Trojan Restoration and the *Aeneid* in Horace *Odes* 3.3

Jonathan Wallis
University of Tasmania
Jonathan.Wallis@utas.edu.au

Abstract
This article argues that Juno's speech in Horace's *Odes* 3.3 includes a short series of programmatic allusions to Virgil's *Aeneid* that assist Horace in promoting the distinct identity of his own lyric poetry. Juno's speech asserts that Rome's passage to greatness depends on not 'rebuilding Troy'. Horace's allusions identify the motif of Trojan restoration as a central theme in *Aeneid*'s narrative, and, in a metapoetic sense, associate it pejoratively with the cultural performance of the epic itself in its canonical retelling of the Trojan story. In this way Horace uses Juno's speech strategically to characterise the *Aeneid* as decadent and regressive; by contrast Juno promotes moral restraint as a virtue that characterises Horatian lyric.

In the mid-20s BCE Rome's major poets were writing what would be the first truly 'Augustan' collections of verse. These texts – especially Horace's *Odes*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Propertius' third book – were inevitably artistic responses to Rome's new socio-political paradigm, the radical scope of which was by then becoming apparent. But these texts were also competitive advertisements between their respective genres for pride of place in giving voice to Rome's new cultural condition. This is especially evident in the 'lesser' genres of lyric and elegy. In their respective third collections, for instance, both Propertius and Horace allude competitively to each other, and to the epic tradition, with the aim of promoting a distinctly 'elegiac' or 'lyric' approach as the best way of making sense of an emergent Augustan reality.[1]

   This article makes two new claims in this literary context. First it argues that, in the speech he writes for Juno in *Odes* 3.3, Horace embeds a series of allusions that imply an awareness of key moments in the text of Virgil's then in-progress *Aeneid*. The second claim is that these allusions combine to circumscribe Virgil's Trojan project by associating it with motifs of repetition and regression. The result is tendentious yet perceptive commentary on the nascent epic serving a programmatic purpose for Horatian lyric. In his 'Roman Odes', and especially in Juno's prediction of destined Roman authority, Horace espouses a 'lyric' virtue of poetic and moral restraint – and part of this process lies in claiming difference from

---

[1] E.g. Keith 2008, 63; Wallis 2011, 121-123; Heslin 2015, 280-284.

a contemporary epic whose cultural significance Horace characterises as excessive and even unethical. The well-known 'political' polemic of *Odes* 3.3, I will argue, includes *literary* politics.

Foundational to the following discussion is the significance of Juno's warning at the end of her speech in *Odes* 3.3 that Rome's future prosperity is conditional upon the Romans having no desire 'to rebuild their ancestral city' (*Od*. 3.3.58-60). This is an enigmatic demand.[2] Scholarly consensus has moved away from speculation that behind Juno's warning lies any real concern that Augustus was considering moving the Roman capital to Alexandria, or even to a reconstructed Troy.[3] Instead, it is broadly accepted that Horace deploys Juno's traditional hostility to Troy to voice conservative Roman polemic about 'eastern' perfidy and decadence, where 'Troy' symbolises the moral failings of Rome's recent past and the corrupt condition that any 're-founding' of Rome must avoid.[4] Rome's moral leadership was certainly a live political issue in the fluid context of the young Augustan principate.[5] But it is significant that the implication of Trojan degeneracy in *Odes* 3.3 also falls within the self-conscious *literary* frame of lyric's competitive engagement with epic (this is not distinct from contemporary socio-political concerns so much as a function of these: at stake is cultural pre-eminence in the articulation of Rome's new condition). Michèle Lowrie (1997, 224-265) has demonstrated that *Odes* 3.3 heads a sequence of three deeply allusive poems which build the capacity of Horace's new Latin lyric by indicating and coopting epic authority (almost) without transgressing lyric's formal limits. For Peter Heslin (2015, 290) there results an overt opposition between lyric and epic in their engagement with cultural authority: in their public ambition, Horace's so-called 'Roman Odes' are presented as a direct alternative to the Augustan epic that the new *princeps* evidently desired. The following case study finds additional piquancy in these claims. Emphasising the poem's competitive socio-literary frame, I argue that Juno's polemic in *Odes* 3.3 includes the metapoetic effect of positioning its poet's moral voice against the ethics of composing an Augustan epic, especially one concerned with Rome's Trojan ancestry.[6] In particular, sophisticated allusion to the *concilium deorum* in what is now *Aeneid* 10 allows Horace to turn the dubious morality of Virgil's Trojans against Virgil's project itself. The 'excessive piety' (*nimium pii*, *Od*. 3.3.58) of those in Horace's poem who would seek to restore Rome's ancestral city offers a parallel for the way the literary ambition of Virgil's Trojan epic abandons Alexandrian restraint in seeking rivalry with Ennius and with Homer himself.

In a specific sense this article furthers our understanding of the 'Augustan reception' of the *Aeneid*. Scholarship on this topic typically focusses on texts written after Virgil's death, when the *Aeneid* has attained the shape and scope that we recognise today, and when allusions to the epic are both more numerous and more secure. In terms of Horace, for instance, it is well established that by the time of *Odes* 4 the *Aeneid* supplants the Homeric

---

[2] Or, perhaps, 'intentionally obscure': Oliensis 1998, 124.

[3] See e.g. discussion at Syndikus 2010, 199; Lowrie 1997, 247 n.30.

[4] See esp. La Bua 2013, 285-290; Lowrie 1997, 247; Commager 1962, 215-222. For an overview of explanations for Juno's edict based in the poem's historical background, see Nisbet & Rudd, 2004, 36-38.

[5] So in both the *Odes* and the *Aeneid* Troy is readily granted Augustan relevance as a symbol for the moral degradation of civil war, something which Augustus might correct: e.g. La Bua 2013, 288-289; Labate 2012, 217-220; Oliensis 1998, 109; Lowrie 1997, 246-247; Quint 1993, *passim*; Commager 1962, 215-222.

[6] Thus we should take seriously the possibility that Juno's caveat against Trojan restoration should include within its range of meanings a 'warning against rebuilding Troy *in poetry*' (Heslin 2015, 286, emphasis added).

and Ennian traditions for the purpose of representing an epic literature against which Horatian lyric can define itself (esp. Robinson 2006, 191-198; Feeney 2016). But the responses of contemporary poets to the *Aeneid* during its lengthy composition is relatively unexplored territory. The following discussion suggests that *Odes* 3.3 shows an early indication of what Robinson (2006, 196) terms the 'iconoclastic' attitude to the Virgil's epic that Horace will display in his later lyric verse. For instance, Robinson (2006, 192-194) argues that Horace's incorporation of Virgilian material in his patriotic *Carmen Saeculare* shows the lyric poet overtly 'sanitizing' the epic of ethically troubling elements – and we will find a very similar attempt to frame an opposition to the *Aeneid* in terms of (literary) morality in *Odes* 3.3. In a broader sense, this article is also an exploration of the resonances that accrue in a literary environment as interconnected as Rome's during the 20s BCE. The presence of competitive tension with the *Aeneid* in Horace's polemical mytho-epic vignette at *Odes* 3.3 attests further to the remarkable influence wielded by Virgil's epic, and offers deeper understanding of Horace's persistent efforts at professional self-definition.

1   Preliminaries: poets making early use of the *Aeneid*

There should be no doubt that Virgil's contemporary poets knew the *Aeneid* in some significant detail by the mid-20s BCE.[7] It is equally clear that these poets were already using Virgil's poem as a point of differentiation. The earliest and best-known interaction with the *Aeneid* is Propertius' 'announcement' of epic in the final poem of his second book:

> Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi,
>   Caesaris et fortis dicere posse ratis,
> qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma
>   iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.
> cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai!   65
>   nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.
>   Prop. 2.34.61-66

> Virgil has the capacity to tell the story of Actian shores under the protection of Phoebus, and of Caesar's brave ships, Virgil who now rouses the arms of Trojan Aeneas and the walls established on Lavinian shores. Make way, Roman writers, make way Greeks! Something greater than the *Iliad* is coming to birth.

This poem, published in 26/25 BCE, makes an overt display of contemporaneity with the *Aeneid*'s composition by presenting Virgil's project in the present tense (*nunc ... suscitat*, 63).[8] A growing consensus in scholarship suggests that, even at this early stage, Propertius is

---

[7] A culture of composition that involved sharing incomplete texts in social and literary networks all but ensured the early circulation of parts of the poem that would become the *Aeneid*: see White 1993; Starr 1987; Quinn 1982. There is an understandable lack of consensus about the extent of contemporary knowledge, but at one end of the spectrum it is not implausible that we should seek to interpret texts from the mid-20s BCE 'within a literary system that contains our *Aeneid*': Miller 2009, 76.

[8] The contemporaneity of Prop. 2.34 with the composition of the *Aeneid* is emphasised by Donatus in his derivative of Suetonius' lost Virgilian *Life*: *VSD* 100-105 (Hardie).

likely to have had sophisticated knowledge of the *Aeneid*'s structure and themes:[9] Propertius' six lines halve the total of the *Aeneid*'s twelve books,[10] and articulate (61-64) with fluent confidence the central thread in Virgil's poem that links Trojan myth and Augustan supremacy.[11] It is also clear that Propertius already knew several key episodes in Virgil's text. While it is not possible to speak conclusively for all the claimed allusions to the *Aeneid*, close reference does at least seem certain to the epic's two proems, in Books 1 and 7.[12] Significantly, in 2.34 Propertius (whether seriously or satirically) positions Virgil's poem as already a dominant cultural text – *cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai!* – and in his representation of the epic it is possible to see the elegist already positioning himself in terms of it. If Propertius did know well poem's thematic shape, for instance, it is striking that the love-poet omits mention of the considerable space given to *amor* in the *Aeneid* (especially so, given the subsequent emphasis on Virgil as an erotic poet in the summary of the *Eclogues*: Prop. 2.34.67-76). Donncha O'Rourke (2011, 473 and *passim*) makes the compelling argument that this omission can be seen as 'a strategic occlusion' by the elegist, part of a deliberate misreading of Virgil's poetic corpus that accords with what we recognise now as the dynamics of Bloomian 'anxiety' in the presence of an influential poetic predecessor.[13] By (mis)representing the *Aeneid* as primarily an Iliadic poem (*maius ... Iliade*, 66) that links mythic warfare (*Aeneae Troiani ... arma*, 63) with a conformist celebration of contemporary events (*Caesaris et fortis dicere ... ratis*, 62), Propertius is able to distinguish the significance of his own work as an erotic poet whose attitude to Augustan triumphalism is rather more ambivalent.[14]

The first of book of Horace's *Odes*, published some two years later in 23 BCE, presents similar self-definitional engagement with the *Aeneid* at an early stage in its composition. The opening two poems of the collection are addressed to Maecenas and Augustus respectively, while the third poem is addressed to a ship which (the poem claims) is carrying Virgil on a journey to Greece:

> sic te diua potens Cypri,
> sic fratres Helenae, lucida sidera,
>   uentorumque regat pater
> obstrictis aliis praeter Iapyga,
>   nauis, quae tibi creditum   5
> debes Vergilium; finibus Atticis

---

[9] O'Rourke 2011, 464-471, presents a thorough collation of probable Virgilian allusions in Prop. 2.34, as well as associated scholarship. More recently, see Heslin 2018, 227-258 (*passim*), for nuanced readings of Propertius in light of what the elegist might, or might not, have known about the progress of the *Aeneid*.

[10] Thomas 1996, 241-244.

[11] Cf. e.g. Horsfall 2006, xxvi, framing Propertius' insight as inspired guesswork.

[12] O'Rourke 2011, 466-471; Robinson 2006, 200-201; Cairns 2003. Cf. Heslin 2018, 220, for the reverse hypothesis that Virgil's Book 7 proem alludes to Propertius 2.34.

[13] See Bloom 1973. Bloom's operative term is 'poetic misprision', the conscious misreading by strong poets of other strong poets 'so as to clear imaginative space for themselves' (5). For the relevance to Bloomian theory to discussion of Prop. 2.34, see O'Rourke 2011, 458; for its relevance to the broader reception of Virgil in the (Roman) epic tradition, see Hardie 1993, 116-119.

[14] For reading a lack of Propertian enthusiasm about the coming *Aeneid*, see O'Rourke 2011, 473-487; Robinson 2006, 200-203. In sum, Propertius' characterisation of Virgil's career at 2.34.61-78 emphasises increasing difference after an early shared focus on erotic material.

> reddas incolumem precor
> et serues animae dimidium meae.
> Hor. *Od*. 1.3.1-8

> So may the goddess ruling over Cyprus, so may Helen's brothers, shining stars, and
> the father of the winds, confining all except Iapyx, guide you, ship – you that owe
> me Virgil, entrusted to your care – so that you deliver him unharmed to Attic shores,
> I pray, and that you keep safe the half of my soul.

In a poem concerning Virgil, the opening depiction of sea-faring offers a clear metaphor for
the composition of the *Aeneid* – a reference to the literary 'voyage' towards Homeric epic
that Virgil was undertaking at the time of Horace's poem.[15] The use of boats and sea-travel as
metaphors for poetic writing was widespread among the Augustan poets, not least in Virgil's
own poetry (e.g. *Geo*. 1.40, 303; 2.41-45). The presence of an epic metaphor is further
supported by patterned verbal and idiomatic borrowing from the *Aeneid* throughout the ode.[16]
Yet, assuming such an intertextual frame, it is striking that Horace links the bravery
necessary for 'sea-travel' with *audacia* and even a lack of *pietas* (*audax ... audax*, 25, 27;
impiae ... rates, 23-24); and that he ends the ode with a general meditation on the peril of
mortal ambition and over-reach:

> expertus uacuum Daedalus aera
>   pennis non homini datis;   35
> perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor.
>   nil mortalibus ardui est;
> caelum ipsum petimus stultitia neque
>   per nostrum patimur scelus
> iracunda Iouem ponere fulmina.
> Hor. *Od*. 1.3.34-40

> Daedalus attempted the empty air on wings not granted to a man; Hercules in his
> labours burst through Acheron. There is no such thing as difficulty for mortals; in
> our foolishness we seek the sky itself, through our crime we do not permit Jupiter to
> set aside his wrathful thunderbolts.

These lines have made this a difficult poem for many critics. In biographically-oriented (and
pre-Bloomian) criticism, it was typical to regard Virgil and Horace as close friends, and
much approval has been bestowed upon Horace's depiction of Virgil in this poem as *animae
dimidium meae* ('the half of my soul', 8).[17] For such readers, the ode's critical conclusion sits
uncomfortably.[18] Yet the negativity in *Odes* 1.3 is less about friendship than it is a conflation
of cultural pessimism and literary critique.[19] The (probably contrived) occasion of Virgil's
ocean adventuring allows Horace to voice the old-fashioned morality that will become a

---

[15] See esp. Robinson 2006, 188-191; also Pucci 1992 and 1991; Basto 1982; Kidd 1977;
Cairns 1972, 235; Lockyer 1967; Anderson 1966, 91; cf. Campbell 1987, 315 n. 3.
[16] See esp. Basto 1982, 34-37 and Kidd 1977, 98-101. Cf. Nisbet & Hubbard 1970, 44.
[17] See esp. Duckworth 1956; also Nisbet & Hubbard 1970, 48.
[18] E.g. Nisbet & Hubbard 1970, 45: 'the trite and unseasonable moralizing seems out of place
in a poem of friendship.' The monumental volume Fraenkel 1957 omits discussion of the
poem entirely.
[19] On links between 'boldness' and transgressive poetics in Horace, see Pucci 1991, 271-273.

feature of his *Odes*, and especially his 'Roman Odes' in Book 3. To the extent that Virgil's ship is also a metaphor for an epic composition, Horace's moralising tone frames the incipient *Aeneid* as symbolic transgression of Alexandrian aesthetic restraint. There is no personal polemic, here: Horace's first-person verbs at the poem's end (*petimus ... patimur*, 38-39) suggest that a charge of *audacia* might well apply to Horace's new project, as well.[20] But there is clear differentiation. The cherished phrase *animae dimidium meae* denotes a schism – in Pucci's florid paraphrase, 'a wholeness cut asunder' (1991, 267). As with Propertius' strategic portrait of Virgil's career in 2.34, here again we read two once-united figures represented as heading in different directions. Horace is ambitious, too, but on the moral spectrum of literary decorum the message is that the *Odes* are to be no *Aeneid*.

2 Horace's Juno and the Roman epic tradition

Exactly two books later, at *Odes* 3.3, I argue that the *Aeneid* (now in an epic pair with Ennius' *Annales*) again provides an ethical foil for Horace's statement of a lyric programme. Here the stakes are raised: as Odes 3 begins, lyric takes on epic as the genre *par excellence* for articulating Rome's potential for greatness.

The six 'Roman Odes' at the outset of Odes 3 invite comparison with epic in formal terms. Their unique metrical continuity gives these poems an overall coherence,[21] and underpins Horace's engagement with grand, national themes.[22] *Odes* 3.3 brings us to the middle of this sequence, and its particular engagement with tropes in the epic tradition is well accepted.[23] The ode presents at length a speech at a council of the gods, a signature set-piece of mythological epic;[24] the pretext for the speech (given here by Juno) is presented as the apotheosis of Romulus, a subject treated by Ennius at a *concilium deorum* in *Annales* 1;[25] and aspects of the poem's diction are recognisable as Ennian or Homeric.[26] Finally, Horace flags the concentration of 'un-lyric' material in this ode by concluding the poem in the conventional language of an Augustan *recusatio*:

> non hoc iocosae conueniet lyrae;
> quo, Musa, tendis? desine peruicax   70
>   referre sermones deorum et

---

[20] Robinson 2006, 190; Basto 1982, 33. The shared image of seeking the sky (*caelum ipsum petimus*, 1.3.38) recalls Horace's hyperbolic vision of striking the stars with his head in the final line of the collection's first ode (*sublimi feriam sidera uertice*, 1.1.36).

[21] For the gradual reduction in metrical variety (and so tendency towards a stichic genre like epic) across the *Odes* as a marker of Horace's increasing poetic *auctoritas*, see Oliensis 1998, 102-105.

[22] See the nuanced discussion of the political ambition of Horace's 'Roman Odes' at Lowrie 1997, 224-229.

[23] See Harrison 1993, 141-148 (= 2007, 184-188), for the central influence of epic, alongside panegyric from Greek lyric, and Roman stoic *sententiae*; see Bowditch 2001, 95-108, for the influence of tragedy.

[24] Cf. Lowrie 1997, 227-228, for the way Horace simultaneously 'stamp[s] a lyric identity' on the poem by presenting 'a single moment in lieu of an extensive start-to-finish narration'.

[25] Ennius frr. xxx-xxxiii Skutsch, with Ov. *Fast*. 481-511, *Met*. 14.805-828. See esp. Feeney 1984, 185-186; also Lowrie 1997, 247-248; Harrison 1993, 144. It is unknown whether Ennius' council included a speech by Juno.

[26] Harrison 1993, 144-145; Lowrie 1997, 247-248.

magna modis tenuare paruis.

　　　　But this will not suit the lighthearted lyre; what are you aiming at, Muse? Stop
　　　　wilfully reporting the deliberations of the gods, and belittling grand themes with tiny
　　　　measures.

The term *magna* ('grand themes', 72) – especially in juxtaposition with *sermones deorum* ('deliberations of the gods', 71) and opposed to the Callimachean verb *tenuare* ('belittle', 72) – is effectively Augustan shorthand for the epic *topoi* that Horace now signals to have characterised the speech in the foregoing poem.[27]

　　We have already seen Horace's programmatic antipathy to the 'epic' morality of Virgil's ocean voyage in *Odes* 1.3. When in *Odes* 3.3 Horace uses Juno's moral polemic to frame a selective interrogation of the epic tradition, it is reasonable to suspect that the lyric poet's attitude to the imminent *Aeneid* will resurface.[28] An obvious opportunity to explore this dynamic comes when Horace's Juno uses her acquiescence to Romulus' deification to insist that Rome's passage to greatness depends on never seeking to restore its ancestral Troy (*ne ... auitae tecta uelint reparare Troiae*, *Od*. 3.3.58-60). As many have noted,[29] this aspect of *Odes* 3.3 bears uncanny similarity to the moment of resolution in *Aeneid* 12 when Juno agrees to lay aside her campaign against Aeneas' Trojans so long as Jupiter ensures that Troy and the Trojan name stay fallen (*occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*, *Aen*. 12.828). But I will not start with this moment, not least because it remains uncertain which poet has influenced the other.[30] Instead I first examine several unexplored interactions with Virgil's epic that I claim Horace's poem contains – in particular, references to key moments in *Aeneid* 1, and to the council of the gods in *Aeneid* 10.

　　First of all there is Juno's anger. In *Odes* 3.3 Juno promises to 'give up her grievous wrath' (*grauis iras　... redonabo*, *Od*. 3.3.30-33), and this is usually linked with the affirmation by Virgil's Juno that she 'yields' to Jupiter's will in *Aeneid* 12 (*nunc cedo equidem*, *Aen*. 12.818), in the same speech with which Horace's Juno is associated in her warning against restoring the buildings of Troy. But the striking phrase *grauis ira* – or anything like it – does not appear in Juno's speech in *Aeneid* 12. Indeed, the phrase appears only once in the *Aeneid*, when Venus identifies the epic's compelling anger as belonging to Juno in Book 5 (*Iunonis grauis ira ... cogunt me*, *Aen*. 5.781-782). But anger does make an emblematic appearance at the very start of the epic, where Virgil reveals the 'unrelenting wrath' of Juno as the cause of Aeneas' trials and so the poem's narrative drive (*saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram*, *Aen*. 1.4). It is, of course, *this* anger that Juno promises to lay aside in the middle of *Odes* 3.3. Does Horace's Juno have in mind not the *Aeneid*'s ending

[27] So Harrison 1993, 147: 'Here we feel that the point is made too late and with some irony.'
[28] Lowrie (1997, 228) comments that *Odes* 3.3 is the first of three Roman Odes (3.3-5) which 'cover the range of available epic', and it is argued here that by 23 BCE this certainly should include the *Aeneid* in substantial form (Lowrie cites Homeric, Hesiodic, and Ennian epic).
[29] E.g. Stok 2016, 77; Heslin 2015, 286; Bowditch 2001, 96; Oliensis 1998, 124; Pani 1975, 69. Some refuse any direct connection between Virgil and Horace here by arguing that each poet derives his text independently from Ennius: esp. Feeney 1984, 186-187, endorsed by e.g. Labate 2012, 217; Nisbet & Rudd 2004, 36; Lowrie 1997, 247. For general discussion, see also Wigodsky 1972, 147-148; Commager 1962, 222, n. 122.
[30] Discussion of the striking correspondence between these texts resumes below. For a history of speculation as to whether Virgil influences Horace here or vice versa, see Wigodsky 1972, 147.

but rather its famous proem? Further suggestion that Horace is thinking of *Aeneid* 1 comes towards the end of the ode, when Juno closes her speech using the same identification as 'wife and sister' of Jove that she uses when closing her first speech in the *Aeneid* (*coniuge me Iouis et sorore*, *Od*. 3.3.64; cf. *Iouisque | et soror et coniunx*, *Aen*. 1.46-47).[31] As a starting point these two moments make a striking pair, and as such moments accumulate within the epic framing of 3.3 the circumstantial case for allusion will become increasingly cogent.[32] Most of all, the intertextual effect passes an initial test of interpretability. Certainly for many modern readers Horace's poem begs comparison with Juno's final speech in the *Aeneid*, the moment when goddess' wrath dissipates and Rome's future seems assured. But if Juno's speech in Horace (also, or instead) recalls the context of her first speech in Virgil, then we leave Horace's poem remembering the *Aeneid*'s beginning, with the narrative of Troy's destruction still ahead of us. Now it is less surprising that the Horatian stanza offering the echo of *Aeneid* 1 presents Juno precisely not setting aside her anger, but promising instead that Troy's disastrous fate will be re-experienced again, and again (*fortuna tristi clade iterabitur*, *Od*. 3.3.62).

We have already seen that Horace's setting at a council of the gods (*elocuta consiliantibus Iunone diuis*, *Od*. 3.3.17-18) links the poem with Ennius' *Annales* 1, where the gods debate the apotheosis of Romulus. But Horace's gesture is also worth pursuing in connection with the only divine council in the *Aeneid*. For one thing: Juno's speech in Horace's poem has only indirect connection with Romulus' deification (as is often noted),[33] but her obsesssion with the restoration of Troy in *Odes* 3.3 does cohere closely with the topic of debate in the council of the gods in *Aeneid* 10. This is how Horace ends Juno's speech:

> 'Troiae renascens alite lugubri
> fortuna tristi clade iterabitur,
>   ducente uictrices cateruas
>   coniuge me Iouis et sorore.
>
> ter si resurgat murus aëneus   65
> auctore Phoebo, ter pereat meis
>   excisus Argiuis, ter uxor
>   capta uirum puerosque ploret.'
>   Hor. *Od*. 3.3.61-68

The fortune of Troy, being renewed under evil omen, will be repeated with sad disaster, while I, the spouse and sister of Jupiter, lead the victorious armies. If her bronze wall should rise three times, three times it will fall, brought low by my Argives, three times will the captured wife weep for her husband and sons.

---

[31] This formulation derives ultimately from Homer (e.g. *Il*. 16.432, 18.356). The phrase appears only once in Latin before Virgil and Horace (Cic. *Nat. Deor*. 2.66: *Iunonis ... quae est soror et coniunx Iouis*) but many times subsequently. This self-identification by Virgil's Juno also attracted the attention of Ovid, who has his Juno quote her Virgilian self in a speech at *Met*. 3.265-266 (see Anderson 1997, 363-364, and esp. Prauscello 2008).

[32] Highet (1972, 270) presents a number of further possible correspondences with the *Aeneid* generally, some more convincing than others.

[33] E.g. Lowrie 1997, 225, 240; Williams 1969, 45.

It is provocative to compare what Juno says here with the way *Venus* speaks in Virgil's council, as she laments to Jupiter that renewed fighting in Italy threatens the Trojans' attempt to establish a new home:

> *Aeneas* ignarus abest. numquamne leuari　　　25
> obsidione sines? muris *iterum* imminet hostis
> *nascentis Troiae* nec non exercitus alter,
> atque *iterum* in Teucros Aetolis *surgit* ab Arpis
> Tydides.
>
> 　　　　　　　　　　Virg. *Aen*. 10.25-29

> Aeneas is absent and unaware. Will you never allow the siege to be lifted? Once again an enemy, a second army, threatens the walls of newborn Troy, and once again a son of Tydeus rises against the Trojans from Aetolian Arpi.

Now the correspondences accumulate more thickly. Juno repurposes Venus' emotive image of a 'newborn Troy' (*nascentis Troiae*, *Aen*. 10.27; *Troiae renascens ... fortuna*, *Od*. 3.3.61-62).[34] Diomedes reprising his Iliadic role in 'rising' against the Trojans in the *Aeneid* (*surgit*, *Aen*. 10.28) is inverted in Horace to become the rising of Troy's defensive walls (*resurgat*, *Od*. 3.3.65). Venus' rhetorical emphasis on iteration in the Trojan narrative (*iterum ... iterum*, *Aen*. 10.26, 28) is echoed by Juno's own emphasis on the repetition of Troy's destruction (*iterabitur*, *Od*. 3.3.62). Dare we sense the absence of Aeneas as *Aeneid* 10 begins (*Aeneas ... abest*, *Aen*. 10.25) in the bronze of Troy's defences that will provide no protection (*murus aëneus ... pereat*, *Od*. 3.3.65-65) against Juno's advancing Argives? The possibility is attractive, though I need not press the point: there is enough evidence yet to make a case that Horace's Juno seems to have 'heard' Venus speak. And this makes sense, of course. In Virgil's council Juno does hear Venus speak first, and there too she twists Venus' words and imagery from this same passage (*Troiam ... nascentem*, *Aen*. 10.74-75; *Aeneas ignarus abest*, *Aen*. 10.85).

The intertextual effect of reading this way is again significant. In the *Aeneid*, Venus's belief that the foothold that the Trojans have established in Italy represents the rebirth of Troy – and that the Italian fighting is a re-enactment of the Trojan War – is emblematic of a complex thread in the *Aeneid* which sees the Trojans risk entrapment in an endless cycle of repetition.[35] The significance of Horace's engagement with this theme is examined in the following section. But I note for the moment that, if Juno revoices the language of Venus' obsession within the argument of *Odes* 3.3, the antagonistic effect in *Horace's* poem is to mobilise a central motif of a contemporary text – its concern with Trojan restoration – on order to articulate the one thing that stands between Rome and greatness (*Od*. 3.3.57-60).

3　Trojan restoration in (and by) the *Aeneid*

My observations so far suggest that, insofar as Horace's poem does engage with the *Aeneid*, Horace frames the epic as a regressive counterpoint by using Virgil's text to articulate the Roman obsession with a Trojan past that receives Juno's censure in the ode. But, if this is true, what should we make of the remarkable affinity between Horace's poem and the

---

[34] With *renascens* and *resurgat*, Horace's addition of the prefix *re*– to Virgil's actions annotates their 'repetition' and 'reversal' in the new context of *Odes* 3.3.

[35] See esp. Quint 1993, 50-96; Anderson 1957.

Aeneid's ending? I noted above that readers who sense a link between the poems do so because in each text Juno 'links the future of Rome to the irretrievable pastness of Troy' (Oliensis 1998, 124). If part of Horace's purpose in *Odes* 3.3 is moral differentiation from Virgil's Augustan epic, then Horace appears to distinguish the two texts precisely where they seem most similar – in both poems, it is only when Troy is finally abandoned that the Roman dream can be realised.[36] Does my claim for Virgilian allusion require a misreading of the epic's narrative that goes well beyond the 'strategic occlusion' that O'Rourke has found in Propertius' early representation of the *Aeneid*?

Perhaps there is a chronological issue at play. It is possible that Horace's association of the *Aeneid* with the motif of Trojan restoration arises from the state of the epic, or the extent of Horace's knowledge of the epic, at the time *Odes* 3.3 was composed. Robinson (2006, 187) makes the point that, after Virgil appeared to signal his intention to write an 'Augustan' epic in the proem to *Georgics* 3, it would have been very easy for Virgil's contemporaries to jump to premature conclusions about the nature of the poem Virgil was writing in the 20s (which would certainly turn out to be different from the poem proposed in the *Georgics*).[37] Heslin (2015, 287) offers a timely reminder that, such is the *Aeneid*'s subsequent influence, it is difficult to think one's self back to a time when the poem was being written and not yet complete. Perhaps the reading of the *Aeneid* that Horace presents is not any 'deliberate misrepresentation' – but simply a misunderstanding? It is also worth noting that the similarity we see between the two poems was likely not yet a similarity when Horace wrote his poem. Duckworth (1956, 303) proposes that it was Juno's Trojan ultimatum in *Odes* 3.3 that inspired Virgil to compose his own Juno-speech for the final stages of the *Aeneid*.[38] Heslin (2015, 286) suggests that we see here the result of an allusive exchange between the two poets, where Virgil's Juno in *Aeneid* 12 alludes to *Odes* 3.3 in response to allusions in Horace's ode to *Aeneid* 1. In this circumstance, our reception of Horace's poem has embedded within it a tension that comes from engaging the *Aeneid* at two points in time in the same moment: one in the mid-20s, which suggests a difference in attitude (or a misunderstanding) relating to the place of Troy in Augustus' new Rome, and one brought about by the later 'completion' of the *Aeneid*, when the two texts have come closely into line.

But I propose a more compelling reading which accords with a symbolic antagonism to Virgil's programme that has been observed elsewhere in Horace's poetry.[39] Here I assume that if Horace has chosen to cite the *Aeneid* in the polemical context of Juno's speech and in a poem whose programme includes a serious statement of literary identity, then he will have been confident that he has represented the the epic in a way that – however reductive this presentation might also be – would remain necessarily recognisable and authentic once the epic was 'finished'. In *Odes* 3.3, the association of Trojan rebirth with the *Aeneid* might conflict with what Virgil's Juno demands as the epic ends, but it does accord with a deeper anxiety in the *Aeneid* about a cultural propensity in the Trojan narrative for endless retelling, and exposes a tension created by the epic's imminent existence with its own ostensible goal

---

[36] See further La Bua 2013, 288-289; Labate 2012, 217-220; Oliensis 1998, 109; Lowrie 1997, 246-247; Quint 1993, *passim*; Commager 1962, 215-222.

[37] The *Georgics* passage makes no mention of Troy, although Prop. 2.34.61-61 does offer an intermediary passage linking a Trojan narrative with the kind of celebration of Augustus's military victories that Virgil does appear to promise in *Georgics* 3.

[38] Cf. eg. Highet 1972, 270, for Virgil influencing Horace.

[39] Robinson 2006, 192-196.

of leaving Troy behind as a form of closure.[40] Broadly speaking, repetition of the Trojan past has a central programmatic role in the *Aeneid*, and is framed as such by the Cumaean Sibyl at *Aen*. 6.88-96.[41] In many instances, this repetition assists in resolving the epic's plot and thematic arc. Anderson 1957 demonstrated that the restaging of episodes from the Trojan War in Books 7-12 of the *Aeneid* presents a careful 'correction' of Homeric models such that Trojans (as future Romans) now emerge victorious. Quint 1993 has argued on a similar basis that the second half of the *Aeneid* represents a successful transition away from 'romance circularity' in Books 1-6, where repetition is associated with traumatic loss, victimisation, and death;[42] here, Anderson's 'repetition-as-reversal' in the second half of the epic becomes a psychological necessity that requires forgetting the past so that it can be undone.[43] At the same time, however, the *Aeneid* foregrounds a paradoxical fascination with revisiting the narrative of Troy's fall that cannot be (and was not) suppressed by the symbolic transformation of Aeneas' Trojans into Romans. Significant here is the way Virgil frames the principal narration of Troy's destruction in *Aeneid* 2 with an appeal to renewal.[44] At the end of Book 2, Aeneas' first act upon leaving the burning city is to turn and seek Troy again – precisely 'to renew' the experience of its sack (*stat casus renouare omnis*, *Aen*. 2.750). Aeneas' action will itself be repeated in the doomed attempts of the Trojans within the *Aeneid*'s narrative to 're-experience Troy' in the form of reconstructions. At the beginning of the Book 2, Aeneas' opening lament to Dido positions the ensuing story itself as already a renewal (*iubes renouare dolorem*, *Aen*. 2.3). In fact, for Aeneas himself (and for the poem's readers), this will be the second retelling of Troy's destruction in the *Aeneid*, the first coming when Aeneas views the narrative images in Carthage's temple of Juno in Book 1 (*Aen*. 1.456-493). Then, in Book 4, Dido will demand Aeneas repeat the story yet again (*Iliacosque iterum demens audire labores | exposcit*, *Aen*. 4.78-79). Such mannered repetition surely reflects a wider cultural phenomenon. Aeneas' initial return to the smoldering city foreshadows the fascination among Greco-Roman tourists with visiting the ruins of a historical Troy.[45] The epic's own many retellings evoke a Roman cityscape already resounding with the story of *Romana Pergama* amid renewed fascination with the idea of Rome as a 'new Troy'. The Trojan narrative, despite its moral paradoxes, is particularly embedded in Augustan ideology, and not least in the celebrated lineage of Augustus' adoptive *gens Iulia*.[46]

   Once Trojan 'renewal' (*renouare*) is recognised as an obsessive cultural act – and Virgil's own poem marks it as such – the allusive antagonism of Horace's Juno (*ne ... reparare*) looks askance not just at a Virgilian theme but at the significance of the *Aeneid* itself, whose destined-to-be-canonical retelling of the Trojan story represents and subsumes

---

[40] As observed presciently by Virgil's Juno at *Aen*. 7.294-296, the Trojans are essentially indestructible as a race – and therefore also as a thematic force, since the Trojan's very indestructibility will be inherited by the Romans: Feeney 2016, 301-303.

[41] Note that the Sibyl anticipates Venus' motif of iteration with a doubled *iterum ... iterum*: *Aen*. 6.93-94; cf. *Aen*. 10.26-28.

[42] Quint 1993, 50-96.

[43] So Anderson 1957, 18: 'By the beginning of Book VI, Aeneas knows that he must not re-create Troy'. See also Quint 1982; Skinner 2013, Rimell 2015, 39-62.

[44] Hardie 2012, 115.

[45] Hardie 2012, 115. See too Minchin 2012 on the iterations of Trojan narrative in Roman cultural memory, including the role of tourism.

[46] On the persistence and cultural awkwardness of Troy in 'official' Augustan narrative, see Stok 2016, 76-79; Pani 1975. On the development of Trojan imagery in Roman iconography during the mid-late Republic, see Rose 2008, 97-102.

within itself the many contemporary tellings of the same story. As we have seen, Propertius has already made it clear that Virgil is open to representation precisely as a poet 'reviving' Rome's Trojan narrative (*qui nunc Aeneae Troiani* <u>*suscitat*</u> *arma*, 2.34.63). Propertius, engaged in his own self-definitional discourse with the *Aeneid*,[47] refined this idea at the outset of his third book:

> omnia post obitum fingit *maiora* uetustas:
>   *maius* ab exsequiis nomen in ora uenit.   24
>   …
> nec non ille *tui casus memorator Homerus*   33
>   posteritate suum crescere sensit opus.
>   Prop. 3.1.23-24, 33-34

> After death antiquity fashions everything greater; after burial one's name comes greater onto the lips [...] Even Homer, the commemorator of your [*i.e.*, Troy's] fall, has felt his work increase through the passage of time.

The repetition *maiora ... maius* (3.1.23-24) evokes the *Aeneid* through renewed reference to the epic's second proem in Book 7 (*Aen.* 7.44-45; cf. *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, Prop. 2.34.66).[48] The presence of *Aeneid* informs the elusive citation that follows of Homer as 'the commemorator of Troy's fall' (*tui casus memorator Homerus*, 3.1.33): this likely conceals a further reference to Virgil – he will be the Roman Homer – not least because the fall of Troy is recounted in the *Aeneid*, and not in the *Iliad*. But here Propertius foregrounds the paradox of memorialisation in epic narrative: a powerful poem that narrates the fall of Troy is inevitably complicit in never allowing Troy actually to fall. Rather, as the text's renown increases through succeeding generations (*posteritate ... crescere ... opus*, Prop. 3.1.34), so Troy performs a cycle of restoration and ruin, as each reading of the text recalls the city to mind only to raze it to the ground. We are now, of course, very much in the space of iterated rebirth and destruction prophesied by Horace's Juno.

One further comparison brings Juno's prescription for Roman greatness in *Odes* 3.3 together with the divine speech in the *Aeneid* whose theme it most resembles: the famous prophecy of Roman dominion given by Jupiter in Book 1. In the *Aeneid*, Jupiter – speaking to Venus, the distraught mother of Aeneas – is at pains to emphasise Trojan continuity through the Julian line that descends from Aeneas' son Ascanius, more aptly known as Iulus (esp. *Aen.* 1.267-268). This approach reaches a mannered climax at the end of Jupiter's speech in the carefully ambiguous figure of 'Iulius Caesar',[49] whose Trojan lineage and terrestrial authority serves as symbols for Rome's own:

> nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
> imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
> Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.
>   Virg. *Aen.* 1.286-288

---

[47] Wallis 2018, 28-30.

[48] Robinson 2006, 201.

[49] Or 'Caesar, a Iulius': see O'Hara 1990, 155-163, on Virgil's 'deliberate ambiguity' (161) in suggesting both Julius Caesar and his grandnephew Augustus.

> There shall be born from this noble line a Trojan Caesar, who shall bound his authority at the Ocean, and his fame at the stars, a Julius, his name descended from great Iulus.

Virgil's emphatic juxtaposition of Troy and Roman power in Jupiter's speech differs notably from Horace's Trojan-free expression of the same theme in the voice of Juno:

> *qui*cumque mundo *terminus* obstitit,
> hunc tanget armis ...
> Hor. *Od*. 3.3.53-54

> Whatever limit bounds the world, this let her reach with her armies ...

Given Juno's antipathy to Troy, there is no surprise in itself that she does not reference Rome's Trojan ancestry – but this is not the whole story. Sufficient suggestion of Virgilian engagement (and especially with *Aeneid* 1) has now been seen in *Odes* 3.3 that we should feel willing to hear Juno acknowledging Virgil's Jupiter even as she offers her version of his Roman prophecy (*qui terminet*, *Aen*. 1.287; *quicumque … terminus*, *Od*. 3.3.53). In this context Juno's appropriation of Jupiter's prophecy becomes a signal act of differentiation in the same moment. Juno is silent on Troy on her own terms, certainly, but by bringing the two texts together Juno enables her silence to articulate her vision of Roman dominion as crucially different from Jupiter's – to draw attention, that is, to the way Jupiter (and the *Aeneid* more broadly) does implicate Roman *imperium* as the climactic iteration of a Trojan narrative.

But Juno's differentiation reflects Horace' own, of course, in the competitive context of Augustan cultural politics. By citing the *Aeneid* on the motif of boundaries, Horace links the thematic distinction between the two gods with a difference between genres when it comes to the ethics of narrating empire; and here we will recall Horace's programmatic pose in *Odes* 1.3, where he first described his and Virgil's sundered soul (*animae dimidium meae*). In both a political and cultural sense Roman imperialism was narrated through its relationship with boundaries in an often-paradoxical 'dialectic between expansion and enclosure'.[50] Rome's imperial genres of epic and lyric similarly engage with boundaries in central ways – but with differing emphases. In his *Odes*, Horace's aesthetic concern with control and containment is reflected in thematic terms by his frequent advocacy for moral restraint, and in formal terms by lyric's frequent metrical *fines*.[51] As such, the 'imperialism' of Horace's lyric project is expressed as thematised mastery of defined space – and this lyric ideology finds a voice at the heart of the 'Roman Odes' in Juno's prediction that Roman authority 'will reach' (but not exceed) whatever limit the world has (*quicumque terminus … hunc tanget*, 3.3.53-54).[52] Rome will rule all the earth, to be sure, but the paradoxical respect shown for the *terminus* in Juno's expression of Roman dominion underpins the moral restraint with which Juno (and Horace more generally) imbues description of the Roman character. By contrast, epic presents itself as a boundless genre. Jupiter's early assurance of Roman *imperium sine fine* rejects limitation in a programmatic sense: this is an edict that sees expression in the

---

[50] Rimell 2015, 29.

[51] Oliensis 1998, 107-112. This fusion of poetics and moral philosophy gives rise to 'a Callimachean ethics': Fowler 1995, 264.

[52] To similar effect Fowler (1995) ponders the expression of Roman expansion in the immediately preceding lines (3.3.45-52) as part of a containment exercise 'which restores boundaries rather than removing them'.

'indefinitely extendable'[53] form of the poem's hexametric metre, and in the trajectory of the poem's narrative whose logical 'end' in the proleptic visions of Augustan Rome in Books 6 and 8 render the poem's actual end in Book 12 no ending at all. Juno's citation of Jupiter in *Aeneid* 1 pointedly catches epic at just such a grandiose moment, where the verb *terminet* (1.287) is used with emphatic irony to 'limit' a dominion whose scope is (being) defined as *limitless*.[54] But for Horace, such 'epic' ambition – what a lyric poet can portray as its lack of restraint – symbolises an unethical quality in the genre and its discourse. In *Odes* 1.3, mankind's (implicitly epic) desire to cross the ocean was not just transgressive but therefore immoral, a journey undertaken in 'impious ships' (*impiae ... rates*, *Od*. 1.3.23-24), and so Horace cleared space on the moral highground for his new lyric project. In *Odes* 3.3, the comparative restraint in Juno's lyric prophecy similarly distinguishes itself from Jupiter's excessiveness, the 'immorality' of which is realised in Juno's paraphrase of (this) epic's discourse – in the 'excessive piety' of those wishing to restore ancestral Troy (*nimium pii ... auitae tecta uelint reparare Troiae*, *Od*. 3.3 58-60).

4   Conclusion

Horace begins his third lyric collection by adopting the guise of the Muses' priest (*Musarum sacerdos*, *Od*. 3.1.3). This complex moment completes a gradual transformation of the erstwhile personal poet into a suggestively (yet elusively) public figure implicated with both capacity and responsibility for addressing a Roman audience on matters of national ethics and morality.[55] In keeping with the other 'Roman odes' that proceed from this moment, *Odes* 3.3 draws upon the lyric poet's new civic status to advocate an idealised sense of Roman-ness[56] – and to demonstrate the suitability of the lyric genre in particular to perform such advocacy. In this programmatic context, *Odes* 3.3 is clearly not just or even mostly about the *Aeneid*. But we should be open to Horace's use of the *Aeneid* – a competing poem whose poet was also addressing questions of what it means to be Roman – as one of several tools to assist in the articulation of a distinctly lyric and 'Horatian' vision for the Roman state. The poem's cooption of epic speech, for instance, both signals and permits the embrace of 'grander' public themes while also elevating (rather than compromising) lyric's attachment to an individual voice and sense of occasion. Horace's specific engagement with Ennius frames the warning given by Horace's Juno as patriotism rather than pessimism.[57] But, whereas Ennius represents the outset of the Rome's epic tradition, in 23 BCE Virgil represents Roman epic in the present tense. The totalising narrative of Virgil's contemporary text provides Horace with the opportunity, if not the imperative, to foreground the ethic of control and restraint that characterises his new lyric voice even in its audacious appropriation of epic's public authority.

    To this end, I have argued that in *Odes* 3.3 Horace organises a short series of allusions to Virgil's poem into a coherent programme that distinguishes the approach taken by each poet to the theme of Roman refoundation under Augustus. In a simple sense the *Aeneid*'s presence

---

[53] Oliensis 1998, 107.

[54] That is to say: 'Same is the extent of Rome and of the world' (*Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem*', Ov. *Fast*. 2.684). The irony in Jupiter's use of *terminet* is reflected in the apt observation by Rimell (2015, 29) that the Augustan empire is envisaged as 'borderless sovereignty in which borders are fiercely policed'.

[55] Lyne 1995, 23-24, 160.

[56] La Bua 2013, 291.

[57] Lowrie 1997, 228.

in the poem is characterised by a regressive and decadent fascination with Troy as Rome's recurrent origin story. In stark contrast, Horace's lyric prediction of Rome's destiny is made of sterner stuff, unconcerned with eastern luxury but built instead upon the example of Ennian Romulus and unflappable Roman stoicism. But Horace's engagement with the *Aeneid* represents a bold act of lyric containment in itself. It is well known that the 'Roman Odes' (and *Odes* 3.3 in particular) seek equivalence with epic as a pre-eminent public artform. But, in doing so, *Virgilian* epic is diminished and subsumed. Already constrained in its thematic representation, the incipient *Aeneid* is reduced to a talking point in the (epic) speech of a rival poet.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, W. S. (1957). Vergil's Second *Iliad*. *TAPhA* 88, pp. 17-30.

Anderson, W. S. (1966). Horace *Carm*. 1. 14: What Kind of Ship? *CP* 61, pp. 84-98.

Anderson, W. S. (1997). *Ovid's Metamorphoses. Books 1–5*. Norman.

Basto, R. (1982). Horace's *Propempticon* to Vergil: A re-examination. *Vergilius* 28, pp. 30-43.

Bloom, H. (1973). *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*. New York.

Bowditch, P. L. (2001). *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley.

Cairns, F. (1972). *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.

Cairns, F. (2003). Propertius 3.4 and the Aeneid Incipit. *CQ* 53, pp. 309-311.

Campbell, J. S. (1987). *Animae dimidium meae*. Horace's tribute to Vergil. *CJ* 82, pp. 314-318.

Commager, S. (1962). *The Odes of Horace*. New Haven.

Duckworth, G. E. (1956). *Animae Dimidium Meae*: Two Poets of Rome. *TAPhA* 87, pp. 281-316.

Feeney, D. C. (1984). The Reconciliations of Juno. *CQ* 34, pp. 179-194.

Feeney, D. C. (2016). Horace and the literature of the past: lyric, epic, and history in *Odes* 4. In: Bénédicte Delignon, N. L. M., Olivier Thévenaz, ed., *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique: Les Odes d'Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque*, Lyon, Paris, pp. 295-312.

Fowler, D. P. (1995). Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics. In: Harrison, S. J., ed., *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford, pp. 248–266.

Fraenkel, E. (1957). *Horace*. Oxford.

Hardie, P. (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.

Hardie, P. (2012). Trojan Palimpsests. The Archaeology of Roman History in *Aeneid* 2. In: Farrell, J. & Nelis, D. P., eds. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford, pp. 107-123.

Harrison, S. J. (1993). The Literary Form of Horace's Odes. *Entretiens Hardt* 39, pp. 131-170.

Harrison, S. J. (2007). *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.

Heslin, P. (2015). *The Museum of Augustus. The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin poetry*. Los Angeles.

Heslin, P. (2018). *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil: Rivalry, Allegory, and Polemic*. Oxford.

Highet, G. (1972). *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.

Horsfall, N. (2006). *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Keith, A. M. (2008). *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London.

Kidd, D. A. (1977). Vergil's Voyage. *Prudentia* 9, pp. 93-103.

La Bua, G. (2013). Horace's East: Ethics and Politics. *HSPh* 107, pp. 265-296.

Labate, M. (2012). Constructing the Roman Myth. The History of the Republic in Horace's Lyric Poetry. In: Farrell, J. & Nelis, D. P., eds. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford, pp. 205-227.

Lockyer, C. W. (1967). Horace's *Propempticon* and Vergil's Voyage. *CW* 61, pp. 42-45.

Lowrie, M. (1997). *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1995). *Horace: Behing the Public Poetry*. New Haven.

Miller, J. F. (2009). *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.

Minchin, E. (2012). Commemoration and Pilgrimage in the Ancient World: Troy and the Stratigraphy of Cultural Memory. *G&R* 59, pp. 76-89.

Nisbet, R. G. M. & Hubbard, M. (1970). *A Commentary on Horace, Odes: Book I*. Oxford.

Nisbet, R. G. M. & Rudd, N. (2004). *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*. Oxford.

O'Rourke, D. (2011). The Representation and Misrepresentation of Virgilian Poetry in Propertius 2.34. *AJPh* 132, pp. 457-497.

O'Hara, J. J. (1990). *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.

Oliensis, E. (1998). *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.

Pani, M. (1975). Troia resurgens: Mito troiano e ideologia del principato. *AFLB* 18, pp. 65-85.

Prauscello, L. (2008). Juno's Wrath Again: Some Virgilian Echoes in Ovid, *Met*. 253-315. *CQ* 58, pp. 565-570.

Pucci, J. (1991). The dilemma of writing: Augustine, *Confessions* 4.6 and Horace *Odes* 1.3. *Arethusa* 24, pp. 257-281.

Pucci, J. (1992). Horace and Virgilian Mimesis: A Re-Reading of "Odes" 1.3. *CW* 85, pp. 659-763.

Quinn, K. (1982). The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age. *ANRW* 2.30.1, pp. 75-180.

Quint, D. (1982). Painful Memories: *Aeneid* 3 and the Problem of the Past. *CJ* 78, pp. 30-38.

Quint, D. (1993). *Epic and Empire*. *Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton.

Rimell, V. (2015). *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics. Empire's Inward Turn*. Cambridge.

Robinson, M. (2006). Augustan Responses to the *Aeneid*. In: Clarke, M. J., Currie, B.G.F., Lyne, R.O.A.M., ed., *Epic Interactions*, Oxford, pp. 185-216.

Rose, C. B. (2008). Forging Identity in the Roman Republic: Trojan Ancestry and Veristic Portraiture. In: Bell, S. H., Inge Lyse, ed., *Role Models in the Roman World. Identity and Assimilation*, Michigan, pp. 97-131.

Skinner, M. B. (2013). Troy and trauma in the *Aeneid*. In: Donald Lateiner, B. K. G., Judith Perkins, ed., *Roman Literature, Gender and Reception*, pp. 40-52.

Starr, R. J. (1987). The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World. *CQ* 37, pp. 213-223.

Stok, F. (2016). Il mito di Troia resurgens. *Le figure del mito in Properzio: Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Propertius, Assisi-Bevagna 30 May - 1 June 2014*, Turnhout, pp. 73-91.

Syndikus, H. P. (2010). The Roman Odes. In: Davis, G., ed., *A Companion to Horace*, Chichester/Malden, pp. 193-209.

Thomas, R. F. (1996). Genre through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius. In: Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R.F. & Wakker, G.C., ed., *Theocritus*, Groningen, pp. 227-246.

Wallis, J. A. C. (2011). Marriage and the Elegiac Woman in Propertius 3.12. *Ramus* 40, pp. 106-129.

Wallis, J. A. C. (2018). *Introspection and Engagement in Propertius. A Study of Book 3*. Cambridge.

White, P. (1993). *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, Mass.

Wigodsky, M. (1972). *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden.

Williams, G. (1969). *The Third Book of Horace's Odes*. Oxford.