster 1988; Gamberale 1991; Horsfall 1995, 24; Theodorakopoulos 1997; Mondin 2007; Kayachev 2011; Ziolkowski and Putnam 2008, 22–25; Laird 2009; Scafoglio 2010, 11–30; Kraggerud 2010/2011; Peirano 2013, 273–74; Power 2017.

mentary on the *Aeneid* with *arma virumque*.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup> 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).<sup>40</sup> Andrew Laird argues that the lines dramatize the presence of the poet who speaks or sings *cano* and the poem that follows.<sup>41</sup> Irene Peirano compares them to other paratexts that buttress the authority of the speaker.<sup>42</sup> 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,<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup> Servius reports vigorous debate over the meaning of the phrase, and why Virgil began his poem with *arma*.<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup> What happens to the hero

38. Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.1; for Prisc. see Gamberale 1991, 974 n. 56; Scaliger, *Poet.* 1: 56; 3: 26; 4: 7; 5: 17; Heyne-Wagner 1832, 1: 58–60; Henry 1873, esp. 2–27, quoting Prisc. at p. 4; Forbiger 1873 2: 2–4; Conington and Nettleship 1877, 2–3.

39. Scaliger, *Poet.* 5: 17: *Veritus enim plagiariorum temeritatem tum hic [G. 4.563] nomen posuit suum, tum pudenter innuit initio divini operis: "Ille ego . . . arma virumque cano . . ." Quae qui abstulere suam faciunt Aeneidem, non Maronis.*

40. Genette 1997, 99–100; similarly, Theodorakopoulos (1997, 160–62) argues that allusion to the sphragis and other self-referential utterances forges coherence and closure across the book of Virgil.

41. Laird 2009, 5–6.

42. Peirano 2013, 273–74.

43. La Penna 1985, 81–83.

44. Henry 1873, 5.

45. Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.1.1: *ARMA multi varie disserunt cur ab armis Vergilius coeperit. Fulg. (Exp. Verg. Cont. 87) interpreted the words allegorically, understanding arma as virtus and vir as sapientia.*

46. Anderson 1969, 5–10; Putnam 1985; Abbot 2012.

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*.<sup>47</sup> 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,<sup>48</sup> 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* “*Aeneadam 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.<sup>49</sup> Interestingly, the epic is cited by both title and opening words.<sup>50</sup> 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*.<sup>51</sup> The epic may have “belonged” to Augustus (*tuae . . . 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.<sup>52</sup> 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-*

47. Ribbeck 1895, 2–3; Geymonat 1973, 126; Scafoglio 2010, 13; Ziolkowski 2014.

48. See Prop. 2.34.63: *Aeneae Troiani . . . arma* with O’Rourke 2011; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.1 *Arma*, with Barchiesi 1997a, 16–17 and McKeown 1987, 72, 106–7; also Ov. *Am.* 1.15.25: *Aeneiaque arma*.

49. I build here on Ingleheart 2010, 384–85.

50. Jacobson 1990.

51. Ov. *Her.* 7.133–38, with Casali 2004–5.

52. Stat. *Theb.* 7.120; Sil. *Pun.* 7.8, with Littlewood 2011; also 8.662, 9.100, 10.505. On Silius’ uses of *arma virumque*, see Landrey 2014.



tur, Virgil. Against this literary context Eulalia, one of Prudentius' martyrs, displays her epic prowess as she, though a woman, challenges the arms of men (*femina provocat arma virum*), invoking as she does so the heroic authority of the *Aeneid*.<sup>53</sup> It is both curious and appropriate that post-Virgilian writers should see *arma virumque* as a condensation of the *Aeneid*, when in Virgil the phrase is so fertile with meaning. It strikes many notes at its first occurrence in Book 1, and continues to accrue resonances until the last page of the epic.

### 5. ARMA VIRUMQUE AT AENEID 1.1

*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*.<sup>54</sup> *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).<sup>55</sup> Phonetically, *arma* may hark back to Odyssean ἄνδρα,<sup>56</sup> 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*.<sup>57</sup> 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, ἄειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν.<sup>58</sup> (Even though *virum* is accusative and ἀνδρῶν gen-

53. Prudent. *Perist.* 3.35, with O'Hogan 2016, 42–43. See also O'Daly 2012, 161 on Prudent. *Cath.* 5.49–50. For further examples from Horace and Ovid, see Bloch 1970, 210–11; see also Pers. 1.96; Mart. 8.55.19–20, 14.185; Sid. Apoll. 3.4; and Claud. *Cons. Hon.* 364, with Ware 2015. For *arma virumque* and other Virgilian quotations in Pompeian graffiti, see Ziolkowski and Putnam 2008, 42–43; Milnor 2014, 233–62; for other non-literary evidence, see Horsfall 1995, 249–55. For the use of *arma virumque* or its variants to translate Iliadic μῆνιν in Hellenistic epigram, see McGill 2006.

54. *Vit. Verg.* 31 Brugnoli and Stok: *Augustus vero, nam forte expeditione Cantabrica aberat, supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris efflagitaret, "ut sibi de Aeneide," ut ipsius verba sunt, "vel prima carminis ὑπογραφή, vel quodlibet κῶλον mitteretur."* *Macr. Sat.* 1.24.10–11: *ipsius enim Maronis epistula, qua compellat Augustum, ita incipit: "ego vero frequentes a te litteras accipio" et infra "de Aenea quidem meo, si mehercle iam dignum auribus haberem tuis, libenter mitterem etc."* Deufert (2013) argues that the latter is a rhetorical prosopopoeitic pseudopigraphon. F. Stok (*per litt.*, August 31, 2015) finds Deufert's arguments convincing and would now print *ut sibi de Aeneide* at *Vit. Verg.* 31 without quotation marks. See further Horsfall 1995, 2 nn. 17, 18; Cugusi 1979, 487–89.

55. For the *Odyssey* as dominant structural model, see Cairns 1989, 177–214.

56. Cairns 1989, 191.

57. Dekel 2012; preceded by Barchiesi 2015, 106–9 [1984, 93–96] and Nelis 2001, 3, on Virgil reading "the *Iliad* through an Odyssean filter." See also Weber 1987, 269–71 for a metrical perspective on allusion to both epics in the poem's incipit.

58. See Knauer 1964, 412, with reference to Cretheus at *Aen.* 9.777.

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 ἀνδρῶν, describing the phrases as a “heroisches Leitmotif.”<sup>59</sup>

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 / prosiliuit dicenda, Epist. 1.19.8*).<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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.”<sup>62</sup> 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 (*residesque 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.<sup>63</sup>

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.<sup>64</sup> 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, Cynthia aurem / vellit, etc., Ecl. 6.3–4*), 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 descried 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*).<sup>65</sup> 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

59. Bloch 1970; see also Conte 1986, 72.

60. Norden 1915, 172–73; 1970, 368 n. 2; for disagreement, see Wigodsky 1972, 123; the closest fragments are 8.267 Sk, *tela virorum*; and 16.403 Sk, *vetusta virum . . . bella*. Cf. Ennius in Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34: *Aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam: / Hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum*. Cf. *heroum laudes* at *Ecl.* 4.26.

61. Conte 1986, 74.

62. Horsfall 2013, 569.

63. See Livy 1.20; Ov. *Fast.* 3.373–77; on Tullus being equipped with *arma vir-*, see Barchiesi 1997a, 175–76.

64. *G.* 3.16, 46–47.

65. Froesch 1991, suggesting also a link with Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*.

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 virtues; he began to do so once his power had been established.<sup>66</sup> 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. Μῆνιν recurs sparingly in the *Iliad*, but when it does, it always refers to the wrath of Achilles or of a god.<sup>67</sup> Ahuvia Kahane has argued that "in the *Odyssey*, verse-initial (accusative) attestations of ἄνδρα carry a subliminal reference to 'Odysseus.'" <sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup> She notes that this phenomenon is replicated on a smaller scale in the songs of Phemius and Demodocus.<sup>70</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup> 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*.<sup>72</sup> In this respect Virgil follows Homeric practice. Occasionally these repetitions seem without particular point beyond being appropriate to a martial context.<sup>73</sup> In themselves these cases are interesting, as they show Virgil imitating a signature style of formulaic repetition that gives the *Aeneid* a Homeric feel.<sup>74</sup> 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."<sup>75</sup> The remainder of this article will mostly present close readings of the recurrences of *arma virumque* in the *Aeneid*.<sup>76</sup>

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

66. See *RGDA* 6, 13–20; Zanker 1988, 95–98; Galinsky 1996, 80–82; Dowling 2006, 309 n. 14.

67. *Il.* 1.1, 1.75, 5.34, 5.444, 9.517, 13.624, 16.711, 19.39, 19.75.

68. Kahane 1992, 115, with Fowler 1997, 20 on the inevitable Virgilian resonances of *arma* after Virgil.

69. Jong 1996, 20.

70. See 1.326: ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδε; 8.75: νεῖκος Ὀδυσσεῖος καὶ Πηλεΐδῳ Ἀχιλλῆος; 8.267: ἄμφ' Ἄρεος φιλότιτος εὐστεφάνου τ' Ἀφροδίτης; 8.492–93: καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον / δοῦρατέου.

71. On the unity of the Homeric epics, see Arist. *Poet.* 8.1451a, 26.14.1462b; Cairns 1989, 184.

72. See Serv. Dan. ad *Aen.* 1.1 *ARMA alii ideo "arma" hoc loco proprie dicta accipiunt [ . . . ] quod prope semper armis virum subiungit, ut "arma virumque ferens" [11.747] et "arma acri facienda viro" [8.441].*

73. E.g., at 2.668, 11.696.

74. See Barchiesi 2015, 110–18 on Virgil's Homeric repetitions as imparting an epic savor.

75. Oliensis 2004, 31.

76. Scholarship on *arma virumque* in the *Aeneid* includes Anderson 1969, 5–10; Bloch 1970; Conte 1986, 70–77; Weber 1987; Hardie 1994 on *Aen.* 9.57; Barchiesi 1997a, 16–23; Oliensis 2004; Abbot 2012.

somewhat widely accepted that Juno begins her wrathful soliloquy with a sonic quotation of μήνιν, the first word of the *Iliad* (*Aen.* 1.36–37):<sup>77</sup>

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 ktistic 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 μήνιν ἄειδε θεά, taking charge of the role of muse to enunciate her own μήνιν. 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 ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis  
Tydide! **mene Iliacis** occumbere campis  
non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra,  
saevus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens  
Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis  
**scuta virum** galeasque et fortia 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 μήνιν. On the one hand, his exclamatory wish is 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 counterclaim 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.<sup>78</sup> Aeneas’ responses to Juno’s apertural rhetoric already anticipates this process. (A parenthetical observation: having attempted to secure his Iliadic inheritance, Aeneas will later refrain from wearying his mother with the “annals” of Trojan misfortunes at *Aeneid*

77. See Levitan 1993; O’Hara 1996, 116; on Silius’ reception of the allusion, see Trinacty 2012. Skeptical: Conte 2017, 55–56.

78. Quint 1993.

1.373.<sup>79</sup> *Annalis* may allude to the title of Ennius' epic, another nod to a poetic "road not taken."<sup>80</sup>

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.<sup>81</sup> 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 sensitize us to the potential significance of later focalizers of *arma virum(que)*, and their rhetorical purpose in echoing the tag.<sup>82</sup>

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  
conspexere, 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 . . .

79. *Aen.* 1.372–73: 'O dea, si prima repetens ab origine pergam / et vacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum . . .

80. See Barchiesi 1997b, 275.

81. Oliensis 2004, 31–32.

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.’”<sup>83</sup> Nelis is not unusual in reading the simile as pointing to both Augustus and Aeneas as statesmen;<sup>84</sup> 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*.<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup>

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.<sup>87</sup> 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 acri 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* (*Aeneadum 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.<sup>88</sup> 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,

83. Nelis 2011, 282 (emphases original).

84. See Beck 2014, 74 for suggestions of specific historical statesmen in this simile.

85. Galinsky 1996, 21.

86. There is a disjunctive and yet intimate relationship between *virī* and *arma* in the prooemium to the catalogue of Italian warriors. The muses remember and can relate . . . *quibus Itala iam tum / floruerit terra alma viris, quibus arserit armis* (7.643–44). The relationship is disjunctive because the land’s flourishing with men and its burning with warfare would seem to be alternatives; and yet intimate, because it is the farmers who turn from the land (*Itala terra alma*) to warfare (7.635–40).

87. See J. Farrell’s forthcoming work on Juno’s *Aeneid*.

88. See Barchiesi 1997b, 276.

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 perii, super imponas: abolere 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*.<sup>89</sup> 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).<sup>90</sup> 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.

90. Cf. *Il.* 7.303; Soph. *Aj.* 660.

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 viri*. In addition she wishes to abolish the memory of Aeneas: his *monumenta*, which can also refer to poetic works,<sup>91</sup> 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 Hannibal 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.<sup>92</sup> Three of these have a bearing on Turnus' performance as a general and soldier and all of them represent significant 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 rousing speech and hurls his javelin into the air. His speech is favorably received (*Aen.* 9.54–57):

clamorem excipiunt socii fremituque 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 morning of his aristeia he rouses his men to arms, himself girt in arms (*Aen.* 9.461–63):

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

91. *OLD*, s.v. *monumentum* 4, 5.

92. I build here on Hardie (1994) on 9.57, 462, 620, and 777.



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 Berecynthia Matris  
Idaiae: 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).<sup>93</sup> 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*.<sup>94</sup>

The last victim of Turnus' *aristeia* is the poet Cretheus, lamented in an obituary that concludes a catalogue (*Aen.* 9.774–77):<sup>95</sup>

et Clytium Aeoliden et amicum Crethea Musis,  
Crethea Musarum comitem, cui carmina semper  
et citharae 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 epanalepsis of *Crethea*, anaphora of *semper*, and chiasmic 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.<sup>96</sup> Beyond this, it is as though Turnus wishes to remove the Trojan poet, obliterating the memory of Trojan heroes' deaths, and leaving them uncommemorated. Immediately after the death of Cretheus, Mnestheus and Serestus marshal 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 virosque* (9.796). Turnus escapes by diving into the Tiber, and on his retreat the book draws to a close.<sup>97</sup>

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 Γλαῦκόν τε Μέδοντά τε Θερσίλοχόν τε. Or take line 6.489, *at Danaum proceres Agamemnoniaeque 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 Agamemnoniaeque 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 a gleam** 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,

96. Similarly Hine 1987, 182; Gale 2003, 348; cf. *Ecl.* 9.11–13.

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 odiis et crimine Drances / infensus iuveni Turno sic ore vicissim / 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.<sup>98</sup> 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*.<sup>99</sup> 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.<sup>100</sup> 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 (*Il.* 9.413).<sup>101</sup> *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 Misenu, Aeneas places the hero's armor on his tomb (*Aen.* 6.232–35):

at pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum  
imponit suaque **arma viro** remumque tubamque  
monte sub aërio, qui nunc Misenu ab illo  
dicitur aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen.

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 Misenu 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.<sup>102</sup> The recall of the incipit points, I think, to the commemorative function of epic.<sup>103</sup> 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 proposuimus; 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.

101. See also *Il.* 6.357–58; 7.91; 9.413; 12.322–28; Nagy 1997, 506–76.

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 *telaque 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 HAEC DE DANAIS 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 VIC-  
TORIOUS 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.<sup>104</sup> The epic *vir* dedicates *arma* with a line that begins with his own name. John Miller and Stefano Rebggiani 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.<sup>105</sup> 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),<sup>106</sup> 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.<sup>107</sup> 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-

104. Nelis-Clément and Nelis 2013.

105. Miller 1993; Rebggiani 2013.

106. For the humor, see Horsfall 2003, ad loc.

107. See Gale 1997 on Turnus; Harrison 1998 on Pallas; for Aeneas, see 8.626–29 and 729–31.

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 Chlorus' armor (11.778–82).<sup>108</sup> 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.<sup>109</sup> 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*.<sup>110</sup>

## 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.

108. See Hornsby 1966; Horsfall 1995, 176–77.

109. Cf. also *Aen.* 12.946, *exuvias*.

110. Putnam 1985, 1 and *passim*; Barchiesi 2015, 45–59, 79–80.

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.<sup>111</sup> 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.

*University College London*

111. Genette 1997, 99–100.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Abbot, James C., Jr. 2012. *Arma virumque*. *CJ* 108: 37–63.
- Anderson, William S. 1969. *The Art of the "Aeneid"*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Arnott, W. Geoffrey. 1996. *Alexis: The Fragments; A Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Austin, R. G. 1968. *Ille ego qui quondam . . . CQ* 1: 107–15.
- Ballester, Xaverio. 1990. La titulación de las obras en la literatura romana. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 24: 135–56.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1984. *La traccia del modello: Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa.
- . 1997a. *The Poet and the Prince*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- . 1997b. Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis. In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. Charles Martindale, 271–81. Cambridge.
- . 2015. *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative*. Trans. Ilaria Marchesi and Matt Fox. Princeton, NJ.

- Beck, Deborah. 2014. The First Simile of the *Aeneid*. *Vergilius* 60: 67–83.
- Bentley, Richard. 1825. *Notae atque Emendationes in Q. Horatium Flaccum Integrae*. Quedlinburg.
- Birt, Theodor. 1882. *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Litteratur*. Berlin.
- Bloch, Alfred. 1970. Arma virumque als heroisches Leitmotiv. *MH* 27: 206–11.
- Borgo, Antonella. 2007. Quando il libro si presenta da sè: *Arma virumque* e i titoli delle opere antiche. *Aevum* 81: 133–47.
- Brandt, Edward. 1928. Zum Aeneis-Prooemium. *Philologus* 83: 331–35.
- Brugnoli, Georgius, and Fabius Stok, eds. 1997. *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*. Rome.
- Butler, Shane. 2011. *The Matter of the Page*. Madison, WI.
- Butterfield, David. 2013. *The Early Textual History of Lucretius* “De rerum natura.” Cambridge.
- Cairns, Francis. 1989. *Virgil’s Augustan Epic*. Cambridge.
- Caroli, Menico. 2007. *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio*. Bari.
- Casali, Sergio. 2004–5. Further voices in Ovid *Heroides* 7. *Hermathena* 177–78: 147–64.
- Castelli, Emanuele. 2016. *Titulus*: Un contributo alla storia della parola nel mondo romano. *TYCHE* 31: 52–73.
- Conington, John, and Henry Nettleship, eds. 1877. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera.*, Ed. J. Conington, vol. 2, 3rd ed., revised by H. Nettleship. London.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation*. Ithaca, NY.
- . 2007. *The Poetry of Pathos*. Ed. S. J. Harrison. Oxford.
- . 2017. *Stealing the Club from Hercules: On Imitation in Latin Poetry*. Berlin.
- Cooley, Alison E. 2014. Paratextual Perspectives upon the *SC de Pisone Patre*. In Jansen 2014, 143–55.
- Cugusi, Paolo, ed. 1979. *Epistolographi Latini Minores*. Vol. 2, *Aetatem Ciceronianam et Augusteam Amplectens: 2 Commentarium Criticum*. Turin.
- Curtis, Lauren. 2017. War Music: Soundscape and Song in Vergil, *Aeneid* 9. *Vergilius* 63: 3–26.
- Daly, Lloyd. 1943. The Entitulation of Pre-Ciceronian Writings. In *Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather: Presented by a Committee of His Former Students and Colleagues*, 20–38. Urbana, IL.
- Dekel, Edan. 2012. *Virgil’s Homeric Lens*. New York.
- Del Corso, Lucio. 2003. Materiali per una protostoria del libro e delle pratiche di lettura nel mondo greco. *Segno e Testo* 1: 5–78.
- Derda, Tomasz, Adam Łatjar, Jakub Urbanik, in cooperation with Grzegorz Ochoła and Andrzej Mironczuk, eds. 2016. *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology: Warsaw, 29 July–3 August 2013*. Warsaw.
- Deremetz, Alain. 1995. *Le miroir des muses: Poétiques de la réflexivité à Rome*. Paris.
- Deufert, Marcus. 2013. Vergilische Prosa? Überlegungen zu Macr. Sat. 1, 24, 11. *Hermes* 141: 331–50.
- Dinter, Martin. 2005. Epic and Epigram—Minor Heroes in Virgil’s *Aeneid*. *CQ* 55: 153–69.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. 1984. Sillyboi. *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8: 185–99.
- Dowling, Melissa. B. 2006. *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Eco, Umberto. 1994. *Reflections on “The Name of the Rose.”* Trans. William Weaver. London.
- Fioretti, Paolo. 2015. Sul paratesto nel libro manoscritto (con qualche riflessione sui ‘titoli’ in età antica). In *Papyrologica Florentina XLIV: Nel segno del testo; Edizioni, materiali e studi per Oronzo Pecere*, ed. Lucio Del Corso, Franco De Vivo, and Antonio Stramaglia, 179–202. Florence.
- Forbiger, Albert. 1873. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*<sup>4</sup>. Leipzig.
- Fowler, Don P. 1997. On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies. *Materiali e discussioni* 39: 13–34.
- Fratantuono, Lee, and Chelsea Faxon. 2013. *Arma atque uirum*: Turnus’ Killing of Virgil in *Aeneid* IX. *Latomus* 72: 400–411.
- Fredouille, Jean-Claude, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Philippe Hoffmann, Pierre Petitmengin, avec la collaboration de Simone Deléani, eds. 1997. *Titres et articulations du texte dans les œuvres antiques*. Paris.

- Froesch, Hartmut. 1991. *Arma virumque cano*: Beobachtungen zu den Eingangswörtern der Aeneis. *Anregung* 37: 309–12.
- Gale, Monica R. 1997. The Shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7.783–92). *GaR* 44: 176–96.
- . 2003. Poetry and the Backward Glance in Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. *TAPA* 133: 323–52.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, NJ.
- Gamberale, Leopoldo. 1991. Il cosiddetto 'preproemio' dell'Eneide. In *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco*, vol. 2, 963–80. Palermo.
- Genette, Gérard. 1972. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Oxford.
- . [1987] 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. J. E. Lewin. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Geymonat, Mario, ed. 1973. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Turin.
- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- . 1994. *Virgil: "Aeneid" IX*. Cambridge.
- Harrison, Stephen J. 1998. The Sword-Belt of Pallas (*Aeneid* X.495–505): Moral Symbolism and Political Ideology. In *Virgil's "Aeneid": Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.-P. Stahl, 223–42. Swansea.
- Henry, James. 1873. *Aeneidea I*. London.
- Heyne, Christian G., and Georg P. E. Wagner, eds. 1832. *P. V. Maronis Opera*. Leipzig.
- Hine, Harry. 1987. Aeneas and the Arts. In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie, and Mary Whitby, 173–83. Bristol.
- Holtz, Louis. 1997. Titre et incipit. In *Fredouille 1997*, 469–89.
- Hornsby, Roger A. 1966. The Armor of the Slain. *Philological Quarterly* 45: 347–59.
- Horsfall, Nicholas M. 1981. Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History. *BICS* 28: 103–14.
- , ed. 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden.
- . 2003. *Virgil: "Aeneid" 11; A Commentary*. Leiden.
- . 2013. *Virgil: "Aeneid" 6; A Commentary*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Ingleheart, Jennifer. 2010. *A Commentary on Ovid, "Tristia," Book 2*. Oxford.
- Jacobson, Howard. 1990. Ovid. *Tr.* 2, 535. *Mnemosyne* 43: 452–53.
- Jahn, Otto. 1843. *A. Persii Flacci, D. Iunii Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae Saturae*. Berlin.
- Jansen, Laura. 2012a. On the Edge of the Text: Preface and Reader in Ovid's *Amores*. *Helios* 39: 1–28.
- . 2012b. Ovidian Paratexts: Editorial Postscript and Readers in *Ex Ponto* 3.9. *MD* 68: 81–110.
- , ed. 2014. *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*. Cambridge.
- Jensen, Minna S., ed. 1999. Dividing Homer: When and How Were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Divided into Songs? *SymbOslo* 74: 5–91.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Jong, Irene J. F. de. 1996. Sunsets and Sunrises in Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes: Book Divisions and Beyond. *Dialogos* 3: 20–35.
- Kahane, Ahuvia. 1992. The First Word of the *Odyssey*. *TAPA* 122: 115–31.
- Kallendorf, Craig. 2015. *The Protean Virgil: Material Form and the Reception of the Classics*. Oxford.
- Kayachev, Boris. 2011. *Ille ego qui quondam*: Genre, Date, and Authorship. *Vergilius* 57: 75–82.
- Keith, Alison. 2000. *Engendering Rome*. Cambridge.
- Kennedy, Duncan F. 2014. Crossing the Threshold: Genette, Catullus and the Psychodynamics of Paratextuality. In *Jansen 2014*, 19–32.
- Kenny, Edward J. 1970. That Incomparable Poem the 'Ille Ego'? *CR* 20: 290.
- Knauer, G. N. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen.



- Koster, Severin. 1988. ILLE EGO QUI or ARMA VIRUM? In *Ille ego qui: Dichter zwischen Wort und Macht*, 31–47. Erlanger Forschungen Reihe A, Geisteswissenschaften 42. Erlangen.
- Kraggerud, Egil. 2010/2011. The False Incipit of the *Aeneid* and *arma virumque cano*. *Eranos* 106: 90–92.
- La Cerda, Juan L. de 1619. *Publii Virgilio Maronis Opera*. 3 vols. Lyons.
- Laird, Andrew. 2009. Virgil: Reception and the Myth of Biography. *Cento Pagine* 3: 1–9.
- Landrey, Leo. 2014. Skeletons in Armor: The *Aeneid*'s Proem and Silius Italicus' *Punica*. *AJP* 135: 599–633.
- La Penna, Antonio. 1985. *Ille ego qui quondam* e i raccordi editoriali nell'antichità. *SIFC* 3: 76–91.
- Levitan, William. 1993. Give Up the Beginning? Juno's Mindful Wrath (*Aeneid* 1.37). *LCM* 18: 14.
- Liddell, Peter, and Polly Low, eds. 2013. *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*. Oxford.
- Littlewood, R. J. 2011. *Silius: "Punica" VII*. Oxford.
- Lowe, E. A. 1925. Some Facts about Our Oldest Latin Manuscripts. *CQ* 19: 197–208.
- . 1928. More Facts about Our Oldest Latin Manuscripts. *CQ* 22: 43–62.
- Martelli, Francesca. 2013. *Ovid's Revisions: The Editor as Author*. Cambridge.
- Martindale, Charles. ed. 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge.
- McGill, Scott. 2006. *Menin virumque*: Translating Homer with Virgil in *Epigrammata Bobiensia* 46, 47 and 64. *CJ* 101: 425–31.
- McKeown, James C., ed. 1987. *Ovid: "Amores"; Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes*. Vol. 1, *Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool.
- Meccariello, Chiara. 2016. Title, ἀρχή, ὑπόθεσις: Notes on the Heading and Arrangement of the Tragic Hypotheses on Papyrus. In Derda et al. 2016, 1185–1200.
- Miller, John. 1993. The Shield of Argive Abas at *Aeneid* 3.286. *CQ* 43: 44–50.
- Milnor, Kristina. 2014. *Graffiti and the Literary Landscape in Roman Pompeii*. Oxford.
- Mondin, Luca. 2007. Ipotesi sopra il falso proemia dell'*Eneide*. *Cento Pagine* 1: 64–78.
- Muetzell, Wilhelm J. C. 1833. *De Emendatione Theogoniae Hesiodaeae Libri Tres*. Leipzig.
- Munk Olsen, Birger. 1997. Les titres dans les manuscrits des poètes classiques latins copiés du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. In Fredouille 1997, 511–27.
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1972. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*<sup>2</sup>. Oxford.
- Nachmanson, Ernst. 1941. *Der griechische Buchtitel: Einige Beobachtungen*. Göteborg.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1997. *The Best of the Achaeans*<sup>2</sup>. Baltimore, MD.
- Nelis, Damien P. 2001. *Virgil's "Aeneid" and the "Argonautica" of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds.
- . 2011. Didactic Voices in Vergil's *Aeneid*. In *Vox poetae: Manifestations auctoriales dans l'épopée gréco-latine*, ed. Emmanuelle Raymond, 275–83. Paris.
- Nelis-Clément, Jocelyne, and Damien Nelis. 2013. *Furor Epigraphicus: Augustus, the Poets, and the Inscriptions*. In Liddell and Low 2013, 317–48.
- Norden, Eduard. 1915. *Ennius und Vergilius: Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit*. Leipzig.
- . 1970. *P. Vergilius Maro: "Aeneis"; Buch VI*<sup>5</sup>. Darmstadt.
- O'Daly, Gerard. 2012. *Days Linked by Song: Prudentius' "Cathemerinon"*. Oxford.
- O'Hara, James J. 1996. *True Names: Virgil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Word-play*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- O'Hogan, Cillian. 2016. *Prudentius and the Landscapes of Late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Oliensis, Ellen. 2004. Sibylline Syllables: The Intratextual *Aeneid*. *PCPS* 50: 29–45.
- Oliver, Revilo P. 1951. The First Medicean MS of Tacitus and the Titulature of Ancient Books. *TAPA* 82: 232–61.
- O'Rourke, Donncha. 2011. The Representation and Misrepresentation of Virgilian Poetry in Propertius 2.34. *AJP* 132: 457–97.
- Owen, Wilfred. 1965. *The Collected Poems of Wilfred Owen*. London.

- Peirano, Irene. 2013. *Ille ego qui quondam*: On Authorial (An)onymity. In *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, ed. Anna Marmodoro and Jonathan Hill, 251–85. Oxford.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Power, Timothy. 2017. Vergil's Citharodes: Cretheus and Iopas Reconsidered. *Vergilius* 63: 93–123.
- Prodi, Enrico Emanuele. 2016. Titles and Markers of Poem-End in the Papyri of Greek Choral Lyric. In Derda et al. 2016, 1137–84.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1985. Possessiveness, Sexuality, and Heroism in the *Aeneid*. *Vergilius* 31: 1–21.
- Quint, David. 1993. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton, NJ.
- Rebeggiani, Stefano. 2013. *De Danais Victoribus*: Virgil's Shield of Abas and the Conquest of Greece. *SIFC* 11: 82–106.
- Rees, Roger. 2014. Intertitles as Deliberate Misinformation in Ammianus Marcellinus. In Jansen 2014, 129–42.
- Ribbeck, Otto. 1866. *Prolegomena Critica ad P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora*. Leipzig.
- . ed. 1895. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri I–VI<sup>2</sup>*. Leipzig.
- Richardson, Nicholas J. 1993. *The "Iliad": A Commentary*. Vol. 6, *Books 21–24*. General ed. G. S. Kirk. Cambridge.
- Scafoglio, Giampiero. 2010. *Noctes Vergilianae: Ricerche di filologia e critica letteraria sull'Eneide*. Hildesheim.
- Scaliger, J.-C. 1994–2011. *Poetices libri septem* (= *Sieben Bücher über die Dichtkunst*). Ed. Luc Deitz and Gregor Vogt-Spira. Stuttgart.
- Schironi, Francesca. 2010. *To Mega Biblion: Book-Ends, End-Titles, and Coronides in Papyrus with Hexametric Poetry*. Durham, NC.
- Schröder, Bianca-Jeanette. 1999. *Titel und Text: Zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften, mit Untersuchungen zu lateinischen Buchtiteln, Inhaltsverzeichnissen und anderen Gliedermitteln*. Berlin.
- Skutsch, Otto. 1985. *The "Annals" of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Theodorakopoulos, Elena. 1997. Closure: The Book of Virgil. In Martindale 1997, 155–65.
- Tombeur, Paul. 1997. Vocabulaire des titres: Problèmes de méthode. In Fredouille 1997, 559–79.
- Trinacty, Chris. 2012. The Manipulation of Juno's Μῆνις: A Note on Lucan's *BC* 9.505 and Silius Italicus' *Pun.* 12.284. *JCS* 37: 167–73.
- Ware, Catherine. 2015. Claudian's *Arma*: A Metaliterary Pun. *CQ* 65: 894–96.
- Weber, Clifford. 1987. Metrical *Imitatio* in the Proem to the *Aeneid*. *HSCP* 91: 261–71.
- . 1995. The Allegory of the Golden Bough. *Vergilius* 41: 3–34.
- Wendel, Carl. 1949. *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung*. Halle.
- West, Martin L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod: "Theogony"*. Oxford.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 2005. The Greek Novels: Titles and Genre. *AJP* 126: 587–611.
- Wigodsky, Michael. 1972. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden.
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Ziolkowski, Jan M. 2014. *Arma virumque cano*. In *The Virgil Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, ed. Richard F. Thomas and Jan M. Ziolkowski, 126–27. Chichester.
- Ziolkowski, Jan M., and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds. 2008. *The Virgilian Traditio: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*. New Haven, CT.